



Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Purchased by the
Mrs. Robert Lenox Kennedy Church History Fund.

ER 142 .B8 1896
Bright, William, 1824-1901.
The Roman see in the early
Church

yes
1 2 5

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

WAYMARKS IN CHURCH HISTORY.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MORALITY IN DOCTRINE. Crown 8vo.

7s. 6d.

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE
GREAT FATHERS, St. Athanasius, St. Chry-

sostom, and St. Augustine. With Appendices.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE
POWER. Crown 8vo. 6s.

HYMNS AND OTHER VERSES. Small
8vo. 5s.

IONA, AND OTHER VERSES. Small 8vo.
4s. 6d.

LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM EC-
CLESIAE ANGLICANÆ. A GULIELMO
BRIGHT, S.T.P., Ædis Christi apud Oxon. Canonico,
Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, Professore Regio, et PETRO
GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Eccles. Cath. S. Albani
Canonico Honorario, Collegii Universitatis apud
Oxon. Socio Seniore. Latine redditus. *Editio*
Quarta, cum Appendice. *With Rubrics in red.*
Small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

THE ROMAN SEE
IN
THE EARLY CHURCH
AND
OTHER STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

THE ROMAN SEE
IN THE
EARLY CHURCH

AND OTHER STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

BY
WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, AND CANON OF
CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

1896

All rights reserved

TO THE MOST REVEREND
WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, D.D.,
LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
THESE PAGES ARE, WITH HIS PERMISSION,
RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED
BY A SON OF HIS METROPOLITICAL CHURCH.

PREFACE

THE first and longest of the following essays is a recension and expansion of two articles on the Rev. Luke Rivington's volume, "The Primitive Church and the See of Peter," which were contributed to the "Church Quarterly Review" for October, 1894, and January, 1895.¹ The third is a combination, with some abridgment, of certain articles on Alexandrian patriarchs of the fifth century, which may be found in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography." Thanks are due to the Editor of the "Church Quarterly Review," and to Mr. Murray, for courteous

¹ As in the postscript to the second article, due notice has here been taken of a pamphlet published by Mr. Rivington under the title, "A Reply to the Church Quarterly Review."

permission to reprint what has already appeared in the "Review" and in the "Dictionary."

The second paper may serve as a companion sketch to "The Episcopate of St. Basil" in the writer's "Waymarks in Church History." The fourth, fifth, and sixth were originally written for a "Summer Meeting of Clergy" at Oxford.

CHRIST CHURCH,

February 29, 1896.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH . . .	I
II. ST. AMBROSE AND THE EMPIRE	214
III. ALEXANDRIA AND CHALCEDON	254
IV. THE CHURCH AND THE "BARBARIAN" INVADERS	310
V. THE CELTIC CHURCHES IN THE BRITISH ISLES.	357
VI. THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH	422
ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE SIXTH NICENE CANON	481
INDEX	485

ERRATA.

Page 2, note 1, *dele* "St."

„ 146, note 2, *for* "ἡμετεργα" *read* "ἡμετέργα."

„ 229, line 11, *for* "Mercurius" *read* "Mercurinus."

„ 282, line 21, *for* "Acacias" *read* "Acacius."

„ 372, note 3, *for* "xxvi." *read* "xxvii."

„ 395, note 2, *for* "637" *read* "367."

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

IT would be a pleasant task to dwell on the many splendid pages—in a true sense, profitable for edification—which ennoble the long record of the greatest of Christian bishoprics. English Churchmen can never forget what they owe to him who for years kept the heathen Angles in his heart before he sent Augustine to inaugurate their Christianity. And looking far beyond the area of merely national obligation, we see in St. Clement how the spirit of love can fuse itself with the spirit of order: we think of the brotherly tolerance of Anicetus, of the fatherly kindness of Soter, of the far-reaching benevolence and theological ability of Dionysius, of the martyrdoms of Telesphorus, Fabian, and Sixtus II. We remember the fidelity of Julius to the cause of faith as impersonated in St. Athanasius, and of Innocent to the cause of righteousness as impersonated in St. Chrysostom. We think of Leo I. as preaching sermons full of

Christ—as expounding the doctrine of the Incarnation with luminous force and “absolute balance”—as delivering Rome, by the majesty of his serene courage, from the savage Hun and the ruthless Vandal. We know what Christendom owes to some of the great mediæval pontiffs, and what examples of episcopal virtue have been set by several of their later successors. But the tasks of history are not always pleasant; admiration, reverence, gratitude, are not the only feelings which they evoke; and so it is that, in considering the historical position of the see of Rome during the early centuries, we are immersed, whether we like it or not, in an atmosphere charged with controversy—and that, a controversy simply inevitable while the Roman Church continues to be what it is. Her members, if they argue at all, are constrained to claim primitiveness for that Papal autocracy which is now the very basis of their whole system: they may adopt the phrases of a “theory of development,”¹ but they must contend for

¹ Mr. Rivington, in his preface to “The Primitive Church and the See of St. Peter,” tells us that the “papacy” of the first five centuries is to the present papacy as the acorn is to the oak, as the child is to the grown man; and he claims the authority of Vincent of Lerins (c. 23). But there is development—and development: forms of expression may be enlarged or

the propositions laid down by Pius IX. in the decree *Pastor Æternus*, and "approved" (whatever that may mean) by the "sacred Vatican Council," on the two main points of the Papal jurisdiction and the Papal "*magisterium*" or teaching office; and this decree explicitly appeals to "the ancient and constant faith of the Church Universal, the tradition received *a fidei Christianæ exordio*," as attesting¹ (1) the right of the

improved, new inferences made from Scripture, new arguments employed,—and, further, new light may be thrown (*e.g.* by controversy) on old beliefs, and the bearings and aspects of Christian truth may be, as Vincent's Commonitory puts it, "more clearly understood, more exactly represented, more intelligently believed" (*cp.* Sir W. Palmer, *Doctr. of Development and Conscience*, pp. 148, 167, 200, 203, etc.). But Vincent not only forbids "mutilation," he excludes also the "addition" of "superfluous" or "alien matter:" "*Nihil de germinis proprietate mutetur*," "*ut cum dicas nove, non dicas nova*." In his illustration from bodily growth, it is the same flesh that has expanded; no new substance has come in to swell it out: whereas we contend that the papal monarchy, like other elements of the Roman system, is "alien" from the original type of Church life. It is not meant that the "alien" ideas found nothing in primitive Christianity to take hold of: the familiar phrase, "Roman corruptions," implies the contrary. What is meant is that unprimitive ideas came in and acted as a leaven, touching this or that primitive element, giving it a onesided and unhealthy exuberance, producing a fermentation which disturbed the proportion of the *credenda*. After all, then, the question recurs: Was a papacy part of the original Christianity?

¹ It would be a bold proceeding to accept these dogmas and reject the assertions made by the same authority as to their substantial primitiveness.

bishop of Rome to a universal jurisdiction, which is at once "plenary, supreme, ordinary, and immediate," and also (2) his infallibility when "defining, *ex cathedra*, a doctrine on faith or conduct, as to be held by the Church Universal," insomuch that such definitions are "irreformable" in virtue of their intrinsic authority, "and not in virtue of the assent of the Church." It is true that this infallibility is not identified with a permanent "inspiration," and is described as being the same with which Christ "willed His Church, when so defining, to be endowed;" and that, to the disappointment, at the time, of some Papalist enthusiasts, it was resolved to abstain from defining more precisely the scope of the Church's infallibility, and thereby of the Pope's, or the relation of the one to the other.¹ But the

¹ "W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival," p. 261. We are told, somewhat triumphantly (Rivington, Concl.), that Père Gratry, in prospect of death, accepted the Vatican decree, with the explanation that what he had feared and opposed was a definition of infallibility as "personal," whereas the decree on *magisterium* spoke only of infallibility official, or *ex cathedra*. But in his "Second Letter to the archbishop of Malines," he had dwelt on the fact that the theory of infallibility as held by Bellarmine, and before him by Melchior Cano, was supported by forgeries, and was therefore untenable. Now both these writers disclaimed what they considered the extreme view (as held by Albert Pighius) of an extra-official or *purely* personal infallibility; and it is the theory which they actually held which by the Vatican decree is made *de fide* for Romanists. *E.g.* Cano's

language, as it stands, is sufficiently explicit for our purpose ; and it is obvious that no view of Papal authority which falls short of it,—for instance, which reduces that authority to “an office of inspection or direction,” to a presidency in General Councils, or to an enforcement of the decrees of such Councils,—or which makes the Papal voice the mere organ of the collective episcopate,—is now within the lines of Roman orthodoxy. The Papal claims stand out before us as formulated in the Vatican decree. Evidence, therefore, which does not profess to prove the validity of those claims—precisely of *those*, and of no others, whether wider or narrower—makes nothing for the Roman arguer’s purpose: it must be simply put aside as irrelevant to the discussion. Premising, then, that in this discussion the terms “Pope,” “Papal,”

conclusion is “that the supreme pontiff, when pronouncing about the faith” “from the apostolical tribunal,” “cannot err,” see Cano de Eccl. Rom. Auct. c. 4, 5, 8 ; and so Bellarmine, De Rom. Pont. iv. 3, that “when teaching the whole Church, he can nowise err in things pertaining to the faith.” This is precisely what Mr. Rivington is bound to maintain. Gratry’s explanation, therefore, was hollow, and his submission was doubtless obtained under a threat of refusal of sacraments. That a certain “historical introduction to the decree,” designed to reassure certain minds by recognising the consultative function of the Church as preparatory to a papal definition, was not published until twenty years later (“W. G. Ward, etc.,” p. 262), is very characteristic of Roman policy.

or "Papacy" will be used in the sense of the Vatican Council, and in no other, let us ask three questions, to every one of which a Roman advocate must return—not by simple assertion, but by distinct adequate proof¹—an affirmative reply. (A.) Did St. Peter act as "the Pope" of the Apostolic Church? (B) Was he himself bishop of Rome? (C) Were the bishops of Rome the acknowledged "Popes" of the primitive or ancient Church?

A.

The first of these queries may surely be dealt with by simply referring to the Acts of the Apostles, to the passages in St. Paul's letter in which "Peter" or "Cephas" is mentioned,² and,

¹ But Mr. Rivington's readers have fair warning as to his own historical criteria. History is to be read "as the Catholic Church" (*i.e.* in effect, the pope) "gives it to us, placing its key in our hands" (p. 148).

² Mr. Rivington's adventurous appeal (Reply to Ch. Qu. Rev. p. 6) to St. Paul's mention of the "head," when he is illustrating Christians' interdependence by the members of a human body (1 Cor. xii. 15-26), may be disposed of by observing that this parallelism runs through seven verses before "head" and "feet" are mentioned together; and that when St. Paul comes to apply it, he mentions, as "set by God in the Church, first, apostles" in the plural. As for the *a priori* assumption (put forward as self-evident by Cardinal Vaughan in his introduction to Mr. Rivington's volume) that the visible Church, as a body, *must* have a single visible head, it obscures a leading feature of

last but not least, to the letters of St. Peter himself. These will show that neither the Apostles as a body, nor the "rock-like" Apostle himself, regarded the sayings, "Thou art Peter," etc. "Strengthen thy brethren," "Feed My lambs, My sheep," as making him, in one word, a Pope. That he was, during our Lord's ministry, the

Christian supernaturalism, by treating the visible Church as complete in itself, like any temporal society; whereas St. Paul, by speaking repeatedly and emphatically of our Lord Himself as "the Head," and never once even hinting at any vicarial headship on earth as attaching to one of the three who "were regarded as pillars" (Gal. ii. 9), lifts up our view of the visible Church into a far higher and more spiritual atmosphere, and represents it as only the smaller part of a great whole, which extends through the worlds seen and unseen, but has its true vital centre in the living and invisibly present Christ. In regard to another passage in the same epistle, it is for Papalists to explain how a "Christ-party" could have been set up against a "Cephas-party" if Peter had been acknowledged to be Christ's representative. In the epistle to the Galatians, even the rebuke addressed by St. Paul to St. Peter at Antioch is less significant than St. Paul's pointed disclaimer of any obligation to, or dependence on, his seniors in the apostolate. He expressly intimates that after his original mission he allowed three years to pass before he "went up to visit Cephas" (R.V.)—a phrase which indicates no more than the natural desire to become acquainted with so eminent a member of the original apostolic company. And he takes care to protest that he derived "no new information" as to his apostolic duties from any of *οἱ δοκοῦντες* at Jerusalem, among, not above whom, he ranks St. Peter. This would have been simply impossible if the "revelation" which he had received had taught him to regard his host of a fortnight as "the visible head" of the Church, the supreme medium of communication with her Lord.

spokesman of his colleagues, the typical Apostle, and that he retained—to some extent in partnership with St. John—a kind of leadership, at any rate during the period extending to the Council of Jerusalem, is undisputed ; but out of such a prominence, or “hegemony,” a Papacy cannot emerge by any process of rightful derivation : and in the Apostolic period it certainly did not exist. We find St. Paul appointing Timothy and Titus as—in the first instance—*his* delegates : we find nothing like this in regard to St. Peter, who himself gives not the faintest hint of any consciousness of any such office as Papalism assigns to him. This is not a mere argument *ex silentio* ; if St. Peter had been, by Christ’s commission, His unique Vicar, the monarch and oracle of the growing Church, a polity so simple and intelligible must have found expression in Apostolic writings, and could not have been ignored by the “Vicar” himself.

B.

The second question sends us, in the first place, to the letters written by St. Paul during his two Roman “imprisonments,” in none of which is there the faintest reference to St.

Peter. Next, let us look to post-Apostolic writers who were in the best position for knowing whether St. Peter had acted as local chief pastor of the Roman Church, in the sense of occupying its see. St. Clement, whom we may assume to have held such an office,¹ and to have written the letter of the Roman Church to the Corinthian, commonly called his epistle, simply ranks St. Peter with St. Paul in Apostolic endurance and martyrdom :² St. Ignatius implies that they both spent some time at Rome, and gave Apostolic injunctions :³ Dionysius of Corinth, also addressing the Roman Church, speaks to the same effect, adding that both were martyred in Italy : and Caius, about A.D. 200, says that their tombs were shown at Rome.⁴ But Irenæus is more explicit : he ascribes the “foundation” of the Roman Church,—evidently in the sense of settlement,—to the two Apostles Peter and Paul, and then says that they “entrusted Linus with the ministry of the episcopate.”⁵

¹ Cf. Bishop Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, i. 69, 81.

² *Clem. Ep. ad Cor.* 5. He takes both as samples of “pillars” of the Church.

³ *Ign. ad Rom.* 4.

⁴ *Ap. Euseb.* ii. 25. Cf. *Bp. Westcott*, on the Canon of N.T. 187, ed. 4.

⁵ *Iren.* iii. 3. 3. The verb (*ἐνεχείρισαν*) happens to be the one which St. Chrysostom uses (in *Act. Hom.* 33. 2) as to the

Would such language be natural in one who believed that this "episcopate" had first been held by Peter? Irenæus adds that "Linus was succeeded by Anencletus" (in the Latin version, Anacletus); "and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement received the episcopate." Here, then, the phrase "from the Apostles" excludes either Apostle from the "episcopal" list. It is true that in two passages, as quoted by Eusebius,¹ bishop Hyginus is reckoned as ninth in the list, which implies either that one of the two Apostles was the first bishop, or that the "duplication" of Anencletus and Cletus was as old as Irenæus' time, which, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, is an "untenable solution."² But against the word "ninth" in these quotations may in all reason be set the definite catalogue of twelve Roman bishops given by Irenæus in the

appointment of St. James to the bishopric of Jerusalem, which no one imagines any apostle to have previously held.

¹ Iren. i. 27. 1; iii. 4. 3, ap. Euseb. iv. 11. The succession, omitting Peter, was (according to Irenæus) 1. Linus; 2. Anencletus; 3. Clement; 4. Euarestus; 5. Alexander; 6. Xystus (or Sixtus), whom Irenæus expressly calls "sixth from the apostles" in iii. 3. 3; 7. Telesphorus; 8. Hyginus; 9. Pius; 10. Anicetus; 11. Soter; 12. Eleutherus, who, says Irenæus, "now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, holds the office of the episcopate." After Eleutherus came, 13. Victor; 14. Zephyrinus; 15. Callistus.

² St. Clement of Rome, i. 204.

third chapter of his third book, according to which Hyginus is eighth bishop, Linus being first of all. The Latin version of Irenæus reads "eighth" in the second passage, and Stieren considers that it originally read "eighth" in the first passage also. On the whole, then, it is clear that the "Petrine episcopate" receives no attestation from Irenæus, who had sojourned and studied at Rome: in his view, St. Peter and St. Paul established the see of Rome, and made Linus its first occupant. Some twenty years later, at the end of the second century, Tertullian, while still a Catholic, wrote a treatise, the title of which may be described as "a plea in bar of the claim of heretics (to represent authentic Christianity)."¹ Here he differs from Irenæus by reckoning not Linus or Anencletus, but Clement, as coming next after St. Peter, "*Clementem a Petro ordinatum.*" But the context shows that he did not regard Peter as the first bishop:² for he is referring to the episcopal lists in various Apostolic churches, as running up to some "first bishop," "appointed and preceded

¹ Tertull. de Præscr. Hær. 32.

² Bishop Lightfoot, indeed, says that Tertullian here "presumably regards Clement as the apostle's own successor in the episcopate" (St. Clement of Rome, i. 344). But the context is against this "presumption." See Dict. Chr. Biogr. i. 577.

by an Apostle or an Apostolic man ;”¹ and the relation of Clement to St. Peter is paralleled by the relation of Polycarp to St. John, so that, as far as this passage goes, St. Peter was no more bishop of Rome than St. John was bishop of Smyrna. There is, indeed, another point of difference between Irenæus and Tertullian : the former links Peter with Paul ; the latter speaks of Peter only, and in such a way as to suggest that he had got hold of a story which—perhaps at a later period²—was embodied in the spurious “Epistle of Clement to James” (*i.e.* the Lord’s “brother,” first bishop, as we call him, of Jerusalem), to the effect that Peter, at the close of his own life, laid his hands on Clement and made

¹ See Pearson, *Minor Works*, ii. 373, that such a first bishop might be called “successor apostoli in ea ecclesia.”

² Rufinus, in the preface to his translation of the Pseudo-Clementine “Recognitions,” says that he “has not prefixed to this work the letter in which Clement informs James that Peter ‘se reliquerit successorem cathedræ et doctrinæ suæ,’ because it is of later date, and he had long ago translated and edited it” (Cotelerius, *Patr. Apost.* i. 492). But Rufinus, at the end of the fourth century, may have been mistaken as to the date of the “letter ;” and even if it had only come to Rome with the “Recognitions” (*i.e.* as Salmon would suppose, about A.D. 200–210), the statement that “Peter placed Clement in his own chair” might well have been current in some “first draft” of the story. It is therefore needless to discuss the relation of the “Recognitions” to the Dialogue on “Laws of Countries” by a disciple of Bardesanes, as to which Hort and Salmon differ (*Dict. Chr. Biogr.* i. 258, 577). Cp. Lightfoot, i. 414.

him bishop. Tertullian does not, as we have seen, *say* that Peter had been bishop, but rather implies the contrary: and even if this singular forgery had been extant and had been read by him, he might not have taken literally its assertion that Peter seated Clement "in *his own* chair." However, the one statement, that Peter ordained (*i.e.* consecrated) Clement, was adopted by Tertullian; and, as to the Petrine episcopate, we can easily understand that, apart from the "letter" as it stands, or even apart from the Ebionitish Pseudo-Clementine literature in its developed forms, some earlier form of the story about Peter and Clement might have reached the West in the latter part of the second century,¹ and two lines of feeling would popularise it at Rome. Peter, as "the first" Apostle,

¹ Salmon (*Infallibility of the Church*, p. 360) says that the real inventor of the story of Peter's Roman episcopate was an editor of the Clementine romance. Bishop Moorhouse contends that the substitution of Clement for Linus as first bishop "after" Peter, with the omission of Paul's name, which Irenæus had associated with Peter's, and the inclusion (more or less explicit) of Peter in the episcopal list, amounted to such a divergence from the older Roman tradition as "the Clementine fiction" alone can account for (see *Guardian* of April 24, 1895). Dr. Bigg holds that the Ebionitish "Homilies" were a recension of an orthodox work, which "contained the Clement legend," and came into existence about 200. But he dates this recension in the fourth century (*Studia Biblica*, ii. 188 ff.).

and the converter of "Roman sojourners" at the great Pentecost, would be thought of as in his own person *the* appropriate organiser¹ of the "first" in importance among Churches: and the name of Clement would loom much larger in the view of Roman Church-people than that of Linus or of Anencletus; hence a welcome would be given to the account (however obtained) which brought Peter and Clement close together, as the consecrator and the consecrated. From this point it would be a short step to make St. Peter actually the first Roman bishop; he is so regarded in the "Chronicle of Hippolytus," as restored by Bishop Lightfoot,² although a different view is implied in the passage quoted by Eusebius from the "Little Labyrinth," written probably by a Roman presbyter;³ and St. Cyprian is naturally understood in this sense when he calls the Roman see "the chair of Peter," and the "place" vacated by a deceased Roman bishop

¹ It was not in the least necessary, in order to this result, that an actual supremacy, a monarchical power over the apostles and the whole Church, should be attributed to St. Peter.

² Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, i. 264.

³ Euseb. v. 28. Victor is reckoned as "thirteenth bishop from Peter." The author could hardly be Hippolytus, but might well, as Salmon suggests, be Caius (*Dict. Chr. Biogr.* iii. 98).

as the *locus Petri*.¹ Can we wonder that a tradition grew up in the West, extending itself also into the East, on the basis of a statement which possessed such attractions as to obscure its highly suspicious connection with a copious Ebionitish romance, or that in minds, like so many in the West, unsuspecting of masked heresy, the fictitious story of Clement's adventures, as it became current, should establish the notion of Peter's episcopate and Clement's immediate succession, until, at the end of the fourth century, Jerome could assert the one with a detail as to its twenty-five years' duration, and speak of the other as believed by "most of the Latins"?² But it has been boldly suggested³ that a contemporary of Irenæus may probably have handed down the fact of the Petrine episcopate; *for* it is asserted in the "Chronicle" of Eusebius, and Eusebius in his "History" quotes from the "Memoranda" of Hegesippus, to the effect that, "while staying at

¹ Cypr. Ep. 59. 14 and 55. 8 (ed. Hartel). He also reckons Hyginus as *ninth* bishop (Ep. 74. 2).

² De Vir. Illustr. 1, 15. Cp. Adv. Jov. i. 12, "Clemens successor apostoli Petri." The "twenty-five years" of Peter's "episcopate" appear in the Liberian catalogue (A.D. 354). Lightfoot thinks that twenty-five "might have been adopted as a convenient round number" (St. Clement, i. 283).

³ Rivington, p. 177.

Rome, he had made out a list of the succession of bishops down to Anicetus, and that, when he wrote, Eleutherus was in the see."¹ But the extract makes no reference to Peter; and if the context had affirmed his episcopate, Eusebius could hardly have passed over so important an affirmation. As it is, in the History, Eusebius describes the Apostle's relation to the Roman Church without hinting that he became its bishop,² whereas St. James's episcopate at Jerusalem is repeatedly asserted.³ Eusebius, in fact, expressly mentions Linus as "the first to receive the episcopate of the Roman Church after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter,"⁴ language which explains the briefer phrase, "first after Peter," in a passage somewhat further on.⁵

¹ Ap. Euseb. iv. 22. The extract does not in the slightest degree indicate any notion of a generic and essential superiority in importance of the Roman over other "successions."

² Euseb. ii. 14 (where Peter's pre-eminence is accounted for by his "courage").

³ Ib. ii. 1, 23; iii. 5, 7; vii. 19.

⁴ Ib. iii. 2. Literally, "the first to have the episcopate . . . assigned to him." Mr. Rivington remarks that "we should say that Henry III. was the first king of England after John, meaning to include John amongst the kings" (Prim. Ch. etc., p. 19). We *should* say so, no doubt, after saying that John was one of the kings. Only, in the History, Eusebius does *not* say that Peter was one of the Roman bishops.

⁵ Mr. Rivington says that in this passage Eusebius "speaks

Yet further, he ranks Clement as "third of those who had acted as bishops after both Paul and Peter."¹ Now, before going further, let us observe that, on the Papal hypothesis, the episcopate of St. Peter at Rome was a fact of absolutely unique significance for all Christians; a fact, therefore, on which the "father of Church history" must surely have spoken with unequivocal distinctness and emphasis, instead of leaving it to be read into such a phrase as "from" or "after the Apostles."² Nor can we, on this showing, explain why Eusebius records the Roman successions in the same quiet matter-of-fact style that he employs as to the Alexandrian and Antiochene. But then there is the statement in his Chronicle that Peter "was *the first to preside* over the Roman Church."³ Since we have the Greek

of Linus as the successor of Peter alone" (p. 20). "Successor" suggests more than is in the text.

¹ Euseb. iii. 21.

² In iv. 1, Eusebius says that Primus was fourth bishop of Alexandria "from the apostles," and that Alexander at Rome "brought down the succession to a fifth place from Peter and Paul." So at Antioch, Theophilus was "sixth from the apostles," iv. 20. So at Jerusalem, Narcissus is named as "thirteenth from the apostles," v. 12. Eusebius had adopted the phrase from Irenæus. Clearly he did not mean that any apostle had been bishop of Alexandria, or more than one at Jerusalem; of Antioch he makes Euodius the "first bishop."

³ See Vallarsi's ed. of Jerome, viii. 659. The Greek, τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ πρώτης προέστη, is in a fragment. The Greek also calls

here, we need not lay stress on translations. The original expression does not "directly call him bishop;"¹ but the verb used is that which in several places of the History represents the episcopal presidency, at Rome or elsewhere.² Yet this one passage cannot be taken to convey Eusebius' adhesion to the popular Roman theory, as opposed to that computation of Roman successions which makes Linus the first and Eleutherus the twelfth, and which he formally adopts from Irenæus in Hist. v. 6. We need not go further down the stream: we have seen that the Irenæan computation is the oldest extant, and that it leaves St. Peter out of the catalogue: and if Jerome adopts the later reckoning, which may not unfairly be named Pseudo-Clementine, he does but report the tradition which he found current at Rome when living there under Damasus: while it is curious that Epiphanius asserts Peter and Paul

Linus "first bishop after Peter." The Armenian version calls Peter "prelate" (Lat. *antistes*), and reckons Linus as "second bishop." Jerome says that Peter "continued as bishop;" but he translated somewhat freely, representing *ὁ κορυφαῖος* by "Christianorum pontifex primus." Later, he is verbally inconsistent, naming "Cletus" and Clement as "second and third bishops," Linus being "first after Peter."

¹ Lightfoot, St. Clement of Rome, i. 215.

² E.g. Euseb. iii. 21, 34; iv. 11, 19.

to have been jointly "first bishops" of Rome as well as "Apostles;"¹ and both he and Rufinus, when noticing a difficulty as to whether Clement was appointed by Peter, or came after Linus and "Cletus," adopt a solution which deprives the two latter of any Petrine successorship by placing their episcopates within Peter's own lifetime.² The uncertainties as to these earliest Roman episcopates suggest a question of some interest. If the Church in the sub-Apostolic period had understood that the Roman see was not only, as the Gallican theory maintains, or maintained, the centre of her unity, but also, in the Vaticanist sense, the throne of her monarch and the fountain of her teaching, would room have been left for inconsistent traditions as to the first recipients of so momentous a charge?³ Nor is it open to

¹ Hær. 27. 6. A sentence in his context is considered by Lightfoot and Salmon to be a quotation from Hegesippus; but it does not follow that Hegesippus is responsible for this assertion about the two apostles, by which probably Epiphanius means that both, when at Rome, had supreme charge of its church. He is not clear whether Clement succeeded "Cletus" in the ordinary way, or whether he was consecrated by Peter, but declined to act as bishop until after the deaths of Linus and "Cletus."

² Rufinus says he has "received" this explanation (Præf. in Recogn.).

³ *E.g.* the Apostolic Constitutions say that "Linus was

Roman arguers to say that, even if St. Peter were not actually bishop of Rome, its bishops could still inherit his peculiar prerogatives, whatever those were, and represent him, and in him, specifically, his Master, in their relation, as bishops of Rome, to the whole Church. For the very core and essence of their present claim is to be *really* his successors, to hold prerogatives attached to their see by him as not only its establisher, but its occupant: the hypothesis is, that he, by becoming the first bishop of Rome, bound up his supremacy with that particular bishopric, and transmitted it to those who throughout all time should sit in that *cathedra* which, as the Pseudo-Clementine fiction words it, might be called "his own." Take away the Petrine episcopate, and the Papal claim is a house without a foundation.¹

appointed as first bishop by Paul, and after Linus' death Clement, as second, by Peter." Optatus, followed by Augustine, has this order—Peter, Linus, Clement, Anacletus (Augustine may have written *Anacletus*). The Liberian Catalogue has—Peter, Linus, Clement, Cletus, Anacletus.

¹ Compare Rivington, p. 6: "St. Clement was successor of St. Peter *because* he was bishop of Rome: he owed his relationship to the Divine Head of the Church, viz. that of His vicar, to his position in the church of Rome." This is explicit enough. If Peter was bishop of Rome, is Jerome's date for his accession—A. D. 42—still maintained?

C.

Let us now turn to the third question, which is, of course, our principal subject. Did the early Church recognise in the Roman bishop, for the time being, a Supreme Pontiff, in the sense substantially of the Vatican decrees?¹ One might go back to a prior question—Did she believe that St. Peter himself had any supremacy, as distinct from eminence or leadership, among his fellow-apostles, or any universal jurisdiction beyond what they possessed, so that, for instance, he could issue commands to St. Paul, or exact from St. John an account of his ministry? But, by way of simplifying, let us inquire into the evidence alleged for an acknowledgment, during the early centuries, of a Papal supremacy in the sense already defined. And once for all, except in reference to a Western patriarchal position, let the ambiguous term “primacy” be put out of court. It has all too often been used, on the Roman side, as a disguise for something that

¹ It is understood on both sides that the wording of the Roman dogma is modern; the question is, whether the powers represented by it were anciently acknowledged or not.

far outruns its scope. As a highly elastic word, capable of meaning comparatively little or absolutely very much, it has repeatedly obscured the true issue, and allured an opponent into admissions of which he did not at the moment perceive the real bearing.¹ Here, then, is the point : Did the Primitive Church look up to and obey the bishop of Rome as a veritable Pope, and that by virtue of Divine rights inherited from St. Peter ?

(I.) THE EPISTLE OF ST. CLEMENT OF ROME.

The first piece of evidence before us would suggest a different form for the question. Did the early Roman bishops claim such a position for themselves as the Vatican decree affirms to have been theirs from the outset ? The letter of remonstrance, in the name of the

¹ "Primacy may signify primacy in place or primacy in time ; and again, primacy in place may mean primacy of power or primacy of honour ; and still again, primacy of power may mean fifty different things, according as the degree of power is greater or less " (Christian Remembrancer, April, 1853, p. 389). The Roman church's "*precedence of honour* and dignity is a matter about which there has not been, and need not be, any dispute " (Salmon, Infallibility, etc., p. 373).

Church of Rome, to the Church of Corinth, on the occasion of a factious movement against certain Corinthian presbyters, is accurately described by a later Corinthian bishop as "written by the agency of Clement,"¹ and hence it is freely called "Clement's epistle." Now, the tenor of this document shows that no exercise of jurisdiction by Rome over Corinth is so much as thought of. It is moral pressure² on the part of a great and influential Church, brought to bear on an inferior Church with a view of correcting disorders which menace the general interest of Christian unity, and the general maintenance of the Christian moral standard. And, if the Roman Church,

¹ Dion. Corinth. ap. Euseb. iv. 23. He is writing to bishop Soter of Rome; but he treats both Soter's letter and Clement's as proceeding from the "Romans" (*ῥωμαῖν*). Mr. Rivington had quoted Irenæus' expression about Clement's letter, *συμβιβάζουσα αὐτοῦς* (the Corinthians), and translated it "*forcing* them together;" but this has been "corrected" into "bringing them together."

² If in c. 63 the Corinthians are urged to "become obedient to what we have written through the Holy Spirit" (cf. c. 59, "if some should disobey what has been spoken by" God "through us"), the obedience is claimed in virtue of the Scriptural warrant of the expostulation, and the whole plea of the letter is called an "entreaty." See Salmon, *Infallibility*, etc., p. 179: "Such a letter could clearly not be regarded as an attempt by Rome to domineer over provincial churches;" the Corinthian church authorities "could be grateful for moral support," etc.

as such, is not commanding but exhorting the Corinthian, if she speaks as a sister, not as a mistress, still less does any undertone of "papal" authority make itself heard. Nothing but the strongest kind of preconception could make so moderate and learned a writer as Duchesne say that in this letter Clement, at the end of the first century, *écrit déjà comme un pape*:¹ but when an Anglo-Roman advocate tells us that of course the Corinthians would understand "the Vicar of Christ" to be speaking through a letter in which Clement simply suppresses himself,² the assumption is such as to make one marvel at the condition of mind which could think it consistent with argumentative decorum.³ It is true, indeed, that, according to St. Cyprian, "the bishop is in the Church, and

¹ Origines du Culte Chrétien, p. 15.

² Rivington, p. 7. In a later passage we are succinctly informed that "St. Clement's *brief* was at once obeyed" (p. 132).

³ On the papal hypothesis, it would be not "lowliness," but unfaithfulness to a trust, which would make a supreme pontiff thus keep his own name and personality in the background. For it was to him, not to his church, that the spiritual sovereignty, on that supposition, had been committed by our Lord; and it was the part of true charity to enforce a much needed admonition by the full sanction of the supposed Petrine "charter." It must be owned that the modesty which Mr. Rivington imputes to Clement has not been imitated by his later successors, who were at least not personally less "unworthy" than himself.

the Church in the bishop ;” but what has to be proved is, that, according to the belief of Christians at the end of the first century, the “Pope” was in the Roman Church, and the Roman Church in the “Pope.” It will not do to assume the existence of such a belief, and then to use it as explanatory of the language under discussion.

(II.) ST. IGNATIUS.

When St. Ignatius, on his way to martyrdom, wrote from Smyrna to the Roman Church, he mentioned neither its bishop nor its clergy. His silence about the Roman bishop is no proof that Rome had then no single chief pastor, unless it also proves that she had then no priests or deacons ; while he “speaks of episcopacy as a thing perfectly familiar, at any rate, to the Church of Rome.”¹ But if

¹ Church Quart. Review, xi. 287. Ignatius asks the Romans to praise God “because He deemed τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας worthy to be found in the West” (c. 2), and says that as for the Syrian church, *μόνος αὐτῆν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐπισκοπήσει καὶ ἡ ὑμῶν ἀγάπη* (c. 9). “No one can doubt that the idea of Church government now universal among Catholics is here, and that the Roman church is supposed heartily to appreciate it. The saint . . . assumes undoubtedly that the Roman Christians recognise a difference between the first and second orders of

Ignatius had known, as on the Vaticanist hypothesis he must have known, that, let us say, Alexander I. of Rome had what we should now call "ordinary jurisdiction" in Antioch, and that he himself held office by his authorisation, and was responsible to him for the administration of the Antiochene episcopate, is it conceivable that in a letter containing the words, "*I am not giving you directions, like Peter and Paul,*" he should send no dutiful message to his ecclesiastical sovereign, and should not so much as allude to him when remarking, "*Jesus Christ alone, and your love, will exercise an episcopate over the Syrian Church in my stead*"? But then we are reminded of phrases used by Ignatius in the beginning of this letter; the Roman Church, it is said, "*presides in the place of the territory of the Romans, and has a presidency of love.*" The first phrase indicates no more than her pre-eminence among Italian Churches;¹ the

the ministry; . . . otherwise, supposing the Romans ignorant of such a distinction, he would give them the notion that Syria was left, not only without a supreme head, but without any presbyters at all."

¹ Mr. Rivington, indeed, takes it of "the centre, not the extent, of the presiding authority" (p. 33). "Authority" is here slipped in, and the gloss means that Ignatius may have believed in a universal papal supremacy. Is it a natural

second has been absurdly strained by treating "love" as a synonym for "the whole Christian community,"¹ (without any such limitation as the other clause suggests), whereas it naturally points to the peculiar conspicuousness of the Roman Church in the matter of generous charity, to which, as Bishop Lightfoot aptly remarks, Dionysius of Corinth bore testimony, and which Dionysius of Rome exhibited by sending relief to sufferers in Asia Minor.²

(III.) VICTOR AND THE "ASIATICS."

The Paschal controversy is wearisome enough to the student of Church history, whether he

interpretation? Apply it to Cyprian de Unit. 5, "Episcopi qui in ecclesia præsidentur."

¹ Mr. Rivington confidently, *more suo*, pp. 33, 134, adopts the rendering of προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης which suits his thesis, and quotes Döllinger in support of it; but Döllinger in his later life expressly said that the earlier edition of his "History of the Church" required to be altered in every line. See Dr. Plummer's letter in the "Guardian" of Dec. 12, 1894. Let any one consider whether Ignatius would have put such an enigmatical expression as "presidency over the love," i.e. *over the Church*, into the fore-front of a letter to the matter-of-fact Romans. Funk's references to other Ignatian passages, in support of this gloss, are irrelevant; for there "love" is distinctly ascribed to the "brethren," the "churches," etc.

² Compare Euseb. iv. 23; vii. 5; Basil, Ep. 70.

is occupied with Quartodecimanism, with the diversity of cycles, or with the peculiarities of the Celtic Easter in Bede. But one starts, so to speak, with a scene which can repeatedly be looked back upon with refreshment, when Anicetus of Rome, unable to convince St. Polycarp, agrees with him to differ, and invites him to take his place in the celebration of the Eucharist.¹ Some forty years later, bishop Victor takes a less tolerant line; but his action has often been somewhat unfairly described, and Roman controversialists have adopted that description in order to extract from the case a witness for Papal supremacy. We must distinguish between what Victor did, and what he "attempted" to do.² He did withdraw the communion of his own Church from the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor; this act was within his competency, the consent of his clergy and people being supposed. He "attempted" to induce other Churches to act in the same manner, and so to effect a general exclusion of the Quartodecimans from Church fellowship.

¹ Iren. ap. Euseb. v. 24.

² Euseb. v. 24. Dr. Salmon observes that he might be excused for feeling strongly when Blastus was attempting to introduce Quartodecimanism at Rome (cp. App. to Tert. de Præscr. 53; Infallibility of the Church, pp. 283, 374).

In this he failed, and drew forth some "rather sharp rebukes" from St. Irenæus and other bishops. The circumstance that Eusebius first mentions what he attempted, and afterwards his "announcement that the brethren in Asia were out of communion," must not mislead us into thinking that the circular in which this announcement was made was professedly a ban which should take effect throughout the Church, instead of being, as it clearly was, a notification that Rome had suspended ecclesiastical intercourse with Ephesus, and a request that the bishops receiving it should do likewise. As far as we can judge, Irenæus, for himself and the Gallic Church, not only declined to act thus, but exhorted Victor to reconsider his own action.

(IV.) ST. IRENÆUS ON THE ROMAN CHURCH.

It is convenient thus to combine, and to contrast, the positions taken up in this controversy by Anicetus and Victor. But now let us turn from Irenæus' practical line in view of a Roman bishop's public conduct, to the memorable passage in which, a few years before, in the time of Victor's predecessor Eleutherus, he had described

the relation of Churches in general to the "very great, ancient, and universally known" Roman Church.¹

What, let us ask, had led him to this subject? The Valentinians, against whom he was writing his great treatise, used to meet the argument from Apostolic tradition to the received or Catholic type of Christian doctrine, by the audacious assertion that the Apostles themselves, and even Christ as His words were reported in the Gospels, had "Judaized," or had spoken at times under an inspiration less than the highest. Irenæus replies in effect—as did Tertullian a few years later—We are quite able to trace up our theology, through lines of episcopal succession, to the Apostolic founders of the Churches: and it is inconceivable that they would keep back, economically, their real beliefs from those to whom they were leaving their own posts of teachership. "But since it would be tedious to go through all these successions," let us take a specimen Church—that of Rome.

Here, before going further, observe the significance of the motive expressly assigned for adducing this particular Church—it is done in

¹ Iren. iii. 3. 2.

order to save trouble ; but such a motive would never have occurred to a believer in the Papal theory. To proceed, next come the words on which so much debate has turned, but which, unfortunately, exist only in a Latin translation : “Ad hanc [to this Church], propter *potentio-rem* [or *potio-rem*], *principalitatem*, *necesse est* omnem *convenire* ecclesiam, *hoc est*, eos qui sunt *undique* fideles—in qua semper *ab* his qui sunt *undique* conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio.” First of all, what does *principalitatem* mean? “Antiquity” is a sense which, so far as the use of *principalis* goes, might be supported by several passages in the Latin translation of Irenæus :¹ and *principalitas* is used some five times for primary or original being : but the context suggests the sense of pre-eminence,² and the Greek may have been *πρωτεία*. But does this “more effective”³ or “superior eminence” belong to the Roman Church, or to Rome the city? Irenæus does not explain ; but if the city itself had been meant, a word or two

¹ Cf. i. 30. 6 ; ii. 21. 1 ; 28. 4, 5. Tertullian opposes *principalitatem* to *posteritatem* (De Præscr. Hær. 31).

² *Principalitas* = pre-eminence in Iren. iv. 38. 3. Mr. Rivington (who relies a good deal on sheer iteration) renders it “sovereignty” five times within four pages (pp. 32-34).

³ The Latin translation, a little further on, renders *ικανωτάτην γεαφήν* (Clement’s Ep. to Cor.) by *potentissimas litteras*.

would have been, perhaps, almost necessary, in order to prevent the quality from being associated with "the Church," which had just been mentioned: still, the "city" view has something to say for itself, and is adopted by Dr. Salmon and Fr. Puller.¹ Let us, however, suppose it to be the Church of Rome that is thus regarded as "pre-eminent." What, then, is meant by *necesse est*, and what by *convenire ad*? Does the first of these phrases indicate a moral obligation, and the second mean "agree with"? Obligation would have required *oportet*: while *necesse est* implies the simple necessity that something should take place, the fact that it cannot but happen. What is that something? That "every other Church, that is, the faithful who are from all sides,"—as we should say, coming from all quarters,—"*should—convenire ad* the Roman Church," that is—if we take the phrase naturally, with an eye to *ad* and to *undique*—"should resort to, converge or come together to, that Church." It is inevitable, St. Irenæus means, that Christians from all other parts of the empire should, from time to time, for various reasons, visit the Church in the great centre of

¹ Infallibility of the Church, p. 382: The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome, p. 40.

the empire ;¹ this is a process which is always going on, which cannot but go on. If Irenæus had meant that other Churches must, as a matter of duty, agree with the Roman Church, or even that they would be sure to be found agreeing with her, one would think that he would have used language suggesting a different translation. For *convenire ad* would be a strange Latin equivalent for "agree with." And further, the ensuing words would have lost their point, if "agreement with the Roman Church" had been the idea. For Irenæus goes on at once to add a clause which Roman quotations of the sentence are apt to omit or slur over.²

¹ Compare the ninth canon of the Antiochene council of 341, stating the fact that "all who have business from all sides (*πανταχόθεν*) meet (*συντρέχειν*) in the metropolis." It is possible that they were actually borrowing from Irenæus' Greek, then extant. Of such a "concurus" to Rome Duchesne says, "Au deuxième siècle tout le christianisme y afflue." But he assumes too much when he attributes to the Roman church at this period a "direction générale" (Origines du Culte Chrétien, p. 15). The word *undique* must be noted ; it is not *ubique* ; and *πανταχόθεν*, in iii. 11. 8, refers to the idea of winds blowing from all quarters. Cp. S. Aug. Ep. 29. 10.

² This is significantly illustrated in the second chapter of the Vatican decree. The first words of the sentence are given with almost verbal exactness, down to "hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles:" then we read "ut in ea sede . . . in unam corporis compagem coalescerent." W. G. Ward is quoted by his son as having written after the appearance of Pius IX.'s syllabus, "to which [the local Roman] Church, because of her *potentior*

"In which (Church)," *i.e.* the Roman, "the tradition which comes from the Apostles has been always preserved *by* those who are from all sides," *i.e.* who flock from all parts of the empire to the capital. But if the point had been that other Churches must needs teach just what the Roman Church taught, whether under obligation or from circumstances, why go on to say that it was *by* members of these same Churches that the Apostolic tradition was preserved *in* the Roman? That fact would be no reason for, no illustration of, the supposed necessity of agreement: but it would be strictly apposite to the remark that other Churches were habitually pouring into the Roman a conflux of their own members, so that the genuine Christian tradition, deposited there by Apostolic hands, might be continuously freshened and reinforced by concurrent testimonies, representing an identical universally diffused belief. Take, then, this final clause of the sentence, with its *in qua* and its *ab his*—for I pass over, as really too absurd for serious treatment, the assumption that "in" here means

principalitas, all others are to look for doctrinal guidance" (W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival, p. 248). Could he, one asks, have ever read the whole Irenæan sentence?

“in communion with,¹ or subjection to,”—observe that, instead of saying that true faith was preserved *by* the Roman Church *for* her multifarious foreign visitors, it emphasises her obligation to them, and explains more fully why she can be taken as a sample of all Churches; and is not this quite decisive against the notion that Irenæus recognised in her bishop the “universal doctor” of Christians? He views her as a reservoir of orthodoxy; and herein he assigns to her even a less active part than that which St. Gregory of Nazianzus, in his farewell to Constantinople,² assigns to that city,

¹ Mr. Rivington—again (as his habit is) relying on Döllinger’s early work—endeavours to support this gloss by St. Paul’s use of ἐν Χριστῷ (p. 38). Such a parallelism does but exhibit a strange insensibility to the depth and richness of the Pauline idea. And in this same chapter of Irenæus, we have “in every church,” “in the church,” “in the church which is at Smyrna,” “in the churches,” always with the simple meaning, “within,” or “at.”

² Orat. 42. 10. It is futile to evade the force of this expression by referring to other language of Gregory’s, which dwells on what Constantinople had been in its Arian times, before the revival to which, as he modestly says, he had “contributed.” Then, no doubt, it was a sad contrast to orthodox Rome; it had ceased to stand upright—as he strongly words it, ἐν βοθῶς ἔκειτο τῆς ἀπωλείας (Carm. de Vit. 573, 575). But his short work there as missionary bishop had rehabilitated the Catholic forces, and secured the influence of a great political centre on the side of orthodoxy. The description of the Roman city, in the autobiographical poem just quoted (De Vit. 571), as τῆν πρόεδρον

as now, through the restored Catholic life of her Church, a "general mart of the faith," *i.e.* a centre whither Catholic Christians bring their own orthodoxy, and take back, so to speak, her witness in its confirmation. Of course, no one doubts that St. Irenæus would have said, for instance, to a Gallic or an Ephesine Christian about to visit Rome, "You will get much good from the great Roman Church—you will return home with your own faith quickened and invigorated by what you have seen of hers:" but that is not the exact point which he takes in the sentence which explains why the argument from the several lines of Church tradition may be summarised by pointing to Rome. If he had held what Roman or Papal writers impute to him, he must have spoken quite otherwise: he must have used the short-cut argument, "You Gnostics are at once put out of court by not 'seeking the law at the mouth of' Eleutherus; *he* is the Divinely appointed exponent of Christian doctrine: hear him, and so you will hear Christ." Papalists have to explain why this typical Father of the second century took a different and less compendious method.

τῶν ἑλῶν, does not go beyond precedency, and must be taken with the context in which new Rome is said to shine in the East, and old Rome in the West.

(V.) HIPPOLYTUS.

When, some forty-five years ago, a treatise on Heresies, which is now assigned to Hippolytus, was discovered and published as the "Philosophumena" of Origen, there was a disposition among anti-Roman controversialists to accept *en bloc*, as unimpeachable evidence, its bitter attacks on the two Roman bishops who came next after Victor. We can now see rather more clearly that, whatever view be taken of the episcopal position of Hippolytus—whether it was to the full extent, or in a modified sense, sectarian and schismatical,—whether he was, in Döllinger's phrase, the first "antipope," or, as Salmon thinks, the head of a separate Greek congregation in Rome¹—for that he somehow did act as a bishop in Rome,² and was not the regular bishop of Portus Romanus, may be considered as an accepted fact,—his tone as to bishops Zephyrinus and Callistus, both in regard to doctrine and to administration, is the tone

¹ Hippol. and Callist. c. 2; Dict. Chr. Biogr. iii. 90.

² "Rome," says Lightfoot, "was the sphere of his activity." Yet Lightfoot thinks he was bishop for a fluctuating population in Portus of various nationalities (St. Clement, ii. 433), and does not admit that he viewed the actual bishops of Rome as *not* bishops *de jure*.

of a hostile partisan, and must be largely discounted as such. He himself may at that time have laid himself open to the suspicion of heresy in one direction, while he charged Callistus with having incurred it in another;¹ and his asperity in judging of a discipline milder than severe rigorists would approve, may warrant us in questioning, or more than questioning, his fitness to represent the spirit of the Church or of the Gospel. "Onesided, hot-tempered, inequitable," even "arrogant," are epithets suggested by his tirades: but their interest for us, with regard to our present inquiry, is independent of the repulsive features which remind us of Tertullian in his Montanist phase;¹ the point is, that he nowhere comes near claiming for himself, as bishop for Rome, in the position which he denied to Callistus, anything like a papal jurisdiction over other Churches; and that he speaks of acknowledged and actual bishops of Rome with a freedom of censure which he could never have used if

¹ He thought Callistus a Sabellian; Callistus thought him an ultra-Subordinationist, and Döllinger considers that the latter opinion was justified (Hippolytus and Callistus, c. 4).

² It is apparently Callistus whom Tertullian ironically described as "pontifex maximus" and "bishop of bishops" (De Pudic. 1), phrases which Mr. Rivington seems to take seriously (p. 92).

the Church in general had regarded them as her Popes.

(VI.) ST. CYPRIAN.

And now we come to a great name, around which, in this debate on Papal claims, much controversy has gathered. St. Cyprian's view of St. Peter's position should be examined before we consider his action in regard to what he regarded as "Peter's chair." That view is contained in some seven passages. It had been worked out in his mind with great distinctness; he evidently thought it both true and important; it is, in effect, that our Lord, accepting Peter as the spokesman¹ of the Apostles in general, addressed certain words to him individually, by way of emphasising that oneness which He willed to be a characteristic of the Apostolate, of the Church, and of the Episcopate which, in and for the Church, was

¹ It seems clear that Peter replied to our Lord's question as spokesman, and that our Lord thereupon addressed him as being, in point of character, their appointed representative. The promise of the keys is explained by Isa. xxii. 22; from this passage it is clear that "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom" is equivalent to "I will make thee My steward." Either, therefore, the keys were not to be held exclusively by St. Peter, or the other apostles were not stewards, which is absurd. See St. Augustine, Sermon. 149. 7.

to succeed the Apostolate in such functions as were permanently needful.¹ Peter was thus to represent the Twelve, and in them the future ministry, and the Church which, as Cyprian says in one passage,² was "founded on Peter in the commencement (or origin) of its oneness, and"—as the next words (*et ratione*) may be best understood, "in the expression of," or "by way of exhibiting," or "bringing out (that oneness)," or else "in the method or order (of that oneness)."³ So again, "in order to manifest the oneness, or unity" (*i.e.* as the context

¹ This is fully brought out in Ep. 33, where Cyprian formally comments on Matt. xvi. 18, 19: "Dominus noster . . . episcopi honorem et ecclesiæ suæ rationem" (systematised order) "disponens . . . dicit Petro, 'Ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, et super istam petram ædificabo ecclesiam mean . . . soluta et in coelis.' Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia *super episcopos* constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur." Here, if Cyprian had been a Papalist, he would have added a salvo for the rights of the Church's "sovereign ruler," from whom all bishops derived their commission, and to whom they owed entire obedience.

² Epist. 70. 3: "super Petrum, origine" (not, observe, *originem*) "unitatis et ratione." Mr. Rivington repeatedly mistranslates the first words by identifying Peter with the "origin." "St. Peter *is*" (*i.e.* according to Cyprian) "the origin of the Church's unity;" "This origin of unity which Peter was made;" "Peter whom Christ instituted as the origin of unity;" "Our Lord made him the origin" (pp. 55, 61, 464, 467).

³ *Ratio* has various shades of meaning in Cyprian's writings.

shows, of the Apostolic college), He by His own authority arranged the commencement of that same oneness as (a commencement) beginning from one person.”¹ The stress is laid on such words as *ratione (unitatis)*, or *manifestaret*, which is equivalent to *ostendit* in a shorter passage. “Upon whom (Peter) He built the Church, and from whom He instituted and showed the commencement of (its) unity.”² Peter was to be a living object-lesson of the principle of unity—this is the thought. Now, would Cyprian have dwelt on this idea, which some might call fanciful,—would he have talked of Peter’s individuality as chosen to *illustrate* unity,—if he had held the extremely practical view which Roman controversialists struggle to extract from his writings, that Peter exclusively possessed by divine grant some special and highly important *powers*, that he was the divinely ordained *centre* of unity, the single visible head of Apostles and of Christians, by subordination to whom their unity was to be *secured*³—that he was

¹ De Unit. 4.

² Ep. 73, 7. He adds, “potestatem istam dedit ut id solveretur,” etc.

³ Mr. Rivington (p. 48, etc.) imagines that Cyprian recognises in St. Peter a special office of headship among and over the

actually, in truth, the universal spiritual ruler? The question might well be left to suggest its own answer; but it is Cyprian himself, who, in the great context which Roman interpolations, long used though now abandoned,¹

Apostles. This idea has to be "read into" his words. Ep. 33 shows, on the contrary, that the words, "Thou art Peter," etc., were taken by him to be a commission to the episcopate as such, not to the episcopate as in subjection to the Roman see. Nowhere does he intimate the opinion fathered on him (cf. Rivington, p. 61), that "the chair of Peter (*i.e.* the Roman see) was the principle of cohesion to the Christian episcopate." When Cyprian says (Ep. 71. 3), "Nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam . . . vindicavit sibi adiquid insolenter . . . ut diceret se primatum tenere, et obtemperari a novellis . . . sibi potius oportere," *primatus* clearly means seniority. Mr. Rivington misreads this, and mistranslates in the same note (p. 83) Augustine's words, "primatus apostolorum," "apostolatus principatus," as if they meant primacy or principality over the apostles, whereas the immediate context settles the sense—"a posteriore apostolo Paulo" (De Bapt. ii. s. 2).

¹ Their literary history is given in Treatises of Cypr., Lib. Fath. p. 151. The text, as given by Hartel, quotes Matt. xvi. 18, 19, and proceeds (omitting what Fell adds, "Et iterum eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit, Pasce oves meas"), "Super unum ædificat ecclesiam: et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat. Sicut misit me Pater, etc. (John xx. 21-23), tamen, ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit." At this point it is well to contrast the true text with the falsified, thus:—

"Hoc erant utique et cæteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis: sed exordium

"Hoc erant utique et cæteri quod Petrus: *sed primatus Petro datur*, ut una ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur . . .

showed to be *per se* inadequate for Roman purposes, adds to his sentence about the "manifestation of unity" in St. Peter the assertion that "the other Apostles were just what Peter was, endowed with an equal share of office [*honoris*], and of power," although, by Christ's arrangement, "a beginning started from oneness," *i.e.* from one man; and elsewhere, after saying, in a passage already referred to, that "power to loose was given by the Lord to Peter," he takes care to avoid misconstruction: "And after His resurrection He addresses the Apostles also;" then quotes John xx. 21-23, by way of identifying the power to "remit sins," thus given to all of them, with the power to "loose" promised¹ to one. Here, we

ab unitate proficiscitur, ut
ecclesia Christi una monstretur
. . . Qui ecclesiæ renititur
et resistit, in ecclesia se esse
confidit?"

"Qui *cathedram Petri*, super
quam fundata ecclesia est,
deserit, in ecclesia se esse
confidit?"

A fraud like this requires no comment; but it has been well said as to the genuine passage, "If, in the time of Cyprian, the bishop of Rome had been conceived to be the head of unity and influence in the Church, it is impossible but that our saint would have seized the opportunity of mentioning it: the supremacy of the pope would have been a palmary argument in favour of unity." And this argument, in fact, he does *not* use.

¹ See Fr. Puller, *Prim. Saints*, etc., p. 351.

may observe, by the way, the hopeless attempt sometimes made to limit the phrase, "an equal share of power,"¹ as if the other Apostles were equal to Peter only in the sacerdotal or in ordinary apostolic powers, or in the jurisdiction which they held in "subordination to his supremacy."² This, of course, is to make Cyprian say that their power was not equal to Peter's; whereas he says just the contrary. It is to make him say that Peter had special powers over his brother Apostles; whereas he nowhere even implies it.

At this point we may conclude this brief survey of the Petrine theory of Cyprian, and come to his dealings with the actual Roman Church. He calls that Church *principalis*:³ it is purely arbitrary to translate this word by "sovereign,"⁴

¹ If Cyprian had believed that St. Peter had a supreme jurisdiction over the other apostles, he could not, as an honest man, have written this sentence without a saving clause. The words in the preceding chapter, "Heresies and schisms arise . . . because the Head is not sought for," are first of all referred by Mr. Rivington to our Lord as having instituted the Petrine headship, and afterwards to the Roman bishop himself. They refer, in fact, to our Lord as having said to Peter *and* to the other apostles what Cyprian is about to quote.

² Rivington, pp. 61, 462.

³ Ep. 59. 14.

⁴ So Rivington repeatedly; also using the term "ruling," and putting them together (p. 58). He refers to Tertullian as

but it may mean "pre-eminent," *i.e.* most distinguished or most conspicuous for historic dignity or moral influence, although the next words, "from which (Church) the unity of the priesthood" (*i.e.* the episcopate) "took its rise," might be held to favour the other rendering, "primeval:" anyhow, the "episcopal unity" is said to arise out of that Church, because Cyprian, rightly or not, regarded it as the mother of Western Churches: to suppose that he viewed it as the mother of all Churches would be to make him talk sheer nonsense. But did he mean the Roman see exclusively when he spoke of the Novatianist schismatics at Rome as having "turned away from the bosom of their root and mother;" when he exhorted Africans bound for Rome to "acknowledge and hold to the root and womb of the Catholic Church;" when he spoke of himself and his brethren as "holding to the head and root of the one Church"?¹ The context shows

having defined the word (*principalis*) as meaning that which is over anything (De Anima, 13). But to be over a thing does not necessarily imply "sovereignty." He quotes Cyprian's language about Tertullian, "Give me my master:" but the De Præscr. Hær., where *principalitatem* is opposed to *posteritatem*, is a likelier book than the De Anima to have been much in Cyprian's hands.

¹ Epp. 45. 1; 48. 3; 73. 2. Mr. Rivington imagines (p. 464)

that he was thinking of the Catholic Church herself as such, everywhere present, and represented, of course, at Rome by Cornelius the bishop, and his clergy and laity, as at Carthage by the community of which Cyprian himself was the head ;—just as, when speaking of the requirements of a valid Eucharist, he says that any one who has been misled into innovations should “return to the root and origin of the Lord’s tradition”¹—that is, to the original tradition itself, to that which St. Paul had received from the Lord. Again, is he thinking of the Roman see when he speaks of “one chair founded by the Lord upon a rock”?² Certainly not, but of the

that in the first passage the “mother” is Cornelius himself, as bishop! If in the second passage the root and womb mean Cornelius, why did not Cyprian say, “We have exhorted them to acknowledge and hold to *thee*”? He might fitly tell them to “acknowledge” or recognise the communion of Cornelius as Catholic. The third passage is decisive: Cyprian is thinking of the Church Catholic as a whole. Mr. Rivington’s pretence that he means “the bishop of Rome who traced to Peter, or perhaps, more strictly speaking, Peter himself, whom they reached through Stephen, and not through Novatian” (p. 85), is clean against the context; the mention of “Novatian” in that passage points to him as head of the sectarians who were external to the Church. Cp. Cypr. ad Demetr. 2, where “springing up as shoots *radicis atque originis tui*” means “. . . from yourself as a root.”

¹ Ep. 63. 1.

² Ep. 43. 5. Hartel reads “*Petrum.*”

episcopate which he describes, in the Treatise on Unity, as "one," and the authority of which, as we have seen, he traces to the great Petrine passage in St. Matthew. Nor is it beside the purpose to observe, that when he speaks of his "brother" Cornelius of Rome as having ascended *ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium*, he explains this phrase in the next line as meaning simply "the episcopate."¹ During the vacancy of the Roman see, he tells the Roman clergy that he "thought it well to abide by their opinion," for the sake, as he adds, of exact co-operation;² and they praise him for desiring to act with them, while "conscious that he is responsible to God only as his judge."³ There is not, in fact, one word in all his correspondence on Roman Church affairs which will admit of being interpreted in a Papalist sense; and he does not shrink from

¹ Ep. 55. 8.

² Ep. 20. 3. Mr. Rivington twists this into, "he submitted his judgment on that question"—that of the lapsed—"to the Roman clergy," *because* it touched "the dogmatic faith" (p. 86; cp. p. 52: "The aroma of infallibility lingered in the vacant see"). No, it was on a special point, the treatment of penitent *lapsi* who were dying, and Cyprian simply thought it right to act on the same lines with the Roman clergy. If he "renders to them an account of his action," it is not out of duty to Rome, but because he has been misrepresented.

³ Ep. 30. 1.

admonishing Cornelius, when he thinks that the Roman bishop shows signs of weakness in the face of schismatical bluster.¹ As for the case of Marcian, the Novatianist bishop of Arles, it was perfectly natural for Gallic bishops, who had not, in that age, a metropolitan, to write to Stephen of Rome for advice; and equally natural that when Stephen, apparently, hesitated, Cyprian should have been applied to by Faustinus, bishop of Lyons, and should then have admonished Stephen, with not a little of respectful peremptoriness, to write to the Catholics of Arles and to "the province," in order that a Catholic pastor might be substituted for Marcian.² But on what grounds does he base his exhortation? Is Stephen to intervene as Supreme Pontiff and universal judge? Not a word of this. The reason expressly given by Cyprian is, that all bishops ought to act under a sense of common interest, in guarding any part of the whole fold from the pestilent influence of a false shepherd.³ So again, when

¹ Ep. 59. 2.

² Ep. 68.

³ "Cui rei nostrum est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime . . . Quapropter facere te oportet plenissimas litteras ad coepiscopos nostros," etc. Mr. Rivington glosses this by "letters of plenary authority," "a mandate," "not merely a papal brief, but also a full exposition of principles" (p. 71).

two Spanish bishops had compromised their Christian fidelity under persecution, and were guilty of other grave offences, their sees were filled up by the regular action of comprovincial jurisdiction; but they endeavoured to get reinstated, and one of them deceived Stephen of Rome into granting him communion as a bishop. The Spanish Church was perturbed; Cyprian was applied to; he held a Council, and a letter in its name was sent to Spain,¹ insisting that the deposition of the two offenders must be upheld, notwithstanding the action taken by "Stephen our colleague" under false information. To say, as has been said, that the African bishops did not "dispute the principle that the Pope could, *where just cause existed*, restore a deposed bishop of Spain," is but one of too many reckless attempts to shift the *onus probandi*.² Lastly, on the

Because Cyprian, again, says that Cornelius and Lucius of Rome *consuerunt* against Novatianism, and adds, "Quam rem omnes omnino ubique *consuimus*, because we could not hold a different opinion when in us there was the one Spirit," Mr. Rivington claims this as an expression of his own Church's doctrine on infallibility (p. 72). Rather, it expresses the old sense of solidarity among churches.

¹ Ep. 67.

² Rivington, p. 75. Nowhere in the letter is this "principle" asserted, or even hinted at. For Stephen's error Cyprian makes allowance, while blaming him to some extent. "Neque

question as to the validity or invalidity of heretics' baptism, the fact that the Western Church tradition has for ages pronounced that Cyprian was wrong, and Stephen of Rome was right, does not affect the historic significance of his absolute and persistent opposition to Stephen's plainly expressed view.¹ He wrote individually to an individual bishop, Pompeius, charging the bishop of Rome not only with rashness and incaution, but with "pride, harshness, obstinacy;"² and implied that Stephen had threatened to withdraw his communion from the Africans. Later, Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia wrote yet more severely, indeed with passionate indignation,

enim *tam* culpandus est ille cui negligenter obreptum est," etc. In p. 73 we are told that Cyprian "nowhere denies the authority of the pope as a matter of principle." Where does he admit it?

¹ When Cyprian and his council told Stephen (Ep. 72. 3) that they believed "etiam tibi pro religionis tuæ et fidei veritate *placere* quæ et religiosa pariter et vera sunt," Mr. Rivington tries to make *placere* mean "will be sanctioned by authority," although in the same paragraph the theory of each bishop's independence of action is carefully formulated (p. 88). In Ep. 74. 1, Cyprian quotes Stephen's words, "Nihil innovetur," etc.: Mr. Rivington comments, "St. Stephen put St. Cyprian on his obedience" (p. 95). Did Cyprian let himself be "put" in any such position? He had just said that the words quoted were but a specimen of "vel superba, vel . . . sibi ipsi contraria, quæ imperite atque improvide scripsit."

² Ep. 74.

and contrasted Stephen's claim to "succeed Peter on whom the Church was founded" with what, from his standpoint, he regarded as Stephen's constructive tolerance of heresy.¹ St. Cyprian held another Council of more than eighty bishops on Sept. 1, 256,² and in his opening speech made a hit at Stephen: "No one of *us* sets himself up as a bishop of bishops, or constrains his colleagues by the terror that tyranny can inspire to an unwilling obedience," etc. The deputies sent by this synod to Rome were treated by Stephen as under a ban: no Roman Churchman was to open his doors to them; so that they were debarred not only from ecclesiastical fellowship, but from hospitable shelter. This fact is asserted by Firmilian: and he says more—in an apostrophe to Stephen he implies that the latter, in pursuance of his threat, had actually suspended communion with Cyprian, and with all other prelates who took the same line about heretics' baptism.³ This must have been said

¹ Firmilian, ap. Cyp. Ep. 75.

² Reckoned as Cyprian's sixth council, and third on the baptismal controversy. Cf. Hefele, Councils, i. 94 ff. E.T.

³ "Te a tot gregibus scidisti . . . dñm enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti" (Ep. 75. 24).

on the warrant of information from Cyprian himself; and it is confirmed by the statement of Dionysius of Alexandria, that Stephen wrote circulars respecting Firmilian and others in Asia Minor, "to the effect that he would not hold communion with them."¹ Did he ever recall this step? There is no ground for thinking so. Did Cyprian, as Mr. Rivington is pleased to suggest, "lead the way in the direction of submission" to Roman authority?² There is nothing to support this imagination but some words of Jerome about the Africans "issuing a new decree;"³ against it there

¹ Ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσω (ap. Euseb. vii. 5). This Mr. Rivington translates "as neither about to communicate with them," and adds, "the Greek is simply in the future." Does this use of the future leave the meaning doubtful? Fr. Puller's rendering (to which Mr. Rivington objects) "saying that he would not communicate with them," is equivalent to that of Valesius, "sese . . . ab illorum communione discessurum." Mr. Rivington refers to St. Augustine c. Cresc. iii. 3, as saying that the Easterns "corrected their judgment," and afterwards describes them as having "dropped their resistance to the decision of Rome" (pp. 111, 114). St. Augustine speaks of "fifty Eastern bishops," but we have contemporary evidence as to great numbers; and we know that in the fourth century, Cyril of Jerusalem generally, and St. Athanasius with special reference to Arians and many other heretics, denied the validity of heretical baptism (Procatech. 7; Or. c. Ari. ii. 42; see Pusey in Tertull. Lib. Fath. p. 286).

² Rivington, p. 112.

³ Adv. Lucif. 23. The statement is not guaranteed by other

is the whole tenor of Cyprian's character and conduct, *plus* the sufficiently decisive fact that the Council of Arles—about sixty-five years before Jerome wrote—found it necessary to legislate “about the Africans,” forbidding them in future to “observe their own rule.”¹

(VII.) THE TWO DIONYSIUSES.

Two other points remain to be noticed in the history of the third century. Dionysius of Alexandria, in his zeal against the Sabellians, had used language which was, to say the least, incautious, and was interpreted as denying the co-essential Divinity of our Lord. The close connection between Rome and Alexandria led some “brethren” to complain of him to his namesake Dionysius,² the only theologian in

evidence. So Vallarsi in *loc.*, adding, “*Quin et ipsa disputatio inter Donatistas et S. Augustinum tale nihil penitus novit.*” See Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iii. 167.

¹ “*De Afris, quod propria lege sua utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit*” that baptism administered in the name of the Father, etc., should not be iterated. Mr. Rivington vainly tries to limit this in p. 111: “We know from the council of Arles that *some* persisted in their erroneous custom.” Here “*some*” is simply his own gloss. It is to this decision of a “plenary council” that Augustine often refers as having settled the question; *e.g.* *De Bapt.* i. s. 28; ii. 5, 14; iv. 8.

² This we learn from St. Athanasius, *de Sententia Dionysii*,

three centuries among the occupants of the so-called "infallible chair." Thereupon the Roman prelate held a synod, which probably approved the term "co-essential," though it does not appear in an extant fragment of his treatise or letter against the Sabellians.¹ The Alexandrian bishop—a model of candour, gentleness,² and all episcopal excellences—explained that he had not rejected the term, and had used words equivalent to it. And this explanation was deemed satisfactory. It should be added that the word "entreating,"³ used by him some four years earlier as to his remonstrance with Stephen in the baptismal controversy, might well represent his humble and charitable temper, without implying anything like submission. The same context dwells on "very large synods of bishops" as having taken a different line from the Roman.⁴

13 ff., and De Synod. 44. They may have been Egyptian bishops; but see Tillemont, iv. 279.

¹ See it in Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* iii. 373. Athanasius makes Dionysius "express the mind" of the synod to his namesake.

² "There is none of the early fathers who impresses me more favourably as a man of earnest piety, good sense, moderation, and Christian charity" (Salmon, *Introd. to N.T.*, p. 272).

³ Mr. Rivington characteristically amplifies *δεόμενος* (Euseb. vii. 5) into "prayers and entreaties" (p. 81).

⁴ Euseb. vii. 5. Yet Mr. Rivington has represented Stephen as "feeling compelled," as successor of St. Peter, "to insist on conformity in Africa to the custom followed in Rome" (p. 96).

And when he asks Stephen's successor for his "opinion" on a peculiar and difficult case, on which he is "afraid of making a mistake," it is the "advice" of a "brother" that he seeks;¹ the words exclude the notion of applying to a supreme authority for orders, or leaning, as our Roman author words it, on "the guidance of the Holy See."

(VIII.) PAUL OF SAMOSATA, AND AURELIAN'S
AWARD.

The case of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, was a matter of extreme difficulty and anxiety. The prelate of the capital of the East, who also held civil office under the powerful queen of Palmyra, gave scandal not only by the secularity (to say no more) of his conduct, but by the combination of two heresies of the first magnitude—that Jesus was a mere man, and that the Word or Wisdom of God was a mere divine attribute. How was he dealt with? Not by any authoritative pronouncement from the Roman see—then filled, as we have just seen, by one most competent to handle such a

¹ Euseb. vii. 9.

question ; but by repeated meetings of a great Eastern Council. At last, in 269, Paul's skill in evasion was baffled ; he was convicted and deposed ; and a circular letter announced the event to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, and to all other bishops, to priests and deacons, "and to the whole Catholic Church under heaven," without a single word indicating any special obligation to Rome. But as the Council was unable to expel the condemned bishop from "the church house," as Eusebius calls it, of Antioch, application was made to the Emperor Aurelian, who ruled that possession should be awarded to that prelate—whether Paul or his orthodox successor—with whom "the Christian bishops in Italy and in the city of the Romans" should communicate.¹ This imperial test is very significant : the bishops throughout the peninsula are co-ordinated with their Roman brother, and named before him : nay, he himself is not individually referred to ; he is but constructively, so to speak, allowed to appear at all. Is this language, whether it be a quotation from Aurelian's rescript, or Eusebius' own way of representing it, compatible with anything like

Euseb. vii. 30. Not, as Mr. Rivington (p. 123) represents Eusebius's phrase, "the bishops of Italy and the bishop of Rome."

Papalism? When Mr. Rivington refers to these "bishops of Italy" as merely "a select number" employed as "the normal organ of papal decisions,"¹ in short, "a *papal consistory*," he simply exhibits his own entire lack of historical perception, his inability to realise the conditions of ancient Church life.

This Ante-nicene period suggests to Mr. Rivington a plea which might have been expected to come in later, a plea for the validity of the "Popes'" own "witness to their office." Here the "witness" is greatly exaggerated; and at the same time it is forgotten that not only in mediæval but in earlier times bishops might be truly earnest and self-devoted, and wholly devoid of personal ambition, and yet be unconsciously affected by the temptation to aggrandise their own see, and in so doing to deal in large indiscriminate claims, or to reproduce, in spite of confutation, assertions which had become traditional and had done service.² The manifest impossibility of any vulgar gain

¹ A few pages further, we find this "organ" itself ignored: "St. Felix achieved the peace of the Church by deposing the bishop of Antioch" (p. 132). Felix I. sat 269-275.

² On the Roman habit or "principle of making the very largest demands . . . on the chance of their being allowed," see Church Quart. Review, xii. 183; and Gore, Leo the Great. p. 101.

might lay them all the more open to this snare of great officials; especially when they were subject to the mysterious influence which the old imperial city, the traditional centre of the spirit of domination, was allowed to exercise over the rulers of its Church. *Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento!* It is not an ignoble suspiciousness, nor a controversial animus, which compels us to recognise human nature, with all its strange involutions and subtle combinations, in those who sit upon Church thrones, Roman or other. "Is there no such thing," we may ask, with a great analyst of character, "as evil working under a veil?"¹ Is zeal for a cause a guarantee against all wrongdoing in support of it? After all these ages of sad experience as to the leavening malignity of the *corruptio optimi*, are we still so simple as to assume that high-minded ecclesiastics are exempt from the tendency to fight for the kingdom not of this world with weapons of the earth, earthy, to stifle scrupulosity as unpractical, to over-ride legitimate opposition by despotism, to dream of serving the All-righteous by injustice, or even,

¹ Mozley, *Essays*, i. 308. He adds, "A Christian is enlightened, hardened, sharpened, as to evil: he sees it where others do not; . . . it rolls itself in its folds, and he uncovers it," etc.

at last, *mentiri pro Deo?* If we think thus, we must be lingering in dreamland—must have all too faint a sense of “the imperfections of religious men,”¹ of the extent to which the salt may become vapid without entirely losing its savour.

We have seen, in a brief survey of evidence extending, roughly speaking, through the interval between A.D. 100 and A.D. 300, what was the historical position of the Roman Church and bishopric in a period which, if not altogether “golden,” was yet comparatively simple in its relations and its requirements. In entering on the fourth century, we confront a condition of Church life at once richer in ascertained facts, and crossed at all points by more intricate complications. It is a time of “wars of the Lord,” inasmuch as questions arise and are multiplied which affect the most vital interests of Christian faith and devotion; a time of stir and movement and well-nigh ceaseless agitation, banishing repose, exacting self-sacrifice, trying the pith and inmost force of patience, endurance, and loyalty; a time of brilliant hopes too soon overclouded—of apparent victories for the Kingdom of Christ, too easily neutralised by the

¹ Church, Cathedral and University Sermons, p. 274 ff.

leavening influence of "the world;" a time of difficulty and bewilderment for simple souls that had hoped to walk on a road too plain for stumbling;¹ a time in which the Church needed guidance at once firm and wise and tender, and in which she obtained it through two or three magnificent personalities, pre-eminently through the "royal-hearted Athanase." On the Roman theory, she had throughout this "needful time of trouble" a single unfailing resource—one guide who could not fail as a leader, one teacher "at whose mouth" she could "seek" and be sure to find "the law." Let us see whether this theory fits in with the evidence; whether it comes out of the facts, or has to be forced into them.

(IX.) DONATISM AND THE ROMAN SEE.

The Donatist schism, arising out of the last great Heathen persecution, had for one of its first results the assembling of a Council at Rome. For the African schismatics, hoping to deprive bishop Cæcilian and the Carthaginian Catholics of the favour of the Emperor Constantine, asked that prince to let their cause

¹ Hooker, E. P. v. 42. 11. See the vivid picture in H. S. Holland's *On Behalf of Belief*, p. 173.

be judged by bishops sent from Gaul. He thereupon wrote¹ to Miltiades, bishop of Rome, whose name was afterwards corrupted into "Melchiades," and to "Marcus," probably to be identified with Merocles, bishop of Milan,² desiring them to act with three Gallic bishops, to whom he had already sent instructions to hasten to Rome for the purpose. This is what a Roman advocate has called "a reference to Rome,"³ as if a Papal judgment were alone in question; and the same writer fastens on a phrase or two repeatedly used by St. Augustine as to Melchiades' "council" or "judgment,"⁴ whereas elsewhere Augustine distinctly represents Melchiades as merely the "president" of the court of inquiry, and as in that capacity "giving his own judgment last,"⁵ or speaks

¹ The letter in a Greek version is in Euseb. x. 5. The original is given in App. to Aug. tom. ix.

² Dict. Chr. Antiq. ii. 1811. Anyhow the phrase, "collegis vestris," applied to three bishops, would suggest that "Marcus" was himself already a bishop; and cp. Tillemont, vi. 702.

³ Rivington, p. 140.

⁴ Aug. Brevic. Collat. iii. s. 31, 33, 36, 38; Ad Donat. post Collat. s. 17, 19, 56. But here Mr. Rivington betrays himself: he says that Augustine uses this phrase "throughout the conference with the Donatists in 411" (p. 141). It was only on the third day of that conference that this council (of Oct. 10, 313) was discussed as part of the history of the Donatist case.

⁵ By which vote, says Optatus, De Schism. i. 24, "judicium clausum est." Cp. Aug. c. Epist. Parm. i. 10.

of "the judgment of Melchiades and of other bishops," "the sentences of the bishops and Melchiades," or of "the bishops who judged at Rome,"¹ etc.; and Constantine's own language is still more pertinent.² It is, in fact, impossible

¹ Cf. Aug. Brev. Coll. iii. 24, 31; Ep. 43, s. 16, "Viri gravissimi . . . suum temperare arbitrium maluerunt;" "Melchiadis ultima prolata sententia;" and s. 19, 20, "Illos episcopos qui Romæ judicarunt . . . tantæ auctoritatis episcopos, quorum iudicio," etc.; Ep. 105, s. 8, "præsidente Melchiade cum multis collegis suis," "de iudicio episcoporum," etc.; and Ep. 53, s. 5, "de iudicio episcoporum . . . conquestos." Mr. Rivington has, indeed, made out a charge of inaccurate translation, on Laud's part, of a passage in Aug. Ep. 43; but he himself (p. 142) had translated "eum confirmari vellet" (Melchiades, in Ep. 43, 16) as if the "confirming" Cæcilian in his position were "the pope's" sole act. This was commented on in Ch. Quart. Review, and thereupon altered. This passage in St. Augustine's letter is also used by him (p. 231) as showing that there could be "temporarily, and by papal dispensation, two bishops, in one city." But "in" is ambiguous; and the original clearly means that only one of the rival prelates (*i.e.* the Catholic) was to be—not by "papal dispensation," but by act of the council under Melchiades' presidency—established as the diocesan. The ex-Donatist, until another flock should be found for him, was simply to reside in the city with episcopal rank. It may be added that Mr. Rivington is pleased to understand the title, "patrem Christian plebis," given by Augustine to "Melchiades," in the Roman sense of "the Holy Father"! (p. 144).

² He wrote to Ablavius, the "vicarius," or vice-prefect, of Africa, describing the inquiry at Rome as conducted both (*tam*) by certain Gallic bishops and by seven of the same communion, "*quam etiam urbis Romæ, episcopi*" (cp. his earlier letter, "before" Miltiades and "before" his "colleagues"); and again, "Cum res fuisset apud urbem Romam ab . . . episcopis

to extract a genuine witness for Papalism from the first of the Lateran Councils; the assertion that "the ecclesiastical status of the bishops in Africa rested with Melchiades,"¹—as if the other bishops, emphatically mentioned as "judges," were simply his "assessors" or advisers, like a congregation of cardinals at the present Papal court,—is an assertion and nothing more. But the Donatists complained, as we learn from Constantine himself, that the case had been heard at Rome by "only a few bishops meeting within closed doors;"² they therefore demanded a fuller court, or, as Optatus puts it, "they determined to appeal from the bishops;" and an appeal such as they made implies that what is aimed at is a more authoritative decision. Constantine therefore arranged for what he called a *plena cognitio* in a large Council of Western bishops, to be held at Arles. On Papal principles, he ought of course to have upheld, as by Divine right final, a judgment

terminata;" and in his letter to Chrestus of Syracuse, Miltiades' part in the affair is described simply by "præsentis quoque Romanæ urbis episcopo."

¹ It is added that his "judgment in the matter was, to a Catholic, final," just as a decision of Leo XIII. would be to Mr. Rivington himself.

² Const. to Ablavius.

affirmed by the Roman see.¹ But nothing of the kind occurred to him, or to any one else at the time. The Council met; Sylvester of Rome, who had recently succeeded Miltiades, was represented by deputies (to call them "legates" would insensibly suggest a loftier position than they occupied); but, says Hefele, Marinus of Arles—one of the three Gallic bishops who had "judged the case at Rome"—"appears to have presided." The Council's first letter to Sylvester, after the close of its proceedings, includes a passage which bears tokens of corruption, but in which occur the words, "te qui *majores dioceses* tenes." The phrase has been set aside by one writer as "an anachronism every way;"² but the request conveyed, that Sylvester could "make known to all" the conclusion arrived at, was not unnatural; and he might be said to "hold the greater *dioceses*" in virtue of his control

¹ Mr. Rivington evades this by saying that "it was not a matter which came within the scope of papal infallibility" (p. 146). But did it not, on his own showing, come within the scope of papal jurisdiction as plenary, absolute, and immediate?

² E. S. Ffoulkes, in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* iii. 831. It is certainly a curiously abrupt phrase in such a context, and might suggest the hand of a later Roman forger (a class only too numerous) who took "dioceses" in the technical sense of "aggregates of provinces," and wished to make out that the Roman bishop was, even in 314, patriarch of "the West."

over Italian districts which, as nearest to Rome, had a central position in the empire—"diocese" being used in its older and vaguer sense.¹ The other letter, which gives the canons at length, begins significantly. Marinus and the bishops tell Sylvester "what *they* have decreed;" they do not ask him to confirm their decrees, but to be the medium of making them universally known; and, "in the first place," they proceed, "as to the observance of the Lord's Paschal feast, that it be observed by us throughout the world on one day, and at one time, and that, according to custom, thou shouldst send² letters to all." Nothing more natural than that a bishop seated in the centre of the empire should there have his peculiar opportunities of communication; but in this he would be acting as the minister of the Council—certainly not as

¹ Cf. Suicer in v.

² "Et juxta consuetudinem litteras ad omnes tu dirigas." *Dirigo* is frequently used for sending, *e.g.* in Leo the Great's letters. Mr. Rivington, with the Latin before him (for he refers to "Haddan and Stubbs"), had rendered this clause, "and as thou shalt *by letters*, according to custom, *direct*." This he has "corrected" into "and that thou shouldst . . . send letters to all." But still he has not got it quite right; in another sentence, "It was a 'custom' for the bishop of Rome to 'direct' the churches as to the day of" Easter "observance," he has substituted "inform" for "direct;" but *dirigas* does not mean "inform" the churches, but "send" letters to them. We shall see more about *dirigas* further on.

the supreme authority whose function it was to give validity to the canons.

(X.) THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY AND
THE NICENE COUNCIL.

The African schism was a wearing and harassing trouble to a part of the Western Church. But it could not be compared, in point of pernicious effect, to the great heresy which some years later broke forth at Alexandria, denying the eternity and the uncreatedness, and therein the true Divinity, of the Son of God. Consider the situation. Here is a controversy which menaces the very life of Christian religion ; which affects not merely, like Donatism, the conditions and limitations of the Church's purity, the validity or nullity of ordinances administered by "unworthy" hands, but the core and basis of Christian belief and practice—the worship of Christ and the idea of God. Consider, next, the Papal assertion that, from the beginning, and therefore in the fourth century, the Roman bishop has had a teaching gift which involves such "assistance" from above as to make him, when speaking officially, an "infallible" guide in matters of faith. Could there ever be a *dignior nodus* for his intervention, a more

imperious call for the fulfilment of so unparalleled a trust? Why did not Sylvester speak *ex cathedra* against Arianism, and promulgate from the fountain-head of orthodox teaching a decision which for all obedient Christians would have been an end of all strife? He did not; and nobody asked him to do so. Nobody, as far as we know, throughout the Church, even thought of applying for a decisive utterance from Rome. A new departure had to be taken, a great experiment had to be made; the first Œcumenical Council had to be assembled, to hear evidence, to debate, and to formulate a creed. Why—on the Papal hypothesis—was all this trouble taken, and all this anxiety endured? The Roman writer so often already referred to appears not unconscious of the naturalness of the question,¹ and propounds three substitutes, as we must call them, for an answer.

(1) The doctrine of infallibility, it is observed, does not imply that “the Pope” was always “able to close the question” when dealing “with such people as the Arians;” as our Lord Himself did not convince the Jews at Capernaum or in the Temple, “His vicar” might be equally unable to silence heretics. If this is to excuse

¹ Rivington, p. 154 ff. So Reply to Ch. Quart. Rev. p. 14 ff.

Sylvester's inaction, it reflects on the Nicene Council for putting forth a formulary that could not compass its object. But the argument is a paltry quibble; to "close a question" by winning-over opponents is one thing, to "close" it by stating the truth for the guidance and comfort of good Christians is another. We are not asking why—on the above hypothesis—the Roman bishop Sylvester did not succeed in doing the one, but why he did not attempt to do the other. The point is, If Christians then believed about Sylvester what Roman doctrine affirms to have been part of Christian belief from the first as to Roman bishops,—and if he, too, believed himself to possess an infallible *magisterium* when speaking under certain conditions,—why was he not appealed to, or why did he not, *ex mero motu*, speak?

(2) Again, it is pretended that Rome had already done her part when "Pope St. Dionysius set his seal to the use of the term Homoousion," as a safeguard of faith, without imposing it on all Christians, and had thus in effect "closed the question." But was the approval of the term by a Roman Council some sixty years earlier sufficient for the exigencies of A.D. 319–325? Could it justify the "Pope" of that later day in not

republishing the term, or some other equivalent, in presence of a far greater peril to Christianity? But in fact, whatever Dionysius may have said had no general effect on the Church, for it was at any rate widely believed that the term was actually withdrawn (some eight years later), under pressure of heretical objections, by the great Council of Antioch in 269,¹ and it is certain that at Nicæa it was only adopted as a last expedient against Arian evasions. Nor did Alexander of Alexandria, in his encyclicals put forth amid the stress and storm of a painful conflict while Sylvester was sitting quietly in the Lateran, even once refer to Dionysius of Rome and his pronouncement as authoritative in support of the orthodox Christology.

(3) Lastly we are reminded that Sylvester may have acted, but his utterances may have perished, for only one Papal letter of the period has been preserved; and that, at any rate, the Sixth Œcumenical Council ascribes "the idea of the Council *not* to the Emperor, *but* to the Pope himself," and "it is in the highest degree

¹ S. Athan. de Synod. 43-45. Mr. Rivington thinks that although Athanasius "*seems* to allow this," he was misinformed, and observes that he says he had not a copy of the synodal letter. Anyhow he expected that this letter would explain the proceedings in question (ib. 47). Hefele believes the statement.

probable" that Sylvester and Alexander had planned the Council between them; that "the way in which St. Sylvester elected to govern the Church was by" such a Council; that thus the Pope then exhibited his Roman "genius for government," while "the Emperor hailed" the proposal of a Council as fulfilling "his own desire for" Church unity; and that, though "not needed for the purpose of" a final definition, because "the decision of the Pope was already formed," it was "conducive to the ends which the Holy Father had in view."

If history may thus be developed, by the aid of maybe's, out of a writer's own consciousness, his work is easy indeed. But perhaps it is not quite worth doing. The suggestion that the Catholics of the period, being, by hypothesis, devout believers in Papal infallibility, could have suffered a Papal judgment against Arianism to perish as a document and be forgotten as a fact, is, to say the least, injudicious; and to refer to the Sixth Council—held 355 years later—for such a statement as the one quoted above, when the passage in question ascribes the assembling of the Nicene Council to "Constantine *and* Sylvester,"¹ is to

¹ Mansi, Concil. xi. 661. In his Reply, p. 18, Mr. Rivington

deal somewhat unscrupulously with authorities invoked. Naturally Constantine would consult some bishops; the point is, that there is no real warrant for ascribing to the bishop of Rome a specially potential voice in the matter.

The Council met; and who presided over it? Apparently Hosius, bishop of Cordova, the Emperor's venerated adviser, the "father" of Western bishops. But did he preside by commission from Rome? Not according to any trustworthy records. He signs first, then two presbyters; but it is to them, not to him, that the delegation from Sylvester is attributed;¹ so that he, a Spanish prelate, takes precedence of presbyters who represent the Roman see. As for the authority of Gelasius of Cyzicus,² adduced in favour of his legatine presidency,

perforce admits this, which in his volume he had in effect denied (p. 158).

¹ A Coptic document, given by Pitra in *Spicil. Solesm.* i. 513, ff., says, "These are the names of the bishops who signed; . . . from Spain, Osius of the city of Corduba,—'I believe thus as is above written;' Vito and Innocentius" (Vincentius) "presbyters,—'We *sign for our bishop*, who is the bishop of Rome: he believes thus as is above written.'" For somewhat fuller forms of this statement, see Mansi, *Conc.* ii. 691, 697. The "Vetus Interpretatio" and the "Prisca Editio" also make "Osius" sign before the "presbyteri urbis Romæ."

² For him and his untrustworthiness, see *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* ii. 620. He lived in the latter part of the fifth century.

a parallelism between his account and that of Eusebius will exhibit his boldness in falsification.¹ He interpolates into the Eusebian text the legateship of Hosius, adding also, in order to give a colour of fact, the names of the "wide-famed Spaniard" and of the two Roman presbyters; and what Eusebius says of Rome and of Sylvester is transferred to Byzantium and Metrophanes! Well may the nobly honest Tillemont—objectionable, as a mere Gallican, and not a "Catholic divine," to modern Papalists²—remark that "one cannot read the text of Eusebius as Gelasius represents it without a corruption and a *renversement manifeste* of its sense."³

¹ EUSEBIUS.

And of the Spaniards themselves the one widely famed was seated with the great body (of bishops).

But of the imperial city the prelate was absent through old age; but presbyters of his were present, and supplied his place.

GELASIOUS.

And of the Spaniards he, the widely famed Hosius, holding also the place of Sylvester bishop of the great Rome, with Vito and Vincent, presbyters of Rome, were seated together with the great body. And of the *now* imperial city, the prelate, named Metrophanes, was absent through old age; but presbyters of his were present, and supplied his place.

² Rivington, p. 231.

³ Tillemont, iii. 808. Mr. Rivington pleads (p. 164) that

That Sylvester was himself orthodox, and that his deputies at Nicæa¹ represented his mind in that respect, may be assumed without hesitation. But Rome (strange to say, on the Vatican hypothesis) was not famous for theological study; and Vincent and Vito were hardly likely to take an active part in the discussions in which Athanasius, as yet only

Gelasius "professes to be copying from older lists." What would be their value against the authority of Eusebius, a member of the council? Le Quien uses no "holiday terms" about this passage: "Quæ a Gelasio, vel ab altero nugatore, conficta esse nemo sanus inficiabitur" (Or. Christ. i. 207).

¹ They are referred to by a Roman council in a letter to the Illyrians (Hefele would date it in 369) in which, after "the 318 bishops," we read, "atque ex parte sanctissimi episcopi urbis Romæ directi" (cf. Theodoret, H. E. ii. 22, ed. Gaisford). It was natural enough that a Roman council should thus mention the presence of Roman deputies at Nicæa. But we cannot accept such a phrase, in default of other evidence, as a proof that they exercised a preponderative influence. In the theological debates they would not be likely to feel at home. But now as to *directi*, which (vid. supr.) means "sent." Mr. Rivington had twice, in a professed translation, rendered the words "*the 318 bishops directed from the city of the most holy bishop of Rome*" (pp. 164, 210), and previously had spoken of "the bishops directed from Rome" (p. 160). The mistranslation was duly pointed out; whereupon, at the end of his "Reply," Mr. Rivington said that "united with those" should be inserted before "directed from" in p. 164, and that "and those" should be similarly inserted in p. 210. Thus the *directi* would be, not (as he had represented it) the 318, but only the Roman legates. But the false rendering was kept. However, in the *corrigenda*, it is abandoned as to pp. 160, 164, 210, "and the legates," or "sent," being substituted. In p. 147, as we have seen, the correction is imperfect.

an Alexandrian deacon, shone supreme. But we are reminded of a Council's assertion that the Nicene fathers "referred the confirmation of all things, and the authority, to the holy Roman Church." When and where was this Council held? At Rome itself, just one hundred and sixty years later, and when Felix of Rome was in the full career of his strife with Acacius of Constantinople!¹ It is obvious to remark that we "like not the security; we think we do know the sweet Roman hand."

There is a considerable significance in the fifth of the Nicene canons: it provided for a right of appeal to provincial synods. Now, either the see of Rome was then regarded as *jure divino* a supreme court of appeal for the whole Church, or it was not. If it was, then we may ask, with Collier,² how the Nicene fathers came to ignore a jurisdiction so august in its origin and sanction. If it was not, the Vatican decree is fundamentally wrong in its history, whereas it professes to be right; and

¹ Mansi, vii. 1140. The letter is there given as belonging to 484: but Hefele gives reasons for dating it in 485. The bishops must have simply accepted, without any attempt at verifying, the statement which Felix made, probably in good faith, on the warrant of traditional Roman assertion.

² Eccles. Hist. Brit. i. 75.

its dogma is closely connected with that profession. But there is one express reference in the Nicene canons to "the Roman bishop" as such. The first sentence of the sixth canon, in its Greek text, runs literally thus: "Let the ancient usages which exist in Egypt, and Libya, and Pentapolis, remain in force, to the effect that the bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all these (districts), since this is customary also for the bishop who is in Rome; and similarly, both as to Antioch and in the other provinces, let the Churches have their privileges secured to them." Thus the purview of the opening clause is limited to the Alexandrian "patriarchate," if we may for convenience antedate the use of that term. This reading is confirmed not only by the Dionysian and Isidorian Latin versions, but by two others of much earlier date. One, which may be referred to the fourth century, though it is known simply as the "Vetus," reads: "Antiqua per Ægyptum ac Libyam atque Pentapolim" [or, "per Ægyptum atque Pentapolim] consuetudo servetur ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum habeat potestatem" [or, "sollicitudinem], quoniam et urbis Romæ episcopo similis mos est." In all three we have a marked accordance

with the Greek, the substitution of singular for plural being unimportant; while a third, which Mansi gives as sent from Constantinople to Carthage in 419, agrees literally with the Greek, as does the Coptic. These versions are thus decisive against the reading produced on Rome's behalf at the Council of Chalcedon, "Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum: teneat autem et Ægyptus, etc.;"¹ and against another Roman version, or rather paraphrase, which bears the name of the "Prisca," and reads, "Antiqui moris est ut urbis Romæ episcopus habeat principatum," and which goes on to describe this "principatus,"—"ut *suburbicaria* loca et omnem provinciam suam sollicitudine gubernet," adding that "the bishop of Alexandria is to have

¹ It is fair to observe that the version did not claim for the Roman church a "primatus" over all other churches. For a "primatus" is to be secured to the church of Egypt (*i.e.* of Alexandria), and further on we read, "Similiter autem et qui in Antiochia constitutus est; et in cæteris provinciis, *primatus* habeant ecclesiæ civitatum ampliorum," so that this Roman translator meant by "primatus," in all three cases, a patriarchal or exarchal jurisdiction. Or, if he meant more by "primatus" in the first case,—if he altered the first words of the original in order to magnify his own church above all others,—he forgot to adopt a different term for the position ascribed to the Alexandrian, Antiochene, and other churches of "the large cities;" he did not, in short, remember that, unless he altered more, he could not make Rome's "primacy" big enough.

the care of all things in Egypt." Nor does Rufinus' free version commend itself as a true representative of the original: "Et ut apud Alexandriam, et in urbe Roma, vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic suburbicariarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat."¹ In two of these Latin renderings we see at once that there is an attempt made to transfer the mention of the Roman bishop's authority from an illustrative parallel to a primary assertion; whereas in the Greek, the Roman case is brought in as *pro tanto* similar to the Alexandrian; one "custom" is cited to back up another. And what was the custom to be backed up? That the bishop of Alexandria should in effect be sole metropolitan, not only for the single province of Egypt, but also for the other regions of Libya and Pentapolis;² and this ample extent of his jurisdiction was confirmed by the Council. But by way of meeting an objection on the

¹ The gloss about "suburbicarian places" found its way into the "Vetus." See "Additional Note" at the end.

² Evidence for the existence of other metropolitans within this patriarchate in the time, *e.g.* of Synesius (see Hefele), is irrelevant, for the hierarchical arrangements of the Nicene period might naturally have been developed and made more complex, after the episcopate of St. Athanasius had raised the *prestige*, and consolidated the authority, of the great "evangelical throne."

part of those who were accustomed to see one metropolitan in each province, it is added that the case of the bishop of Rome is similar. The canon does not explain "how ;" but it was evidently understood at Nicæa that the Roman was the only metropolitanical see for the provinces of central and southern Italy, with the three great islands, which were civilly under the "vicarius urbis." The "suburbicarian Churches," or "places," are now identified with the much smaller district of a hundred miles around Rome, which was under the "præfectus urbis."¹

To pretend that in Nicene times the Roman see was, in fact though not in name, patriarchal in regard to the whole West, is to go beyond historical warrant, and to ignore the subsequent enactments obtained by Rome from docile Western Emperors, as we shall see further on.

But to return to the clause adducing the "custom" in regard to the Roman bishop as parallel to that which affected Alexandria. Is it legitimate to treat it as implying that Rome was "the true norm" of Church government everywhere?² Assuredly not; to do

¹ See Hefele, Councils, i. 398, E.T., on this sense of "suburbicarian." Cf. Bingham, ix. i. 9.

² Rivington, p. 168. In a note, we are told that this "is the interpretation given by Nicolas I. in his letter to the emperor Michael." Mr. Rivington seems unaware that there are five

so is to thrust on the words a sense which no natural construction would find in them. Still more hopeless is the attempt to infer that Alexandria's jurisdiction over all Egypt, in the extended sense, had been itself a grant from Rome,¹ that "the Papal legates *may* have given the information that the bishops of Rome had long ago originated, *or* arranged, *or* consented to, this jurisdiction of Alexandria."²

such letters. The passage intended is in the fourth: "Si instituta Nicænæ synodi diligenter inspiciantur, inveniatur profecto quia Romanæ ecclesiæ nullum eadem synodus contulit incrementum, sed potius ex ejus forma, quod Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ tribueret particulariter, sumpsit exemplum" (Mansi, Conc. xv. 206). And what if Nicolas I. did say so? It cost him no trouble to affirm after this fashion. In the same letter he dogmatically interprets "primatem dioceseos," in the Latin version of Chalc. can. 9, of the pope, as "vicar of the first apostle"! (ib. 201). We know, too, that having ignored the "false decretals" in 863, he argued disingenuously for them in 864.

¹ Mr. Rivington (p. 169) prefers this explanation. "Taking the words simply as they stand, the canon may be said to assert that the subjection of the Egyptian bishops to Alexandria was customary with the bishop of Rome. *That is to say,* the jurisdiction of Alexandria over these bishops had been the arrangement with respect to them recognised and acted upon by the bishop of Rome himself, and that *consequently* things must remain as they were." The little word *καὶ* between *ἐπειδὴ* and *τῶ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ* is ignored in this ingenious *videlicet*. Thus far we get only the idea of "recognition by," or "cognisance of," Rome. Then, when the ground has been thus far prepared, Mr. Rivington leads us a step forward; the word "originated" glides into the paragraph, and the page-heading boldly affirms that "the sixth canon bases its judgment on papal authority"!

² The notion that such information given by "legates"

But, lastly, the utter silence of this canon as to any specifically Papal prerogatives¹ inhering in the Roman see can hardly be explained by saying that here its quasi-patriarchal rights alone were in question, and its Papal character might therefore, for the time, be left out of consideration. The rejoinder is obvious; the language of the canon is exactly what would be natural on the part of a Council which knew nothing of Papal claims, which simply regarded one chief see as in an analogous condition to another. It is *not* what would be natural on the part of any assembly of Christian bishops who believed that Christ had given to the Roman see a plenitude of jurisdiction which differed, not only in degree but in kind, from that of any other see whatsoever. Men who so believed would have taken care to safeguard in very express terms that unique prerogative of "the bishop who is in Rome," which made him, by Divine commission, so very much more than a primate or patriarch, —which set him apart as, in an awfully full

would have decided such a point, or that, if decided, it would not have been put into plain terms, may be left to refute itself.

¹ Hefele condescends to use an ambiguous term here, contending that the canon contains nothing contrary to "the *primacy* of the holy see." How much does "primacy" cover?

and absolute sense, the representative of the Church's Heavenly Lord.

(XI.) JULIUS AND THE EASTERNS.

Julius I., who governed the Roman Church for fifteen years from the early part of 337, added greatly and deservedly to the moral influence of his see by his unswerving loyalty to the Nicene faith, and his cordial and effective support of its great champion in the troubles which so soon followed on the "first return" of St. Athanasius.¹ It was most probably in the end of 339² that the "Eastern" Arianisers or "Eusebians," bent on ruining the restored archbishop of Alexandria by reviving old charges, or rather old libels, and reinforcing them by new ones,—asked Julius to assemble a Council for a fresh inquiry into the case, "and, *if he pleased*, to act as judge."³ Obviously these Easterns did not deem themselves bound to appeal to the bishop of Rome as to a supreme judge in all ecclesiastical cases: they invite him to preside over the

¹ One of the best letters that a Roman bishop ever wrote was Julius' letter of congratulation to the Alexandrians in view of Athanasius' second return. S. Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 52.

² Those who, like Prof. Gwatkin, date Athanasius' first return in 337, and his second exile in 339, would date this request at the end of 338.

³ S. Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 20.

trial ; and he, in turn, complies with their request for a Council by summoning one to meet in Rome, and inviting both parties to attend it. Athanasius, having escaped from Alexandria after the sacrilegious outrages of the spring of 340, appears at Rome, and waits there, impressing the bishop and the Church by the moral grandeur and beauty of his character. The Eusebians detain the messengers of Julius until the January of 341, and then write to him in a querulous spirit, charging him with partiality to the accused bishop (who, in their view, was still canonically under deposition by sentence of the Council of Tyre in 335)—throwing on him the responsibility for “rekindling the fire of discord,” and insisting that, although his see was “apostolic,” yet “all bishops were of equal authority, and were not to be esteemed according to the greatness of their respective cities”—a clear hint that, in the East, the Roman Church was suspected of building overmuch on the dignity of its city. The reply of Julius,¹ which was not written until the late autumn, contains some points which have been misapprehended.

¹ It is given in Athanasius' *Apol. c. Ari. c. 20 ff.* See *Historical Writings of St. Athanasius* (Oxford, 1881), p. xxvi.

1. The Nicene Council, he says, "agreed," and even "prescribed," that the decisions of one synod might be reversed by another.¹ But this remark (whatever may be its historical basis) has no bearing on any special function of the Roman see or Church; it would hold good just as fully if the Council, thus supposed to be competent to re-hear causes decided by synods in Asia, had been summoned to meet anywhere else than at Rome.

2. Next comes a sentence to the effect that, if Athanasius, or Marcellus of Ancyra (whom the Easterns had condemned as having put forth a form of Sabellianism), "had given offence, word should have been written to us all, that so a just decision might proceed *from all*."² Some confusion has arisen from not observing that Julius is here looking back to the past wrongdoings of the Eusebians, when they condemned Athanasius and others in synods, at Tyre and Antioch, which were not properly representative of the collective episcopate. "You acted in this

¹ S. Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 22. Robertson thinks this is a "free" reference to Nic. can. 5, about re-hearings of cases by provincial synods. Transl. Ath. p. 111. But the cases are such as have been decided by individual bishops.

² Literally, "that so what was just might be determined by all" (Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 35).

way," he says in effect; "you ought to have acted otherwise, considering that the 'sufferers were bishops of eminent Churches which Apostles had personally governed.'" He illustrates the word "all" by saying that "the bishops will be obliged again to assemble, in order that the condemnation of those who are found guilty may take place in the presence of all." But then he reminds them of a special "custom" in regard to Alexandrian Church causes,—“that word should be written first to us, and so a just decision should proceed from this place”¹ (Rome). This must be the passage which Socrates in the next century so gravely misapprehended, as if Julius had quoted a “canon commanding that the Churches should make no regulations without the consent of the bishop of Rome.”² Papalist advocates are apt to produce this statement as if it were of primary authority;³ whereas it needs to be corrected by what Julius actually wrote, which refers to Alexandria simply, in view of its specially close relation to Rome. Since Athanasius personally was concerned, “they ought to have informed the Church

¹ *Καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὀρίξεσθαι τὰ δίκαια.* This “custom” is misrepresented by Mr. Rivington, as if it applied to any “case of difference arising amongst bishops” (p. 471).

² Soc. ii. 17, and cf. Soz. iii. 10.

³ Rivington, p. 176.

here ;” whereas “now they wish us to concur in a sentence which they had passed by their own authority without consulting us. This,” proceeds Julius, “is by no means in accordance with what the directions of Paul, and the traditions of the Fathers, have prescribed to us ;” they must allow him to say this,—he is writing in the common interest,—“*for* what we have received from blessed Peter the Apostle, this I make known to you.” This context refers to the special case of Alexandria ; and whatever Julius understood by “the directions of Paul” and “the tradition from Peter,” he probably had in mind the associations which linked the names of the two great Apostles with that of Mark, the reputed founder of the Alexandrian see. He then returns to the general subject of his letter.

(XII.) THE COUNCIL OF SARDICA.

The genuineness of the canons ascribed to the Sardican Council of 343 is open to some doubt, inasmuch as canons passed by that great Western synod¹ would ordinarily have been circulated throughout the West, and this would

¹ As at Nicæa, so at Sardica, Hosius presided, and signed first : then “Julius of Rome *by his presbyters* Archidamus and Philoxemus” (Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 50).

have prevented St. Augustine, and the African Church in his time, from confounding the "Sardican Council" with the Arian "conciliabulum" of seceders to Philippopolis, which usurped its name and its rights in a circular letter.¹ But for our present purpose, the canons in question may be assumed to be really Sardican; and one need not spend time in discussing the bold hypothesis that four Roman bishops of the fifth century who persisted in calling them "Nicene"—we shall see ere long from what motive—were stating the literal fact as to their origin.² Another theory, somewhat

¹ "Sardicense concilium Arianorum fuit, quod totum (quod notum) jamdiu est, ut habemus in manibus, contractum maxime contra Athanasium," S. Aug. c. Crescon. iii. s. 38. . . . Quod quidem concilium, ne te lateat, Arianorum est" (ib. iv. s. 52). So in his Ep. 44. s. 6. The old ecclesiastical historians know nothing of canons, but only of synodical letters, as put forth by the true Sardican Council. Cf. S. Athan. Apol. c. Ari. 37 ff. But in a letter of the Constantinopolitan council of 382 a "Nicene rule" is quoted, as to inviting "the bishops of the bordering territory" to meet the bishops of a province when assembled for the consecration of a new colleague (Theodoret, v. 9). This is not "Nicene," but has a resemblance to a sentence in the seventh Sardican canon, but only in its Greek text. However, Gratus of Carthage in 348 said he "remembered" a Sardican decree which is like Sard. 19 (or 15).

² This is the theory which Mr. Rivington, in p. 178, describes as "quite possible," but in p. 473 adopts as "the most satisfactory," although he considers the one next mentioned to be "perfectly tenable" (p. 473). He accordingly supposes the Sardican "provisions" about appeals to have been Nicene

less adventurous, would explain the description of them as "Nicene" by assuming that they were considered an "appendix and explication of Nicene directions," and *so* "were part and parcel of the Nicene settlement," as the "Constantinopolitan" recension of the Creed was "virtually contained in its Nicene" form. Well, we know what that "Nicene" form was; what do we know of any Nicene rulings which could stand in such a relation to the Sardican? and what authority had the Sardican Council, not being œcumenical, to accredit an appendix to Nicene laws? The words ascribed in one of these canons to bishop Hosius, and presently to be considered, are incompatible with the theory. And as for the suggestion that Popes might keep on "speaking of them as Nicene to Africans," in order to avoid confusion with the Pseudo-Sardican "conciliabulum," it is utterly hopeless. These "Popes" did *not* say, "The true Sardican Council was orthodox, and its rules are a legitimate explanation or development of the Nicene;" what they said was, "These in very deed, but *preserved, after a while, at Rome only, the home of accuracy, the metropolis of canonical lore.*" Among the many extraordinary assertions in which his volume abounds, these words may take a foremost place. In his view, the sixth Nicene canon originally contained such directions. Why then did the Roman "legate" at Chalcedon read it without them?

rules *are Nicene* ;” and they knew well how that assertion would be understood. But now for the provisions in regard to the see of Rome contained in the third, fourth, and fifth canons. They are introduced by a proposal on the part of Hosius ; “ If it is your pleasure, let us honour the memory of Peter the Apostle ;” a phrase which is incompatible with an ancient right acknowledged on all hands.¹ But what is the power thus given, *de novo*, to Julius² of Rome, or to any “ Roman bishop ” ? It comes to this : a

¹ Hefele denies this, on the ground that “ *si placet* ” is often used in formulating a doctrinal decree, which must express an old truth : and that “ every acknowledgment even of an ancient papal right is always made out of reverence to St. Peter.” But (a) the matter in question is not doctrinal, but merely one of judiciary administration. (b) The reference to St. Peter’s memory is made without any *salvo*, or even an implicit intimation that “ an acknowledged papal right is being referred to,” and in the circumstances such a *salvo* would have been absolutely necessary. Mr. Rivington contends that this reference pertains merely to the third canon, which does not deal with appeals to Rome strictly so called. But in all reason it must be read with all the following provisions that refer to Rome, as recommending them for adoption.

² This name is in the Greek text (on which see Hefele, ii. 108, s. 64.) and in the Vetus and the Dionysian. The Prisca and Isidorian give no name. Mr. Rivington tells his readers that “ some copies have ‘ *Sylvester*, ’ ” which would suit his theory. He does *not* tell them that no good edition admits this reading, and that a note to the Codex Canonum in the appendix to St. Leo’s works says bluntly : “ *Nomen Silvestro pro Julio . . . substitutum est . . . ut congrueret cum tempore Nicæne synodi.* ”

bishop deposed by his provincial synod may demand a new trial, and appeal to the bishop of Rome for that purpose (can. 4, 5); in which case his comprovincial judges shall also write to the same bishop (can. 3), who, if he deems the appeal reasonable, may send the case to the bishops of the next adjacent province, and, at the appellant's special request, may depute one or more presbyters *de latere suo* to act with them, as "holding his authority;"¹ and the previous deposition shall not take effect until it has been reaffirmed by such a tribunal.

The first remark to be made is suggested by Mr. Rivington's assertion that "these canons do indeed condition appeals *to Rome*, but they assume their necessity,—do not inaugurate them," but "suppose that there will be" such appeals. There is no warrant for such a statement: the probability of appeals to some quarter is indeed supposed, and it is deemed desirable to provide for them: but that they should be made to Rome is not a presupposition, but a "condition." Next the "appellate jurisdiction," if so it is to be called, thus conceded to the bishop of Rome, is in four respects limited. He may not evoke

¹ It is going beyond the text to assume, as does Hefele, that this means presiding in the court.

the cause, *motu proprio*, to Rome.¹ He may not, *motu proprio*, call the provincial synod to account. He may not form the new tribunal at his own pleasure. He may not decide the case personally. The power, in fact, is much less than was given by the Council of Chalcedon in such cases to the "exarch" or primate,—as superior to the metropolitans of his "diocese,"—or to "the see of Constantinople." One is really surprised at the complacency with which such provisions as these (natural enough at the time) are adduced as serviceable in controversy to the cause of a Papal sovereignty. They are not only inadequate, but actually damaging. St. Hilary² gives a Latin version of a letter, said to be addressed by the Council to Julius, and containing the sentence, "For this will seem best and 'valde congruentissimum, si ad caput, id est ad Petri apostoli sedem, de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes.'" Hefele admits that it does not come in naturally, but "interrupts the train of

¹ It is not true that "Julius told the Eusebians that they ought to come to Rome, and have their cause tried there (in exact accordance with the provisions of the so-called Sardican canons)." These provisions do not go that length, and Julius' "exhortation" was in reply to the Eusebians' own "request" (Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 20, 22).

² Fragm. ii. 9-13.

thought." Yet, if it be genuine, it does not go beyond what would be natural for Westerns to say of the great primatial and sole "apostolical" see in the West.

(XIII.) LIBERIUS.

It is an ungrateful task to dwell on the one instance of weakness and unfaithfulness which is associated with the name of Julius' immediate successor, who in other respects was a good and true man. But as an attempt has been made which might be called gallant, if it were not so desperate, to nullify the evidence for the lapse of Liberius, one must see what that evidence is, and what it proves. Liberius had been zealous for Nicene orthodoxy: and when Constantius had terrorised the Council of Milan in 355, his attempts to gain Liberius, then at Rome, had been repelled with a defiant indignation, which, but for later events, might have seemed to indicate a "rock-like" constancy.¹ But two

¹ See the remarks of Newman, *The Arians*, p. 329. Mr. Rivington speaks of Liberius on this occasion as "knowing himself to be the Atlas whom our Divine Lord had appointed to bear the world of Divine revelation on his shoulders" (p. 189), *because* Theodoret in his rhetorical account makes Liberius say, "The cause of the faith is not weakened because I am alone." But Theodoret makes him add, "*For*, in the ancient story, three only are found to resist the decree" (ii. 16).

years of exile in Thrace made a difference, the extent of which must be carefully estimated. First, according to what is implied in a postscript to Athanasius' "Apology against the Arians," and asserted in a passage of that "History of the Arians" which has been sometimes thought to be not throughout of his own writing,¹ Liberius, longing to return home, consented to sign a document renouncing communion with Athanasius.² There is no sufficient reason for questioning these statements, although Mr. Rivington, following a Jesuit guide,³ intimates a belief that

¹ But see Robertson's St. Athanasius (Lib. Nicene and Post-nicene Fathers), p. 266.

² Apol. c. Ari. 89: "He did not endure to the end the affliction (*θλίψιν*) of banishment." Hist. Ari. 41: "Liberius . . . broke down, and, in fear of threatened death, signed" (*i.e.* against Athanasius; cf. *ib.* c. 31). To refrain from quoting either passage, and to say that the former "does not speak of a fall, but merely of Liberius not having completed his term of exile" (Rivington, p. 186), is most disingenuous. Hefele (who rejects the evidence of the Hilarian fragment) says that "it is useless trouble to try to find in these words any other meaning than this, that he did not hold out," etc., and that both passages are additions by Athanasius himself. The "History of Arians" was evidently written piecemeal; see Robertson, *l.c.*

³ Stiling, in Vit. Liberii, Act. SS. Sept. 23. "No," exclaims Mr. Rivington; "what Liberius did sign for certain was all in support of Athanasius." When Bellarmine owns "*Liberium, etsi non expresse, tamen interpretative, in hæresim consensisse*" (de Rom. Pont. iv. 9), he must seem to Mr. Rivington to concede far too much.

they are spurious. But it would be unfair to cite them as implying that Liberius went further, and actually signed a heretical creed. On the other hand, their silence on this point might be due to a characteristic generosity, and cannot outweigh the evidence of Hilary in his pamphlet against Constantius, "I know not whether you showed more impiety in banishing him (Liberius) than in restoring him," which can only mean that his restoration was purchased by a compromise of his orthodoxy. The passage in St. Hilary's sixth Fragment, in which certain "letters of Liberius" are exhibited, with fierce comments anathematising him as a "prevaricator" or betrayer of trust, involves a well-known difficulty; for the creed which he signed, and which is branded as a "perfidia," is said to have been framed by Easterns at Sirmium. Now Hilary, who put the best possible construction on Semiarian formulas, and, in particular, on the long Sirmian creed (which was several years prior to Liberius' exile), could not here be thinking of it; and while the short Sirmian creed of 357 would suit the description, inasmuch as he himself calls it a "blasphemia," it was a Western or Latin composition, drafted by the bishop of Lisbon in a small meeting at

Sirmium.¹ It is true that a later Sirmian creed, compiled in 358 by Easterns in a Semiarian interest out of three older formularies, is identified by Sozomen with the one which Liberius accepted in substitution for the Nicene;² but except *as* such a substitute, Hilary would not have denounced it as "perfidia." However, Jerome is distinct in affirming that Liberius did under pressure sign something "heretical,"³ and, in another passage, that being overcome by the weariness of exile, "et in hæreticam pravitatem subscribens," he had entered Rome as a conqueror.⁴

¹ Newman, *The Arians*, p. 435. This creed is given in the original Latin by Hilary, *De Synodis*, 11, and in a Greek version by Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 28. It condemns both Homoousion and Homoiousion, and says, "no one can doubt that the Father is greater than the Son . . . in Godhead." But it does not absolutely affirm the Anomoion.

² Soz. iv. 15. Cf. Newman, *Arians*, p. 437. Döllinger considers (*Fables respecting Popes*, p. 183) that he signed both the long Sirmian creed and the compilation, the latter involving a "sacrifice of the Nicene doctrine."

³ *De Vir. Illustr.* c. 97. The statement cannot be invalidated by a mistake, as we must consider it, as to the exact date, which is here implicitly placed at the beginning of the exile.

⁴ *Chronicle*, ann. 352. Stilling, of course, treats the incriminating passages as interpolations (*Act. SS. Sept.* 23, c. 147). Will it be contended that most of them were forged by the party which glorified the intruder Felix, and invented the story of a bloody persecution of his adherents by Liberius on his return? Let those who champion Liberius à *l'outrance* explain the

Jerome, indeed, as attached to Damasus (formerly a partisan of Felix), was not likely to be partial to the memory of Liberius; but he must have known that Liberius had, at any rate in his later years, been energetically Catholic, and he was not the man to blacken the name of a Roman bishop, in a series of biographies and in a Chronicle, without evidence of a solid character; nor would even schismatics like Marcellinus and Faustinus, themselves bitterly hostile to Damasus, have ventured, in default of such evidence, on affirming in the preface to their memorial to Valentinian II. and Theodosius I. that Liberius “*manus perfidiae dederat*,” and on those terms had regained his see.¹ The impulse which drives Roman advocates, in certain awkward cases, to take an ultra-sceptical line about evidence, is pretty sure to place them on quaking ground.²

honours long paid by Rome to “*pope St. Felix II.*” (See *Vit. Pontif. i.* 58.) Jerome’s Chronicle condemns Felix.

¹ See this in Sirmond, *Op.* vol. I. To whatever extent he lapsed, he lapsed not as a private Christian, but in his public ecclesiastical capacity as bishop of Rome.

² Renouf says that Stilling’s “*article on Liberius is calculated to impose upon precisely those who have no notion of the difference between . . . Pyrrhonism and sound criticism*” (On Pope Honorius, p. 44). We need not dwell on the strange perversion of history by which it was once maintained on the Roman side—as by Anglc-Roman prelates “*in their address to queen*

(XIV.) ROME AND THE ANTIOCHENE SCHISM.

It is well known that the dissension between the "Eustathian" or Old-Church party at Antioch and those who, while agreeing with them in Nicene faith, communicated with bishops who were in fact crypto-Arian, had seemed likely to be abated when Meletius, having been appointed by Arians to the see of Antioch, made a clear avowal of orthodoxy.¹ The Alexandrian Council of 362 defined the terms of a concordat, whereby the Eustathians, under their presbyter Paulinus, might enter into communion with Meletius and his orthodox adherents. The Council clearly regarded the Eustathians as in their rights, and advised them to treat with the other orthodox section, as now,

Elizabeth—that Athanasius was "censured by pope Liberius, and the emperor reprimanded Athanasius for opposing the head of the Church. But in this," proceeds Collier gravely (Eccl. Hist. vi. 290), "they plainly misreport the case; for Athanasius never received a rebuke from the emperor for non-submission to the papal supremacy. Nothing of the modern pretensions were challenged [*i.e.* claimed] at that time of day;" and Elizabeth reminded the memorialists that "Athanasius was right, and the pope" (Liberius) "was wrong, in the Arian contest."

¹ Not by "openly avowing his belief in the Homoousion," (Rivington, p. 192), but still with sufficient clearness to show his adhesion to its meaning; see Newman, Arians, p. 373.

in effect, trustworthy. But in this they were not acting, as has been maintained,¹ under orders from Rome. It is fatal to such an assumption that the synodical letter, drawn up by St. Athanasius, says not a word to that effect; and one passage in a version of a letter of Athanasius to Rufinianus, which was read in the second Nicene Council (only 425 years later!²), cannot be authority for such a statement as that the rules adopted by the Council for the reconciliation of ex-Arians had been "drawn up in Rome," and brought by Eusebius of Vercellæ, as "Papal legate," to Alexandria, where in that capacity he presided with Athanasius in the Council.³

¹ Rivington, p. 190: "Liberius . . . influenced and *authorised* the great bishop of Alexandria to convene a council. . . . The council at Alexandria adopted the rules laid down by the *Sovereign Pontiff*. . . . Liberius had sent his legates, Eusebius of Vercellæ and Lucifer of Cagliari." Here, as in other passages, bold assertion stands for evidence. Mr. Rivington is somewhat less cautious than Stilting, who admits that he nowhere finds any express assertion of this second legation of Eusebius and Lucifer, but argues that it is "most probable," *for* how could they have acted with such authority if they had not been papal legates? As to the Alexandrian rules having been drawn up at Rome, which Mr. Rivington asserts in his text, though in a footnote he speaks less confidently, Stilting says that "fortasse simul innuitur," in the words quoted as from Athanasius.

² Ταῦτα καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐγράφη, καὶ ἀπεδέξατο ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησία. Mr. Rivington refers for this to "Mansi, tom. vii. col. 75, 6,"—obviously a second-hand reference. It should be "Mansi, xii. 1030."

³ Rivington, pp. 192–195. He infers from a letter of Liberius

This is pure imagination. Eusebius had been Liberius' envoy, eight years before, in conjunction with Lucifer, to Constantius; but there is no real evidence for their having received a second commission from Liberius in the opening of 362, and they both came straight to Alexandria from their places of exile in the Thebaid. And when Lucifer took upon him to consecrate Paulinus as bishop of Antioch,¹ and to Eusebius, written A.D. 354, that one who had then acted in union with Liberius would not now act save as his legate. And in a footnote we are told that, "from St. Athanasius' letter to . . . Jovian, it is evident that Liberius had dealt with the matter of the lapsed bishops *before* the council of Alexandria met,— letters had come from Gaul and Britain." Here it suffices to look at the letter and the dates. The Council met in the spring of 362; the letter to Jovian was written in the autumn of 363, and it does not say one word about action on the part of Liberius; what it does say about the "Spanish and British churches, with those of the Gauls, all Italy, Dalmatia," is that they assent to the Nicene creed. As for the statement in a Vercellian Life of Eusebius, that he and Lucifer were acting as again "legates" of Liberius, and so carried the Alexandrian decrees to Rome for his confirmation, it betrays itself. The Life is described by Mr. Rivington as "published under the authority of Eusebius's successor, St. Honoratus" (p. 195), and in Act. SS. 20 May, to which he refers, we find that it is said to give the statement as on the authority of Honoratus, that St. Eusebius had *four* "legations" from Liberius, this to the Alexandrian synod being the second, and that he and Lucifer, his fellow legate, carried the "acta concilii," in a Latin translation to Rome, where Liberius confirmed them, etc. This shows a much later hand.

¹ Gregory of Nyssa says obscurely that "some one attempted to corrupt Meletius' spouse," the Antiochene church (Orat. de

thereby defeated the Council's peace-making scheme, it is wholly arbitrary to assume that he must have been acting as Rome's representative, and have "decided to use his Papal faculties," for that, otherwise, the Egyptian Church would not have ultimately recognised Paulinus. As to the first point, if Lucifer was clothed with a "legate's" power, it is all the more significant that his act was strongly condemned; and as to the second, it might well appear to strict Churchmen, in Egypt or elsewhere,¹ that Meletius was disqualified by his Arian consecration, and that Paulinus, however unfortunate were the circumstances of his elevation to the episcopate, did at any rate represent those who had never in any respect

Melet.). Mr. Rivington explains it of Euzoius, the new Arian bishop, and says that *ἐπεχείρητο* (? the word is *κατεπεχείρηει*) "would not apply to Paulinus," and that the context "implies a long interval before Meletius' second exile." But Gregory would not take account of so mere an alien as Euzoius, while he would be likely to feel bitterly against Paulinus. The period 362-365 might be called rhetorically a "long interval."

¹ At the same time we must recollect that Athanasius did at one time prepare to recognise Meletius, but was repelled by the latter's cold reception of his overtures—the result, no doubt, of a misunderstanding; whereupon he fell back on his old relations with the Eustathians, and so with Paulinus as now their bishop. See Basil, Ep. 89. When Basil tells the Westerns that he leaves them to "judge whether there was anything culpable in Paulinus' ordination" (Ep. 263. 5), he is refraining from touching a sore.

compromised their orthodoxy. Thus the breach became aggravated; St. Basil did all he could to induce Athanasius, and through him the West, to recognise Meletius: he failed, as he could not but fail;¹ and he was also bitterly disappointed that Damasus, who had succeeded Liberius in 366, did not respond as he had hoped to the entreaties of the Easterns, under a new Arian persecution, for effective Western sympathy.² And this leads us to consider Basil's attitude towards the Roman see.³ Reserving for consideration in a note a few minor details,⁴ let

¹ See Newman, *Church of the Fathers*, p. 73.

² Mr. Rivington lays some stress (p. 209) on Athanasius' words in his *Ep. ad Afros* (A.D. 369): "We have written to our beloved Damasus . . . concerning Auxentius, who invaded the church of Milan, and have narrated his proceedings and expressed surprise that, up to this time, he has not been deposed and cast out of the Church." Now for the comment: "It appears from St. Athanasius that nothing less than a Roman synod could authoritatively allay the disquiet abroad: *but* the value of a Roman synod could obviously only be rated thus by reason of its being an expression of the mind of the bishop of Rome" (*i.e.* solely). But Athanasius might very well urge the orthodox chief bishop of central Italy to declare himself explicitly against the heterodox chief bishop of northern Italy. And whereas Mr. Rivington dwells on the letter of a Roman synod as implying that the Ariminian council's authority was "nullified" by the dissent of "the Roman bishop" (p. 210), Athanasius treats that council as invalidated simply by its opposition to the Nicene (*Ad Afros* 3) and as rejected by many bishops.

³ Mr. Rivington imagines (p. 190) that Basil was a bishop in 359-60!

⁴ In *Ep.* 69. 1, Basil writes to Athanasius: "It has appeared

us take first the letter in which Basil refers to

to us appropriate (ἀκόλουθον) to write to the bishop of Rome, (and ask him) to take cognisance of (ἐπισκέψασθαι) our affairs and give his opinion (γνώμην), in order that, since it is difficult to get any persons sent from thence by a general and synodical resolution, he himself should act authoritatively (ἀθθεντῆσαι) in the matter, by choosing men capable of enduring a toilsome journey," etc. Here (a) ἐπισκέψασθαι has nothing to do with "a quasi-episcopal visitation," a visitatorial intervention in the technical sense, on the part of a "superior authority" (Rivington, p. 213 ff.) ; it is the verb used in the very next letter as to the Roman bishop Dionysius' active sympathy with the sufferings of Cappadocians : and so we find ἀδελφῶν ἐπίσκεψις in connection with "a letter of comfort" (Ep. 242. 2), and ἡ τῶν ἀσθενούντων ἐπίσκεψις (Ep. 263. 1). (b) By γνώμην is meant not a supreme judgment, but an opinion (the Latin version has "consilium") ; and (c) the authority to be assumed by Damasus is clearly that of a representative of the Western church in general. Next, in Ep. 214. 2, Basil says he "hears that adherents of Paulinus are carrying about letters of the Westerns assigning (ἐπιτρέποντα) to themselves the episcopate of the church of Antioch." This could only mean letters in which "Westerns" acknowledged Paulinus as *the* bishop of Antioch. (The Latin version has "attribuunt.") It is absurd to infer that, "according to St. Basil, Rome had the right to decide," by her inherent "jurisdiction," between two competitors for that see (Rivington, p. 219). Again, in Ep. 243. 1, while entreating sympathy from Italian and Gallic bishops, Basil quotes, "The head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you ;" but this is no acknowledgment of a papal monarchy ; and when he says, further on, that, "were it possible, it would be right πολλοὺς ἡμᾶς συνδραμεῖν to your reverences"—words which Mr. Rivington glosses as implying "some right of hearing appeals," (p. 217), *i.e.* as pertaining to Rome, one may remember that his words in Ep. 69, "it would be a good beginning if ὡσπερ ἐπὶ κορυφῇ τῶν ὄλων τὴν σὴν ἀναδράμοιμεν τελειότητα," are addressed to St. Athanasius. Again, when in Ep. 263 the Westerns are asked to warn the Easterns (which Basil himself, being "suspected by many," could not so well do) against

Liberius as having in a letter "reinstated" Eustathius,¹ — the shifty intriguer, who had unwarily communicating with certain subtle heretics, what has this to do with papal "jurisdiction"? Or when, in the same letter, he urges the Westerns to "give attention" (*ἐπιμέλειαν*, which Mr. Rivington twists into "careful oversight"), and to say that if the persons in question persist in their (doctrinal) innovations, the Westerns will "withdraw from them," how does this imply that "communion with Rome" is *sine qua non* for "communion with the Church"? (p. 226). Again, as to Apollinaris, one of the persons referred to in Ep. 263, did Basil treat him "somewhat tenderly" (p. 225), and refrain from denouncing him until he had heard of that condemnation which he hoped would come from the West? Not so. It is true that in 376 he had written, "I never counted Apollinaris an enemy; and on some accounts I even respect the man" (Ep. 244, 3): but in this later Ep. 263 he ranks him among wolves in sheep's clothing (not a specially "tender" phrase), and mentions gross errors in his books; and when in Ep. 265 he treats him as an outsider, he never refers to any Roman censures, but rests purely on the schismatic attitude and the heterodox speculations of the man who "at first seemed to be on our side." In this same letter he deals with the case of Marcellus. Mr. Rivington refers to Hefele's Councils, ii. 29 ff., E.T., for "a most careful summary of the case for and against Marcellus" (p. 222, note); but he does not tell his readers that Hefele describes Zahn's unfavourable judgment as "very noteworthy," and, in effect, adopts it in p. 105. However, let that question stand as open: Mr. Rivington proceeds to argue that, although St. Basil complains of the Westerns as having confirmed the Marcellian "heresy" (Ep. 239. 2), he might not only consider that they had done so in ignorance, but *might* still "believe in the pope as the divinely appointed monarch of the Church," who (on Roman principles) could in certain cases "err" (p. 223). But the question which Mr. Rivington tries to ignore is, Where does Basil, either directly or implicitly, intimate any such "belief"?

¹ The words of Basil, Ep. 263. 3, are: "But what were the things proposed to him by the most blessed bishop Liberius,

passed through many phases, and whom Basil had been compelled by a painful experience to denounce. The "reinstatement" consisted simply in a testimony borne by Liberius to the fact that Eustathius, with two other Semiarian deputies, had at Rome, in his presence, signed the Nicene creed (in 366). Fortunately, we have the letter itself, as preserved by Socrates;¹ it makes not the faintest allusion to any act of "Papal" jurisdiction; but there is no wonder that, on reading it, a Catholic synod held at Tyana in 367 had recognised Eustathius as an orthodox bishop. St. Basil was writing ten years later; and he tells the Westerns that "*since it was from the West that Eustathius had gained his power to injure the Churches*" by his subsequent relapse, "it was necessary that from

and what he himself agreed to, we know no more than this, that he brought a letter reinstating him, on showing which to the council at Tyana, he was restored to his post." For Eustathius' knaveries, as Tillemont calls them, see Dict. Chr. Biogr. ii. 386. He was now trying to curry favour with the dominant Arians (Basil, Ep. 226). What Basil "did not know" in 377 was whether, besides the Nicene creed which he knew Eustathius to have signed at Rome (Ep. 244. 5), any other terms had been proposed to, and accepted by him. Tillemont thinks that Basil (and the Easterns with him) may have supposed that he had also professed belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit, which he was now, as the context says, prominent in denying (ix. 270).

¹ Soc. iv. 12. Cf. Tillemont, vi. 543.

the West should also come the setting right of the affair." The context here decisively shows that Basil, instead of bowing before Papal "authority," is telling the Westerns, and Rome in particular, that, as their too facile reliance on Eustathius' professions has given occasion to the existing trouble, it is their business to do what can be done for its abatement.¹ The other piece of evidence is his language regarding Damasus. In one short letter he says, bitterly enough, that his brother Gregory might be of some use as an envoy to "a kindly disposed person," but, as being wholly unable to flatter, could make no way at all with "one who sits up ever so high, and therefore is out of hearing of those who speak the truth to him from below."² This is no doubt very shocking language from a Roman point of view; but in the following year, 376, he not only refers to what he calls "the Western superciliousness," but adds, "I had meant to write to *their coryphæus*—not about

¹ See the context, Ep. 263. 3. Mr. Rivington has built up a fabric of misinterpretation on the assumption that the letter in question was a papal mandate which the obedient Easterns had simply to register and obey (p. 225). He omitted the critical words italicised in the text, and thus gave a turn to the "passage" which is at once disposed of by the context. In his Reply, p. 28, he pretends that the omission had made no "difference."

² Ep. 215.

Church affairs, save only by way of hinting that they (Westerns) neither know the truth about us, nor take the right way to learn it, and generally that it was not right to mistake haughtiness for dignity.”¹ Now, unquestionably members of the Roman communion have at times, rightly or not, allowed themselves to complain sharply of some act or some attitude of the “Holy See.” But the point is, that according to the present Roman contention Basil knew that Damasus was by Divine right his lord² and master, supreme alike in the East and the West. Could one who held that belief, under any amount of momentary irritation, call a Pope “the coryphæus of the Westerns”?

But what was the attitude of Damasus, and of the Roman Church under him, towards Basil’s

¹ Ep. 239. It is hopeless to attempt to exempt the “coryphæus” from the charge of “not caring to know the truth” brought against Westerns in general, still less from that of haughtiness, etc. But, in fairness, it should be remembered that Basil did not see the best side of Damasus. His questions to Jerome as to points of Biblical interpretation give a new and pleasing interest to his personality: see Jerome, Epp. 19. 35. See also his metrical (if not very poetical) epitaphs on the saints, on his sister, and others, Galland. Biblioth. Patr. vi. 346 ff. For an account of his work in opening and adorning the catacombs, see Roma Sotterranea, E. T. p. 97.

² Mr. Rivington expressly adopts the phrase, “lordship over the universal Church” (p. 222).

friend Meletius? Just after this last letter of Basil's, Jerome, then living in Syria, wrote the celebrated letter to Damasus which is so constantly paraded as evidence of a received "Papal" doctrine, in which he says he "knows that the Church was built upon the chair of Peter, and that whoso eats the Lamb outside that house is profane."¹ What does this effusive loyalty to Damasus prove as to a general Church belief? Nothing whatever; Jerome, then a lay ascetic of little more than thirty,—by no means as yet a Doctor of the Church,—is not echoing any Eastern language, but simply falling back on what, doubtless, he had been wont to hear

¹ Ep. 15. (A.D. 376.) In Adv. Jovin. i. 26 (seventeen years later), he denies that St. Peter was the exclusive foundation of the Church, or the sole holder of "the keys," although adding that he was made "head of the Twelve" (A.D. 393). In the famous letter to Evangelus (the date of which is uncertain), Jerome says that wherever a bishop is, at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, etc., he is "ejusdem sacerdotii," and all are "apostolorum successores." Roman arguers say that this simply refers to the pope "as bishop of Rome," and has no bearing on his papal claims. But the very point of the passage is to deny that a particular Roman custom has any claim to universal observance: "Si auctoritas quaeritur, orbis major est urbe" (*i.e.* than *the* city, Rome). "Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem?" On the papal theory, Jerome ought certainly to have put in a salvo here for the universal jurisdiction attaching to one bishop over all others, and for Rome's authority as the *magistra* of all other churches.

some years before, in religious society at Rome. He requests Damasus to tell him with whom to communicate at Antioch;¹ and in the next letter observes that Meletius, like Paulinus, "professes to adhere to" Damasus. This obviously means, to agree with Damasus as to the faith; which, indeed, Meletius did. And when, some three years later, Meletius, at the head of a large Antiochene synod, put his signature as "bishop of Antioch"² to a doctrinal formulary of Roman origin (afterwards called "the Tome of the Westerns"), which was accordingly sent back to Rome, Damasus would naturally accept it as a proof of his Catholic orthodoxy, but it would by no means follow that he recognised him as bishop *of* Antioch.³ For here lay the

¹ He says, "I abhor Meletius, I ignore Paulinus." It is not without significance that some three years after he had addressed this inquiry to Damasus, he attached himself definitively to the side of Paulinus, and was by him ordained presbyter.

² Mansi, Conc. iii. 461, 511. Hefele ascribes this formulary to a Roman council of 369 (Councils, ii. 361, E.T.); Mansi, with greater probability, to a more recent council of 377 (iii. 466). Meletius' council was held in October, 379 (cp. Greg. Nyss. tom. ii. p. 187). St. Basil had died on January 1.

³ Damasus does not seem to have interposed when, in his hearing, Peter of Alexandria told Dorotheus (whom Mr. Rivington calls "Meletius' agent") that Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata "had been numbered among Arians" (not, as Mr. Rivington too gently puts it in his own words, "as though they were tinged with Arianism," p. 226); see Basil, Ep. 266. 2. And as to his

pith of the whole question; while they both lived, was Meletius, or was Paulinus, the rightful occupant of the see? Rome had consistently upheld Paulinus; if he was the true bishop, Meletius was *pro tanto* in schism; when did Rome change her mind as between these two claimants? There is no evidence of any such change;¹ and there is clear evidence to the contrary. For after Meletius died in the summer of 381, St. Gregory of Nazianzus urged the Council of Constantinople to agree in accepting Paulinus, on the terms of a concordat arranged between the two parties, that the survivor should be acknowledged by both. One of his reasons was, that "at present the West was alienated,"² *because* the majority of Easterns had upheld

"calling Dorotheus 'brother,' but not entering into close intercourse with Meletius," the Roman synod which spoke of "our brother Dorotheus the presbyter" (Mansi, iii. 460) was referring to him, as the context shows, not as a special representative of the claims of Meletius, but as the accredited organ through whom the Westerns were to be informed of the sufferings ("injurias") of the persecuted Easterns as a body. Even supposing Damasus to have been then persuaded of Meletius' anti-Arianism, that would not prove that he did not regard him as a pretender to the Antiochene see.

¹ It is significant that when Constantius had tried to persuade the Roman people to recognise both Liberius and Felix as joint bishops, the circus rang with the cry, "One God, one Christ, one bishop!" Theod. ii. 17. Cf. Soz. iv. 15; Cypr. Ep. 49. 2.

² Greg. Naz. Carm. de Vita sua, 1637, ξένου . . . ἡ δύσις.

Meletius. Was not Rome part of the West? And soon afterwards, the bishops of the Council of Aquileia expressly informed the emperors that "Paulinus, bishop of the Church of Antioch," had always "maintained inviolate the agreement of communion with them,"¹ whereas certain others—*i.e.* some partisans of Meletius—had been of "unsteady" faith in times past, and the Council could only wish to enter into relations with them *if* their entire orthodoxy could be ascertained; but it was manifestly right to carry out the concordat by the joint recognition of Paulinus, and for this purpose the Council requested that a "Council

¹ S. Ambros. Ep. 12. 4. This council certainly calls the Roman church the head of the Roman world, whence "in omnes venerandæ communionis jura dimanant." But the first phrase is natural in the mouths of Westerns, and the second implies no more than a centre within a united episcopate. Mr. Rivington has remarked that St. Ambrose's words about St. Peter as *agens primatum confessionis, non honoris* (which he translates, "not of honour," whereas it means, "not of office"), *fidei, non ordinis*, refer to what he was before our Lord had promised him the keys. How, then, does Ambrose go on to interpret "this rock"? "*Non de carne Petri, sed de fide*," a faith common to all the apostles, though confessed by Peter "*pro cæteris . . . immo præ cæteris*" (De Incarn. 32). The dictum of Ambrose, "Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia," is constantly quoted for papalism without reference to its context. It occurs in a highly "mystical" passage, which has no reference to any supremacy as belonging either to Peter or to Rome (in Ps. 40, s. 30). "Quod Petro dicitur, apostolis dicitur" (in Ps. 38, s. 37).

of all Catholic bishops might be held at Alexandria." Would these North-Italian bishops at Aquileia have written thus, if Meletius before his death had been recognised by Rome? They might believe him to be personally orthodox, and might reasonably approve of the concordat, as, indeed, a somewhat later Council at Milan referred to it, in a letter to Theodosius,¹ as an appropriate healing measure, which they had some time before asked the emperors to sanction. But neither of these approvals of the concordat would in the least imply that Rome had pronounced for Meletius as *the* rightful bishop before it could become operative. And if she did not, then, as she was incapable of recognising two bishops *of* the same Church, she necessarily continued to regard Meletius as for the time an intruder: and with an intruder, as such, she could hold no communion; even if she were willing to admit that by surviving Paulinus he would be legitimated as successor, she was bound to regard him as, for the present, not *the* bishop.

¹ Ambr. Ep. 13. 2. The expression, "ut quoniam Antiochena civitas duos haberet episcopus, Paulinum atque Meletium, quos fidei concinere putabamus," does not mean that the council of Milan had ever regarded them as actually joint diocesans (an idea foreign to Church order, and abhorrent to the Latin mind), but simply that as a matter of fact they were two bishops residing at Antioch. Cp. Gore on the Ministry, p. 164.

If, as appears to have been the case, the great synod held at Rome in 383 received Paulinus in person as bishop *of* Antioch,¹ we cannot imagine that it did so on the ground that he had succeeded to the rights of the deceased Meletius. It would be matter of satisfaction to Damasus that *he* had never compromised the claims of a visitor who had been consistently true to the Nicene faith.

(XV.) GRATIAN'S GRANT.

We must now go back a few years, to notice the first of a series of what may be called State acts which have contributed materially to the growth of the Roman bishop's power. Damasus had been repeatedly harassed by accusations proceeding from the partisans of Ursinus, the disappointed candidate in that election to the see which was disgraced by faction-fights resulting in wholesale slaughter; and there was also trouble caused by Donatist and Luciferian schismatics. A Roman Council in 378 addressed a letter to Gratian² (and as a matter of form to Valentinian II., as his colleague), referring to a

¹ Combine Jerome, Ep. 127. 7, with Soz. vii. 11.

² See the letter and the rescript in Mansi, iii. 624. Gratian was then only nineteen.

former imperial decree,¹ and asking that it might be carried out. What does this request amount to? If a deposed bishop² is contumacious, the Council desires that he may be sent to Rome by the prætorian prefect of Italy or the vice-prefect (*vicarius*) of Rome; or, if the case arose "in remoter parts," let it go before the metropolitan; or, if the metropolitan himself is the offender, let him be sent to Rome, or be tried before judges named by Damasus: let an accused bishop, who suspects his metropolitan, or any other bishop, of partiality, appeal (*provocare*) to the Roman bishop, or to a Council of at least fifteen neighbour bishops; and if Damasus himself is again accused—seeing that "though equal to his brethren in office (*munere*) he excels them *prærogativa apostolicæ sedis*,"—let him be exempt from ordinary civil jurisdiction, and allowed to plead before the emperor himself. Gratian, in his reply, concedes

¹ Cf. Tillemont, viii. 392, ascribing this earlier decree to Valentinian I. It was aimed at the Ursinians. Gratian was then nominally associated with his father.

² Mr. Rivington translates a sentence beginning, "We ask that your goodness would deign to order, that whoever shall have been condemned, and shall have determined unjustly to retain his church" (p. 240). After "condemned" should come in "either by his (Damasus') judgment or by that of us who are Catholics." The omission is significant.

the request,¹ but enlarges its scope. For whereas the Council had been thinking, first of cases in Italy, as at Parma, Puteoli, etc., and next of cases in "remoter parts" of the prætorian prefecture of Italy, which included the Italic, Illyrian,² and (Western) African "dioceses" (or groups of provinces), Gratian speaks of the prætorian prefects of Gaul and Italy, and the "proconsuls" and "*vicarii*," thus associating with the officials referred to by the council the head of the vast Gallic prefecture, with his three "*vicarii*" and the subordinate provincial governors, and also the proconsul of Africa (in its narrower sense, as one of the six provinces of the African "diocese"), who was immediately under the emperor. Gratian adopts the Council's phrase "remoter parts;" but, as used by him, it must mean the remoter parts of that much wider region which he contemplates in his rescript, and which is in fact the whole Western empire. For as it is impossible that Gratian should use

¹ This imperial concession is described by Mr. Rivington, in a grandiloquent chapter-title, as "The Homage of Kings."

² See Fr. Puller's *Prim. Saints and See of Rome*, p. 156, note; and Bury's *Later Roman Empire*, i. p. xvii. If the earlier decree to which the bishops' letter refers had included the Gallic prefecture, it would have been very much to their purpose to mention its officials; but this they did not do.

the phrase for districts outside the region which he had just described by mentioning its highest civil officials, we must interpret it analogously in the Council's memorial, which had referred, in similar style, to a smaller area. Here, then, as Fr. Puller has said, "by one stroke of his pen the Emperor Gratian created, so far as the civil power could create, a patriarchal jurisdiction over the whole Western empire, and vested it in the bishop of Rome." The act was in some respects parallel to a later edict which, under the prompting of Leo the Great, was issued by Valentinian III.¹ But it was not tainted by overbold generalisations.

But Gratian's act in dividing Illyricum, and

¹ Duchesne observes that, until Zosimus, "deceiving himself as to the character" of Patroclus of Arles, made him his vicar in respect to the Gallic and Spanish churches, Rome had never been able to exercise over the Gallic episcopate more than "une action faible et intermittente:" a significant admission (*Origines du Culte Chrét.* p. 38). Nor had the Spanish church of old been accustomed to regard Rome as its patriarchal centre. When the Priscillianists, having been condemned in 380 by a council at Saragossa, resolved to seek for Italian support, they thought not only of Damasus but of Ambrose, whose see of Milan at this time shared with Rome in the "hegemony of the West" (*ib.* p. 32); and Priscillian, in his recently recovered memorial to Damasus (*Corp. Script. Lat. Eccl. xviii.* p. 34 ff.) addresses him as "your crown" (= your highness), as holding an "apostolic see," as "handing on the faith left him by the apostles," and as "*senior omnium nostrum*," a phrase quite inadequate for supreme jurisdiction.

attaching the Eastern part to the dominions of Theodosius, must have given no small dissatisfaction to Damasus: and he "is said" to have managed to neutralise it ecclesiastically by appointing the bishop of Thessalonica his vicar for Eastern Illyricum.¹ It is, however, probable that Damasus only gave to bishops Ascholius and Anysius power to represent him in certain cases, and that a permanent vicariate was first established by his successor Siricius, to whose action Leo the Great refers as a precedent for his own appointment of Anastasius as his representative.² Siricius, we may observe in passing, issued the first authentic "decretal"³ to Himerius of Tarragona, claiming thereby authority over Spain (A.D. 386).⁴

¹ Neale, *Introd. East. Church*, i. 47. See Tillemont, viii. 417.

² Leo. Ep. 6. 2. See Gore, *Leo the Great*, p. 103. As Neale says (following Le Quien) "the council of Chalcedon, while it subjected to the patriarch of Constantinople the Thracian, Pontic, and Asian dioceses, gives him no authority over that of Illyricum;" but since the reign of Leo the Isaurian (716-741) Eastern Illyricum has been subjected to Constantinople, and a series of papal decrees made void. Le Quien denounces this act of the iconoclastic emperor as "Leonini furoris facinus" (*Oriens*, Christ. ii. 25). Duchesne, however, considers that some two centuries earlier the vicariate had ceased to be effective (*Origines du Culte*, p. 42). Ascholius was Acholius to Latins.

³ Littledale, *Petrine Claims*, p. 169.

⁴ Siricius is named in a passage of Optatus (ii. 3) as the existing bishop of Rome. Optatus may have added this reference at

(XVI.) THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL OF
CONSTANTINOPLE.

Theodosius I., by the edict of Feb. 28, 380,¹ to which Gratian's name was prefixed with his own, had "willed that all the people subject to the empire should adhere to the religion which had been delivered by St. Peter to the Romans, and which was known to be followed by the bishop (*pontificem*²) Damasus and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of Apostolic

a later period than that of the composition of his treatise. He calls Siricius "noster socius;" but does he say that all churches ought to obey him? No; but only that *with him* "nobis totus orbis commercio *formatarum* (letters of ecclesiastical communion) in una communionis societate concordat." Certainly he had just said that Peter, "omnium apostolorum caput," was the first to sit in the episcopal chair at Rome, "unde et Cephæ appellatus est" (?), "in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur." Mr. Rivington (p. 38) claims this passage: but the next words show what is in Optatus' mind; "Ne cœteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent; ut jam schismaticus . . . esset qui contra singularem cathedram alteram collocaret." Then, after giving his list of the Roman bishops, he makes a hit at Macrobius as the Donatists' bishop at Rome. He means, of course, not that Peter's see was the only one existing in the apostolic times, but that no other apostle ever thought of setting up a chair of his own *at Rome*, as against Peter's.

¹ "Cunctos populos:" Cod. Theod. xvi. 1, 2.

² Mr. Rivington ventures to claim this phrase as making Damasus more than a "bishop," as if he were "the pontiff of the Christian religion" (p. 245).

sanctity:" and he proceeded to describe this religion as a belief in the Triune God. Was this religion, then, thus imposed simply on the ground that it was held by the Roman bishop? The terms of the law refute that supposition. And when, in the next year, Theodosius assembled a Council at Constantinople, for the purpose, mainly, of abating religious dissensions in the East, he did so without reference to Rome. Now Damasus, in the character of a Western primate or patriarch, would have no direct responsibility in such a matter; but on the modern Papal hypothesis he was very much more; and it is obvious that Eastern prelates who met and acted, in order to the establishment of orthodoxy, without his sanction or assent, could not have so much as heard of the doctrine that, as bishop of Rome, he was the pastor and teacher of all Christians, the sovereign ruler of all prelates and their flocks. The Council, as is well known, passed four canons: we are now concerned only with the third, which assigned to the bishop of Constantinople "the precedence of honour (*τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς*) after the bishop of Rome, *because* Constantinople was New Rome," implying that the precedence enjoyed by the bishop of Rome was

due to the fact that his city was *Old Rome*, and so, to a great extent, though not wholly, it was. It is attempted to discredit this enactment as not strictly a canon at all, but an arrangement agreed upon by the bishops who remained at Constantinople after the departure of the Egyptians, who would never have assented to the deposition of the see of Alexandria from ancient rights as next in rank to that of Rome. But, as Hefele says, resentment at the recent Alexandrian interference in favour of the wretched impostor Maximus might well have caused the adoption of this canon by the majority of the prelates; and another objection, based on the authority of the "Prisca Versio," is also disposed of by the same writer.¹ Socrates himself is boldly claimed in support of this very intelligible Roman contention: *because* he emphasises this ὄρος (as he significantly calls it) by introducing it before the "confirmation" of the Nicene creed, and the prohibition of extra-diocesan intervention, *therefore*, it seems, he assists the conclusion that "it was slipped in amongst the canons" without due warrant! And when we are told that "certain writers," who "speak of

¹ Hefele, ii. 352, s. 98.

the third canon as though it possessed the authority of the Church, need to be confronted with St. Leo's *determined accuracy* in calling it only the decree of 'certain' bishops,"¹ we "need" only answer that Leo (as will presently be seen) was much more likely to be determinedly *inaccurate*, when "confronted" by facts which crossed his own theory and programme. In the next year, 382, another Council met at Constantinople, and a letter was addressed to Damasus, Ambrose, and other Western bishops or "fellow-ministers,"² who had invited the Easterns to meet them in Council at Rome. An attempt has been made to extract some testimony to Papalism from the suave language of this document, as if the words, "You invited us as your own members," suggested that the writers looked to Rome as their "head;"³ as if the expression of a wish to "be at rest" among the Latins implied that Rome was their acknowledged "mother,"

¹ Rivington, p. 258. Cf. Leo, Ep. 106. 5.

² Theod. v. 9. Besides Damasus and Ambrose, five others are addressed by name. The address runs, "To the most honoured lords, and most religious brethren and fellow-ministers . . . and the other bishops assembled at Rome."

³ Rivington, p. 270. In the text, "It might perhaps be freely argued;" in the note, "The context suggests the above meaning."

whereas that title is expressly assigned to Jerusalem; as if, by accepting a "tome" or doctrinal formulary which they describe as proceeding from a Council at Antioch, but which was in fact originally framed at Rome, and which they associate with the "tome" of "the last year's Council,"¹ they had implicitly submitted themselves to a Papal *magisterium*, whereas they describe both tomes as deserving acceptance on account of their intrinsic orthodoxy: as if, when they hoped that the Westerns would be "well pleased with the arrangements which they had made, as having been lawfully and canonically settled among them,"² they were in fact requesting a Papal confirmation of their action, whereas they expressly describe their own proceedings as definitive, and request the Westerns' acquiescence on the ground of "spiritual love, and the fear of the Lord controlling human prepossessions."

¹ This document is referred to in the so-called fifth canon of Constantinople (belonging, as Mr. Rivington rightly says, to the council of 382) as "the tome of the Westerns." It is observable that this council in the letter before us ignores its Roman origin.

² Mr. Rivington abbreviates thus, "They express a hope that Damasus and the West will 'congratulate' them on what they had done—a courteous ecclesiastical formula to request confirmation" (p. 276). No, their object is "unanimity."

(XVII.) THE FOUR ITALIAN COUNCILS.

But we must now look back to the West. When the Council of bishops, assembled at Aquileia in the September of 381, wrote their third letter to the emperors — that is, in effect, to Theodosius—were they aware of the proceedings of the Constantinopolitan Council? It would appear not. They might ask for a new General Council to be held at Alexandria, and to treat “more fully” of the Antiochene difficulties, without any such cognisance; and had they learned how the Council of Constantinople had, under factious influence, set aside the Antiochene concordat, and appointed Flavian to succeed Meletius, they could not have been content simply to restate their previously expressed approval of the concordat. And when thanks are tendered to Theodosius for “excluding misbelief, and restoring faith and concord to the Catholics,” to what law of his were these Italian bishops alluding? Surely to the first law, that of February, 380, which had established Trinitarian orthodoxy as the recognised religion for all subjects of the empire, whereas the second law, of July 30, 381, had

special reference to the East.¹ And next, as to the Council of Milan, held soon after that of Aquileia, and presided over by St. Ambrose: its members had heard of the appointment of Nectarius to the see of Constantinople; they had been deceived by Maximus into admitting his own absurd claim; and they thereupon complained that the Easterns had acted without "waiting for their opinion" on the subject.² It is pleaded on the Papalist side that by *nostram sententiam* they "certainly meant the judgment of Rome," and thus "invoked the principle" of what is boldly described as "the Niceno-Sardican canon."³ Then why did not they say

¹ *Episcopis tradi*, Cod. Theod. xvi. 1. 3. Mr. Rivington assumes that this Aquileian letter refers to it, and remarks that "this law of July brings in the name of Nectarius, who was ordained at that council" of Constantinople in 381 (p. 264). It does so; but then it is not the Aquileian, but the Milanese letter,—not Ambr. Ep. 12, but Ambr. Ep. 13—which mentions Nectarius. No doubt the council of Milan had learned with displeasure what was done by the council of Constantinople.

² Ambr. Ep. 13. 4.

³ Rivington, pp. 275, 478. He adds, "The council did claim that the East should act in accordance with its provision," "not mentioning the canon, but obviously arguing upon its lines." In p. 478, Mr. Rivington waxes bolder still: "They in effect invoked the Niceno-Sardican canons." In p. 266 he twice says that they refer to "the council of Constantinople as comparatively recent (*nuper*)."³ He cannot have even read the original context, which refers to a council in which Maximus showed a letter from Peter of Alexandria in his behalf; which he did at a council in *Italy*: "ad hoc partium venisse Maximum," etc.

so? In the context, they tell the emperor that "Athanasius of holy memory, and Peter, and very many of the Easterns," had set Maximus a precedent by "having recourse to the judgment of the Roman Church, of Italy, and of the whole West." And the words which close the same paragraph, and explain the sentence in question, claim for Westerns "not the chief part in the inquiry, but a share in a general decision."¹ Nor is this all: towards the end of the same letter, they argue that if the Easterns had thought it worth while to invite a single Western bishop, Ascholius, to join the Council of Constantinople, much more was it befitting that they should "submit to have the question discussed by the prelate of the Roman Church *and* by the neighbouring and Italian prelates."² Not much here of a "Papal appellate jurisdiction," even in its rudimentary form.

¹ "Non *prærogativam* . . . examinis, sed consortium . . . *communis arbitrii*" (Ep. 13. 4). On this we have two glosses: "A common judgment is not necessarily one in which all parties . . . contribute the same amount of authority, but in which all, *head* and members as well, join" (p. 275). Where does the council recognise the idea of a dominant *Roman* headship over a general council? The "*prærogativa examinis*" is rendered an inquiry "of first instance." But the antithesis excludes the dilution of "*prærogativa*."

² Ambr. Ep. 13. 7. They add, "Si quid *uni* huic reservatum est, quanto magis *pluribus* reservandum est?"

The fourteenth letter of St. Ambrose is commonly connected with the same period. Thus Hefele dates it in 382, the Benedictines "about" 382. It has been recently assigned to 391, but for reasons that may well seem insufficient, and in the teeth of high authorities.¹

A Council met at Rome, in accordance with the desire of the Council of Milan, in 382, but—which is somewhat remarkable—we have but few accounts of its proceedings. Paulinus was present, and was doubtless recognised as *the* bishop of Antioch, Flavian being ignored. Epiphanius also attended. St. Ambrose was incapacitated by illness soon after his arrival.²

¹ Rivington, p. 477. The Apollinarian trouble might well be matter of anxiety in 382: see Greg. Naz. Epp. 101, 102, written in that very year. Instead of there being no Gothic war known nor "disturbance in Illyricum" (such as this letter mentions) in 382, we know from Idatius that it was on October 3rd of that year that "universa gens Gothorum in Romaniam se tradiderunt," the result being a "pax infida" (so Marcellinus: "Romano sese imperio dedit mensi Octobrio." Cf. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, i. 147. Westerns *had* been thought unreasonable in asking Easterns to attend a synod in Italy in 382: the "courteous" letter from Constantinople shows this (see Tillemont, x. 149), and Ambrose's Ep. 13 was likely enough to have been misconstrued by Easterns. Theodosius might well invite Western bishops to the East with the good will of their own emperor Gratian. See the last words of Ep. 13. Ep. 14. 5, indeed, refers naturally to the preceding letter, and is unintelligible apart from it.

² Cp. Ambr. Ep. 15. 10.

Lastly, we come to the Council of Capua, held in 391, in the hope of terminating the Antiochene dissension, which had been aggravated by the consecration of Evagrius as successor of Paulinus. Theodosius desired Flavian, whom almost all the Easterns regarded as bishop of Antioch, to attend the Council; but he excused himself, and thereby, in the opinion of St. Ambrose, made his case worse than before, although Evagrius was "not wholly in the right." The Council, thus baffled, "committed the judgment of the case" to Theophilus of Alexandria and his suffragans, as supposed to be impartial; and Ambrose adds, on his own behalf, when writing to Theophilus, "We (*i.e.* I) think you should refer to our holy brother the bishop (*sacerdotem*) of the Roman Church, for we feel sure that what you will decide will be what he also cannot disapprove."¹ Yet a Papalist advocate thinks himself justified in giving this account of the resolution of the synod: "The contest was remanded to the judgment of Theophilus . . . and the matter was *to be confirmed*

¹ Ambr. Ep. 56. In the last sentence of the letter a hope is expressed, "ut nos quoque, accepta vestrorum serie statutorum, cum id gestum esse cognoverimus quod ecclesia Romana haud dubie comprobaverit, læti fructum hujusmodi examinis adipiscamur."

by the *Apostolic See*.”¹ Is this a fair way of dealing with documents, when the reader is not presented with the original? Of course the sense is, “Confer with Damasus, for you and he will be sure to take the same view of the matter.”

(XVIII.) ROME AND THE AFRICANS.

On entering the fifth century, when the materials for investigation become more abundant, Mr. Rivington undertakes to “show that the Church of North Africa in the days of St. Augustine held that the bishop of Rome was the supreme governor of the Church under Christ, by His Divine appointment.” Let us see how this thesis is maintained.

(1) First, we find the diocesan synod of Jerusalem taking up the question of Pelagianism at the instance of the young Spanish priest Orosius. It was a Western question, for which Eastern minds were not prepared; and it was natural, therefore, that the bishop John and his priests should agree to refer it to Innocent I., and to adopt his decision.² But on second thoughts, John brought the case before a synod

¹ Rivington, p. 476.

² “Universi quod ille decerneret secuturi” (Oros. Apol. 6).

of Palestinian bishops, who exhibited their unpreparedness for the task which they undertook by accepting the disingenuous explanations of Pelagius in the absence of his accusers. On hearing of this result, the African bishops met at Carthage, where, four years previously, Celestius, the keen-witted associate of Pelagius, had been condemned, and where the question as to the Fall and as to grace excited the deepest interest. What wonder if this Council wrote to Innocent, expressing its hope that the decisions already given in Africa might be upheld by the *apostolicæ sedis auctoritas*? The letter assumes that Pelagianism is a heresy, and tells Innocent that he ought to anathematise it. The Numidian prelates, including St. Augustine, met soon afterwards at Milevis; their letter to Innocent is much in the same tone; but when they refer to his *auctoritas* as drawn *de sanctarum Scripturarum auctoritate*, they do not mean, as our author assumes, that his Papal right to decide such questions was "of Divine institution," but that his teaching is sure to be based on the Scriptural grounds to which they have just been referring.¹ However, Mr. Rivington

¹ The words, we are told, "ought to be written over every

relies chiefly on Innocent's own replies as if they had been simply accepted by the African Church. "From Peter has proceeded the episcopate itself, and the whole authority of that title.¹ . . . The Fathers decreed, by a judgment not human but Divine, that nothing done in remote provinces should be considered final until it came to the knowledge of this see, so that any just decision should be confirmed by its entire authority,

page of those treatises which endeavour to enlist the witness of 'the church of North Africa in the days of St. Augustine' against the supremacy of the holy see" p. 287). We can have no objection, provided they are given with their context. Earlier in the letter (Aug. Ep. 176. 3) we find, "Quæ contra sanctas scripturas plurima disserunt." So the council of Carthage quotes some texts about grace, referring to "numberless" others which might be gathered "de scripturis omnibus," and then almost apologises for mentioning the texts cited "quæ majore gratia de sede apostolica prædicas" (Ep. 175. 3).

¹ So to the Milevitan council: "All our fellow-bishops are bound to refer to none but Peter—that is, the author of their name and office" (Ep. 182). In the case of St. Chrysostom Innocent knew that no such claims would pass with the East. But Mr. Rivington misrepresents some words in his letter to five individual African prelates (Ep. 183. 2). He does not say "that his sentence will have its effect in whatever part of the world Pelagius may be;" but that wherever any Pelagians may be, he "believes that they will easily be set right when they hear of the condemnation" of their leader. The Latin is unmistakeable. Mr. Rivington has combined the opening reference to what Pelagius, "wherever he was," had formerly done, with the mention of his "condemnation" some eight lines further. In other words, he has not read the sentence through. The letters are Innoc. Epp. 24-26.

and the other Churches should take from it¹ what they ought to enjoin," etc. Swelling words these, which it would have been impossible for Innocent to verify: the "Fathers" had never made any such decree,² and if "this one rescript contains the teaching of the Vatican Council entire," that teaching rests—as indeed we have already seen—on apocryphal history. The plain English of the matter is that Innocent, in true Roman fashion, was interpreting an application as broadly as suited him, and adding a broad assertion to match. But did the African bishops commit themselves to these statements by the mere fact of not challenging them? Consider their position: they did really ascribe to the see of Rome, as "Apostolic³ and Petrine," a very great weight and a very unique dignity; their object was to secure its "auctoritas" on their side against Pelagianism; they would not, in such circumstances, feel bound to criticise its language about itself, but would dwell on its Catholic

¹ Here, in a parenthesis, Rome is assumed to be the fountain-head of all churches. Such is Roman "accuracy."

² The language goes far beyond the provisions called Sardican. So does that of Innoc. Ep. 2. 3.

³ Yet Augustine recognises a plurality of apostolic sees in C. Faust. xxviii. 2; C. litt. Petil. ii. 118.

view of the question at issue. Some phrases of St. Augustine may be considered in a footnote.¹ But we must give full prominence to our author's daring, and twice repeated, defence of "Roma locuta est, causa finita est," as no more than "the exact equivalent" of certain words of St. Augustine (pp. 291, 317; cf. 360). What words? He gives a fair enough translation of — "Jam enim de hac causa [*i.e.* Pelagianism] duo concilia missa sunt ad sedem apostolicam: *inde etiam rescripta venerunt: causa finita est.*"² He tells us that it has been "customary" to represent the words

¹ The statement that Innocent had "replied *ad omnia* in a manner worthy of the bishop of the apostolic see" must be taken with the words preceding, that Rome had been informed by two councils "de hac re," *i.e.* the discussion as to grace; and individual bishops, Augustine and four others, had also written to him "de ipsa causa" (Ep. 186. 2). "The Lord's testimony," which Augustine says (C. Jul. i. 13) Innocent "used," was, not any "Petrine" text, but the great saying prophetic of the Eucharist (John vi. 53).

² Serm. 131. 10, preached September 23, 417, before Augustine could know of Zosimus' letter in favour of Celestius, which must have been a sore disappointment to him. Gratry, in his second letter, charged the archbishop of Malines with assigning the "Roma locuta est," etc., to Augustine, and numbers it among the false passages "put in circulation by the ignorance and audacity of a school of error." It is important to observe that twenty-four years earlier Augustine had said to the Donatists, "*Olim jam causa finita est, quod vos non statis in pace,*" *i.e.* because they had broken off from Church unity (Ps. c. part. Donati, 37).

which we have italicised by the formula in question, which he describes as doing them full justice—although it gives no hint whatever of the purport of what precedes them as to the reports of two Councils, to which Rome's utterance was a reply. So then, to suppress one of the elements in a process, and to ascribe the whole result to the other, is, in Roman eyes, a "customary" and a legitimate way of using a document for a controversial end. In Anglican eyes, it is a scandalous offence against truth, and one of a numerous class of "signs" against Rome.¹

¹ See a striking article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxviii. p. 31 ff. entitled, "Certain Graver Aspects of the Roman Position;" and see p. 358 of the same volume, on falsified quotations. In 1849 Pusey wrote, "When the passages of the Fathers" (adduced on the Roman side) "are spurious, this makes things worse; and this is a further difficulty, that practices grew up *through forgeries*," etc. (*Liddon's Life of Pusey*, iii. 208). On such "forgeries" adduced as to "the Glories of Mary," see *Christian Remembrancer* for October, 1855, p. 453 ff. It is difficult to keep this subject quite apart from a certain "Theory of Truthfulness" discussed in the *Christ. Remembr.* for January 1854. For one famous fabrication, which adopted a Donatist libel against St. Marcellinus in order to make up an early testimony to the principle that the pope could not be judged by any man, see *Mansi*, i. 1257: it was fashioned, apparently, at Rome, in the days of Symmachus; it was introduced into the Roman breviary (April 26) in 1536, and stood there until, thanks to Leo XIII.'s sense of historical truth, it was recently removed. It is needless to dwell on other cases.

But Zosimus succeeded Innocent ; and Celestius “deceived” him, but how? First, he gave in an evasive written statement, in which he did *not* retract the heresy imputed to him, but did submit himself to “the judgment of the Apostolic see.” Mr. Rivington seems afraid of quoting from the extant fragments of this *libellus* ; it contained a denial of *peccatum ex traduce*, which would be understood to mean a denial of original sin. Zosimus held a solemn inquiry ; he asked Celestius whether his paper represented his real mind—which was to acknowledge it to be, as far as it went, satisfactory. He did extract from Celestius a condemnation of errors imputed to him, “according to the condemnation of them by Pope Innocent ;” but nothing more explicit could be obtained, and Zosimus, as if still puzzled, adjourned the case, but then very inconsistently wrote to the African bishops, describing Celestius’ faith as “entirely sound,” expressly combining his oral statement with his *libellus*, which was, on one point, at least suggestive of heresy, and declaring that statements “so plain and open should leave no doubt in their minds.”¹ He next took

¹ Cf. Aug. c. duas Epp. Pel. ii. 6 ; Zos. Ep. 3. 3, 5.

account of a long and yet more pointedly evasive paper sent by Pelagius, containing no retraction, but rather an implicit reassertion of his theory, together with a request to be corrected, if in error, by him "who held both the faith and the see of Peter." Again Zosimus was taken in; he wrote, in terms of yet stronger remonstrance, to the Africans. "The letter of Pelagius had most abundantly cleared him;"¹ he and Celestius were men of "entirely sound faith," had "never been separated from Catholic truth," had been victims of false accusation and hasty censure, such as even the cautious equity of secular tribunals should have taught ecclesiastics to avoid. Mr. Rivington slurs over these points, and professes to rely on St. Augustine's account as "answering by anticipation" what Dr. Pusey has said on the case in the second part of his *Eirenicon*.² But the fact remains, that

¹ By way of proving it to be satisfactory, Zosimus remarks that it quite agreed with Celestius' paper. "Omnia quidem paria . . . quæ Cœlestius ante protulerat, continebant" (Zos. Ep. 4. 1; Mansi, iv. 353).

² On Healthful Reunion, p. 219ff. He notices that Augustine did not treat a formal approval of Pelagianism by the Roman church as "a thing impossible, but as much to be deprecated (*quod absit*)." One does not see how, if it had happened, "Zosimus would have injured *sibi, non sedi apostolicæ*," as Bossuet persuaded himself (Def. Decl. ix. 35). The

Zosimus (covering his virtual retreat under something very like bluster¹) assured the Africans that he had not really taken a final step, tried to explain away his approval of Celestius, and afterwards, in a "Tractoria," or circular letter (which, one would conjecture, was written for him), absolutely condemned both Pelagius and Celestius. And before his change of mind could have been known in Africa, a large council met at Carthage (May 1, 418) and passed several stringent decrees against Pelagianism. Two

assurance with which Mr. Rivington says that "Dr. Pusey is mistaken in nearly every assertion that he makes on this subject" (p. 293), and that "in his handling of that pope's history" we have "the old story of the conflict between science and religion," is really a mental and moral phenomenon. He has inferred the assertion of "the infallibility of the holy see" from Innocent's words, "Following Peter, we know how to condemn . . . and to approve" (p. 288). Here, then, is an occupant of "the holy see" "approving," as "completely satisfactory," statements at least suggestive of heresy. Moreover, he claims the language of an African council (about the end of 417), decreeing that "Innocent's sentence from the see of Peter against Pelagius and Celestius should stand, until they plainly acknowledged" the true doctrine. Here the Africans were setting the authority of the late "successor of Peter" against the present—an ingeniously respectful mode of admonishing the latter to reconsider his own position.

¹ Again we have a Roman bishop using language about his own see which, if challenged, he could not possibly have supported by evidence. "Quamvis patrum traditio apostolicę sedi auctoritatem tantam tribuerit, ut de ejus judicio disceptare nullus auderet, idque per canones semper regulasque servaverit" (Zos. Ep. 10. 1, March 21, 418).

years later, Augustine endeavoured to meet the Pelagian charge of tergiversation against the Roman clergy by minimising their bishop's previous mistake, as if he had but provisionally or contingently acquitted the accused persons on the faith of their promise to accept his own decision.¹ But this will not pass. Augustine could not excuse Zosimus by ignoring some of his most inappropriate words. It was not simply on the ground of docility, or, as Mr. Rivington says, of their "profession of amendment" (a rather equivocal phrase), but on something more—on the ground of their written statements—that he had vindicated the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Celestius; and although he was not professing to teach the Church *ex cathedra*, he did for the time, through ignorance and carelessness, acquit men whose language would have been intelligible enough to any one who understood the theological issue. Is this case, then, an illustration of the "charisma" of Popes for the

¹ C. duas Epp. Pel. ii. 5. Tillemont has a curious sentence about this, which ought, perhaps, to propitiate Mr. Rivington: "The charity of St. Augustine, who was not writing a history in which he would have been obliged to represent things just as they were, covers this fault of Zosimus with a modest silence" (xiii. 726). "The excuse goes beyond the words of pope Zosimus" (Pusey, p. 222).

guardianship of Christian doctrine? Does it justify such a section-heading as "St. Zosimus' Support of the Faith"?

(2) The other African case is that of a wretched offender whom Rome was so imprudent as to patronise; and Zosimus reappears upon the scene. Apiarius, an African priest, deposed and excommunicated for gross offences, goes to Rome, and is upheld by Zosimus, who, being at the time malcontent with the African church, demands that the appellant's own bishop shall reinstate him. The African Council of May 1 met this interference by forbidding any clerics to carry an appeal out of Africa.¹ Thereupon Zosimus, according to Mr. Rivington, "commissioned his legate, Faustinus, to impress upon the Africans that the principle of his procedure had been included in the Nicene canons" (p. 297)—a wording calculated to "impress upon" the reader that what this "Pope" called Nicene was Nicene. In fact, Zosimus affirmed in the instructions to his legates, that the Nicene Fathers "said"²—then followed one of the canons known as Sardican,

¹ A clause, probably added later, says that *bishops* had "often been forbidden" to do so. Cf. Mansi, iii. 728; iv. 332.

² "Ita dixerunt in concilio Nicæno," etc. (Mansi, iv. 404).

sanctioning an appeal on a *bishop's* part to "the most blessed bishop of Rome." Another of these instructions made the like claim of Nicene authority for a Sardican rule allowing a cleric to appeal from his own bishop to "neighbouring bishops," a phrase which Rome would strain to include her own bishop. The former of these provisions would not directly touch the case of Apiarius; but the bishops who conferred with the "legates" in September, 418, were unable to say "It is a Sardican canon," for they knew not the true history of the Sardican Council; but they told Zosimus that they would abide by whatever was Nicene. On inquiry at Carthage, the Africans found that the canon produced was not in their own copies of the Nicene canons;¹ and when Faustinus repeated the citation on behalf of Boniface I., the successor of Zosimus, at the Council of May 25, 419, it was resolved to ascertain the Nicene text by inquiring at Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch,² the

¹ One of them said afterwards, in the legate's presence, with fine irony, "I don't know how it was, but we did *not* find these words anywhere in our copies" (Mansi, iv. 404). The speaker was Augustine's intimate friend, the Alypius of his "Confessions."

² Faustinus hinted (as we may understand his somewhat dark

bishop of Rome being requested to do the like on his own part.¹ In the interim the canon as quoted by Faustinus was to be observed.² A letter was accordingly sent to Boniface. In a very short time, it appears, authenticated copies were obtained from two of the great Eastern sees ;³ and, of course, the canon about appeals to

speech) that it would be sufficient for Rome and Africa to inquire without consulting the Easterns, and that thus "contention" would be avoided. His motive was obvious. But the council did not see it in that light ; and Faustinus gave way for the moment, but presently, as Van Espen puts it, "made a fresh attempt negotium ad pontificem trahere" in regard to the other rule about priests or deacons ; but he was again put aside.

¹ The Africans do *not* "imply that they would be guided by Italian custom" (p. 298), as such. The passage in the synodical letter to Boniface is, as Tillemont (xiii. 783) says, "obscure" ("Quæ si ibi," etc. ; Mansi, iv. 512). But the drift of it appears to be that they will abide by what is proved to be Nicene.

² St. Augustine made a similar "interim" proposal as to the canon about clergy, but Van Espen thinks it was not carried *simpliciter* (Opp. iii. 276, ed. Lovan. 1753).

³ The bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria are admitted, in p. 298, to have sent their copies ; while "Antioch did not send her canons." Then we are referred to p. 474, where we find that "the supposed letter from St. Cyril and from Atticus, accompanying their copies . . . is obviously a translation from the Latin, suggesting that the original was a Latin forgery, and containing terminology nowhere else found in Cyril's writings." There are two letters in Latin (Mansi, iv. 513). The Greek of Cyril's, at the end of his "Epistles," is only twenty-seven lines long ; and its use of the Latinism *σκηπίου* is quite compatible with genuineness. Atticus' letter is also short. But it is interesting to learn that Latins as well as Greeks could

Rome was conspicuous by its absence. But that is nothing to Mr. Rivington: he considers "the most satisfactory theory" on the subject to be simply this, that the Eastern text of the Nicene canons had been mutilated by those "busy forgers" the Arians (p. 473; cf. pp. 165, 181, 385).

But when the information thus obtained was transmitted to Boniface at the end of 419, did the African Church suddenly throw up its case and sanction episcopal appeals to Rome? So it is maintained, on the ground that, three years afterwards, Antony, the unworthy bishop of Fussala, appealed to Boniface against a sentence which had deprived him of his episcopal jurisdiction. Boniface, as might be expected, favoured the appellant: and Augustine wrote to his successor, Celestine, piteously entreating that Antony might not be supported by civil or military "powers" employed to reimpose his presence on Fussala. This was in 423.¹ But

"forge"—always provided that they were not Romans! Yet what of the so-called correspondence between African councils and Damasus (Mansi, iii. 430), in which the Africans are made to say that "the decrees of all the fathers had reserved the decision of the highest ecclesiastical affairs to his see," and he is made, in reply, to claim "an episcopal ministry over the universal catholic church"? On the text as authenticated by Atticus, see "Additional Note" at the end.

¹ Ep. 209. 9. He quotes 1 Pet. v. 3. It was years before this,

in the very next year, as Hefele dates it,¹ the African Church returned to the subject, when the question of Apiarius had again become urgent. The council of 419 had accepted the profession of repentance, and restored him to his priestly functions. He had relapsed, had been again deposed, had renewed his application to Rome, and, as Mr. Rivington ventures to think, had been "unhappily absolved" by Celestine. Hereupon, a council met at Carthage, which put an end to any provisional acquiescence in the demands of Rome on the subject of appeals. Faustinus reappeared as "legate," and tried to bully the African bishops into receiving Apiarius; but they insisted on a full inquiry, which extracted a full confession from this scandalous client of three Roman bishops. Then it was that the Council spoke out. The famous letter beginning "Optaremus," and addressed to Ultramontanes, and our author has recourse to two expedients: 1. While treating it as genuine, as

in 418, that Augustine had gone to Mauritania on some "urgent church business enjoined on him by Zosimus." See Aug. Ep. 190. 1. The business was probably this very case of Apiarius (Van Espen, *Opp.* iii. 273).

¹ Tillemont dates the council in 426.

“written by the Africans,” he contends that it does not “oppose the principle of Papal jurisdiction”¹ (p. 299), but only objects to its exercise, in Africa, by legates *a latere*, like Faustinus, instead of by a “commission” of African bishops²—and to a “hasty and undue reversal” of African decisions; or (with a parenthetical “if it is genuine”) he represents “Africa as pleading” by it “for a court of *first instance* of a more satisfactory nature, which would *diminish* their attendance at Rome” (p. 119; observe the *suggestio* in “diminish”). 2. Then he shifts his ground.

¹ However, five pages further on, it is called “the heated letter *against appeals*,” and is apparently alluded to as “a forged letter which *does* repudiate the supreme jurisdiction of” Rome (p. 304).

² Mansi, iv. 515. Not one word in the letter about a “papal commission” of such bishops. In the sentence which says it is “incredible that God would give the spirit of justice *unicuilibet*, and deny it to many bishops assembled in council,” Mr. Rivington applies “*unicuilibet*” to Faustinus. But this is against the context, which sets the authority of (1) a provincial council, (2) a council of all Africa, in antithesis to that of “any one you can think of,” of whatever rank or position—this individual being regarded as residing “beyond sea,” *i.e.* at Rome; while Faustinus is mentioned as actually present in the African council. And it is only in a subsequent sentence, as if by afterthought, that the plan of a legateship *a latere* is just referred to as unauthorised by “any synod.” It was in the Sardican canon, adduced on Rome’s part as “Nicene;” but the Africans had set that canon aside as not Nicene.

It is probably spurious—"the gravest suspicion rests on" it; and in a later context (for this author's scepticism *vires acquirit cundo*) it is roundly declared "to have every possible mark of forgery" (pp. 303, 474).¹ The motive

¹ The objections taken are very weak. The aggrieved tone is natural under such provocations. Then we are told of the difference between the fifteen names prefixed to the letter and the list of fifteen representatives who were appointed by the council of May, 418 (not "shortly before"), to "represent a universal synod" (p. 304). Now, first, the list at the head of the letter does not "differ altogether" from the earlier list; four names appear in both. "Antonius" may well be, not (as Mr. Rivington repeatedly assumes) the disgraced bishop of Fussala, but the Antonius who signed the Carthaginian letter to Innocent (Mansi, iv. 321). St. Augustine may have been absent, as considering that he had said his say to Celestine. But next, Mr. Rivington forgets that the appointment in 418 was for the business of that year (Mansi, iv. 508; cf. Hefele, ii. 42); and the council of 419 appointed a committee of eighteen to wind up its business, of whom four only had sat on that of 418. The absence of a date proves nothing, for this letter alone remains of the acts of this council; and the letter to Boniface (Mansi, iv. 511; see Hefele, s. 122) is also undated. But then, Mr. Rivington, who had made use of that letter in p. 298, considers it to be "suspicious" in p. 474. He says: "Van Espen expresses himself as quite nonplussed in regard to the council from which the letter to Boniface is supposed to have emanated." An ordinary reader would infer that Van Espen doubted the authenticity of the letter. But here Mr. Rivington is in a tangle of errors. He refers to "Jus. Eccl. vii. § 10, art. 2, Lovanii, 1766;" a loose reference. It is in his *Dissertatio in Synodos Africanas* that Van Espen treats of these councils. The council of which he says, "Sat obscurum est cujus loci," is the first held on the affair of Apiarius (Diss. § x. art. 2); but he thinks it was at Caesarea in Mauritania (Algiers), where we know

for this twofold and broadly incoherent criticism is obvious: the letter insists that all Church matters ought, in all reason, and on Nicene principles, to be settled by the native Church authorities; ¹ it absolutely denies any distinction, on this point, between the cases of bishops and of clergy; it dwells on the impossibility of securing a due examination of witnesses before a foreign tribunal; and it warns Celestine against a course ² which would "introduce into the Church the smoky

that Augustine took part in a meeting of bishops (see above). It is in art. 7 that he comes to the letter to Boniface, and considers it to have been written (by the committee of bishops) after the closing of the council of Carthage, begun May 25, 419 (Opp. iii. 273, 278). And then, as to forgery: on Mr. Rivington's showing, who should forge? The African church, he asserts, acknowledged the "supreme jurisdiction of that see which it called . . . the apostolic see" (p. 304). As if that phrase, applied to Rome alone in *the West*, carried with it the papalist principle, or implied that the Roman bishop was regarded as "the permanent apostle of the Christian Church"! (p. 120). Van Espen considers that the canon of "the 20th council" against "transmarine appeals," read in the Carthaginian council of 525 (Mansi, viii. 644), was the resolution of the council which closed the case of Apiarius.

¹ See Cyprian, Ep. 59. 14, on this principle.

² *I.e.* that of sending Roman clerics to carry out his orders in Africa. The reading should be, "Executores etiam clericos vestros quibusque petentibus [not 'potentibus,' as in Mansi's text] nolite mittere," etc. Mr. Rivington dwells (p. 359) on "lest *we* should seem to introduce," etc. But this is a polite way of advising *him* not to present himself in that light.

arrogance of the world," an expansion of a phrase used as to the Roman deputy in the letter to Boniface. And this may suffice about the Church of Africa.

(XIX.) THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.

Three questions arise as to the relation of the Council of Ephesus to the Roman see.

(1) What was the nature of the authority exercised by Celestine I. when he commissioned Cyril to act for him in the case of Nestorius? (2) When the Council was summoned, did this commission "devolve" (as Mr. Rivington maintains) upon it? (3) When it met, did it (as Mr. Rivington holds) act as Celestine's instrument and minister?

(1) It was in the summer of 430 that Cyril wrote a synodical letter to Celestine, giving an account of the Nestorian controversy up to that date. "Long-standing usages of the Church,"

¹ It is a pleasure to agree entirely with Mr. Rivington (p. 305) as to the vital importance of the doctrine secured at Ephesus. But he might as well have brought out more clearly the difference between a "substantial" and an "accidental" union. The one secures our Lord's personal Divinity, the other reduces Him to a pre-eminent saint. This was, in fact, the issue raised.

he says, "induce him to communicate the facts to Celestine;" he feels that he "must needs" do so, although heretofore he has not written on the subject either to Celestine or to any other of their "fellow-ministers"—a phrase which shows that in this connection he regards the bishop of Rome as a *primus inter pares*, and, having resolved to warn the episcopate at large, begins naturally with him. He will not separate himself from the communion of Nestorius until he has thus informed Celestine, whom, therefore, he requests *τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν*.¹ Mr. Rivington understands this as an application for a final judicial decision which "the Pope alone" could give. The Latin translation of Cyril's letter simply renders, "quid hic sentias præscribere;"² and this is supported by what follows, for Cyril tells Celestine that he ought to make known his mind (*σκόπον*) to the Macedonian and the Oriental bishops. We shall presently see that the Oriental bishops did not regard Celestine as the one supreme judge of

¹ Mansi, iv. 1016.

² Our author, *more suo*, reiterates his gloss on *τυπῶσαι* and *τύπος*, and infers from such terms that Celestine "resumes in himself the apostolic government of the Christian Church," etc. (p. 315). Of course, therefore, he renders *καταξίωσον* by "deign;" but see the word as used in Mansi, iv. 1057, for "be so good as," "think proper," etc. Cf. Basil, Ep. 68.

such a question. Celestine summons a Council at Rome, and in its behalf replies to Cyril; he calls it "a great triumph for his belief that Cyril adduces such strong proof in support of it." Is this the language of a Pope who, as Mr. Rivington words it, "at once assumes his infallibility"? He desires Cyril to take a certain line of action as his representative. But here Mr. Rivington objects to the rendering of an important clause as "join the authority of our see to your own" (p. 313). He substitutes "assuming the authority of our see" (p. 309). But a man who had no official authority might "assume the authority" of one who appoints him a plenipotentiary, as a Pope might make a mere deacon his legate; and the words, as read by Cyril in Greek, are "the authority of our see having been *combined* (*συναφθείσης*) with yours," so as to recognise in Cyril an authority with which Celestine's was to be linked.¹ Cyril is told to "act authoritatively as taking Celestine's place."² But Celestine proceeds to say that

¹ Mansi, iv. 1020. Mr. Rivington says that "there is nothing in the Latin or Greek exactly corresponding to 'his own'" (*i.e.* Cyril's). He quotes *σοί*, but leaves out *συναφθείσης*. The Latin, it is true, has "adscita."

² Τῇ ἡμετέρα τοῦ τόπου διαδοχῆ ἐπ' ἐξουσία χρησάμενος. Here *διαδοχῆ* of course implies a delegation.

unless Nestorius, "within ten days after receiving his admonition," gives written assurance of agreement with the faith of the Roman and Alexandrian Churches, and of all Christians in general, Cyril is to "provide for" the Church of Constantinople, and Nestorius is to know that he is separated from "our body." Nestorius is similarly warned that in that case he must regard himself as "ejected from all communion with the Catholic Church."¹ Celestine writes in a like sense to the orthodox at Constantinople;² and to John, patriarch of Antioch, he writes that this sentence had been uttered by himself, "or rather by Christ" (a phrase used also in the letter to Cyril), and that Nestorius, on failing to give satisfaction, will be in the position of one "removed from the assembly of bishops." Mr. Rivington treats this language as expressing a fully Papal "assumption of infallibility."³ But Celestine here lays stress on the complete doctrinal accord between Cyril and himself; he is certain that what they

¹ Mansi, iv. 1036.

² This letter has a beautiful passage on St. Athanasius, followed by a truly Christian reminder as to that everlasting "country" of which no exile in this world can deprive Christ's servants.

³ Here he criticises Dean Church (p. 312).

thus hold is the very truth revealed in Christ ; he confidently assumes that it is this, and nothing else, which all Churches hold ; and he infers that all Churches will agree with Rome and Alexandria in excommunicating a bishop who denies it. This is further illustrated by Cyril's letter to John of Antioch, written after he had received the commission of Celestine.¹ On Mr. Rivington's showing, Cyril knew that he and any other bishop must absolutely bow to Celestine's judgment as being, *because* his, the judgment of Christ delivered through His vicar. If he held this, we know how he must have written to John. How, then, does he write? Does he say, in effect, "You and I, of course, must obey the bishop of Rome as our sovereign ruler and our infallible guide"? Nothing like it. He says: "A clear direction has been given" (using the word *τετύπωκε*) "by the holy synod of the Romans" (so above, "the pious bishops who were found in the great city of Rome"), "whom it is necessary for those to follow (*πείθεσθαι*) who cling to communion with the whole West." He adds that "they have written to Rufus of Thessalonica, and to some other Macedonian bishops, who always concur

¹ Mansi, *l.c.*

ταῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ ψήφοις, and also to Juvenal of Ælia [Jerusalem]. It is then for your Piety to consider what is expedient ; for we shall follow the decisions given" . . . [here Mr. Rivington proceeds] "by him," meaning Celestine, and the Greek text has παρ' αὐτοῦ; but this is clearly an iteration, by oversight, of the previous παρ' αὐτοῦ, for the context requires παρ' αὐτῶν, and so the Latin version has "quæ illi judicaverunt," and Cyril adds, "fearing to fall away from the communion," not (as Mr. Rivington renders) "'of such'" (*i.e.* "the whole West"), but "of so many." It is necessary to insist on this, because Mr. Rivington (p. 315) misrepresents the passage as recognising an "*ex cathedra* judgment on a matter of faith" in the sense of the Vatican decree. Now let us ask whether it is conceivable that a patriarch of Alexandria (that is, of a Church very closely associated with Rome), if he held what that decree affirms to be of faith, could sink the obligation of obeying Christ's Vicar in the "expediency" of keeping on good terms with "the whole West;"¹ or whether, if he

¹ So, after the council of Ephesus was concluded, its members wrote to the emperors, "The synod which has the whole West, with your great Rome and the apostolic see, συνεδρεύουσιν, and all Africa and all Illyricum" (Mansi, iv. 1433).

thought the "Roman synod" the mere "apparatus, machinery, or setting,"¹ of one man's sovereign "judgment," he would thus have put the instrument for the *causa efficiens*. Next, let us look at John's letter to his friend Nestorius. On Vaticanist principles, they both knew that Celestine as Pope had a "plenary, ordinary, and immediate" jurisdiction over them and their Churches; that, in a word, he was their pastor and their sovereign, and that to resist him was sheer rebellion against the Divine "Bishop of souls." Now, when John would persuade Nestorius to accept "Theotocos" within the term (short, he says, but long enough) prescribed by "my lord Celestine" (ὁ κύριος μου being a familiar title of respect), does he appeal to any such relation between the Constantinopolitan see and the Roman? By no means. His argument is: We of the East have just got rid of the trouble caused by dissension with the West;² if you stand stiffly out against the adoption of a word which is really orthodox, "the West, and Egypt, and perhaps Macedonia," will again be in formal separation from the East. There

¹ See Rivington, p. 428; and *v. supr.* p. 57.

² Honorius had described the deputation on behalf of St. Chrysostom as representing "our West."

is not a word in the letter which can be interpreted in the Papalist sense.¹

(2) There was, we are told, "no limitation in point of time in respect of" the commission given by Celestine to Cyril (p. 322). How can this be, when it expressly specifies "ten days" as the period within which Nestorius is to retract on pain of immediate excommunication? Cyril himself not less expressly refers to the "period" thus assigned;² he describes himself as "acting in conjunction with the holy synod assembled at Rome under the presidency of his brother and fellow-minister Celestine" (words which Mr. Rivington neglects) when he gives the third (and evidently the final) warning, "Unless you adopt the right faith" (*i.e.* within ten days) "know that you have no part with us nor any

¹ Mr. Rivington is not quite satisfied with its "tone," but considers that it "urges obedience." Certainly it does not, in the sense which he requires. He also refers to τὸν ὀρισθέντα τύπον in Cyril's letter to Juvenal of Jerusalem. But Cyril there gives his reason for sending on Celestine's letter, "to stir up your zeal . . . and that we may with one heart . . . save our imperilled flocks" (Mansi, iv. 1060).

² Τὴν ὀρισθεῖσαν προθεσμίαν, Ep. ad Nest. 3. 2. It is quite arbitrary to say that "the very terms of the commission implied its continuance" beyond that period. Mr. Rivington says, as if he had read it in black and white, that "the pontiff had left the execution of his sentence, including its delay (if deemed advisable), to the synod" (p. 336). When, and in what words? It was Cyril who had to "execute" it.

place among God's priests and bishops." Is he not regarding himself as fulfilling the charge contained in Celestine's letter, and announcing the Roman and Alexandrian ultimatum? True, he had also been instructed, in such case, to provide a new bishop for Constantinople. But this was impracticable; and what Cyril could do, that he did. Mr. Rivington struggles to make out that the commission was not "exhausted" by his action (p. 322), but survived to pass on to the Council as summoned by Theodosius. But a commission cannot be at once fulfilled and unfulfilled. If it is fulfilled as far as is possible, it is necessarily "exhausted." If the recipient is to take further action, he must get a new commission. So stood matters at the close of 430; Nestorius had not simply ignored the requirement pressed upon him; he had met Cyril's twelve articles by counter-anathematisms of his own. He was therefore, by the very terms of the commission, *ipso facto* excluded from the communion of Rome and Alexandria. But Theodosius, under his prompting, had summoned a General Council to meet in Ephesus at the ensuing Pentecost. In the letter of invitation, he had ruled

that "no new steps should in the interim be taken by any individuals,"¹ and by this, as Tillemont puts it, he had "arrested, in effect, the decrees of the Council of Rome." The action, then, of Celestine in August, and of Cyril about the end of October, was suspended by the emperor's act, which cut straight across the lines of their policy. Indeed, the very *raison d'être* of a General Council was to bring on the stage a fuller authority than that of one or of two patriarchs. Naturally, they were disappointed; naturally, they tried to minimise the effect of the citation, and to think of the arrangements of August as still somehow inchoate. But in such a case facts must outweigh words; and if Celestine, according to Mr. Rivington, "virtually owned the commission originally given as still running," or if Cyril thought that "he was but continuing on the ground of the original commission," we can only say that no one can alter the grammatical scope of his own once published words. The *vox missa*, in that sense, will not "return" for his convenience. As for Mr. Rivington's assertion that the Council was summoned with Celestine's "consent" (p. 318), he consented

¹ Mansi, iv. 1113; Tillemont, xiv. 364.

in that he made the best of the situation. But does any one imagine that Theodosius asked his leave before issuing a peremptory citation? ¹

(3) The Council met in June, 431.² Cyril presided, partly as bishop of Alexandria, partly as "managing the place of Celestine," just as Flavian of Philippi "occupied the place" of Rufus. Was he, then, commissioned to represent Celestine at the Council? "It is difficult," as Tillemont tersely remarks (xiv. 393), "to see how the commission of August 430 could extend to enabling him to act for Celestine at the Council which was not summoned until November;" and Celestine, when writing to Cyril on May 7th, had said nothing of any such delegation, nor had he instructed his actual legates to treat Cyril as their chief, but only to take counsel with him.³ However, Cyril was

¹ Mr. Rivington is following Baronius, Ann. v. 732: whom Tillemont dryly criticises, xiv. 759.

² That Cyril did act impatiently as to the opening, see "Waymarks in Church History," p. 150 ff. John's message "not to wait" must be read with his letter to Cyril.

³ Mansi, iv. 556. In a courteously written article in the "Dublin Review" for April, 1895, Mr. Rivington infers from Celestine's letter to Cyril "that he did mean Cyril to be president." The letter neither says nor implies this. Next we are referred to the council's letter to the emperor as saying "that

not likely to be punctilious in such a matter, and "might well assume that Celestine would not disavow him on that head."¹ Now let us look at the conduct of the bishops assembled. Did they regard themselves as simply Celestine's agents for the carrying out of his previous sentence against a heretic? This must have been their view if, however erroneously, they had regarded the commission of August as "devolving" upon them. They would then have had one, and only one, question to ask: Had Nestorius, at the expiration of his term of grace, given satisfaction to Cyril, and therefore to

Celestine sent Cyril to supply his place." If Mr. Rivington had quoted the words (Mansi, iv. 1301) it would have been plain that they relate to the commission of August, 430. "Even before this holy synod was convened, Celestine commissioned Cyril to occupy his place" (*i.e.* in proposing an ultimatum to Nestorius), "and now by another letter he has made *this* plain to the synod." But the letter here referred to does not name Cyril at all; it does name the three Roman envoys. What, then, is meant by "this"? We have to look back to the earlier sentences of the synodical letter: "this," in the sentence first naming Celestine, expressly refers to the function of all bishops in the exclusion of false doctrine.

¹ Mr. Rivington makes a difficulty about Cyril's proposal that a "second" imperial decree should be read, beside the letter of citation dated November 19, 430, on the ground that it directed the bishops to take up the question of doctrine "without any delay." This "second decree" was the letter in Mansi, iv. 1117, which, however, merely ruled that the question of doctrine should take precedence of others.

Celestine? Five minutes would have sufficed for proving that he had done the very contrary ; and then the Council would have promulgated the Papal sentence as already "irreversible," and as having *de jure* taken effect against Nestorius months before, and have proceeded to take measures for the filling up of the Constantinopolitan see as having thus *de jure* become vacant. Instead of this, the assembled prelates spent a whole midsummer day, even until dark,¹ in going through the whole mass of pertinent evidence, after repeated formal citations calling on "the most religious bishop Nestorius to present himself among them."² Even after his third refusal they did not at once condemn him for contumacy : they tested Cyril's second letter to Nestorius, which Celestine had approved, by the Creed of Nicæa ; but whereas, on Papalist principles, they should have treated Celestine's letter to Cyril as decisive, they heard it without remark ;

¹ They were escorted home with lights (Mansi, iv. 1241).

² Συνεδρεῖν is used on the first occasion (Mansi, iv. 1132). Probably, had he come, he would have had a seat in the midst, as Dioscorus had at Chalcedon. But until his deposition by the council, "he was treated as bishop of Constantinople, the Roman council's decree notwithstanding" (Tillemont, xiv. 364). He is called "most religious" until the general "exclamation" against him in Mansi (iv. 1177), and even once afterwards.

and again, whereas, on that showing, they should have put in the very forefront Cyril's third letter, as conveying the Papal ultimatum, they only listened to it, and abstained from giving it an express synodical approval. Instead of simply accepting Cyril's and Celestine's estimate of the language used by Nestorius, and treating it as already proved to be heretical, they professedly inquired whether his letter to Cyril was, like Cyril's own letter, "in accordance with what was put forth by the holy Fathers at Nicæa;" they condemned it as "wholly contrary" to that standard, and to Cyril's second letter; they heard evidence as to his recent reiterations of heresy; they read seventeen extracts from approved theologians; they went through twenty passages from the sermons of Nestorius; and then, at last, they pronounced his condemnation.¹ Before we come to it, let

¹ Mansi, iv. 1169-1212. "He was deposed, not by virtue of the pope's judgment, which had been read, but on the proofs which were given of his false teaching" (Tillemont, *l.c.*). "Celestine," says Mr. Rivington, "considered himself as, in a peculiar sense, clothed with apostolic authority which he could exercise, *as we have seen*, in the way of deposing the bishop of Constantinople" (p. 480). But the council deposed that bishop; it could not, therefore, have recognised "apostolic authority" as having already done so. The Dublin Review represents it as having only taken the most "deliberate method" of "carrying out the papal judgment." But as "we have seen," if

us notice Mr. Rivington's remark: "It was St. Celestine's expressed desire that they should satisfy themselves as to the heterodoxy of Nestorius," and so "should give to his judgment a rational adhesion."¹ If this was his "desire," it was beyond the scope of the commission on which, according to Mr. Rivington, they were acting; and no "desire" of his was made known to them until the arrival of the legates—that is, nineteen days after the memorable 22nd of June. Mr. Rivington exults over one clause in the Council's sentence against Nestorius, which he renders, "necessarily compelled by the canons and by the letter of our most holy father and fellow-minister,² Celestine" (p. 334). It is not

that judgment was binding on the council, Nestorius was a deposed heretic at the end of 430, whereas the council begins by treating him as still *dans ses droits*. Before it opened, his friend Acacius had dealt with him as not yet irreclaimable.

¹ So in the Dublin Review he defines the relation between pope and council in "catholic theology." The council is indeed morally bound to agree with whatever the pope has decided as to doctrine: but it is not to be his unintelligent tool; it is to "judge," *i.e.* to satisfy itself as to the grounds of the papal decision, and thereby to give a peculiarly "striking character" to the sole infallible judgment. This is all! Did bishops who travelled to ancient councils know this "theology"?

² Mr. Rivington takes the first of these two titles in a distinctively papal sense; and the second, he imagines, means only that Celestine and the bishops were alike in priesthood!

“necessarily compelled,” but “necessarily” or “irresistibly urged” or “impelled;”¹ but let that pass. In the missives to Nestorius himself, and to his clergy, the Council mentions the canons and not Celestine. The canons, and Celestine’s letter to Nestorius, cannot here be treated as coordinate; for the Council had *not* rendered literal obedience to that letter; its purport was broadly inconsistent with any laborious examination of the opinions of the man whom he had therein branded as a “wolf.” The words, then, cannot be strained into meaning that “the compulsory nature of the” previous “Papal decision was presumed” by the synodical sentence, which “added nothing to its intrinsic authority;” they simply indicate that the

Of course it is here used for “fellow-bishop” (*supra*, pp. 119, 145). *Λειτουργία* is frequently used for the “ministry” of a bishop (see Euseb. ii. 24, iii. 13). In the Acts of Ephesus the title of archbishop is given six times to Celestine, seventy-six times to Cyril. To assume that, when bishops call Cyril “holy father,” as they do fifty-five times in the first session, it is as Celestine’s delegate, is to ignore the Eastern *usus loquendi*. Any “primate” would be so called. See, too, other cases in Mansi, vi. 1055 ff.; vii. 265, 493.

¹ *Ἀναγκάως κατεπειθέντες*. See Liddell and Scott on this verb and on *ἐπείγω*. If we are to be rigorously literalistic as to this *ἀπόφασις*, we must suppose that the bishops actually “wept much” while passing it. On *ἀναγκάως*, cf. Mansi, iv. 1240, 1301 (letters to the emperor).

bishops desired to utilise to the utmost the fact that the greatest see in the Church¹ was on their side, as against the bishop of the Eastern capital, who was understood to be patronised by the court, and to have many sympathisers in the Antiochene patriarchate—the “Orient” technically so called. They would be the more disposed to do this because they had been obliged to act without waiting for Celestine’s envoys. And when, on July 11th, these “legates” appeared in the Council, they brought a letter from Celestine² which requires rather more comment than is given in Mr. Rivington’s text; but in one of his Appendices he returns to it, and urges that, although the Pope speaks of the Apostolic teachership as having “descended in common to all bishops” (“*hæc ad omnes in commune Domini sacerdotes mandatae prædicationis cura pervenit*”), he does not say that it has descended to them “equally” (p. 480). We ask in reply: Where does he say that it has come to him in a unique sense, as

¹ If Rome is spoken of at Ephesus as “the apostolic see,” is this, as Mr. Rivington thinks, “a point of tremendous significance”? The bishops would not care to magnify Antioch by emphasising its apostolic character, and Jerusalem was still subordinate to Cæsarea.

² Mansi, iv. 1283.

the teacher of the Church Universal? Where does he differentiate his own share of the "teachership" from that of other successors of the Twelve? Where does he distinguish his own position from theirs, as the "priest's" is distinguished from the "people's" in "common prayer"? (p. 482). Mr. Rivington, indeed, pretends that Celestine identifies his relation to the bishops with that of St. Paul to Timothy (p. 339).¹ This is a peculiarly audacious gloss. What Celestine says is:—

"We must act by labouring in common, that we may preserve what has been entrusted [to us], and hitherto retained *per apostolicam successionem*.² For this is now required of us, to

¹ In his "Dublin" article Mr. Rivington still maintains this, and says that by "we" and "us" Celestine in that passage means the council: "He is speaking as occupant of the see of St. Peter and St. Paul, and they occupy the place of St. Timothy the bishop of Ephesus." This is paltry. Celestine supposes himself to be present by his envoys at Ephesus. He never even alludes to his own see as that of Peter's. He never claims any sole apostolic authority. Still less does he, as the Review represents him, exhort the council to "execute the sentence passed . . . by the apostolic see."

² He had said before, "Sanctum est . . . concilium, in quo utique nunc *apostolorum* frequentissimæ illius quam legimus congregationis aspicienda reverentia est. Nunquam his defuit Magister . . . docebat qui dixerat quid docerent . . . qui in apostolis suis se confirmat audiri . . . Hæc ad omnes," etc. "Hæreditario in hanc solitudinem jure constringimur [*i.e.* all bishops]

walk according to the Apostle. . . . *We* must take up spiritual arms. . . . The blessed Apostle Paul admonishes all who are now stationed in the place where he ordered Timothy to remain. . . . The same place, then, the same cause, even now requires that very duty. . . . Let *us*, also, now do and aim at that which Timothy undertook as incumbent on him, ‘ne quis aliter sentiat’ [referring to 1 Tim. i. 3, 4].¹ Let *us* be of one mind, . . . since the faith which is one is being struck at,” etc.

Is not Fleury warranted in saying that Celestine here “places himself in the rank of the bishops”? It is true that he refers at the end

quicumque . . . eorum vice nomen Domini prædicamus, dum illis dicitur, ‘Ite, docete omnes gentes.’ Advertere debet vestra fraternitas quia accepimus generale mandatum . . . Subeamus omnes eorum labores, quibus omnes successimus in honore,” etc. So afterwards: “Quæ fuit apostolorum petitio deprecantium? Nempe ut acciperent ‘verbum Dei loqui cum fiducia’ . . . Et vestro nunc sancto conventui quid est aliud postulandum,” etc.

¹ Eccl. Hist. xxv. c. 47. Mr. Rivington refers to the bishops’ acclamations “to Celestine, the guardian of the faith!” Literalism consistently applied to such language would produce curious results. Compare the greetings addressed to an emperor in the sixth session of Chalcedon; e.g. “O teacher of the faith!” (Mansi, vii. 177). When the council applies to Celestine and Cyril alike the title of “a new Paul,” Mr. Rivington is sure that Cyril was viewed simply as Celestine’s representative; and when it hails Celestine as τῷ δμοψύχῳ τῆς συνόδου, this is turned round, as it were, to mean that the council’s “judgment” was but “an intelligent adhesion to the papal sentence”! (p. 339).

to what he had "previously ordained" as to be "carried out" by his three legates; and there is also a difficulty as to the text of the final clause, where the Latin "id quod agitur" is not in accordance with the Greek ὅπερ αὖ γινώτε.¹

Let us now see what follows. The successor of St. Basil acknowledges that Celestine's "Apostolical see had previously given a direction,² and that they had followed and carried it out;" but he immediately adds, "by pronouncing against Nestorius a canonical and Apostolical judgment."³ The bishop of Ancyra then said that Celestine's letter was a divinely given proof of the justness of their decision. But why? Because it showed his "zeal for the divine faith."⁴ In the next session, one of

¹ A various reading of the Greek agrees with the Latin.

² Τύπον. The word ψήφον, "sentence," precedes.

³ Firmus, Ap. Mansi, iv. 1288. Bossuet: "Sic exsequitur synodus generalis primæ sedis sententiam legitima cognitione et inquisitione, nec simplicis mandatarii vice, sed canonico et apostolico dato iudicio" (Def. Decl. vii. 13). Mr. Rivington (who seems to think that the Defensio is not wholly Bossuet's) does, in fact, reduce the "general council" to the position of a dignified and intelligent "mandatarius" of the Pope. With Celestine's letter fresh in memory, a Cappadocian primate was hardly likely to mean that all "apostolical" authority was concentrated in Rome.

⁴ Both in his book and in his article, Mr. Rivington quotes Theodotus without giving this reason for his assertion.

the legates, *more Romano*, refers to our Lord's words to St. Peter, and affirms that the Apostle "up to this time and always lives and exercises judgment in his successors;"¹ another speaks of himself and his brethren as sent by Celestine to "execute" his resolves. But what says Cyril himself? He takes care (*a*) to describe the legates as representing, not only "the Apostolical see," but "all the holy synod of the bishops of the West,"² and (*b*) to distinguish *their* action, as Celestine's real "agents," from the sentence already pronounced by the synod to which he requests their "assent" in writing. But does he, then, recognise them as giving the supreme sanction without which the act would not be properly valid? Not a word like this appears in his speech. But Mr. Rivington fastens on the subsequent declaration of the bishops that the legates had spoken *ἁκολούθως* (Lat. *consentanea*). "It is enough," he exclaims; "we ought . . . to hear no such accusations as to Rome's disregard for history as are indulged

¹ Mansi, iv. 1295. Mr. Rivington says that "East and West, at Ephesus, agreed in" this (p. 371). So, again, he assumes that "the East to a man believed" what a legate said about "Peter judging in his successors" (p. 382). The notion that Easterns believed whatever they heard and did not contradict shows a curious lack of humour.

² Thus "the West" was not absorbed into Rome.

in by some writers, whose position is absolutely excluded by the history of the Council of Ephesus. . . . The teaching of the Vatican decree on this subject [the Church's government] was the teaching of the Fathers of Ephesus, and it was the rule of their conduct" (p. 347). Was it so, indeed? We need not repeat the terms of the decree; but does this declaration commit the Council to everything which a Roman envoy might say about the dignity of his master? Does not the context show that the Council was referring to the legates' agreement with its decisions? If we render the word "suitably," this would be the ground of the "suitableness" or consistency. One of them had just said that they were "bound to affirm [or "confirm"] the council's teaching,¹ according to what had been done in it" (that is, in view of its recorded proceedings): then comes the remark, "Since they have spoken ἀκολούθως, it follows that they should make good their own promise, and affirm [or "confirm"] what has been done by their signatures;" whereupon they sign the minutes, one of them as "entirely assenting to

¹ This must be the sense of *ἐαυτῶν διδασκαλίας*—*leg. αὐτῶν*, Lat. "*eorum doctrinam*." The Latin must be of primary authority in a "legate's" speech. Mansi, iv. 1299.

(ἐξᾶκολουθῶν) the last judgment of this holy and œcumenical synod." Their language would thus be "appropriate as emphasising" their "solidarity" with the synod on the one great question which it had to decide. The word *βεβαίω* is somewhat elastic; its sense in any particular passage must be settled by the context; and we learn by Cyril's phrase, "canonical assent," in what sense the legates were expected to "confirm" the council's proceedings. We need only add that in the synodical letters to Theodosius, Celestine is "commended for having condemned the heresy before our sentence" (*ψήφου*), and the legates are said to represent both him and "the whole synod of the West."¹ As to any notion of obedience in the Papalist sense being due to Celestine from the "œcumenical Council," there is not a single word. We may well say with Bossuet that at the outset, "*Ipsa synodus intellexit omnia ipso jure in suspenso esse, atque ex synodi pendere sententia;*" and that, in the proceedings, the Council so acted as to show that Celestine's judgment was *not* regarded as "*ultimum atque irreformabile.*"

But this, which Bossuet denies, is what his

¹ Mansi, iv. 1240, 1301, 1433, 1461.

Church now affirms to have been acknowledged from the first. Mr. Rivington placidly assumes that when Cyril in the fourth session spoke of the Council as having had the task of "confirming the right definition of the Apostolic faith," he meant, "of course, the ὀρισθέντα τύπον of" Celestine. But Celestine's "direction" was *not* a definition of the faith; and a little more acquaintance with ancient dogmatic phraseology would have saved Mr. Rivington from this blunder. Just before the Creed was read, in the first session, the purpose in hand was stated by Juvenal—"to establish the right faith,"¹ *i.e.* as formulated by the Nicene Council. This faith, or rather Creed, was to be confirmed, not as any bishop's teaching could be confirmed, but in the sense of being synodically reaffirmed; and so, when the African primate's letter² had been read, it was summarised by Cyril as aiming at the "confirmation of the ancient doctrines of the faith;" and in his great letter to John he writes, "We cannot allow

¹ A like phrase had been used still earlier (Mansi, iv. 1133).

² Mr. Rivington summarises this letter (p. 317) as saying that "the bishops of Africa have accepted the decision of the holy see," yet quotes it fairly as referring also to "the judgment of the bishops agreeing together" as against Pelagianism.

the Nicene Creed to be unsettled.”¹ The Council, too, in its letter to Celestine, speaks of Nestorius’ error as “dislodging from its basis the economy of the mystery.” Mr. Rivington cites this letter for the sake of two remarks in it, that the Council felt it a matter of “necessary duty to report to Celestine all its proceedings”—which, considering his eminent position, was natural enough—and that, although it might “justly and lawfully” have deposed John, it had “reserved his case for Celestine’s judgment” (p. 353). And here is an illustration of Mr. Rivington’s “ways.” He makes the Council give as its reason for this reservation, that “the matter concerned one of the ‘greater thrones,’” a phrase taken from a subsequent paragraph relating (as he himself intimates) to a different point;² he glosses the assertion of a right to depose John, as if it depended

¹ Cyr. Op. ed. P. E. Pusey, vi. 50. Compare with *κρατυνοθηναί* (Cyril’s phrase), Mansi, iv. 1344, that “the synod decreed *κρατεῖν . . . τὴν πλίστιν;*” and on *ἕρον*, Cyr. adv. Nest. i. 5, “the symbol which the Nicene fathers *ἠρίσαντο*,” and cf. Mansi, iv. 1361, and Soc. i. 37, etc.

² The excommunication directed against Cyril and Memnon by John of Antioch and his supporters (Mansi, iv. 1336). “For if persons are left free to insult the greater thrones” (or “sees”) confusion will follow. Thus the council means to include Ephesus, as well as Alexandria and Antioch, among sees of this class.

on the presence of Roman legates; and he omits the reason actually assigned for not doing so—"that by forbearance we might overcome his temerity." Once more, he assumes that three Cyprian bishops spoke untruly when they claimed a traditional independence of Antioch;¹ and he affirms this with a positiveness which contrasts with the language of such great scholars as Tillemont and Le Quien. His reason is, that Innocent I. had pronounced "that the Cyprians ought to return to their obedience." But Innocent's letter avowedly proceeds upon an *ex parte* statement;² and how, on Vatican principles, could a General Council, even provisionally, reverse the alleged "decision" of a Pope? He pours scorn on the suggestion that there may have been some connection between the African bishops' deprecation—in that previous letter to Celestine which he wishes to represent as spurious—of acts which would introduce into the Church "the smoky arrogance of the world," and the Ephesine resolution *re* Cyprus, forbidding

¹ One of them said: "They cannot prove that from the apostles' times he of Antioch, or any other, ever imparted to our island the grace of ordination" (Mansi, iv. 1468).

² "Cyprios sane *asseris* . . . Quocirca *persuademus* eis," etc. (Innocent to Alexander of Antioch; Mansi, iii. 1055).

bishops to usurp jurisdiction beyond their own bounds, "lest under the guise of episcopal action there should creep in the arrogance of [worldly] authority." The resemblance is almost a verbal identity; it seems to demand some explanation. Eastern bishops, about ninety years before, had shown some jealousy of Roman self-assertion; is it incredible that Eastern bishops in 431 should have thought the words opportune in case of its recurrence?¹ The greatest Asiatic bishop of the fourth century had complained of the "haughty bearing" of that same Roman bishop whose accession, compromised by sanguinary conflicts, had given occasion to a Pagan historian to dwell sarcastically on the pomp and wealth which made his

¹ Cf. Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 25. In page 359, referring to "Dr. Bright's imagination," Mr. Rivington says, "he thinks that the Roman legates at Ephesus *may* have been absent from that particular session which dealt with the Cyprian case." And yet we read, in page 357; "This decision was probably arrived at after their [the legates'] withdrawal, and *so* was merely a provisional arrangement pending further inquiry," as if any resolution arrived at without their presence could of course be only tentative; whereas the decree is most absolute in its terms, and, by authority of "the holy and œcumenical synod," annuls any "direction" which may conflict with it. He also denies that Besulas, an African deacon, represented Africa at the council (p. 359). But at the end of the list of members we find, "Besulas deacon of Carthage." He represented his bishop Capreolus (Mansi, iv. 1128, 1208).

see an object of ambition.¹ Eastern prelates were often shrewd and acute men, and certainly not simple enough to think the occupants of "the first see," as such, inaccessible to the temptation of domineering; and such of them as were alive some fourteen years later would probably feel that their words had been unconsciously prophetic of Leo I.'s attempt to subjugate the Church of Gaul by the aid of an imperial rescript, containing language which, as Tillemont says, "does little honour" to his memory.²

¹ Ammian. xxvii. 3.

² Valentinian III. was made to say (July 8, 445), "Since the primacy of the apostolic see has been confirmed by the merit of St. Peter, the dignity of the city of Rome, and also *the authority of a sacred synod, ne quid præter auctoritatem sedis istius illicitum præsumptio attentare nitatur*; for then will the peace of the churches everywhere be preserved, *si rectorem suum agnoscat universitas.*" But neither the Sardican provisions, which Leo persists in referring to as Nicene (Epp. 43, 44), nor the Roman version of Nic. can. 6, would justify this inference, for which Leo must be held responsible. Valentinian was not likely to insist on having its validity established. The rescript orders that "whatever the authority of the apostolic see has directed, or shall direct, is to be law throughout the provinces," *i.e.* of the West. Yet Leo could write of another bishop, "*Propria perdit qui indebita concupiscit*" (Ep. 104. 3): a pregnant maxim, which sums up our case in regard to his own see. One ought, perhaps, to notice the argument that if the canons referred to had really been Sardican, Leo would have had "no reason for quoting them as Nicene, since, as Sardican, they would have been a sufficient authority for his purpose" in

(XX.) THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

At last we come to the Fourth General Council. At the end of the trial of Eutyches in Flavian's Council of Constantinople (November, 448), it seems that, *after* the assembly broke up, the condemned abbot, in a low voice, appealed to certain foreign "synods." What were they? According to the "patrician" Florentius, to whom he had spoken, "the synods of Rome, and of Egypt, and of Jerusalem."¹

writing to the Eastern emperor. But (as Mr. Rivington himself says, in p. 468) the Sardican council was not known, in the East, to have put forth any canons; and in any case a Western synod could not have had as much "authority" as the Nicene, nor have suited Leo nearly so well. As is well known, he was bent on crushing Hilary of Arles, who had withstood him. Hilary may have dealt over-stringently with bishop Chelidonius: but the interest of the case lies not simply in his dignified firmness when protesting against the acceptance of Chelidonius' appeal, or threatened by Leo's *entourage*, or put under guard by Leo's despotic order, but rather in the ground taken by the prefect Auxiliarius as a peacemaker. He entreats Hilary—not to submit himself penitently to a spiritual sovereign whom he had affronted, but—to make some concession to "Roman sensitiveness" (cf. Honoratus, Vit. Hilar. c. 17). See Dr. Cazenove's signally equitable treatment of the case, in Dict. Chr. Biogr. iii. 70.

¹ Mansi, vi. 817. The monk Constantine's account is set aside by Mr. Rivington, because he was "convicted of untrustworthiness." But it would have been as well to say what the "account" was. This pertinacious advocate of Eutyches still thought fit to represent him as having appealed, not only to

Mr. Rivington ingeniously recasts this: "to an Egyptian and Jerusalemite, *as well as to a Roman Council*;" and then sets himself to minimise the reference to the two former, and, with regard to the latter, to sink the "Council" in the "Pope." We know nothing, he argues, of any letter from Eutyches, except the one to Leo: therefore, we may practically treat the application to Leo as standing alone (p. 366). This is a "short and easy method," indeed; but it happens that Eutyches, in 449, charged Flavian with ignoring his appeal to a General Council.¹ Then as to Leo's correspondence with Flavian; he naturally thought that Flavian "ought to have written" to him as soon as Eutyches did. Flavian's first letter was, in fact, somehow delayed, but in his second he gives a full account.² Mr. Rivington

these three "synods," but also to that of Thessalonica (Mansi, vi. 817). But we may take it as certain that he made no formal appeal whatever during the council.

¹ Mansi, vi. 641. This was said at the Latrocinium. Eutyches, as Mr. Rivington says, told "a falsehood" when he professed to have formally appealed to Leo; but the point of interest is that he represented himself as having appealed to *several* authorities. In an age of hierarchical solidarity, the help of any great see might be invoked by a sufferer; and so, apparently, Flavian, at the Latrocinium, appealed to Leo (Ep. 43).

² Leon. Ep. 26. The first letter is Ep. 22. Leo had not

grandiloquently describes him as "invoking St. Leo's prerogative," acting as a "judge of first instance," and "bringing Eutyches before Leo" for a "final peremptory judgment;" and the heading of page 369 runs, "Flavian *prefers a Papal Brief*"—something, we presume, in the style of documents sealed with "the Fisherman's ring," and menacing the disobedient with the "indignation of Almighty God, and of His Apostles Peter and Paul." He makes the bishop of Constantinople say, "Deign to give your decision by means of briefs, in accordance with the canonical deposition of Eutyches" at Constantinople. How many of his readers will turn to the original? Those who do so will find Flavian in no such humble attitude; he says, "Be so good as to give assent,¹ by a letter of your own, to the deposition which has canonically taken place;" and he adds that nothing now is wanted save Leo's "impulse and assistance" to tell on the mind of Theodosius, and to stop the mischievous scheme for a new Council.² This is natural received it when he wrote Ep. 23, Feb. 18, 449. On May 21 he acknowledged receipt of Flavian's letters (Ep. 27).

¹ Literally, to vote with, *συμψηφίσασθαι*. The Latin has "suffragari."

² If Theodosius had recognised Leo's see as "the supreme

on the theory of a precedency of position and influence ; but no rotundity of phrase in a modern Papalist comment can puff it out into a recognition of Papal monarchy. Nor is there in the last paragraph of that famous and inestimable letter to Flavian, which is known as Leo's "Tome," anything like a claim of real supremacy ; while, even had the language been stronger, the œcumenical acceptance of the Tome had reference to its magnificent exposition of the great doctrine on which Christianity is based.

In Leo's letter to the unhappy Council which he afterwards, with excusable exaggeration, branded as "a meeting of robbers," the object in view is described : "that all error may be done away with by a fuller judgment."¹ Mr. Rivington forthwith glosses : "the sentence of the Pope was to swell out and be completed by its synodical proclamation, *as the sufferings of Christ are completed by those of His followers*" (p. 377). By aid of this most gratuitous and

court of appeal," he would not have entertained and acted on this scheme in spite of Leo's objections.

¹ Ep. 33. Theodosius had *not* implied, as Leo chooses to suppose, that he desired to get an exposition of Peter's confession "from Peter himself," *i.e.* from his see. This (as we have already seen) was a Roman *usus loquendi*.

hardly reverent illustration, a Council intended to be œcumenical is degraded into a mere Papal consistory; and while Leo's account of the pledge given by Eutyches, "per omnia nostram se secuturum sententiam," is translated into a "promise to obey the Holy See," the part to be taken by the Council is thus described: "His legates were to determine with the holy assembly of the episcopal brotherhood 'what things will be pleasing to the Lord.'" Is "with" here intended as an adequate representation of *communi vobiscum sententia*?

That Leo, alike in his high official position, and in his force of character and religious earnestness,¹ was *the* man to stand forward amid this Eutychian peril, will be admitted by all who believe in the One Christ as "perfect God and perfect Man," with gratitude due to him for that firm theological equipoise whereby, while the error of the time being is exposed, no advantage is given to its Nestorian opposite. He went much too far, we believe, in magnifying his own bishopric, by consolidating

¹ A great man, being also first among bishops, and Roman patriarch, with the *prestige* of the "Petrine" tradition, would be quite strong enough for what Leo succeeded in doing. An acknowledged spiritual monarch, supreme alike in East and West, would have done more.

and formulating the "Petrine" ideas which had long grown up among its clergy ;¹ but let us not underrate the significance of his words when, in attempting to work upon the Eastern court for the redress of wrongs done by the "Latrocinium," he speaks as the mouthpiece of "*omnes nostrarum partium ecclesiæ, omnesque sacerdotes*" (even as afterwards he speaks of writings of his as sent to Constantinople "*non solum apostolicæ sedis auctoritate, sed etiam sanctæ synodi, quæ ad nos frequens convenerat, unanimitate*").² This, according to Mr. Rivington, refers merely to such bishops as happened to be in Rome, whose authority, when sitting with him in synod, was due to him alone—as if they were but a sort of cabinet council to the Sovereign of the entire Church. But Leo means Theodosius to understand that he has the Western Church at his back ; one is reminded of Cyril's care to

¹ See Canon Gore's *Leo the Great*, p. 99.

² Epp. 43 and 61. In quoting Ep. 44 Mr. Rivington makes Leo speak of the "faith which, inspired divinely, we have received," and claims this as "meaning exactly that divine assistance which constitutes papal infallibility according to the Vatican decree" (p. 387). He complacently remarks that the phrase, "if taken too strictly, goes beyond" that decree. But the Latin is "*fidei quam divinitus inspiratam et accepimus et tenemus*," *i.e.* the faith as originally communicated by God to the Church, and so handed down to Leo and to the "holy synod" in whose name he writes.

insist that Celestine and his legates represent the Western hierarchy. It was on this occasion that he repeated the claim of Nicene authority for a Sardican canon; and if Zosimus and Boniface had made that claim in good faith, Leo made it in the face of evidence which had been in the possession of his Church for thirty years. Yet all the urgency of Leo,¹ supported by the Western emperor² and princesses, fails utterly with a pious but feeble prince bred up under the influences of Eastern Christianity.³ Readers of Gibbon will recollect

¹ It is the urgency of entreaty: "Obsecramus—supplicant" (Ep. 44. 2, 3); "supplicationi nostræ" (Ep. 54. 2); and to Pulcheria, "obsecrantes . . . supplicationem" (Ep. 45. 1, 2. Ep. 54 was written after the others, but not, as Mr. Rivington says, in "January," 450; he has mistaken the Ballerini's date, *oct. Kal. Jan.* = Dec. 25, 449.) As Bishop Andrewes says, "Audis jam hic mandatum nullum" (Tort. Torti, p. 196). Mr. Rivington hardly allows this to be observed by his readers.

² As for Valentinian's letter (Leon. Ep. 55) which, as Mr. Rivington truly says, "was inspired by Leo," it is a little too much to assume that Leo's religious "motive" could justify the claim that he should "judge about the faith and the bishops." Yet this is modified into a request for a general council in Italy.

³ When Mr. Rivington says, "We *know* that" Theodosius "had avowed the sovereignty of the see of St. Peter over all the sees of Christendom by his signature to the 'constitution' of Valentinian," *re Hilary* (p. 393), he forgets the imperial *usus loquendi*, which saved the principle of the unity of the empire by uniting the names of both emperors in the edicts of each. Cf. Marcian's letters, Leon. Epp. 100, 110 ("Valentinianus et Marcianus"), despatched in both names from Constantinople.

his sly allusion to the "fortunate stumbling of the emperor's horse."¹ Theodosius dies; Pulcheria and her "nominal husband," Marcian, ascend the Eastern throne; and Marcian writes to Leo as having "oversight and rule in regard to the divine faith,"² and offers a new Council in which, σοῦ ἀυθεντοῦντος (Lat. *te auctore*) peace may be settled among Catholic bishops.³ These phrases by no means warrant the gloss that at the future synod Leo's authority should be all-decisive; and in the correspondence which followed we see clearly that when Leo intimated that he did not want a new council, unless it was to be held in Italy, Marcian held to his resolution that a council should be held, and *not* in Italy, but near Constantinople. Leo had to make the best of it, though he did not conceal

Leo had "obtained the 'constitution' from Valentinian, who was then at Rome" (Tillemont, xv. 83), and it was sent off to Aetius, then ruling in Gaul. Theodosius' own conduct shows that he *could not* have committed himself to the "constitution," or acknowledged it as binding in the East.

¹ Gibbon, vi. 27.

² Ep. 73. Ἐπισκοπεύουσαν καὶ ἄρχουσαν τῆς θείας πίστεως. This cannot mean that Leo was the "ruler of the faith," but that, as chief Christian bishop, he was that faith's foremost guardian.

³ The same phrase is used by Pulcheria in Ep. 77; Mr. Rivington quotes it (p. 392) and glosses the very next word, ὀρίσωσιν (*i.e.* the bishops), as if Leo were to decide everything by his legates "in the council."

his annoyance : he could not use Marcian as he had used the wretched Valentinian.¹ Even before Theodosius died, Leo had written to him about the new bishop of Constantinople, whom he had reason to regard with suspicion, and he wished his own Tome to be a test. Be it remembered that on Vatican principles, as Mr. Rivington expressly says (p. 415), the Tome "*was already of faith.*" Yet Leo speaks here with remarkable moderation : Anatolius should study the Fathers' writings, and with them Cyril's letter to Nestorius, and the minutes of the Ephesian Council ; and "*let him not disdain to peruse my letter also, which he will find to be in full accord with the pious mind of the Fathers.*"² Can words be

¹ Mr. Rivington thinks Marcian a signally "holy" emperor. He was, at any rate, a very "capable" one. See, *e.g.* Bury's *Later Roman Empire*, i. 135.

² Ep. 69. In Ep. 70, "I ask that he will assent to Cyril's letter to Nestorius . . . *vel* *epistolæ meæ*," etc. The Ballerini (naturally, from their standpoint) argue that *vel* here = *et*. But even taking it so, Cyril's letter and the tome are put side by side ; both are to be "heedfully considered." Is this like "dealing with the archbishop of Constantinople as a subject, and imposing on him the Roman 'form of faith' "? (p. 395). The circumstances fully account for the letter (of a year later) about two of Anatolius' priests, who had visited Rome and satisfied Leo of their orthodoxy (Ep. 87). But Mr. Rivington, in p. 397, italicises a phrase in this letter, "by the teaching of the Holy Spirit," as if Leo could not ascribe what "he had learned and taught" to that Divine "instruction" without

plainer as against the assertion that the Tome, *qua* Leo's, was deemed infallible? No doubt, as to the bishops who had yielded to the tyranny of Dioscorus, Leo commissions Anatolius to act with his envoys, and entrusts him with the carrying out of his *dispositio*¹—a word which suggests to Mr. Rivington the parenthetical hint, “cf. the use of *dispositio* for an imperial edict,” so that Leo may be thus represented as nothing less than a spiritual emperor; which, indeed, *is* the position in effect assigned by authentic Roman teaching to his present namesake.

At the opening of the Council of Chalcedon, the “legates” objected to the presence of Dioscorus. Let us hear our author: “The imperial commissioners wished to resist the decision of the legates [that he should have no seat in the Council], but in vain. They had to obey ‘the head of all Churches,’ and cause Dioscorus to

assuming to be the infallible teacher of all Christians. Cf. Leo, Ep. 120, from which Mr. Rivington (p. 415) quotes some words on the contents of the tome as being “what God had previously defined by his ministry;” but further on Leo explains this by referring to the Scriptural authorities “brought together in it,” as rendering “further doubt” impossible. Leo also says twice that the council, by its assent, “strengthened” the tome; but Mr. Rivington is not satisfied without inserting “*further*” and glossing, “It was already of faith.”

¹ Rivington, p. 396.

leave his place. His presence, *however*, was required, and he was therefore allowed to sit in the middle, without, that is to say, a seat as a constituent member, which was the gist of the legates' demand" (p. 401).

But Mr. Rivington omits (one is really weary of having so often to use this verb) the original insistence of the "legates," "Let him go out, or else we will go out;" and the remark of the commissioners, "If you represent a judge, you must not be an accuser as well." The arrangement come to was in the nature of a compromise;¹ but Dioscorus was treated as bishop of Alexandria until his final act of contumacy.² The title of "Œcumenical Patriarch," employed in the Alexandrian petitions to Leo as president, and to the Council, was obviously put in to please Leo; and it must not be inferred from the Council's silence that such a phrase received its sanction,³ or, indeed, that the memorialists

¹ See Mansi, vi. 581.

² *E.g.* in the third citation (Mansi, vi. 1036).

³ If it did, then one might say that the council declared itself to be composed of angels; for three of these effusive memorialists address the council as "your angelical company" (Mansi, vi. 1009, etc.; as does one of the bishops, *ib.* 1063). This sort of complimenting was not exclusively Eastern: Leo himself does not shrink from ascribing to emperors a "sacerdotal energy" and "a sacerdotal mind" (Epp. 24, 115, 155).

expected to be understood literally. Again, when Dioscorus is condemned, the dictum of the "legates," that Leo "by them and by the Council" deposed him, is to be read with the successive speeches of bishops.¹ Anatolius, who had his own reasons for wishing to stand well with Leo, professes to be "altogether of one

Mr. Rivington's phrase, "The term 'universal bishop' . . . was freely used *at* the council of Chalcedon" (p. 438), would mislead an unwary reader.

¹ Mansi, vi. 1048 ff. The vote of the "legates" speaking first is assumed by Mr. Rivington to be the "sentence" of the Council (p. 405). In this he is following the Ballerini. True, the legates, as presiding, had repeatedly asked the council what was its mind as to the penalty merited by Dioscorus, and the council had replied that the penalty prescribed by "the canons" should be inflicted (Mansi, vi. 1044). One Lydian bishop remarked that Dioscorus had been "the first to give judgment" when he presided at Ephesus (at the *Latrocinium*), and requested the legates, as now presiding, to "pronounce" according to the canons, adding that the whole council was *σὺμψηφος* with them, a phrase repeated by the bishop of Antioch. Then the legates made their speech, which Tillemont calls their "avis." If it was *the* synodical sentence, why did it conclude with "the synod *ψηφίσεται* according to the canons"? and why was it followed by a series of episcopal pronouncements, among which the verbs "decide" or "define" occur some thirty times, and the verb "judge" over seventy, besides such terms as "I condemn" or "I exclude," or "I assent to the judgment pronounced by the fathers" (*i.e.* the leading bishops), etc.? Where "I think" occurs, it involves a judicial opinion or finding. In the subsequent signatures two of the three legates, speaking as such, profess to "define" (decide) "together with the synod;" and three great prelates, speaking next, use the same phrase without alluding to Rome.

mind with the Apostolic see ;” out of the other prelates, a few combine Leo’s name with that of Anatolius ; still fewer combine it with the Council’s ; a large number associate the names of both prelates with the Council’s ; one adds the name of the bishop of Antioch, but the great majority refer to the Council or “the fathers” simply. In the missives to Dioscorus and to his clergy, the sentence is grounded on his previous offences *plus* his contumacy towards the Council ; and instead of accepting, even constructively, the position of being Leo’s minister, the Council repeatedly describes the deposition as its own act.¹ No doubt, in the letter to the Emperor we read that Dioscorus might have been pardoned if he had not “barked against the Apostolic see itself, and attempted to excommunicate the Pope² Leo.” But Mr. Rivington stops just short of the momentous

¹ Mansi, vi. 1096, 1097. *E.g.* Παρὰ τῆς . . . συνόδου καθαιρεῖσθαι. Twenty-eight refer to his refusal to plead ; three to his conduct *re* Eutyches and Flavian.

² Mansi, vi. 1099. He is also twice in this context called “archbishop,” a title which, like “pope,” was applied by the Easterns to occupants of pre-eminent sees. In the deposition votes it is repeatedly given both to Leo and to Anatolius ; and also once to the bishop of Thessalonica. In the votes as to the tome, one bishop in the same sentence prefixes “pope” both to Leo and to Cyril (Mansi, vii. 21). In fact, this title had in the East a special applicability to the bishop of Alexandria.

words, "He has been fittingly deprived of his episcopate *by the Universal Council.*"¹

And now as to the treatment of the Tome. The commissioners propose that the Council should frame a doctrinal formulary. This is objected to, on the ground of the Ephesian Council's "rule" against compiling "another Creed."² "We dare not make another exposition, *for* we have in writing those made by the Fathers"—meaning the Nicene and "Constantinopolitan" forms of the Creed,³ to which the commissioners had referred. One bishop remarks, however, that Eutychnianism has required some new statements of truth, that Leo has given a "type" or formulary, and that "we follow him and have signed his letter," as,

¹ Mansi, vi. 1099. Because the council tells Pulcheria that "Christ had used Leo as champion of the truth, as of old He used Peter," therefore, according to Mr. Rivington's logic, the council declares Leo to be "the vicar of Christ in his direction of the Church—a statement which is correctly summed up in the more modern phrase, 'papal supremacy' or 'infallibility'" (p. 408): Q.E.D.! In one passage, Mr. Rivington ventures to say that "the invalidity of the Robber-synod was assigned by the bishops simply and solely to the decision of the bishop of Rome" (p. 435), as if it did not result from the proceedings *re* Dioscorus. See Mansi, vi. 936.

² See this "rule" in Mansi, iv. 1361. For its purport, I may refer to my Notes on the Canons, etc., p. 133. Πίστις is a creed.

³ Mansi, vi. 953.

indeed, many bishops had done before the Council met.¹ The bishops exclaim, "We all say this; the expositions given are sufficient; it is not lawful to make another." Clearly, "this" refers to what they had said before; and Mr. Rivington ought to have recognised that the "expositions" mean the Creed, and do not, as he imagines (p. 409), include the Tome, for the Ephesian "rule," which is referred to as an authority, would *not* have excluded any addition to documents like the Tome, which did not profess to be a Creed.² The Creed was read in both forms, followed by Cyril's two chief letters, and by the Tome, the last three documents being hailed with acclamations. But the subject was postponed until a subsequent session, when the Tome was solemnly accepted by the Council; but in what terms? The remark that the Council "no more sat in judgment on the Pope and St. Cyril, as superiors, than a man acts as

¹ Anatolius and a synod had done so in the autumn of 450 (Leon. Ep. 77). Others signed later.

² Leo expressly distinguishes it from the creed (Ep. 165. 10). In the preceding discussion at Ephesus, "exposition" had been repeatedly used as meaning "creed." Mr. Rivington is doubly wrong when he says, "It was (*they said*) Leo's sentence . . . which made it unnecessary." Not "unnecessary," but "unlawful;" and not because of "Leo's sentence," but of *δ κανών*.

superior to St. James and St. Paul" when he propounds a "Harmonia Apostolica" (p. 411), is absolutely gratuitous. The Fourth Council did not "judge" of Cyril's teaching, because it had been solemnly adopted by the Third; but did it not, in any true sense, "judge" Leo's? Let us see. The bishops at Ephesus, in their individual affirmations, had approved of Cyril's teaching as expressed in his second letter to Nestorius, *because* (as many of them said) they "found," or "saw," or "recognised," or "understood," or "ascertained" it to be consonant to the Creed.¹ They thus "judged" it, and thereupon erected it into a standard. It was so regarded when Leo's Tome was dealt with at Chalcedon. Now, here are some of the phrases in which the bishops adhere to a document proceeding from the Roman chair, and, according to Mr. Rivington, "already irreversible," being "an *ex-cathedra* pronouncement,"² obligatory on all Christian consciences from the moment of its promulgation by Leo, simply because it was he who promulgated it: "I have ascertained—I judge—

¹ Mansi, iv. 1140 ff.

² Rivington, pp. 397, 415. He assumes that "no orthodox Christian could" then "seriously maintain that any of the bishops were free to revise that dogmatic letter" (p. 416).

I am fully persuaded—we find—we have found—that it is in accordance with the Creed,” and, as many bishops add, “with the teaching of the Council of Ephesus” or “of Cyril.” Or, “as far as I have been able to perceive,” or “to understand, it agrees—I perceive that it no way differs—we have proved by examination that it no way differs—I find in it nothing divergent—I have found that it agrees—your Splendours [the commissioners] see that it agrees,” etc.¹ Are we to say that such language implies a real “judgment” when applied to a writing of Cyril’s, but, when applied to one of Leo’s, means only that the speakers now appreciate the grounds of a teaching which, independently of such appreciation, had a divine right to their submissive acceptance? Nothing in the Acts could warrant a distinction *prima facie* so arbitrary. If words on a solemn occasion mean anything, here is a series of declarations in which individual bishops, members of the Œcumenical Council, accept the Tome *because* they personally believe it to be conformable to Church standards, just as their predecessors had dealt

¹ Mansi, vii. 9 ff. The last affirmation is by a bishop from Pontus (ib. 24).

with Cyril's letter; and thus by their act it acquires a place among Church standards.¹ The series in question, including the statements of those prelates who had found a few difficulties in the Tome (as if it tended to Nestorianism) and had been satisfied by explanations, extends (with the Latin rendering) over nearly thirty-seven columns of Mansi's seventh volume. Was it fair in Mr. Rivington to refrain from giving any samples of this language? One may ask another question: was it quite *prudent*?²

¹ Mr. Rivington rightly observes that the acclamation, "Peter hath spoken [thus] by Leo" meant "that as a matter of fact he was true to the Apostle's teaching." Yet he adds, "*but* their exclamation suggests their belief that it followed from his official position" (p. 412). Rather, that he himself had spoken in a manner worthy of that position. Against this Roman convert of a few years' standing, who insists that the council had no option as to accepting the tome, one may set a pope, Vigilius, quoted in "Waymarks in Church History," etc., p. 229. As Bossuet says (Def. Decl. Cler. Gall. vii. 17), "placuit Leonis epistolam ad *legitimum concilii examen* revocare," and he couples "examen" with "inquisitio" and "judicium," meaning that the bishops recorded the result of such "examen," that they had previously satisfied themselves of the soundness of the tome. There is no parallel between this and Leo's offer in 458 to send clerics to explain the Chalcedonian teaching (Ep. 1623); for in the same letter, as elsewhere, he insists that this teaching is not open to revision; whereas it is the merest *petitio principii* to assume that his tome was in that position before the "examen."

² The speech of the legates is partly corrupt; but Mr. Rivington has misrepresented it. They do *not* "describe the attitude of the synod towards the tome of Leo as being

Coming to the "Definitio Fidei" as ultimately adopted by the Council, Mr. Rivington makes the commissioners "ask practically whether the bishops were prepared to withdraw themselves from the Supreme Pontiff" (p. 421). We need not say that there is nothing like "Supreme Pontiff" in the original, which reads, "from the most holy Leo," a title by no means, in those days, equivalent to the "Holy Father" among Romanists.¹ Our author has, indeed, a good right to emphasise the great service rendered by Leo's envoys in prevailing on the Council to substitute "*in* two natures" for the ambiguous

precisely the same as their attitude towards the council of Nice and the council of Ephesus" (p. 414). On the contrary, they ground the claim of the tome to acceptance on its agreement with the two forms of the creed and with the Cyrilline-Ephesine dogma (*Idoique—καὶ τοῦτου χάριτι*, Mansi, vii. 11). That is, just when, on Mr. Rivington's showing, they ought to have proclaimed, in such language as was appropriate to their time, the principle of papal infallibility, they, speaking for Leo, take up quite different ground. Mr. Rivington says of that principle, "the thing was there" (p. 417). It was *not* there; it was conspicuous by its absence. Something else was there instead.

¹ Mr. Rivington tries to produce an effect by a free use of the phrases, "the Holy See," "His Holiness," etc. Thus, in p. 337, "Most Holy Father" appears with three initial capitals, while "fellow-minister" is not so distinguished, and might almost escape the eye. In two of the passages quoted in pp. 353, 354, "your Holiness" is substituted for the original "your piety," a common title of all bishops, as indeed was "your holiness." These are little matters, but worth noting: we see what is aimed at.

“of two natures,” which at first stood in the “Definitio.” But the commissioners, in giving full support to this request, relied, not on any “Papal prerogative,” but on the argument from consistency. By accepting the Tome, which pointedly affirmed that “*in* the complete nature of very Man was born very God, whole *in* what was His own, and whole *in* what was ours,” the Council had committed itself to “*in*.”¹ And the “Definitio,” as revised and promulgated, has nothing of Papalism in it, and classes the Tome with Cyril’s letter, “*inasmuch* as it is accordant with Peter’s confession.”² Mr. Rivington mentions the address to Marcian, but slurs over a critical part of the case. The Council there defends the letter of “the admirable prelate of Rome” from the charge of “innovation” by precedents from earlier dogmatic letters, and then says, “If it is *not* accordant with the Scriptures, and with previous Fathers, and if it is not manifestly an advocacy of the Nicene creed, let them confute it.”³

¹ “Therefore add to the definition,” etc. Mansi, vii. 105. See Leo, Ep. 28 (the tome), c. 3, and “*in* both natures,” c. 5.

² “With which letter [of Cyril] the council has *reasonably combined* the letter of . . . archbishop Leo,” etc. Mansi, vii. 113. Routh, Scr. Opusc. ii. 78.

³ Mansi, vii. 465 (ἐλεγχέτωσαν). Marcian is asked to

Theodoret's case is very unsatisfactorily treated by our author.¹ The injured bishop of Cyrrhos unquestionably uses the technical term ἐπικαλουμένῳ in this application for Leo's help, and undertakes to abide by Leo's judgment, whatever it may be. But in the

“confirm by the synod the teaching of the see of Peter;” and sixteen passages from fathers are added, in defence of its theology from the charge of “innovation.” Yet, according to Mr. Rivington, it was *de fide* from the first! This address Hefele refers to the fifth session, in which the “Definitio” was adopted.

¹ He *had* written, “Theodoret . . . [in Ep. 113] enumerates the advantages with which the apostolic throne is adorned, viz. ‘abundance of spiritual gifts as compared with others, superabundant splendour, the presidency over the whole world, abundance of subjects, present rule, and the communication of her name to her subjects’” (p. 427). Now, Theodoret (whose original is referred to in footnotes), after speaking of the “advantages,” goes on to speak of the *city* of Rome, and attributes to *it* “an abundance of good things, for it is the greatest of all, presides over the whole world, swells with a multitude of inhabitants, has developed an existing sovereignty, communicates its name to its subjects,” but is “chiefly adorned by its faith, and by the tombs of Peter and Paul.” He then reverts to the “see,” as made most conspicuous by these apostles—as *their* see,—as having acquired a new “splendour” through the orthodox zeal of Leo himself. This gross perversion of Theodoret's language was pointed out, and has since been included in the list of *corrigenda*; but how?—simply by reading “*is adorned. Rome has ‘abundance,’*” etc. Any reader might infer that “Rome” meant “the apostolic throne,” which has been mentioned just before. Is this an adequate effacement of such a blot? In p. 33, “Theodoret uses *προκαθημένη τῆς οἰκουμένης of the holy see*” is now corrected by “deleting” the last four words.

letter to the Roman priest Renatus¹ (of whose death he was not aware), he hopes that the "archbishop" of Rome will bid him take refuge with "your council," and promises to accept what "you" (ὑμῶν) may decide. This "council," Mr. Rivington insists, would be the mere "machinery" of the purely "Papal judgment;" but in another letter Anatolius (a "patrician" to whom Theodoret wrote seven letters) is asked to obtain leave for Theodoret to "go to the West and be judged by *the bishops* who dwell in it;"² so that the Council was somehow to represent the Western Church, which a bishop wronged in the East would naturally wish to enlist on his side. As Theodoret must have expected, Leo, and doubtless some assembly of Westerns, pronounced in his favour. This, on Vaticanist principles, should have been amply sufficient to place him, as a matter of

¹ In this letter the Roman see is said to have "on many accounts the presidency, τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, over all churches." Mr. Rivington mistranslates this by his favourite "sovereignty," and does not appreciate the significance of the chief reason assigned—the fidelity of its occupants to the truth.

² Τοῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ, Ep. 119. Tillemont says, "Although Theodoret, in writing to the pope, speaks as if he had addressed him alone, we see that it was from the bishops of the West in general that he awaited the decision of his cause" (xv. 294). The letter to Florentius (Ep. 117) is considered by Tillemont to be a circular to these bishops.

course, among the constituent members of the Council of Chalcedon. But it was by no means deemed sufficient. The commissioners found that, in face of strong opposition, he could only take his seat in the midst as a competent accuser capable also of being accused. He did not vote, "except on such business as was connected with his own justification," *i.e.* as was properly doctrinal.¹ In the eighth session he was called upon explicitly to anathematise Nestorius. Mr. Rivington (applying the Vatican "principles") thinks that this did not prejudice the previous Roman judgment, chiefly because "the legates" themselves "actually gave the" synodical "decision" in his favour (p. 432). But the fact remains that the bishops vehemently and persistently imposed on him a test which Leo had not imposed; that he tried to satisfy them by something short of it; that he was not pronounced "worthy of his see" until he submitted.² The "legates" did *not* "give the decision," but simply took the lead in giving a vote; six bishops followed, of whom five made no allusion referring to Leo's action, while a

¹ See Tillemont, xv. 308.

² Mansi, vi. 589; vii. 188.

sixth seems to include him among "archbishops;"¹ then all the prelates assented by acclamation, and the commissioners pronounced that Theodoret "should regain the Church of Cyrrhos, according to the judgment of the Council"—words not exhibited by our author.²

¹ Maximus said he had "from the first known Theodoret to be orthodox—*because* he had heard his preaching" (Mansi, vii. 192). Mr. Rivington pleads that the council was here simply acting under commission from Leo; but Ep. 93. 2, to which he refers, merely exhorts the council to "heal the wounds" caused by the unjust ejection of orthodox bishops. And the council had not "exclaimed" that Leo had "judged with God," until its own demand had been complied with.

² Mansi, vii. 189 ff. Two other cases may be touched on in a note. Domnus of Antioch had been deposed at the Latrocinium, and Maximus had been consecrated in his place. If all the Latrocinian acts were invalidated, Maximus could not be bishop of Antioch; but Leo had pronounced in his favour, and Mr. Rivington holds that this pronouncement was the sole ground on which Maximus was recognised at Chalcedon, and that the case "covers everything ever claimed by the holy see in the way of jurisdiction," so that in recognising Maximus the council admitted that "the government of the Church was strictly and properly papal" (p. 434). But Maximus had already approved himself orthodox by circulars "throughout his provinces" (Leo, Ep. 88. 3); so that the council, in accepting him from the outset as bishop of Antioch, had not *merely* Leo's act to rest upon; and in the tenth session Stephen of Ephesus spoke of his appointment as originally "canonical," on the ground, apparently, that Domnus had waived his own rights (Mansi, vii. 260). As for Juvenal of Jerusalem, the approval of a compromise between him and Maximus, about jurisdictions, was the act of the council itself, in the seventh session. The salvo by which, according to Mr. Rivington,

Lastly, as to the twenty-eighth canon. Mr. Rivington moralises (in a manner which suggests some reflections) on the "lust of power" which possessed the see of Constantinople. This passion, it seems, is very "infectious in an imperial centre." Not at all, we suppose, in a centre which emperors had left open to bishops like Leo! But to proceed. "Constantinople," says our author, "wished to be in the East what Rome was as patriarch of the West. Πατριαρχίας κληροῦσθε was St. Gregory of Nazianzus's condemnation of the East" (p. 440). The words, in one of his autobiographical poems, have nothing to do with technical patriarchates ;

Maximus referred to Leo's sanction as necessary to validate the arrangement, is not in the Greek acts (Mansi, vii. 180), but only in a manuscript "edited by the Ballerini" (p. 436); and the legates' speech, even as there given, ignores it (cf. Migne's Leo, ii. col. 731); nor does Leo mention it in his letter of 453. Mr. Rivington applies his words "in hac sollicitudine" to that question; but Leo is speaking of the maintenance of the faith ("ne quid sibi hæretica pravitas audeat vindicare"), and it is immediately afterwards that he urges Maximus to uphold the "privileges" of Antioch, and to "consult" with him for that end. He is writing two years after the council (a point overlooked by our author); and he does not speak as he must have spoken if such a salvo had been referred to him; he only says that he has not sanctioned any act of his legates on matters not doctrinal. He does mention Juvenal's earlier "attempts" made in 431 (Ep. 119. 4). The salvo, then, may be dismissed as a clumsy Roman invention.

nor do they "condemn the East" at large : they refer (as Mr. Rivington would have seen had he looked them up) to ambitious prelates who wanted promotion to grander sees.¹ As for the "rebuffs which Constantinople had met with" at Chalcedon, the Council had not refused to call the "Sojourning Synod" a synod, but had simply blamed it for condemning a bishop unheard ;² and when it declined to sanction Constantinople's custom as to the consecration of bishops for a town in Bithynia, the commissioners added that "whatever was fitting for the see of Constantinople, with regard to consecrations within the provinces, should be considered in due order at the Council."³ The Roman envoys were present, so that they and any Eastern prelates interested had fair warning.⁴ There was nothing like stealing a march or springing a mine. When,

¹ Carm. de seipso et de episcopis, 799. He has just said, *Θρόνους μὲν οὖν ἔχοιτε καὶ τυραννίδας*. In Orat. 42. 23 he uses "patriarchs" for senior bishops. At Chalcedon the commissioners extend it to all primates or exarchs (Mansi, vi. 953).

² Mansi, vii. 92. The *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* grew up out of natural relations between the bishop of Constantinople and bishops visiting that capital on their own church affairs.

³ Mansi, vii. 313.

⁴ Anatolius told Leo that he had "often informed them about this very matter" (Leon. Ep. 101. 5).

at the close of the next day's session, Aetius, the archdeacon of Constantinople, announced that his Church had some business to bring forward, the commissioners "directed the Council to examine it" without their presence,¹ but the "legates" said that "they had no instructions about such a matter." Their game (if such a phrase may be used) was obvious: they wanted to avoid being outvoted, and afterwards to come in and protest against what might have been resolved upon in their absence; but, as Mr. Rivington says, "it turned out that they *had* also received orders from Rome to oppose any attempt at altering the relations of bishops on the ground of the civil *status* of their sees" (p. 442). He means that on the next day, a "legate," on being challenged, produced some instructions from Leo to that effect.² Their former reply, then, was a falsehood which had served its purpose. However, the Council could not have its action stopped by the withdrawal

¹ Mr. Rivington's statement that they "refused" to attend (p. 442) gives a very false impression. Contrast Hefele: "The commissioners themselves had requested the synod to take in hand the discussion of the privileges of the see of Constantinople (iii. 385, E.T.). He ascribes their absence to "prudential considerations" in view of their judicial position.

² Mansi, vii. 443.

of those who professed to be its presidents ; and the canon ranked as twenty-eighth was passed in a form which afterwards received a not unimportant modification. Unquestionably, there was more of ingeniousness than of ingenuousness in the wording, which endeavoured to make the newly sanctioned patriarchal jurisdiction in the "Asiatic," Pontic, and Thracian *dioceses* (*i.e.* groups of provinces), a logical consequence of the precedency conferred on Constantinople in 381.¹ We are not concerned to defend, as a complete statement of the facts, the assertion that "the fathers with good reason assigned its privileges to the see of Old Rome, because that city was imperial," although undoubtedly it was a main element in the case.² Nor is it our business to hold a brief for the see of the Eastern capital; its prelates and clergy were just as open to the temptation of self-aggrandisement as those of Rome; but three points must in fairness be remembered. First, between 381 and 451 Constantinople had been practically allowed in several cases to exercise authority in Asia; secondly, the ninth and seventeenth canons of this very Council had allowed an

¹ Cf. Bright, Notes on the Canons, p. 222.

² Cp. Salmon, Infallibility of the Church, p. 370.

appeal from primates¹ in Asia Minor to “the see of Constantinople;” thirdly, “Rome herself,” in Tillemont’s phrase, was probably “a cause of this canon which she opposed so strongly,” for some dissatisfaction at “the legates’ presidency” appears to have been exhibited in the Council, and it may well be “that the Easterns were glad to augment the power of Constantinople, as being most likely to hinder that of Rome from raising itself higher and higher;”² so that thus “the canons passed with the consent even of the principal bishops of Asia”—including those of Antioch and Jerusalem, and a number of metropolitans, with the deputy of him of Heraclea, — and several bishops present abstained from voting, but apparently did not oppose.³ Next day both commissioners

¹ We have already seen a brilliant specimen of papal exegesis in regard to the ninth canon (p. 79).

² Tillemont, xv. 710. Mr. Rivington calls a statement to this effect “strange” when made by Mr. Gore, who, however, was simply following Tillemont. But we know what papalists think of the great Gallican. As Tillemont fairly remarks, Ephesus was vacant, and the primate of Pontus and the metropolitan of Galatia did not sign. But it appeared afterwards that they felt no strong objection (Mansi, vii. 449 ff.).

³ The number of signatories present was short of 200, but three metropolitans profess to sign also for twenty-three suffragans. As Mr. Rivington remarks (p. 441), many bishops had left Chalcedon. It is observable that Theodoret signed.

and legates reappeared : the former asked for an explanation of what was said to have been done. The new canon was accordingly read, whereupon one "legate," with a truly Roman intrepidity of assertion as to what had taken place in his absence, affirmed that the signatures had been given under constraint. It does not in the least surprise one that, in spite of the evidence that "the bishops exclaimed, 'No one was forced,'" that the commissioners expressly asked the "Asian and Pontic" signatories whether they had signed of their own free will, that thirteen successively replied in the affirmative, and that "the rest exclaimed, 'We signed voluntarily,'" Mr. Rivington (without evidence) restricts the disclaimer of coercion to "some few," thinks the assertion of the legate "probable," and gravely adduces in its favour the "fearless" assertion of Leo to the same effect (pp. 443, 447), as if Leo would hesitate about repeating "fearlessly" whatever his legates reported to him on such a matter.¹ But now see how Mr. Rivington deals

¹ "*Extortis assentionibus*," Ep. 114. 2; cf. Ep. 106. 3. Mr. Rivington, as we have seen, had already lauded Leo's "accuracy." This very accurate pontiff informed Anatolius (Ep. 106. 5), that the third canon of Constantinople had "long ago collapsed." "He could have known but little of what had taken place in the East" (Tillemont, xv. 701). Wishes were apt to make facts for Leo. See above, as to the Sardican

with the Acts when they speak of a reading of certain earlier canons. "The legates read the sixth canon of Nicæa, . . . quoted the sixth Nicene canon, beginning, 'Rome has always held the primacy'" (pp. 443 ff.).¹ Here, let us remark in passing, it is clearly intended to prepossess the reader in favour of the genuineness of what they read. But "Aetius is then *supposed* to have read first a *slightly different* version of the same canon, and then the third of Constantinople." (It was not Aetius, but Constantine, an imperial secretary, to whom Aetius had handed the codex.) "But this is in the highest degree improbable," because the Nicene canon could not throw light on the claims of the see of Constantinople, which was then only the see of Byzantium, and the Church of Constantinople now relied on the third canon of Constantinople,

canon being quoted as "Nicene," and the "constitution" of Valentinian. Again, the Acts represent the legates, in their speech *re* Dioscorus, as calling Leo "pope" and "archbishop of the great and elder Rome." Leo himself, in 452, writing to the Gallic bishops, and professing to give the legates' words, makes them describe him not only as "papa," but as "*caput universalis ecclesie*" (Ep. 103), a phrase which, to say the least, looks very like a papal addition to words used at Chalcedon. It *may* have been what the legates reported to Leo; but he would see no harm in "correcting defects" in their language.

¹ This commencement is called by Van Espen the *character specialissimus* of the Roman codex of the canons (Opp. iii. 14,

the Nicene canon being its "difficulty."¹ But if it was *ad rem* for a legate to quote his version of a Nicene canon, why was it irrelevant for a Constantinopolitan to read its Greek text? Then as to the "slight difference": Mr. Rivington does not give the Latin version here in parallelism with the Greek; but he more than suggests (as he had done before) that the Latin represents the true text, and therefore that the Greek was at least erroneous. He relies on a subsequent speech by the "commissioners," that they "perceived that by the canons the first place (τὰ πρῶτῆα) and distinguished honour were

ed. 1753). The version read by one of the legates is that which has been termed "antiquissima," but which, as we have seen, is at variance on this important point with two older Latin versions. The so-called "Prisca" verbally modifies it by introducing the reference to "ancient custom." See "Additional Note" at the end.

¹ So in p. 171: "The occurrence of this sixth canon in what the archdeacon of Constantinople is *supposed* to have read is probably due to the copyists." Here, no doubt, Mr. Rivington follows Hefele and the Ballerini. But if the legates' version of the canon was alone read, then the Greek text was practically thrown overboard by the church of Constantinople at the very moment at which its exhibition would have been necessary in order to prove that it *was* the text. It would be more consistent to suppose, as Mr. Rivington does, but as Hefele does not, that the "Greek text" was spurious; but that view is against Greek authorities and the best Latin versions. The minutes contain no remark as to the discrepancy; but "silence" in such a case would be both courteous and "expressive."

reserved for the archbishop of Old Rome.”¹ But so they were, in effect, by the third canon of Constantinople; and the commissioners at once go on, “*but* that the archbishop of New Rome ought to enjoy the same privileges of honour” (meaning, ought to rank next to the bishop of Rome, and before all others); and they propose some changes in the wording of the canon, intended to safeguard the rights of local Churches. But enough has been already said about the false Latin version; and one is past being surprised at finding that “the legates’ protest,” at the end of the proceedings, is given (p. 446) without the commissioners’ humiliating rebuff: “All that we have proposed² has been sanctioned by the whole Council.”

Yet the letter of the Council to Leo is claimed by Mr. Rivington as recognising to the full his universal supremacy, and therefore as nullifying “the Anglican interpretation” of the canon

¹ This was to conciliate the “legates:” and apart from all question about canons, Rome’s position as the “first” see was undisputed and indisputable.

² Διελαλήσαμεν, *interlocuti sumus*. Hefele explains, “The prerogative assigned to the church of Constantinople is, in spite of the opposition of the Roman legate, decreed by the synod” (not, as Mr. Rivington says, by a “little knot of bishops”). Πάντα is evidently a mistake for πᾶσα—see the Latin version (Mansi, vii. 454). Πρεσβεῖα is here explained by τῆς τιμῆς.

which was thus enacted in the teeth of his envoys' protest. Now, first, the canon must be taken in its grammatical sense, and not explained away on the score of any expressions in the letter. Then look at the expressions :¹ the bishops call Leo their "head," because by his legates he was their president, and, as first among bishops, might fairly be addressed as their "father."² He had "held the position of interpreting the words of blessed Peter," inasmuch as they had accepted his Tome expressly on the ground that it truly represented the purport of Matt. xvi. 16; and by publicly affirming the true faith they had "used him as an originator of what was good." "To him had been committed by the Saviour the guardianship of the Vine": to him conspicuously and eminently, as holding a primary place, but certainly not in a sense generically unique; for they themselves had "received authority both to root up and to plant," and they treated the "definition" as their own. They requested him to "honour the decision by adding his own vote" (*ψήφοις*), and so to "confirm and assent to" what had been

¹ Leon. Ep. 98.

² Suffragans, in presenting a bishop-elect to the metropolitan for consecration, are required by our ordinal to address him as "father."

done by "the Œcumenical Council" and, as they do not shrink from adding, "under the guidance of a Divine command"; and accordingly they "make known to him the whole purport (δύναμιν) of their proceedings."¹ Our author has thus exaggerated in the Papal interest the force of language which is otherwise sufficiently explained, especially by the light of acts which say more than words. Mr. Rivington himself would not deny that Oriental fluency of "compliment" appears in that curious passage which assumes that the legates only resisted the new canon that Leo might have the pleasure of approving it. Was it not also intelligible and inevitable that Leo, as president, should be asked to confirm a canon which, although it did not interfere with his own patriarchate or with Western Church administration, and therefore had no relation to Western Church law, did expressly mention his see, and expressly assign a cause for the "privileges" which had been

¹ Πᾶσαν ὑμῖν τῶν πεπραγμένων τὴν δύναμιν ἐγνωρίσαμεν εἰς . . . βεβαίωσιν τε καὶ συγκατάθεσιν. Anatolius, no doubt, did say what the council *did not* say, that "all the force and confirmation of what was done was reserved for the authority" of Leo (Mr. Rivington has "corrected" the mistake of attributing this language to the council, p. 454); but, as our author puts it, he said it "later on" (p. 457). Yes, more than two years later (Leon. Ep. 132. 4), and when he had a point to gain.

“given” to it? Then as to Anatolius’ letter: it says that the Council was summoned to “confirm the faith of the fathers *and* the letter of Leo;”¹ but Mr. Rivington himself knows how to put different senses on “confirming,” and the synod had met, by imperial order, to secure the right faith, of which Anatolius could truly say that Leo’s letter was in full “accord” with it. But we have seen in the Acts of the Council an essential difference between the treatment of the Creed and the treatment of the Tome; and if, as Anatolius says, the bishops “laid on the altar their definition drafted for the confirmation of the fathers’ faith, in accordance with” the Tome, he means that the Tome was solemnly approved as a true expression of that faith. Anatolius quotes the authoritative statement of the commissioners, that “the *ῥπος*” (meaning here the canon) “of the holy Council² was established;” and it is *honoris gratia*, as the Latin version puts it, that Leo is requested to give it his “approval and confirmation.” And, lastly, as to Leo’s letter on the subject, Mr. Rivington had formerly made him by implication the Church’s “Emperor;” he now explicitly makes him the Church’s

¹ Leon. Ep. 101. 1.

² He charges the legates with “disturbing the synod.”

“King,”¹ but he will not admit what is implied in the particular line of objection which Leo through several letters² takes up and maintains. No doubt, in these “majestic and *tender*” epistles, he reiterates such dulcet terms as *ambitionis spiritus, improbi desiderii, illicito appetitu, præsumptio, intemperanti cupiditati, prava cupiditas, vanitatis elatio*. But although his real motive may be discerned through this copious vituperation, and although he professes to “annul it by the authority of Peter,” he never takes up a properly Papal ground of objection as to its merits:³ he poses, throughout,

¹ “As it is the duty of a king . . . so Leo” (p. 460). One sees why Mr. Rivington is so careful to speak of ancient “popes” as “reigning” (cf. pp. 175, 185, 201, 215).

² See Epp. 104–106, etc.

³ Mr. Rivington notices this objection on p. 182 (where, however, the third canon of Constantinople seems to be named by oversight for the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon), and meets it by one of his facile assumptions. Canons “were not a hyper-papal power, ruling the popes themselves, *for they acquired their force from the popes.*” Then come two illustrations: (1) A king is bound to respect the laws—“*not* because they are superior to him, but because he is bound by the natural and divine law to set the example.” Has submission to ecclesiastical absolutism made Mr. Rivington forget the traditions, the basal ideas, of kingship as understood by Englishmen? He may consult a Roman Catholic historian: it was part of Richard II.’s despotic policy to “place himself above the control of the law” (Lingard, *H. Engl.* iv. 255; cf. “K. Rich. II.” ii. 1, “Thy state of law is bondslave to the law”). (2) The relation of pope to

as the champion of Nicene rules, as guarding the interest of Alexandria and Antioch, of the privileges or "*primacies* of provinces," and of metropolitanical sees.¹ Being a statesman, and, so far, a diplomatist, and having to address, not his own Western, but an Eastern Emperor and Eastern ecclesiastics, he forbears to rest on the Papal claim as such, and falls back on the lower but safer line which might have been taken up by an Egyptian or Syrian prelate who looked with jealousy on Constantinople.² The inference is too obvious

canons is compared with that of Roman emperors to law : *i.e.* the pope is more than the king, he is the autocrat, of the Church ! (So, indeed, Vaticanism makes him ; see Mr. Gladstone's *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*, p. 99.) But in this case Leo keeps his supposed kingship, or emperorship, in the background. By the way, if the pope *has* this position, how can Mr. Rivington venture to say that for Sylvester to have "sent an authoritative utterance," imposing "the Homoousios" (usually spoken of as "Homoousion") on the East, as "a condition of Catholic communion," would have been the "*despotic* method" (p. 158)? It would have been strictly within the terms of the Vatican decree.

¹ Epp. 104, 105, 106.

² A bishop (Eusebius) assured the council of Chalcedon that, when at Rome, he had read the third canon of Constantinople to Leo, who had approved of it (Mansi, vii. 449). "It is not easy," says Tillemont, "to harmonise this with what St. Leo afterwards asserted, that the Roman church had never given its approval to this canon" (xv. 618). The bishop (who was an impetuous person) most likely misunderstood Leo's silence,

to need statement; nor need we dwell on the fact stated by Tillemont after Liberatus, that "ce canon subsista et fut exécuté, malgré l'opposition de S. Léon et de ses successeurs, parceque les empereurs l'appuyoient."¹

In his "Conclusion" (p. 461), Mr. Rivington professes to give us "the verdict of history." Does this phrase come well from one for whom the "verdict" has been dictated before the professed inquiry has commenced? and is it usual to give a verdict before the evidence has been judicially summarised? Of this process there could not be, and there is not, a single trace in our author's volume. His readers soon learn what they have to expect: there is very

pretty much as Mr. Rivington has misconstrued the silence of Easterns in certain circumstances. In the very first session of Chalcedon the legates had recognised Anatolius as ranking next to Leo (Mansi, vi. 607).

¹ Liberatus, Brev. c. 13, says, "And although the apostolic see even now contradicts, *quod a synodo firmatum est imperatoris patrocinio permanet quoque modo;*" cp. Tillemont, xv. 715, 730; so also Hefele says (iii. 446), that the Greeks, although for a time they "seemed" to yield, ultimately secured what the canon gave them, and reaffirmed the canon at the council "in Trullo" (c. 361). At last even the fourth council of Lateran, professing to "renew the ancient privileges of patriarchal sees," recognised Constantinople (then in Latin hands) as ranking second after Rome as supreme (Mansi, xxii. 989).

little relief from the tedious monotony of unproved assumption, unwarranted gloss, and undisguised special pleading. No one will doubt that he has written throughout under a sense of religious obligation; but the Roman spirit, when it dominates a writer who is himself a recent proselyte, absorbs all other considerations into the supreme necessity of making out a case for Rome. Judging by the work before us, one could imagine that spirit as saying to such a writer, "*Hæ tibi erunt artes, Romane*. No facts in regard to Church history can be for you so certain as is the view of it imposed on the faithful in the Vatican decree of Pius IX. You will therefore read that view into all your documents. You will assume it as in possession of the ground, and throw on opponents the task of proving its absence. Whatever seems to make for it, you will amplify; whatever seems to make against it, you will minimise, or explain away, or ignore. Such words or acts as imply deference you will strain into pledges of submission; such as point rather to independence you will slur over or disparage. You will assume that although Popes may err when not speaking under the conditions of the Vatican decree, yet what they may say about their own

rights is practically above question ; and that, although they have no immunity from ordinary temptations, they are never betrayed into a love of power for power's sake. Some generally received rules of literary scrupulosity you will leave to men of the world, or to Protestants, who have no sacred cause to defend *quocunque modo*. Loyalty to Rome will determine how much of a passage or a sentence should be quoted in the text ; or how far the reader is to be enabled by footnotes to refer to authorities and to judge of your accuracy. You will deal largely in assertion, and in repetition and reiteration of what has been asserted ; you will not be afraid of paradox, in maintaining the genuineness of what has usually been deemed spurious, or the spuriousness of what has usually been deemed genuine. You will uphold the majesty of the Holy See by an air of superb confidence ; you will apply to the defence of Papal authority the watchword of a great revolutionist, '*De l'audace, encore de l'audace, toujours de l'audace !*' Such 'boldness' suits the Roman genius, and is traditional with those who have best understood Rome."

A Churchman's "verdict," then, on this bold attempt to Vaticanise antiquity must be given

with that sincere regret which is due to Mr. Rivington's former and unforgotten services in the promotion of Christian piety, but which cannot be allowed to bar judgment where interests so serious are concerned. The thing furthest from the writer's intention would be to do him any injustice; nor is it needful to dwell on specimens of lax scholarship or false logic, on the too frequent absence of all references, or on the occurrence of references taken at second hand or misunderstood—a sure evidence of superficiality, of what may be called unreal knowledge. Such things might be complained of on literary grounds, if it were worth while. But graver issues are raised by a publication which is obviously part of a new Roman campaign against the English Church and the Churches in communion with her. It is a mere duty to speak plainly of the most untrustworthy presentation of a great period of history which has ever come under the writer's notice; there is no difficulty in understanding the influences which have determined its character; and the inevitable conclusion is that, so far from attracting any thoughtful Anglicans to Papalism, it will but confirm their antagonism to a system which employs—and requires—such methods of support.

ST. AMBROSE AND THE EMPIRE.

IT was certainly a daring venture of faith when, in the November of 374, the Christian people of Milan persistently demanded that their vacant bishopric should be filled by the appointment of the governor of their own Ligurian province, who, although a devout believer, was still unbaptised. Ambrose was known as a strong man and a good magistrate, but this popular election was a step which necessarily relied on future results for its justification; and even after it had then been splendidly justified, the use of it as a precedent in the case of Nectarius, without due consideration of moral and mental dissimilarities, was not altogether fortunate for the see and church of Constantinople. Yet the "strangely unanimous" movement of minds which caught up a child's casual exclamation as a watchword—"Ambrose for bishop"¹—

¹ Paulinus, Vit. Ambros, 6,

might have suggested the proverbial identification of the *vox populi* with the *vox Dei*. Milan believed itself to be stirred by an inspiration, to be responding to a Divine call, which suspended the ordinary rule against sudden promotion to spiritual offices;¹ and the years that followed would confirm that impression into something like a certainty of religious experience.² One consideration probably weighed much with the inhabitants of a city which, in its character as an imperial residence, might be said to overshadow Rome itself; the son of a prætorian prefect, with the high and forceful qualities which his administration as "consular" had already indicated,³ was likely to prove a "statesman," and to make his church respected by secular powers at a time when its political eminence was making it a great ecclesiastical centre, with far-reaching influence

¹ Nic. can. 2.

² It was, after all, with a bolder reliance on instinctive forecast that the "dux" German was recommended by Amator as his own successor in the see of Auxerre. But here, too, the "prophecy" was verified.

³ Basil had this in mind when he wrote to Ambrose, that "He who of old had raised up a ruler for His people from the sheep-folds had now drawn a man entrusted with the government of a nation, a man of lofty spirit, noble birth, and conspicuous position, to take charge of the flock of Christ" (Ep. 197. A.D. 375).

that might soon tighten into authority. And thus, although the episcopal life of Ambrose is rich in interest on its purely spiritual side, and eminently in connection with the progress of a yet greater mind towards Catholic Christianity,¹ yet its public importance centres mainly in his relations to State rulers, and to these we may now confine our attention.

I.

Of the two sons of Valentinian I., Gratian was fifteen when Ambrose became a bishop, and had been for seven years nominally associated with his father in the sovereignty: Valentinian was only three years old, and was under the care of his mother Justina, whose Arianism was to be such a source of acute trouble. Gratian succeeded his father in 375, and had the good sense to baffle an army-plot by recognising his little brother as a colleague. He himself was born to be liked or loved, a kindly and gracious youth, gentle, modest, temperate, and pure; but not strong enough, as he himself felt, to sustain the weight of undivided empire, and boyishly apt to postpone

¹ S. Aug. Confess. v. 23, 24.

business to amusement. Ambrose became very fond of him,—wrote at his request¹ a treatise explanatory of “the Faith,” and ventured on predictions of success against the Goths which Gratian’s eastward expedition, in 378, was not destined to verify. When, in 383, the military discontent provoked by his thoughtless frivolity had culminated in the revolt of Maximus, and his own tragical death at Lyons, Ambrose mourned as for a much loved son,² but was immediately called upon to bestir himself in behalf of the murdered prince’s young half-brother, as now the sole legitimate Western Augustus. Justina, who dwelt with her son at Milan, had been busily intriguing against the Catholic archbishop; but she felt that, at a crisis so perilous, her dislike must yield to political necessity. At her urgent request he travelled into Gaul; and his firm tone doubtless induced Maximus to accept the compromise proposed by Justina through the

¹ See prologue to *De Fide*, 3. Gratian afterwards requested him to add a treatise “on the Holy Spirit.” Ambrose, in reply, asks for time (*Ep.* i. 7).

² Nine years later he wrote as if the wound was still fresh. “*Doleo in te, fili Gratiane, suavis mihi valde; plurima dedisti tuæ pietatis insignia; tu me inter tua pericula requirebas, tu in tuis extremis me appellabas*” (*De Ob. Val.* 79).

envoy whom he had sent to Milan before Ambrose reached his headquarters,¹ and who returned while Ambrose was still with him.

II.

The year of his return to Milan was remarked by the most important of four attempts, on the part of the Pagan senators at Rome, to procure the restoration of the altar of Victory to the senate-house. Augustus had originally erected this altar, with its accompanying statue of the goddess.² It had been first removed either by Constantius or by Constans: Julian, of course, had replaced it; and it had continued for years to be, as before, the visible cherished symbol of the bond between Rome and the Pagan worship.³ Senators, as they entered, threw on the altar a grain or two of incense; and while they still saw the proud image in its old place, they might boast that, in spite of

¹ He afterwards reminded Maximus that he had never promised that Valentinian should visit him (Ep. 24. 7).

² It was the image of a winged maiden with smooth hair and bare feet, holding forth a laurel crown. "Pennigeram puellam," says Prudentius (c. Sym. ii. 33 ff.).

³ Ambrose represents Valentinian I. as ignorant even of the existence of the altar (Ep. 17. 16).

more than forty churches where "the Crucified One" was adored, and of a numerous Christian community whose "high priest" bore himself like a prince,¹ and whose creed was owned in the stately palace of the great Anician family,²—"the City" herself, in the sanctuary of her corporate life, was true to the traditions which had made her imperial. But Gratian had deprived them of this satisfaction by taking away both image and altar; the Pagan senators appointed a deputation to remonstrate: but Damasus forwarded to Ambrose a counter address from their Christian colleagues, which had the effect of closing Gratian's presence-chamber against the Pagan memorialists.³ This was in 382: but now, in 384, the Pagan aristocracy seemed to have a better chance. The advisers of a boy of thirteen would have special reasons, in the exigencies of the time and the weakness of his position, for conciliating the majority of the noble Roman houses: and they found an ideal advocate in Symmachus, prefect of the city, an eminent member of the Pagan priesthood, a zealous adherent of the

¹ See the anecdote in Jerome, c. Joan. 7.

² "Ante alios . . . Anicius," etc. (Prudent. c. Sym. i. 552).

³ Ambr. Ep. 17. 10.

official cult, admired for his brilliant oratory and justly esteemed for his civic virtues.¹ His memorial¹ is extant, and is full of significance. He does not take the high ground which some years before might have been natural; he pleads, as it were, with bated breath.² At least, let the connivance of former emperors be a precedent; at least, let the "name of victory" have the honour which is refused to the *numen*; at least let the fittings of the senate-house be spared; let the altar still admonish senators to respect their official oath. And here comes in a sceptical admission—"The Divine mind has distributed various religious rites among various cities; and, since our reason is all in the dark, we are safest in adhering to those which have been associated with prosperity. Let Rome herself be imagined to plead for the observances amid which she has grown old, too old to repent of using them," and then the assumption is slid in,—“by which she has won her triumphs. All national rites, however various, point to the same object, for *the mystery of the universe*

¹ Cf. Prudent. c. Sym. i. 632 ff.

² According to the usual form, this "Relatio," though meant for Valentinian, was addressed to Theodosius and his son Arcadius as well. See above, p. 178.

cannot be reached by one path only.”¹ In the remainder of the memorial Symmachus urges the restoration of the confiscated income of the Vestals, by which the treasury has not been a gainer. He remarks that the spoliation has been *followed* by an extraordinary scarcity, and hints that the antecedent was the cause. He contends that individual bequests of property to the ministers of the ancient worship ought in justice to be respected by the government; and that if a Christian prince should plead a conscientious objection to maintaining the endowments of a religion not his own, the answer is obvious: “You have no responsibility in the case, because, if right is right, you have no option.” It is remarkable to find a Roman magistrate thus broadly intimating that an emperor is not above, but under the law. But the main interest of the paper is in its underlying agnosticism, which is indicated even in the loyal aspiration that Valentinian may be favoured by “*sectarum omnium arcana præsidia.*”

Ambrose would not wait to see this memorial

¹ “Uno itinere non potest perveniri ad *tam grande secretum*” (Relat. 10). “Il laisse entendre qu’en réalité toutes les religions se confondent,” etc. (Boissier, *Fin du Paganisme*, ii. 322).

before writing to warn Valentinian. He urged in a vehement letter¹ that the Pagans should be content with their own freedom of worship, instead of dictating to their sovereign. A straightforward policy would commend itself even to "Gentiles:" "for every one ought freely to defend and maintain the honest purpose of his own mind." Ambrose ventures to assert that the Christians are a majority in the senate, but gives a weak answer to the obvious question, Why, then, did they not vote against the remonstrance?² He adopts a tone of spiritual menace: if Symmachus prevails, and the Pagan demand is conceded, he will have to say to Valentinian, "Christ's altar spurns your gifts, now that you have made an altar to images,"—clearly a rhetorical exaggeration *ad invidiam*. The emperor must remember that he cannot escape responsibility for such a concession on the score of his youth, since "every age is perfect for Christ" (a proposition which Ambrose lived to reconsider in regard to the selfsame prince); he should also think twice before implicitly censuring the act of his late brother

¹ Ep. 17. He acknowledges the "merits" of Symmachus.

² "Non interfuerunt," they absented themselves when the vote was taken, and memorialised the emperor.

in a like case. But now as to the bishop's formal reply, written with the memorial before him:¹ we see the *quondam* Roman barrister in its sharp retorts, and in its "points" taken up with a view to an immediate impression. If the Roman gods were to have credit for Rome's success, then how about her misfortunes?² It was, after all, not her religion, but her inherent valour, that had nerved her arm to such purpose; and as it was never too late to learn, so Rome was not too old to correct her mistakes. Her advocate had confessed his ignorance of the "secret"—which was no secret at all to Christians.³ The Vestals, for all their pomp and privileges, were but a scanty band compared with the multitudes who have embraced a "virgin life" from no other motive than devotion. After some remarks as to the disadvantages which the law still imposed on Christian clergy, with a taunting challenge to show as many charities maintained by "the

¹ Ep. 18.

² The altar, he remarks, was standing when Valerian's capture humiliated Rome.

³ This leads him to notice a Pagan objection, "You worship one who has died." "That was the death of the flesh, not of the Godhead" (Ep. 18. 9. Cf. Ambr. de Incarn. Dom. Sacrament. 39, 45).

temples” as those of the Church which “spent her property on the poor,” Ambrose replies to the argument from bad seasons, and meets the plea for “ancient usages” by pointing to the universal law of improvement by progress, as illustrated by the development of the world out of chaos,¹ the increase of light from sunrise to midday, the gradual ripening of the fruits, the expansion of the child’s mind into the adult’s,²—and by boldly proclaiming that the true period of venerable age for the world was that in which Christianity had been intelligently welcomed. After touching one or two other topics,³ he puts aside a Pagan inference from Gratian’s untimely death by treating it as only one more instance of the revolutions of human fortune,⁴—a line which would seem to a serious Pagan what a “secularist” view of history seems to the mind that owns a ruling God. In truth, the bishop’s eagerness to refute

¹ This context is the most eloquent in the whole letter (c. 23 ff.).

² He must have been thinking of 1 Cor. xiii. 11, though he does not quote it. “Nos quoque, ævi rudes, sensus habemus infantiam; sed mutati in annos ingenii rudimenta deponimus.”

³ One is, that Rome has already admitted many foreign rites into her system, as those of Cybele, etc.

⁴ “Human affairs move in *orbe quodam atque circuitu*” (Ep. 18. 34).

Symmachus makes him somewhat incautious in his choice of weapons; his opponent's deprecatory conservatism is pushed aside by a confident liberalism¹ which occasionally becomes verbally rationalistic: it never occurs to him that a non-religious explanation of Roman successes is somewhat out of place in an episcopal rejoinder, or that the "progressive" argument which he urges *ad hominem* would be directed by later unbelievers against Christianity itself, as if it, in turn, had been outgrown by advancing thought. He was evidently quite satisfied with his own presentation of the case. "Both my papers," he said, some eight years later, "were read in the consistory: Valentinian then listened to my advice, and did nothing but what the principles of our faith required."² It may be added that Symmachus was again employed in 388 to move Theodosius in the same matter, and met with a deliberate repulse:³ and that a fourth application in 392 was refused by

¹ Boissier, as a French liberal, remarks that French "clericals" can take no benefit from an argument which rather helps those who would suppress the budget of *cultes* (Fin du Paganisme, ii. 338).

² Ep. 57. 3.

³ Ib. 4.

Valentinian without any fresh prompting from Ambrose.¹

III.

And then the scene of conflict shifts: it is no longer a question about a Pagan altar at Rome, but about a Christian church at Milan; and the antagonist of Ambrose is not Symmachus, but Justina. She naturally enough desired to obtain a place of worship for her circle of Arian dependents,² in a city which, some ten years before, had a bishop who disowned the Nicene Creed. The successor of Auxentius is now summoned to the imperial consistory, and ordered to make over to the emperor, for the use of the Arian court, the "Portian church," which stood outside the western wall of Milan. He steadily refused: the people rose in menacing strength to back up his refusal: and, for the moment, the demand was withdrawn—but only to be renewed on Friday in the fifth week of Lent, April 4, 385, when he was commanded to give up a new and larger church actually within the city. Again he stood firm,

¹ On this last case, see Ep. 57. 5; De Ob. Val. 19.

² Gratian had quickly revoked his grant of one.

again he was supported by the people, and the requirement was modified; "At least, let the extramural Portian church be given up." The people would not hear of either concession; and on Palm Sunday, while Ambrose was explaining the creed¹ to advanced catechumens or "competentes," who were to be baptised on Easter Eve, he heard that the "curtains" which were adjuncts of the imperial state were being hung up in the Portian.² A tumult ensued,

¹ On the ceremony of "Traditio Symboli," see Duchesne, *Origines du Culte*, p. 289; Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology*, p. 146. Paulinus says that Ambrose used to do more, in regard to postulants for baptism, than five bishops of a younger generation could well get through (*Vit. Ambros.* 38). For Ambrose's description of the baptismal rites, see his *De Mysteriis*. On the strictly ministerial character of the officiant, see *De Sp. Sanct.* i. s. 18: "Non mundavit Damasus . . . Petrus" (of Alexandria) ". . . Ambrosius . . . Gregorius; nostra enim servitia, sed tua sunt sacramenta."

² Ep. 20. 4. The news made him fear a disturbance; "but," he says, "I continued at my duty, et *missam facere cæpi*." The ordinary catechumens had already been "dismissed;" and Ambrose goes on, "While I was making the oblation, I heard that the people had seized an Arian presbyter." This, together with the word "began," which would hardly be appropriate for the act of sending away the few competentes," suggests that we have here the earliest instance of the use of "mass" for the liturgy properly so called. Of course the word is derived from "dismissal," first of catechumens, and finally of "fideles:" hence the plural form "missæ" used by Gregory the Great. "Missa" is used for "celebration" by Leo, Ep. 9. 2.

for which the whole body of tradesmen were held responsible and severely punished: and, on Tuesday in Holy Week, the demand was again peremptorily urged on Ambrose by "counts and tribunes." The emperor, they said, had absolute rights over everything. Ambrose replied, "If he asks me for what is my own, I will give it, though all I have belongs to the poor; but he has no rights at all over the things that are God's." The demand at times was limited to one church only, but Ambrose met it with "Not one." He intimated that what he feared was a collision between the people and the troops sent to take possession of the basilica. "Well, but it is your duty to keep the people quiet." He answered somewhat evasively: "It is my duty not to excite them, but it is only God who can quiet them when excited." But the troops, it soon appeared, were in sympathy with the bishop: and after the people, both in the older church¹

¹ Clearly not the Portian outside the walls, but another church within the walls which was older than the "new church." It is not quite clear where Ambrose was then living: from the "old" church he "went home" on the Tuesday night (Ep. 20. 10). Probably his "home" was in the precinct of the old church, for on the Wednesday morning, as soon as he goes out, he finds "the church surrounded by soldiers;" and hears the indignant groans of the congregation; the service begins

where Ambrose remained, and in the "new church," had given abundant evidence of steady determination, news came, first, that the "curtains" were being removed from the new church, where apparently they had been set up, and then that the soldiers were recalled, and the fines of the tradesmen remitted.¹

So ended the first serious attempt of the Arian court against the Catholics of Milan. The second was made in the January of 386, by the aid of Mercurius, or, as he called himself (after Ambrose's heretical predecessor), Auxentius, an Arian bishop, who drafted a new edict, by which Valentinian professedly granted freedom of worship to the adherents of the (Arian) creed of Ariminum, and menaced with death any who should either tumultuously oppose, or even petition against, the execution of the decree.² Beyond this, there was in the same "basilica," and, while the lessons are being read, he hears that the new church is also full, and that his presence is desired there; but he sends presbyters instead, etc. (Ep. 20. 11, 15).

¹ Soldiers themselves, in joyous enthusiasm, brought this last intelligence, as it was Maundy Thursday, the day, says Ambrose, "quo in ecclesia poenitentia relaxatur" (Ep. 20. 26). But Ambrose foreboded fresh trouble: he knew that the young emperor was jealous of his influence, and a "chamberlain" insolently threatened him.

² See it in Cod. Theod. xvi. 1, 4, "Damus copiam cf.;" and

no interference with Catholic liberties: but Ambrose, in his wrath and alarm, regarded the new law as fraught with all the tragic consequences which it might indirectly involve.¹ But he had now to meet a new attack on himself: he was summoned to dispute with "Auxentius" on the great doctrinal issue between them, in presence of the emperor, and of "umpires" whom each party was to choose: failing which, he and his adherents might leave Milan. After consulting some other bishops, Ambrose wrote his famous letter to Valentinian,² intimating with dignity and decision that he could accept neither alternative. He quoted a rescript given (we know not when) by the emperor's father, to the effect that in spiritual cases "the judge ought to be one who is neither inferior in office nor dissimilar in right," *i.e.* that such questions should be tried by bishops alone.³ When did the emperor ever hear of "laymen judging as to a bishop in a cause

Soz. vii. 13. The Ariminian creed was of the Homœan, not the Anomœan or ultra-Arian type.

¹ "De templo . . . ejicit. . . Mercurinus securi . . . cruentas leges ore dictans," Sermon c. Aux. 23 ff.

² Ep. 21.

³ Ep. 21. 2. The words which Sozomen (vi. 7) attributes to Valentinian I. could hardly have been used in view of the proposed meeting of *Eastern* Semiarians at Lampsacus.

of faith"? On that showing it would be for the laymen to teach, and the bishop to listen. Yet he proceeded to make an offer which was all but inconsistent with the contention; let his rival come to the church, and let the people of Milan (not "judge," but) "choose" between them. This, however, he modified in a subsequent passage; he would meet "Auxentius" in a council, and nowhere else. He made a homethrust at Valentinian's obvious unfitness for the office of "chief umpire:" was a youth, "still ignorant of the truths of the faith,"¹ to claim jurisdiction in a doctrinal controversy? And then, with a ready keenness which recalled his old experience as a "counsel," he observed that, by ordering this dispute to take place, Valentinian had in effect suspended his own new law. As to the suggestion that he should leave Milan, he could not "betray Christ's altar" by abandoning his flock: but he ended by saying that he would place himself at the emperor's disposal, if only he could be assured that no Arian would be intruded into the see.

¹ So in Serm. c. Aux. 29: "adolescens catechumenus, sacræ lectionis ignarus."

It seems that the court, after receiving this memorial, repeated its demand as to the Portian basilica. When Ambrose had reiterated his refusal, he received a definite order to leave the city: whereupon he took sanctuary, as it were, within the precincts of the "new" church, where for several days and nights the people kept watch with him, while the entrances were guarded by troops. To calm their agitation, the bishop set them to chant psalms antiphonally, and to sing some hymns of his own. One can imagine¹ how, while the soft light of the March evening gleamed and faded along the columns of the basilica, there rose up and resounded through the aisles the verses which gave thanks for the gift of nightly repose, and which besought of "the One who was the Trinity" protection for His suppliants:² how invigorating at daybreak would be the appeal to "the Brightness of the Father's glory," or the exultant confession of the coinherence of Father

¹ Cf. Serm. c. Aux. 19, apparently referring to a Palm Sunday lection. In 385 that Sunday was March 29.

² "Artus solutos ut quies
Reddat laboris usui,
Mentesque fessas allevet . . .
Unum, potens, per omnia
Fove precantes, Trinitas,"

and Son.¹ The bishop addressed his flock, giving a narrative of the recent proceedings. "Who can deny that it is in the church that a cause of faith is to be pleaded?" It would be idle, moreover, to expect an impartial judgment in the consistory, when the emperor was already committed by the recent decree. They need not fear that he would voluntarily desert them: he "had been wont, they knew, to pay respect to sovereigns, but not to give way to them;" he would remain at his post, and abide what God might send;² and then, with characteristic dexterity, he employed the Catholic dogma as a ground of quietness and confidence. "Our Lord Jesus is Almighty,—this is our faith; therefore, whatever He commands will be fulfilled." A servant of Christ was safe in His hands.³ Let them, then,

¹ "Splendor Paternæ gloriæ,
De luce lucem proferens . . .
In Patre totus Filius,
Et totus in Verbo Pater."

These two hymns are the second and seventh of St. Ambrose's twelve.

² Writing in 387, he says that he was more than once near being "martyred" (Ep. 36. 4). An Arian at one time made preparations for seizing and carrying him off into exile (Paul. Vit. 12). An attempt on his life failed (ib. 20).

³ Here came in the story of St. Peter's vision and "Domine, quo vadis?" Sermon. c. Aux. 13.

be tranquil and trustful; if they heard that his personal safety was threatened, let them not lose heart. And after some application of Scripture lessons recently read, such as the story of Naboth and the expulsion of the money-changers, he noticed the imputation made against him, "You want to be more powerful than the emperor,"—observed that there was no question of denying to the State its lawful tribute from church property,—and put aside the paltry charge of having abused the people's sensibility by the "religious excitement" of his Trinitarian hymns. One other sentence, doubtless uttered with all his energy, must have thrilled the audience with the significance of a terse formula condensing a great idea—"The emperor is within the Church, not above the Church." ¹

Once more the storm passed by; once more Justina had been baffled by Ambrose, and thought it best again to utilise him in the interest of her son. Accordingly he undertook, in the early summer of 387, a second embassy to Maximus,² which might have had some

¹ Serm. c. Aux. 36.

² The Gallic emperor declined, he says (Ep. 24. 2) to receive him except in full consistory. Ambrose, mindful of his own dignity, observed that bishops were usually allowed a private

temporary success had not the situation been complicated by the alliance between Maximus and the "Ithacian" party who had procured the execution of Priscillian. Ambrose, like Martin, abhorred that deed, and refused to communicate with bishops who, four years earlier, had achieved a "bloodstained triumph."¹ They avenged themselves by procuring an order that Ambrose should instantly leave Treves.² Maximus lost no time in beguiling another envoy sent from Milan, and making a

audience; but he waived that point in order to fulfil his commission. Maximus asked first for the kiss of peace. "How can I kiss one who does not acknowledge me?" "Bishop," said Maximus, "you are excited." "If so, it is with shame at finding myself in a place which does not befit me." "On that former occasion," said Maximus, "it was your cajoleries that got round me, and kept me from invading and conquering Italy." Ambrose replied at length to this charge, and then asked to have Gratian's corpse given up for fitting burial. Maximus objected that the sight of it might revive old feelings for the Valentinian dynasty; but at the end of this audience he said that he would treat: they parted with this understanding.

¹ Ep. 26. 3; cf. Ep. 24. 12; Sulpicius, Hist. ii. 50.

² His last experience in the great city where he had been born and bred is worth remembering. His tender heart was moved by the sad condition of a poor old bishop who was "being sent into exile when he seemed to be at the last gasp." "When I asked that he might at least be supplied with a cloak and a down pillow, I was thrust out myself" (Ep. 24. 12). The bishop's name was Hyginus; he had apparently made some concessions to the Priscillianists.

descent into Italy; Justina and her son were fain to take refuge in the realm of Theodosius, who took occasion to read them a lecture on the consequences of oppressing the true Church.

IV.

The defeat and death of Maximus, in July of 388, was followed by a prolonged sojourn of Theodosius in the West. And thus began the relations between him and Ambrose,—not, it must be owned, in a fashion which reflects entire credit on the archbishop.

At Callinicus in Osrhoene, a Jewish synagogue had been burned—at the bishop's instigation, as it was asserted: and certain monks, provoked by an interruption of their procession, had burned a village chapel in which the Valentinianism of the second century had kept up a pertinacious existence. Theodosius ordered that the synagogue should be rebuilt at the bishop's expense, and that the monks should be punished; whereupon Ambrose remonstrated in a tone which is too like that of wrongheaded fanaticism.¹ If, he said, the

¹ Ep. 40.

bishop should refuse obedience, and thus incur capital punishment, he would be a martyr; if he was to obey, he would be a betrayer of the faith. Or if, being not really concerned in the incendiarism, he were to take the full responsibility upon himself, it would be a "blessed falsehood." The act, indeed, was one which he, Ambrose, was quite ready to justify. Under no circumstances ought the synagogue, as a place where Christ was denied, to be rebuilt; if any churchmen were frightened into paying for its reconstruction, it ought to bear the inscription, "A temple of impiety, made out of the spoils of Christians." Public order must yield to religious interests: in some well-known cases, even the burning of churches had been unpunished; Julian had treated with indifference the outrages suffered by Christians under his rule;¹ and as for the Valentinian chapel, every such place of worship was no better than a Pagan temple, and the one in question must have been a rude little building of no value,—as if on that account its destruction did not signify; a shabby suggestion which he applies also to the case of the synagogue.²

¹ An argument truly wonderful in its shortsightedness.

² "Fanum . . . tumultuarie conditum" (Ep. 40. 16). And so

He proceeds to interpret the fall of Maximus as a punishment for his unfaithfulness in requiring a burnt synagogue to be re-erected: and he does not shrink from telling Theodosius what Christ will say to him if he carries out his order; he will assuredly be hazarding his faith and risking his salvation,—all for the sake of Jews. What is to be said of this strange letter? That the writer had retained too much of the old professional habit of special pleading, and had also been elated by his triumphs over an Arian court; and his hatred of Judaism and of the “residuary” Gnosticism had destroyed, for the time, his sense of moral proportion, committed him to a principle which would canonise any zealot’s violence, and blinded him to the duty of a supreme magistrate, as God’s “minister” for that purpose, to uphold civil justice and social order. He seems, indeed, to have had misgivings as to the success of his remonstrance; he asks that other prelates may be consulted, and intimates that the hierarchy is already discontented at the existing limitation of clerical immunity from the oppressive “curial” obligations. When Theodosius next

the synagogue, “*ædificio vilissimo, quid enim in tam ignobili castro esse potuit?*” (ib. 13).]

came to church, Ambrose addressed him in a sermon, abandoning, however, the high ground which he had taken, and simply requesting the emperor to pardon the monks for the sake of Him whose servants they were. Then a singular scene ensued.¹ Theodosius gently, almost playfully, said to him in a low voice, "You have been preaching at me." "I preached what was for your benefit." "Well, my order about the synagogue *was* rather harsh, but it is recalled. As for the monks, they do commit many crimes." By way of reply the bishop said, "Set my mind at ease; let me offer (the Eucharist) for you." Without answering, the emperor nodded his head in silence; Ambrose did not move towards the altar. "Well," said Theodosius, "I *will* cancel the rescript." "Wholly?" "Well, I will." "Now," said Ambrose, "I trust you, I trust you." "Yes, trust me." Then, at last, Ambrose proceeded with the celebration. The whole proceeding needs to be distinctly realised, and remembered as a warning instance of the errors into which a one-sided ecclesiastical zeal, refusing to be balanced and checked by considerations of

¹ Ep. 41. 27.

public morality, could betray a high-souled man and a true saint.

It was on a far different occasion that he next came forward as a censor of the emperor's conduct. In the spring of 390, Milan was startled by the ghastly news of the wholesale massacre which, by Theodosius' secret orders, had avenged a murderous outbreak on the part of a mob at Thessalonica. What made matters yet worse was, that Ambrose and other bishops had at first prevailed on Theodosius to spare the city, but the malign influence of his minister Rufinus had brought him back to his original resolution—too congenial, as it was, to the fiery Spanish temper which it cost him such painful efforts to restrain. Repeatedly those efforts had prevailed; he had pardoned the outrages to his statues at Antioch, had recalled the daughters of Maximus from exile, had granted at Ambrose's request the release of prisoners or of criminals condemned. But now the evil impulse had been dominant; and the city where he himself had often resided, and had received a Catholic baptism, was "deluged," in Sozomen's phrase, "with innocent blood,"¹ for every drop of which he was responsible.

¹ Soz. vii. 25.

Ambrose thought it wisest to convey his rebukes by a letter; and he took care to write with his own hand.¹ Quoting the words of Ezekiel about the duty of reproving offenders, and adverting to the emperor's irascibility as his acknowledged besetting fault, he spoke of the "unparalleled" deed of which he and other prelates, then at Milan, had heard with intense sorrow. Not one of them had viewed it leniently; and Ambrose himself would be compromised if he did not insist that Theodosius should regard himself as a Christian man who had sinned, and was bound to "condemn his sin instead of excusing it." To bring the matter to a point—he durst not "offer" if Theodosius chose to be present; nor could the emperor, while impenitent, expect to have his offering accepted by the God who required mercy and not sacrifice.

Theodosius, unmoved by this letter, set forth to attend service at one of the Milanese churches; Ambrose instantly confronted him in the court which intervened between the outer and inner gates, and "refused him permission to enter." What was said we do not know, for the speech which Theodoret puts into the

¹ Ep. 51.

mouth of Ambrose is probably a dramatic invention;¹ but it seems that Theodosius retired with a clear consciousness of temporary exclusion from Christian fellowship.

Some eight months passed away, and Christmas came to gladden the faithful of Milan with one of their bishop's hymns,² in which they hailed the "Divine Son of the Virgin, from whose manger-cradle beamed forth to the eye of faith the fresh brightness of a never-ending day." But one Christian remained within his apartments, not daring to join in welcoming the great Birthday. The story that Theodosius was found by Rufinus sitting alone and in tears, that Rufinus proposed to intercede with Ambrose, but was repulsed by him as the instigator of the massacre, and that Theodosius afterwards had an interview with the bishop in a room adjoining the basilica, is probably in some degree an embellishment of the facts; but it appears that the emperor was restored to communion on the condition of enacting that thirty days should always elapse between a capital sentence and its execution; and it is certain that when he did re-enter the church

¹ Theod. v. 17.

² The "Veni Redemptor gentium." It was quoted by Celestine I. in a Roman synod, as opposite against Nestorianism.

“having stripped off his insignia, he wept in the presence of the congregation for the sin into which he had been betrayed. Nor was there,” Ambrose adds, “a single day of his after life in which he did not bewail that error.”¹

This is, in Milman’s phrase,² “the culminating point of pure Christian influence,” when Christianity appeared before the world as the champion and vindicator of outraged humanity. That an absolute prince of so passionate a disposition should have submitted to such a “penance” was a token of the vitality and reality of his religious convictions; and Augustine may be believed when he tells us³ that general sympathy and admiration were called forth by the emperor’s acceptance of the “shame that is glory and grace.” The crime had been worthy of an Oriental tyrant, but the humiliation which ensued was the true ennobling of Christian monarchy; for, although the precedent which it involved might be abused in the interest of “priestly aggression,” it was itself the recognition by the civil power,

¹ De Ob. Theod. 34. Ambrose there says, “Dilexi virum qui magis arguentem quam adulantem probaret.”

² Hist. of Christianity, iii. 260; cf. Latin Christ. i. 101.

³ Cf. Civ. Dei. v. 26.

on genuinely Christian and moral grounds, of its subjection to an authority which knew no respect of persons when enforcing amends for a sin against humanity and against God.

V.

We now approach the closing tragedy of the dynasty of Valentinian I. Restored by Theodosius to his throne, the young Western emperor had given promise of a good reign. He was affectionate, self-controlled, ready to profit by advice, "equitable as a judge," considerate towards the over-taxed provincials. He had shaken off his Arian associations, and looked upon Ambrose as a spiritual father;¹ and yet he was still a catechumen. Suddenly, in his twenty-first year, while staying in Gaul, he fell into the power of his general, an ambitious Frank named Arbogast; alarmed for his personal safety, and longing to receive from Ambrose's own hands the baptism which he had too long deferred, he sent off a palace-officer to entreat the archbishop to come quickly. On the third day afterwards, which

¹ See Ep. 53. 2. On his character, cf. *De Ob. Val.* 15 ff.

was one of the two great baptismal days, Whitsunday Eve, May 15, 392, he was found strangled near his palace at Vienne. By one account, the corpse bore the appearance of suicide ; but it was most probably so arranged by murderers under orders from Arbogast. The remains were brought to Milan, and Ambrose pronounced the funeral address, remarkable as containing the passage which Hooker quotes,¹ as to the efficacy of "desire" of baptism when the sacrament could not be obtained. Arbogast proceeded to set up an emperor in the person of Eugenius, a rhetorician, who had been secretary of state, and was probably still at heart a Pagan,² for his cause was eagerly embraced by the Pagan party at Rome, and he permitted the restoration of the altar of Victory. He wrote in courteous terms to Ambrose, who, however, foreseeing the line which he would take, made no immediate reply ; but afterwards the anxiety for some persons in whom he was interested induced him to write to Eugenius in their behalf. At the outset of 393, Eugenius and

¹ De Ob. Val. 51, 53 ; Hooker, E. P. v. 60. 9. Cf. S. Tho. Aquin. Sum. iii. 68. 2.

² Soc. v. 25.

Arbogast came from Gaul into Italy. Ambrose thought it expedient not to meet them, and quitted Milan before their arrival, but wrote to Eugenius, pointing out the inconsistency between his continued profession of Christianity and his concession to Pagan importunity.¹ Excluded by the Milanese clergy from church service, Arbogast and Eugenius associated themselves with the hopes and passions of a Pagan reaction; and the Frank vowed that if he returned victorious from the inevitable contest with Theodosius, he would turn the great church at Milan into a stable.² The contest was decided in the valley of the river Frigidus,³ on the 6th of September, 394. After a preliminary battle, in which Eugenius gained the advantage, Theodosius, then in danger of being hemmed in by the enemy, resolved to risk a second engagement; he could not, he said, allow the standard which bore the Cross to retreat before that which bore the image of Hercules.⁴ The result was a decisive victory:

¹ Ep. 57.

² Paulinus, Vit. Ambr. 31.

³ On the scenery, see Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, i. 159. Cf. Gibbon, iii. 400.

⁴ Ambrose makes Theodosius exclaim at the critical moment, "Ubi est Theodosii Deus?" (*De Ob. Val.* 7).

Eugenius was captured and slain; Arbogast fled, and slew himself. Ambrose received from the conqueror a letter, which he held in one hand, while celebrating the Eucharist; and the victory of Christianity was most appropriately illustrated by the mercy shown to the sons of Eugenius,¹ and, at Ambrose's request, to some adherents of his usurpation.²

But when the great emperor unexpectedly passed away in the beginning of 395, Ambrose must have felt that the empire had sustained a loss which in his experience had no parallel. It was again to be parted between two sovereigns—and such sovereigns! Ambrose might profess, in a solemn discourse, forty days after the death of Theodosius, that “he had not entirely departed, for he had left his children, in whom it was a duty to acknowledge him:”³ the word *debemus* seems to drop from him, as if the obligation of discerning their father's character in Arcadius and Honorius was almost too arduous to be fulfilled. His own emperor was, if possible, the feebler of the two; but then he was more especially under the potent “shield”

¹ See Aug. Civ. Dei, v. 26.

² Cf. Amb. Ep. 62, de Ob. Theod. 4; Aug. Civ. Dei, v. 26.

³ De Ob. Theod. 6.

of Stilicho,¹ instead of being the dupe and wellnigh the slave of Rufinus. Ambrose was indignant when Stilicho's officers, in spite of the urgent remonstrances, had dragged away a criminal from the altar;² but he was able to do the empire some service by inducing the chief of a German frontier-people to acknowledge his subjection to Rome.³

Stilicho, for his part, understood Ambrose well enough to be exceedingly anxious when, in the beginning of 397, the archbishop's health was obviously failing. He was reported to have said that "when Ambrose was gone, the ruin of Italy would be imminent;" and, sending for some Milanese churchmen of high position, he partly persuaded and partly constrained them to ask Ambrose to pray for a prolongation of life—as if the prayers of such a man must needs be granted. The request, at any rate, enriched the Church with a saying which Augustine, in his old age, used often to quote

¹ Claudian, 4 Cons. Hon. 433.

² But he was successful with Stilicho in using his episcopal privilege of "intercession" for criminals in a case mentioned by Paulinus, Vit. 43.

³ Paulinus, Vit. 36. Ambrose's letter to queen Frigitil is not extant. See Ep. 59. 3, on danger to Milan from "barbarici motus."

and dwell upon: "I have not," said Ambrose, "so lived among you as to be ashamed to live longer; but neither am I afraid to die, for we have a kind Lord."¹ The end came very quietly² on the morning of Holy Saturday, April 4, 397. We can well imagine that those who attended the long Easter Eve services in the "great church" would remember through life how they had gazed in awe and grief on the dead face of their beloved chief pastor; how, after the Easter morning Eucharist, they had followed in the long procession (including even some Jews and Pagans) which attended the remains to their last resting-place beneath the altar of a basilica which he had recently built, and which is represented by the ninth century church of "San Ambrogio," which has been truly called "far the most interesting spot

¹ "The last clause recurs in De Pœnit. ii. 28. For his feeling about death, see De Bono Mortis, s. 52.

² He had lain with hands extended, and lips from time to time moving inaudibly, from 5 p.m. on Good Friday until after midnight. It was then that a bishop, who had been watching beside him, but was taking some rest in another room, seemed to hear a voice, "Rise, be quick, he is just going," and was just in time to give Ambrose his last communion with the Sacrament reserved for such a purpose—as Paulinus says, "to impart to him the Lord's Body, which he received, and then expired, carrying with him a good *viaticum*" (Vit. 47).

in Milan,"¹ especially as containing so venerable a grave.

After looking at a great life-work from a single point of view, one is specially bound to remember that it was in fact manysided, and has a proportionally manifold significance. Augustine was not merely a "protagonist" in four controversies; Gregory the Great was more than a consolidator of Western Christendom; the investiture contest did not supersede in Anselm's thoughts the subject of the *Cur Deus Homo*; and monastic reform, the Abelard speculations, the second crusade—big matters all of them—had each their share in the interest of Bernard. The labours which wore out Ambrose at fifty-six were those of a public man as we have tried to picture him—a diocesan, metropolitan,² and primate, a "father in Christ" to his young clergy,³ a student in moments of daytime leisure, a prolific writer who at night dispensed with a secretary "because

¹ B. Webb, *Continental Ecclesiology*, p. 205.

² See especially the important letter to the church of Vercellæ, Ep. 63, on the impending election of a bishop.

³ See the letter to "clerics" tempted to wish for an easier calling with greater secular advantages, Ep. 81. Cf. *De Off. Ministr.* ii. 134: "Episcopus ut membris suis utatur clericis, et maxime ministris" (deacons) "qui sunt vere filii."

he did not wish to give trouble to others ;” a vigilant opponent, in writing or in discussion, of heretics, as Arians or Apollinarians, while he knew and said that “ God had not willed to make His people’s salvation depend on logic ;”¹ a preacher whom outsiders might find first attractive and then instructive,² a spiritual guide who could melt and win hearts by his sweet and living sympathy.³ That he was not equally successful in all branches of work—that he made some mistakes, or sometimes took up untenable ground—that his hatred of selfishness drew from him some sayings which, apart from their context, sound communistic—that his comments on Scripture are spoiled for us by his excessive fondness for “ mystical ” application, which often runs into merest fancifulness—that in his zeal against heresy he sometimes strains the sense of a doctrinal text⁴—or that one of his theological treatises struck Jerome as

¹ De Fid. i. 42.

² Aug. Confess. vii. 24. For advice as to preaching, see Ambr. Ep. 2. 5 ; De Off. Min. i. 101.

³ Paulinus (Vit. Ambr. 34) applies to him Rom. xii. 15. On his tenderness of heart, see Ep. 83 ; on his affectionateness to his friends, De Off. Ministr. iii. 127, 131, 135 : Epp. 49, 90 ; and as to his brother, De Exc. Fratris, i. 72.

⁴ Ep. 35. 8 ; De Fid. ii. 56 : v. 54, 220 ff. But the De Fide anticipates the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies.

“pretty and graceful,” but wanting in “virile” force of argument,¹—need cause us no surprise. His knowledge of human nature comes out in his treatise on the “Duties of Ministers ;” his classic culture appears, without a touch of pedantry, in quotations from Virgil, or Plato, or Aristotle, or from Greek poems or plays, or from Cicero’s correspondence. All who came near him must have felt his genuineness of character, his love of justice and consistency, his hatred of all insincerity,² his candid willingness to profit by criticism.³ Ascetic as were his habits (he took no forenoon meal except on festivals)⁴ he could be playful and humorously kindly : the majestic disciplinarian who put an autocrat under penance could write about a friend’s little grandson as troubled with a cough and requiring regular medicine.⁵ Beneath all his strictness or sternness

¹ Rufinus is indignant at this criticism, and says that Ambrose wrote the *De Spiritu Sancto* with his heart’s blood (*Apol.* ii. 24, 25).

² “*Quales haberi volumus, tales simus:*” *De Off. Ministr.* ii. 96.

³ On this last point, see *Epp.* 46. 2 : 48. 2.

⁴ Among which, according to the well-known Milanese use (referred to by St. Augustine), Saturdays were included ; *Paulinus*, 38).

⁵ *Ep.* 54, a charming little note : “*Et me medicum putat, expectat prandium*” (*i.e.* “looks to me to give him his meal”) “*bis ad diem curatur.*” See, too, *Ep.* 3, on the “amazingly big”

—which sometimes caused him to be misconstrued and misrepresented—there was an intense love of souls, a truly pastoral spirit, itself the outcome of a supreme devotion to Christ as the true Highest Good.¹ The motive force of his life may be summarised in one of his own terse sentences, “*Omnia Christus est nobis.*”²

mushrooms sent him by Felix: “*partem direxi amicis, partem mihi reservavi.*”

¹ Ep. 29. 6 ff.

² De Virginit. 99. Cf. Ep. 63 fin.: “*Ad summam, convertimini omnes ad Dominum Jesum.*” He once says that in Christ “*et summa universitatis et portio singulorum est*” (De Exc. Frat. I. 6); compare the “*Christian Year,*” Monday before Easter.

ALEXANDRIA AND CHALCEDON.

DIOSCORUS succeeded Cyril in the see of Alexandria about midsummer, in A.D. 444, receiving consecration, according to one report,¹ from two bishops only. He had served as Cyril's archdeacon ; Liberatus says that he had never been married. It is difficult to harmonise the accounts given us of his character. On the one hand, Theodoret, declared in a letter to Dioscorus, soon after his consecration, that the fame of his virtues, and particularly of his modesty and humility, was widely spread ; and seven years later his people showed their attachment by defying the authority which had deposed him.² On the other hand, after he had involved himself in the Monophysite heresy, he not only exhibited a tyrannical disposition, but was accused of having gravely misconducted himself in the first years of his episcopate. It was

¹ Mansi, vii. 603.

² Ep. 60.

said that he had, by means of false charges, extorted money from the heirs of Cyril, in order to win popularity by lending money without interest to Alexandrian bakers and vintners, that they might "supply the people, at a low price, with the purest bread and the costliest wine."¹ A deacon named Theodore complained, at the council of Chalcedon, that Dioscorus, on coming to the see, expelled him from his clerical office merely because he had been patronised by Cyril. "He made it his aim," said Theodore, "to expel from Alexandria, or even to put to death, not only the relatives, but even the friends of Cyril. He is a heretic—has all along been an Origenist" (in these words we catch an echo of the violence with which Theophilus, in St. Chrysostom's days, persecuted the Tall Brothers for the alleged offence of Origenism); "he has not kept clear of bloodshed, nor of cutting down trees, nor of incendiarism, nor of destruction of houses; and he has all along led an infamous life, as I am ready to prove."² According to another deacon, Ischyron, Dioscorus had laid waste property, inflicted fines and exile, bought up and sold at a high price the wheat sent

¹ Liberatus, *Brev. c.* 10; cf. Fleury, *b.* 27, *c.* 3.

² Mansi, *vi.* 1008.

by the government to Libya, appropriated and grossly misspent the money left by a lady named Peristeria for religious and charitable purposes, received women of notorious character into his house, and persecuted Ischyriion as a favourite of Cyril's, ruined the little estate which was his only support, sent a "phalanx of ecclesiastics, or rather of ruffians," to put him to death, and, after his escape, again sought to murder him in a hospital; in proof of which statements Ischyriion appealed to six persons, one of whom was bath-keeper to Dioscorus.¹ According to a priest named Athanasius, Cyril's nephew, Dioscorus, from the outset of his episcopate ("which he obtained one knows not how," says the petitioner), harassed him and his brother by using influence with the court, so that the brother died of distress, and Athanasius, and his aunts, sister-in-law, and nephews, were bereft of their homes by the patriarch's malignity. He himself was deposed, without any trial, from the priesthood, and became, perforce, a wanderer for years. According to a layman named Sophronius, Dioscorus hindered the execution of an imperial order which Sophronius had obtained for the redress of

¹ Mansi, vi. 1012.

a grievous wrong. "The country," he said, "belonged to him rather than to the sovereigns" (*τῶν κρατούντων*). Sophronius averred that legal evidence was forthcoming to prove that Dioscorus had usurped, in Egypt, the authority belonging to the emperor. He added that Dioscorus had taken away his clothes and property, and compelled him to flee for his life; and he charged him, further, with adultery and blasphemy.¹ Accusations of this sort were made with so much readiness in that age—as the life of St. Athanasius himself indicates—that some deduction must needs be made from charges brought against Dioscorus in the hour of his adversity; and wrongs done by his agents may have been in several cases unfairly called his acts. Still, it is but too likely that there was sufficient truth in these denunciations to demonstrate the evil effects on his character of elevation to a post of almost absolute power; for such, in those days, was the great "Evangelical throne." We find him, before the end of his first year, in correspondence with Leo the Great, who did not miss the opportunity of giving directions, as from the see of St. Peter, to the new successor of St. Mark. He wrote,

¹ Mansi, vi. 1029.

on June 21, 445, to Dioscorus, that "it would be shocking (*nefas*) to believe that the disciple formed his rules for Alexandria otherwise than by those of his teacher and consecrator, who received from the Lord the first place among apostles ;" *therefore*, "what we know to have been observed by our fathers we wish (*volumus*) to be retained by you also," as to holding ordinations early on Sunday morning, and not at any other time, and repeating the Eucharistic celebration on great festivals, in the church, as often as a fresh congregation might make it necessary.¹

In 447 Dioscorus appears among those who were indicating their suspicion of the theological character of Theodoret, who had in the preceding controversy been so much mixed up with the party of Nestorius. It was rumoured that the bishop of Cyrrhos, preaching at Antioch, had practically taught Nestorianism ; and this charge came to the ears of Dioscorus by means, says Theodoret, of "some three or four, or at the most fifteen, persons." The bishop of Alexandria, who, whatever might be

¹ Ep. 9. *More suo*, Leo ends by saying that Dioscorus' messenger has learned by visits to Rome "quid in omnibus apostolicæ auctoritatis teneremus."

his personal feeling as against Cyril's favourites, deemed himself the lawful inheritor, so to speak, of Cyril's position as guardian of anti-Nestorian orthodoxy, wrote to Domnus of Antioch, Theodoret's patriarch, to state what he had heard; ¹ whereupon Theodoret wrote to him in remonstrance: ² "I was grieved (excuse me, my lord, if my sorrow forces me to say it) that your godly excellence did not keep one of your ears inviolate" (from calumny). He went on to express his belief, in orthodox language; referred to Theophilus and Cyril as sanctioning the doctrine of two natures in the incarnate person of Christ; observed that "Cyril of blessed memory had often written" to him, ³ and had even desired John of Antioch to show to him, among other Eastern theologians, certain of his own writings; whereupon, he added, "I read and admired them, and wrote to Cyril, who replied to me, bearing witness to

¹ The Syriac "Acts" of the "Second Council of Ephesus" (v. *infr.*) contain a correspondence between Dioscorus and Domnus. Naturally Domnus stood by the "Reunion," and Dioscorus resented any slight to the "twelve articles" of Cyril.

² Ep. 83.

³ A statement, by the way, which might be urged against the genuineness of the offensive letter about Cyril's death, which has been attributed to him. To represent that letter as a rough joke does not much mend the matter for Theodoret.

my doctrinal accuracy and my good will." The letter ended by an anathema against all who should "deny the holy Virgin to be Theotocos, call Jesus a mere man, or divide the one Son into two," and by a request that Dioscorus would pray for him and write back to him. Dioscorus did write back, but in no friendly tone; he assumed the truth of the charge against Theodoret, "as if it had been proved by torture."¹ Theodoret rejoined in "gentle terms," but in vain. Dioscorus allowed Theodoret's enemies to anathematise him in open church, and even rose from his throne to echo the malediction; and, Theodoret adds, insisted on the dignity of the throne of St. Mark, as if Antioch did not possess "the throne of the great Peter, the first and coryphæus of the choir of apostles." It appears also from this letter of Theodoret to Flavian of Constantinople, that Dioscorus frequently inveighed against the Eastern bishops for having accepted a synodical letter of Proclus (whom Flavian had recently succeeded), and thereby compromised the rights of the sees of Antioch and Alexandria. At the same time, Dioscorus thought it well to send some bishops

¹ So Theod. Ep. 86. In the Syriac Acts, this letter is ascribed to Domnus.

to Constantinople by way of supporting his quarrel with Theodoret.¹

So stood matters when, in the November of 448, the aged Eutyches, an archimandrite of Constantinople, and a vehement enemy of Nestorianisers, who had recently written to Leo on the subject of the revival of Nestorianism, and received from him a kind reply,² was arraigned before a council, of which Flavian was president, on the ground of maintaining an opposite error. He clung tenaciously to the phrase, "one incarnate φύσις of God the Word," which Cyril had used on the authority (erroneously alleged) of St. Athanasius; but neglected the qualifications and explanations by which Cyril had repeatedly made "one φύσις incarnate" mean simply that Christ was one in Person with the Word. Thus, although he was brought to own that, as man, Christ was "co-essential with us," and freely confessed that He was "made perfect man," his absolute refusal to admit that Christ, as incarnate, had "two natures," appeared

¹ It is fair to remember that Theodoret had mainly himself to thank for the suspicion that dogged his name. If modern theological tendencies make Eutychianism seem more destructive than Nestorianism, they so far seriously mislead.

² Leo, Ep. 20.

to his judges to be, in effect, a revival of the Apollinarian heresy—a denial of the distinctness and verity of Christ's manhood; and he was thereupon deprived of his priestly office, and put under excommunication. When he whispered to Florentius, the "patrician," after the council had broken up, "I appeal to the Roman, the Egyptian, and the Hierosolymitan synods,"¹ he would certainly rely most on the second of the three; accordingly, his patron, and Flavian's enemy, the emperor's chamberlain Chrysaphius, applied to Dioscorus for aid: he would support him in all his designs, if he would take up the cause of Eutyches against Flavian.² Eutyches himself wrote to Dioscorus, asking him "to examine his cause,"³ and Dioscorus, not only as opposed to the Syrian school of theology, but also, doubtless, as nothing loth to strike a blow against the see of Constantinople, wrote to the emperor, urging him to call a general council, in which Flavian's judgment might be reviewed. Theodosius, influenced by his wife and his chamberlain—not by his sister Pulcheria—issued letters (March 30, 449), ordering that each of the chief prelates (patriarchs, as we may

¹ See above, p. 172.

² Niceph. xiv. 47.

³ Liberatus, c. 12. Cp. Mansi, vi. 820.

call them, and exarchs) should repair with a certain number of their dependent bishops to Ephesus by the 1st day of August next.¹ On May 15 he wrote again, directing that an archimandrite, Barsumas, should sit in the council as representing all the Eastern archimandrites;² and in other letters, premising that some Nestorianisers were trying to get Theodoret invited to the council (contrary to his orders), he entrusted the chief management to Dioscorus and Juvenal.³

This council of evil memory⁴—on which Leo afterwards fastened the name of “*Latrocinium*,” or “gang of robbers”—met on August 8, 449, in St. Mary’s church at Ephesus, the scene of the third General Council’s meeting in 431. The bishops present were about 130 in number.

¹ Mansi, vi. 587.

² *Ib.* vi. 593.

³ *Ib.* vi. 600.

⁴ The “*Acts*” of this council, published by the Abbé Martin in a French translation from a Syriac manuscript of A.D. 535, and defended in his “*Pseudo-Synode*” against suspicion of forgery, omit the first session, in which Flavian was condemned, and to which the synod owes its “melancholy immortality.” The *Acts* are made to begin with the proceedings against Ibas; and they certainly give proof enough of a furious temper expressing itself in “acclamation.” But if, as M. Martin thinks, the records, destroyed everywhere else, had been carefully preserved in Monophysite convents, the scribe would be not unlikely to suppress that part which had brought such special obloquy on his cause.

Dioscorus had brought with him to Ephesus the rough "Parabolani" of Alexandria, "the strongest support of the secular power of his see." He assumed the presidency; next to him sat Julian, or Julius, the representative of the "most holy bishop of the Roman Church," then Juvenal of Jerusalem, to whose "council" Eutyches had appealed; then, taking a place below his rank, Domnus of Antioch; and then—his lowered position indicating what was to come—Flavian of Constantinople.¹ The respective bishops had their notaries or clerks to take down the proceedings: and it was afterwards affirmed that the clerks of Dioscorus had cheated those of the bishop of Ephesus, had rubbed out their notes, and wrenched away their inkstands.² Dioscorus is said to have peremptorily asked the bishop of Smyrna, after his arrival at Ephesus, why he had signed the sentence against Eutyches? "I signed," said the frightened prelate, "what they offered me."³ The archbishop of Alexandria, in fact, showed himself throughout a committed partisan. He did indeed propose the acceptance of Leo's letter to the council, a letter written at the same time as, and expressly referring to, the

¹ Mansi, vi. 607. ² *Ib.* vi. 623. ³ *Ib.* vi. 689.

famous "Tome" or doctrinal letter to Flavian which, Tillemont¹ thinks, was presented along with it;² he is said to have "sworn seven times" that it should be read; but it was only handed in, not read,—Juvenal moving that another imperial letter should be read and recorded. The president then intimated that the council's business was not to frame a new doctrinal formulary, but to inquire whether what had lately appeared—meaning, the statements of Flavian and Eusebius on the one hand, those of Eutyches on the other—were accordant with the decisions of the councils of Nicæa and Ephesus,—“two councils in name,” said he, “but one in faith. The Holy Spirit sat in those assemblies (*συνήδρευσε*); therefore whoever unsettles their decisions, makes void His grace.” The council loudly expressed its concurrence.³ Eutyches was then introduced, and made his statement, beginning, “I commend myself to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the true verdict of your justice.” After he had finished his address, Flavian desired that Eusebius, who had been his accuser, should be called in and heard. Elpidius, the imperial commissioner, vetoed this proposal

¹ Tillemont, xv. 559. ² Leo, Ep. 44. ³ Mansi, vi. 628.

on the ground that the judges of Eutyches were now to be judged, and that his accuser had already fulfilled his task, "and, as he thought, successfully:" to let him speak again would be a cause of new disturbance.¹ This view of the case, however inconsistent with ordinary judicial instincts, was supported by Dioscorus. Flavian was baffled, and the council resolved to hear the acts of the synod of Constantinople which had condemned Eutyches. The episcopal deputy of Leo, with his companion, the deacon Hilarus, urged that "the pope's letter"—probably including the "Tome" in this proposal—should be read first, but this was overruled; Eutyches openly expressed his suspicion that Julius and Hilarus had been tampered with by Flavian; Dioscorus moved that the "acts" should be first read, and then the letter of the bishop of Rome. The reading began.² At one point Eustathius of Berytus interrupted the reader by observing that Cyril's letter to John of Antioch must be interpreted by his language

¹ Mansi, vi. 645. See Gibbon, vi. 27, on the need of "dis-entangling the double involution," whereby the acts of Flavian's synod are enclosed with the acts of the first session of the Latrocinium, and these within the acts of the first session of Chalcedon.

² Mansi, vi. 649.

on "one nature incarnate, as explained in other letters."¹ When the passage was reached in which Basil of Seleucia and Seleucus of Amasia had said that the one Christ was *in* two natures after the Incarnation, a storm of wrath broke out. "Let no one call the Lord 'two' after the union! Seleucus was not bishop of Amasia! Do not divide the Undivided! This is Nestorianism." "Be quiet for a little," said Dioscorus; "let us hear some more blasphemies. Why are we to blame Nestorius only? There are many Nestoriuses."² The reading proceeded as far as Eusebius' question to Eutyches, "Do you own two natures after the incarnation"? Then arose another storm: "The holy synod exclaimed, 'Away with Eusebius, burn him, let him be burnt alive!'³ Let him be cut in two,—be divided, even as he divided!" "Can you endure," asked Dioscorus, "to hear of two natures after the Incarnation"? "Anathema to him that says it!" was the reply. "I have need of your

¹ Mansi, vi. 676. Yet the letters ought to have shown that Cyril was *not* a Monophysite.

² *Ib.* vi. 685.

³ The Syriac Acts make the bishops afterwards utter this hideous outcry against Nestorians in general, and Ibas in particular.

voices and your hands too," rejoined Dioscorus ; "if any one cannot shout, let him stretch out his hand." Another anathema rang out.¹ Another passage, containing a statement of belief by Eutyches, was heard with applause. "We accept this statement," said Dioscorus. "This is the faith of the fathers," exclaimed the bishops. "Of what faith do you say this?" asked Dioscorus. "Of Eutyches' : for Eusebius is impious."² Similar approbation was given to another passage containing the characteristic formula of Eutychianism : "I confess that our Lord was of two natures before the Incarnation ; but after the Incarnation (*i.e.* in Him as incarnate) I confess *one* nature." "We all agree to this," said Dioscorus. "We agree," said the council.³ Presently came a sentence in which Basil of Seleucia had denounced the denial of two natures after the Incarnation as equivalent to the assertion of "a commixture and a fusion." This aroused once more the zealots of the Alexandrian party ; one bishop sprang forward, shouting, "This upsets the whole Church : " the

¹ Mansi, vi. 737.

² ἀσεβής, Mansi, vi. 740. Eutyches, in the statement, had acknowledged that the Son ἐνανθρωπήσαι τελείως.

³ Mansi, vi. 744. The formula ἐκ δύο φύσεων was thus nugatory.

Egyptians, and the monks led by Barsumas, cried out, "Cut him in two, who says two natures! he is a Nestorian!" Basil's nerves gave way; he lost, as he afterwards said, his perceptions, bodily and mental.¹ He began to say that he did not remember whether he had uttered the obnoxious words, but that he had meant to say, "If you do not add the word 'incarnate' to 'nature' as Cyril did, the phrase 'one nature' implies a fusion." Juvenal asked whether his words had been wrongly reported; he answered helplessly, "I do not recollect."² He seems to have been coerced into a formal retraction of the phrase "two natures;" but he added "hypostases or persons" as explanatory of "natures," and professed to "adore the one nature of the Godhead of the Only-begotten, who was made man and incarnate."³ Eutyches declared that the acts of the Constantinopolitan synod had been tampered with. "It is false," said Flavian. "If Flavian," said Dioscorus, "knows anything which supports his opinion, let him put it in writing." Flavian answered, "You have debarred me from making any just allegation." Dioscorus answered that he had

¹ Mansi, vi. 636.

² *Ib.* vi. 748.

³ *Ib.* vi. 828. Seleucus did the like.

done nothing of the kind : "No one hinders you, and the council knows it." Flavian referred to two metropolitans ; they answered by urging him to speak : "Even now," said Juvenal, "say whatever you like." Flavian then said that the acts had been scrutinised,¹ and no falsification had been found in them ; that, for himself, he had "never glorified God otherwise than by holding what he then held." Dioscorus called on the bishops to give their verdict as to the theological statements of Eutyches. They did so, acquitting him of all unsoundness, as faithful to Nicene and Ephesian teaching. Domnus intimated regret for having mistakenly condemned him.² Basil of Seleucia spoke like the rest. Flavian, of course, was silent. Dioscorus spoke last, affirming the judgments of the council, and "adding his own opinion : " the result was that Eutyches was "restored" to his presbyteral rank and his abbatial dignity.³ His monks were then released from the excommunication which they had incurred at Constantinople. The doctrinal decisions of the Ephesian council of 431, in its first and sixth sessions, were then read. Dioscorus moved that these decisions,

¹ By the emperor's orders, in April, 449. Cf. Mansi, vi. 753.

² Mansi, vi. 836.

³ *Ib.* vi. 835 ff.

with those of Nicæa, should be recognised as an unalterable standard of orthodoxy: that whoever should say or think otherwise, or should unsettle them, should be put under censure. "Let each one of you speak his mind on this." Several bishops assented. Hilarus, the Roman deacon, testified that "the apostolic see revered those decisions," and that its letter, if read, would prove this. No attention was paid to this suggestion. Onesiphorus, bishop of Iconium, whispered to the prelates who sat next him that the motion was simply intended to promote the deposition of Flavian. "God forbid!" replied Epiphanius of Perga; "if any one is to feel the indignation of Dioscorus, it will be Eusebius. No one will be so mad as to attempt such a thing against Flavian."¹ But Onesiphorus was right. Dioscorus called in some secretaries, who brought forward a draft of a sentence of deposition against Flavian and Eusebius. The ground taken was, that the Ephesian Council had enacted severe penalties against any one who should frame or propose any other creed than the Nicene. Flavian and Eusebius were declared to have constructively committed this

¹ Mansi, vi. 829.

offence by "unsettling almost everything, and causing scandal and confusion throughout the churches." The practical conclusion was, that they must be deposed.¹ When this document had been read, Flavian said briefly, "I decline your jurisdiction:" (one does not see, Tillemont observes, why he did not say so earlier). Hilarus uttered one word in his own tongue,—*Contradicitur*. Onesiphorus, with some others, went up to Dioscorus, clasped his feet and knees as in supplication, and passionately entreated him not to go to such extremities.² "No, by the feet of your Piety! he has done nothing worthy of deposition; but if he deserves condemnation, let him be condemned. . . . You have priests of your own, you must not for a priest's sake condemn the bishop." "It must be," said Dioscorus, in answer; "if my tongue were to be cut out for it, I would still say so." They persisted, and he lost all self-command: starting from his throne, he stood up on the footstool so as to dominate the whole assembly by his voice and presence: "Are you getting up a sedition? where are the counts?" Military officers, soldiers with swords and sticks, even the proconsul with chains, entered at his call.

¹ Mansi, vi. 907.

² *Ib.* vi. 832.

He peremptorily commanded that the bishops should sign the sentence, and exclaimed with a fierce gesture of the hand, "He that does not choose to sign has to do with *me*." A scene of terrorism followed. Those prelates who were reluctant to take part in the deposition of Flavian and Eusebius were threatened with exile, beaten by the soldiers, denounced as heretics by the partisans of Dioscorus, and by the crowd of fanatical monks¹ who accompanied Barsumas, until they put their names, one after another, to a blank paper on which the sentence was to be written out; fifteen, who held out longest, were kept in the sacristy of the church until evening.² They afterwards protested that they had signed under terror and compulsion. Basil of Seleucia declared that he had yielded because he was "given over to the judgment of 120 or 130 bishops; had he been dealing with magistrates, he would have suffered martyrdom." "The Egyptians," says Tillemont, "who signed willingly enough, did so after the others had been made to sign."³

Flavian's own fate was the special tragedy of the Latrocinium. He had lodged in the hands

¹ Mansi, vii. 68.

² *Ib.* vi. 601 sq., 625, 637, 988.

³ Tillemont, xv. 571; cf. Mansi, vi. 601.

of the Roman delegates a formal appeal to Leo and to all the Western bishops.¹ It was nearly his last act. He was brutally treated, kicked and beaten, by the agents of Dioscorus (we need not literally accept the phrases or statements which imply that their master took part in this enormity, but Barsumas, it is said, stood over him and cried, "Stab him.")² The injuries which he received were not immediately fatal; he was thrown into prison, and then sent into exile, but died while in the hands of his guards, three days after his deposition. "Dolore plagarum," says Liberatus simply, "migravit ad Dominum," August 11, 449. He was regarded as a martyr for the doctrine of "the two natures in the one Person" of Christ.³ Anatolius, who had been the official correspondent (*apocrisiarius*) of Dioscorus at Constantinople, was appointed his successor.

Dioscorus, desiring to obtain the acquiescence of Hilarus, tried to frighten him into attending a second session of the council. But the sturdy deacon (as he himself tells the story in a letter

¹ Not to Rome alone; see Leo, Ep. 43; Tillemont, xv. 374.

² Mansi, vii. 68.

³ See Alban Butler, Lives of Saints, Feb. 17. "It was the glory of St. Flavian to die a martyr of the mystery of the Incarnation," etc.

to Pulcheria,¹ succeeded in getting away from Ephesus and came "per incognita et in via loca" to Rome. Julius appears to have been less conspicuously steadfast, but to have refused assent to the deposition.² Dioscorus and his council—as we may well call it—proceeded to depose Theodoret and several other bishops; "many," says Leo, "were expelled from their sees, and banished, because they would not accept heresy."³ Theodoret was put under a special ban. "They ordered me," he writes,⁴ "to be excluded from shelter, from water, from everything." The feeble Domnus of Antioch gained nothing by having retracted his former condemnation of Eutyches; he, too, was deposed, and Maximus was substituted for him by Anatolius⁵ "without any decree of the clergy

¹ Leo, Ep. 46.

² Ib. Ep. 48.

³ Ep. 93. 3. Ibas of Edessa, Irenæus of Tyre, Acylinus of Byblos, were condemned as Nestorians; Daniel of Carrhæ for crimes; Sophronius of Thella for divination,—see the curious story in the Syriac Acts of a boy being made to look into a phial or a hole full of oil and water, and asked "what he saw."

⁴ Ep. 140. This is borne out by Dioscorus' speech in the Syriac Acts, denouncing divine judgment against any who should receive or visit Theodoret, sit at his table, or even converse with him; see Martin, Actes des Brigandage, p. 125.

⁵ Leo, Ep. 104. Domnus was accused of Nestorianism *because* in addressing catechumens he had dwelt on the distinctiveness of the two natures.

or people of Antioch.”¹ But as Leo and the council of Chalcedon afterwards recognised him (Domnus, probably, making no claim for himself), it was said in that council that his appointment was the only act of “the so-called synod”—the *Latrocinium*—which could be regarded as valid.²

The “confusion and scandal,” if we may so apply Dioscorus’ words in Flavian’s case, which now pervaded the Eastern Churches, and which might be summed up in Tillemont’s phrase, “Dioscore règne partout,”³ led necessarily to efforts for a new Œcumenical Council. It was impossible to acquiesce in the proceedings of the “*Latrocinium*.” Leo bestirred himself to get such a council held in Italy: the imperial family in the West supported his request, but Theodosius persisted in upholding the late council. It was probably in the spring of 450 that Dioscorus took a new step, which was regarded as exceptionally audacious; being at Nicæa, on his way to the court, he caused ten bishops whom he had brought with him from Egypt on this second journey, to sign a document excommunicating the bishop of

¹ Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 723.

² Mansi, vii. 257.

³ Tillemont, xv. 589.

Rome,¹ doubtless on the ground that Leo was endeavouring to quash the canonical decisions of a legitimate council. His cause, however, was ruined when the orthodox Pulcheria succeeded to the empire on the death of her brother, and gave her hand to Marcian; this event opened the way to the assembling of a new council at Chalcedon on the 8th of October, 451.

In the long list of its members, the deputies of Leo, two of them being bishops, come first, then Anatolius, then Dioscorus, then Maximus, and then Juvenal. At the outset of the proceedings, Dioscorus sat first among those bishops who were placed on the right hand of the chancel. The Roman deputies came forward from their places on the opposite side, and desired, in the name of Leo, and in virtue of his instructions, that Dioscorus should not sit in the council, but should forthwith go out.² The "magistrates," who acted as imperial commissioners (and were the *effective* presidents), asked what was charged against him? Paschasinus, the chief Roman delegate, answered, "When he comes in"—*i.e.* after

¹ Mansi, vi. 1009, 1148; vii. 104. For the time, see Tillemont, xv. 603, 909.

² See above, p. 181.

having first gone out—"it will be necessary to state objections against him." The magistrates desired again to hear the charge. Lucentius, another delegate, said, "He has presumed to hold a synod without leave of the apostolic see, which has never been done."¹ "We cannot," said Paschasinus, "transgress the apostolic pope's orders." "We cannot," added Lucentius, "allow such a wrong as that this man should sit in the council, who is come to be judged." "If *you* claim to judge," replied the magistrates sharply, "do not be accuser too." Then, instead of ordering Dioscorus to go out, they bade him sit in the middle by himself, and the Roman deputies "sat down and were silent," having got as much as was possible in the circumstances. Eusebius of Dorylæum came forward and asked to be heard against Dioscorus. "I have been injured by him: the faith has been injured; Flavian was killed, after he and I had been unjustly deposed by Dioscorus. Command my petition to the emperors to be read." "Let it be read," said the magistrates. Eusebius sat down in the middle, near Dioscorus; his petition

¹ Rome did not recognise the "second general council" of 381; which, in fact, was not then owned as general. Lucentius' negative assertion showed a Roman indifference to evidence.

was read by Beronicianus, the secretary of the imperial consistory. It was to this effect: "At the recent council at Ephesus, this good (*χρηστὸς*) Dioscorus, disregarding justice, and supporting Eutyches in heresy,—having also gained power by bribes, and assembled a disorderly multitude, did all he could to ruin the Catholic faith, and to establish the heresy of Eutyches, and condemned us; I desire, therefore, that he be called to account, and that the records of his proceedings against us be examined." Dioscorus, preserving his self-possession, answered, "The synod was held by the emperor's order; I also desire that its acts against Flavian may be read." "This is my request too," repeated Eusebius. But Dioscorus added, "I beg that the doctrinal question be first considered." "No," said the magistrates, "the charge against you must first be met; wait until the acts have been read, as you yourself desired." The letter of Theodosius, con- voking the late council, was read. The magistrates then ordered that Theodoret should be brought in, because Leo had "restored to him his episcopate," and the emperor had ordered him to attend the council. He entered accordingly. The Egyptians and some other

bishops shouted, "Turn out the teacher of Nestorius!" Others rejoined, "We signed a blank paper; we were beaten, and so made to sign. Turn out the enemies of Flavian and of the faith!" "Why," asked Dioscorus, "should Cyril be ejected?" (*i.e.* virtually, by the admission of Theodoret). His adversaries fiercely retorted: "Turn out Dioscorus the homicide!" Ultimately the magistrates ruled that Theodoret should sit down, but in the middle of the assembly, and that his admission should not prejudice any charge that might be brought against him. The storm, however, was not abated until the magistrates said, in grave reproof, "These outcries do not befit bishops, nor help either side. Allow everything to be done in due order."¹ The reading went on; at the letter giving Dioscorus the presidency, he remarked that Juvenal, and Thalassius of Cæsarea, were associated with him, that the council had gone with him, and that Theodosius had confirmed its decrees. Forthwith, a cry arose from the bishops whom he had intimidated at Ephesus: "Not one of us signed voluntarily. We were overawed by soldiers." Their attendant clerics swelled

¹ Mansi, vi. 592. The shouts are called "vulgar."

this cry; and the Egyptians answered, "These men signed *first*,"—"the council consists of bishops, not of clerics; turn out those who have no place here" (τοὺς περισσοῦς).¹ Stephen of Ephesus told how insolently the friends of Eutyches had treated him. Thalassius pleaded that he had urged moderation. Another bishop described the scene of coercion. The Egyptians scornfully interrupted: "A Christian, a Catholic, fears no one." Dioscorus coolly said that if the bishops had not understood the merits of the case, they ought not to have signed. The reading was resumed. Flavian being named, his friends asked why he had been degraded to the fifth place? and further altercation followed as to whether the "screaming" came from the clerks of Dioscorus—who, he said, were but two,—or from others. "Read on," said the magistrates. The next interruption was in reference to the suppression, at the Latrocinium, of Leo's letter. Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople, said it had not even been "received." "But," said Dioscorus, "the acts show that I proposed that it should be

¹ Bishops alone, or representatives of absent bishops, were constituent members of ancient synods, although clerics and laics frequently gave information or advice, without voting.

read. Let others say why it was not read." "What others?" "Juvenal and Thalassius." "No, answer for yourself." "I have said already that I twice proposed the reading." Juvenal, on being questioned, said, "The chief notary told us that he had an imperial letter; I answered that it ought to come first; no one afterwards said that he had in his hands a letter from Leo." Thalassius (evidently a weak man, though holding the great see of St. Basil) said that he had not power, of himself, to order the reading of the letter.¹ At another point, the "Orientals,"² the opponents of Dioscorus, objected to the way in which the acts of Ephesus had represented their words. "We did not say that." Dioscorus replied, "Each bishop had its own secretaries: I had mine; Juvenal had his, etc. There were many other secretaries of bishops, taking down the speeches." Stephen of Ephesus then narrated the violence done to his secretaries; Acacias of Ariarathia described the coercion-scene. When the reader came to Dioscorus's words, "I examine the decrees of the fathers" (councils), Eusebius said, "See, he said, 'I examine;' and *I* do the same."

¹ Mansi, vi. 617.

² The region dependent on Antioch was called specifically the "Orient." Above, p. 160.

Dioscorus caught him up: "I said, 'examine,' not 'innovate.' Our Saviour bade us examine the Scriptures; that is not innovating." "He said, 'Seek and ye shall find,'" was the retort. One bishop objected to the record of "Guardian of the faith" as an acclamation in honour of Dioscorus; "No one said that." "They want to deny all that is confessed to be the fact," said Dioscorus; "let them next say they were not there." At the words of Eutyches, "I have observed the definition of the council," *i.e.* the Ephesian decree against adding to the Nicene creed, Eusebius broke in on the reading: "He lied! There is no such definition, no canon prescribing this." "There are four copies," said Dioscorus calmly, "which contain it. What bishops have defined, is it not a definition? It is not a canon: a canon is a different thing."¹ The bishop of Cyzicus referred to additions made, as he asserted, in the council of 381,² to the original Nicene creed (*e.g.* "of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary"). The Egyptians disclaimed all such additions. (Cyril, in fact, had never acknowledged that revised version of the Nicene formulary.) There was some further

¹ But a canon could be called *ῥπος*.

² See Bright, Notes on the Canons, p. 93.

criticism of the profession of faith made by Eutyches ; whereupon Dioscorus said, and the words are to be remembered, "If Eutyches has any heterodox opinion, he deserves not only to be punished, but to be burnt! My only object is to preserve the Catholic faith, not that of any man. I look to God, and not to any individual ; I care for nothing but my own soul and the right faith."¹ Basil of Seleucia described what had taken place as regarded his own statements.² "If you taught in so orthodox a tone," said the magistrates, "why did you sign the deposition of Flavian?" Basil, as we have seen, pleaded the compulsory authority of a council of bishops. "See," said Dioscorus, "you are condemned out of your own mouth ; on your own showing, you betrayed the faith for fear of men." Others who had given way with Basil cried out piteously, "We all sinned ; we all ask pardon." "But," said the magistrates, "you said at first that you had been forced to sign a blank paper." The "peccavimus" was reiterated.³

¹ Mansi, vi. 633.

² He added that he anathematised alike those who "divided the natures" (by assigning each to a different person), and those who "did not recognise their distinctiveness." To the fanatical Egyptians this seemed Nestorianism.

³ Mansi, vi. 639.

When the reader came to the failure of Flavian's attempt to get Eusebius a hearing, Dioscorus threw the responsibility on Elpidius: so did Juvenal; the unfortunate Thalassius only said, "It was not my doing." "Such an excuse," said the magistrates, "is no defence when the faith is concerned." "If," said Dioscorus, "you blame me for obeying Elpidius, were no rules broken when Theodoret was brought in?" "He came in as accuser." "Why then does he now sit in the rank of a bishop?" "He and Eusebius sit as accusers," was the answer; "and *you* sit as accused."¹ Afterwards the magistrates recurred to this topic: "Eusebius, at Constantinople, when he was accusing Eutyches, himself asked that Eutyches should be present. Why was not a like course taken at Ephesus?" No one answered.² Further on, after Cyril's letter to John of Antioch ("Lætentur cœli") had been read as part of the acts of Ephesus, the bishops of Illyricum cried out, "We believe as Cyril did! Cyril's memory is eternal!" Theodoret, by way of clearing himself, anathematised the assertion of "two Sons."³ *All* the bishops—so the acts of Chalcedon say expressly—cried out, "We believe as did Cyril; we did so believe,

¹ Mansi, vi. 644.² *Ib.* vi. 656.³ *Ib.* vi. 673.

and we *do*. Anathema to whoever does not so believe." The opponents of Dioscorus then claimed Flavian as in fact of one mind with Cyril, as clear of Nestorianism. The Orientals added, "Leo believes so, Anatolius believes so." There was one universal protestation of agreement with Cyril; the very magistrates joined in the shouting, and answered, as it were, for Marcian and Pulcheria. Then came a fierce outcry against Dioscorus, his opponents having thus, as they thought, established their own orthodoxy. "Out with the murderer of Flavian—the parricide!" His suffragans tried to mend matters by a loyal shout, "Many years to the senate, to the emperors!" The magistrates asked, "Why then did you receive to communion Eutyches, who holds the opposite to this belief? why condemn Flavian and Eusebius, who agree with it?" "The records," answered Dioscorus, "will show the truth." Presently, in regard to some words of Eustathius of Berytus, adopting Cyril's phrase, "one incarnate *φύσις*," as Athanasian, the Orientals cried, "Eutyches thinks thus, so does Dioscorus." Dioscorus replied in words which showed that he was careful to disclaim, even with anathema, all notions of a "confusion, or conversion," of

Godhead with or into manhood, in Christ. The magistrates asked whether the canonical letters of Cyril, recently read—*i.e.* his second letter to Nestorius,¹ and his letter to John,² *not* including the third letter to Nestorius, to which the twelve anathemas were annexed—bore out the language cited as from Eustathius. Eustathius himself stepped forth into the midst of the church, and held up the book from which he had taken Cyril's language. "If I spoke amiss, here is the manuscript: let *it* be anathematised with me!" He quoted one of Cyril's letters, and then explained it; "One nature" did not exclude the flesh of Christ, which was co-essential with us; and "two natures" was a heterodox phrase if (*i.e.* only if) it was used for a "division" of His person. "Why, then, did you depose Flavian?" "I erred."³ Flavian's own statement, that Christ was "of two natures after the incarnation," in one hypostasis and one person, etc., was then considered; several bishops, in turn, approved of it, including Paschasinus, Anatolius, Maximus, Thalassius, Eustathius.⁴ The Orientals called "archbishop Flavian" a martyr. "Let his

¹ Mansi, vi. 66c.

² *Ib.* 665.

³ *Ib.* v. 677.

⁴ Two of them expressly said that Flavian agreed with Cyril.

other words be read," said Dioscorus; "you will find that he is inconsistent with himself."¹ At this point Juvenal, who had been sitting on the right side, went over to the left, and the Orientals welcomed him. Peter of Corinth, a young bishop, did the same, owning that Flavian held with Cyril; the Orientals shouted, "Peter thinks as does" (St.) "Peter." Other bishops spoke similarly. Dioscorus, undaunted by seeing them go over from right to left, said, "The reason why Flavian was condemned was plainly this, that he asserted two natures after the Incarnation. I have passages from the fathers, Athanasius, Gregory, Cyril, to the effect that after the Incarnation there were not two natures, but one incarnate nature of the Word. If I am to be expelled, the Fathers will be expelled with me. I am maintaining their doctrine: I do not deviate from them at all: I have not got these extracts carelessly, I have verified them."² After more reading, he said, "I accept the phrase 'of two natures,' but I do not accept 'two'" (*i.e.* he would not say "Christ *has* now two natures"). "I am obliged

¹ *I.e.* "he says elsewhere there *are* two natures, and Cyril did not." Dioscorus here misunderstood Cyril.

² Mansi, vi. 684. Many such passages were forged by Apollinarians: cf. Leontius ap. Galland. xii. 701.

to speak boldly (*ἀναισχυντέιν*); I am speaking for my own soul." Being accused of putting Eusebius in peril of his life, he replied that he would answer that to God. "Nay, but you must answer it to the laws also; why else have I come here? why have you come, if not to meet charges?" "Was Flavian," asked Paschasinus, "allowed such freedom of speech as this man takes?" "No," said the magistrates significantly, "but then *this* council is being carried on with justice."¹ Some time later, the Orientals denied that the whole council at Ephesus had assented to Eutyches' language; it was the assent of "Egyptians, of Dioscorus the homicide." Eustathius, wishing, he said, to promote a good understanding, asked whether "two natures" meant "two divided natures." "No," said Basil, "neither divided nor confused."² Basil afterwards, with Onesiphorus, described the coercion used as to the signatures.³ The reading went on until it was necessary to light the candles;⁴ at last the magistrates proposed that, as the condemnation of Flavian and Eusebius had been proved to be unjust, Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius,

¹ Mansi, vi. 692.

² Ib. vi. 744.

³ Ib. vi. 827: "Soldiers rushed in," etc.

⁴ Ib. vi. 901.

and Basil, as having been of chief authority in the late synod, should be deposed ; but this, it appears,¹ was a provisional sentence, to be further considered by the council. It was received with applause, "A just judgment! Christ has deposed Dioscorus! God has vindicated the martyrs!"

The second session was held on October 10 ;² Dioscorus was absent. After some discussion as to making an exposition of faith, the usual exclamations were made, among which we find that of the Illyrians, "Restore Dioscorus to the synod, to the churches! We have all offended, let all be forgiven!" On the other hand, the enemies of Dioscorus called out for his banishment, and the clerics of Constantinople said that he who communicated with him was a Jew.³ In the third session, Saturday, October 13, the magistrates not being present, a memorial to the council from Eusebius of Dorylæum, setting forth his charges against Dioscorus, was read.⁴ It then appeared that Dioscorus had been summoned, like other bishops, to the session ; and had sent word that he was willing to come, but that his guards

¹ Mansi, vi. 936, 1041.

² *Ib.* vi. 937.

³ *Ib.* vi. 976.

⁴ *Ib.* vi. 985.

prevented him. Two priests were thereupon sent to search for him, but he could not be found in the precincts of the church. Three bishops were then sent, with a notary. They found him, and said to him, "The holy council begs your Holiness to attend its meeting." "I am under guard," said he; "I am hindered by the officers" (*magistriani*, the subordinates of the "master of the offices," or "supreme magistrate of the palace").¹ At last, after consideration, he said he would not come unless the magistrates were present: if they were to be present, he would come and reply to Eusebius. This being reported in council, Eusebius said that Dioscorus (who is still called "the most pious bishop") was resorting to evasion. A second synodical summons was then sent by the hands of three other bishops. He pleaded that he was not well,² and that he must stipulate for the presence of the magistrates; he had requested the emperor to grant this. "But," said the envoys, "this is a canonical question that is raised, and laymen have no business with it. To put off coming is to strengthen your accusers." "Let other bishops," said Dioscorus, "come with me ;

¹ See Gibbon, ii. 326.

² "I told you before that I was ill ; and now I am worse." "You never said a word about illness," was the rejoinder.

Eusebius attacks what we did in common." "No, he accuses you individually." When the envoys returned, the council resolved to hear the petitions framed against Dioscorus by the persons referred to as having complained of him.¹ Then a third summons was sent to Dioscorus; but he positively and finally refused to come. He had nothing more to say than what he had said to former envoys. They begged him to reconsider it. "If your Holiness knows that you can answer the charges of Eusebius, and of those who have to-day presented charges against you, come and rid God's holy Church of a blot." "The Catholic Church," said Dioscorus sternly, "has no blot; God forbid!" "But if your Holiness knows that you are falsely accused, the council is not far off; do take the trouble to come, and refute the falsehood." "What I have said, I have said; it is enough." They returned, and reported their failure. "What will your Holinesses do?" asked Paschasinus, addressing the council. "Do you order that we proceed to ecclesiastical penalties against him?" "Yes, we agree." One bishop said bitterly, "When he murdered holy Flavian, he did not adduce canons, nor proceed by church

¹ Mansi, vi. 1005.

forms." "Again I ask," said Paschasinus, as chief president, "what is your pleasure?" "Whatever your Holiness pleases," said Maximus: "we will vote with you." Whereupon the Roman delegates proposed a sentence, to this effect: "Dioscorus has received Eutyches, though duly condemned by Flavian, into communion. The apostolic see excuses those who were coerced by Dioscorus at Ephesus, but who are obedient to archbishop Leo" (as president) "and the council; but this man glories in his offences. He prevented Leo's letter to Flavian from being read. These things might have been condoned, but he has presumed to excommunicate Leo, and he has thrice refused to come and answer to charges. Therefore Leo, by us and the council, together with St. Peter, the rock of the Church, deprives him of episcopal and sacerdotal dignity."¹ Anatolius, Maximus, and the others, gave their votes for the deposition. A letter was written to Dioscorus, announcing that he was deposed for disregarding the canons and disobeying the council; the clerics in attendance on him received information to the same effect, and were bidden to take charge of the property of

¹ Mansi, vi, 1045. See above, p. 183.

the Alexandrian church until a bishop could be appointed. Dioscorus at first made light of the sentence, and said that he should soon be restored; the council, hearing of this, put forth a declaration that the sentence was irrevocable. They wrote to the two emperors, reciting his misdeeds: (1) he had hindered Leo's letter to Flavian from being read at Ephesus; (2) he had restored the heterodox and justly deposed Eutyches to his office, in contempt of Leo's letter on Eutyches' case; (3) he had done injury to Eusebius; (4) he had received to communion persons lawfully condemned; (5) he had attempted to excommunicate Leo himself; (6) he had disobeyed the citations of the council.¹ There is little more to be told. The deposition of Dioscorus was confirmed by the emperor; he was banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, and died there in 454. His deposition inaugurated the great schism which to this day has divided the Christians of Egypt, the majority of whom, distinguished as Copts, have always disowned the council of Chalcedon, and venerated Dioscorus as "their teacher" and as a persecuted saint.² As to his theological position, there is,

¹ Mansi, vi. 1097.

² Lit. Copt. S. Basil. in Renaudot, Lit. Orient. i. 4.

perhaps, little or nothing in his own words—even including those which Le Quien cites as decisive against him—which might not be so interpreted as to be consistent with orthodoxy. He might have rejected the formula, “two natures after the Incarnation,” not only as then deficient in authority, but as, to his mind, suggestive of Nestorianism; yet he might not, after all, have advisedly rejected the great doctrine which since 451 it has enshrined, *i.e.* that the Son of God, as personally incarnate, exists in two distinct spheres of being. He might have sympathised with Eutyches for his fidelity to a dictum of Cyril; and knowing, as he well did, the manifold persistency of Nestorianisers, he might have been honestly anxious lest Cyril’s work should be undone—lest the belief in the one Christ, God and Man, should be virtually superseded by the notion of a close alliance between two Christs. But it is not his theological mistakes, whatever they were, which have determined his reputation. And even as to his conduct, the charges brought by the Alexandrian petitioners at Chalcedon are too deeply coloured by passion to command our full belief: a mere profligate oppressor would not have secured so largely the

loyalty of Alexandrian churchmen ; nor do we know how Dioscorus would have answered his accusers, had the magistrates come to the third session of the council to ensure order and fair play. But when we look at his public acts in 449, we cannot but see in them the perversion of considerable abilities—of courage, resolution, clear-headedness—under the temptations of excessive power and the promptings of a despotic self-will. The brutal treatment of Flavian, which he practically sanctioned, has made his memory specially odious ; and his name is conspicuous on a tragical but admonitory list, the list of the “violent men” of Church history.

Proterius had been presbyter and church-steward under him, and seems to have incurred his displeasure by taking an opposite view of the Eutychian question.¹ If so, however, he must have, to some extent, regained his bishop’s favour ; for he was left in charge of the church when Dioscorus went to attend the council of Chalcedon. After his deposition by that council, the Emperor Marcian gave orders for a new election to the see. The suffragan bishops, with the exception of thirteen detained

¹ See Ischyron, ap. Mansi, vi. 1017.

at Constantinople by a resolution of the council,¹ were assembled in synod ; and the chief laymen of the city came as usual to express their mind, and assent to the prelates' choice.² There was great difficulty, however, in coming to a conclusion ; for the majority of the Alexandrian Church-people were profoundly aggrieved by the action of the late council. In their eyes Dioscorus was still their rightful "pope," the representative of Cyril and of Athanasius, the victim of a Nestorianising reaction which had enlisted the aid of the East and of the West. The tyranny of a heterodox majority could never annul a spiritual right. Dioscorus lived, and had not resigned his charge ; and therefore the Church which had been "espoused" to him, could not, without the guilt of "adultery," form relations with any new bishop. Ultimately, however, opposition to the imperial mandate was felt to be impracticable : not a few must have been wearied by the despotism, or scandalised by the conduct, of the deposed patriarch. The synod, according to Liberatus, included four Egyptian prelates who had sat in the council, and there, after hearing a statement

¹ Chalced. can. 30.

² Liberatus, Breviar. c. 14.

of Flavian's read, had followed a number of other bishops in passing over from the side where Dioscorus sat, and joining the ranks of the "Orientals."¹ It was resolved to elect; and then "the opinion of all inclined" in favour of Proterius, who might be deemed, in one point of view, the more acceptable, as having held a post under Dioscorus. He was accordingly consecrated and enthroned (A.D. 452); but the passions of the Dioscorian and anti-Dioscorian parties broke out at once into tumultuous dissension, which Evagrius likens to the surging of the sea.² He adds that Priscus the rhetorician, then arriving in Alexandria from the Thebaid, was present at a collision between the populace and the authorities, when the soldiers were called out, were pelted, were driven into the ruinous Serapeum, and there actually burnt to death. Florus, who united the functions of Augustal prefect and commander-in-chief, punished this outrage by cutting off the general dole of bread, closing the baths, stopping the exhibitions, and sending for fresh troops from Constantinople, whose insolent license, however, did but aggravate the excitement, until Florus

¹ Mansi, vi. 681.

² Τῶ δῆμῳ . . . κυμαινομένῳ, Evagr. ii. 5.

found it prudent to meet the people in the hippodrome, and promise to cancel his restrictive measures. Theophanes, who wrote about the end of the eighth century, tells a story which is probably no more than a story, that the people on this occasion threatened to stop the corn-supplies for Constantinople, whereupon Marcian ordered that the Egyptian corn should be exported from Pelusium instead of from Alexandria; and the Alexandrians, being reduced to straits, employed the intercession of Proterius with the emperor.¹ Proterius sent to Leo the usual announcement of his elevation; Leo replied by asking for some definite assurance of his orthodoxy, and received by the hands of Nestorius of Phlagon, one of the four bishops above mentioned, a letter which, as he expressed it, was "fully satisfactory."² Thereupon (in March of 454) he wrote again to Proterius, advising him to clear himself in his people's eyes from all suspicion of Nestorianising, by reading to them certain passages from approved Fathers,³ and then showing that the "tome" did but hand on their tradition, and guard the truth from perversions on either side. Leo took care,

¹ Chronograph. i. 165.

² Epist. 113. 3; 127. 1.

³ He names Athanasius, Theophilus, and Cyril.

in thus addressing the "successor of St. Mark," to dwell on that evangelist's relation to St. Peter as of a disciple to a teacher; and he bespeaks the support of the Alexandrian see in this resistance to the "unprincipled ambition" of Constantinople, which in the twenty-eighth canon, so called, of Chalcedon, had injured the "dignity" of the other great bishoprics.¹ Another question prolonged the correspondence. The Nicene fathers were believed to have commissioned the Alexandrian bishops to ascertain and signify the right time for each coming Easter, "because," says Leo, "skill in such computations appeared to be of old time traditional among the Egyptians." Leo had accordingly consulted Cyril as to the Easter of 444; and he now, in 454, applied to Proterius, through the emperor, for his opinion as to the calculation of the Easter of the next year, 455, which the Alexandrian paschal table appeared to him to place too late.² Proterius, after studying the subject, as he expressed it, in the books of the (Mosaic) "law," and in the writings of "ancient teachers," replied to Leo at some length.³ The paschal cycle of the "blessed

¹ Epist. 129. See above, p. 209.

² *Ib.* 121, 127. Cf. *Dict. Chr. Antiq.* i. 594.

³ Ep. 133, April, 454.

father" Theophilus, representing, as it did, the mind of that Egyptian Church which was confessedly "the mother of such laborious investigations," was demonstrably faultless; and Egypt and the East would, in conformity to it, close the ante-paschal fast¹ in the coming year on Saturday evening, April 23, and keep Sunday, April 24, as Easter Sunday. He added reasons in support of this opinion.²

It was doubtless a relief to him to busy himself in these quiet studies—a distraction of thought from anxieties which must have been deepening day by day. Leontius plainly exaggerates when he says that not a single Alexandrian would communicate with him:³ but undoubtedly great numbers of his flock regarded him as a traitorous hireling, who had climbed up into a fold bereft of its true shepherd. He had troubles within the circle of his clergy; not long after the council, a priest

¹ Cf. Euseb. v. 23. The closing of the fast would be ritually analogous to our "first evensong of Easter."

² In his argument he laid stress on the point that the closing of the fast could never take place on a Sunday evening; therefore, when the 14th of the moon fell on a Sunday, as would be the case, by Alexandrian rules, in 455, the fast must be continued on weekdays until the ensuing Saturday evening. As Hefele remarks, he assumes "that Christ partook of the Passover on Nisan 14" (Councils, i. 329). ³ De Sectis, v. 1.

named Timotheus, and a deacon named Peter, nicknamed Mongus, or "the stammerer," refused to communicate with him, because in his "diptychs" he ignored Dioscorus and commemorated the council of Chalcedon. He summoned them to return to their duty; they refused; he pronounced against them in synod a sentence of deposition.¹ Four or five bishops and a few monks appear to have actively supported them, and to have been included in their condemnation, and in the imperial sentence of exile which followed it.² These bishops were probably among the thirteen whom the Council of Chalcedon had terrified by its severity.³ The monks in Egypt, as elsewhere, were generally attached to the Monophysite position, which they erroneously identified with the Cyrilline; they knew not of, or they could not appreciate, the explanations whereby Cyril had, as he thought, safeguarded the formula of "one φύσις of God the Word, but that as incarnate." They took for granted that the late council had to all intents and purposes been striking at Cyril through Dioscorus; and that what was at

¹ Liberatus, c. 15; Brevic. Hist. Eutyh. or Gesta in causa Acacii, in Mansi, vii. 1062.

² Epist. Ægypt. Episc. ad Leonem Aug. in Mansi, vii. 525.

³ See Mansi, vii. 52.

stake was Christ's single and divine personality, as against the error which had resolved the Incarnation into a signal association between the Word and a pre-eminent saint. Thus, besides those monks who had overtly taken part with Timotheus and Peter, others apparently had suspended communion with the archbishop; and Marcian had found it expedient to address them in gentle and persuasive terms, assuring them that the doctrine of "one Christ," symbolised by the term *Theotocos*, had been held sacrosanct at Chalcedon, and exhorting them therefore to "unite themselves to the Catholic Church of the orthodox, which was one."¹ But the schism, once begun, was not thus to be abated; the zealous seceders raised a cry, which has practically never died out, that the Egyptian adherents of the council of Chalcedon were a mere state-made church, upheld by the Court against the convictions of the faithful. Even to this day the poor remnant of orthodoxy in Egypt is weighted with a name which in that connection is a stigma, "Melchites," or "men of the king."² Even after the death of Dioscorus

¹ Mansi, vii. 481.

² Comp. Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 119; Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* ii. 7. Both add that the orthodox accepted the term. They could not well help themselves. Timotheus Salofaciolus

in exile, Proterius had to see himself ignored and disclaimed, to know that he was the object of a hatred that was biding its time, and "during the greater part of his pontificate," as Liberatus tells us, to depend for personal safety on the presence of a military guard. Thus imperilled and thus protected, "the emperor's bishop" had to live and to do what work he could—often surely with much sickness of heart, and with grave apprehensions as to the future. At last, in the January of 457, Marcian died, and the Monophysites thought they saw their opportunity. Some of the malcontent Egyptian bishops renewed their outcry against the council;¹ and Timotheus, having ventured back to Alexandria, began those intrigues which won for him the title of *Ælurus*, "the Cat." He crept by night into the cells of ignorant monks, and told them that he was "an angel sent to warn them to separate from Proterius, and to chose Timotheus as bishop."² When his plans were matured, he called to his aid a force

himself was nicknamed "*Basilicus*" (Evagr. ii. 11). The term would have much the same significance as "*Erastian*" in the mouth of a Scottish covenanter.

¹ Eulogius, in Photius, *Bibl.* 130, p. 283, ed. Bekk.

² Theodorus, *Lect.* i. 8. Timotheus had himself been a monk

which had for ages been proverbially terrible—the *familiaris furor*¹ of the Alexandrian mob, which had burst forth against the Jews in the days of Philo, had “polluted every street with blood” in the reign of Gallienus,² and by its very unaccountableness had led a pagan historian of the fourth century to refer to some oracular predictions,³ even as in after days it was commonly said that the mere fracture of a vessel might be an occasion for stirring the city to wild tumult.⁴ It so happened that the “dux” Dionysius was absent in Upper Egypt; and Timotheus found it all the easier to gather a disorderly following, and to procure for himself an irregular consecration by two bishops only, who had been just before deposed for joining in his revolt, and had been sentenced to exile. He proceeded to hold ordinations, and do other schismatical acts; but after thus playing the patriarch for a few days, he was expelled on the return of Dionysius. Then his partisans, in revenge,—carrying out, it was said by opponents, his intentions—rushed to the house of

¹ Hist. August. ii. 311.

² Milman, Hist. Jews, ii. 137; Gibbon, i. 414.

³ Ammianus, xxii. 11. 4; cf. ib. 16. 15.

⁴ Evagr. ii. 8: ed. Vales.

Proterius, and after besetting him for some time in the adjacent church of Quirinus, pursued him when he fled into its baptistery, ran him through with a sword, and completed the bloody work with many wounds. Six of his clerics perished with him. The murderers fastened the corpse to a cord, and dragged it in ghastly procession across the central place called Tetrapylon, and then through nearly the whole of the vast city, with hideous cries, "Look at Proterius!" it was beaten as if it could still suffer, torn limb from limb, and finally burnt, and its ashes "scattered to the winds"—a scene of horror which recalls the murder of George the Arian bishop in 361,¹ but is aggravated by the fact that the performers were professing Christians, that the place of the murder was a baptistery (which, say the fourteen Egyptian bishops in their narrative to the emperor Leo, partly quoted by Evagrius, is "awe-striking even to barbarians and savages"), and, to add one circumstance which distinguishes it even from the murder of Hypatia by savage fanatics, that the time was, according to the Egyptian bishops, "the festival (*πανήγυρις*) of the Passover of salvation," which should mean

¹ A similar story was current in Alexandria as to the martyrdom of St. Mark.

Easter-day, although Liberatus and the Breviculus say it was "three days before Easter, the day on which *Cæna Domini celebratur*," i.e. Maundy Thursday. Easter Sunday in the year 457 was March 31st.¹ The biographer of Peter Mongus, as Evagrius tells us, naturally tried to make out that Proterius provoked his death by exciting a disturbance, and that it was inflicted by soldiers, not by the people. St. Proterius is venerated as a martyr in the Greek and Latin Churches, on February 28. Timotheus "the Cat" was now triumphant; he kept possession as a Monophysite patriarch and an open enemy of the Chalcedonian formula until he was ejected by the emperor Leo I. in 460. For sixteen years the Church of Alexandria was at peace under the kindly rule of Timotheus Salofaciolus ("Wearer of the White Cap"),² to whom even the Monophysite majority were wont to say, "Though we do not communicate with thee, yet we love thee."³ Ælurus regained possession in

¹ For authorities, see Ep. Æg. Episc. in Mansi, vii. 525; Leo, Epist. 156. 5; Breviculus Hist. Eutyech. in Mansi, vii. 1062; Liberatus, Brev. c. 15; Evagrius, ii. 8; Theod. Lect. i. 8. See also Le Quien, ii. 413; Neale, Hist. Patr. Alex. ii. 12.

² See Du Fresne, Gloss. Med. et Inf. Græcit. ii. 1659.

³ Liberatus, 16. This gentleness became weakness when he inserted the name of Dioscorus in his diptychs, a step for which he expressed regret to Simplicius of Rome, but which gave

476, by favour of the emperor Basiliscus, but died (it was said, by taking poison) apparently in the autumn of the next year. Salofaciolus, having overcome a movement in favour of Peter Mongus, died in 482. John Talaia, an orthodox priest, was then elected; but intrigues triumphed in his exile, and Peter Mongus was placed in the see by the emperor Zeno, in pursuance of his plan for uniting both parties by the formulary called "Henoticon," which, however, in its natural sense, threw a slur on the Council of Chalcedon. Peter was a timeserving diplomatist, who alternately recognised and rejected the council, thereby provoking the more honest Monophysites to form a separate communion;¹ and the alliance which Acacius of Constantinople² was so ill-advised as to contract with him gave rise to a long schism between the churches of Old and New Rome. Soon after Acacius'

occasion to one of the many blunders of Eutychius, who ranked him with his namesake as a "Jacobite" (Ann. ii. 103).

¹ Hence they were called the "Acephali."

² Acacius, unfortunately, had fancied himself slighted by John Talaia. Pressed by Rome to ascertain distinctly whether Peter did or did not adhere to the council, and disturbed by hearing of Peter's anti-Chalcedonian proceedings, Acacius obtained false assurances from Peter, which he thought it best to accept, and was thereupon excluded from communion with Rome for patronising a heretic.

death, Euphemius, an uncompromising Catholic, became patriarch, and excommunicated Peter for anathematising the council; but the new contest thus imminent was prevented by the death of the clever but worthless "Mongus" in October of 490.¹

¹ Reference has repeatedly been made to the Chalcedonian formula of "one Christ *in* two natures." As it stands in the "Definitio Fidei," it clearly excludes the too popular "Kenoticism," which supposes our Lord, on becoming man, not only to have accepted human limitations, or restrained the exercise of divine prerogatives, within His human sphere of being, but to have (for the period of His humiliation) absolutely surrendered His divine attributes, His divine consciousness, His divine activity, His divine mode of existence,—and therefore, practically, to have *ceased to live as God*.

THE CHURCH AND THE "BAR- BARIAN" INVADERS.

WE are sometimes apt to judge with too absolute a severity the practical concessions made by the Church of Patristic days, within her own sphere of action, to the newly Christianised, or rather, perhaps, the half-Christianised, Imperial power. It was certainly unseemly that Eusebius should write as he sometimes does write of Constantine; and that a sovereign who had not even applied for baptism should exhort bishops, and argue about doctrines, in the first General Council, was, to say the least, anomalous. It was worse that, in the East, traditions of obsequious courtiership should infect the Church's current phrasology; that in the West, as well as in the East, some great Churchmen, though happily not all, should forsake the principle laid down by St. Athanasius, and welcome the aid of penal legislation against heresy.

Precedents thus formed were, as we know too well, prolific in scandals that have not yet exhausted their effect; the Church of France is at this moment suffering from her former too close alliance with a despotism that professed to emulate the zeal of Catholic Cæsars.¹ It must not, indeed, be forgotten that the bold protests of four Western bishops which astounded the Arian tyrant Constantius,² and the stringent rebuke addressed by St. Ambrose to Theodosius as, in the Church's eyes, "a man"³ who, like other men, had sinned and must repent,—were specimens of a counter-influence that could check the excesses of Cæsarism: but still, on the whole, we must think that Church-leaders in those old times, as in times nearer to our own, were not sufficiently "apprehensive" of the secular power when it "brought them gifts." Yet there is allowance to be made: it must have been a dazzling, unsettling experience to deal with

¹ See Hassall's "Louis XIV.," p. 288. Nor can we in England forget how injuriously our own Church was compromised in the seventeenth century by her association with "government by prerogative," and with what bishop Andrewes had in mind when he prayed against *τῆς ἀποθειώσεως τῶν βασιλέων* (Greek Devotions, ed. Medd, p. 151).

² S. Athan. Hist. Ari. 76. Cp. ib. 44.

³ S. Ambros. Ep. 51. 11. See above, p. 241.

an Augustus who proclaimed himself a Christian; and, after that first surprise was spent, it might well seem to thoughtful Christians that a close bond between the Church and the Cæsar was the best guarantee for social order, and therein for "godly quietness." Might not the Empire, by becoming Christianised, renew its youth, and gather up its forces to resist the frontier-foes that for centuries had been threatening its very life? Had it not been, even in its Pagan days—even amid its moods of persecuting cruelty—that very "restraining power" which, according to St. Paul, was to keep off worse evils until their appointed "season"?¹ and was it not at least probable that its baptism would vitalise it afresh, and that, by its alliance with the kingdom not of this world, it might be invigorated for a prolonged career of service alike to religion and to society?

To such hopes, it would seem, Churchmen gravely anxious about the future of the world, as they knew it, would cling tenaciously—while they could. The fear of the barbarians had often been a paralysing terror. As far

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 7. See Tertullian, *Apol.* 32, with note in *Transl. Lib. Fath.*

back as the days of Marcus Aurelius, "the northern frontier," in Merivale's vivid language, had been "skirted by a fringe of fire," while "through the lurid glare loomed the wrathful faces of myriads, Germans, Scythians, Sarmatians, all armed for the onslaught in sympathy or concert."¹ The policy of "buying them off," of trying to "divide," and, if not to "govern," yet to avoid blows, had alternated with defensive campaigns, as emperors were vigorous or feeble. In the early part of the third century the Goths, as Gibbon expresses it, "migrated from the Baltic to the Euxine;" they tasked the energies, and triumphed in the death, of one of the most vigorous of the Cæsars, whose name is associated with a terrible persecution of Christianity: the confederacy which "deserved, assumed, and maintained the honourable epithet of Franks, or Freeman," swept like a storm through Gaul and Spain into Africa: another miscellaneous host, which had taken the name of Alemanni, gave Italy a foreshadowing of future humiliation, but was ultimately and decisively beaten back. It was reserved for a prince whose

¹ Hist. Rom. viii. 360. Cp. Capitolinus, in Hist. Aug. i. 339, "Tantus autem terror belli Marcomannici fuit," that Marcus had recourse even at Rome to "foreign rites."

epitaph truly described him as "Probus imperator, et vere probus," to drive out the German invaders of Gaul, and not indeed to conquer, but to fence them off by a wall stretching from the Rhine to the Danube.¹ But the perils became intensified in the fourth century: Julian's campaigns could only "suspend for a short time the inroads of the barbarians;" Valentinian I. had to put forth all his energy in securing Gaul against the Alemanni, and actually died in a fit of passion excited by the inroads of the Quadi; and the relations of his incapable brother Valens with the Goths had ended in a second Cannæ at Hadrianople. And if a Gothic king, after enjoying the hospitality of Theodosius, could liken him to "a god upon earth,"² the Goths whom his policy settled within the empire were at best but dubious "allies," whom any fierce impulse might turn into enemies.³ The fifth century opens with the Visigoths' invasion of Italy;⁴ and it must have been a day of dark forebodings at Milan when a Roman

¹ See Gibbon, i. 379-393: ii. 44-46.

² Athanaric, who died at Constantinople in January, 381.

³ Gibbon, iii. 352 ff. See Socrates, vi. 6, for the revolt of Gainas. Compare Arbogast in the West.

⁴ The alarm caused is discernible through Claudian's premature exultation over the repulse of the barbarians by Stilicho, *De Bell. Get.* 568 ff., 637.

emperor, "distinguished," says Gibbon, "above his subjects by the pre-eminence of fear as well as of rank,"¹ resolved on securing himself behind the marshes of Ravenna,—a day of yet intenser alarm when a wilder chief, "most savage of all Rome's foes,"² gave Roman Pagans an occasion for saying that the Christian ascendancy had brought on them the peril of his approach.³ Pass a few years, and an event occurs which is one of the cataclysms of history—Alaric takes Rome; and Jerome, on hearing of this disaster, recurs to a psalm of the Captivity for language apt to describe it.⁴ What was

¹ See Gibbon, iv. 33. Procopius "thinks he would have been" content if people (*τις*) would have allowed him to be quiet in his palace;" De Bell. Vand. i. 2.

² "Rhadagaisus, omnium antiquorum præsentiumque hostium longe immanissimus. . . . Fervent tota urbe blasphemiarum; vulgo nomen Christi, tanquam lues aliqua, præsentium temporum opprobriis gravatur." Orosius, vii. 37.

³ That Rome was long a seat of residuary paganism appears in the persistence of the unseemly Lupercalian festival until the pontificate of Gelasius (492-496).

⁴ "Hæret vox," writes Jerome, "et singultus intercipiunt verba dictantis. *Capitur Urbs quæ totum cepit orbem.*" Ep. 127. 12. Then, after quoting from Isa. xv. 1 about the "taking of Moab in a night," he breaks forth into the first verses of "Deus, venerunt," and adds the "Quis cladem illius noctis" of the "second Æneid." He must, indeed, have been in some degree expectant of this catastrophe: for sixteen years before, Ep. 60. 16, he had recited a list of barbarian invaders as devastating Scythia, Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, Dacia,

its chief significance? That the *prestige* of Rome was ruined; and that thereupon the hopes of those who had dreamed of a consolidated and perpetuated empire, a "holy Roman" State, faithful to Christianity, and in turn reinforced by it, victoriously repelling barbarians, and guarding the treasures of a Christianised civilisation,—gave way in dismal collapse.

Thessaly, Achaia, Epirus, Dalmatia, etc.—slaughtering clergy, destroying churches, "stabling their horses *ad altaria Christi*:" and had written again in 409, that all between the ocean and the Rhine had been devastated by "Quadus, Wandalus, Sarmata, Halani, Gipedes, Heruli, Saxones, Burgundiones, Alemani, . . . Pannonii;" at Mentz "thousands have been butchered in the church . . . and Spain is trembling on the verge of ruin." "Cætera taceo, ne videar de Dei desperare clementia," etc. Ep. 123. 16. St. Augustine endeavoured in a discourse, "De Urbis Excidio," to allay the intensity of a shock by which some Christians' faith might be disturbed: "Were there not," people asked, "fifty righteous men in Rome?" He answered that, in this great catastrophe, God's mercy had been more conspicuous than His wrath: and he began his great work "On the City of God" with the intention of confuting those Pagans who, in the usual Pagan fashion, attributed the humiliation of the empire to its abandonment of the old worship, or, as he expresses it, "imputed to Christ what that earthly *civitas* had suffered." The barbarians, he observed, were, after all, Christians, and "for Christ's sake they had spared many Romans who were hostile to His name." "Testantur hoc martyrum loca et basilicæ apostolorum, que in illa vastatione urbis ad se confugientes suos *alienosque* receperunt," etc. De Civ. Dei, i. 1.

It was, indeed, most natural that a crisis so unparalleled and so tremendous should be spoken of under the forms of Old Testament imagery. It must have been in truth a "day of the Lord," "a day of darkness and gloominess, of clouds and of thick darkness," bringing with it the onward rush of "a great people and a strong." "The Lord was" visibly "making the earth waste, and turning it upside down, and causing its haughty people to languish, and shaking its old foundations, and dissolving" its once coherent strength: its "inhabitants were fleeing from the noise of the fear to fall into the pit," or "coming up out of the pit to be taken in the snare." So, to refer again to Jerome, whose work of commenting on Ezekiel had been deferred until he could somewhat recover from the shock of the awful news,—it was felt, at the moment, that "in that one city the whole world was ruined:"¹ the phrase has a significance, a breadth of application, beyond anything that Jerome, when he

¹ "Ita consternatus obstupui, ut nihil aliud diebus ac noctibus nisi de salute omnium cogitarem. . . . In una urbe totus orbis interiit" (in *Ezech.* l. I. præf.). Further on he says that he is interrupted by the arrival of Western fugitives, whose wounds and destitution are tokens of the "rabies barbarorum" (l. 7. præf.), and alludes to St. Ambrose's comment (*De Fide*, ii. 138) on *Ezek.* xxxviii. 14: "Gog iste Gothus est" (l. II. præf.).

thus wrote, was likely to realise. By degrees it would become manifest that the social system in the West was too far gone in corruption and moral decadence to be capable of purification and healthful self-recovery.¹ Again one recurs to the prophet's phrases: "The whole head was sick, and the whole heart faint." Salvian of Marseilles² is a writer whose burning zeal for righteousness, purity, and Christian consistency, may here and there lead him to exaggerate the net-result of shameful facts, and to paint in too hideous colours the moral condition of Christian provincial life during the first half of the fifth century. His "noble book," as Kingsley calls it,³ "On the Government of God," takes its title from the argument with which it opens, and which runs through the first two parts. The devastations, the miseries, the terrors of the time had driven

¹ "The corruption of Rome's great cities," says Dr. Hodgkin, "showed in all its hideousness the degradation which might be achieved by a civilisation without morality and without God." Italy and her Invaders, i. 521.

² His "De Gubernatione Dei" was published, says Gibbon, "after the loss of Africa, and before Attila's war" (iv. 252). So Tillemont, dating it about 440. This truly estimable man lived to be called a "teacher of bishops," and died about the end of the fifth century (Gennadius, de Script. Eccl. lxxvii). Tillemont says he always merited the title of Saint recently given him by a French martyrologist (xvi. 181).

³ The Roman and the Teuton, p. 34.

many professing Christians—who, as he says, had "somewhat of Pagan unbelief" hanging about them—into a despairing scepticism as to an observant and governing Providence; "incuriosus a quibusdam Deus dicitur." It was a trouble analogous to that which, in Cyprian's days, had made some men's faith quiver amid the horrors of a pestilence,—to that which, long afterwards, in our own King Stephen's reign, made the victims of Norman tyranny complain that "Christ and all His Saints were asleep,"—to all those piercing trials of faith under which "the cry goes up, How long?" Why does God allow such things? Could they go on if He cared about men, if He had not "forsaken the earth"? Salvian will not "pry into the secrets of the Divine counsels;" but, premising that he is arguing with a Christian, he exposes the hollowness of the popular profession of Christianity. All classes, according to him, are infected by an epidemic of vice: to have the disease in a milder form is, "in a sort of way, a kind of sanctity." The province of Africa is a volcano of sensuality, a reservoir of all the vices.¹ At Carthage, in particular, men in high position alternately "ascend the sanctuary of Christ" and

¹ De Gub. Dei, iii. 9; vii. 13, 15-17. He calls Carthage a city "omnium iniquitatum genere *ferventem*."

do homage to the goddess Cœlestis ; while the lower classes cannot see a monk in the streets without cursing and howling at him.¹ Everywhere in the West the rich oppress the poor ;² the town councillors, or "curiales," are tyrants ;³ the exaction of civic dues and the tenure of high provincial offices are turned into a means of self-enrichment.⁴ Many whose position is thus made intolerable take shelter among the "barbarians."⁵ The old passion for circus games and demoralising theatrical exhibitions is not chastened by any amount of public calamities :⁶ at Treves, for instance, the ancient "home of emperors,"—four times already captured by

¹ De Gub. Dei, viii. 2, 4. St. Augustine, as a young man, had seen the foul rites in honour of this African "queen of heaven" (De Civ. Dei, ii. 4). A monk was known by his pale face, his "pallium" or cloak, and his close-cropped hair.

² De Gub. iv. 6, v. 7: they throw on the poor the burden of "tributa" which they ought to bear; and see the anecdote in iv. 15, of a pitiless "man in power."

³ Ib. v. 4; iii. 10. They were tyrants because they were also victims. (Cf. Hodgkin, Italy and her Invaders, ii. 604 ff.)

⁴ Ib. v. 4, "Exactio publica peculiaris est præda;" cf. iii. 10 on "rapina," and iv. 4, "Quid aliud quorumdam quos taceo prefectura quam præda?"

⁵ Ib. v. 5. The name of Roman citizen, he adds, "nunc ultro repudiatur ac fugitur" (cp. v. 8). So Orosius, viii. 41, "Qui malunt inter barbaros pauperem libertatem," etc., and Sidonius Apollinaris, Ep. v. 7, contrasting a class of informers with "the more merciful barbarians."

⁶ De. Gub. Dei, vi. 12.

barbarians,—Salvian had seen frivolity and revelry as rampant as ever among "elderly" Christians of high rank;¹ "after devastation, bloodshed, overthrow, amid the ashes and blood of slaughtered victims, the people still demanded their amusements;" and at one city, only second to Treves, "the chief men did not even rise from their banquet when the invaders were actually within the gates."² Was the Church guiltless? Alas, "the Lord's priests" too often did not dare to stand up in defence of the oppressed: they were silent, or as good as silent—and that systematically, in order to avoid a collision with the oppressors.³ He emphasises the failure of suffering to amend populations which had lost all moral fibre:⁴ when repeatedly "stricken," they had "refused to receive correction;" they

¹ De Gub. Dei, vi. 8, 13, 15. In vii. 2 ff. he describes South Gaul as 'singularly favoured by the gifts of God's natural providence, and yet profoundly corrupted by vice.

² Ib. vi. 13.

³ Ib. v. 5: "Aut tacent. . . aut similes sunt tacentibus." He even says (Ib. iii. 9) that the Church, which ought to be "placatrix Dei," had become "exacerbatrix." So, v. 10: "Sub specie religionis vitiis sæcularibus mancipati. . . Vestem tantummodo exuere,—non mentem." Penitents by profession, he adds, lived so as to make that profession a thing to be repented of. They abstained from some things lawful, but indulged in what was unlawful (*e.g.* in "rapine").

⁴ Ib. vi. 12, 16; vii. 12.

ran into yet wilder excess of riot, because their hold on property or life was so insecure ; or they turned fiercely against religion itself, and called God "negligent," or "hard" and "unmerciful," because of the very woes which they had deserved.¹

It is clear enough from such evidence that society was wholly disorganised ; Salvian makes a great point of the bitter hatreds and deep-seated mistrusts² which had cut straight to the heart of its unity. And if the disease was so manifold and so deadly, how appalling was the prospect of more and more inflictions coming thick and fast from without on the sick man ! The Vandal conquerors of Spain and Africa were not among the bravest of barbarian races,³ but they were among the cruellest. If we can trust traditionary evidence, they took a savage pleasure in torturing bishops and priests in order

¹ De Gub. Dei, iv. 8, 11: "Quædam paganica . . . et in ecclesiis Dei ante non visa ;" *i.e.* blasphemies against God.

² Ib. v. 4: "Quis enim civis non invidet civi?" All classes come in turn under his censure, including the "negotiores" (iv. 14), and the "officiales" and "militantes" (iii. 10). Very few "nobiles" or "divites" keep clear of crime ; some who abhor it in others practise it themselves. "We see hardly any corner of all the churches that is not full *omni letalium peccatorum labe*" (iii. 11). The malignity of "informers" had enough to work upon.

³ Ib. vii. 7 ; cf. Hodgkin, ii. 236.

to extort from them church treasures ; and Victor of Vita gives some horrible details to this effect.¹ One instance will suffice as a specimen, — a venerable prelate "was burned all over his body with plates of red-hot iron." And one may imagine that the faithful of Hippo would take some comfort in knowing that Augustine had been released from life before the city fell into Vandal hands. Perhaps we may reasonably deduct not a little from the tales of horror which had had sixty years to grow :² but, anyhow, Gaiseric was hard-hearted by nature, and, as an Arian, intolerant towards the conquered Catholics ; even if he did not carry out a systematic persecution,³ he is at least responsible for much intermittent severity, which would often, under the provocation of Catholic constancy,

¹ Vict. Vit. de Persec. Vandal. i. 2, 3.

² The date of Victor's writing (i. 1) was A.D. 487.

³ On this, see Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, ii. 281. Even Victor gives with a "fertur" the story of his saying to some Catholic priests who, having lost churches and property, asked merely for leave to live in their old homes, "I have determined to leave not one of your name and race," and of his having to be persuaded not to drown them (i. 5). But that he was cruel is undoubted, says Hodgkin (ii. 245) ; and cf. *ib.* iii. 489, "While the barbarian Gaiseric and his son (Hunneric) plunge with blind zeal into the theological fray, cut out the tongues and rack the limbs of Catholic bishops," etc.

be carried to inhuman lengths.¹ Other barbaric races would exhibit evil qualities which inspired repugnance, distrust, or dread:² the Alans were intemperate and rapacious; the Goths and Franks were faithless, the Gepidæ³ inhuman, the Huns brutal in their animalism, and the Saxons (a point worth remembering) "ferocious in cruelty,"—it is Salvian's own phrase: from Sidonius Apollinaris, his junior contemporary,⁴ we learn that this race, in which we are so much interested, was peculiarly truculent,—he speaks of its pirates as in later days men spoke of the buccaneers, and tells us that they deemed it "a part of their religion to torture a captive rather than to put a price on his life." Had he written some twelve years later, Salvian would have doubtless dwelt on the devouring fury of the Hunnish invasion,

¹ Compare Sidonius Apollinaris, Ep. vii. 6, on the persecution of Catholics by the Visigoth king of Toulouse, Euric, who forbade Catholic sees to be filled up. Churches were in ruins, cattle browsed on the "altarium latera," the paths to the basilicæ were obstructed by thorns, and even in towns congregations were becoming thin; there was a danger of failure in the succession of priests, etc.

² De Gub. Dei, iv. 14; vii. 15.

³ They came from the south of Dacia. They were crushed by Alboin the Lombard.

⁴ Ep. viii. 6. For him see Hodgkin, ii. 298 ff.; Travers Smith, *The Church in Roman Gaul*, p. 366 ff.

when the clergy of Metz were massacred on Easter Eve,—when the bishop of Rheims was hewn down before his own altar,—when the bishop of Orleans, according to the noble story so well told by Gregory of Tours, upheld the trembling faith of the besieged people until the combined forces of Romans and Visigoths brought, just in time, "the aid of the Lord."¹ But it is fair to say, with Dr. Hodgkin, that Attila was warring "on civilisation, not on religion, for he did not understand it enough to hate it."

Such were the grounds of serious alarm when the Church looked the problem in the face—what should be done, what could be done, with the barbarians? Less grave, yet still embarrassing, was the fact on which Kingsley liked to dwell²—the combination, in many, of huge strength with boyishness of character. They were like the children of Anak ("giants seven foot high," says Sidonius of the Burgundians³),

¹ The graphic touch of the "rising up of something like a mist," after a "third prayer" (Greg. Turon. ii. 7), may have been an imaginary addition. But St. Anianus was anyhow "the hero of Orleans" (Hodgkin, ii. 133).

² The Roman and the Teuton, p. 6; and the opening of "Hypatia."

³ *Septipedes*: Sidonius, Carm. 12. He describes them as "gigantes," with greased hair, and smelling of onions, etc. See

physically over-developed, mentally—if not as a rule, yet often enough—untrained, unaccustomed to think or forecast, living for the day, passing—like the Maltese of St. Paul's time—with childish rapidity from one mood to the opposite. You might take them on the right side, and might impress them for the moment ; and yet the slightest cause, a casual irritation, a passing cloud of suspicion, might undo all that had been said. It was a questionable enterprise at the best, this of gaining influence over a “barbarian ;” it might be a forlorn hope, it might be a matter of extreme peril.¹ And yet the task was set before the Church ; something must be done with the rough wild people that could exhibit such formidable strength, against which “Roman” culture had often been found so helpless. They could not be left to rage and devastate ; they must somehow be got hold

a humorous translation by Hodgkin, ii. 362. Sidonius describes Frankish chiefs as yellow-haired, their legs mostly bare, their feet in ox-leather boots, their bodies in tight-fitting coloured tunics : lances in their right hands, shields on the left side, big swords hung in baldrics from the shoulder (Ep. iv. 20). Procopius says that all the barbarians were fair, yellow-haired, tall, and with good countenances (De Bell. Vand. i. 2). Cf. Claudian, De Bell. Get. 419: “flavis . . . Sicambris.”

¹ Martyrdoms were not infrequent : see the cases of the Black and Fair Ewalds (Bede, v. 10), and of St. Boniface.

of. The aversion which an educated provincial ecclesiastic would feel for what he might think rude animal force, the fastidiousness with which he would recoil from the harsh or ugly features of a "barbaric" presence and its surroundings, the well-founded apprehension which tales of ravaged districts, captured towns, slaughtered clergy, profaned altars, would arouse in his breast,—all these *must* be surmounted, if he and his order were to be true to their high calling. And there were among them men capable of confronting new conditions of service, of accepting unfamiliar and distracting responsibilities ; men who appreciated the honour of such a mission, men capable of taking their lives in their hand, and going forth not knowing whither they went, because they represented the kingdom of the Redeemer of all nations, and could believe that He "had much people" in races to which the future seemed to belong.¹ Or even without converting the invader, they might impress him to some good effect, as when Attila and Gaiseric listened to St. Leo, or when Attila made Lupus of Troyes his fellow-traveller as far as to the Rhine. The work of St. Severinus, in

¹ "It was time for the Teutonic nations to rejuvenate the world" (Italy and her Invaders, ii. 546).

a district which now forms part of Austria, illustrates the moral fascination which a thoroughly brave and single-minded priest could exercise over "barbarians,"¹ with the result of considerably mitigating the sufferings of provincials exposed to incursions² of this or that horde from the further north: and although he would never say from what country he came, Dr. Hodgkin³ thinks that when he bestowed a sort of benediction on a tall "young soldier of fortune," in poor clothing; whose name was Odovakar, or Odoacer,⁴ it was an instance in which a Latin recognised the intrinsic greatness,

¹ "He preached, he taught, he succoured, he advised, he fed, he governed: he turned aside the raids of the wild German kings" (Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton*, p. 188). His own words, as reported by his biographer Eugippius, may summarise his career, "Deus ipse me periclitantibus his hominibus interesse præcepit." He appeared amid the break-up of Attila's kingdom (c. 455). He died Jan. 8, 482, with the last words of Ps. 150 on his lips; Eugipp. Vit. S. Sever. c. 43. The king of the Rugians "consulted him as an oracle;" the king of the Alemanni said that he had "never in battle trembled so much" as in his presence.

² Sidonius introduced "Rogations," or processional litanies, after the example of Mamertus, by way of securing Auvergne from Gothic inroads (Ep. vii. 1).

³ Italy and her Invaders, ii. 527; cf. iii. 173, 185, on the life of Severinus.

⁴ His head touched the low roof of Severinus' cell; so the "Anonymus Valesii" ap. Ammian. Marcellin. tom. i. p. 617, and Eugippius, Vit. S. Sever. c. 7.

and, according to the story, predicted the future pre-eminence, of a man of Teuton blood. Another saint who did much to prevent war between the Empire and the "barbarian,"¹ whose pacific exhortations were received favourably by a warlike Visigoth king in southern Gaul,—who obtained from two rival princes in Italy, and from two Burgundian kings² at Lyons and Geneva, the release of captured enemies,—who bowed the hearts of even the ferocious Rugians,—whose moral charm could win from the great Ostrogoth king of Italy an amnesty for a defeated party and a remission of taxes for his over-burdened flock,—deserves to be held in honour as one of the most beautiful characters of his time: it is Epiphanius, bishop of Pavia.³

¹ See Ennodius, *Life of Epiphanius*, in *Sirmond*, Op. i. 1002 ff., for his success in mediating between Ricimer the "Patrician" and the Western emperor Anthemius, and in averting Euric's designs against Nepos. Cf. *Hodgkin*, ii. 480, 502.

² One of these was Gundobad, before whom was held the ineffective "*Collatio Episcoporum*," at Lyons, in 499. He was not persuaded to become a Catholic, but he begged Avitus, bishop of Vienne, to pray for him. (The Arians had charged the Catholics with Tritheism.) *Galland. Bibl. Patr.* x. 794. Epiphanius, on his embassy to Gundobad, had to cross the Alps in winter, and face the "deadly cold."

³ For "his sweet and pure figure," see *Hodgkin*, ii. 480; ep. iii. 220, "the transparent beauty and holiness of his character."

He is perhaps the best specimen of a class of prelates whose surroundings in that age forced them to the front as informal "tribunes of the people," as the Roman see gained in power by standing up like "a rock amid the floods," and gathering distressed populations under its shelter.¹

It is true that these men were not in the proper sense missionaries; but by thinking of the difficulties, and even the dangers, which they had to prepare for and confront, we may form some estimate of the task undertaken by those who endeavoured to convert some of the invaders from heathenism, or to commend to others the Catholic form of Christianity. In some respects the latter undertaking was more arduous than the former: a Vandal conqueror of Africa would be apt to associate the Nicene doctrine with a tottering "Roman" empire and a morally enfeebled and debased civilisation; a Goth might look to the rock from whence his fathers' Christianity was hewn, and deem it a point of

He died in 497, æt. 58. For Theodoric's relations with St. Cæsarius, see Hodgkin, iii. 403.

¹ Sometimes the people would deprecate the appointment of an ascetic to a bishopric, because he would not have weight with secular officials (Sidonius, Ep. vii. 9).

honour to adhere to the faith of Ulfilas.¹ If the Arians sometimes adopted a "liberal" tone, and professed "not to insult the belief" of the Catholics;² if Theodoric "made no attempts against the Catholic religion;"³ if even Euric could listen to a Catholic counsellor, and liberate an imprisoned bishop;⁴ if an Arian synod under the Spanish king Leovigild declined to rebaptise "those who came from the Roman religion *ad nostram catholicam fidem*,"⁵ and only required them to accept Arian confirmation, and to use the Arian doxology;⁶ if the heresy of the savage Lombards, who broke into Italy, and whose name Gregory the Great so frequently associates

¹ References to the contest with barbaric Arianism will be found in C. of Agde, 60; Epaon, 29; 1 Orleans, 10; 2 Saragossa, 1; Reims, 4.

² Greg. Turon. Hist. Fr. v. 44.

³ The "Anonymus Valesii," cp. Ammian. Marcell. i. 620. See Hodgkin, iii. 489, "Even orthodox bishops loudly praised his fairness," etc.; and Oman, Europ. Hist. 476-918, p. 21.

⁴ Sidon. Ep. viii. 3. Tillemont says that "God preserved Leo in this barbaric and Arian court for the consolation of His servants" (xvi. 256).

⁵ Mansi, ix. 941. Salvian says that the Arian barbarians deem themselves to be Catholics, and brand us with the name of "heretics" (De Gub. Dei, v. 2). So Sidonius says that Euric the Visigoth believed his successes to be rewards "pro religione legitima" (Ep. vii. 6).

⁶ "Gloriam Patri *per* Filium *in* Spiritu Sancto dare."

with "swords,"¹ was "not of a militant type, like" that "of the Vandals;"² yet the old persecuting spirit, which had clung to Arianism in the days of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, blazed out repeatedly in savagery like that of an old Visigoth queen towards her own granddaughter who refused to abandon the faith of the "Co-equal Trinity,"³ and in prolonged and systematic cruelties such as those which were inaugurated in Africa by Hunneric's edict against the "Homoousians," and carried out until "not a house nor place was left" unvisited by "torturers."⁴ On such exhibitions of Arian temper it is not to our purpose to dwell; we may leave them with the remark that they help us to appreciate the significance, for European

¹ *E.g.* Ep. v. 40: "Quæ inter Langobardorum gladios hoc in loco patior;" and Ep. vi. 60.

² Hodgkin, v. 158.

³ Greg. Turon. v. 39. The sufferer was Ingunthis, a girl of sixteen, the daughter of Brunichild and the bride of Hermenigild, whom she converted. But Hermenigild did little credit to Catholicism by his rebellion against his father.

⁴ Vict. Vit. iv. 2; v. 1. In this edict he appeals to the authority of the council of Ariminum. "He became," says Procopius, "the most ruthless and unjust of all men to the Christians (Catholics) in Libya" (i. 8). Gibbon says that he "tormented the Catholics with unrelenting fury," etc. (iv. 329). But their bishops told the Arian bishop Cyrila that *he* had "kindled this conflagration" (Vict. Vit. ii. 18).

history, of Clovis'¹ baptism as a Catholic in 496, of Recared's success in establishing Catholicism by a national Spanish synod in 589, and of "the final conversion of the Lombards of Italy before the end of the seventh century."²

But our interest lies in the problem presented to Western Churchmen by the heathenism of Northern invaders.³ Christianity had to be brought to bear upon them: what points of contact could it find? to what elements in their character could it most hopefully appeal? how far, in a word, had they been prepared to receive it? They were the reverse of a downtrodden and sorrow-stricken people, to whom it could offer the strong consolations

¹ This softened form of the original Chlodovech, Clodwig, or Hlodowig, has become still more historic and familiar in "Louis."

² Gibbon, iv. 341. So was completed the work begun by the Catholic queen Theudelinda. The Suevi, who had been so powerful in Spain about the middle of the fifth century, gave up their Arianism about the middle of the sixth. The Burgundians had become at once Christians and Catholics about 413; see Orosius, vii. 32 (Socrates' account, vii. 30, is a romance). But they seem to have lapsed into Arianism, though one of their kings had married a Catholic wife, and his daughter Chrotechildis was the Catholic wife of Clovis. Burgundy was conquered by Frankish kings in 534. To us this old realm in south-east France is interesting for the sake of St. Felix, the first bishop of East Anglia. Cf. Bede, ii. 15.

³ The Heruli were never converted (Hodgkin, v. 106).

which carry sufferers through seasons of affliction, and bring them out into a wealthy place. They were in the high tide, the splendid bloom and flush, of a success which might well intoxicate young conquerors.¹ It would be natural that they should exhibit that pride of strength which the Greeks of old called *ὑβρις*—should resemble “the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation,”² whom the prophet depicts as “coming all for violence,” with “faces set eagerly as the east wind,”—should trample down every obstacle which a strange religion might set in their path, and be all the more infuriated by any attempt to control them in its name. And yet, as eminent writers have shown, there were in the Teuton or German race certain “rude primitive elements” of character, which might give some response to Christianity when it addressed them. The historian of “the Romans under the Empire” observes³ that even in the “few pages” bestowed on their nationality by Latin observers “they have already acquired a deep reverential sense of spiritual things; a profound respect for the

¹ Cf. Dean Church, *Gifts of Civilisation*, etc., p. 315.

² Hab. i. 6, ff., R.V.

³ Merivale, *Conversion of Northern Nations*, p. 88.

voice of God speaking with authority through human organs; a sense of Divine government and providence; a conscience active and inquisitive; suspicion, at least, of sinfulness; apprehension of punishment; longing for forgiveness; a passion for sacrifice and atonement, . . ." a "spiritual conception of Deity, a sense of responsibility in regard to human life," a "fine appreciation of the worth of the female character," and a "belief in an immortality" hereafter. To the last but one of these qualities Salvian alludes, when he tersely describes the Saxons as "wildly cruel, but wonderfully chaste,"¹ even as he notes the same combination in those Vandals who, on becoming masters of Carthage, turned away with austere scorn from the ubiquitous seductions of its profligacy.² "The Teutons," says Dr. Hodgkin,³ "when they descended upon the

¹ De Gub. Dei, vii. 15.

² Ib. vii. 20, 21.

³ Italy and her Invaders, i. 521. Cf. Gibbon, i. 363; and Döllinger's *Gentile and Jew*, E.T., i. 61. The "great distinction of the Germans was the sacredness of marriage, and the consequent consideration and respect for women." He refers to Tacitus, *Germ.* 18: "Prope soli barbarorum singulis uxoribus contenti sunt." Ib. 19: "Sæptæ pudicitia agunt . . . paucissima in tam numerosa gente adulteria. . . . Nemo illic vitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrumpi 'sæculum' vocatur."

dying empire, still preserved" what Greeks and Romans had lost, "that precious inheritance" from their Aryan forefathers, the idea "of a strong and pure morality which guarded the sanctity of the home."¹

Here, assuredly, was something to work upon. And what was the nature of the required work? Let us listen to one whose steady and luminous judgment makes him a sure guide over all kinds of ground, theological, moral, historical. With Teutons, says Dean Church, "the business of Christianity and the Church is not so much to comfort as to tame, . . . to lay hold on fresh and impetuous natures, to turn them from the first in the right direction, to control and regenerate noble instincts, to humble pride, to curb luxuriant and self-reliant strength, to train and educate and apply to high

¹ A splendid instance of this is the persistence of the noble Ostrogothic king Totila (properly, Baduila) in the infliction of capital punishment on one of his own bodyguards, a valuable soldier, who had outraged a Calabrian maiden. So, after he had taken Rome, his kindness protected every woman from insult, and he "gained great honour ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη" (Procopius, *Bell. Goth.* iii. 8, 20). "Baduila . . . showed a moral elevation, a single-hearted purity of purpose, a chivalrous courtesy, justice, and piety, worthy of the best of the knights of the Middle Ages" (Oman, *Europ. Hist.* 476-718, p. 97). Yet in him, too, the "barbaric" cruelty could flash out—in one case, towards a bishop who had given him false information (*Hodgkin*, iv. 526).

ends the force of powerful wills and masculine characters." It was a *disciplinary* function which the Church had thus to exercise, often considerately, "sometimes over-indulgently, always resolutely;" and that innate respect for lawful authority which lifted the Teuton "barbarian" so high above the level of the savage was called forth by his becoming unexpectedly acquainted with the spiritual kingdom which pervaded all "Roman" lands, and bore itself as distinct from and superior to all worldly powers. There it was, that "strange organised polity," with its officials and its mysterious rites,—"defenceless in the midst of never-ceasing war, yet inspiring reverence, ruling by the word of conviction and knowledge and persuasion, arresting and startling the new conquerors with the message of another world."¹ Or—to quote from those remarkable Bampton Lectures which, some fifty-three years ago, awakened in Oxford an interest in the subject of Missions—"the means adopted for the conversion and civilisation of the Germanic tribes were . . . such as peculiarly to set forth the social life of Christians controlled by an unseen spiritual Power, by which the rude

¹ Cf. *Gifts of Civilisation*, pp. 309, 317.

warriors were most likely to be attracted, since it exhibited what they most needed.”¹ Thus it was that, in many cases, the work of missions was carried on from monastic centres² which could exhibit the presence of the new Kingdom in concrete form and with concentrated energy; and herein also lay the opportuneness of the Church’s stately ritual, as being exactly calculated to impress and overawe the warriors and chiefs to whom it came as a surprise. Remigius understood this, when he prepared his church for the baptism of Clovis³ with embroidered curtains and lighted tapers and fragrant fume of “balsam;” when, speaking in the name of an unseen King, he addressed the convert simply as a “Sicambrian,”⁴ and bade him “gently bend his head.”

¹ Grant, *Bamp. Lect.* p. 121.

² Such as those founded by Boniface, and entrusted to men like Gregory of Utrecht and Sturmi of Fulda. A “parochial system” was, of course, impossible in the infancy of these Teutonic churches: it was not established in England during Bede’s lifetime, although some approach was made to it in the churches with priests and deacons settled in certain parts of the East Saxon kingdom, which Lord Selborne considers analogous to the central churches called “baptismal:” see *Ancient Facts and Fictions*, etc., pp. 55-61, 121.

³ *Greg. Turon.* ii. 31.

⁴ A rhetorical expression; Sicambrians were supposed to have become united with the Franks. Gregory adds that Remigius was “*rhetoricis apprime imbutus studiis.*”

Our own St. Augustine understood it quite as well, when, a hundred and one years later, he approached Ethelbert¹ in the "isle of Thanet" at the head of a reverend procession of monks, with chanted litany and high-raised silver cross, and "the likeness of our Lord and Saviour painted on a board." Ethelbert, indeed, was of different stuff from the fierce Frank, whose Catholic baptism did not exorcise his native ferocity;² but that some impression was made on those who saw and heard Remigius, or otherwise came across representatives of spiritual authority, cannot reasonably be doubted. If the whole career of the Frankish kings who belonged to the Merwing race is lurid with crimes which are among the stumbling-blocks of Christian history,—if an unbeliever might take advantage of them to ask, "What good did a so-called conversion do to men so incurably brutal?" if under them Christianity itself, as Dean Kitchin has said,³ lost much of

¹ Bede, i. 25.

² Fortunatus, the author of the *Vexilla Regis*, is too often a mere panegyrist as to Frankish princes; but in one poem he praises a lady for "mildness" remarkable in one of "barbaric origin," iv. 26.

³ Hist. of Fr. i. 74, 85. Gregory tells of one bishop who was both a drunkard and inhuman (iv. 12). Simony became

the "spirit of the Gospel,"—still it was something that the favour shown by them to their Gallo-Roman clergy should amend the condition of the Gallo-Roman population ; something that a warlike grandson of Clovis should "make himself eminent in every form of goodness," and refuse repayment of a sum lent for the poor ;¹ something that another grandson should exhibit a kindly and peace-making temper ;² something that a good bishop like St. Germanus of Paris should remind a queen who was pressing on a war between "brothers," that "where peace and love reigned, *there* would be God's lovingkindness ;"³ and something, also, that another bishop, Gregory of Tours himself, should boldly refuse to expel from sanctuary a fugitive son at the bidding of Chilperic,—“It is impossible that such a thing should be done.”⁴ But we must turn away from

rife in the Gallic church, to the indignation of his great namesake (S. Gregor. Epp. v. 53 ; ix. 106, etc.).

¹ So says Gregory of Theudebert I. of Austrasia, iii. 25, 34. But it must be owned that Gregory calls evil good in his panegyric on Clovis, ii. 40.

² Guntram, or Gontran, of Burgundy (Greg. vii. 7).

³ For his letter to Brunichild (properly Brunichildis), during the war between Sigebert and Chilperic, see Greg. Turon., appendix, 1343.

⁴ Ib. v. 14. "Chilpericus" was the Latinised form of Hilperik. Gregory compares this Neustrian king—who must

scenes which are chiefly instructive as indicating the fatal power of an irrepressible lawlessness¹—together with the faithlessness² which Salvian had remarked as a bad point in Frankish dispositions—to defeat or debase religion, and to hinder the work of God.

Other "barbarians," as we have seen, were truer to the best types of Teuton character. They had an instinctive sense that man was made for order, that individual passions must somehow be subjected to law. And they had their own thoughts about the unseen world. Their Northern mythology had told of the slaughter and future revival of the beloved god Baldr, and had pointed, however vaguely, to some far-distant overthrow of evil and of death.³ And

needs pose as a theologian, and drew up a Sabellian formulary—to Nero and Herod (v. 45, vi. 46). He was the wicked husband of the more wicked Fredegond (or Fredegundis).

¹ This lawlessness was specially dominant in Austrasia, while Neustria was more open to Gallo-Roman ideas. "It is in Austrasia that one least meets Roman or heterogeneous elements:" (Guizot, *Civilis. in France*, lect. 19). And yet, as he shows, it was the Austrasian family of Pippin which allied itself with missionaries and with the papacy. Cp. Bede, v. 11.

² See Greg. iii. 14, for an instance of cynical contempt for an oath.

³ Cf. Kemble, *Saxons in Engl.* i. 367. Loki, the Northern nations' Satan, and the wolf-god Fenris, who was Death, were some day to be bound in hell for ever. Merivale, p. 91.

when, among thoughtful Teutons, the belief in ancestral gods had become faint, they still craved fervently for some light on the mysteries of "whence and whither:" they could not be contented agnostics or secularists; as it has been well said, they "demanded immortality."¹ One scene, which Bede has made imperishable,² represents the attraction thus exercised by the creed which alone could illuminate the future. We stand, as it were, in the Witan of the Northumbrians, assembled some miles to the south-east of York. The question is, Shall Paulinus, the bishop sent from the South, be accepted as a teacher? And after the pagan chief-priest has frankly declared that he, at least, has got but little from worshipping Thor or Woden, one of the thanes present puts forth a parable. He likens human life, as they know it, to the rapid flight of a sparrow through the king's lighted hall on a stormy winter evening. Out of the darkness, at one end, the bird issues: into the darkness, at the other end, it passes out, and so disappears. "Can

¹ Merivale, *Conv. North. Nations*, p. 129. Bishop Daniel of Winchester advised St. Boniface to suggest—"gently, and with great moderation,"—questions as to the Teutonic mythology which might undermine the Germans' belief in it.

² Bede, ii. 13.

the new lore give us any certainty as to what has gone before our life, and what will come hereafter? If so, let us adopt it."¹ We can understand how, after this, an event took place which is too frequently ignored—the national acceptance, by the Anglian nobles, and "very many among the common people," of the Gospel message brought by Paulinus. Just thirty years before, the Kentish folk had been largely won over to Christ by the goodly promises, the *dulcedo doctrinæ cælestis*, which came home to them from the lips of our first archbishop.² Twenty-six years later, the heir of the grim old Mercian king who had been the champion of Saxon heathenism was led, by "the promise of a heavenly kingdom, and the hope of resurrection and of future immortality," to profess his full resolve to become a Christian:³ and the king of those East Saxons who had previously cast off their unformed faith was similarly impressed by a Northumbrian king's assurance, that "for those who would both learn and do the will of the

¹ See Maclear, *Conversion of the Slavs*, p. 34, on the "bewildered recognition in pre-Christian systems of the unfathomable mysteries thronging the road of human life," etc.

² Bede, H. E. i. 26.

³ *Ib.* iii. 21.

true God, He had eternal rewards in store ;”¹ and when, after his death, some of his own people again relapsed, they were reclaimed so effectually as to choose rather “to die under a pestilence with the hope of resurrection than to live on amid the foulness of unbelief.”² It is needless to add further illustrations ; but it is well for us occasionally to read in a few instances the ever-recurring verification of St. Paul’s boldly exultant dictum, that by “bringing life and incorruption into light, the Saviour had made death ineffective.”³

And yet, with all such an amount of preparedness for Christian teaching as we have any ground for ascribing to the German race as a whole, the work of a mission among them required real courage at its outset, and firm perseverance in its gradual execution. We are apt to be severe in judging the monks sent forth by “Gregory our father,” because, when scared in Southern Gaul by reports of Saxon ferocity, they sent back Augustine with a petition to be excused from their task. Do we, when we thus criticise these “Italians” as fainthearted, remember what devastation

¹ Bede, iii. 22.

² Ib. iii. 30.

³ 2 Tim. i. 10, *καταργήσαντος*.

and wholesale slaughter had marked the advance of Saxon and Angle through the south-east and centre of South Britain, until the visible presence of a British Church was confined to the land stretching from Cumberland to Cornwall?¹ If "Saxons" were not so wantonly cruel at the end of the sixth century as in the latter part of the fifth, they had done things during the first period of their conquest which might well "give pause" to monks fresh from a quiet home on the Mons Cælius.² It must have been a great relief to hear that the leading "Saxon" king had a Christian wife, and yet more to withdraw from his presence with the assurance of protection, of maintenance, and of licence to preach to his people. And again, when the work was taken in hand, there was a risk attending the very facility which sometimes seemed to prosper it. Even if a royal convert like Ethelbert had imbibed the lesson of "no coercion to Christianity,"³ there might be among his subjects

¹ "In the conquered part of Britain, the Church, and the whole organisation of the Church, vanished. . . . What the missionaries found was a purely heathen land;" Green, *Making of England*, p. 144. He adds that this is a proof of the "displacement of the British people." ² Bede, i. 15.

³ Bede, i. 26. Contrast the forcible baptism of Saxons under

a superficial impulse to follow his example because it was his, or a vague apprehension that not to do so might involve unpleasant consequences;¹ or missionaries might be tempted to promise too much as to the connection of prosperity with Christianity; or the effect of numbers all joining in the cry of "We will be Christians" might hinder some from duly counting the cost—a danger which is illustrated by the frequent mention, in Bede's narrative, of careful "catechising" as an indispensable preliminary to baptism.² Or the sudden shock of a great calamity, the death of a Christian king, or the ravages of a pestilence, might prove that the seed had fallen where it could find no "depth of earth,"—as when the first thoroughly Christian king of the East Angles was slain by a heathen, and forthwith the "province was involved in heathenish error for three years;"³ or when among the East

Charles the Great, and the unchristian mode of propagating Christianity adopted by Olaf Tryggveson.

¹ "Favore vel timore regio" (Bede, ii. 5). Compare iii. 21, on those Mercians who, evidently to please Peada, accepted the new faith but did not act up to it, and whom his father Peada justly scorned as "contemptible wretches." St. Boniface told bishop Daniel that he could not carry on his work "sine patrocinio principis Francorum" (Ep. 12).

² *E.g.* Bede, ii. 14; iii. 1, 7; iv. 16; v. 6. ³ *Ib.* ii. 15.

Saxons, as we have seen, the Yellow Plague¹ scared one of their kings and "very many of the people" into "restoring the heathen temples;" or when Cuthbert had to "persuade" some country folk around Melrose that they could not avert the dreaded sickness by spells borrowed from their old idolatry.² Akin to this hankering after a heathenish past would be the tendency which for centuries presented an anxious problem: How much of the old observances, more or less associated with heathenism, might the Christianised people be permitted to retain? Different answers were given to the question. St. Gregory, at first, was for ordering the utter demolition of the temples; on second thoughts he advised that they should be simply cleared of idols, and then

¹ The Irish name for the great epidemic which caused such mortality in Britain in the middle of the seventh century.

² Bede, iv. 27, from Vit. Cuthb. 9. Compare S.P.G. report for 1888, about converts in Borneo, who, when terrified by cholera, set up sheds by the riverside, with little offerings or tributes of rice, to propitiate the spirit that had "sent" the disease; their missionary had to tell them that any such acknowledgment was sinful for baptised Christians, and that, if they rebuilt one of these shrines which he had pulled down, he would hold no more services for them. They submitted, although twenty of them had suffered from choleraic symptoms. Relapsing into idolatry is treated of in the 2nd council of Orleans, c. 20.

hallowed as churches,¹ and that the old sacrificial feasts should be turned into occasions for innocent "convivia" with thanksgiving to God for His gift of food.² For, says this great and wise man in his extant letter, "you cannot all at once cut away everything from rough natures; and he who means to climb to the highest point, must be content to ascend by steps, not by jumps." But there were old usages which could not be thus adopted or Christianised; and the decrees of Anglo-Saxon Councils³ abound in prohibitions of charms, incantations, auguries, omens, necromancy, or heathenish rites connected with wells, with stones, or with trees. The tenacity of such quasi-paganism in Christianised Europe is a vast subject which here can be simply glanced at,⁴ but which might receive only too copious

¹ St. Boniface, like St. Martin before him, took more drastic measures. See Willibald's Life of him, c. 8, for the story of "Thor's oak" at Geismar.

² Bede, i. 30. Gregory goes on, very remarkably, to adduce the adoption of animal sacrifice into the worship prescribed to Israelites, but with new ideas which got rid of its heathenish character. So the Ark had *some* likeness to the shrines of Egyptian gods.

³ Johnson, Early Engl. Canons, i. 244, 378, 415, 513.

⁴ In Sermon 196, St. Augustine says that, on the preceding 24th of June, the nativity of the Baptist, some Christians had bathed in the sea, "de solemnitate . . . pagana." See his

illustration from usages long kept up in outlying parts of England¹ (not to speak of the

Confessions, vi. 2, on his mother's abandonment of a practice which "was very like to heathen superstition;" and Ep. 29, on the difficulty with which he suppressed it, as carried on at Hippo (under the name of "Lætitiæ"), on the ground of an earlier permission which, as he explained, was only a concession to the "weakness" of new converts. See also Serm. 265 in append. to St. Aug.'s Serm., on the customs of dancing in heathenish fashion in front of a church, shouting during a lunar eclipse, paying vows at springs or at trees, or doing no work on Thursday, etc. On the last two, see Council of Auxerre, c. 3; Narbonne, 15; on the use of auguries, Agde, 42; on the use of spells muttered over bread or herbs, Rouen, 4. Even in 742, St. Boniface complains to pope Zacharias that at Rome itself pagan dances, singing, and shouting went on "when the Kalends of January came in" (comp. C. of Auxerre, 1; 4 Toledo, 11; Rouen, 13; and the mass called "Prohibendum ab idolis" for that day, in the "Gelasian" Sacramentary, ed. Wilson, p. 10), and that women wore "phylacteries" in pagan fashion, to the scandal of Teuton visitors, and to the hindrance of his own mission work. And see the list of pagan usages to be avoided by Christians in his "Concilium Liptinense." The question of "idol-meats" was often a pressing one, as when king Hacon of Norway, in the tenth century, was induced to make a compromise as to the eating of horse-flesh: see Maclear, *Apostles of Mediæval Europe*, p. 177. Comp. 2 C. of Orleans, 20; 4 Orleans, 15.

¹ Dr. Atkinson, in his *Forty Years in a Moorland Parish*, observes that the folklore surviving in Yorkshire dales shows how hard was the struggle between the old paganism and the new Christianity, and how often the Christian teachers had, in a sense, "capitulated" with elements of the ancient nature-worship, by turning its spells into benedictions, and associating its "holy hills" and "holy wells" with Christian ideas of sanctity.

Scottish Highlands)¹ when their original significance had been forgotten—as well as from all the innumerable superstitions connected with “luck,” and witnessing to that deep-seated fear of unfriendly powers which in Paganism usurped the place of trust in a Providential sovereignty. Nor can it be denied that the amount of superstition distinctly connected with the reverence for Christian saints would indirectly tend to retard the spiritual education of Teuton converts, and to confuse their ideas of St. Mary or St. Peter, or of a martyr whose relics were regarded as wonder-working, with reminiscences of their ancient gods. Yet one more difficulty must be mentioned: the Pagan temper might at any time break out in fierce revolt against the gentleness enjoined by Christianity.² This “new law,” it would be said, would turn heroes into weaklings; and so we understand why two thegns slew the good king Sigebert of Essex for no other reason, as

¹ See cases described in *Good Words* for 1889, p. 334 ff.

² So later, among Scandinavians, there was a “feeling that the teaching of the ‘White Christ’ would weaken the arm of those who listened to it,” would unnerve “the sons of Odin,” and demoralise, as it were, the natures which should rejoice in battle and defy death; see Maclear, *Conversion of Northmen*, p. 183.

they avowed when questioned, than that he was too ready to spare his foes and forget all wrongs at the first request for pardon.¹

And yet, in spite of hindrances, the conversion of our Angle and Saxon fathers was effected more completely and more healthfully than that of any other "barbarian" race. "In no part of the world," says Freeman, "did Christianity make its way in a more honourable manner."² In no part of the world, we may add, was there a national conversion so genuine—so pure, on the whole, in its dominant motives—or so rich in examples of Christian nobleness, in lives and deaths full of truest moral beauty. It is to that first age of the old English Church that a great writer, already quoted, refers when he says,³ that "in its best days it had a straightforward seriousness of purpose, and a fire, a thoroughness of faith, among its early converts, which are very much its own." He grants that the authority of chiefs trusted and honoured went for much with the people, and that, sometimes, the "worse aid of superstition" and even of "fraud" promoted the success of the missionary

¹ Bede, iii. 22.

² Norman Conquest, i. 29.

³ Church, Beginnings of Middle Ages, p. 68, ed. 1.

enterprise. But at bottom it was the teaching itself—"the breadth and greatness of Christian ideas," the "high solemnities" which gave them vivid expression, and, as we have already seen, the wonderful heart-uplifting assurance of "eternal life" for the faithful servants of Him in whom that teaching was summed up—the light which it cast on the mystery of life, of its purpose and of its issue. Nor can we fail to trace in the English conversion the well-nigh irresistible power of consistency between the teacher's words and his conduct. Bede is never weary of emphasising this point. He bids us see and appreciate it in Augustine and his companions, in Aidan, in Fursey, in Cuthbert, in Egbert. Nothing, he means, and in one place expressly says, can assist a teacher so effectually, can give such persuasiveness to his teaching, as the visible carrying-out of what he says in what he does—in what he is. In the words of an eminent English historian, it was "in the missionaries' mouths, and still more in their lives," that "Christianity taught what the fierce English warrior most wanted to learn, the duty of restraining his evil passions, and, above all, his cruelty."¹ Another point of importance is

¹ Gardiner, *Student's Hist. of Engl.*, p. 49.

the interest which typical lay Christians were led to take in the work of the missionaries ; they become, in a way, effective missionaries themselves. One need but remember the line thus taken by Ethelbert and Edwin and Oswald, and Sigebert of East Anglia, and Oswy himself, faulty as he was, in regard to the East Saxon Sigebert. In one of these kingly Christians, at least, we see also the impressiveness of a devout family life ;—when we think of the effect which Anna's household with its simple fervent piety produced on the mind and heart of the exiled Kenwalch, we see a power which may be set over against that very different type of power, exerted by monastic self-devotion, of which Dr. Gardiner does not hesitate to say that "the lesson was all the better taught because those who taught it were monks," whose example exhibited the Christian's self-control "writ large." Again, the alliance sealed in East Anglia, as well as in Kent, between the Church and the school, is a fact significant for Church workers in all times, not least in our own. And, once more, the story has contrasts and surprises, and "changings of the hand of the Highest,"¹ which alternately overawe and exhilarate the

¹ Ps. lxxvi. (= our lxxvii.), II (Vulg.).

Christian observer. What strange disappointments of seemingly reasonable expectation, what heavy trials of patience and faith, in the successive violent deaths, after brief reigns, of such kings as Edwin and Oswald!¹ And then, when the discipline of check and reverse, and apparent overthrow of structures half built, has been accepted, what sudden brightening of the whole prospect, what splendid discoveries of good following after evil, when expulsion and hopeless exile bring a prince who has refused the faith under influences which lead him to accept it,—when the son of the chief Pagan king becomes the agent in Christianising his subjects, and his brothers and sisters become examples of Christian sanctity! Nor can we forget the lesson contained in that variety of instrumentalities which distinguished the process of English conversion. Italy did her part in Augustine and Birinus and Paulinus; Burgundy in Felix; Ireland in Aidan and his next two successors,

¹ Cp. the failure of Witbert's efforts, after two years' work in Friesland (Bede, v. 9). If for a moment we look to the further North, we see St. Anskar, the apostle of the Scandinavians, falling back under heavy discouragements on the words of a senior bishop: "Certus sis quia quod nos pro Christi nomine elaborare cepimus fructificare *habet* in Domino." There was the point: faith assured these workers for God that a result "had got to" come, in His own time and way.

and, through them, in the missionaries, mostly English, whom they sent to evangelise the Midlands and Essex; Northumbria, which had owed so much both to Italy and to Ireland, in Wilfrid, who brought the process to a close in Sussex and the Isle of Wight.

Thankful may we be for our own national record of the Church's dealings with that one "invading" race which, with whatever infusions of non-Teutonic blood, has made our England. More gladly, perhaps, than others can Englishmen, after such a retrospect, put their hearts into the last words of the Proper Preface for Whit-Sunday: "Whereby we have been brought"—*we*, in the persons of those our forefathers—"out of darkness and error,"—the darkness which those first converts knew too well,—“into the clear light and true knowledge of the Father and of the Son.” And with such thankfulness we may loyally cherish the hope, that whatever tasks may await English Churchmen in the century which a few years will inaugurate, whatever strange problems they may have practically to consider, whatever new and perhaps unwelcome conditions of work they may have to accept and to utilise,—He who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, who

brought their fathers into the light of the faith, will exhibit in the children its ever-new inexhaustible force, will "go before" them, as of old, along paths "not heretofore" trodden, and make their strength proportionate to their day.

THE CELTIC CHURCHES IN THE BRITISH ISLES.

THE old Celtic Churches in our islands present, as might be expected, a singular contrast to the Anglian or Saxon type of Church life, which began to form itself in Kent under the teaching of the missionaries sent from Rome. If we look to Wales as the refuge of British Christianity after Saxon invasion, to Ireland before the episcopate of St. Malachy, to Scotland before the reforms of St. Margaret,—we are in presence of religious phenomena very unlike, in many respects, to those which characterise the development of the Church of England properly so-called. We see, in fact, on a large scale the workings of the emotional temperament, with all the attractions of its fervid enthusiasm, its affectionateness and receptiveness, but also with all the drawbacks of that fitful impulsiveness which makes it both unstable in purpose and

impatient of discipline and law. At present, of course, we can only attempt to select, and generally to appreciate, the most conspicuous features of this non-Teutonic Christianity—to distinguish its strong and its weak points—to see what it did, and what it failed to do—how it needed, and how far it received, the touch of a new influence, which could invigorate by introducing order.

I.

Of the ancient British Church there is, after all, not very much to say, unless one were to plunge into the intricacies of legend, or make up a primeval history out of conjecture.¹ There

¹ The reader may be referred for details to the Rev. E. J. Newell's "History of the Welsh Church," a scholarly and vivid narrative, which, one may hope, will be continued beyond "the dissolution of the monasteries." It is specially full and interesting on the early Welsh saints and religious foundations; and it illustrates the affinity between Wales and Ireland with regard to the predominance of monasticism in a strongly tribal form. Perhaps it would be too much to expect, in the circumstances, an entire freedom from "national" bias respecting the contest between Celtic and non-Celtic churches. But when Augustine's "prediction" of woe to the British clergy, because they "would not be at peace with their" Latin "brethren, and refused to preach the way of life to the English," is thrice exaggerated into a "curse," one cannot but reflect that (as Mr. Newell observes in an earlier passage) it was Celtic saints who were adepts in

can be no doubt that it was founded in the second century, and it seems highly probable that it was an offshoot of the Church of Gaul; if we please, we may suppose that, as in the days which followed "the persecution that arose about Stephen," some Christians from Lyons or its neighbourhood withdrew to the north of Gaul, and thence made their way across the Channel, and deposited the germs which grew into the "British Church;" or else, that the name of Christ was first heard from the lips of some Christian members of a Roman provincial household. At the end of the second century, at any rate, it was believed in Africa that out-of-the-way parts of the island, not yet entirely Romanised, had become in a degree "subject to Christ;"¹ but we *know* no more until the beginning of the

"cursing." And when we are told that Bede "half applauds, as though it were almost a Christian work, the massacre of the monks of Bangor Iscoed by the pagan Æthelfrith" (pp. 124, 132), we must demur to such language as unjust. Mr Newell calls it "stupid to blame harshly the Britons for not sending missionaries among the pagan English," and pleads that any such missionaries would have been speedily martyred. But the point is that they obstinately refused to make the attempt, and treated English Christianity as "a thing of nought," under the influence of vindictive race-hatred. However, Mr. Newell admits "that it was well" that the unorganised Celtic Christianity gave way before the Latin.

¹ The well-known expression of Tertullian, *adv. Judæos*, 7.

fourth century, when there is fair reason for accepting as historic the fact of the martyrdom of St. Alban, and clear evidence of the presence of bishops of York, London, and one other British town not certainly identified,¹ at the great Western Council of Arles. Then again the mist comes down, and we only know that in general the British Church was faithful to Catholic Christianity, and, particularly, approved the decision of the Sardican Council in its favour of St. Athanasius,² and also sent three bishops to the Council of Ariminum, who were apparently, like the mass of that assembly, orthodox in intention, though at last beguiled or harassed into Arianising; the one additional fact, that they were exceptionally poor,³ seeming

¹ It is usually thought probable that "*Coloniæ Londinensium*," given in the record of this council as the name of the third episcopal see, is a copyist's mistake, occasioned by the word "*Londinensi*" just preceding, and that the true reading is "*Coloniæ Legionensium*," Caerleon-on-Usk. But see Bevan, *Dioc. Hist. St. David's*, p. 11; Routh, *Rel. Sac. iv.* 313, would read "*Lindi*," Lincoln.

² He places "Britain" among the countries whose bishops wrote accepting the Sardican decision (*Apol. c. Ari. 1*). No bishops from Britain are recorded as present at Sardica (*ib.* 50).

³ *Sulp. Sev. ii.* 41: "*Tres tantum ex Britannia inopia proprii publico usi sunt, cum oblatam a cæteris conlationem respissent.*" (The words "*id est Aquitanis, Gallis, et Britannis*," in the preceding sentence, are probably a gloss).

to indicate that the insular Church had but a weak hold on the official classes or the well-to-do provincials, among whose monuments or relics, of various classes, very few possess a Christian significance.¹ We hear of Victricius bishop of Rouen, some thirty years later, as visiting Britain at the request of continental prelates, in order to abate a dispute,² which may have been a doctrinal controversy. Pelagius is the only conspicuous figure on the stage of Continental Christianity in the next century who is authenticated as a Briton ;³ his heresy—perhaps as originated by a Briton—proved congenial to some of his fellow-countrymen ; and the rhetorical

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, i. 37. The most important discovery in this line is that of the foundations of a basilica or church among the remains at Silchester. The venerable church of St. Mary-in-the-Castle, at Dover, has at least traces of Roman work ; but that it was built as it stands by British workmen in imitation of Roman models, half a century before the Romans left Britain, and that, conspicuous as its position was, it escaped demolition by Saxons, is a theory which even Canon Puckle's ingenious advocacy will hardly avail to establish.

² "Pacis me faciendæ consacerdotes mei . . . evocarunt . . . Vobis intra Britannias obsequer" (Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* viii. 228).

³ His companion Cælestius is thought to have been an Irishman ; see Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 290 : although Jerome's words, "Pelagius habet progeniem Scoticæ gentis" (in *Jerem.* iii. præf.), *might* be otherwise understood. Fastidius, a "British bishop," about 430, seems to have Pelagianised.

account, adopted by Bede,¹ of the visit of the great Gallic saint and bishop German to our island, for the purpose of confuting those who upheld "human presumption" against "the belief in heavenly grace," — suggests that the native clergy were but incompetent theologians, while it also describes the "heretics" as wealthy and richly attired, and fluent in speech though superficial in argument. It was not unnatural that the gratitude of British Catholics should develop legends "prolonging St. German's stay in Britain,"² and assigning to him the foundation of ecclesiastical colleges in Wales.

But the long attack by invading Saxons and Angles on the southern part of the island, which Rome had now left to itself, appears to have produced not only havoc and devastation, but great internal confusion among the people whom it gradually "displaced." We hear no good report of British princes or ecclesiastics from Gildas,³ but his invective is too indiscriminate

¹ From Constantius of Lyons. Bede, i. 17.

² Haddan and Stubbs, i. 19. Archd. Pryce considers that he probably "advised the establishment" of such institutions (*Anc. Brit. Church*, p. 124). But see Bevan, *Dioc. Hist. St. David's*, p. 34.

³ He specially vituperates king Maelgwyn, who, like Ivan the Terrible, combined tyranny and cruelty with fits of devotion:

to be accepted without considerable deduction ; and, at any rate, in the middle of the sixth century a religious revival sprang up, which bore fruit in the creation of schools of sacred learning connected with monastic foundations, and in the lives of some eminent Welsh saints, among whom the most famous name is David's. It was then, apparently, that Welsh episcopacy became regularly diocesan, and two synods were held for the establishment of wholesome discipline ; but there was no metropolitanical see, as there was no one king of all the Welsh districts. This was, perhaps, the happiest period of the Cymric Welsh Church : one is loth to remember how soon the racial feud, the national vindictiveness towards the Saxon, impelled the British clergy to stand obstinately aloof from all co-operation with the foreign missionaries in preaching the Gospel to the heathen conquerors who had wrought them so much evil. A resolute adherence (which Latins would think dogged) to national usages as to the calculation of Easter, or the form of the clerical tonsure,—an invincible

at one time he became a monk, but presently relapsed into evil courses. As for the clergy, they are rather "wolves" than shepherds : they teach, but they set the worst possible examples : they do not rebuke sinners, but rather imitate their conduct, etc.

suspicion of Augustine's aims, and a very clear resolution not to acknowledge him, however definitely commissioned by Rome, as their archbishop,¹—conspired to harden them in that abstention from all share in his mission-work which may be ascribed rather to antipathy towards Saxons than to any sense of peril in the enterprise. The fact, however explained, however estimated, remains unquestionable; whatever testimony was borne to Christ by the words or the sufferings of individuals,² the Britons took no part, as a people or a Church, in the conversion of the English; on the contrary, not only did one of their kings³ join with Penda the Mercian in his attack on the Christian king Edwin, but the whole people persisted for the rest of that century, and longer, in "treating

¹ Bede, ii. 2. This determination proves indisputably that "the British church" did not then acknowledge more than a primacy of honour in the see of Rome. The suggestion in the "Dublin Review" for April, 1895, that Augustine went to meet the British bishops *before* Gregory had professed (in the letter given by Bede, i. 29) to make them "subject" to him, would have astonished Bede. Gildas speaks of all bishops as occupying "the seat of Peter," language which suggests that he had imbibed the old African idea of St. Peter's representative character.

² Merthyr Tydvil is said to preserve the memory of Tydvil, a Celtic princess slain by pagan Saxons.

³ Cadwallon: he is usually called a king of North Wales (Gwynedd).

the Christianity of the English as no better than heathenism," and elaborately displaying their resolution to avoid its contact.¹ Considering the saintly memories which the Welsh would have best honoured by Christianlike forgiveness of wrongs, and Christianlike self-devotion in the cause of the Gospel, this refusal to evangelise, this acrimoniousness towards the evangelised, are lamentable enough ; but great allowance has to be made for the effect of other recollections, which more than a century of losses and humiliations had burned deep into the hearts of a people of whom Giraldus Cambrensis said that they were "quick to avenge old injuries as if quite recent."² It was not until the middle of the eighth century that the British Church entered on that very long process of gradual absorption, or, if the term be preferred, of incorporation, into the English, which did not terminate until the closing years of the thirteenth, but which *did* then terminate, once for all.³ In the first part of this period, the laws of

¹ Bede, ii. 20 ; v. 22 ; and Aldhelm's letter to king Geraint.

² "Velut instantes" (Descr. Camb. i. 17).

³ The approximation began by the adoption of the "Catholic" Easter, first in North and then (after much resistance) in South Wales (about 755-809). The other stages were, the claim of jurisdiction over Wales advanced with success by Anselm of

king Howel the Good exhibit the clergy as in privilege and honour ; church censures are put in force against royal evil-doers ; and in the sees of St. David's and Llandaff we find bishops famed for wisdom and assiduous in promoting devotion and sacred knowledge. But the secular records of the tenth and eleventh centuries are lurid with internecine war.¹ The latter years of the twelfth century introduce the "irrepressible" personality of Giraldus, and his persistent but fruitless attempts to become bishop, and even archbishop, of St. David's. He writes too much for effect to be unreservedly credited ; but any inconsistency between his pictures of good and evil in the Welsh character is partly abated by his shrewd remark that the nation was "intense in everything," and "constant in nothing but inconstancy." Their taste for external devotion, their eagerness for a

Canterbury (previous archbishops having, according to certain records, consecrated a few Welsh bishops)—the visitation of Welsh churches by archbishop Baldwin as papal legate—the visitation by Peckham as archbishop in 1284. See Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 22 ff. ; and for Cornwall, *ib.* 673 ff.

¹ The names of Bledri and Joseph of Llandaff, and Sulien and Rhyddmarch of St. David's (all in the eleventh century), should be held in honour. After the death of the last, "instruction for scholars ceased at Mencia" (St. David's : Haddan and Stubbs, i. 298).

bishop's blessing, their love of pilgrimage, their respect for sanctuaries, their excessive reverence for anything like a relic, their frequent desire to end a life of fighting by dying in the monastic garb, availed but little to restrain ferocity, sensuality, and faithlessness, or to suppress the profane habit of treating churches as so much family property.¹ Welsh history was then a wild scene, and Welsh bishoprics were often misused by bad appointments on the part of English sovereigns: there is evidence that at the end of the period referred to, the Church was in need of invigoration and revival;² but the requisite moving force was not supplied.

II.

Let us turn to our main subject—the development of Celtic Churches, of the Church as existing under Celtic conditions, in the wider area of Ireland and Scotland.

Whatever else Ireland owes, or does not owe,

¹ Churches, says Giraldus, *Descr. Camb.* ii. 6, “have as many *personæ* as there are families of chief men in the diocese,” sons simply succeeding to fathers. We shall meet with this Celtic abuse again.

² “The archbishop” (Peckham) “evidently entertained a low estimate of the condition of the church in Wales” (Bevan, *Dioc. Hist. St. David's*, p. 130).

to the greater island, whose close vicinity has been too often fruitful in complications for both, she is certainly indebted to Britain for her Christianity. Whatever date be adopted for the first preaching of St. Patrick, we cannot doubt that, at any rate before the latter part of the fourth century, some intercourse between "the Roman island" and "the barbaric," as they were still distinctively called in the fifth century, had sown the seed of the word, here and there, on the eastern shores of "Erin." But this would not suffice to form a Church. There would be, probably, some sporadic cases of believers dwelling near each other,¹ meeting as they could for worship, teaching their children the faith as they knew it, and waiting for better times; the question is, when did those times set in? It has been usual to say—In the days of Celestine I. of Rome, who "sent Palladius as first bishop to those Scots"—*i.e.* Irish—"who believed

¹ The legend was, that before either Palladius or Patrick there were four bishops in Munster, besides other bishops and ascetics. But of the Munster bishops, Kieran, Ailbe, Declan, and Ibar, not one seems to have been prior to Patrick; see Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 198 ff. (But Todd credits, *substantially*, a story about Patrick pointing out to Ailbe a subterranean stone altar with four glass chalices, in a cave in Co. Sligo, p. 222; see Whitley Stokes, *Tripart. Life*, i. 95, ii. 313.) Patrick is said to have ordained Ailbe.

in Christ ;” so Prosper of Aquitaine in his Chronicle words it, and dates the event in 431, a year in which he himself was at Rome on Gallic Church business ; and after Palladius had practically failed, then came Patrick as Ireland’s true apostle, or, as an Irish homily expressed it, “the father of the baptism and the belief of the men of Erin.” But to speak of Palladius first : there can be no doubt of the historical fact of his coming to Ireland, or of its date : and it is also practically evident that, although in another work — the *Contra Collatorem*— Prosper says that its result was “to make the barbarous island Christian,”—he was thus far “talking at large” under the instinct of magnifying a papal achievement. For the Irish traditions speak of this Roman missionary as building a few churches (one of them being afterwards known as “the Roman’s House”), and then either suffering martyrdom among the Irish, or abandoning the field in despair, setting out for Italy, and dying in Britain,¹ or, as a later

¹ See Whitley Stokes, *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* (an invaluable collection and edition of the Patrician documents), i. 31 ; ii. 272, 332. The Scottish legend ascribed to “St. Palladius” a ministry in Aberdeenshire. Against this, see Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 26 ff ; but Bishop Dowden, *Celtic Church in Scotland*, p. 41, thinks we are “not entitled to reject . . . the hitherto prevailing (Scottish) belief” on this point.

legend says, in the land of the Picts. In Ireland, at any rate, his work was ineffective; but what can we ascertain as to that greater name of which Prosper tells us nothing,—as to which Bede is so strangely silent? The scepticism which reduced St. Patrick to a purely mythical figure may now be treated as obsolete; but in trying to get at the facts, we must distinguish first of all between the principal and the inferior authorities. The primary documents consist of his two books—the Confession,¹ written late in his life, and a shorter work, addressed “to the Christian subjects of the tyrant Corotic,” a “British” king. Next to these come two prayers or hymns traditionally called his, and a Latin hymn by his disciple, Sechnall or Secundinus; but when we enter the seventh century,² a few trustworthy references are mixed up with some “credulous hagiography” which plunges us, so to speak, in a rank upgrowth of Patrician mythology. Let us put aside at the outset all but the original documents: what do we learn

¹ See it in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. 296 ff., and Whitley Stokes, *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, ii. 357 ff. It has been translated, with notes, by Prof. G. T. Stokes, of Dublin, and Dr. C. H. H. Wright.

² Tirechan’s “notes” and Muirchu’s memoir belong to this century: Fiacc’s hymn to the eighth.

from them? First, that Patrick's father was a deacon named Calporn—the son (or possibly the grandson) of a priest,¹ and a *decurio*, or town-burgess,—who lived in “Britain,” and had a farm at a place called Bannavem Taberniæ.² Here, at sixteen years of age, when “almost a beardless boy,” Patrick was seized (with many others) and carried captive into North Ireland, where he was employed by day and by night in tending the cattle of his master. And then came the spiritual crisis of his life. He had, while at home, committed some fault or sin—“on one day,” he says, “or rather in one hour, when he was hardly fifteen.”³ Although a clergyman's son, he had had no personal sense of religion; he “knew not what he ought to aim at, or what to avoid;” he even says that he was “ignorant of the true God,” and “remained in deadening

¹ The received text of the Confession describes his father as “*filium quemdam Potiti, filii Odissi presbyteri.*” But “*fili Odissi*” is a marginal addition to the “Armagh text.” Cp. Ep. ad Chr. c. 5.

² Unidentified: probably on the shore of the Firth of Clyde. Patrick uses the correct technical name “*Britanniæ*,” which referred to the five Roman provinces of the island. It is not natural to take it here, as Lanigan does, of North-west Gaul. We find “*Galliæ*” elsewhere in the Confession.

³ “*Quæ in pueritia mea una die gesseram, imo in una hora. . . . Nescio, Deus scit, si habebam tunc annos quindecim*” (Confess. c. 12).

unbelief."¹ It was under the discipline—in his own phrase, “the severe chastisement”—of exile, captivity, and hardship, that the lad was, as we should say, “converted;” and then his “love for God, together with awe and faith, grew mightily.” When out on the wild hills, he would say a hundred prayers a day, and nearly as many in one night; snow and frost were nothing to him in this fresh devotional fervour, to which, as an old bishop, he looks back, and owns with beautiful candour that he cannot regain it. “Then I used to feel no harm, nor was there any sluggishness in me, as now I see there is!” After six years he contrived to escape; he was taken on board a vessel manned by sailors who were still Pagans,² yet who trusted him for his fare. On landing, they took him across some waste country where food failed them: at last they found some wild honey, which, however, he would not taste, because one of them said it was such as was used in sacrifice.³ “On the sixtieth

¹ One might infer that Calporn had been somewhat secularised by his civil employments.

² Probably, as Todd suggests, in his volume on St. Patrick (p. 375), the time spent with them was afterwards looked upon as the time of his second and brief captivity.

³ The impulse which, he says, he felt to “call on Elias,” when a violent temptation at this time beset him, was probably so described with a recollection of Matt. xxvi. 46, 47.

night" he got away and returned to his home: his parents, rejoicing at his escape from slavery, begged him with tears, and "with offered gifts," to promise not to leave them again; but "in the bosom of the night" he saw a man named Victoricus¹ coming as from Ireland, who gave him a letter beginning, "The Voice of the Irish." While he read it, he thought he "heard in his mind the voice of dwellers near the wood Foclut, which is near the Western sea,² crying, 'We pray thee, holy youth, to come and walk now among us.' And," says Patrick, "I was deeply moved in heart, and could not read any further; and so I awoke. Thanks to God, that after very many years the Lord granted to them according to their cry." He says that he was ordained deacon, but does not speak of having received priest's orders. One sentence, taken by itself, might seem to imply that he returned to Ireland as a missionary while still, in some sense, a young man. "You know, and God knows, how I have lived among you *from my youth*, in belief of the truth, and in sincerity

¹ This was afterwards used to invent for the Irish a special angelic patron called Victor, whom Patrick, in vision, "saw tracing out lines for the city" of Armagh (Trip. Life, ii. 295, 332, 409, 473).

² Near Killala, Co. Mayo.

of heart:" so that on this view we should ascribe to him a ministerial career in Ireland during several years previous to his return as a bishop.¹ But he may be looking back to the period of his servitude and conversion; and while the words quoted above as to his preaching in the west of Ireland imply a long interval,² he certainly seems to connect his "first spontaneous journey to Ireland," and his entrance on "the work as to which Christ had given him instructions," with circumstances just preceding his consecration. For, according to the natural sense of a passage in the Confession, that event took place "thirty years" after the fault already referred to,³ which he had confessed, before his first ordination, to a very intimate friend, who had then passed it over, and had even approved of his promotion to the episcopate, but had unaccountably turned round and proclaimed the fact as a disqualification. The objection was overruled as vexatious. But where and by whom was he consecrated? He

¹ So Whitley Stokes, *Trip. Life*, i. p. cxxxviii.

² So Conf. c. 20: "Non cito acquievi."

³ "Post annos triginta invenerunt me adversus (*quod* adversus me) verbum quod confessus fueram antequam essem diaconus;" Confess. c. 11. That the reckoning must be from the commission, not from the confession, of this fault, see Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Irel.* i. 136. He felt the humiliation keenly.

says not a word: it may be conjectured that "holy men" in Gaul were concerned, but he tells us nothing about any mission from the Gallic Church, and nothing—which is more important—about that mission from Rome on which Irish Roman Catholics have rested as a certainty, but which is a transference from the story of Palladius.¹ His repeated acknowledgment of a want of scholarship, which his writing makes patent enough, is surely fatal to the notion of his having studied under St. German, which may perhaps have grown out of a confusion between Palladius, *also called Patricius*, and St. Patrick. Perhaps the most natural supposition is that he was consecrated in his native country. As he writes, he looks back on a "laborious episcopate:" he had gone through many perils, had "suffered many injuries at the hands of unbelievers," and even still could "daily expect to be slain, or taken by surprise, or reduced to slavery." But come what might in the future,

¹ It is unknown to the authors of the hymns of Secundinus and Fiacc; and the Catalogue of Saints says only that the "first order" consisted of Romans, Franks, Britons, Scots. The statement in Tirechan's notes, that both Palladius, "who was the first Patricius," and St. Patrick, were sent by Celestine, is a later addition. Cf. Dict. Chr. Biogr. iv. 205. Muirchu ascribes the consecration and mission of Patrick to bishop Amatorex (*qu.* Amator, the predecessor of German); see Tripart. Life, ii. 273.

he had had great success: he had "baptised thousands, and had ordained clergy to preach and to baptise. Many in Ireland who had formerly worshipped idols and foul things,¹ had become a people of the Lord; sons of Irishmen and daughters of princes had embraced the monastic life." Some passages which are not in the "Armagh text" of the Confession are considered to "bear no sign of want of genuineness:"² they amplify the account of his labours in outlying districts: they tell us how he refused the gifts pressed on him by his converts, while, on the other hand, he had endeavoured to conciliate kings by presents, and, on one occasion, having failed to do so, had been seized, despoiled of all that he had, and kept in chains for a fortnight. He had been open-handed to the poor, and had spent in relieving their needs the market value of fifteen slaves. And if there is one passage in this deeply interesting memoir which beyond others would assure us of its genuineness, it is that in which Patrick says, "I put no trust in myself, so long as I shall be

¹ Or, "foul idols." Cf. Bp. Dowden, *Celt. in Ch. Scotl.* p. 22. The Confession contains a reference to sun-worship; Tirechan's notes mention fountain-worship (*Tripart. Life*, ii. 323).

² Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 296.

in this body of death : for strong is he who is daily endeavouring to turn me away from the faith and purity of unfeigned religion, which I will preserve to the end of my life for Christ my Lord." The last words of this interesting autobiography are pathetic : " And this is my confession before I die " (c. 25). Though written in a fashion far from methodical, it bears throughout a stamp of truth :¹ it illustrates his character,—his sensitiveness to ungenerous and supercilious criticism,² his consciousness of a want of literary style, his profound personal humility,—" I was but a stone lying in deep mud, and He that is mighty came, and in His mercy took me up, etc." ³ Like Samuel, and like St. Paul, he disclaims all self-seeking ; no convert has made *him* rich. And the all-sustaining motive of devotion to Christ underlies his whole account of himself : with a tender simplicity and a habitual sense of unworthiness, he thanks God who has often " pardoned his

¹ " The Latin is very bad ; there are many places where it is difficult to make out the sense ; . . . but, on the whole, this work is full of good sense, and even of intellect and fire, and, what is better, it is full of piety " (Todd, p. 383).

² He calls his censors " rhetorici " (c. 5), " Rideat et insultet qui voluerit," etc. (c. 20) ; compare c. 4.

³ Confess. c. 5. So, " Scio ex parte quod ego vitam perfectam non didici " (c. 19).

negligence," and been merciful to him "unto thousands of thousands, because He saw that I was ready," *i.e.* was prepared to do and suffer anything for His sake.¹ His other book, the letter to the Christian subjects of Corotic, who has been identified by some with a Welsh prince, by others with a king of his own native district in South-west Scotland, exhibits a sterner side of his character. He utters a ban against those soldiers of Corotic who have killed some and captured others of his own neophytes for whom Christ was crucified ;² "the holy and humble in heart" are exhorted "not to take food or drink with" these offenders, likeminded, as he says they are, with "Scots" and Picts that have fallen away from the faith,³ and to whom some of his poor converts

¹ The book contains a sort of creed, different in wording from the Nicene. It speaks of the Son as "having been always, before the origin of the world, spiritually with the Father, ineffably begotten *ante omne principium*," etc. "That every tongue may confess *quia Dominus et Deus est Jesus Christus*." Bp. Dowden compares it with the creed in the Antiphony of Bangor (Celtic Ch. Scotl. p. 213).

² He describes these sufferers as "chrismati, in veste candida, dum fides flagrabat in fronte ipsorum." Cf. Bede, ii. 14, on the newly-baptised "albati."

³ These may have been some Irish Picts who had lapsed from the Christian faith (the Picts of North Ireland, called the Cruithne, occupied Co. Down and the south of Co. Antrim,

have been made over. "It is the practice of Roman and Gallic Christians to send presbyters to the Franks¹ and foreign nations, with thousands of *solidi* to redeem baptised captives, whereas Corotic kills them, and sells them to a nation that knows not God." The fire has certainly kindled when Patrick thus speaks. He presumes that these Briton soldiers of a professedly Christian British king think nothing of Irish Christianity. He is led to refer again to the impulse which had led him, a freeborn man of rank, to give himself up to the task of evangelising a race that had formerly taken him captive, together with "his father's male and female servants;" so that he has "a portion with those whom God has called and predestined to preach the gospel, amid no small persecutions, even to the end of the earth." At the close of the letter his gentler spirit prevails, and he hopes that the "homicides," on hearing the letter read, may be moved to "repent, and to set free the baptised captives, and so may live to God and be made

Skene, *Celt. Scotl.* i. 131); or they may have been Galloway Picts who had been converted by St. Ninian (v. *infr.*).

¹ This was before the baptism of Clovis, but late in Patrick's own life; he mentions a presbyter whom he had "taught from infancy" (*Ep.* c. 2).

whole here and for eternity.”¹ All this shows us the truly human character of a man never to be named without reverence, whose traditional grave, under a mound of earth on the south side of the cathedral of Downpatrick,² is one of the most sacred spots in our islands, either for an Irish or an English Christian. We may accept a few details on other evidence; thus, his birth-place is called Nemthor,³ which may be the older name of Alcluith,⁴ afterwards called the “Dun,” or stronghold, of the Strathclyde “Britons”—the mighty twofold rock which dominates the northern bank of the broad Clyde; or, perhaps, with Kilpatrick,⁵ where is now a station between Dunbarton and Glasgow. His original name of Succat had a warlike significance: it was altered, after a fashion of which Bede gives some instances, into Patricius.

¹ The final ascription or benediction is curious: “*Pax Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto.*”

² So says Muirchu (Trip. Life, ii. 298), calling the place Dun Lethglaisse. Another tradition mentions Saul in the same county (ib. 332). See Todd, St. Patrick, p. 493.

³ Fiace’s hymn, Whitley Stokes, Trip. Life, ii. 405. The “*Lebar Brece*” homily seems to identify “Nemthor” with “*Ail-cluaide*,” ib. 433.

⁴ Bede mentions “*urbem Alcluith, quod lingua eorum*” (Britons) “*significat petram Cluith*,” i. 12; comp. Adamnan, Vit. Col. i. 15, “*petra Cloithe.*”

⁵ Dict. Chr. Biogr. iv. 203.

His servitude may be associated with the towering hill of Slemish in Ulster; his master is called Miliuc, Milchu, or Milcho, described by two ancient writers as a heathen man or a "wizard:" but there is no need to assume his identity with an Ulster "king" of that name, and thereupon to date Patrick's birth as early as 373. This would involve great difficulty, for, according to the note of time already given, his consecration at the age of forty-five would have to be dated thirteen years earlier than the mission of Palladius; whereas we can hardly suppose Prosper to have mistaken in calling Palladius the "first bishop" of the Irish. But if we date Patrick's birth near the close of the fourth century, his captivity would fall within the second decade of the fifth, and his ordination probably soon after 420, while Dr. Todd may be right in dating his consecration about 440.¹

¹ Cf. Todd, *St. Patrick*, p. 394 ff.; Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 295. It is necessary here to notice Mr. Olden's theory, as set forth in his "History of the Church of Ireland," pp. 14, 407 ff., that St. Patrick was in fact the "Sen-Patrick," or Patrick the first, "of native records," and that he preceded Palladius, as a missionary bishop in Ireland, either by thirty-four or by twenty-six years. First, let us waive all discussion of Tirechan's statement that *both* were sent by pope Celestine. The question is not about Tirechan, but about Prosper. Can his words, quoted above, being those of a contemporary, allow of the "suspicion that Palladius never came at all"? Or can

Obviously the date of 432 is bound up with the unverified tale of his Roman mission. The legends admit that he failed to convert the arch-king Loegaire;¹ but those who have stood by the historic mounds of Tara may be disposed to believe that the sight of his Paschal fire as kindled at Slane disquieted the "Druids"

primus episcopus, as used by him in this passage, mean "primate" or archbishop? Few will deem either suggestion tenable. Prosper evidently thought that when Palladius was sent as bishop to the Irish, no one had gone to them, as bishop, before him. He may have been ignorant of the existence of older bishops whose work in Ireland is merely matter of legend; but could he have been ignorant of such a ministry as, by hypothesis, Patrick had so long exercised? and if Patrick had been at work so many years in Ireland, would Palladius have been so badly received? As for the objection that, if Patrick succeeded Palladius, "we have the spectacle of a conscientious missionary arrogating to himself all the credit of" his predecessor's work, it is surely enough to remark that, according to all tradition, and on Mr. Olden's own showing, Palladius' mission was a "failure." As for continental martyrologies which say that St. Patrick *primus* or *primum predicavit* in Ireland, they do not counterweigh the obvious purport of Prosper's statement, and were compiled when and where the unsuccessful mission of Palladius had, not unnaturally, been forgotten. As for "Sen-Patrick," the title is far more likely to have been distinctive of a less illustrious namesake than of *the* St. Patrick. I am also unable to follow Mr. Olden in his interpretation of "after thirty years," which he takes to mean "when I was thirty years old;" if Patrick had meant this, he would have said so. See above, p. 371.

¹ Various written; pronounced Layary (cf. Collier, Hist. Irel. p. 24), whence Leary. The Ard-righ had an undefined superiority over the other four kings.

(wizards or seers), who surrounded their monarch at the central home of Irish royalty. Of the length of his episcopate we cannot speak with certainty: and the few facts on which we can rely contrast pointedly with the huge morass of legends, occasionally beautiful,¹ sometimes grotesque, sometimes repulsive or even demoralising,² which formed round the primitive documents as handled in turn by this or that monastic scribe, in whom a freedom of imagination, or the eager delight in piecing out a tradition with more and more of "glorifying" material, was altogether unfettered by any scrupulosity about evidence. But something of Patrick's own spirit may be preserved in the hymn of courageous faith,³ which represents him

¹ *E.g.* he meets the two daughters of Loegaire, Ethne the Fair and Fedelm the Red,—catechises, baptises, communicates them; they then "sleep in death" (Tirechan). The point of the story is, that they had asked to see the face of Christ, and are told that they must receive the Eucharist, and also must die, in order to enter His presence.

² *E.g.* as to the stay on Croagh-Patrick hill, until he obtains through an angel the granting of certain requests. One is that outlanders may not dwell in Ireland (Tripart. Life, ii. 477; cf. i. 117, for an amplification of this story.

³ It may be called the "Breastplate" (Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, ii. 320). Legend-dealers called it the "Deer's Cry," because it pleased them to imagine that the liers-in-wait, set by "druids" to seize Patrick on his way to Tara, were caused by an illusion of senses to take him for a deer; see Whitley Stokes,

as arming himself against "druids,"¹ and "women's spells," and all unholy knowledge, —by the invocation of the Trinity, by the manifold power of the Incarnation, by the sanctity of angels and of God's servants among men, by the powers of the elements, and again by the power, wisdom, eye, ear, word, hand, way, shield, and host, of God Himself; and his expressed dependence on Christ is at least consonant with the lofty strain—"Christ protect me against poison, burning, drowning, death-wounds: Christ be with me, before me, behind me, within me, below me, above me,—at my right, at my left . . . in the heart of every one that thinks of me, in the mouth of every one that speaks to me, in the eye of every one that sees me, in the ear of every one that hears me." "Salvation," the song

i. pp. ci. 49; ii. 381. The mention of powers of nature, air and fire, wind and sea, etc., has been made an objection to the Patrician authorship, as if it betokened a "mixed form of faith" (Borlase, *Age of the Saints*, p. 59); but the form of a poem allows some license. It is likely enough that the hymn, as it stands, is post-Patrician, but that it embodies some benedictory or supplicatory sayings of his. Another saying may be genuine: "Let every church that follows me sing Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Thanks be to God." Another hymn called Patrick's begins, "Altus Prosator Vetustus dierum;" see an English version of it in Bishop Dowden's *Celt. Ch. in Scotl.* p. 323.

² See Bp. Dowden, p. 99; "druids" here = wizards.

concludes, "is the Lord's—is Christ's; may Thy salvation, Lord, be always with us! Amen."

The hymn called *Fiacc's* ends by saying, with terse significance, that "Patrick was in the service of Mary's Son." Indeed he was so; and we may leave him with that summary of his work. But what results did it leave? Not, assuredly, a conversion of all Ireland. "It is certain," says Dr. Whitley Stokes, "that the whole of Ireland did not submit to Patrick's influence."¹ Not, apparently, a settled Church—only churches in this and that district, with Armagh as a sort of centre;²—it would not be safe to rely literally on the style "canons of St. Patrick"³ prefixed to a number of old

¹ *Tripartite Life*, i. p. cxliii. Hero-worship ere long created the belief recorded by Tirechan in the seventh century, that Patrick "baptised nearly the whole of Ireland" (*ib.* ii. 332). Loegaire, it is admitted, was not really converted, and was buried with heathen rites. Of his next successors, the first cannot "with certainty" be called a Christian; the second, Lugaid, Loegaire's son, is said to have "violated the law of Patrick," doubtless by practising heathen rites; and the fifth, Dermid, was a "self-willed semi-pagan," who favoured St. Kieran, but violated the privilege of sanctuary, whereupon St. Ruadan, in 554, excommunicated him, and cursed the royal abode at Tara (*McGee, Hist. Irel.* p. 29).

² "Primacy to Armagh," in *Fiacc's* hymn. In a saying ascribed to Patrick it is called a "dear dwelling" and a "dear hill" (*Tripart. Life*, ii. 487).

³ *Haddan and Stubbs, Councils*, ii. 328 ff. Another of these

Irish Church laws, if only because they presume the existence of something like a diocesan system, which was not established in the earlier Irish Church. And the Catalogue of Three Orders of Irish Saints,¹ attributed by Todd to a writer of the eighth century, is evidently made up to suit a theory; but it is so far

canons, which directs that in cases of difficulty resort is to be had to the chair of "the archbishop of the Irish," and, if it cannot be thus settled, "ad Petri apostoli cathedram auctoritatem Romæ urbis habentem," is certainly post-Patrician, and implies a belief in Patrick's mission from Rome, but was referred to by Cummian, in the seventh century, as a reason for sending delegates to Rome, as "children to a mother," for direction as to the right calculation of Easter.

¹ This catalogue is given by Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. 292. The first order were bishops who had one Head, Christ,—and one leader, Patrick,—and celebrated one form of mass, and had one tonsure from ear to ear, and did *not* decline "mulierum administrationem et consortia;" (compare the "spiritual sisters" or "subintroducæ"). The second order consisted chiefly of catholic presbyters, who celebrated diverse masses and did decline "mulierum," etc.;—they *received a mass* from David, Gilla (Gildas), and Doc (Cadoc), Britons. Among them were two Finians, Kieran, Columba, etc. The third dwelt in deserts, and had different tonsures, rites, and Easter rules. The first order was most holy, the second holy of holies, the third holy; the first like the sun at noon, the second like the pale moon, the third like the rising dawn; again, like a pervading fire, fire on the hills, lights burning in valleys. Adamnan says that "a British stranger," Mochta, a disciple of Patrick, prophesied of the birth and renown of Columba: *Vit. Columb. præf. ii.* It may be added that Brigid, or "St. Bride," the foundress of Kildare, strangely called "the Mary of Ireland," was born about 453 (Lanigan, i. 378).

valuable that it indicates alternations in the matter of "sanctity," and this fits in with what we know of a revival, after decadence, of religion and of asceticism in Ireland, about a century after Patrick's death, by the agency of holy men from Wales.¹

Two strong points and two weak points are conspicuous in this old Irish Church's character. First, let us do honour to Irish missionary zeal. It has of late years been usual to lay stress on the great debt of thankfulness which we owe to that zeal for its work in the north of England, and, though more indirectly, in the Midlands as well ;² and all who, while travelling in Cornwall, have seen the county studded with local names of saints, have special reason for appreciating the ministry of Irish evangelists, among whom some women are prominent—St. Breaca,—St. Burian, whose church towers up over the open country near the Land's End,—and St. Ia, who is commemorated

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 115. The collection of old Irish laws, called *Senchus Mór* (great laws), claims to be of Patrick's time, but is later, though it may contain sixth-century elements (*ib.* ii. 339). In its introduction both "Laeghaire" and Patrick are named among its "authors."

² One little Irish monastery in Sussex was altogether ineffective in the way of impressing the pagan people (*Bede*, iv. 13).

in "St. Ives."¹ Columba's mission-life belongs to Scotland; but there is no more typical Irish missionary than that Columban whose name is a prolongation of his, and who left Ireland for the Continent with companions who were "the very pick of the Irish nation," very soon after the revival above referred to.² He became a preacher of righteousness to Frankish royalty in its moral degradation, the inaugurator of a very strict monastic rule, and ultimately the vehement and imperious denouncer of Paganism in the country of Zug and Zurich. A pious, fearless, self-devoted man,³ but with not a little of Celtic passion in his nature; it is with some sense of relief that we recur to his gentle and dignified remonstrance with the Gallic clergy in regard to the Easter dispute.⁴ "I entreat you by

¹ Borlase, *Age of the Saints*, p. 63 ff.

² "Seized with the yearning after foreign travel which seemed to have taken so many of his countrymen by storm, and eagerly desirous to preach the Gospel to the pagan tribes on the Continent," etc; Maclear, *Apostles and Mediæval Europe*, p. 59. So Baring Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, Nov. 21: "The adventurous temper of his race, the passion for pilgrimage and preaching," etc. He landed in France in 580, and died near his monastery at Bobbio in 615.

³ For his fervent devotion to our Lord, see his "Instructions," 10. 2; 13. 3, etc.

⁴ Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 348. See Prof. Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, p. 141.

our common Lord, that I may be suffered to live on amid these woods, in silence, as I have lived for twelve years, beside the bones of our seventeen departed brethren, and to pray for you, as I am bound to do, and have done. Let Gaul, I pray, find room for us, as room will be found in the kingdom of heaven, if we are worthy." But Columban was positive even to dogmatism in the defence of the Celtic Easter; and he was mistaken in attributing to Anatolius of Laodicea, in the third century, a "Paschal canon" which Celts quoted as supporting their own methods. Nor did he show a real appreciation of the question of "the three chapters," when, after addressing Boniface IV. as "head of all the Churches of Europe, and pastor of pastors," he lectured him as having appeared to compromise the faith by accepting the decision of "some fifth Council," in which it was said that "*both* Eutyches and Nestorius had been approved by Pope Vigilius"!¹ Here was the *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*

¹ Ep. 5. 9. He is "devoted to the chair of St. Peter," but the notion of its infallibility has never occurred to him. "Ut mundes cathedram Petri ab omni errore, si quis est, ut aiunt, intromissus" (ib. 8). See, too, his blunt admonition to Gregory the Great, Ep. 1. 3. He calls Rome the head of all churches, saving the "prærogativa" of Jerusalem (Ep 5. 10).

combined with strange ignorance as to facts : nor is this the only mistake in his remonstrances with this pope.¹ St. Gall, as his Irish name of Callech was Latinised,² was a scholarly pupil and fellow-labourer of Columban, and survived him twelve years: Kilian became the apostle of Franconia; Fridolin earned for himself the designation of "the Traveller;" Ferghil, better known as "Virgil," got into trouble with St. Boniface and Pope Zacharias on the subject of the "antipodes," but afterwards held the bishopric of Salzburg. Men like these, restless in their love of movement, indefatigable in their Christian and ascetic propaganda, founded monasteries over half Europe, such as those of Bobbio in Lombardy, Chur in Switzerland, and Fontenelle in Normandy;³ but, as Milman observes, they could not perpetuate their peculiar observances.⁴ The Continental Church influence,

¹ He claimed the second canon of Constantinople as implicitly sanctioning the Celtic Easter-rule (Ep. 3).

² With his name is associated that wild tale which may remind us of the "spirits of flood and fell" in the Lay of the Last Minstrel. The mountain-spirit asks the water-spirit to help him to expel the strange preacher; the answer is, "I would fain spoil the nets of one of them who is fishing on my lake, but he is always sealed up in sleepless prayer." Vit. S. Gall. in Pertz, Monum. Hist. Germ. ii. 7.

³ See a full account in A. W. Haddan's Remains, p. 268 ff.

⁴ Milman, Lat. Chr. ii. 294.

with its uniformity and its superior culture, drew these Irish foundations into its sphere. Another excellent thing in the old Irish Church was its love of teaching and study. Cummian's scholarship was the chief motive power in the adoption of the Continental Easter by the South - Irish Churches, although Ulster held out, under the influence of its Columban monasteries, until the seventh century was somewhat advanced.¹ Our own Bede, who is so hostile to the Britons, warmly praises the Irish as "a harmless nation," which, until a Northumbrian force without provocation invaded Meath, were "most friendly to the Angles;" and he illustrates the remark by the openhearted, generous hospitality which they had extended to Anglian students, attracted to Ireland by the fame of its monastic schools,—among whom he mentions Egbert, Chad, and an exiled Northumbrian prince, Aldfrid, who lived to become the first English scholar-king.² And with this zeal for sacred learning

¹ The total abolition of the Celtic Easter in Ireland is marked by a canon which censures the Britons for dissenting "a Romano more," etc. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 126).

² Cf. Bede, iv. 26 (*gentem innoxiam et nationi Anglorum semper amicissimam*); iii. 27; iv. 3. Aldfrid is said to have written verses in praise of Irish monasteries: "I found in every

—for what Bede calls the study of Scripture—must be associated a love for certain kinds of art. The Irish Academy in Dublin has treasures of this sort, such as crosiers or the tops of crosiers, or hand-bells,¹ used by the early Irish saints; but its finer specimens of metal-work belong to a much later period.

But missionary enthusiasm and intellectual activity are not all that a Church requires for the purposes of its existence. It needs

great church learning, devotion, holy welcome, protection.” “The office of scribe was of” great “importance in an Irish monastery” (Warren, *Lit. and Ritual of Celtic Church*, p. 18). There was a “third part” of Armagh (“*Trian Sassenagh*”) devoted to schools frequented by “Saxons.” There were famous schools at Clonard and Clonmaenois, and Lismore on the Blackwater. Aileran of Clonard wrote a tract on the names of Christ’s ancestors (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxx. 527). Banchor, or Bangor, on Belfast Lough, founded by St. Comgall, “must have been a thoroughly equipped and vigorous seat of learning in the latter half of the sixth century” (Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, p. 135). He has a chapter on the study of Greek, and even of Hebrew, in Irish monasteries. The Duke of Argyll, however, considers that Irish Christian book-lore has been much exaggerated (*Irish Nationalism*, p. 17). Its most splendid memorial is the Book of Kells (assigned by Miss Stokes to about A.D. 700), the copy of the Gospels used in the Columban church there, and now kept in Trinity College library.

¹ One crosier, from Durrow, is called St. Columba’s. The oldest of the bells is the rude iron “bell of St. Patrick,” inclosed in a case of much later date. For it, and for other such bells, see Miss Stokes’s *Early Christian Art in Ireland*, p. 58 ff. Cases, or “shrines,” were also made for relics and prized manuscripts.

organisation ; and that was what the old Irish Church so conspicuously lacked. Here the racial weakness came out. It has been pointedly said by one who knows the Irish nature¹ well, that "its radical error is *incoherence* ;—no bond, no union . . . is sufficient to keep Irishmen together. Law, as a form of order and coherence, is in itself distasteful to the Irish Celt. This explains why the Island of Saints, from the dawn of history until now, has never yet had a year of harmony and concord." The Church was abnormally constituted on lines intensely tribal, and, as such, un-diocesan.² The tribe—a large clan—was for religious purposes aggregated round large groups of monks, who acted as centres of Christian life to its members.³ The people could not, perhaps, have been otherwise dealt with ; for they had no national feeling,⁴ nothing but

¹ Miss Cobbe, in Tinsley's Magazine for 1868.

² See Skene, Celtic Scotland, ii. 22 ff. The tribe was called a *tuath*. A section of it was called a *finé* (Skene, iii. 171).

³ Green, Making of England, p. 284 ; Skene, ii. 64 ff. The early monasteries were groups of huts or cells of "bee-hive" form, with a wooden church or chapel (the round towers were of later date), and enclosed within a *cashel* or stone wall, and a *rath* or earthwork. At Clonard and Bangor there were at times 3000 and 4000 monks ; the smallest convents had 150. Lands assigned by a tribe to a church were called *termon* lands.

⁴ The disintegrating effect of Irish tribalism is well illustrated

attachment to this or that tribe, and within it to this or that clan. It followed that Church government, such as it was, passed into the hands of the abbots of monasteries, as near kinsmen of the respective tribal chiefs, rather than of bishops. The episcopal character was bestowed freely and very largely on priests of conspicuous learning or sanctity;¹ but (to Bede's astonishment when he learned about this "unusual arrangement"² as in force at Icolmkill or Iona) there was no diocesan episcopal jurisdiction. The multitudinous bishops were subject, in their own tribal districts, to the great monastic chiefs,³ saving always their exclusive right to perform certain

by the failure of even such a hero as Brian Boru to establish a monarchy, in the proper sense of the word. Ancient Ireland thus lost her one chance of attaining to national unity.

¹ Skene, ii. 21. On the groups of seven bishops in one church, see *ib.* 25.

² Bede, iii. 4. Cf. Reeves's *Adamnan*, pp. 69, 341; Grub, *Eccles. Hist. Scotl.* i. 153 ff.; Skene, ii. 42 ff.

³ So tribal was the monasticism of Ireland, that when the founder of a monastery was of a different tribe from that of the chief within whose tribe-district it was founded, the abbot was still chosen from the founder's old tribe, if within it could be found a person capable of singing the psalms. The idea was that the head of the community should belong to the "tribe of the saint," so as to be tribally the saint's "coarb" or successor. And even at Armagh the title "coarb" (originally, co-heir of territory) belonged not to the bishops as such, but to the abbots.

properly episcopal functions,—for which purpose certain monasteries kept bishops within their own precincts, to officiate in ordination,¹ etc. And even in the appointment of these bishops the tribal leaven came in,—they were usually members of some particular family within the tribe. And, yet again, the abuse of hereditary succession in abbacies was a further result of the tribe's influence on the Church,² which was thus as effectually stifled in the grasp of tribalism as the continental Church

¹ Skene, ii. 43. Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 340: "Five bishops of Hy are mentioned in the Irish annals at various dates." St. Brigid procured the appointment of a bishop, Conlaeth, for her own monastic churches; see *Lanigan*, i. 406. Archd. Pryce thinks it probable that a similar arrangement existed in Wales (*Anc. Brit. Ch.* p. 166). There is clear evidence from *Adamnan's Life of Columba* that *he* fully recognised the superiority of the episcopal order: as when bishop Cronan from Munster visited him, concealing his character; on the next Sunday, Columba bids him celebrate; he asks Columba to come to the altar, that, "as being two presbyters, they might break the Lord's bread at the same time,"—in later phrase, might "concelebrate;" whereupon Columba, looking hard at him, desires him to "break the bread alone, as is usual with bishops" (i. 44; cf. i. 36). Well-informed presbyterians have long given up the notion that the old Celtic church was not episcopal.

² Skene, iii. 141. "The office of chief of the Culdees at Clonmacnois was handed on from father to son for three generations all through the twelfth century" (*Stokes, Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church*, p. 361). Families transmitted Welsh benefices in the same period. See above, p. 637.

of the eleventh century in that of feudalism. Such a system, or rather no-system, characteristic of Irish Church life in those old times, is more than sufficient proof of the beneficent result for England of the Conference of Whitby, which in effect determined that the English Church should *not* be cast in an Irish mould, and thereby cut off from order, culture, and civilisation.¹

And this anarchical condition of matters was closely connected with a yet worse evil. The Church was unable to tame the Irish nature. She was in sad truth infected by its wild impetuosity, its irrepressible tendency to feud and conflict. Thus, the monastic discipline was excessively severe ;² the passion for austerities went beyond anything known in Western Europe. Some cases are mentioned in which asceticism passed into a self-torture such as Hindoo devotees would think meritorious.³

¹ See Green, *Making of England*, pp. 318-325.

² Cf. King, *Hist. Ch. Irel.* i. 281. See Columban's *Pænitentialis* on "percussiones" (*Galland. Bibl. Patr.* xii. 324). But he says, "Vana est . . . corporalis sola afflictio . . . nisi comitetur animi fructuosa temperantia." (*Instructio* 2, *ib.* 332). Columba also imposed long penances (*Adamn.* ii. 39; and cf. *Bede*, iv. 25).

³ Whitley Stokes, *Tripart. Life*, i. p. excv.: "We read of Finnchu suspending himself on sickles inserted in his armpits,"

But this was only one form of that unbalanced intensity which, if powerful for good, could also be powerful for evil. So we find that Irish ecclesiastics were too apt to throw themselves into the feuds of their tribes,—feuds perpetually raging, which have left terrible traces in the laconic records of *bellum, occisio, jugulatio, combustio*, which recur so often in the “Chronicon Scotorum.”¹ We cannot wonder that reverence for churches was all too easily effaced from the minds and memories of Connaught men making war in Munster; but it is startling to find that the Munster king, Phelim MacCriffan, who devastated the holy precinct of Clonmacnois, with another famous monastery of Columban foundation, was himself both abbot and bishop.² Nor can we forget the strange

etc., as if the idea of self-training for a definite moral end had been simply lost in a wretched superstition.

¹ See, too, Annals from the Book of Leinster (Whitley Stokes, ii. 515 ff.).

² Phelim is the pronunciation of Feidhlimidh: see Wars of the Gaedhill (Gael, or Irish) with the Gaill (Foreigners, Norsemen) p. 44. Prof. Stokes twice records the deeds of this “taker of the sword.” In 833 he slew the monks of Clonmacnois (Chron. Scot.); in 836 he “took the oratory at Kildare by arms;” some years later, after capturing Armagh, he preached every Sunday for a year to its people, as bishop! And “the prelates of Armagh were just as” fierce (Irel. Celt. Ch. pp. 200, 270. See, too, his Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Ch. p. 364). A

proneness of Irish saints to forget "of what spirit they were," as Christians, by a fierce volubility in cursing their enemies, or the enemies of the Church;¹ as when even the noble Columban imprecated destruction on the children of hostile peasants.² And sometimes they would "fast against" persons by way of procuring a Divine judgment upon them.³ Here, surely, was a mournful proof of corruption and retrogression. The light had become dimmed, if not darkened; the world in its roughest and wildest temper had degraded the Church which should have drawn it upward, but which found its wrist stronger than her own, and which had, indeed, "economised" overmuch in her adaptation of old Celtic observances superficially Christianised.

much better combination of bishop and king is seen in Cormac Mac-Cullinan, whose lovely chapel crowns the glories of the rock of Cashel. But he fell in battle, in 903 or 907.

¹ Columba himself went near to this, if he did not reach it. He prayed against a "malefactor" who departed from Iona deriding him (*Adamn. Vit. Col. ii. 22*); see Bishop Reeves, *Adamnan*, pp. 77, 133. A legend said that he "solemnly cursed" a young Irish prince for throwing mud at the clergy (*Todd*, p. 137). Patrick was fabled to have "cursed" very freely. The word occurs twenty times in *Whitley Stokes's* index to the *Tripartite Life*, etc., under the head of "Patrick."

² *Pertz*, *Mon. Hist. Germ. ii. 7*.

³ *Reeves*, *Adamnan*, p. liv. Cf. *Trip. Life*, i. 219, "Patrick fasted against the king;" and the suggestive note *ib. ii. 560*.

So unreal is the dream of a period in which the "Isle of Saints" is depicted as "a kind of Hesperian elysium of peace and plenty."¹ It had its saints—many saints,—and also numerous scholars, some of whom, like Ferghil, or the famous John the "Scot"—called in classical phrase Erigena,—were independent thinkers, whom the ecclesiastical authorities would be disposed to compare with the Irish Cælestius, the outspoken associate of Pelagius. But it was never civilised by its Church, never purged by her influence of the chronic leaven² of savagery and internecine warfare. A tree is known by its fruits, and Celtic Christianity cannot avoid the criterion. No ruins are more pathetic than those which haunt the memory of the English traveller in Ireland,—for instance, at Clonmacnois or Monasterboice; but their "crown of sorrow," the peculiar intensity of their mournfulness, is appreciated in proportion as one remembers this dismal failure of a Church so rich in

¹ Milman, *Lat. Ch.* ii. 285.

² "A hereditary taint," Prof. Stokes calls it, *Irel. and Celtic Ch.* p. 201. See the duke of Argyll's *Irish Nationalism*, pp. 26-37. There was exaggeration, no doubt, in Giraldus' reproach addressed to a Dublin synod: "If only Irish bishops since St. Patrick had been bold enough to correct the disorderliness of their people!" (*Girald. Op.* i. 68, *Rolls Series*); but it had some foundation. St. Laurence O'Toole had recently died.

canonised names to fulfil the most obvious purpose of its mission. We cannot wonder that the Danish Church, so to call it, settled in Dublin and a few other towns, held aloof from the old Irish Church, and looked to Canterbury rather than to Armagh;¹ that disorder became rife among Irish Churches;² that bishops profaned ordination by simony; that the marriage bond was popularly disregarded; and therefore that it was high time for such a "real reformation of the Irish Church" as was inaugurated by Gille or Gilbert, the Danish bishop of Limerick,³ and completed by the efforts of Malachy as

¹ Stokes, *Ireland and Celtic Church*, p. 314 ff. The Danes of Dublin, Waterford, etc., were called Ostmen (see King, *Ch. Hist. Irel.* ii. 419 ff.). Of the two Dublin cathedrals, Christ Church (properly, Holy Trinity) represents the old Danish minster, and St. Patrick's an older Celtic church outside the Danish walls.

² The see of Armagh was held during eight successions by laymen of the same family. This was the more scandalous, since from the eighth century at least it had been recognised as primatial (Stokes, p. 333); and we can believe St. Bernard's statement that this "mos pessimus" was the source of a widespread "dissolutio disciplinæ" (*Vit. S. Malach.* c. 10). Other irregularities were the non-use of chrism at baptism, and consecration of bishops by a single bishop (see King, ii. 424, 432). The latter custom existed also amongst Britons (see Jocelyn, *Vit. Kent.* c. 11; and Warren, *Lit. Celt. Ch.* p. 68).

³ King, ii. 439 ff. Stokes, pp. 324, 337. It is curious to find Lanigan complaining of this prelate's narrow-minded zeal for ritual uniformity in accordance with Roman models (iv. 27).

primate of Armagh,¹ who did indeed bind the Irish Church, for the first time, closely to Rome,—for these laxities are sufficient proof that Rome had not previously *governed* her,²—but who could no otherwise have exorcised the spirit of secular corruption and moral license. It is expressly said of him by Prof. Stokes, that he resigned his see “when he had thoroughly broken the old clan or tribal idea connected with” it.³ His death took place on All Saints’ Day in 1148;⁴ and four years afterwards the work, begun when Cashel was made a metropolitan see for the southern half of the land,⁵ and carried on when the country was divided into regular dioceses, was completed when the synod of Kells gave to Ireland, for the first time,

¹ King, ii. 455 ff. Stokes, p. 339 ff.

² Reverence for the Roman see might exist long before any idea of subjection to its supremacy. The Stowe Missal, with its prayer for “our pope, the bishop of the apostolic see,” shows no more than “that the Roman canon was introduced into at least partial use in Ireland as early as the ninth century” (Warren, *Lit. and Ritual of Celtic Church*, p. 204).

³ Stokes, p. 346. Celsus of Armagh, says Bernard, had been too “timorous” to put down abuses.

⁴ He died like a saint, saying to the Clairvaux monks who surrounded him, “I have loved God ; I have loved you ; and love never fails” (*Vit. Mal.* c. 31).

⁵ Called “Moa’s half,” after a legendary king of Leinster ; the northern half being named after “Conn of the Hundred Fights.” Cf. Olden, *Hist. Ch. Irel.* p. 118.

a regular hierarchical organisation with four provinces under four archbishoprics, the primacy being reserved to Armagh. Truly it was no golden age that succeeded the English invasion; but the Celtic wildness was, at any rate, somewhat broken in. Although the attempt of the synod of Cashel, in 1172, to Anglicise the Irish church was obstructed by the tenacity of Irish customs,—and the long hostility between the Celtic and Anglo-Norman elements foreshadowed and prepared the way for that antagonism of the native Irish, as a body, to the Reformation as forced on them from England, which bequeathed such troubles to the future,—yet for all this, one thing is most certain, and most needful to be remembered: if Irish history is like a record of doom—weird, mysterious, well-nigh hopeless,—the doom goes back to ages long and long anterior to that in which the wretched King Dermot of Leinster¹ procured the support of Robert FitzStephen and Richard called “Strongbow.” It is not England that originated the miseries of her unhappy sister isle.

¹ “Ever the prince of evildoers and of cruelty” (Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church, p. 8). He was driven out of Ireland in 1166: the invasion begun in 1169. But before his expulsion he had founded an abbey at Ferns and a priory in Dublin.

III.

Of the primitive Scottish Church it may be said that it must have existed from, at any rate, an early period in the fourth century, if Patrick was born, as is usually said, on the Firth of Clyde; for, as we have seen, his grandfather, if not his great-grandfather, was a presbyter, and he speaks of his contemporaries as having been inattentive to their "priests." But the first "apostle" of Southern and Central Scotland was undoubtedly St. Ninian, a Briton of Strathclyde,¹ trained and consecrated at Rome, who, as Bede expresses it, "preached the word to the Southern Picts"² as well as to their kinsmen in Galloway. The Southern Picts, says Bede, "dwelt on this side of a range of mountains which divided them from the Northern Picts:"—a range extending from the

¹ Strathclyde proper extended from Alcluth or Alclyde (Dunbarton) to the river Derwent in Cumberland (Bp. Forbes, *Lives of SS. Ninian and Kentigern*, pp. lxvi. 331; Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 235). In a broader sense it took in the modern Lancashire. Part of Wales was so called in 890.

² Bede, iii. 4. Bishop Forbes considers these Southern Picts to have made no permanent settlement south of the Firth of Forth (*Lives of Ninian and Kentigern*, p. 280). Skene infers from a passage in Bede's *Life of Cuthbert* that Galloway itself was Pictish in the seventh century (*Celtic Scotland*, i. 133).

neighbourhood of Ben Nevis to the district near Aberdeen,¹—their southern frontier being the Firth of Forth. St. Ninian's immediate task would be the fuller evangelisation of Strathclyde. He would penetrate into the extreme south-west, and address the Picts of Galloway; and he may well have made visits to the land of the South Picts proper beyond the wall which united the two firths. His episcopal see was Whithern (Whithorn), or "Candida Casa," as Bede calls it,² in the present Wigtonshire, where now the ruins of a small cathedral, on a woody eminence in full view of the Solway, represent the older church,³ "built of stone in a manner unfamiliar to the Britons," and famous as a centre of study and devotion under the names of the "Great Monastery" and "Rosnat," or "Headland of Learning."⁴ His episcopate

¹ It was called the "Mounth" (Bp. Forbes, *Lives of Ninian and Kentigern*, p. 279; Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 230; "the backbone of the Grampians," *ib.* iii. 286).

² It was a restoration or perpetuation of an older name, "Lucopibia" (Ptolemy), probably a corruption of "Leucokidia."

³ Bp. Forbes, *Calendars of Scottish Saints*, p. 422; *Lives of Ninian and Kentigern*, p. 268 ff.). On the associations of the spot, *ib.* p. 60. The Arbuthnot missal has a collect for September 16, "Deus qui populos *Pictorum et Britonum* per doctrinam S. Niniani . . . convertisti," etc.

⁴ Bishop Dowden (*Celt. Ch. Scotl.* p. 32). Irish students

may be said to have begun before the death of St. Martin in 397. The venerable bishop of Tours, at the very end of his life-work, had shown kindness to the younger brother whose tasks lay still in the future; and the "White House" was dedicated to his memory, the first of a multitude of "St. Martin's" churches in Britain. And long after Ninian had passed away, his memory, as Bishop Dowden says, "was a power in Scotland;"¹ his name was popularly turned into "Ringan;" and among the numerous chapels dedicated in his honour is included a rude oratory on the south-west coast of Shetland.² But here, too, as in many other cases, the seed sown appeared to have struck no deep root. His converts did not hand down a settled Christianity; there was not a little of revival and reconstruction to be accomplished for the Christianity of South-west

resorted thither; and a teacher at Whithern is named, Mugentius; see Bp. Forbes, *Lives of Ninian*, etc., p. 292. Viventius, Mavorius, and Florentius, the three priests commemorated on the sculptured stones at Kirkmadrine in Wigtonshire, were probably among Ninian's clergy. See Bp. Dowden, *Celt. Ch. Scotl.* p. 16; and Haddan and Stubbs, i. 120.

¹ *Celtic Ch. in Scotland*, p. 31. See W. Stephen's excellent *History of the Scottish Church*, i. 12.

² Cp. "The Pirate," vol. ii. c. 5. There were, in fact, two sanctuaries of St. Ninian in Shetland.

Scotland when St. Kentigern¹ was bishop of Strathclyde, at first when Christianity was the faith of a small minority, and ultimately under the powerful patronage of King Roderick the Bountiful;² and he so endeared himself to his flock that his real name was obscured in the appellation of Mungo, "the Loveable."³ His

¹ Kentigern is a corruption of Kyndeyrn (chief lord). It was his work, says Bishop Dowden (p. 50), "to restore the lapsed and to strengthen the weak" Christians in Strathclyde. We may trust Jocelyn, his twelfth-century "biographer," when he says that when Kentigern first became bishop, the Christians of Cambria (*i.e.* Strathclyde, then called *Cumbria*) were "perpauci" (Vit. Kent. c. 2.). The link between Ninian and Kentigern may be represented by the tradition that Kentigern found at Glasgow a cemetery which Ninian had hallowed (*ib.* c. 9.), the link between Kentigern and Columba by the beautiful legend of their meeting beside the Molendinar burn, when Kentigern's choir sang, "Via justorum recta facta est," and Columba's responded, "Ibunt sancti de virtute in virtutem," and the two saints exchanged pastoral staves (see Skene, ii. 194, from Vit. Kent. c. 39). There may well be some truth in both.

² Properly, Rhydderch Hael, "one of the three liberal princes of Britain." His victory at Arthuret, near Carlisle, in 573, established the supremacy of Christianity in Strathclyde, together with his own kingship; and he recalled Kentigern, whom the hostility of a former king, Morken, had obliged to retire meanwhile into Wales, where he passed twenty years, and founded the see of St. Asaph. Roderick was one of the many who had been baptised and instructed in Ireland.

³ From two Welsh words for "amiable" and "dear" (Skene, Celtic Scotl. ii. 183). Cp. the "Mo" (dear) prefixed to Irish saintly names. The central platform in the crypt of Glasgow cathedral is pointed out as "St. Mungo's grave." Kentigern died about the time of the great overthrow of the Britons and Dalriad Scots by Ethelfrith at Dawston (Bede, i. 34).

work, which had Glasgow for its centre, belongs to the latter half of the sixth century ; and he was thus a contemporary of the great missionary, the great abbot, whom Scotland owes to North Ireland, "Columba of the Churches," who, after a career in Ireland as a founder of monasteries, "sailed away," as his biographer, St. Adamnan, expresses it, "desiring to sojourn abroad for Christ's sake," and arrived in Hy, I-colm-kill, or Ioua, which we now soften into Iona,¹ at the Whitsuntide of 563. Apparently the fact that he had been, for a time, under synodical censure "for certain trivial and venial causes, and, as it ultimately appeared, unjustly"²—which is the brief statement of Adamnan—was exaggerated into the story that he had been provoked by a decision against him in a suit which he was prosecuting³ to stir up a tribal war in which his own North-Irish clansmen were victorious,⁴ and was thereupon enjoined,

¹ Ioua insula, Reeves's Adamnan, p. 259. Hy, "the island," is also written Hii, I, or Ia, etc.

² Adamn. Vit. Col. iii. 3.

³ As to whether he might keep his copy of a manuscript belonging to Finnian of Moville. The "arch-king" Diarmaid ruled that he might not, *because* "to every cow belongs her own calf, to every book its copy."

⁴ The battle of Cooldrevny, near Sligo. The Chronicon Scottorum (p. 53) says that the victory of the Connaught men over

by way of penance, to leave his beloved "Erin" and become a missionary to the heathen Picts in North Britain. It is not of course unlikely that an Irishman of exceptional force of character should have shown at times a fiery or passionate nature; and there is evidence that Columba did so, although an eminent writer on "Celtic Scotland"¹ pronounces that the earliest evidence on the subject discredits the "popular tradition" about his pugnacity, vindictiveness, and remorse, and represents his disposition as predominantly amiable. "He was," says Adamnan, "angelic in aspect, clear

Diarmaid was won through the prayer of Columille. The story is one of three; two other occasions are named in which Columba, on one of his subsequent visits to his native country, was in some degree connected with tribal warfare. See Bp. Reeves, Adamnan, pp. lxxvii. 248 ff. Adamnan's book has been recently edited in a most convenient form, by Dr. Fowler of Durham. But Bp. Reeves's edition is truly a monumental work.

¹ Skene, *Celt. Scotl.* ii. 145, 146. But he admits that "he may have in some degree, either directly or indirectly, been the cause of the battle," as being deemed at first somehow responsible for the blood then shed (*ib.* 81). The tradition is exquisitely utilised in Mr. Skrine's beautiful drama on St. Columba. And undoubtedly there are passages in Adamnan's biography which exhibit Columba as stern and even resentful, as i. 39; ii. 22, 23; he does not hesitate to predict the final condemnation of some offenders, etc. But his "righteous indignation" was clear of all personal vindictiveness; see Bp. Dowden, *Celt. Ch. Scotl.* p. 109.

in speech, holy in conduct, excellent in disposition, great in counsel: never did a single hour pass in which he was not engaged in prayer, or reading, or writing, or some other work . . . and amid all this, he was dear to all, his holy face always cheerful to look at, his inmost heart gladdened with the joy of the Holy Spirit." In the same context his motive for going to North Britain is concisely stated in the simple words quoted above—*pro Christo peregrinari volens*. That he was a grand saint, and a man of extraordinary courage, perseverance, energy, determination;—born to guide and sway minds, and also to win hearts;—that he maintained a "sweetness and brightness of disposition" which called forth a passionate affection and loyalty; that he did a great work for the conversion of the Northern Picts¹ and the

¹ The fortress of king Brude, or Bridei, son of Mailcon (who reigned from 554 to 584), is thought to have been on Torvean, south-west of Inverness. The year in which he was baptised by St. Columba is probably 565 (Skene). Adamnan tells the story of Columba's thundering chant of Ps. xlv., as terrifying the king and people while he stood outside the fortress (i. 37). But we may say with the duke of Argyll, in his interesting little volume on "Iona," "It is really afflicting that Adamnan gives us no ray of light on" such questions as, "What were to the" Caledonian "tribes the attractive elements in the new religion?"

Hebridean islanders ;¹ that he founded Churches among the Christian Southern Picts ; that, in short, he deserves to be ranked in the very first rank of illustrious and successful missionaries ;—to say this is but to summarise the main points of a life-work which, perhaps, is less generally known than the death-scene which comes near to Bede's own in tenderness, pathos, and solemn peace. Persons who knew little else about Columba have heard of that Whitsuntide Saturday of 597, when the old man for the last time fondled his faithful horse,²

What were the arguments addressed to them by Columba ?” However, there is no doubt that “under those limitations which must always be understood in regard to a national conversion, the kingdom of the Northern Picts was converted by Columbia and his immediate disciples” (Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scotl.* i. 56).

¹ When once staying in Skye, he baptised an old pagan who “throughout his life had preserved *naturale bonum*” (Adamn. i. 33). One of his monks, named Cormac, visited Orkney (Adamn. ii. 42). He himself settled his pupil Drostan at Deer in Aberdeenshire. Another of his disciples, Donnan, suffered “red martyrdom” in Eigg, just after finishing mass, in 617.

² Tenderness to animals is a feature in several mediæval saints, as in Cuthbert : see, too, the stories of St. Serf's robin and St. Hugh's swan. (Contrast the inhuman neo-Roman teaching.) Adamnan tells feelingly how the white horse that carried milk between the cowhouse and the monastery thrust his head into Columba's bosom, as if he knew “*dominum a se suum mox emigraturum,*” and began to whine, “*et valde spumans flere,*” and how the saint said, “Let him alone, he loves me, let him weep on my bosom,” and “*mæstum a se*

concluded his transcription of psalms with the verse, "They that seek the Lord shall want no manner of thing that is good," uttered his farewell admonition as to "mutual unfeigned charity,"¹ his farewell assurances of heavenly help; and then, just after the Sunday morning had begun, was found by his monks lying before the altar, his countenance bright, but his voice gone,—his hand, when raised by a faithful monk, just "able to make the sign of blessing."² The 9th of June should be an honoured anniversary with all who know what Britain owes to such a life; not Scotland only,³ but England,—for it was the inspiration of that life which sent St. Aidan to Northumbria, and

revertentem equum benedixit ministratorem" (iii. 23). Cp. the account in the homily on St. Columba, Skene, ii. 503. See, too, Adamnan, i. 48, on his kind treatment of the wearied crane.

¹ Skrine versifies this—

"But you,
Who must rule after me, remember . . .
. . . No deed can live but only Love's."

² Adamn. iii. 23. The duke of Argyll's Iona, p. 124. The story is well told by Stephen, Hist. Sc. Ch. i. 75.

³ "Who are these who rise and hail him 'father,'
Soldier-sons, and all the lands ingather,
Isle and island, height and highland, shore and shore?
'Neath the shade of our great spirit parted,
Mightier shadow of the mighty-hearted,
Strives a seed and lives a deed for evermore."
(The last lines of Skrine's "Columba.")

thereby, ultimately, evangelists into Mercia, and so into the East Saxon district.

The splendour of Columba's career,¹ as a light kindled amid the gloom of Pictish heathenism, contrasts with the dimness which for the most part predominates in early Scottish Church history during several centuries after his death. We know that "the Island of Columba of the Churches" remained a centre of Christian life and enterprise, and that the notion that its theory of the ministry was Presbyterian because in the district occupied by a "Scotic" or Irish colony, to which it belonged, its abbot exercised the jurisdiction which should normally have been held by bishops, is purely the result of ignorance of the peculiar constitution of "Scotic"

¹ The pre-Columban period has another saint named Ternan, who has been called a disciple of Palladius, and who perhaps brought his relics into South Pictland; and others, more or less legendary, as Machan, and the abess Modwenna. After Columba, like stars following on sunset, we meet with Modan of Roseneath, Marnock of Kilmarnock, Malrue of Applecross, whose name survives in Loch Maree; and Fillan, whom bishop Forbes places in the eighth century, and whose bell and staff, after curious adventures, are in the museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Edinburgh (see Anderson's *Scotland in Early Christian Times*, pp. 186-193, 216 ff). Skene considers that Riagail, Regulus, or "good St. Rule," was a Columban monk who settled at St. Andrews (*Celtic Scotl.* ii. 268); so A. Lang, *St. Andrews*, p. 7; and Stephen, *Hist. Sc. Ch.* i. 177.

Churches.¹ The seventh century presents us with the mission of Aidan and his two successors; and the beautiful nobleness and simplicity of their work, and of the type of character which they represented, seem to be reproduced in Cuthbert when, as prior of Old Melrose, he goes about the dales of Lothian as a representative of Christian insight and sympathy, and "no one could hide from him the secrets of the heart."² An Anglian bishopric is planted on the south frontier of Southern Pictland, but is swept away in 685 by the overthrow of Northumbrian supremacy at the battle of Dunnichen, near Forfar,³—a loss which is somewhat compensated in 730 by the restoration of Whithern as an Anglian see.⁴ The wearisome Paschal controversy continues to divide "Saxon" from "Celt;" the Roman Easter, step by step, wins its way on Celtic ground; the Pictish king Nectan, convinced by an elaborate letter, in which Bede's hand may be traced,⁵ accepts it,

¹ See above, p. 394; and cp. the full discussion by bishop Dowden, *Celt. Ch. in Scotl.* p. 252 ff.

² Bede, iv. 27; cf. Dowden, p. 169.

³ *Ib.* iv. 12, 26.

⁴ *Ib.* v. 23. The bishop was Pecthelm.

⁵ *Ib.* v. 21. It is the fullest statement which Bede gives of the case for the Roman reckoning. The offensive point in

and with it the Roman or circular form of the tonsure, as opposed to the semi-circular, which Anglian zealots vilified as "Simonian;"¹ and when the monks of Columban convents within his realm stand out, he expels them in 717;² they withdraw beyond the ridge which separated Pictland from the "Scotic" kingdom of Argyllshire;³ but already the mother-house itself has given up its Celtic heritage, and Continental or "Catholic" ways have been adopted⁴—in spite of the reclamations of a stiff-backed the Celtic was, that it allowed the "14th day of the moon," if a Sunday, to be kept as Easter-day; whereas the correct thing was to make the 15th the earliest possible Easter-day, and the 21st the latest.

¹ Adamnan said to abbot Ceolfrid, "Scias, frater mi, quia etsi Simonis tonsuram ex consuetudine patria habeam, Simoniacam tamen perfidiam tota mente detestor et respuo; beatissimi autem apostolorum principis, quantum mea parvitas sufficit, vestigia sequi desidero." "It is well," replied Ceolfrid, "but then why not do so *visibly*?" The peculiarity of the Celtic tonsure consisted in leaving a small fringe of hair across the forehead and letting the hair grow behind, so that there was not a complete *corona* (Bede, v. 21, "quæ in frontis quidem superficie," etc.). This is confirmed by the figure of an ecclesiastic on a sculptured stone at St. Vigean's, near Arbroath.

² Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 177; Reeves, p. 381.

³ "Britanniæ Dorsum," Adamn. i. 34. It was called Drumalban; it divides Perthshire from Argyllshire. The *Chronicon Scotorum* dates this expulsion of "the family of Hy" in 713. But see the *Introd.* p. xlv.

⁴ At Easter, 716; Bede, v. 22. But correct what he seems to say about Egbert's having established conformity at Iona by Skene, ii. 281.

minority, which actually sets up a rival abbot. This schism seems to have lasted nearly up to those dark days in which the Northmen repeatedly attacked and devastated the holy island, on one of which occasions an abbot was hewn in pieces for refusing to give up the silver-gilt shrine of the founder.¹

The expulsion of the Columban monks made room in eastern Scotland for secular clergy who followed the "Catholic" usages, and brought in a peculiar reverence for the names of St. Peter and St. Andrew. The supposed relics of the latter apostle were perhaps brought to Scotland by Acca, when expelled in 732 from the see of Hexham; and a bishopric was founded at Kilrimont, now St. Andrews, in the middle of the eighth century. But the monasteries left vacant passed under secular influence; and so opportunity was given for a fresh monastic revival, proceeding from Ireland, and carried on in eastern Scotland by hermits who bore the famous name of Culdees, *Cele De* or *Keledei*, that is, either "servants of God" or "friends of God"—an Irish form of the Continental term "*Deicolæ*."² Scottish imagination

¹ This was in 825; his name was Blathmac (Skene, ii. 300).

² Thus the institution was not at all peculiarly Irish, although

has run wild about the Culdees, as if they were Protestants before the time, the ministers of a "simple" Christianity divested of Latin accretions: and Columba himself has been absurdly called a Culdee. They were originally solitary ascetics, who soon became grouped in companies; and the melancholy fact of their story is that they themselves, after adopting the status and rule of canons,¹ deteriorated very markedly, and ultimately, at St. Andrews, became a close corporation of thirteen kinsmen who "performed their own rite in a corner of a very small church," while certain lay "persons" held the main church without keeping up its services, and divided the lion's share of its income. The Culdees, in short, have been idealised by ill-informed controversialism.² They did nothing, in their whole existence,

the Irish had an extreme, an inordinate admiration for hermit sanctity (Skene, ii. 159, 249; Reeves, Adamnan, p. 366; and Miss Stokes, *Early Christian Art in Ireland*, p. 158). The first Culdee settlement in Scotland was established by St. Serf on an isle in Lochleven, and the anchorites there were regarded with respect by Queen Margaret.

¹ The name "Colidei" was applied, in the tenth century, to the clergy of York cathedral; and Professor Stokes mentions the curious fact that the "Culdees" of Armagh became ultimately the vicars-choral, and as such "survived the Reformation, and were incorporated by Charles I." (*Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church*, p. 359).

² Cf. *Chron. of Picts and Scots*, p. 188 ff. Skene, ii. c. vi. and p. 356 ff.; Stephen, *Hist. Sc. Ch.* i. 269, 310-322.

for sacred learning; their corporate tone became secularised, and they drew on themselves, by their own conduct, discouragement and ultimate suppression.¹ The unsettled condition of Scottish affairs at the period which terminated by the definite preponderance of Scots (originally from the Dalriad colony in Argyllshire) over the Picts of eastern and central Scotland, was reflected in the transition of primacy, as it is called,—of ecclesiastical headship in a vague sense,—from Iona to Dunkeld,² from Dunkeld to Abernethy,³ from Abernethy to St. Andrews, the bishop of the latter church being called simply “bishop of Alban.”⁴ This final settlement belongs to the first part of the tenth century—perhaps to the year 908, when Constantine II. and bishop Cellach met on the Moothill, afterwards called the Hill of Belief, at Scone.

An interval of about a century and a half lies

¹ Skene, ii. 385 ff.

² Under Kenneth Macalpine, in 850 (849, says Grub, i. 129). Skene, ii. 307. The abbot of Dunkeld was also made bishop of Fortrenn (South Pictland).

³ Skene, ii. 310 (in the reign of Constantine I., son of Kenneth Macalpine, acc. 863). The round tower was then built by an ex-abbot of Kildare; that of Brechin belongs to the latter part of the next century, when Kenneth II. founded there a church “after the Irish model,” Skene, ii. 332.

⁴ Skene, ii. 324; Grub, i. 172.

between this centralisation of Church government in the place associated with the "first-called apostle" and the great "Anglicising" revival which is connected with the name of Queen Margaret—a name which historians may well delight to honour.¹ Her reforms, of course, were not theological, but practical; and they came just in time to hold up the Church of her adopted country, when it was fast lapsing into the apathy of barbarism; when its religious tone was relaxed, its standard of conduct lowered, its ideals forgotten amid disorders which had become a rule.² She could not abate all these evils: after her death the usurpation of spiritual benefices, even of abbacies,

¹ So Freeman, *Reign of William Rufus*, ii. 20: "Of the true holiness of Margaret, of her zeal not only for a formal devotion, but for all that is morally right, none can doubt." So Skene, ii. 344: "There is perhaps no more beautiful character recorded in history than that of Margaret," etc. Her pathetic death-scene is well known.

² See the account in Skene, ii. 346 ff.; Stephen, i. 234 ff. The Scottish clergy refrained, out of a mistaken reverence, from communicating on Easter day; and Saturday, not Sunday, was the day of cessation from work. Men used to marry their stepmothers, or their sisters-in-law. It is curious, as Skene remarks, ii. 337, that Malcolm Canmore, the husband of Margaret, was descended from a line of *lay abbots* of Dunkeld, and that one of her own sons inherited this title. In the chief monasteries this kind of secularisation had become normal (cf. Stuart, *Preface to the Book of Deer*, p. cviii.).

by laymen of the "founder's kin," survived through the twelfth century; and at St. Andrews the lofty tower of St. Rule, with the little church adjoining it, is the monument of a foundation of canons-regular, intended to absorb the old Culdean society, which "refused to be reformed," and was "too strong to be dispossessed."¹ But the impulse given by St. Margaret was ultimately irresistible; and the blessing which rested so manifestly on her work was perpetuated to her posterity in the direct royal line. When, nearly two centuries after her death, the last of the three Alexanders perished by that fatal stumble of his horse on the Fifeshire cliffs,² the calamity was one which made itself felt in effects that last to our own time. For the wars of independence, into which Scotland was driven by Edward I.'s hard lawyer-like policy, brought with them evil as well as good. They brutalised the Scottish nobles; and the weakened crown, in self-defence, turned instinctively to the Church, which represented such culture as was attainable. The practice of

¹ This, at least, is the received opinion. The priory was founded by bishop Robert in 1144.

² She died in 1093; Alexander III. in 1286. He was the grandson of William the Lion, who was the great-grandson of St. Margaret.

endowing bishoprics and monasteries had been to David the Saint a natural expression of piety; under the first Stuarts, it seemed equally natural to heap riches and lands on sacred corporations by way of counterpoise to a barbarous aristocracy. And it had demoralising results; the disproportionate amount of such resources in the hands of high ecclesiastics made the Scottish hierarchy, in the age before the great catastrophe of the Reformation, the most corrupt, perhaps, in Europe¹—some few noble examples, such as those of bishops Kennedy and Elphinstone, notwithstanding. And when the storm broke, it was bound to be a tempest; the changes carried through under Knox were such as distinguish a violent revolution, furiously determined on breaking altogether with the past; and they gave to Scottish ideas of religious duty a “dour” and stubborn character which makes it sometimes difficult for English Churchmen to appreciate a “righteousness”

¹ The writer heard this opinion expressed by the late learned and saintly bishop Forbes of Brechin. The mediæval Scottish Church, which successfully resisted the authority of the see of York, had no native metropolitan until 1472, and then Graham, first archbishop of St. Andrews, was persecuted to death by a combination of adverse forces. Mr. Stephen thinks he was sincerely bent on “correcting corruptions and abuses” (*Hist. Scott. Ch. i. 475*), which became worse after his time.

that is linked with so much that is unlovely.

The Celtic element in Scottish Christianity has long been wholly subordinate; but its tendency towards a fanatical type of Presbyterianism is as significant as the tenacious Romanism of the Irish, in regard to a point which English "moderation" is apt to ignore. The Celt has no patience for balancing coordinate principles, no wholesome dread of "the falsehood of extremes," no appreciation of "a sober standard of feeling in matters of religion." But he has a firm hold on some ideas which are not the less important because he may express them crudely or onesidedly. He is, in effect, a witness for the fact that dryness, stiffness, over-reserve, dislike of enthusiasm, are defects for which no "correctness," culture, or learning will compensate; that a professed representation of the kingdom of God must exhibit it as a power in the spiritual order; that fervour is the first condition of real worship, and that religion loses its salt in proportion as it loses intensity.¹

¹ The Manx Church, though variously connected with Wales, northern England, and Norway ("Sodor" = the Scotch isles south of Orkney, long Norse), was fundamentally Irish.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH.

THE interval between the accession of Queen Elizabeth and the Church movement connected with the names of Andrewes and Laud is conspicuous among the transitional periods of history. Such periods have their importance and instructiveness, but, as perhaps our own experience tells us, they give an impression of incompleteness and unrest. The ground, as it were, is unsteady beneath our tread ; the phenomena with which we have become familiar are passing away, and the old order is giving place to the new. What will that new order be like? how will it deal with problems which are waiting for their solution—which evidently must wait for it until elements more or less opposed have coalesced, or until one has dominated the other? Meantime, all is unsettled ; the definitive moulding has not taken place. It was so,

in regard to the Church, through Elizabeth's forty-four years, and for most part of the reign of James I. "The Elizabethan settlement" is a convenient phrase, but, as we shall see, it requires at the least very considerable qualifications. Undoubtedly this transitional character was stamped on the great Queen's reign in its political aspect; she had to feel the surge of parliamentary opposition gathering strength to restrain the personal monarchy; before she died she must have foreseen that "her seat, which had been the seat of kings," might prove uneasy for such a successor as the only prince to whom she could leave it.¹ Still, from the political and social point of view, her "times" have been most happily called "spacious:" the nation was exulting in a new consciousness of energy, was feeling its life strong within it, was reaching forth, as with youth renewed, along various paths of enterprise; it was an intense relief, after the gloomy days of a policy more Spanish than English, which weighed the realm down with its sullen pressure, to find that in Mary's half-sister was impersonated a thoroughly national royalty, that around her could be arrayed all the forces

¹ See Gardiner, *Hist. Engl.* i. 42.

of national expansion: the people could again be proud of their sovereign, and assured that sympathy with them was part of her very life. No wonder that, with all drawbacks allowed for, the reign was the most splendid in English history. But Elizabethan times could not be called thus "spacious" in their religious or ecclesiastical aspect. There is in them, when so regarded, from the first, a pronounced antagonism of principles; the administration is restrictive, official authority is unsympathetic, and seems deficient in ideas; and resistance is dogged in its conviction of a mission, and can easily be exasperated into exhibiting its capacities for tyranny. An observer with a faculty for forecasting might have predicted in the mid-period of Elizabeth's reign that the two opposing elements of Anglicanism and Puritanism were destined to collide with a shock that would mean civil war.¹

I.

The queen's own character is a symbol of the

¹ Dr. Gardiner says that "between the controversialists whom Charles I. had hoped to silence" (by his Declaration) "there was a difference not to be measured by words or terms," etc. And thus "the real line of separation between the king and the house of commons had lain in the religious question" (Hist. Engl. vii. 39, 123).

incoherences of her time, as seen from the standpoint of religion. The recently published "Life of Edward Freeman" contains an extract from an article of his in the "Quarterly Review" of June, 1854, in which two "portraits" of her are sharply contrasted, and "neither of them," says the writer, "is to be set aside as an entirely fictitious one. . . . The longer we contemplate her chequered nature, the more we are impressed with the truth of the dictum that in Elizabeth there were two wholly distinct characters, in one of which she was greater than man, and in the other less than woman."¹ Antitheses like these are usually too sparkling to be altogether accurate; human nature does not often exemplify the combination of "a man's head with a horse's neck;" some threads of unity are discernible running through all inconsistencies: but still the diversity of features in this wonderful royal figure is manifest enough, and may illustrate some points in her treatment of Church affairs. There is an appearance of "facing both ways:" her assertions of royal supremacy, embodied in statutes or other documents, are as stringent as her father's; an Act in her first

¹ Dean Stephens, *Life and Letters of E. A. Freeman*, i. 160 ff.

year attaches to the crown "all such jurisdiction as by any spiritual authority hath been or may be lawfully used over the ecclesiastical estate ;" and yet in the same context the jurisdiction thus claimed for the crown is called "ancient"—(a point on which Mr. Gladstone has laid stress in his paper on the "Royal Supremacy")¹—and the object seems to be to exclude all "usurped foreign power." The famous "*suppletas*" clause in her letters patent for Parker's consecration² includes in its scope deficiencies not only in the requirements of "the statutes of this our kingdom," but also of "the *laws ecclesiastical*:" and a subsequent act, 8 Eliz. cap. 1, intended to overrule objections to the legitimacy of his status as archbishop, declares that all ordinations or consecrations performed since the queen's accession are rightful, "any statute, law, *canon*, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding." It is at least arguable that such language refers

¹ Gleanings of Past Years, v. 197. So Neal says that, "admitting the court of high commission to be legal, both the queen and her commissioners exceeded the powers granted them by law ; for it was not the intendment of the act of supremacy to vest any new powers in the crown, but only to restore those which were supposed to be its ancient and natural right" (Hist. Purit. i. 271).

² See them in Denny and Lacey's *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 207.

to technical impediments, under ecclesiastical law, attaching in 1559 to any of the prelates named in the letters patent, or to a want of legality, at that time, in the Ordinal of King Edward. But we cannot wonder that Collier, for instance,¹ is scandalised by the breadth of the assertion in 1 Eliz. cap. 1; it has undoubtedly a twang of what is popularly called Erastianism. On the other hand, the royal Injunctions of that same first year contain an explanation of the supremacy which Hallam² describes as "intended not only to relieve the scruples of Catholics, but of those who had imbibed from the school of Calvin an apprehension of what is sometimes, though rather improperly, called Erastianism—the merging of all spiritual powers . . . in the paramount authority of the State, towards which the despotism of Henry and obsequiousness of Cranmer had seemed to bring the Church of England." The queen expressly "accepts³ as good and obedient subjects those who will accept the oath of supremacy with this interpretation," namely, "that her majesty is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner

¹ *Eccles. Hist.* vi. 214.

² *Constit. Hist.* i. 111.

³ Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, i. 233.

of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, *so as* no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." "This interpretation," says Hallam, "was afterwards given in one of the Thirty-nine Articles," *i.e.* the thirty-sixth, "which having been confirmed by parliament, it is undoubtedly to be reckoned the true sense of the oath." Again, in regard to ritual, and probably also to dogma, Elizabeth's own preference would have been for a system somewhat like that of her father's later years;¹ she would at least have liked to restore the First Prayer-book of Edward; she did insist on the excision of a bitter clause about Papal "enormities" from the Litany, on the replacement of the earlier form of administering the consecrated elements in combination with the form of 1552 (which, taken alone, gave a quasi-Zwinglian impression), and on a statutable provision (substantially repeated in a rubric)

¹ "The queen was a believer in the real presence, and did not object to the mass except in some few particulars" (*e.g.* the elevation); Archd. Perry, *Student's Ch. Hist. Engl.* ii. 260. He refers to Ranke, *Hist. Engl.* i. 233, for this explanation made by her to Philip II. See her twentieth injunction, "the communion of the *very* body and blood of Christ" (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. 220), copied from the injunctions of 1547.

for the "retention and use of the ornaments" which had the authority of parliament in the second year of her brother's reign, until she should, "with advice" of certain officials, "take other order,"¹—which, we may say, she never did.² In fact, she fairly told Parker that she would not have agreed to divers orders of the Prayer-book as re-established, but for a proviso in the Act of Uniformity allowing her, in case of "contempt or irreverence in the ceremonies of the Church, to publish *such further* ceremonies as might be most for the . . . reverence of Christ's holy mysteries," etc.³ Her chapel presented

¹ The rubric in the Prayer-book of 1559 (which was inserted by the queen's sole authority) directs that "the minister . . . shall use," etc., and quotes, "according to the act of parliament set in the beginning of this book," words referring to the clause in the act, "*until other order* shall be taken by the authority of the queen's majesty with the advice of her commissioners . . . or of the metropolitan," etc. Our present "ornaments rubric" copies the wording of the act, *minus* the qualifying "until," etc., which seems equivalent to legalising the "ornaments" of 2 Edw. *simpliciter*.

² James Parker on the Advertisements, pp. 37-52. Cf. Perry, Stud. Engl. Ch. Hist. ii. 290, 300; Ch. Qu. Rev. xvii. 521. The point is, that she never formally promulgated these "advertisements" by virtue of authority given her under the statute. For proof that long afterwards, under Whitgift, the "ornaments" were spoken of as legal, cf. Strype's Whitgift, i. 245, 285.

³ Strype's Parker, ii. 34. The archbishop added that she had thus ordered the use of wafer-bread, and the placing of the tables within the choir. On the latter point, the injunctions direct

what would be now called an extremely "ritualistic" appearance: on the altar stood a silver crucifix, with images of the Blessed Virgin and St. John, and gilt candlesticks lighted during the service—a grievance and scandal to some of her own bishops, as Sandys of Worcester and Cox of Ely.¹ Neal says that "when Sandys bishop of Worcester (afterwards archbishop of York) spoke to her against" this "crucifix, she threatened to deprive him."² The chapel was served by a surpliced choir and "priests in copes" (this is Neal's account); "the service was sung not only with the sound of organs, but of cornets, sackbuts, etc., on solemn festivals; the ceremonies observed by the knights of the Garter in their adoration towards the altar, which had been abolished by King Edward, and revived by Queen Mary, were retained; in short," proceeds the historian of the Puritans, "the service

that the holy table shall stand where the altar stood except at communion, and then in the most "convenient place" within the chancel. Evidently Elizabeth would have liked to do what was afterwards practically effected by Laud. She ignores the rubrical mention of "the *body* of the church." Doc. Ann. i. 234.

¹ Strype's Annals, i. pt. 2. 501. Zurich Letters, i. nos. 24, 28, 29, 31. Strype says that the queen "seemed to have laid these things aside, but not long after resumed" them (Annals, i. pt. 1. 260), *i.e.* in 1563, but without lights; Z. L. i. No. 57.

² Hist. Purit. i. 107.

performed in the queen's chapel, and in sundry cathedrals, was so splendid and showy, that foreigners could not distinguish it from the Roman, except that it was performed in the English tongue. By this method most of the Popish laity were deceived into conformity, and came regularly to church for nine or ten years." But Elizabeth was at the same time obliged to make great concessions to a more distinctly "Protestant" spirit. Hardly one of her political advisers sympathised with her Catholic inclinations in regard to ritual: and some of them were definitely in favour of advance in the Protestant direction, while her worthless favourite Leicester threw his weight into the same scale. She could not find men altogether of her own mind for the episcopate;¹ she had ascertained through the correspondence of Sir William Cecil with Edmund Guest that the commissioners for revising the Prayer-book would not go back to the standard

¹ According to Strype, Wotton, who had been dean of Canterbury under Pole, was "said by some" to have been thought of by Elizabeth's advisers for the primacy (Strype's Parker, i. 71). "It is plain," says Freeman (Hist. Essays, iv. 310), "that Elizabeth hoped to carry with her what we may call the party of Thirlby and Tunstall," but soon found that this was impracticable, though many must have desired it.

of 1549; some of the clergy in the Lower House of Convocation were at first disposed to go great lengths in the direction of further change:¹ and at last the queen was obliged to consent to the adoption of a revised series of Articles, including one—on the case of “wicked” communicants—which she particularly disliked, and which she had managed to exclude from the Latin text of 1563, although it reappeared in the final text as sanctioned in 1571:² on the other hand, she secured, apparently by somewhat “high-reaching” action, the insertion of the famous clause which recognised the authority of the Church in controversies of

¹ See Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. 239 ff., for a petition by over thirty members of the lower house against copes, surplices, clerical gowns and caps, organ-playing, observance of saints’ days, and for making kneeling at communion and the sign of the cross in baptism “indifferent.” This was not adopted by the house; but another, which was for abrogating all holy days but Sundays and principal feasts of Christ, requiring the minister to say service with face toward the people, allowing the omission of the sign of the cross in baptism, leaving the posture at communion to the discretion of the ordinary, and abolishing organs, and all vestures save the surplice, was lost only by a majority of *one*, twenty-seven members not voting (Strype, *Ann.* i. 1. 505). And the house did adopt a request that the confession at holy communion might include a “detestation and renunciation of ‘the idolatrous mass,’” that every one not intending to communicate might be obliged to depart before the confession, and that sponsors should no longer “answer in the infant’s name.”

² Hardwick, *Hist. of Art.* pp. 141, 151.

faith.¹ It is rather surprising that she allowed the bill to pass with such limiting phraseology as seemed to confine subscription to those articles "*which only* concerned the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments," as if those which concerned Church polity were not to be deemed binding.² And the pressure put upon her by home-circumstances, imposing a decisively "Reformation" character on the ecclesiastical arrangements which she had to accept and authorise, was seconded by the necessities of her position among European sovereigns. She could not practically have held that position without the support and general sympathy of the Protestant powers on the Continent.³ She yielded,

¹ See Hardwick, *Hist. of Artic.* p. 141. It may also be noticed that whereas in the Edwardian series the Latin title of Art. 31 (32) is "*Cælibatus ex verbo Dei præcipitur nemini*," in the Elizabethan it is "*De conjugio sacerdotum*." Yet the word "blasphemous," applied to "fables" in Art. 30 (31), was not in the Edwardian form, which had "forged" instead.

² So Hardwick, p. 224, on the interpretation of this phrase; but another view is taken by Strype, *Ann.* ii. i. 105, and Perry, p. 301. To this act of 13 Eliz. the Commons referred in 1629 as if it had established their Calvinistic "sense" of the Articles: cf. Gardiner, *Hist. Engl.* vii. 41. The canons, and Charles II.'s act of uniformity, exclude any limitation.

³ Not that she ever meant to unite England absolutely with those powers: she aimed, says bishop Creighton, at maintaining for the English Church and State "a mediate

therefore, to what it required of her: for, after all, her personal taste for a stately ceremonial, or her theoretical inclination towards doctrinal statements more akin to the "old learning" than to the "new," were of incomparably less moment to her than the determination to maintain her throne against Roman assailants—among whom Spain was principally to be reckoned with,—and to make the England which she thoroughly understood and loved a power of the first rank among Christian kingdoms.

Elizabeth's conduct towards bishops and episcopal sees was too often self-willed, overbearing, and unjust. She was irritated with most of the prelates, as men practically forced upon her, and inclined, or more than inclined, towards the Calvinistic rigorism and the unsightly bareness of ritual which they had learned in exile to associate with "the gospel." She visited this grievance upon them by scolding them for their slackness in enforcing uniformity¹: she threw

position," and she "succeeded in spite of overwhelming difficulties" (Laud Commemoration Addresses, p. 9).

¹ See her letter to the primate, Jan. 25, 1565, for the repression of "diversities in opinions and rites:" clearly referring to the existing Prayer-book law as a standard (Parker, on the Advertisements, p. 48). See Strype's Whitgift, i. 338, for Burleigh's

on them the *onus* in this task, and she steadily withheld any express sanction from the "Advertisements" which Parker put forth (having dropped the title of "Ordinances") in the hope of securing a minimum of ritual observance, and for which some equivocal words in their title were afterwards supposed to claim the royal authority.¹ Even he, whom she preferred to all his suffragans, was wearied by what he felt as her untowardness. Her council contained some anti-ecclesiastical elements, such as Walsingham and Knollys. It was one of her worst weaknesses to allow Leicester to counterwork Parker: she provoked the wearied primate to say, "I will no more strive against the stream—fume or chide who will."² "In 1573 she allowed the bishops," as Archdeacon Perry words it, "to be deliberately insulted"³ in a letter from the Privy Council, to the effect that they had connived at

unfavourable opinion of "many" of the bishops, as having become "worldly" since their consecration; and Whitgift admits as much as to "some few." Scambler of Peterborough was probably in his mind. But the prelates as a body were a poor set.

¹ James Parker, on the Advertisements, p. 145.

² See Hook, Archbishops, new ser. iv. 388. Towards the end of his life, Parker even thought it possible that he might be imprisoned (Strype's Parker, ii. 394).

³ Stud. Engl. Ch. Hist. ii. 298. See the letter in Cardwell, Doc. Ann. i. 387.

nonconformity: "The fault is most in you." When Archbishop Grindal remonstrated against her absolute prohibition of the "prophesyings," or theological addresses in clerical meetings, which she viewed as a form of Puritanical activity,¹ she at first thought of depriving him. And her behaviour in regard to Church lands and the revenues of vacant sees was yet worse. Her "rapacity," as it has been called, was, like her father's, exhibited to a great extent in the interest of her ministers or favourites,—Cecil, Leicester, Walsingham, and others.² In 1584

¹ In this remarkable letter, the very "protestant" writer reminded the queen of the sin of Uzziah and its punishment, and took a somewhat "sacerdotalist" line (on the authority of St. Ambrose), as to the propriety of referring matters which touched religion, or the doctrine and discipline of the Church, to the bishops and divines as she referred questions "of law to her judges;" and he also exhorted her "not to pronounce" on matters of that kind "too resolutely and peremptorily, *quasi ex auctoritate*, as she might do in civil and extern matters" (Styple's Grindal, pp. 570 ff.). The letter was written in 1576. Parker, by Elizabeth's orders, had stopped the prophesyings in the diocese of Norwich, in spite of opposition from members of her own council. "The good old bishop," as Neal calls Parkhurst (i. 215), had to submit. Cooper of Lincoln had sanctioned the prophesyings in 1574, with due provision against abuse (Styple's Ann. ii. 1. 476). Cf. Fuller, ix. 122.

² "Over-persuaded by some great man, the queen wrote to archbishop Sandys to lease out" two manors (one being that of Southwell, his favourite abode) "for seventy years. . . . A few years after, his London house also was earnestly endeavoured to be gotten from him:" in both cases "he remained

five sees were kept vacant that the queen might have the disposal of the incomes ;¹ and the see of Oxford was particularly unfortunate in being thus treated during forty-one years, all told, of the reign of a queen most gracious to the University.

And yet, heavy as was her hand, and autocratic as was her temper, the English Church owes very much to this kinglike daughter of Henry VIII. But for her, the forces of division would have become forces of anarchy and of disruption, or Calvinism would have crushed Anglicanism in the germ. She kept the Church from falling to pieces, or being revolutionised, by the despotic energy of her grasp, in the character, not of "Head," but of "Supreme Governor."² The condition of matters was far from ideal under such a system ; a bad precedent was kept up, and considerable occasion of scandal was given ; but she carried the Church through its present and exceptional trials, and thereby established a claim on its lasting gratitude.

resolute" (Strype's Whitgift, i. 545). For Whitgift's remonstrance to Elizabeth in regard to church lands, before he became archbishop, see Walton's Life of Hooker. He says that the queen gave "patient hearing" to "this affectionate speech."

¹ Strype's Whitgift, i. 336 ; Perry, ii. 322.

² The title of "head" was never resumed by the crown.

II. 1.

Puritanism is a somewhat elastic term, and may be taken to represent various positions, or, to use an old term, "platforms," in the wide area of anti-Anglican Protestantism. One has to distinguish broadly between (1) the malcontent unconfirming Churchmen, who either simply (*a*) objected to this or that ecclesiastical ceremony or usage—for instance, to surplice-wearing,—or (*b*) aimed at a "further reformation" of the Church of England on the lines of Calvinistic doctrine and discipline, and (2) the thoroughgoing separatists, who held communion with the Church to have become religiously unlawful. And this distinction is the more necessary because modern separatists, while readily acknowledging the Church to be a Christian communion, and to have its own field of religious usefulness, appear to dislike the term "Dissenters," and to prefer to call themselves by that title of "Nonconformists" which was originally applied to the former class.¹ Both these forms of opinion were represented in the days of Edward VI. The typical unconfirming Churchman—in Canon Dixon's phrase, "the

¹ See Church Quart. Review, xvi. 402 ff.

episcopal founder of Nonconformity" — was Bishop Hooper, who, being designated to the see of Gloucester, refused to wear the cope, surplice, and episcopal habit, and only gave way after some five months, which had ended in a fortnight's imprisonment.¹ But there were actual separatists² in Kent and in Essex earlier than the date of Hooper's resistance to Ridley's urgency. Their separation began about the middle of 1550, and was developed in 1551. After the accession of Elizabeth we find the same tendencies to a more moderate and a more extreme theory of "further reformation." The persecution under Mary had driven many into exile; and a circumstance of great historical importance for England was that they took refuge for the most part not among Lutherans, but among Calvinists, or Reformers strongly inclining to Calvinism. This was natural; for Martin Bucer, and Peter Martyr Vermigli (who went further than Bucer), had held theological professorships at Cambridge and Oxford, and had done much to promote the substitution of the Second Prayer-book for that of 1549. Dissensions, as is well known, broke out among the

¹ Strype's *Cranmer*, i. 302 ff.; Dixon, *Hist. Ch. Engl.* iii. 213 ff., 255.

² Dixon, iii. 206.

English refugees; the "troubles of Frankfort" were a scandal;¹ Cox, who upheld the Second Prayer-book as against a new Calvinistic order of service, triumphed over Knox and the extreme party: but, on the whole, the foreign religious atmosphere had its effect, and those, in particular, who had found at Zurich a secure refuge came to regard it as a sort of Jerusalem, and returned with foreign ideals in regard to worship and discipline.² The English Church, even as Edward VI. had left it, seemed to them but imperfectly purified; they adhered in theory to the ground which Hooper had at first taken up, and objected to all ceremonies of "man's inventing," and in particular to the use of such vestures as had been in any way associated with the unreformed worship: but, in fact, the more

¹ See Whittingham's narration of these troubles. It is written from the Calvinistic point of view, and represents Cox in a very unfavourable light. He comes to Frankfort in March, 1555, and finds the English congregation there content, or more than content, to adopt Genevan forms of worship, under Knox as their minister: Knox prevails on them to admit Cox and his friends to membership; Cox requites this by denouncing Knox, on political grounds, to the magistrates, and having thus got rid of him, persuades the magistrates to impose the use of the English book. The second part of the "troubles" consisted in a quarrel between Horne as pastor and the congregation in general, whose line is that of spiritual democracy.

² See Parkhurst, *Zurich Letters*, i. no. 46, "Egone Tiguri-norum meorum oblivisci possim? Non possum, 'dum memor

eminent among them, who were marked out for the episcopate, followed the advice given to Hooper by Peter Martyr, and conformed in the hope of abolishing what they disliked.¹ Of the clergy in general, very little was required in this

ipse mei,' etc. 'Si *canis Tigurinus* ad me commearet . . . plurimi facerem.' So Sampson: "Valeat et feliciter vivat Tigurum" (ib. no. 58). Jewel addresses not only Peter Martyr, but Bullinger, as his "father." Even in 1573 bishop Parkhurst still regarded Zurich as a model.

¹ Cf. Strype, Annals, i. 1. 264, that "Cox, Grindal, Horne, Sandys, Jewel, Parkhurst, Benthams, laboured all they could against receiving into the church the papistical habits, and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside. But they could not obtain it," etc. Whereupon "they concluded unanimously not to desert their ministry for some rites that, as they considered, were but a few, and not evil in themselves," etc. Sandys wrote, in 1560, that he "hoped the copes would not remain long" (Zurich Letters, i. no. 31). Horne said, in 1565, that they had obeyed the order to use caps and surplices, in order to keep adversaries out of the posts which they occupied (ib. no. 64). In 1566, Jewel wrote, as to the surplice question, "Utinam omnia *etiam tenuissima* vestigia papatus . . . e templis . . . auferri possent!" (Ib. no. 67; see also Grindal, ib. no. 73). He and Horne wrote, in 1567, that they only bore with the cross in baptism and kneeling at communion "donec meliora Dominus dederit" (ib. no. 75). Peter Martyr had distinguished between the cap and habit, as not necessarily superstitious, and ministerial vestures which "speciem missæ referunt" (Zurich Letters, ii. no. 14. This is the letter in which he says, "Cum essem Oxonii, vestibus illis albis in choro nunquam uti volui, quamvis essem canonicus"). But soon afterward she thought the so-called "sacred vestures" might be used "in cœna Domini administranda," *provided* that those who wore them denounced the use of them! (ib. no. 17). But he drew a line at the crucifix.

line ; the cope was rarely used,¹ the "vestment" or chasuble never ; it was only a question of the surplice, and of the clerical dress or apparel (that is, the square cap, gown, and tippet), which was ordered for use by the 30th of the royal Injunctions of 1559 : and when some thirty London ministers in 1565,² and thirty-seven in 1566, refused to comply, they were suspended or deprived as contumacious. The city was largely infected with the anti-ceremonial spirit ; the sign of the cross was sometimes omitted in baptism, the surplice not always used ; and at the Eucharist some would receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting.³ The malcontents must

¹ James Parker, on the Advertisements, p. 102. The cope was ordered for general use in the interpretations of the Injunctions ; but the "advertisements" require it "in cathedral and collegiate churches."

² The scene on March 24, 1565, was curious enough. One minister who had conformed appeared in "a scholar's gown, priestlike," with a tippet and square cap ; the summoned ministers were bidden by the chancellor of the diocese to look at him ; would they promise to wear such apparel, "and in the church a linen surplice?" They must write *Volo* or *Nolo*. "Be brief ; make no words." This imperative demand was made in the name of "the council." Out of 140, all wrote "Volo" but 30. Strype's Grindal, p. 145. Cp. ib. 154, for the next case. The word "habits" might include vestures of ministration, but was commonly used for the out-of-door clerical garb. (Parker, on the Advertisements, p. 73.)

³ See Neal, ii. 125.

have felt that they were hardly used when conformity was pressed upon them simply in the name of "the queen's laws,"¹ and when it was well known that some bishops, as Grindal and Sandys,² disliked not only the cope, but the surplice, and even the ordinary clerical attire. To disapprove, and yet to conform, seemed inconsistent to men like Sampson, dean of Christ Church, and Humphrey, president of Magdalen College, who compared the surplice to the "strange apparel" in Zeph. i. 8, and would not admit, on the authority of Bullinger or Martyr, that the use of it was *per se* indifferent.³ Sampson

¹ Strype says of Parker, that "the great reason which made" him "so earnest in urging conformity was, to keep up a veneration for law established, and to maintain the authority of the prince" (Life of Parker, ii. 424). Cp. Strype's Aylmer, p. 93.

² Sandys, referring to the other ornaments of the second year of Edward, required by the act of uniformity to be used "until" the queen should take other order, stooped to use a despicable quibble, as if it meant "that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the mean time shall not convey them away, but that they may (*i.e.* shall) remain for the queen" (Strype, Ann. i. 1. 122). It is difficult to see how an honest man could thus "gloss" the "text," as he phrased it. He was also, at first, in favour of "blotting out the collect for crossing the infant in the forehead," as "seeming very superstitious."

³ Cf. Hooker, v. 29. 6. See their replies to Parker's queries, Dec. 1564 (Strype's Parker, i. 329). For Sampson's questions to Bullinger, see Zurich Letters, i. no. 69; and another letter from him and Humphrey (no. 71), which is written in a tone of disappointment. By this time (July, 1566) they had

was consistently pertinacious, and Elizabeth by special order caused him to be both imprisoned and deprived. Humphrey was imprisoned, but, as Neal says, "obtained a toleration," and "ten or twelve years after was persuaded to wear the habits."¹ A second stage in the "nonconforming" movement is associated with a more important name. In 1571 Elizabeth had practically blocked a bill for a Puritan revision of the Prayer-book;² in 1572 she peremptorily commanded the Commons to proceed no further with two bills brought in by a Puritan, which were to "reform the Church after the pattern of Geneva."³ Then it was that Thomas Cartwright, with other Puritanical divines, put forth a twofold "Admonition" to the Parliament, in which the whole existing Church system was

made up their minds, and represent their "departure from their places," as forced upon them by the bishops. In 1571 bishop Cox writes to R. Gualter, complaining of such brethren as "obstreperos, contentiosos," regardless of weak brethren, etc., (ib. no. 94). See, on the other side, a letter complaining of the bishops as inconsistent, and as having tried to "overawe" the inferior clergy by depriving Sampson (Z. L. ii. no. 62).

¹ Neal, i. 139. Cf. Zurich Letters, ii. no. 49; Strype's Parker, i. 369. Both these men died in 1589.

² Strype, Ann. ii. i. 93.

³ Perry, ii. 297. The introducer of the bills was Peter Wentworth, who had said to archbishop Parker in 1571, "Make you popes who list, for we will make you none." Strype says he had "learnt his lesson from Cartwright" (Parker, ii. 203).

attacked in terms which would logically conduct to open schism. They were "bent," says Hooker, "against all the orders and laws wherein this Church is found unconformable to the platform of Geneva."¹ Whitgift, afterwards primate, was employed to answer the Admonitions:² and Cartwright, in his rejoinder,³ took the ground which is familiarised to us by Hooker's elaborate

¹ Pref. 2. 10; cp. ib. 3. 9; E. P. iii. 7. 4.

² See Zurich Letters, ii. no. 94, a letter of Gualter's to Cox, referring to this answer, and criticising the demands of the Admonition party, as described to him in Cox's letter (Z. L. i. no. 107). One of them insisted on entire parity among ministers: another "condemned the order of confirmation." On the Admonition, as "utterly condemning the present church," etc., see Strype's Whitgift, i. 55.

³ For his writings, see Keble's Hooker, i. 47. Cartwright had used his position as Margaret professor at Cambridge to promote the Puritanic schemes, and had "condemned the present constitution of the Church of England" (Strype's Parker, ii. 39); and Whitgift, in 1571, had procured his expulsion from the university. Hooker alludes to his "disdainful sharpness of wit" (Pref. 2. 10.); and Strype quotes his contemptuous language towards reformers as well as fathers (Whitgift, i. 105-7). After Whitgift replied to the rejoinder, Cartwright published a second reply in two parts. Whitaker, professor of divinity at Cambridge, himself puritanical in sympathies, said of the first part, "May I die if I ever saw anything looser and even more childish!" (Whitg. i. 136). The second part appeared when he had fled abroad, in 1577. Whitgift thought it needed no reply (ib. i. 576). Cartwright was passionately in earnest, and ready to "afford the loss of a little ease and commodity unto *that* whereunto his life itself, if it had been asked, was due" (ib. i. 138).

negation of it. The polity of the Church, including all its observances, must, according to Cartwright, have explicit Scripture warrant ; and nothing that had been abused under Popery could be retained.¹ Here, at last, was a plain issue, an overt unmistakable challenge to the Church, inviting a clash of irreconcilable principles, a conflict which no concessions to scruples about surplices could have averted or long postponed. The queen was exasperated, and ordered all copies of the Admonitions to be given up—an order more easily issued than enforced. The bishops, says Parker, were “bearded” by the patrons of the Puritans,² or, as he used to call them, “Precisians.” Some prelates who had strongly inclined that way found it necessary to draw a line ; but Grindal, after succeeding

¹ These are what Strype calls his “two false principles and rotten pillars” (Whitg. i. 102). See Hooker, iii. 5 ; 7. 4 : iv. 3, 4 ; 9. 2 ; 14. 6 : v. 28. 1.

² Strype’s Parker, ii. 201. The term “Puritan” was imposed *ab extra*, as a rendering of “Cathari ;” but Neal calls it “proper enough to express their desires of a more pure form of worship and discipline.” So Whitgift wrote in 1584 to Burleigh, who was personally his friend, but thought him too stringent, “I know I lack not calumniators, especially among those that would seem most *pure* ; but it is their manner” (Whitgift, i. 339 ; and see Hooker on “the purified crew,” Keble’s Hooker, i. 374). Burleigh reasonably objected to the practice of putting questions which the persons summoned were to be bound *ex officio mero* (as a matter of sheer duty) to answer. Cf. Fuller, ix. 183 ff.

Parker at Canterbury,¹ endeavoured to regulate, instead of abolishing, the "exercises" called prophesyings, and, as we have seen, came thereby into collision with Elizabeth. He was followed in 1583 by Whitgift, who was a stronger man, but needed all the firmness which he called "constancy," and his enemies called severity,² for the task which the primacy then involved. For Puritanism, as represented by those who were bent on revolutionising the Church from within, instead of seceding from it, had made full use of the opportunity which it had enjoyed since the issue of Pius V.'s bull against Elizabeth in 1570, and the subsequent massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1572. Three causes may be assigned for this rapid growth of its ascendancy in the city of London, in Parliament, among the country gentry, and also among "the common sort."³ It could utilise the ever-increasing alarm and wrath with which England was watching the designs of the Roman Catholic powers all over

¹ He was translated from York in 1576. In November, 1574, he had received a censorious letter from Sampson, broadly hinting that he had "a liking for lordly state" (Strype's Parker, ii. 376). His rules for the "exercises" are given by Strype, Grindal, p. 327. They are reasonable enough.

² Strype's Whitgift, i. 326. Neal, i. 405: "A severe governor of the church, pressing conformity with the utmost rigour."

³ Cf. Hooker, Preface, 3. 5; Strype's Whitgift, iii. 33.

Europe, and pre-eminently of the dreaded and abhorred "Spaniard;" could represent itself as the one safeguard of Reformation principles,—imperilled or compromised, as it would contend, by such a half-and-half policy as that of the queen and her bishops; and could contrast their method with the thoroughgoing completeness, the logical finish, the "courage of convictions," with which its own Genevan theory was upheld by men who knew their own mind, and were ready for any sacrifice in the cause of what they deemed the truth.¹ Secondly, we must do justice to a most legitimate element of strength which is thus described by Fuller: "What won them most repute was . . . painful preaching in populous places," which inevitably contrasted with the inefficiency of many of the incumbents.² Like the Methodist of a later age, the Puritan was often the only accessible representative of spiritual earnestness, and commended his whole system to those who had experienced his care for their souls. And, lastly, we may attribute some effect to that dislike and suspicion of

¹ This is well stated by Gardiner and Mullinger, Introduction to Engl. Hist. p. 113.

² Hooker says that, for lack of men, the bishops were often obliged to ordain persons "meanly qualified in respect of learning" (v. 81. 5). Cf. Otley's "Lancelot Andrewes," p. 31.

ecclesiastical authority, as such, which had been intensified by the experience of Marian times, but is traceable much higher up to the pre-reformation days, in which the English laity had been offended by the arrogance or the oppressiveness of their prelates. So it was that, as soon as Whitgift put forth certain "articles"¹ for the purpose of maintaining Church order, some clergymen of his own diocese,—“for the most part,” he says, “young in years and of very small reading,”—took up a violent line of protest,² and were backed up by Kentish gentlemen whom he was obliged to remind that their clients “differed from” the Church not “only in rites and ceremonies”—although, even in regard to these, no Church could tolerate breaches of order—but “*in some points of substance.*”³ Here was the very point: the

¹ The royal supremacy to be acknowledged; the prayer-book, with the ordinal, to be approved, and its forms to be exclusively used; the thirty-nine articles to be accepted. Whitgift told the council that he was “ready by learning to defend them against all mislikers thereof.” They are embodied in the thirty-sixth canon of 1604.

² One of them proposed an addition to the bidding prayer—“that God would strike through the sides of all such as go about to take away from the ministers of the gospel the liberty which is granted them by the word of God” (Strype’s Whitgift, i. 247). This, of course, meant the archbishop of Canterbury.

³ *Ib.* i. 274.

“Discipline,” as the Calvinistic programme of a Church organisation was called,¹ and the whole set of ideas which centred in it, meant a great deal more than a rejection of three or four ceremonies; they meant “a substitution of an entirely new idea of the Church for that on which the Reformation in England had been based”²—a new idea of the Church, and withal an idea of the Sacraments which would have required a revision of the Prayer-book, even as it then stood³ without the concluding portion of

¹ See the story of the “artisan of Kingston” in Keble’s *Hooker*, i. 150.

² Dean Church, *Pascal and other Sermons*, p. 75. So Dean Paget, *The Spirit of Discipline*, p. 297: “A plan had been devised by which this alien structure might be quietly built up within the episcopal, and athwart its lines, so as gradually to supersede it.” See also H. O. Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans*, p. 45, and bishop Creighton’s address at the “Laud Commemoration,” p. 8. The attorney-general, after consulting all papers relating to a trial of Puritans in 1591, told Burleigh that when once they had established their discipline, they were “resolved not to give allowance of either bishops or archbishops to be in the church” (*Strype’s Whitg.* ii. 83). Years before, even the puritanical bishop Pilkington saw and said that the malcontents had now plainly shown their hand,—that “the whole Church polity was attacked:” although in the same context he lamented that certain changes were practically impossible (*Zurich Letters*, i. no. 110).

³ One of the Kentish ministers (not a graduate) said, “The words of the prayer at baptism, ‘Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant that it (*sic*) may be born again,’ are not agreeable to the

the Catechism; in short, the contest raised issues of principle which year after year became more apparent. As the Londoners had shown sympathy with Cartwright in 1573, so the great men who surrounded the throne gave moral support to the malcontents;¹ and the House of Commons, in 1584 and 1586, committed itself² to their movement in favour of the abolition of "oaths" of canonical obedience, or "subscription" to Whitgift's articles, or for the "new model" set forth in 1580 in a book "on Ecclesiastical Discipline,"³ of which Walter Travers was the chief author, and which afterwards was revised by word of God, but contrary to the same." So that here a far-reaching issue was raised as to the principle of sacramental efficacy; and it is significant that Hooper, when he objected to the episcopal habit, maintained that sacraments did not "confer" grace, but only "sealed" it (Hardwick, Hist. Artic. p. 94). But some Sussex ministers were satisfied by Whitgift's explanation of the form of ordination (which Cartwright had called ridiculous and blasphemous), to the effect that the ordaining bishop only acted *instrumentaliter*, under Christ as the "only giver of the Holy Ghost" (Strype's Whitgift, i. 258).

¹ We cannot wonder, then, that Robert Beal, clerk to the council, wrote on that side, and treated Whitgift with great rudeness in an interview. This sour-tempered lawyer actively promoted the execution of Mary Stuart.

² The house also dwelt on the abuses of pluralism and non-residence. They were defended on the score of clerical poverty. Pluralities were restrained by canon in 1583, Cardwell, Synod. i. 145. On nonresidence, cf. Hooker, v. 81. 6.

³ Hooker, iii. 7. 4; Strype's Whitgift, i. 345. The book had been printed in Latin in 1574: Strype's Ann. iii. 1. 413.

Cartwright and other "leaders of that faction," to use Strype's phrase.

Elizabeth, as we have seen, had imperatively stopped the progress of two "bills of reformation" sixteen years before. She now showed herself equally resolute, although she condescended to argue the points raised. But the Puritan ministers, under an absolute conviction of the sacredness of their cause, persisted in promoting it, set up in certain counties their "classical and provincial assemblies,"¹ and engaged themselves to work for the carrying out of their "model," by the civil power if possible, but at any rate somehow.² And this emboldened a group of extreme Puritans to exhibit the worst effects of their system—the coarseness, bitterness, unmeasured abusiveness which it encouraged in vehement natures; the "Martin Marprelate" libels,³ printed at a secret

¹ Strype, *Ann.* iii. 1. 690; Whitgift, i. 554, ii. 6 ff. The Warwickshire "synod" in 1588 declared the bishops' calling to be *unlawful* (*i.e.* in a religious sense).

² *Ib.* i. 503, ii. 18.

³ For the puerile vulgarity (not to speak of the ferocity) of these writers, see specimens quoted in Strype's *Whitgift*, i. 553, 570. Whitgift was bidden to "remember his brother Haman," and described as more tyrannous even than Bonner. The "lords bishops" were "swinish rabble, petty popes, who had sinned against the Holy Ghost;" the conformist clergy "worshipful paltrypolitans, right poisoned persecuting priests, cogging knaves,

and moveable press, and boiling over with the most outrageous language, especially against Whitgift himself, seem to have acted as a hindrance to the very cause which they were intended to help. At first the Church party were alarmed at the violence of the onslaught ; but it soon appeared that Puritanism had gone too far, and this scandalous literature was the "drunken Helot" which promoted a reaction ; that reaction was facilitated by the twofold relief from anxiety about Roman designs which the nation had derived from the execution of the Queen of Scots in 1587 and the defeat of the Armada in 1588 ;¹ and it was inaugurated by Bancroft's epoch-making sermon at St. Paul's, February 9, 1589.² When he proclaimed his belief in a Divine basis for episcopal authority,

limbs of Antichrist, ungodly wretches," etc. See, too, Hooker, *Dedic. to bk. v.* : "the scurrilous and more than satirical immodesty of Martinism." One "Tom Nash" answered them in their own fashion ; see Walton's *Life of Hooker*. Cartwright "continually declared against them" (*Strype's Whitg.* ii. 27). Cf. the late Aubrey Moore's notes of lectures on Reformation History (p. 294), that "two things come out in the Marprelate controversy : (1) puritanism now appears in its true colours —its attack on episcopacy was not accidental, but essential ; (2) the attack led to a new and truer setting forth of what episcopacy is," etc.

¹ Keble, *Preface to Hooker*, p. lxiv.

² The date given by Strype and Neal, January 12, is incorrect.

the Puritan Sir Francis Knollys showed some perspicacity by trying to ruin him with Elizabeth, and raising the cry (often since then repeated by Protestant zealots), "The Royal supremacy in danger!"¹ It is quite true, as a very candid Nonconformist has remarked,² that "the Anglo-Catholic spirit had in a measure manifested itself" from the outset of the English Reformation; the tone and spirit of the Prayer-book, the retention of the historical "Orders," the habitual assumption of ecclesiastical continuity,³ had been so many irresistible leavening forces; the influence of those "Marian" clergy who had conformed under Elizabeth would tell silently in favour of safeguards against Protestant extremes. Jewel did more than he knew by his anti-Roman

¹ See Strype's *Whitgift*, i. 560, and for more about Knollys' zeal against episcopal pre-eminence, *ib.* ii. 124 ff. He criticised *Whitgift* himself for asserting "that the superiority of bishops was God's own institution." Elizabeth twice rebuked Knollys for his puritanism; *ib.* 54. It was in the same year that bishop Hutton (who had once been puritanical) privately stated to Burleigh and Walsingham (who had become adverse to the puritans) the case for the apostolic origin of episcopacy. (*Whitgift*, iii. 227). "In the end" they seemed convinced.

² Stoughton, *Religion in England*, i. 6.

³ *E.g.* "The service in *this* church of England these many years hath been read in Latin," etc. *Introd. to B. of C.P. of 1549*, etc.

appeal to antiquity ; the canons of 1571, though not without language which Puritans would approve, struck a chord which was bound to vibrate when they insisted on "what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops had inferred from the teaching of" Scripture. In short, no movement is without antecedents ; it exists because it has been prepared for. And thus the "bold speaking" of the future primate was, in a real sense, a new start for English Churchmanship : neither the preacher nor his censors could foresee its results ; but the impulse thus originated went on increasing in volume and force,¹ until it produced the "Caroline" Church revival, and developed the "English Reformation" on lines from which foreign influences had too long caused it to diverge. From this date, also, may be reckoned the decline of nonconforming Puritanism as a power in the realm, during the remaining years of Elizabeth.² But its influence had

¹ Andrewes was rising into prominence before Elizabeth died. Bishop Young, who ordained Laud in 1600, approved of the patristic turn which his studies had taken.

² See Perry, ii. 337 : "The latter years of Elizabeth's reign were almost free from troubles from the puritans." In 1590 Cartwright was repeatedly imprisoned, and required to purge himself on oath from charges of nonconformity and sedition, aggravated by a previous engagement not to impugn the church

been too widely diffused and too energetic to be defeated "along the line" by the Church's returning self-assertion. Hooker, some years later, addressed his "Preface" to "them that seek, as they term it, the reformation of laws and orders ecclesiastical," and pointed out the revolutionary tendencies of Puritanism, while intimating a fear of its ultimate success; and if open agitation for the Genevan model had been abandoned, as too dangerous while the Tudor queen lived, the Genevan theology which had possessed the minds of its advocates retained a hold over the Universities,¹ over most of the clergy, and over large masses of the laity, and was transmitted to those who, in

polity. He refused; he was called before the Star-chamber in 1591, but still refused the oath, and was at last discharged on "promise to be quiet,"—a pledge which he fulfilled. He and his fellow prisoners had assured Whitgift, that they "had not alienated their affections from the holy fellowship of the church" of England. Cf. Fuller, b. ix. 197 ff.; Strype's Whitg. ii. 22 ff., 74 ff., 88; Hook's Archbishops, new series, v. 153.

¹ This is illustrated by the hostility of the Oxford authorities to Laud as a young man. As to Cambridge, see Cambridge Transactions during Puritan Period, ii. 17, 71, etc. Cambridge had, from the puritans' point of view, an advantage denied to Oxford—a college recently founded "for the extension of the pure gospel" by Sir Walter Mildmay, in 1584. Emmanuel was long faithful to its tradition: see J. W. Clark's "Cambridge," p. 255. Yet it produced Sancroft.

the first parliament of Charles I., made the House of Commons look too much like a synod of Calvinist inquisitors. But it is simple justice to add that, for men like these, the austere dogmas which have driven so many into sheer revolt from Christ were associated with all their deepest religious convictions and motives, with all that bound them personally to an unseen Saviour and Lord.¹

II. 2.

But the Puritan movement, in the large sense of the term, had its Jacobins in the Separatists, who would keep no terms with the Church, and regarded it as in truth no Church at all. It was in their eyes, "at the best, a mingle-mangle of the elect and the reprobate; at the worst, a synagogue of Satan."² A National Church

¹ See H. O. Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans*, p. 43.

² *Ch. Quart. Rev.* xiv. 179. Cf. Strype's *Whitgift*, ii. 191, quoting Barrow on "the profaneness, wickedness, and confusion of the people which were there" (in what he called "the parish assemblies," *i.e.* the church congregations) "received, retained, and nourished as members." Barrow was replying to the "nonconformist," Geo. Giffard. Rogers, Bancroft's chaplain, represents the separatists as holding that "a confused gathering of good and bad in public assemblies was no church" (on the Articles, p. 167).

was far removed from their ideal ; it would necessarily include many who were not "God's people,"—in modern phrase, not converted ; what they wanted was a Church, or rather a group of absolutely separate Churches, formed on a basis of sheer individualism : and this theory seems to have underlain all their hostility to a system which retained what they regarded as appurtenances of "Antichrist." The separatism which, as we have seen, had begun to show itself under Edward, reappeared in London at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth.¹ Some whose antipathy to the Church was far too pronounced for any compromise, disowned her altogether, and worshipped apart, forming themselves, as Strype puts it, into "clancular and separate congregations," and "using a book of prayers framed at Geneva."² The matter became known to the queen, and she ordered these "dissenters" (so Strype calls them) to be dealt with at first by remonstrance, and, if obstinate, by deprivation of their privileges as freemen of London. About a hundred such persons were gathered together in Plumbers' Hall on the 19th of June, 1567 ; they had hired the hall for a meeting under false pretences—

¹ See Zurich Letters, ii. no. 13. ² Strype's Grindal, p. 169.

“It was wanted for a wedding.” The sheriffs interrupted the worship, and some of the leading men were brought before the Lord Mayor and certain of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, including Grindal, bishop of London,¹ who began by rebuking them for telling an untruth. Their spokesman explained their position, laying stress on the imposition of the “accursed conjuring garments,” the use of “idolatrous gear” in parish churches, the fact that some of the London parish priests had held their cures under Mary,² and the “persecution of God’s servants” carried on under the present queen. To men of the temper of these seceders, persons like Sampson or Humphrey, or even Cartwright, were weak-kneed and half-hearted. If the conforming clergy were in their eyes “formal Protestants, Pontificals, or Traditioners,”³ the unconforming malcontents,

¹ “In that we said to the sheriffs, it was for a wedding, we did it to save the woman” who was caretaker “harmless.” “Yea,” said the bishop, “*but you must not lie*” (quoting Eph. iv. 25). Ch. Qu. Rev. xxxvi. 469. They were imprisoned for about a year, and then, by Grindal’s intercession, discharged.

² Cf. Zurich Letters, ii. no. 62.

³ A congregation of separatists signed a declaration in which “the church of the traditioners” was charged with maintaining “the discipline of Antichrist;” the ceremonies in the prayer-book were denounced as filthy rags, which the signatories “would not beautify with their presence” (Neal, i. 211).

specifically called Puritans, and sometimes "Reformists,"¹ appear to have excited their special animosity as "false brethren," or even as "hypocrites," whose principles should have carried them into actual "separation," who "said, and did not," who stayed in Babylon when they knew that it was Babylon,² etc. Their chief leader, although he ultimately conformed, was Robert Brown, who had separated on the ground of the ceremonial,³ and written books to prove that the Church was essentially antichristian, and therefore that to communicate with it was sinful. He is the true founder of Congregationalism; his followers acquired from him that name of "Brownists" which appears in Shakspeare's "Twelfth Night."⁴ Another schismatic was Henry

¹ See Church Quart. Review, xiv. 181.

² See Hooker's Preface, 8. 1, for a description of this line of criticism, which he evidently enjoys.

³ Compare Fuller, b. ix. 166; Perry, ii. 314. Brown was well-born, and the ecclesiastical commissioners had to insist in 1571 that he could not, as chaplain to the duke of Norfolk, be exempt from their jurisdiction. He afterwards went abroad, and with Harrison, a schoolmaster, wrote a "book which was dispersed over England, condemning this church as no church" (Strype's Parker, ii. 69).

⁴ Act iii. sc. 2: "I had as lief be a Brownist as a politician" (in the unfavourable sense of "politician"). Laud enumerates various "fundamental" errors as held by some or by all Brownists: Works, vi. 131. Abbot had denounced them.

Barrow, a lawyer, whose position is defined in the maxim, "The further from Romish manners, the purer is our Church,"¹ and who exhibited the true Puritanic intolerance by urging that it was the duty of the sovereign "to exterminate all other religions" than that which he called the Gospel.² With John Greenwood, a minister, and many others, he was imprisoned for the violence of his language, which was construed as seditious;³ and ultimately he suffered death, like the young Marprelate libeller, John Penry.⁴ The position of these men, sometimes called Barrowists, was

¹ Strype, *Annals*, ii. 2. 189.

² Cf. Gardiner, *Hist. Engl.* i. 37; *Ch. Quart. Rev.* xxxiv. 358. So untrue is it to represent him as a sufferer for religious liberty.

³ The 23 Eliz. c. 2 was used in these cases.

⁴ Barrow and Greenwood were executed in April, 1593. Penry had begun as a "puritan," but became a separatist. He suffered a month later. Strype calls "this poor unhappy young man (little above thirty when he died) a minister well disposed, and very anxious that the Welsh, his countrymen, should be better taught," etc., but withal "a hot Welshman who would not lie still." He kept on writing pamphlets against the bishops and the council, and ultimately censured the queen herself (*Whitg.* ii. 42 ff. 175 ff.). Laud remarks that "Penry was hanged, and Udal condemned and died in prison, for less than is contained in Mr. Burton's book" (*Works*, iii. 391). Udal was condemned for "defaming the queen's government," but his life was spared at Whitgift's intercession (*Whitg.* ii. 40). He disclaimed "Brownism" (*ib.* ii. 99).

formally stated in a memorial to the Privy Council:¹ "We, upon due examination and assured proof" (*i.e.* out of the Scriptures), "find the whole public ministry, worship, government, ordinances, and proceedings ecclesiastical, of this land, by authority established . . . not to belong unto, or to have any place or use or so much as mention in, Christ's Church, but rather to belong unto and to be derived from the malignant synagogue of Antichrist, being the self-same that the Pope used and left in this land." This is explicit enough.² The attitude taken up by these extremists combined with the disgust which the Marprelate virulence excited

¹ Strype, *Annals*, iv. 131. An imprisoned Brownist named Francis Johnson, calling himself "pastor of this poor distressed church," said in a letter to the lord treasurer, "We suffer these things *only* for refusing to have spiritual communion with the antichristian prelacy and other clergy abiding in this land" (*ib.* 190). So Penry, in his last days, writing to the queen, implies that the churches where the established worship is carried on are the tents of Antichrist (Strype's *Whitgift*, ii. 180).

² One cannot believe that Barrow and Greenwood would have conformed to the church, as Strype thinks (*Life of Aylmer*, p. 162), if they could have been assured that the "descent into hell" meant only the passing of our Lord's soul into Hades. Barrow, in one of his requests for a public conference, writes, "We . . . only make this separation for love we have to keep the Lord's commandments, and for fear to disobey Him" (*Annals*, iv. 242). For a list of "Barrowist errors," see *ib.* iv. 202.

to damage Puritanism in all its forms in the eyes of the "respectable" English public.

III.

And now let us ask, in conclusion, what was the mind and tone of the "conforming" Churchmen, and of their official leaders? No one who knows the facts will attribute to the latter class what would now be called a High-church tone. Archdeacon Perry does not hesitate to say that "the main body of" Elizabeth's first "bishops were both Calvinistic in doctrine and inclined to Presbyterianism in discipline." Parker must be excepted from this description; yet although a man of learning and merit, and deserving, in more respects than one, of our gratitude and sympathy, he sometimes, says Dean Hook, appeared as "the unconscious advocate of ultraprotestant notions, to which in his deliberate actions he was hostile to the last, or "sometimes acted as if he were an Erastian, although he was not."¹ But he strikes us as cold

¹ Hook, *Lives of Archbishops of Canterbury*, new series, vol. iv. pp. 293, 385. See *ib.* 321, on Parker's advocacy of a licence for printing the Geneva Bible. He obliged Magdalen college to accept Humphrey as president (*Strype's Parker*, i. 222). But he disliked the "Germanical natures" of some of the bishops; Hook, iv. 271.

and dry-minded, and the same biographer, while calling him "great," in effect denies him greatness by describing him as "a man without enthusiasm." Of Grindal it suffices to say that he was gentle and pious, but (as his portrait at Lambeth seems to indicate) too weak for his great post, even if he had not been affected by the Calvinistic influences of his former exile.¹ Whitgift was freely charged with holding "popish opinions," because he upheld episcopacy, which he ultimately spoke of as "apostolical and divine;"² but his remarks in the controversy between Hooker and Travers were significant of a highly militant protestantism: "If papists had as their errors deserved, he did not see how they should be saved;" and the proposition, "The Church of Rome is within the new covenant," was corrected by the archbishop into "The Church of Rome is not as the assemblies of Jews, Turks, and Painims."³ And he was content to accept the Lambeth articles, so called—of which more presently—after their rigid

¹ Strype's Grindal, p. 234.

² In his reply to Beza, 1593; Strype's Whitgift, ii. 170. In 1583 he used "*officium pontificale*" for the episcopal office (Cardwell, Doc. Ann. i. 465).

³ Strype's Whitgift, i. 452. This was in 1585.

Calvinism had received some modifications from a committee employed to consider them. If a bishop like Cheyney of Gloucester laid stress on freewill, or seemed "Lutheran" on the Eucharist, he incurred suspicion as unsound;¹ and, on the whole, it is clear that the Elizabethan episcopate took up a theological position very unlike that which characterised the Caroline prelates, and was substantially represented in the Prayer-book revision of 1661. But those who in our time patronise the former class of bishops as frankly protestant, or as untainted by "sacerdotalism," must take their Calvinism along with those merits. They were swayed in various degrees, yet effectually, by the commanding authority which the most systematic intellect and the most imperious temper among all the Continental Reformers had won for the mighty "Genevan Pope." It was not in them to shake off the bondage of Calvin's ascendancy;² but we who can hardly,

¹ Strype, *Annals*, i. 2. 282. Cheyney complained to bishop Guest that "only" in Art. 28 "took away the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament:" Guest answered that "the article was of his own penning," and that the word did not exclude the presence, but only a "gross" or "sensible" mode of reception. So Guest wrote to Cecil, Dec. 22, 1566.

² Hooker lived to write, in reply to his puritan critic, "Safer

by any effort, appreciate its pressure must allow largely for it in estimating the conduct of smaller men, when set to govern a Church which fraternised practically with the foreign Reformed. It was inevitable that, in face of the complex and formidable hostility of Roman powers secular and ecclesiastical, English Churchmen should make common cause with those abroad who were in peril for resistance to Popery ;”¹ and this has to be remembered when we look at the three celebrated cases (samples, probably, of a class²) in which persons not episcopally ordained were allowed to minister in the Elizabethan Church.

Whittingham had acted with Knox in appealing to Calvin (his brother-in-law) against the use, among English exiles, of Edward VI.’s Second Prayer-book ; in 1562, through Leicester’s influence, he obtained the deanery of Durham without having received holy orders, and even without having been regularly admitted

to discuss all the saints in heaven than M. Calvin !” etc. (Keble’s Hooker, i. 133). Even in 1595 Whitgift said that, if men thought Calvin wrong, they should say so without naming him.

¹ It required some courage to write even as Hooker did in E. P. iv. 13, in reply to claims made for “foreign churches.”

² Yet Whitgift, as archbishop, declared that he “knew none such :” Strype’s Whitgift, iii. 185.

to the Presbyterian ministry at Geneva ;¹ his tenure of office was questioned in 1576, on the ground that he was *mere laicus* ; he died in 1579 before the inquiry was concluded, but even archbishop Sandys in the course of it affirmed that "the Church of Geneva was not touched," *i.e.* its ordinations not impugned, because, "as far as yet could appear, Whittingham had not received his ministry by any authority or order from that Church." Travers' case is connected with his, because Travers, when his *status* was in question, claimed Whittingham's as a precedent. He himself, "disliking" the English form of ordination, had gone to Antwerp, and been there, in 1578, "made a minister" by Cartwright, Villers, a French Huguenot, and others, "after the form of Geneva."² Whitgift made this a

¹ There was some ambiguity, apparently some disingenuousness, as to the evidence. He produced certificates which mentioned "lot and election," but also "such other ceremonies" as were used at Geneva, imposition of hands not being named. The fact was that, as Sandys expressed it, Whittingham was "made minister by a few lay persons, in a private house at Geneva, without the knowledge or consent of Mr. Calvin," in fact, by English exiles alone (cf. Ann. ii. 2. 167 ff. 620 ; iii. 1. 468). Why, then, did Whitgift say in 1585, that Whittingham was "ordained minister by those which had authority in the church persecuted," although, "had he lived, he had been deprived, without" (*i.e.* but for) "special grace and dispensation" ? He must have been partly misinformed.

² Fuller, Ch. Hist. ix. p. 214 ; Strype's Whitgift, i. 477 ;

ground of objection to his being appointed master of the Temple; and when, as "reader," he got into controversy with Hooker, the archbishop again adduced it as a main reason for prohibiting him to preach. Travers wrote to Burleigh in defence of his ministerial position; and Whitgift wrote marginal criticisms on the plea, laying stress on the fact that Travers had treated his own Church with "contempt,"—denying that by being again ordained in England he would be "making void his former calling,"—but insisting on the legal requirement that "such as are to be allowed as ministers in this Church should be *ordered* by a bishop."¹ The case of Morrison belongs to Grindal's primacy. In 1582 his vicar-general, acting by his "express command," granted a license to minister "throughout the province of Canterbury" to John Morrison, as having been admitted, according to the "laudable form of the Reformed Church of Scotland, to sacred orders and the most holy ministry by the imposition of hands."² The fact seems some-

Ann. iii. i. 352. So was Robert Wright, who in 1582 confessed himself to be (legally) "a layman" (ib. iii. i. 178. Cp. cases in Ann. ii. i. 277, and Cardwell, Synod. ii. 554).

¹ Strype's Whitgift, iii. 185.

² Strype's Grindal, p. 596.

what doubtful, because at the time alleged, 1577, the First Book of Discipline, which abolished imposition of hands, was still of authority; the Second Book, which restored it, was not formally accepted by the Scottish Assembly until 1581.¹ Nor was "sacred orders" a phrase of the Scottish Reformed. But the main point—the non-episcopal character of Morrison's ordination—was indisputable and undisputed; and Grindal here treats it as both valid and regular. This is the strongest case of the three, and Grindal may, like Travers, have relied, from the legal point of view, on 13 Eliz. c. 12,² as allowing the ministrations of persons "pretending to be priests or ministers by reason of any other form of ordering" than the Edwardian, on their making due subscription; but this, as Travers himself admitted, would apply, in the first instance at least, to priests ordained according to the old pontifical under Mary, and would restrict such persons from officiating until they had subscribed.³ The

¹ Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scotl.* ii. 217. The Kirk had approved the first book. But the titular archbishop Douglas had received imposition of hands when appointed in 1572 (*ib.* 180).

² Yet the licence implies some doubt as to legality.

³ See Travers in Keble's *Hooker*, iii. 554: more positively in *Strype's Whitgift*, iii. 185. Observe the first words of

wording might seem wide enough to be construed as recognising non-episcopal ordinations ; but even if it had done so expressly, it could not cancel the requirement of the Ordinal preface, as it was worded in 1552.¹ Individual bishops might practically set aside that requirement ; but their acts would be simply violations of the Church's own law.² It is truly significant that, in the circumstances, such a law was retained as interpreting an ordinal which supposes the historical ministry of the Three Orders to be that which God, "the giver of all good things, had appointed by His Holy

the statute—"That the churches of the queen's majesty's dominions may be served with pastors of sound religion." And the third clause directs that "no person shall hereafter be admitted to any benefice or cure except he then be twenty-three years of age at the least, and a *deacon*." Cf. Keble's *Serm. Acad. and Occ.* p. 372 ; Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 224 ; and Denny, *Anglican Orders*, p. 202. Strype takes the act to refer to both classes of persons, but primarily to priests of Roman ordination (*Annals*, ii. 1. 105 ; 2. 175).

¹ "It is requisite that no man, not being at this present bishop, priest, or deacon, shall execute any of them" (*i.e.* "these orders"), "except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following." The clause was re-worded in 1661.

² See Whitgift's articles of 1583, adopted by his suffragans and sanctioned by the queen. One is, that no one but a priest, or at least a deacon, "admitted thereunto according to the laws of this realm," shall be allowed to preach. Strype's *Whitgift*, i. 229 ; cp. note in Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* ii. 23.

Spirit in His Church," and describes as "necessary in" that Church the two orders which are throughout presumed to depend upon the third for their bestowal.¹

As a rule, the palpable defect in the prelates' insistence on conformity was that they rested too much on State "law," meaning the Act of Uniformity,—and on the royal authority in general. They did not appeal to "Church principles," for those principles were not as yet realised. There was little if anything to relieve the hardness of their line towards those who scrupled at compliance, or whose ideas of pure and spiritual religion disposed them to aim at radical changes. "Why stop at this or that point, and not go further? Why seek to stereotype a halting compromise, because the reigning sovereign's preferences looked backward and not forward?" In a word, no man with high and clear conceptions about the kingdom of Christ could be satisfied with the

¹ The more stress we lay on this connection between the English church at this period and non-episcopal reformed bodies, the more significant it is that her formularies provided no way by which any of their ministers could be admitted to officiate within her bounds save that which made them postulants for the "inferior office" of a deacon, as preliminary to the commission of a "dispenser of the word and sacraments."

legalism of conformity; it was not interesting, it was not beautiful, it was not coherent: something was needed¹ which could meet and outface the religious fervour of the Puritan, could reply to the claim set up for "the Holy Discipline" by pointing to the majesty of the historical Catholic Church. Mr. Keble has shown, in his monumental preface to Hooker, how men like Bancroft and Bilson,² and the anonymous author of the *Querimonia Ecclesiæ*, "had been gradually unlearning some of those opinions which intimacy with foreign Protestants had tended to foster, and had adopted a tone and way of thinking more like that of the early Church." They had come to see that Calvinism would not *do*. In Hooker himself it is easy to find traces of the hold which the great foreign system had early

¹ "The higher spirits of the time wanted to breathe more freely and in a purer air" (Church, Pascal and other Sermons, p. 77).

² Bilson's Perpetual Government of Christ's Church, and Bancroft's Survey of the Holy Discipline, were both published in 1593. Bilson contends that certain parts of the apostolic office are necessary and permanent, and that historically they have descended to bishops (c. 9 and 13). He became a bishop in 1596. It has been asked,—Did Hooker's friend, Saravia, receive Anglican ordination on settling in England? Moral probabilities may here outweigh the lack of documentary evidence. Cf. Firminger, Non-episc. Ordinations, p. 18.

acquired over his mind ; for even in the "fifth book" he uses somewhat inconsistent language as to the Sacraments and the Ministry;¹ and although he ultimately came to think of Episcopacy as properly of "Divine institution," he stopped short of some natural inferences from such a belief.² Occasionally, he adopts too much of the tone of a counsel retained to argue for all that is established ;³ once or twice we are annoyed by special pleading,⁴ or by a careless quotation involving some unfairness ;⁵ or we wonder whether it ever occurred to him that his theory of the identity of Church and State might break down through the acquisition of civil rights by persons professedly external to the Church.⁶ But after all such deductions, we see in him one raised up to lift the whole tone of the English Church out of

¹ Those who claim Hooker's language in E. P. v. 78. 2, as "anti-sacerdotal" should consider whether they can approve of v. 77. 1-8. See too v. 25. 3.

² See Keble, Preface to Hooker, pp. lxxv. ff. ; and Perry, ii. 346.

³ E. P. v. 19. 3 ; 81. 6. Cf. Dean Church on Bacon, p. 12.

⁴ Ib. viii. 5. 2, as to Valentinian I.

⁵ Ib. viii. 6. 8—a misuse of a canon of Innocent III. : see Keble's note. Also ib. v. 79. 17, as to Irenæus.

⁶ Ib. viii. 1. 2. See bishop Barry, in *Masters in English Theology*, p. 57.

confusions, negations, and rigorisms, and to abate the wild "workings after storm" by the application of the ideas of reasonable authority, of balanced moderation, of order and harmony, of reverence and seemliness, which possessed him, as Walton tells us, even on his deathbed. Three permanent lessons may be derived from his personality and his life-work. First, he teaches theological students always to look at immediate questions of detail in the light of some broad and lofty principle. Secondly, he teaches them to associate Christian ordinances, the instrumental activities of the kingdom of grace, with the Person and the work of the Incarnate Redeemer. And thirdly, he teaches them to control the controversial temper, to avoid the contagion of *odium theologicum*; and the lesson is all the more impressive as coming from one who, as some well-known passages indicate, had a keen sense of humour and no small capacity for sarcasm.¹ He had become Master of the Temple in 1585; his experience of London Puritanism led him to

¹ *E.g.* E. P. v. 29. 6, 7; 34. 2; 66. 9; 74. 1; 75. 2. Cf. Keble's Hooker, i. 373, ii. 257, for samples of his notes on passages in the "Christian Letter of certain English Protestants," a criticism on the "Eccl. Polity," of which an account is given in Keble's Preface, p. ix. ff.

begin his great work after retiring into Wiltshire in 1591; he settled in Kent in 1595, after publishing the first four books of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*;—the fifth was published in 1597; he died in his forty-seventh year, the last of the sixteenth century. Elizabeth, it is said, expressed “very much sorrow” at the news of his death; and James I. was probably assisted to detach himself from Calvinistic traditions, as by other converging influences, so by the satisfaction which, as he told Whitgift, he had received from Hooker’s “grave, comprehensive, and clear” reasoning, “backed with the authority of the Scripture, the fathers, and schoolmen, and with all law both sacred and civil.” James added, “There is in every page the picture of a divine soul.” It was well spoken by that “witty and well-read”¹ royal scholar, who, after all, was something better than a mere pedant; and it might be ranked with the yet graver testimony given by Pope Clement VIII. after listening to a Latin version of the first book of the “*Polity*.”²

The remaining event in Elizabethan Church history is the episode of the “*Lambeth Articles*.”

¹ Macaulay’s phrase (*Essay on Bacon*).

² Walton’s *Life of Hooker*.

Both universities were still Calvinistic strongholds; and at Cambridge the chair of Divinity was filled by Whitaker, who maintained predestinarianism as a dogma of faith. The Margaret Professor Baro, a French refugee, inculcated a milder theology;¹ and in 1595 Barret, a fellow of Caius College, declared in more stringent terms against what was then "the received doctrine of assurance,"² the theory of reprobation as irrespective of sin, etc. A sort of retractation was wrung from him: but his academic censors, not satisfied, referred the case to the archbishop. It is not, perhaps, unfair to suspect that Whitgift thought it possible to utilise the situation by conciliating the more moderate Puritans in regard to the strictly

¹ For Baro's case see Hardwick, *Hist. Artic.* p. 165; *Cambr. Transact. during Puritan Period*, ii. 91 ff. In February, 1596, he complained to Burleigh of certain persons who held "Deum maximam hominum partem ad interitum *de industria* hactenus creasse, et quotidie creare," and that the inefficacy of Christ's death for many is not caused by their wilful rejection of Him, "sed *quod ipse nolit* suam illis mortem prodesse . . . Hæc sunt de quibus hodie accusor." Travers had taught this doctrine of absolute reprobation, of which Laud wrote in 1641 that his "very soul abominated" it (*Works*, vi. 133).

² Hardwick, p. 167. The Latin term for assurance was *securitas*. Whitgift remarked to the Cambridge heads of houses that "security" was "never taken in good part" (*Strype's Whitgift*, ii. 229; cf. "Macbeth," iii. 5). Saravia, whom he consulted, also deprecated the affirmation of *securitas*.

theological issue, and so attaching them to episcopal government. Yet, on hearing the other sides, he was disposed to think that, although Barret was wrong in "giving occasion of these questions," the Cambridge authorities had been "rash and peremptory." They answered him "stiffly;" he rejoined with dignified firmness. They insisted that their Calvinism, as we should call it, was "the doctrine that had always since the Reformation been received and allowed,"¹ and persevered in their plan of crushing Barret, to whom, accordingly, eight questions were submitted. His answers were declared to be "not only insufficient, but for the most part popish also." Whitgift disapproved them in part, excused them in part, and evoked the case, so to speak, to his own tribunal. Whitaker was sent to confer with Whitgift and other divines, and out of the conferences emerged "the Lambeth Articles,"—a painfully ominous title, considering that the changes made at Lambeth in Whitaker's draft were only sufficient to soften in some respects the terrible rigour of its Calvinism.²

¹ It will be remembered that "to allow," in the English of that time, meant "to approve:" cf. Ps. xi. 6, P.B. Version; and Shakspeare, *Cymb.* iii. 3, etc. Hooker opposes "allowance" to "patience," v. 19. 5.

² Cf. Hardwick, *Hist. Artic.* pp. 174, 363-367. "Quosdam

The Church was thus in some danger of being compromised, although the archbishop, as if alarmed at his own act, represented the "nine propositions" as merely expressing the "private judgments" of those concerned.¹ But Burleigh objected to their predestinarianism; Elizabeth, says Hook, "condemned them more strongly, if possible, than her ministers;"² and they were *ad mortem reprobavit* was explained, by Whitgift's committee, of the unbelieving. They denied any necessity of condemnation as flowing "ex ipsa prædestinatione." Modifications were introduced as to "certitudo;" a certain "power" was recognised in the will as "consenting to grace." Still, the language goes far beyond the 17th article. For Hooker's further modifications, see Keble's Hooker, vol. ii. p. 596. For Overall's position, see Strype's Whitg. ii. 305. Andrewes criticised the "censure on Barret," and plainly affirmed that perdition was due to sin, not to any *actus absolutus* on God's part, etc.

¹ Nov. 24, 1595. Yet two months later the Cambridge "heads" treated them as authoritative against Baro, who had explained them away.

² Hook, v. 160. When Whitgift wrote, "that her majesty was persuaded of the truth of the propositions," though she disapproved of their publication (Strype's Whitgift, ii. 284), he must have persuaded himself incorrectly. Her words against puritanic schemes in 1584, "I see many overbold with God Almighty, making too many scannings of His blessed will," (Whitg. i. 393), may show how she would criticise the Calvinistic dogmatism about divine "decrees." On Dec. 5, 1595, she "required Whitgift to suspend" the propositions. At the Hampton Court conference, James I. vetoed a request for the addition of these articles to the thirty-nine (Cardwell's Conferences, p. 185). When he sanctioned the Irish articles of 1615, which substantially included the Lambeth propositions, he may have been thinking of his Scottish settlers in Ulster.

happily suppressed. It was not the least of the great female "Governor's" services to the Church which she had dominated, but preserved. When, seven years later, she passed away, and left her sceptre to the Stuarts, their attempt to emulate her absolutism under gravely altered conditions introduced new complications into the Church's relations with the English people, and involved the revival-movement in the storms through which it passed to substantial and final victory.¹

¹ It is not always remembered that the Anglican body of doctrine was not completed until the year after Elizabeth's death, and thirty-three years after her ratification of the articles. It was in 1604 that the sacramental questions and answers were added to the catechism. Two years later, the lower (if not the upper) house of convocation of Canterbury committed itself to the principle of apostolical succession by accepting the second as well as the first part of Overall's "Convocation Book." It is right, however, to add, that Overall as bishop of Norwich (1618-9) was willing to recognise the Dutch ordination of De Laune, and to accept him as presented to a benefice; but the presentation fell through, and De Laune was afterwards instituted to another benefice without any new ordination: see Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, p. 185 ff., where the letter in which Cosin gives this information is further quoted in regard to Whittingham. Cosin erroneously imagined that "Whittingham had judgment finally in his favour, it being declared that ordination beyond the seas was equivalent to ordination in England, and that, for the better confirmation of this, a bill . . . passed both houses, and this statute, which was *either* 13 Eliz. c. 8 *or* 8 Eliz. c. 13, enacted that whosoever, alleged to have been ordained minister beyond the seas, if he subscribed the thirty-nine articles,

. . . might be admitted to a benefice in the Church of England." The statement only shows how ill-informed Cosin then was ; and Birch quotes from a marginal comment on a copy of the letter which he thinks was "probably" by bishop Burnet, in which it is questioned as probably so much "hearsay," the writer adding that the 13 Eliz. c. 8 "could not be referred to, because Sandys was not archbishop of York until the 18th of Eliz." (rather, the 19th), and that "Whittingham might retain his deanery by virtue of his letters patents, though no priest,—nothing being frequenter than for dignities and prebends to be held by those who were no priests . . . even in the time of king James." (It appears that later still, in 1629, Vossius was installed as prebendary of Canterbury : Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 113.) It may be well to add that the act 8 Eliz. c. 1 (to which Cosin seems to have made an inaccurate and "unverified" reference) was clearly intended to correct an oversight in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which had not expressly revived the legal use of the ordinal which had been "annexed" to the prayer-book of 1552. It professed to remove certain doubts and objections as to the *legality* of consecrations performed according to that ordinal since the queen's accession ; it did so by affirming them to have been "duly and orderly done according to the *laws* of this realm ;" and it concluded by declaring all persons similarly consecrated or ordained in the future to be "rightly made," *i.e.*, as the whole drift of the statute shows, in a legal sense.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE SIXTH NICENE CANON.

THE Latin version of Nicene and other canons which the Ballerini distinguish as "Vetus" was printed by them from a Verona manuscript of the seventh century, containing the collection made by a deacon named Theodosius. They considered it to have been made from a Greek codex of Alexandrian origin, extant long before the council of Chalcedon. For it is prefaced by the words, "Synodus Nicæna sub Alexandro episcopo Alexandriae imperatore Constantino; multa igitur seditione facta beato Alexandro cum suis de mala mente Arii . . . Constantinus scripsit illi et omnibus episcopis occurrere, colligens concilium," etc. Then comes the Nicene Creed in its original form, and dated by consulates and by the era of Alexander, with the day of the month. The number of bishops present is given as 318: it is added that "studiosi servi Dei magis curaverunt orientalium nomina episcoporum conscribere," because the Westerns had not the question of heresy to the same extent before them. The only signatures given are those of "Osius," and of "Avitus" and "Vincentius" as Roman presbyters. My friend Mr. C. H. Turner, Fellow of Magdalen College, who has "collated all, or almost all the manuscripts of Latin versions of the Nicene canons which are of any importance," has kindly permitted me to see the results of his re-collation of two other manuscripts of this version, found by Maassen, assigned to the ninth century, and named after Freisingen and Würzburg. Great interest attaches to their text of the version, because it appears as part of the acts of a Carthaginian council—that of A.D. 419,—being prefaced by "Danihel notarius recitavit, Nicheni concilii fidei professio vel

ejus statuta," etc., and ending with a speech by Aurelius, bishop (of Carthage), to the effect that these canons as "recited" by Daniel were from the copy of the Nicene "statutes" which "our fathers" had brought home with them from the Nicene council, and which were preserved in the church of Carthage ("apud nos"). The ordinary text of the proceedings of the Carthaginian council is quite accordant with the above postscript; for we read, "Daniel notarius Nicæni concilii professionem fidei vel ejus statuta recitavit in concilio Africano" (Mansi, iv. 407).

Although the two German manuscripts in some places virtually correct the Veronese, and justify the emendations suggested by the Ballerini, they still do not give a thoroughly literal representation of the Greek. But this amount of verbal laxity attaches a greater significance to the accordance of the "Carthaginian" version, if we may so term it, in all three manuscripts, with the Greek exordium of canon vi., as opposed to that which Paschasinus so confidently produced at Chalcedon. The same must be said of another Latin version, which Mr. Turner identifies with the one sent by Atticus of Constantinople in reply to the request of the African bishops, and preserved in a ninth-century manuscript, "nunc Vaticanus Palatinus." It is headed—"Exemplaria concilii Nicæni directa sub die vi kal. Decemb. post consulatum . . . Honorii xii. et Theodosii viii . . . Bonifatio urbis Rome episcopo" (= Nov. 26, A.D. 419); and again, between the creed and the canons, (2) "constituta patrum in magna et sancta synodo apud Nicæam . . . quæ de greco translata sunt a Philone (et) Euaresto Constantino-politano," *i.e.* the secretaries whom Atticus employed for the purpose (cp. "per Teilonem et Tharistum" in Mansi, iv. 407). It is a much more exact version than the one already described, but in can. vi. it inserts "metropolitanis" before "ecclesiis." It renders τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατεῖτω τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, κ.τ.λ., quite literally, "Antiqui mores obtineant qui apud Ægyptum sunt," etc. Here, then, we have another ancient testimony against the exordium once current at Rome: and it is significant that the version of Dionysius Exiguus, agreeing substantially as it does with the Greek, and sanctioned by the Roman church, involves an official withdrawal, in the early part

of the sixth century, of the incorrect fifth-century clause, "ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum," represented in the Italian version which the Ballerini, under the title of "Antiquissima," printed from a ninth-century manuscript written for Ingilram, bishop of Chieti,—a version also remarkable for the strange freedoms which it takes with the received order and distinction of the canons. It appears that this reading has the support of another group of manuscripts, representing a Gallic recension of the original "Isidorian" version, so-called, in which this "Isidorian" has been altered by the introduction of the clause from the "Ingilram"; and that it was current in Italy (and Sicily) for a considerable time before the council of Chalcedon. But this does not give it any independent value. It remains an *Italian* reading: for there is nothing to show that the "Ingilram" version circulated outside Italy and its dependencies. Mr. Rivington (p. 166) conjectures that the original reading was, "It is the ancient custom that the Roman church should hold the primacy." This disturbs the drift of the context, is clearly suggestive of "conflation," and substantially represents the text of the "Prisca" version, which is regarded as a compilation from the text ascribed to Atticus' secretaries and that of the "Ingilram" manuscript.

Through the kindness of the Rev. G. B. Howard (well known as the author of "The Christians of St. Thomas and their Liturgies") I am enabled to insert his rendering of the sixth canon from a Syriac manuscript (Add. MSS., 14528, Brit. Mus.) containing a (Nestorian) translation of the Nicene, Ancyran, Neocæsarean, Gangran, Antiochene, Laodicene, Constantinopolitan, and Chalcedonian canons, professing to have been made "from the Greek, carefully and with lucidity, in the city Mabug" (Hierapolis in Syria), "in the year 812 of Alexander" (=A.D. 500-1): "Let the peculiar customs be retained which are in Mitsrin" (Egypt) "and in Libya, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria have authority over all these, forasmuch as to him of Rome also this custom appertains. And so also in Antiochia, and in these other provinces, let precedence be retained in the churches."

INDEX

A

Acacius, patriarch, 74, 308
 Adamnan, 407
 Aetius, 198, 202, 281
 Aidan, 352, 411, 413
 Alaric, 315
 Alcluith, 380
 Aldfrid, 391
 Alemanni, 313
 Alexander of Alexandria, 69
 Alexander I. of Rome, 26
 Alexander III., king, 419
 Alexandria, see of, 77
 Ambrose, 122 ff., 214 ff., 311
 Anatolius of Constantinople,
 180, 207, 274
 Anatolius of Laodicea, 389
 Anatolius, patrician, 193
 Andrewes, 422, 478
 Anencletus, 9 ff.
 Anianus, 325
 Anicetus, 1, 28
 Anna, king of East Angles,
 353
 Antioch, councils of, 56, 69,
 107, 120; schism at, 96
 Antony of Fussala, 139
 Anysius, 115
 Apiarius, 136 ff.
 Aquileia, council of, 121

Arbogast, 244
 Arianism, 66, 96, 251, 332
 Ariminum, council of, 229,
 360
 Arles, council of, 53, 63, 360
 Armagh, 385, 400 ff.
 Ascholius, 115, 123
 Atticus, 138, 482
 Athanasius, 1, 60, 73, 82 ff.,
 123, 257, 310
 Athanasius, priest, 256
 Attila, 327
 Augustine, 61, 127 ff., 323
 Augustine of Canterbury, 339,
 344, 352, 354
 Augustus, 218
 Aurelian, 56

B

Bancroft, 453, 472
 Baro, 476
 Barret, 476
 Barrow, 461
 Barsumas, 263, 269, 274
 Basil, 100 ff.
 Basil of Seleucia, 268 ff., 284
 Bede, 346, 352, 391, 410
 Bilson, 472
 Birinus, 354
 Boniface I., 137 ff.

Boniface IV., 389
 Brownists, 460
 Bucer, 439
 Bullinger, 443
 Burgundians, 325, 333, 354
 Burleigh, 475, 478

C

Cæcilian, 60
 Caius, 9, 14
 Callistus, 37
 Calporn, 371
 Calvin, 465
 Capua, council of, 125
 Carthage, 319; councils of,
 49 ff., 127, 134, 140
 Cartwright, 444, 459, 467
 Cashel, synod of, 402
 Cecil, 431, 436
 Celestine I., 139 ff., 144 ff.
 Celestius, 127, 132 ff.
 Cellach, 417
 Celts, 357, 421
 Chad, 391
 Chalcedon, council of, 172 ff.,
 277 ff.
 Cheyney, 465
 Chrysostom, 1, 255
 Clement I., 1, 9, 23
 Clement VIII., 475
 Clovis, 333, 338
 Columba, 407 ff.
 Columban, 388
 Constantine I., 60 ff., 70, 310
 Constantinople, council of,
 117 ff.; see of, 196
 Constantius, 91, 218, 311
 Corinth, church of, 23

Cornelius of Rome, 47
 Cornwall, saints in, 387
 Corotic, 378
 Cox, 430, 440
 Culdees, the, 415
 Cummian, 391
 Cuthbert, 347, 352, 413
 Cyprian, 14, 39 ff., 319
 Cyprus, 169
 Cyril, 144 ff., 186 ff., 259 ff.

D

Damasus, 95, 104 ff., 112 ff.,
 170, 219
 David, 363
 David, king of Scots, 420
 Dionysius, the Great, 52
 Dionysius of Corinth, 9, 27
 Dionysius of Rome, 1, 27, 53,
 68
 Dionysius, the "dux," 305
 Dioscorus, 181 ff., 254 ff.
 Domnus, 259, 264, 275
 Donatism, 60, 66, 111
 Dublin, 400

E

Edwin, 353, 364
 Egbert, 352, 391
 Eleutherus, 29
 Elizabeth, 403 ff., 452, 478
 Elpidius, 265
 Ephesus, council of, 144 ff., 270
 Epiphanius, 18, 124
 Epiphanius of Pavia, 329
 Epiphanius of Perga, 271
 Ethelbert, 339, 345
 Eugenius, 245
 Euphemius, 309

- Euric, 331
 Eusebius, 15 ff.
 Eusebius of Dorylæum, 265
 ff., 278
 Eusebius of Vercellæ, 97
 Eustathians, 96
 Eustathius of Berytus, 266, 286
 Eustathius of Sebaste, 102
 Eutyches, 172 ff., 261 ff.
 Evagrius, 125
- F
- Fabian, 1
 Faustinus, legate, 136 ff.
 Faustinus of Lyons, 48
 Faustinus, schismatic, 95
 Felix, intruder, 95
 Felix of East Anglia, 333, 354
 Felix II. of Rome, 74
 Ferghil, 390
 Firmilian, 50
 Firmus, 163
 Flavian, 121, 172 ff., 261 ff.
 Florentius, 172, 262
 Frankfort, 440
 Franks, 313, 324, 339
 Fridolin, 390
 Fursey, 352
- G
- Gaiseric, 323, 327
 Gall, 390
 Gelasius of Cyzicus, 71
 Gepidæ, 324
 German of Auxerre, 362, 375
 German of Paris, 340
 Gilbert of Limerick, 400
 Giraldus, 365
- Goths, 313, 324
 Gratian, 111 ff., 216 ff.
 Gregory I., 1, 250, 347
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 35, 108,
 196
 Gregory of Tours, 325, 340
 Grindal, 436, 459, 464, 468
 Guest, 431, 465
- H
- Hegesippus, 15
 Hilarus, 266, 271 ff.
 Hilary of Poitiers, 90, 93
 Hippolytus, 14, 37
 Hooker, 456, 472 ff.
 Hooper, 439
 Hosius, 71, 87
 Howel, king of Wales, 366
 Humphrey, 443, 459
 Hunneric, 323, 332
 Huns, 2, 324
 Hyginus, 10
- I
- Ignatius, 9, 25 ff.
 Illyricum, 114
 Innocent I., 1, 126 ff., 169
 Iona, 394, 407, 412, 417
 Irenæus, 9 ff., 29 ff.
 Ischyron, 255
 Ithacians, 235
- J
- James, St., 16
 James I., 475
 Jerome, 15, 52, 94, 106, 315
 Jewel, 454

John, St., 8
 John of Antioch, 147 ff., 259
 John "Erigena," 397
 John of Jerusalem, 126
 John Talaia, 308
 Julian, emperor, 218, 257, 314
 Julian or Julius, 264, 275
 Julius I., 1, 81 ff.
 Justina, 217, 226, 234
 Juvenal, 167, 265, 282

K

Kells, synod of, 401
 Kentigern, 406
 Kenwalch, 353
 Kilian, 390
 Knollys, 435, 454
 Knox, 420, 440

L

Lambeth articles, 477
 "Latrocinium," council called,
 263 ff.
 Leicester, earl of, 431, 435,
 466
 Leo I., emperor, 306
 Leo the Great, 1, 119, 171
 ff., 257, 264, 299
 Leovigild, 331
 Liberatus, 210, 254, 274, 304
 Liberius, 91 ff.
 Linus, 9 ff.
 Loegaire, king, 382
 Lombards, 331 ff.
 Lucentius, 278
 Lucifer, 98
 Lupus, 327

M

MacCriffan, Phelim, 397
 Malachy, 400
 Marcellinus, schismatic, 95
 Marcellus, 83
 Marcian of Arles, 48
 Marcian, emperor, 179, 296 ff.
 "Marcus" (Merocles), 61
 Margaret, 418
 Mark, St., 85, 257, 300
 Martin, 235, 405
 "Martin Marprelate," 452
 Maximus of Antioch, 195, 275
 Maximus "the Cynic," 118,
 122
 Maximus, emperor, 217, 234
 Meletius, 96 ff., 107
 Mercurinus, 229
 Metrophanes, 72
 Milan, councils of, 91, 122
 Milevis, council of, 127
 Miliuc, 381
 Miltiades (Melchiades), 61 ff.
 Morrison, 468

N

Nectan, king, 413
 Nectarius, 122
 Nestorius, 144 ff.
 Nestorius of Phlagon, 299
 Nicæa, council of, 66 ff., 83;
 canons of, 74 ff., 202 ff.,
 481 ff.
 Ninian, 403 ff.
 Novatianists, 45

O

Odoacer, 328

Onesiphorus, 271
 Optatus, 63
 Orosius, 126
 Ostrogoths, 329
 Oswald, 353
 Oswy, 353

P

Palladius, 368
 Parker, 426, 435, 463
 Paschasinus, 277, 287, 482
 Patrick, 368 ff.
 Paul, St., 6, 344
 Paul of Samosata, 55
 Paulinus of Antioch, 96 ff.,
 108, 124
 Paulinus of York, 342
 Pelagius, 127, 133, 361
 Penda, 364
 Penry, 461
 Peter, St., 6 ff.
 Peter of Alexandria, 116, 123
 Peter of Corinth, 288
 Peter Martyr, 439 ff.
 Peter Mongus, 302
 Picts, 403, 408, 417
 Pius V., 447
 Pius IX., 3, 211
 Polycarp, 12, 28
 Probus, 314
 Proclus, 260
 Prosper, 369, 381
 Proterius, 296 ff.
 Pseudo-Clementines, 12 ff.
 Pulcheria, 179, 262, 277
 Puritans, 438 ff., 447

Q

Quartodecimans, 28

R

Recared, 333
 Remigius, 338
 Renatus, 193
 Rhadagaisus, 315
 Ridley, 439
 Roderick of Strathclyde, 406
 Rome, councils of, 61, 111,
 124; precedency of church
 of, 22, 31 ff., 204
 Rufinus of Aquileia, 12, 19, 77
 Rufinus, minister of Theo-
 dosius I., 240

S

St. Andrews, 415 ff.
 Salvian, 318 ff., 335
 Sampson, 443, 459
 Sandys, 430, 443, 467
 Sardica, council of, 85 ff., 137,
 360
 Saxons, 324, 335, 345
 Scone, 417
 Sechnall, 370
 Seleucus, 267
 "Separatists," English, 457 ff.
 Severinus, 327
 Sidonius Apollinaris, 324
 Sigebert, king of East Angles,
 353
 Sigebert, king of East Saxons,
 350
 Siricius, 115
 Sirmium, creeds of, 93
 Sixtus II., 1
 Sophronius, 256
 Soter, 1
 Stephen of Ephesus, 281

Stephen of Rome, 48 ff.
 Stilicho, 248
 Strathelyde, 403, 406
 Sylvester, 64 ff.
 Symmachus, 219 ff.

T

Tara, 382
 Telesphorus, 1
 Tertullian, 11 ff., 30, 359
 Teutons, 334
 Thalassius, 282
 Theodore, deacon, 255
 Theodoret, 192 ff., 258 ff.,
 275, 280
 Theodoric, 331
 Theodosius I., 115 ff., 121,
 236 ff., 314
 Theodosius II., 177, 262, 276
 Theophilus, 125, 255, 259, 301
 Timotheus "the Cat," 304 ff.
 Timotheus Salofaciolus, 307
 Travers, 451, 467
 Treves, 320
 Tyana, council of, 103
 Tyre, council of, 82

U

Ulphilas, 331
 Ursinus, 111

V

Valens, 314
 Valentinian I., 314
 Valentinian II., 111, 216 ff.,
 244
 Valentinian III., 114, 171
 Valentinianism, 30, 236
 Vandals, 2, 322, 330, 335
 Vatican council, decree of, 3
 ff., 33, 129, 169, 180, 211
 Victor I., 28
 Victor of Vita, 323
 Victricius, 361
 Villers, 467
 Vincent and Vito, 73
 Visigoths, 329, 332

W

Walsingham, 435
 Welsh church, 363
 Whitaker, 476
 Whitby, 396
 Whitgift, 445 ff., 464, 476
 Whittingham, 440, 466
 Wilfrid, 355

Z

Zeno, 308
 Zephyrinus, 37
 Zosimus, 132 ff.
 Zurich, 440

January 1896.

A Selection of Works

IN

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Abbey and Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY, M.A., Rector of Checkendon, Reading, and JOHN H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Epworth. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Adams.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The four Allegories may be had separately, with Illustrations. *16mo. 1s. each.*

Aids to the Inner Life.

Edited by the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Rector of Kirby Misperton, Yorkshire. *Five Vols. 32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each; or cloth extra, 1s. each.*

With red borders, 2s. each. Sold separately.

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS À KEMPIS.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

Barry.—SOME LIGHTS OF SCIENCE ON THE FAITH.

Being the Bampton Lectures for 1892. By the Right Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., Canon of Windsor, formerly Bishop of Sydney, Metropolitan of New South Wales, and Primate of Australia. *8vo. 12s. 6d.*

Bathe.—Works by the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE, M.A.

A LENT WITH JESUS. A Plain Guide for Churchmen. Containing Readings for Lent and Easter Week, and on the Holy Eucharist. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

AN ADVENT WITH JESUS. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

WHAT I SHOULD BELIEVE. A Simple Manual of Self-Instruction for Church People. *Small 8vo, limp, 1s.; cloth gilt, 2s.*

Bathe and Buckham.—THE CHRISTIAN'S ROAD BOOK:

PART I. DEVOTIONS. By the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE and Rev. F. H. BUCKHAM, *Fcap. 8vo. Sewed, 6d.; limp cloth, 1s.; cloth extra, 1s. 6d.*

Benson.—THE FINAL PASSOVER : A Series of Meditations upon the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Rev. R. M. BENSON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. *Small 8vo.*

Vol. I.—THE REJECTION. 5s.

Vol. II.—THE UPPER CHAMBER.

Part I. 5s.

Part II. 5s.

Vol. III.—THE DIVINE EXODUS.

Parts I. and II. 5s. each.

Vol. IV.—THE LIFE BEYOND THE GRAVE. 5s.

Bickersteth.—YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER : a Poem in Twelve Books. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., Bishop of Exeter. *One Shilling Edition, 18mo. With red borders, 16mo, 2s. 6d.*

The Crown 8vo Edition (5s.) may still be had.

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.

THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER : Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. *4to. 21s.*

THE COMPENDIOUS EDITION OF THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER : Forming a concise Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. *Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.*

DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo. 21s.*

DICTIONARY OF SECTS, HERESIES, ECCLESIASTICAL PARTIES AND SCHOOLS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo. 21s.*

THE BOOK OF CHURCH LAW Being an Exposition of the Legal Rights and Duties of the Parochial Clergy and the Laity of the Church of England. Revised by Sir WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Bart., D.C.L., and G. EDWARDES JONES, Barrister-at-Law. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE : Being a Plain Commentary on Scripture History, to the end of the Apostolic Age. *Two Vols. small 8vo. Sold separately.*

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d. THE NEW TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d.

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY : a Handbook of Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, etc., etc. *Paper cover, 16mo. 1s. Also the Larger Edition, 3s. 6d.*

Body.—Works by the Rev. GEORGE BODY, D.D., Canon of Durham.

THE LIFE OF LOVE. A Course of Lent Lectures. *16mo. 2s. 6d.*

THE SCHOOL OF CALVARY ; or, Laws of Christian Life revealed from the Cross. *16mo. 2s. 6d.*

THE LIFE OF JUSTIFICATION. *16mo. 2s. 6d.*

THE LIFE OF TEMPTATION. *16mo. 2s. 6d.*

Boulton.—A COMMENTARY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, formerly Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Bright.—Works by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

WAYMARKS IN CHURCH HISTORY. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

MORALITY IN DOCTRINE. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS: St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH; and other Studies in Church History. *Crown 8vo.*

Bright and Medd.—LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIE ANGLICANÆ. A GULIELMO BRIGHT, S.T.P., et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Latine redditus. *Small 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Browne.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., formerly Bishop of Winchester. *8vo.* 16s.

Campion and Beamont.—THE PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVED. With Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By W. M. CAMPION, D.D., and W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. *Small 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: a Manual of Prayer for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest.

18mo. 2s. 6d.; *cloth limp,* 2s.

Bound with the Book of Common Prayer, 3s. 6d.

Red-Line Edition. *Cloth extra, gilt top.* *18mo,* 2s. 6d. *net.*

Large-Type Edition. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE WAY OF LIFE: A Book of Prayers and Instruction for the Young at School, with a Preparation for Confirmation. Compiled by a Priest, *18mo.* 1s. 6d.

THE PATH OF HOLINESS: a First Book of Prayers, with the Service of the Holy Communion, for the Young. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. *16mo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp,* 1s.

THE GUIDE TO HEAVEN: a Book of Prayers for every Want. (For the Working Classes.) Compiled by a Priest. *18mo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp,* 1s. *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp,* 1s.

[continued

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford—*continued.*

SELF-RENUNCIATION. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

THE STAR OF CHILDHOOD: a First Book of Prayers and Instruction for Children. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

NICHOLAS FERRAR: his Household and his Friends. With Portrait engraved after a Picture by CORNELIUS JANSSEN at Magdalene College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN KETTLEWELL. With Details of the History of the Non-Jurors. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Conybeare and Howson.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. With numerous Maps and Illustrations.

LIBRARY EDITION. Two Vols. 8vo. 21s.

STUDENTS' EDITION. One Vol. Crown 8vo. 6s.

POPULAR EDITION. One Vol. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Creighton.—PERSECUTION AND TOLERANCE: being the Hulsean Lectures preached before the University of Cambridge in 1893-4. By M. CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Devotional Series, 16mo, Red Borders. Each 2s. 6d.

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

CHILCOT'S TREATISE ON EVIL THOUGHTS.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.

HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.

KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*

*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.

*——— ——— HOLY DYING.

** These two in one Volume. 5s.*

Devotional Series, 18mo, without Red Borders. Each 1s.

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE,

HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.

KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER, *Large type.*

*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.

*——— ——— HOLY DYING.

** These two in one Volume. 2s. 6d.*

Diggle.—RELIGIOUS DOUBT : its Nature, Treatment, Causes, Difficulties, Consequences, and Dissolution. By the Rev. JOHN W. DIGGLE, M.A., Vicar of Mossley Hill and Hon. Canon of Liverpool, Author of 'Bishop Fraser's Lancashire Life.' *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Edersheim.—Works by ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., D.D., Ph.D., sometime Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint, Oxford.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. *Two Vols. 8vo. 24s.*

JESUS THE MESSIAH : being an Abridged Edition of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH : The Warburton Lectures, 1880-1884. *8vo. 12s.*

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM UNDER TITUS. Revised by the Rev. HENRY A. WHITE, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. With a Preface by the Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. *8vo. 18s.*

Ellicott.—Works by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. Greek Text, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised English Translation. *8vo.*

I CORINTHIANS. 16s.

GALATIANS. 8s. 6d.

EPHESIANS. 8s. 6d.

PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND

PHILEMON. 10s. 6d.

THESSALONIANS. 7s. 6d.

PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10s. 6d.

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. *8vo. 12s.*

Epochs of Church History.—Edited by MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Peterborough. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A.

THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. GEO. G. PERRY, M.A.

THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A.

HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES. By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A.

THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFEN. By UGO BALZANI.

THE COUNTER REFORMATION. By ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, Litt. D.

WYCLIFFE AND MOVEMENTS FOR REFORM. By REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

Fosbery.—Works edited by the Rev. THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

VOICES OF COMFORT. *Cheap Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The Larger Edition (7s. 6d.) may still be had.

HYMNS AND POEMS FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING. In connection with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. Selected from Various Authors. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Fremantle.—THE WORLD AS THE SUBJECT OF REDEMPTION. Being an attempt to set forth the Functions of the Church as designed to embrace the whole Race of Mankind. (The Bampton Lectures, 1883.) By the Hon. and Rev. W. H. FREMANTLE, M.A., Dean of Ripon. New Edition, Revised, with New Preface. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Gore.—Works by the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Canon of Westminster.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. *8vo. 10s. 6d.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Goulburn.—Works by EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Dean of Norwich.

THOUGHTS ON PERSONAL RELIGION. *Small 8vo. 6s. 6d.*

Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.; Presentation Edition, 2 vols. small 8vo, 10s. 6d.

THE PURSUIT OF HOLINESS: a Sequel to 'Thoughts on Personal Religion.' *Small 8vo. 5s. Cheap Edition. 3s. 6d.*

THE GOSPEL OF THE CHILDHOOD: a Practical and Devotional Commentary on the Single Incident of our Blessed Lord's Childhood (St. Luke ii. 41 to the end). *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE COLLECTS OF THE DAY: an Exposition, Critical and Devotional, of the Collects appointed at the Communion. With Preliminary Essays on their Structure, Sources, etc. *2 vols. Crown 8vo. 8s. each.*

THOUGHTS UPON THE LITURGICAL GOSPELS for the Sundays, one for each day in the year. With an Introduction on their Origin, History, the modifications made in them by the Reformers and by the Revisers of the Prayer Book. *2 vols. Crown 8vo. 16s.*

MEDITATIONS UPON THE LITURGICAL GOSPELS for the Minor Festivals of Christ, the two first Week-days of the Easter and Whitsun Festivals, and the Red-letter Saints' Days. *Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.*

FAMILY PRAYERS, compiled from various sources (chiefly from Bishop Hamilton's Manual), and arranged on the Liturgical Principle. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 16mo. 1s.*

Harrison.—Works by the Rev. ALEXANDER J. HARRISON, B.D.,
Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society.

PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANITY AND SCEPTICISM. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SCEPTICS: a Conversational
Guide to Evidential Work. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE REPOSE OF FAITH, IN VIEW OF PRESENT DAY DIFFI-
CULTIES. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Heurtley.—WHOLE SOME WORDS: Sermons on some Im-
portant points, of Christian Doctrine, preached before the University
of Oxford by the Rev. C. A. HEURTLEY, D.D., late Margaret Professor
of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Edited, with a
Prefatory Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. W. INCE, D.D., Canon
of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford. *Crown*
8vo. 5s.

Holland.—Works by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A.,
Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

GOD'S CITY AND THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM: *Crown*
8vo. 7s. 6d.

PLEAS AND CLAIMS FOR CHRIST. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CREED AND CHARACTER: Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF. Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CHRIST OR ECCLESIASTES. Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

LOGIC AND LIFE, with other Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Hutchings.—SERMON SKETCHES taken from some of the
Sunday Lessons throughout the Church's Year. By the Rev. W. H.
HUTCHINGS, M.A., Canon of York. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

Ingram.—HAPPINESS IN THE SPIRITUAL LIFE; or,
'The Secret of the Lord.' By the Rev. W. C. INGRAM, D.D., Dean
of Peterborough. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS; or, Thoughts on the
Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to come. Col-
lected chiefly from English Writers by L. P. With a Preface by the
Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Jameson.—Works by Mrs. JAMESON,

SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART, containing Legends of the Angels
and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles. With 19 Etchings and
187 Woodcuts. *2 vols. 8vo. 20s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in the
Fine Arts. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. *8vo. 10s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.
With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. *8vo. 10s. net.*

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD, as exemplified in Works of Art.
Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON; continued and completed by
LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. *2 Vols.*
8vo. 20s. net

Jennings.—**ECCLESIA ANGLICANA.** A History of the Church of Christ in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Jukes.—Works by ANDREW JUKES.

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE: a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE ORDER AND CONNEXION OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING, as set forth in the arrangement of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the Year. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

SACERDOTALISM, WHEN RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD, THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

SKETCHES IN SUNSHINE AND STORM: a Collection of Miscellaneous Essays and Notes of Travel. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE HOPES AND DECISIONS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, in Lent and Advent. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN MANCHESTER. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE WITNESS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

[continued.]

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.—*continued.*

THE LIGHT OF LIFE. Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Sermons preached for the most part in America. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR.

FOR DAYS AND YEARS. A book containing a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for Every Day in the Church's Year. *16mo.* 2s. 6d. *Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo.* 1s.; *or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.*; *or with red borders, 2s. 6d.*

FIVE MINUTES. Daily Readings of Poetry. *16mo.* 3s. 6d. *Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo.* 1s.; *or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.*

WEARINESS. A Book for the Languid and Lonely. *Large Type. Small 8vo.* 5s.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE. *16mo.* 2s. 6d. *32mo.* 1s.; *cloth limp, 6d.*

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHIES. *Nine Vols. Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d. *each.*

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis xv., known also as the Mother Tèrese de St. Augustin.

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Père Besson, of the Order of St. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By PÈRE GRATRY.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FÉNELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE.

DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Edited by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. *New and Uniform Editions. Nine Vols. 16mo.* 2s. 6d. *each.*

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO MEN.

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO WOMEN.

A SELECTION FROM THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE.

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

SELECTIONS FROM PASCAL'S 'THOUGHTS.'

- Liddon.**—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.
- LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Vicar of Cuddesdon, Oxford; and the Rev. ROBERT J. WILSON, D.D., Warden of Keble College. *With Portraits and Illustrations. Four Vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., 36s. Vol. III., 18s.*
- CLERICAL LIFE AND WORK: Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES: Lectures on Buddhism—Lectures on the Life of St. Paul—Papers on Dante. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. *8vo. 14s.*
- SERMONS ON OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF CHRIST. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- ADVENT IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Two Comings of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- CHRISTMASTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Birth of our Lord and the End of the Year. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- PASSIONTIDE SERMONS. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- EASTER IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. 5s.*
- THE MAGNIFICAT. Sermons in St. Paul's. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
- SOME ELEMENTS OF RELIGION. Lent Lectures. *Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.; or in paper cover, 1s. 6d.*
- The Crown 8vo Edition (5s.) may still be had.*
- SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
- MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. P. LIDDON, D.D. Selected and arranged by C. M. S. *Crown 16mo. 1s.*
-
- DR. LIDDON'S TOUR IN EGYPT AND PALESTINE IN 1886. Being Letters descriptive of the Tour, written by his Sister, Mrs. KING *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D.,
Dean of Lichfield.

THE HISTORY OF MARRIAGE, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN, IN
RELATION TO DIVORCE AND CERTAIN FORBIDDEN
DEGREES. *New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

AFTER DEATH. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive
Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship
to the Living. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND
JUDGMENT. Being a Sequel to *After Death. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE SON OF MAN, as traced by St. Mark. Being
Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instructions
in Church. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE DIVINE LITURGY. Being the Order for Holy Communion,
Historically, Doctrinally, and devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions.
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON
PRAYER. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The
Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices.
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE BISHOPS IN THE TOWER. A Record of Stirring Events
affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the
Revolution. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LYRA GERMANICA. Hymns translated from the German by
CATHERINE WINKWORTH. *Small 8vo. 5s.*

MacColl.—Works by the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon
Residentary of Ripon.

CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

LIFE HERE AND HEREAFTER : Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Mason.—Works by A. J. MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor
of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL. A Manual of Christian Doctrine.
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM. As taught
in Holy Scripture and the Fathers. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Mercier.—OUR MOTHER CHURCH : Being Simple Talk
on High Topics. By Mrs. JEROME MERCIER. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Milne.—THE DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE OF THE
EUCARIST as deduced from Scripture and the Ancient Liturgies.
By J. R. MILNE, Vicar of Rougham, Norfolk. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Mortimer.—Works by the Rev. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D.,
Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia.

HELPS TO MEDITATION: Sketches for Every Day in the Year.
With an Introduction by the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD.

VOL. I.—ADVENT to TRINITY. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

VOL. II.—TRINITY to ADVENT. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SERMONS IN MINIATURE FORE-
TEMPORE PREACHERS: Sketches
for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the
Christian Year. Crown 8vo. 6s.

NOTES ON THE SEVEN PENE-
TENTIAL PSALMS, chiefly from
Patristic Sources. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

STORIES FROM GENESIS: Sermons
for Children. Crown 8vo. 4s.

LEARN OF JESUS CHRIST TO
DIE: Addresses on the Words of our
Lord from the Cross, taken as Teaching
the Way of Preparation for Death.
16mo. 2s.

THE LAWS OF HAPPINESS; or,
The Beatitudes as teaching our Duty to
God, Self, and our Neighbour. 18mo. 2s.

THE LAWS OF PENITENCE: Ad-
dresses on the Words of our Lord from
the Cross. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

Mozley.—Works by J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ
Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

ESSAYS, HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. Two Vols. 8vo. 24s.

EIGHT LECTURES ON MIRACLES. Being the Bampton Lectures
for 1865. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

RULING IDEAS IN EARLY AGES AND THEIR RELATION TO
OLD TESTAMENT FAITH. Lectures delivered to Graduates of
the University of Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, and on Various Occasions. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

SERMONS, PAROCHIAL AND OCCASIONAL. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A REVIEW OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. Crown 8vo.
3s. 6d.

Newbolt.—Works by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon
and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral, Select Preacher at
Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ely.

COUNSELS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE: being Sermons preached
on various occasions. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

SPECULUM SACERDOTUM; or, the Divine Model of the Priestly
Life. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT. Being Ten Addresses bearing on
the Spiritual Life. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE MAN OF GOD. Being Six Addresses delivered during Lent a
the Primary Ordination of the Right Rev. the Lord Alwyne Compton,
D.D., Bishop of Ely. Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE PRAYER BOOK: Its Voice and Teaching. Being Spiritual
Addresses bearing on the Book of Common Prayer. Crown 8vo.
2s. 6d.

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D., sometime Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. *Eight Vols. Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d. each.*

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons,' *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

. *A Complete List of Cardinal Newman's Works can be had on Application.*

Norris.—RUDIMENTS OF THEOLOGY: a First Book for Students. By JOHN PILKINGTON NORRIS, D.D., late Archdeacon of Bristol, and Canon Residentiary of Bristol Cathedral. *Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Osborne.—Works by EDWARD OSBORNE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE CHILDREN'S SAVIOUR. Instructions to Children on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Illustrated. 16mo. 2s. 6d.*

THE SAVIOUR KING. Instructions to Children on Old Testament Types and Illustrations of the Life of Christ. *Illustrated. 16mo. 2s. 6d.*

THE CHILDREN'S FAITH. Instructions to Children on the Apostles' Creed. *Illustrated. 16mo. 2s. 6d.*

Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1800-1833. By the Rev. JOHN H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln, Rector of Epworth, Doncaster, and Rural Dean of the Isle of Axholme. *8vo. 14s.*

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, formerly Bishop of Montreal.

PLAIN SERMONS, to which is prefixed a Memorial Portrait. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE HISTORY OF MY LIFE: An Autobiography. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

PEACE AND ITS HINDRANCES. *Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed; 2s. cloth.*

THE PATHWAY OF SAFETY; or, Counsel to the Awakened. *Fcap. 8vo, large type. 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition. Small type, limp, 1s.*

THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT. *New Red Rubric Edition. 32mo, cloth. 2s. Common Edition. 32mo. 1s.*

OUR CHURCH AND HER SERVICES. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

[continued.]

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN formerly Bishop of Montreal—*continued.*

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. First Series. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d. Second Series. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

LARGE TYPE EDITION. Two Series in one Volume. *Crown* 8vo. 6s. COTTAGE SERMONS; or, Plain Words to the Poor. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS FOR HOLY WEEK. *16mo, cloth.* 1s. 6d.

DECISION. *18mo.* 1s. 6d.

THE HOME BEYOND; or, A Happy Old Age. *Fcap.* 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE LABOURING MAN'S BOOK. *18mo, large type, cloth.* 1s. 6d.

Paget.—Works by FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church. STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER: Sermons. With an Introductory Essay. *Crown* 8vo. 6s. 6d.

THE SPIRIT OF DISCIPLINE: Sermons. *Crown* 8vo. 6s. 6d.

FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DISBELIEF. *Crown* 8vo. 6s. 6d.

THE HALLOWING OF WORK. Addresses given at Eton, January 16-18, 1888. *Small* 8vo. 2s.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS. By a CLERGYMAN. With Prefaces by H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., and the BISHOP OF LINCOLN. *Crown* 8vo.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. 4s. 6d.

THE PSALMS. 5s.

ISAIAH. 4s. 6d.

THE HOLY GOSPELS. 4s. 6d.

ACTS TO REVELATIONS. 6s.

PRIEST (THE) TO THE ALTAR; or, Aids to the Devout Celebration of Holy Communion, chiefly after the Ancient English Use of Sarum. *Royal* 8vo. 12s.

Prynne.—THE TRUTH AND REALITY OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE, Proved from Holy Scripture, the Teaching of the Primitive Church, and the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. GEORGE RUNDLE PRYNNE, M.A. *Crown* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Puller.—THE PRIMITIVE SAINTS AND THE SEE OF ROME. By F. W. PULLER, M.A., Mission Priest of the Society of St. John Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford. *Crown* 8vo 7s. 6d.

Pusey.—LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Vicar of Cuddesdon, Oxford, and the Rev. ROBERT J. WILSON, D.D., Warden of Keble College. *With Portraits and Illustrations. Four Vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., 36s. Vol. III., 18s.*

Pusey.—Works by the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

PRIVATE PRAYERS. With Preface by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *32mo.* 1s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. *Crown* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Randolph.—LAW OF SINAI : being Devotional Addresses on the Ten Commandments delivered to Ordinands. By B. W. RANDOLPH, M.A., Principal of the Theological College and Hon. Canon of Ely. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Sanday.—Works by W. SANDAY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

INSPIRATION : Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1893. *Crown. 7s. 6d.*

THE ORACLES OF GOD : Nine Lectures on the Nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration and the Special Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the Present Time. *Crown 8vo. 4s.*

TWO PRESENT-DAY QUESTIONS. I. Biblical Criticism. II. The Social Movement. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Seebohm.—THE OXFORD REFORMERS—JOHN COLET, ERASMUS, AND THOMAS MORE : A History of their Fellow-Work. By FREDERICK SEEBOHM. *8vo. 14s.*

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE, *Eight Vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Sold Separately.*

THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE HOLY GOSPELS.	OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Third Year).
A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.	THE HOLY WEEK.
OUR LORD'S NATIVITY.	OUR LORD'S PASSION.
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Second Year).	OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

FEMALE CHARACTERS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Series of Sermons, *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE CHARACTERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE APOCALYPSE. With Notes and Reflections. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.*

PLAIN SERMONS ON CATECHISM. *Two Vols. Cr. 8vo. 5s. each.*

SELECTIONS FROM ISAAC WILLIAMS' WRITINGS. *Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., Author of several of the 'Tracts for the Times.' Edited by the Venerable Sir GEORGE PREVOST, as throwing further light on the history of the Oxford Movement. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

Wordsworth.—Works by the late CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln.

THE HOLY BIBLE (the Old Testament). With Notes, Introductions, and Index. *Imperial 8vo.*

Vol. I. THE PENTATEUCH. 25s. Vol. II. JOSHUA TO SAMUEL. 15s. Vol. III. KINGS TO ESTHER. 15s. Vol. IV. JOB TO SONG OF SOLOMON. 25s. Vol. V. ISAIAH TO EZEKIEL. 25s. Vol. VI. DANIEL, MINOR PROPHETS, and Index. 15s.

Also supplied in 12 Parts. Sold separately.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the Original Greek. With Notes, Introductions, and Indices. *Imperial 8vo.*

Vol. I. GOSPELS AND ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. 23s. Vol. II. EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE, and Indices. 37s.

Also supplied in 4 Parts. Sold separately.

LECTURES ON INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. *Small 8vo.*
1s. 6d. cloth. 1s. sewed.

A CHURCH HISTORY TO A.D. 451. *Four Vols. Crown 8vo.*

Vol. I. TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325. 8s. 6d. Vol. II. FROM THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA TO THAT OF CONSTANTINOPLE. 6s. Vol. III. CONTINUATION. 6s. Vol. IV. CONCLUSION, TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 451. 6s.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS: a Manual of Instruction on the Church and the Anglican Branch of it. *12mo. 2s. 6d.*

ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTION ON THE CHURCH. *16mo.*
1s. cloth. 6d. sewed.

ST. HIPPOLYTUS AND THE CHURCH OF ROME. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.*
ON UNION WITH ROME. *Small 8vo. 1s. 6d. Sewed, 1s.*

THE HOLY YEAR: Original Hymns. *16mo. 2s. 6d. and 1s. Limp, 6d.*

” ” With Music. Edited by W. H. MONK. *Square 8vo. 4s. 6d.*
GUIDES AND GOADS. (An English Edition of 'Ethica et Spiritualia.')

32mo. 1s. 6d.

MISCELLANIES, Literary and Religious. *Three Vols. 8vo. 36s.*

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH. *32mo. 1s.*

Younghusband.—Works by FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND.

THE STORY OF OUR LORD, told in Simple Language for Children. With 25 Illustrations on Wood from Pictures by the Old Masters, and numerous Ornamental Borders, Initial Letters, etc., from Longmans' New Testament. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE STORY OF GENESIS, told in Simple Language for Children. With Frontispiece. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE STORY OF THE EXODUS, told in Simple Language for Children. With Map and 29 Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty,
at the Edinburgh University Press.



BW911 .B85
The Roman see in the early Church, and

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 8149