THE FIRST EIGHT GENERAL COUNCILS AND PAPAL INFALLIBITY

BY

DOM JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.



LONDON

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

1906

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PREFACE

THESE pages are simply a lecture delivered on May 15, 1906 before the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury, "Students of the West." In accordance with the title of this Society, its members inquire into the views of others. After the lectures which are given at their invitation, a discussion follows. It is not to be presumed that members of the Society agree with what they hear.

The Catholic Truth Society has kindly undertaken to publish my lecture at my own request, as I hope that the historical data I have put together may be found useful in this compact form. I am conscious that the subject was far too large for a single lecture, and that some of the views put forward may seem crude without more elaborate justification than a few references and notes. The part which deals with Dr. Döllinger and the Old Catholic movement was added by special request, and it may perhaps be regarded as somewhat of an excrescence.

JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.

ERDINGTON ABBEY,
BIRMINGHAM.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	7
I. NICÆA	9
II. CONSTANTINOPLE	13
III. EPHESUS	16
IV. CHALCEDON	22
V. CONSTANTINOPLE (II)	44
VI. CONSTANTINOPLE (III)	60
VII. NICÆA (II)	68
VIII. CONSTANTINOPLE (IV)	77
IX. THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND HISTORY	84

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

The First Eight General Councils and Papal Infallibility

THE councils which we accept to-day as œcumenical are divided by a broad line into two great groups: the first eight councils are Greek, the rest are Latin. The Greco-Russian Church accepts the first seven, and indeed styles herself "The Church of the Seven Councils." The eighth council marks almost the most important crisis in the gradual growth of a permanent division between East and West. The seeds of division were sown by the foundation of Constantinople as New Rome. The division was consummated by the capture of that city by the Turks in 1453. In the long and weary history of quarrels and reconciliations during eleven centuries, the eighth council and Photius mark the greatest crisis until Michael Cerularius. Before Photius the divisions were always due to the refusal of Popes to communicate with State-appointed Patriarchs who countenanced the heresies successively dallied with by certain Emperors—Arianism in the 4th century, Monophysitism in the 5th, Monothelitism in the 7th, Iconoclasm in the 8th and 9th. From Photius onwards the union is never cordial, and is but occasional. The

Digitized by Google

division is no longer Rome's doing; but since Photius the East has learnt to accuse the West of heresy, persistently, if not always quite seriously. Rome, on the other hand, has from that date onward an independent position, and is mother of the new kingdoms of the West. To the Easterns the Pope is henceforth politically a foreigner, and almost a foe.

My subject to-day is the investigation of the views held with regard to Papal Infallibility by the Eastern Church until Photius. The eight Greek Councils are great landmarks which I have chosen as texts. You will remember that at the Council of Florence, in the 15th century, just before the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the delegates of the Greeks united, though insincerely, for the last time with the Latins, and admitted the authority of the Pope, with an appeal to the witness of the councils.

The decree says :—

"We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have a primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter was given full authority by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, rule and govern the Universal Church, *according as it is also contained in the acts of the œcumenical councils and in the sacred canons.*"

Digitized by Google

I. NICÆA

AT the beginning of the 4th century the Church awoke from a hideous persecution which was to have destroyed the name of Christian once for all, to find herself crowned and throned in the person of Constantine. The first Christian Emperor set his successors an example of managing the Church, but he took care to govern it according to ecclesiastical custom. The Donatists appealed to him. He refused to hear them himself, but he appointed judges. They were dissatisfied, and he appointed yet others. But the first court of appeal consisted of the Bishop of Rome with those of Cologne, Autun, and Arles as assessors.[1] The second court was a great synod at Arles, which sent a report of its proceedings to the Pope. Nothing could be more satisfactory to the Church than such procedure; but a real danger lay in the initiative taken by the Emperor.

When Arianism began to be troublesome, Constantine, who cared immensely in the interests of his Empire for dogmatic agreement, was delighted at the suggestion that he should arrange for a

[1] The assessors were added to please the Donatists. The method of conducting the inquiry was left to the Pope (Euseb. *H.E.* x. 5).

Digitized by Google

council which should really represent the whole Church. The bishops were delighted also.

The first general council met nearly three hundred years after our Lord's Ascension. We gather from this that general councils are not a part of the Apostolic Constitution of the Church. They are not foretold nor enjoined in Holy Scripture. No precedents existed in 325 for the Council of Nicæa to follow, no canon law on the subject of œcumenical synods and their procedure. It was indeed no new thing that the whole Church should speak. Synods were held simultaneously throughout the Church before the end of the 2nd century on the question of Easter, and this at the bidding of Rome. Again, when an anti-Pope arose in 251, great councils were convoked throughout East and West to condemn Novatian and to adhere to Cornelius. When in 269 Paul of Samosata was condemned at Antioch by a council which represented the whole East, the decision was admitted by Alexandria, and ratified at Rome.

But the new fact of a Christian Emperor made possible the hitherto impossible. He granted the bishops the use of the imperial post carriages, and paid their expenses, thus making the hardships of the long journeys tolerable. The council was a great success. The Emperor was present. A formula of faith was agreed to by all but two of the bishops. Who was the president? Pope Silvester could not come. Had he wished his legate to preside he must have sent a bishop. In fact, he was represented by two priests. Probably Hosius of Cordova, who alone signed before these two legates, presided. A Greek historian, Gelasius

Digitized by Google

of Cyzicus, in a somewhat mythical history of the Nicene Council written 150 years later, of which part only has been printed, repeatedly makes Hosius president and representative of the Pope. This only shows what a Greek writer, a quarter of a century after the Council of Chalcedon, took to be a matter of course. In the 7th century and afterwards, Greeks and Latins were certain that the Papal legates had presided. It is much more likely that Constantine nominated Hosius as president, and that the bishops were glad to agree.

Mediæval canon law rightly says that the convocation, the presidency, and the confirmation of œcumenical councils belong to the Pope. We have dealt with the convocation of the Nicene Synod and with its presidency. Did the Pope solemnly confirm it? No acts of the council remain, and we are driven to conjecture. I am inclined to think that no Papal confirmation was ever given. It was a matter of public notoriety that the Pope accepted the council. But had he gone further than this, had he issued a letter confirming it and making it his own, I cannot but think that so important a fact would have been frequently mentioned during the controversies of the next fifty years. It is, indeed, true that every subsequent œcumenical council requested and received a Papal confirmation. But the Council of Nicæa was for many years ignored in the East in a way which would hardly have been possible in those days, had it been well known that Rome had set its seal upon its decrees.[1]

[1] Father Puller has made many strange remarks upon the Council of Nicæa. I will quote one as an instance: "Is it

Digitized by Google

not marvellous that on the very first occasion, when the whole Church has an opportunity of meeting together by representation in an ecumenical synod, the one matter, in which it seems to take no interest, is the divinely-given prerogatives of its head?" (*Primitive Saints*, 3d. ed. p. 140). I should have thought there were other matters, such as the divinity of the Holy Ghost, for example. But if the council had made canons about the Papal prerogatives, as the Council of Sardica did soon after, Father Puller would have cried out that the council was conferring prerogatives on the Pope! There is no pleasing him. But as a fact the sixth canon of Nicæa is very noticeable. It runs roughly thus:—

"Let the ancient customs prevail, namely, those in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have power over all these, since the same is customary for the Bishop of Rome. Similarly in Antioch and other eparchies, the Churches must preserve their rights," &c. The preceding canons dealt with metropolitans; this canon deals with those bishops who are above the metropolitans, viz., those of Alexandria and Antioch, and of the "eparchies," apparently Ephesus, Cæsarea of Cappadocia and (probably) Heraclea of Thrace. The existence of this superior authority is justified by the fact that the Roman bishop also exercises a similar "Patriarchal" power. (It follows that the Pope had metropolitans in his own province, though some have doubted this without much reason.) But the council does not venture to approve or confirm the Pope's Patriarchate. If Father Puller's view was right, the canon would have run thus, I suppose: "Let the ancient customs prevail, namely, those in the suburbicarian Churches, that the Bishop of Rome have power over these, likewise in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have rule over these, similarly in Antioch," &c. It must be further remembered that we possess no acts of the council, and in fact know very little about it. There is one other reference to Rome, and one which makes it the centre of Catholic communion: "We announce to you also, with regard to agreement about holy Easter, that this matter has also been set right through your prayers, so that all those brethren in the East, who heretofore celebrated it with the Jews, will keep it henceforth with the Romans, and with us and with all those who have from of old kept Easter with us" (Synodal Letter to the Church of Alexandria, Socrates, i. 9). There is a manifest reference here to the first canon of the Council of Arles, which had directed that the Pope should announce the date of Easter to all the Churches. But there is no real testimony in favour of (still less against) the authority of Rome to be extracted from the little we know about the first general council.

Digitized by Google

II. CONSTANTINOPLE

THE transference of the seat of Empire to the East left Rome to the Popes. But the bishops of the new Rome on the Bosphorus at once began to arrogate to themselves a practical primacy over the East. The greatest ecclesiastical personage of the Greek-speaking world, not only in rank but in power, was the Patriarch of Alexandria. Antioch was a bad second, and was glad to join Constantinople in humbling the ecclesiastical Pharaoh. Eusebius of Constantinople with the Court bishops of the Emperor Constantius, against Athanasius of Alexandria—this is the political skeleton of the involved history of the struggles with Arianism. St. Athanasius was not accused of heresy, but of all sorts of other crimes. He appealed to Rome, and took refuge in that city. The Pope offered to his accusers a general council of East and West at Rome, but they excused themselves, and, later at Sardica, refused to sit with the Catholic party. They preferred their own councils. "A sort of permanent council," writes Mgr. Duchesne, "more or less numerous, is constantly assembled within reach of the imperial palace. If the sovereign thinks fit to put it in direct relation with the Western

Digitized by Google

bishops, as he did in 343 for the great Council of Sardica, he sends it off in a body to the place of reunion in a long convoy of postal carriages, under the protection of a general officer. If the Emperor himself should remove, his episcopate is likewise set in motion;—it is seen assembled far away from the East, at Sirmium, at Milan, at Arles. It is difficult to conceive an episcopal body better organized, more transportable, more easily led."[1] Thus far Mgr. Duchesne.

Such were the synods held against the orthodox faith under Constantius. This Emperor was not an Arian; neither were most of his Court bishops. But as Constantine had gone in for uniformity, so his son Constantius went in for comprehensiveness. His large-minded bishops were willing to absolve Arius on the one hand, and had no objection to orthodoxy on the other, unless it was exclusive. They drew up formula after formula in which the word "consubstantial" was conspicuous by its absence, but they did not reject or anathematize the Nicene decree; they merely ignored it, and exiled all bishops who were less comprehensive than themselves.

Gradually the slandered Athanasius became the symbol of Catholic orthodoxy, and the Nicene formula its watchword. Rome protected both; and when Theodosius the Great re-established orthodoxy, Rome and Alexandria and the Council of Nicæa had their triumph, and what had been merely a very large and influential council was now second only to Holy Writ in the estimation of the orthodox. But it is noticeable that in the edict of

[1] *Eglises Séparées*, 1896, p. 173.

Digitized by Google

Theodosius the Nicene decrees are not yet the obvious standard of uniformity. His will is proclaimed that all the peoples ruled by his clemency should hold the religion which was delivered by St. Peter to the Romans, and of the œcumenical council not a word is said.

The Catholic Emperor assembled a council of the whole East at Constantinople in 381. It was not a very edifying assembly, according to St. Gregory of Nazianzum, its second president, and its history is very obscure. Since the 6th century it has been counted as the second œcumenical council, but only on the ground of a creed which was attributed to it as early as 431. Its canons were never accepted at Rome, and it is doubtful whether it did put forth a creed, so that it might seem to have gained its high rank under false pretences.

Digitized by Google

III. EPHESUS

THE antagonism of Constantinople and Alexandria survived the Arian troubles. Peter of Alexandria, who had been obliged like Athanasius to take refuge at Rome, celebrated the triumph of his cause by pretending himself to appoint a bishop to Constantinople. The proceeding was irregular, the person unworthy and unorthodox. The Council of 381 rejected him, and actually passed a canon to legitimate the already existing primacy of Constantinople in the East. The principle involved was solemnly condemned by Pope Damasus in a synod at Rome in the following year. But the canon described a *fait accompli.* The great eparchies of Ephesus and Cæsarea of Cappadocia found it to their advantage to keep in touch with the Emperor by submitting to the superiority of the bishop of the imperial city. Antioch gave her greatest son to be its most famous bishop, John Chrysostom. The Patriarch of Alexandria, Theophilus, who had Origenism on the brain, accused Chrysostom of that elusive heresy, and deposed him. This time Rome was against Alexandria. Theophilus was disgraced, and the privilege of direct communion with Rome was withheld from him until the end of his life as a mark of punishment. His nephew and successor, Cyril, was not at once able to regain the Papal favour.

In 428 Antioch once more supplied an eloquent

Digitized by Google

bishop to the imperial see. Nestorius turned out badly, and Alexandria had a better pretext for interference. I do not question that Theophilus had believed himself to be in the right in persecuting St. John Chrysostom. Unquestionably his nephew, St. Cyril, was right in denouncing Nestorius as a heretic. But Cyril had learnt wisdom, and he proceeded with caution. As the Bishop of Constantinople would not listen to fraternal warnings, Cyril wrote to the Pope, St. Celestine, instead of venturing to deal with the matter himself. Old ecclesiastical custom, he wrote, obliged him to bring the case to Rome.

The reply was imperious and of most startling severity. Cyril is to assume the authority of the Roman See,[1] and to tell the Patriarch of Constantinople that unless he recants within ten days from the reception of the notice he is cut off from the Church, excommunicated, and his see will be

[1] Dr. Bright (*The Roman See in the Early Church*, 1896, p. 146) says: "The words, as read by Cyril in Greek, are 'The authority of our see having been *combined* (*συναφθείσης*) with yours,' so as to recognize in Cyril an authority with which Celestine's was to be linked." This is a mere mistranslation. St. Celestine did not say, "joining to yours," but "joining to yourself": *συναφθείσης σοι τοίνυν τῆς αὐθεντίας τοῦ ἡμετέρου θρόνου, καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ τοῦ τόπου διαδοχῇ ἐπ' ἐξουσίᾳ χρησάμενος, ταύτην ἐκβιβάσεις ἀκριβεῖ στερρότητι τὴν ἀπόφασιν.* The Latin has: "Quamobrem nostrae sedis auctoritate adscita, nostraque vice et loco cum potestate usus, eiusmodi non absque exquisita severitate sententiam exequeris" (Mansi, iv. 1019). "Wherefore assuming to yourself the authority of our see, and using our stead with power, you will deliver the following sentence with strict severity." It passes my comprehension how any one could suppose that the Pope recognized any authority in Cyril over Nestorius, since he dictated the sentence he was to deliver without allowing him any option or opinion. I cannot possibly answer all similar objections of Dr. Bright's. *Ex uno disce omnes.* Wherever I contradict Bright or Puller in the text, I only ask the reader to consult the authorities and judge for himself.

Digitized by Google

administered by Cyril. The Alexandrian prelate was not slow to pass on this ultimatum to Nestorius. At the same time he wrote to John, Patriarch of Antioch, who was likely to demur to such hasty proceedings, that if he questioned the reasonableness of the sentence, he might find himself cut off from the whole West and Macedonia (which was a Papal dependency) as well as from Egypt. John took the hint, and advised his old friend Nestorius to submit: the time allowed is indeed short, but a day, a few hours, will suffice to show him his true course.[1] Here we find the Bishop of New Rome threatened with deposition within ten days by the Pope, if he does not recant an obvious heresy. The Patriarch of Alexandria promotes and executes the mandate of the Pope; the Patriarch of Antioch admits that it must inevitably be obeyed, in spite of the severity of the conditions.

But these Eastern Patriarchs had above them all a superior, who had to be reckoned with. The Emperor Theodosius the younger had no mind to see his Court bishop thus humbled. Before the Roman sentence had been promulgated, Nestorius had already prevailed upon him to issue a summons to all the metropolitans of the East to attend a council to be held at Ephesus.

[1] Neither Dr. Bright nor Dr. Rivington seem quite to understand the point of St. Cyril's letter to John of Antioch. It was certain that the latter would wish to support his old friend, and the sentence was summary. To prevent his remonstrating, St. Cyril points out that Rome represents the whole West, that the Pope's council has written to Macedonia and to Jerusalem, "it is then for your Piety to consider what is expedient, for we shall follow the decisions given." It was a thinly veiled threat, "If you try to get better terms for Nestorius, you will find yourself isolated and treated as unorthodox." John himself understood perfectly.

Digitized by Google

If any theory had then been before the world that a council was above the Pope, St. Celestine might have been vexed at the Emperor's policy. But, in fact, he looked upon it as an excellent thing for the whole East to join in condemning Nestorius. He sent two bishops to represent himself and his Roman Council, and a priest, Philip, to represent himself. Philip, therefore, takes the first place, but cannot have been intended to be president. No doubt it was a matter of course that the Patriarch of Alexandria would preside.

Nestorius was among the earliest arrivals at Ephesus, and found himself to be pre-judged. The archbishop of the city, Memnon, shut its churches to him, and the bishops who arrived regarded him as a reprobate.

I have elsewhere [1] explained—I believe for the first time—why it was that St. Cyril described himself at the council as the Pope's representative, why the examination and condemnation of Nestorius was concluded in a single day, and why the bishops considered that they had no alternative before them.

The reason was simply this. St. Cyril, on hearing that there was to be a council, wrote to the Pope to ask whether the holy synod could receive Nestorius, or, "because the time of delay had elapsed, whether the sentence was still in force." St. Cyril got no reply, for the Papal legates were delayed by bad weather. Consequently, neither he nor the council ventured to treat the sentence as suspended, nor doubtless did he wish to do so. Cyril, therefore, as the executor of the original

[1] *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, Longmans, 1905 (6d.), pp. 88–90.

Digitized by Google

sentence, describes himself throughout the proceedings as "also holding the place of the most holy Archbishop of the Roman Church." Nestorius was thrice cited, that he might, if possible, explain his neglect to submit within the specified ten days. He refused to appear as a culprit at the council which he had himself procured.

Cyril and the council were therefore bound *by the canons* to condemn him for contumacy, and *by the letter of Celestine* to Cyril to depose him for heresy. Only one long day was needed for the formal proceedings. The second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, and the reply of the latter were read; then that of Pope Celestine to Nestorius, and that of Cyril enclosing it. The anathematizations appended to the latter for Nestorius to accept were approved. Then some extracts from the Fathers were read, and a letter of Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, who was unable to attend.

These formalities being concluded, immediately, without any further discussion, the sentence is given in a few words:—

". . . we being necessarily impelled thereto *by the canons*, and *by the letter of our most Holy Father and colleague, Celestine*, Bishop of the Roman Church, with many tears, have arrived at the following sentence against him:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who has been blasphemed by him, defines by this present most holy synod that the same Nestorius is deprived of episcopal dignity and all sacerdotal intercourse" (Mansi, iv. 1212).

This was on June 22, 431. On July 10th the second session was held, the Papal legates having arrived. They could not but approve of all that had been done; for though the letter of the Pope, which they brought with them, permitted Nestorius

Digitized by Google

to have a fresh trial, his refusal to appear had made this grace of no avail. In the third session the legates, having had time to peruse the minutes of the first session, formally confirmed the council's sentence. The formula used by the legate Philip is celebrated, but I will quote it once more, since it accurately describes the theory upon which St. Cyril and the third œcumenical council had been acting before his arrival:

"It is doubtful to no one, nay, it is known to all ages, that holy and blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith, and the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, the keys of the kingdom, and that to him was given the power of loosing and of binding sins—who up to this time and always lives in his successors and gives judgement. His successor and representative, therefore, our holy and most blessed Pope, Bishop Celestine, has sent us to this synod to supply his place" (Mansi, iv. 1296).

He recites the crimes of Nestorius, and confirms his deposition. He spoke in Latin, which the Fathers did not understand; but his words were inserted in Greek in the acts of the council. They were read by all those subsequent Fathers and councils who spoke with reverence of the decisions of the Council of Ephesus, presided (as they put it) by Celestine and Cyril. Such claims never roused any protest in the East; nay, we shall hear their echoes in the East itself.

There was a counter synod held by John of Antioch, to protest against the haste of Cyril. That Saint was himself imprisoned by the Emperor. But the council had reported its acts in a long letter to the Pope.[1] Celestine was dead meantime, but his successor, Xystus III, confirmed the council.[2] The Emperor gave way, and Nestorius was banished.

[1] Mansi, iv. 1329. [2] Ibid. v. 375, "nobis confirmantibus."

Digitized by Google

IV. CHALCEDON

IT has again and again been repeated by anti-Papal writers that the Council of Chalcedon in 451 denied by implication the infallibility of St. Leo, for the bishops examined his dogmatic tome, and pronounced it satisfactory after comparing it with the creeds and with those letters of St. Cyril which had been approved by the Council of Ephesus.

It has been replied that the bishops in a council sit as judges, and that the verdict given in favour of St. Leo's letter did not imply that the bishops had any previous doubt that on inquiry it would appear to be orthodox—as, for instance, if I should declare that the Fourth Gospel is in harmony with the teaching of the Synoptists, you would not think that I set myself above the Fourth Gospel.

On dogmatic grounds I should be quite ready to accept either of these views. I have no *à priori* theory ready made with regard to the pace at which the dogma of 1870 must have developed.

But I do not think that either view is in accordance with the facts which we learn from the voluminous documents at our disposal.

Eutychianism or Monophysitism based its teaching of one nature in Christ after the union, on

Digitized by Google

certain unguarded expressions of St. Cyril, and was of the nature of an exaggerated reaction against Nestorius.

When Abbot Eutyches was condemned by his bishop, St. Flavian of Constantinople, in a council, he wrote to the Pope, St. Leo, pretending falsely that he had appealed to him from the sentence, and promising to abide by his judgement.[1] Letters from St. Flavian, explaining the circumstances, also arrived at Rome[2] after an accidental delay, of which St. Leo complained.[3] The Pope thereupon condemned Eutyches, unless he should repent, and explained the true faith in a famous letter to Flavian, commonly known as St. Leo's "Tome"—the most famous letter ever written by a Pope.[4] He represents it himself as an authoritative exposition of the faith, and never suggests the possibility of its needing any correction or revision or improvement. At the present day we should hardly feel inclined to consider so long a document to be a decision *ex cathedra;* we should expect its argument to be summed up in a few carefully worded phrases imposed under anathema, while the rest would be but an authoritative preamble and explanation, but not strictly *de fide.* But in those days the idea of Papal authority in matters of faith was wider, precisely because it was less definite; and we shall see that this Roman pronouncement was treated as an irreformable decree, or (to be more accurate) as an authentic declaration of the unfailing tradition of the Roman Church.

Eutyches appealed to other bishops, in what

[1] St. Leo, Ep. 21. [2] Ibid. 26. [3] Ibid. 23–4. [4] Ibid. 28.

Digitized by Google

words we do not know, though in two cases we know with what result. The answer sent by the great preacher and Doctor of the Church, St. Peter Chrysologus, has been preserved.[1] He tells the heretical archimandrite that he is unable to venture an opinion after hearing only one side; "but we exhort you," he continues, "to attend obediently in all things to all that is written by the most blessed Pope of the city of Rome. For blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own see, grants the truth of the faith to those who ask him." Here is a plain enough statement from the Archbishop of Ravenna, the imperial city of the West, which Galla Placidia was just adorning with the famous churches which we can still admire: "Whatever the Pope tells you, will be the faith, the voice of Peter," he says in effect. The Saint goes on: "For we, for the love of peace and faith, cannot hear causes of faith without the consent of the Bishop of the city of Rome." In other words, questions concerning faith are reserved to the See of Peter.

A very different reply was received by Eutyches from Alexandria. The opportunity of humbling Constantinople was too good to be lost. The Patriarch Dioscorus wrote to approve the teaching of Eutyches as in accordance with that of his predecessor, St. Cyril, and even declared him absolved from excommunication. Observe that nobody, except the Alexandrian himself, thought this jurisdiction could extend to Constantinople, while nobody doubted that the Pope's did. A second time it is the weak Theodosius II who causes all the trouble. Under the influence of his minister,

[1] Leo, Ep. 25.

Digitized by Google

Chrysaphius, he hastily summons a general council to decide the difficulty, or rather to absolve Eutyches and condemn St. Flavian. St. Leo was invited. He approved of the council, but regretted that the shortness of the notice must prevent the West being represented except by his own legates. That he himself should attend, he said, would be contrary to tradition—in other words, beneath his dignity.[1]

Theodosius, who had put his foot in it eighteen years before by not recognizing the Council of Ephesus at once and by imprisoning St. Cyril, now is anxious to show his regard for that council, and falls into the arms of the opposite heresy. He appoints Ephesus once more as the rendezvous, and Dioscorus of Alexandria, St. Cyril's successor, is to preside. The Pope seems to have had no objection to this arrangement. He did not intend his legates to preside, but he did intend them to dictate the faith to the council. He sent with them a letter in which he said that the Emperor, in asking for the support of Papal authority, had in effect desired to hear Peter himself explain Peter's great confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." He enclosed, therefore, his dogmatic "Tome," which he thus claimed to be nothing less than the voice of the Prince of the Apostles.[2]

At the council, which met in 449, Dioscorus managed to put off on some pretext the reading of these letters each time it was proposed, so that eventually they were never read at all.[3] As

[1] Ep. 29. [2] Ibid. 33.

[3] It is to the passing of decrees when the representatives of Rome were no longer present that the legate Lucentius referred in the first session of the Council of Chalcedon when

Digitized by Google

Theodosius had intended, by force and fraud this Robber Council condemned St. Flavian and absolved Eutyches. The Papal legate Hilarus interposed a veto and fled for his life.

When St. Leo heard the results of this would-be œcumenical council, instead of respecting its authority, he instantly pronounced it null and void. St. Flavian appealed from its sentence to the Pope; and so did Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum, the original accuser of Eutyches, who had also been deposed. They did not doubt that the Pope could revise the sentence, or that the faith of Rome was right.[1]

St. Leo accepted these appeals, and promptly excommunicated all who had taken part in the

he refused to admit the right of Dioscorus to sit among the bishops, "because he had held a synod without commission from the Apostolic See, which had never been done before, and never ought to be done." (His acting as president was not objected to.) If we should be inclined to set down this statement of Lucentius as mere Roman pretension, we should remember the round statement which the Constantinopolitan historian Socrates had made a very few years before, that "it was an ecclesiastical law that the Churches must not make canons without the approval of the Bishop of Rome" (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 18).

[1] Their letters have lately been discovered and published by Dom Amelli, Prior of Montecassino. St. Flavian says: "I appeal to the throne of the *Apostolic See of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles*, and to a universal synod subject to your Holiness." Perhaps it would be more correct to render "to the universal (œcumenical) synod, which is subject to your Holiness," and understand the Pope's local council, constantly meeting, from which almost all Papal decrees were issued. The "œcumenical" would be an *epitheton ornans*, as in the famous and frequent phrase "œcumenical bishop," which St. Gregory the Great and some other Popes misunderstood. Eusebius of Dorylæum bases his appeal upon the declaration that Rome always retains the faith unshaken (see Rivington, *The Roman Primacy*, 430–451, pp. 173–8).

Digitized by Google

deposition of St. Flavian, *including the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, and most of the principal metropolitans of the East.* St. Flavian died of ill-treatment on his way to exile. The secretary of Dioscorus, Anatolius, was made Patriarch of Constantinople, and *St. Leo instantly annulled the appointment.*

Meanwhile the infamous minister Chrysaphius induced the Emperor to confirm the Robber Council. St. Leo protested, demanding a new council to be held in Italy under his own eye.[1] He induced the Emperor of the West, Valentinian III, to support his request. In his letter to his Eastern colleague, Valentinian exhorts Theodosius to defend the faith and the peculiar dignity of the Apostle Peter, "in order that the most blessed Bishop of the city of Rome, to whom antiquity attributed the episcopate above all others, *may have occasion and means to judge concerning the faith and bishops.* For which reason, according to the custom of synods, the Bishop of Constantinople also made an appeal to him in writing."[2] We learn that it was a custom to appeal from a council to the Pope; also that the new council is intended to enable the Pope to judge. The Dowager Empress, Galla Placidia, was also inspired by St. Leo to write both to her nephew Theodosius and to his sister the Empress Pulcheria. To the former she says that the case of Flavian should be referred to the Council of[3] the Apostolic See, in which he who was found worthy to receive the keys of heaven first adorned the archiepiscopal dignity, to be tried

[1] Ep. 43. [2] Ibid. 55. [3] "Of," or "and," Ep. 56.

Digitized by Google

according to the decree and definition of the Apostolic See. To Pulcheria she expresses the same view in saying that Flavian's case must be referred to the Apostolic See.[1] The wife of Valentinian also wrote to Theodosius, who was her father, in the same sense.[2] Observe that the council to which Theodosius is to send his Eastern bishops is simply to agree with the Pope.

The Emperor replied to Valentinian and the two Empresses[3] that they and the Pope had been misled into an unfavourable view of the Robber Council, as he was explaining at length in his letter to St. Leo, an epistle which is unfortunately lost. St. Leo at once sent ambassadors to Constantinople; but in the meantime Theodosius had been killed by a fall from his horse. His sister St. Pulcheria remained sole ruler of the East, but she took as colleague and nominal husband the general Marcian. She had already signified to St. Leo her adhesion to the condemnation of Eutyches. The influence of Chrysaphius was over, and under orthodox rulers the faith was safe. St. Leo, therefore, wrote to her that the council he had demanded was now unnecessary and would be impossible in Italy, owing to the invasions of the barbarians.[4] His letters were crossed by those of the Emperor and Empress to him.[5] Both expressed their anxiety for the restoration of the faith in their Eastern Empire, a large part of which was now on the side of Dioscorus. They had, therefore, convened a council to meet at Nicæa to be held "under the authority of the Pope, the overseer and

[1] Ep. 58. [2] Ibid. 57. [3] Ibid. 62–4.
[4] Ibid. 70. [5] Ibid. 73 and 77.

Digitized by Google

guardian of the holy faith."[1] Pulcheria adds that the new Patriarch Anatolius had without hesitation subscribed to the Tome of St. Leo.

The Pope could only be pleased at these letters. He now accepted the appointment of Anatolius, and wrote to him prescribing the terms on which the bishops whom he had excommunicated for joining in the condemnation of Flavian, could be admitted to communion by Anatolius and the legates.[2]

We have now to see how the council was actually celebrated "under the authority of Leo," as the Emperor and Empress had promised.

The place of meeting was changed to Chalcedon in order that the Emperor himself might be at hand. Lay commissioners presided in his stead over the transaction of business, naturally without a vote. The legates of the Pope were the ecclesiastical presidents. In spite of the mistranslations and misunderstandings of many writers, it is clear that the commissioners had for their office to uphold the authority of the Pope, and that they regularly supported the legates.[3]

[1] Σοῦ *αὐθεντοῦντος*, Ep. 73.

[2] Ep. 80. With regard to those bishops who were repentant for having agreed to the sentence on Flavian through fear, St. Leo approves the decision of his legates, that they should be content for the present with the communion of their own Churches, "ut suarum interim ecclesiarum essent communione contenti," but those who make a complete satisfaction may receive the favour of communion with Rome, "pacis et communionis nostrae *unitate* laetentur." Dioscorus and the five chief bishops he reserved, committing them to the judgement of the council.

[3] The one apparent exception to this rule was in the fifteenth session, when the 28th canon was passed, against the will of the legates. But Paschasinus had already allowed

Digitized by Google

In the first session they compelled Dioscorus to sit as accused, and allowed the historian Theodoret, in spite of the reclamations of the bishops, to sit as an accuser. This session was occupied by the reading of the acts of the two councils in which

the Patriarch of Constantinople to sit in the first place, a blunder which prevented his speaking on this occasion, and the legates could only say they had no permission from the Pope to allow such a subject to be discussed. The council and the commissioners (and afterwards the Emperor) evidently really thought that St. Leo would agree. A point at the beginning of the first session must be explained, because it has been misunderstood. At the very beginning of that session (Mansi, vi. 580–2), Paschasinus the legate announced that he had an order from "the blessed and apostolic Bishop of Rome, who is head of all the Churches," that Dioscorus should not sit with the council, and if he should attempt to do so, he should be cast out, "else we shall leave the council." The commissioners asked what was the accusation against him. Paschasinus replied, "The accusation must be made when he has been admitted [as accused, and not till then]." (This was not quite understood by Dr. Rivington.) The commissioners insisted that it must be declared of what he was accused. Indeed, one does not see how he could be made to sit as prisoner at the bar without being accused of something. Lucentius, the other legate, saw that his senior had made a mistake, and answered, "He has to give an account of his own judgement, for he took upon him the office of judge, which he had not; and he dared to hold a synod without commission from the Apostolic See, which had never been done, and ought never to be done." Paschasinus added, "We cannot go against the orders of the blessed and apostolic bishop who occupies the Apostolic See, nor against the ecclesiastical canons or the traditions of our Fathers." Again Paschasinus returns to the mere command of the Pope, without being able to give a direct answer. He may have been a good mathematician and astronomer, but he was not businesslike, and spoilt the effect of Lucentius's reply. The commissioners naturally repeat their question. "What is the particular offence you charge him with?" Lucentius again rises: "We cannot suffer such an insult to be done to ourselves and to you, as that one who is put on his trial should sit with us." The commissioners being unable to elicit any definite accusation, were obliged to succumb.

Digitized by Google

St. Flavian had condemned Eutyches, and the acts of the Robber Synod.

In the second session the bishops declared that they would issue no new definition of faith, for the Creed of Nicæa, that attributed to Constantinople, the two letters of St. Cyril which had been approved at Ephesus, and the Tome of St. Leo, which most

They addressed Dioscorus without further ado: "If you sit as judge, you cannot defend yourself as accused" (*εἰ δικαστοῦ ἐπέχεις πρόσωπον, ὡς δικαζόμενος οὐκ ὀφείλεις δικαιολογεῖσθαι* literally "if you have the office of judge, you are not bound —*i.e.*, it would be incorrect for you—to be defendant"). "And Dioscorus, the most reverend Bishop of Alexandria, having according to the order of the illustrious rulers and the sacred senate taken his seat in the middle" (and no longer on their right, but as accused), &c. The words in which the commissioners gave this order are corrupt in the Latin: "Si judicis obtines personam, non ut accusator debes prosequi." We should evidently read *accusatus*, and take *prosequi* in a passive meaning, a solecism of this sort being not uncommon in these acts. It was natural, however, for a scribe to understand *prosequi* in its correct deponent sense, and then think that *accusatus* was a mistake for *accusator*. The Latin misled Dr. Bright and Bishop Hefele into the supposition that the words were addressed to Lucentius, and conveyed a reproof: "If you are a judge, you cannot be an accuser also." But Lucentius had refused to accuse Dioscorus, merely declaring that he was on his trial! The Greek shows no sign of corruption, and gives perfect sense. The Latin makes it inexplicable that Dioscorus should quietly go and sit as accused, just when the commissioners had rebuked the legate for saying he must do so! It is hard to see how Hefele could have fallen into such a blunder. (I have not compared the German; perhaps the translator has altered the passage, as he has done elsewhere.) The right reading shows that the commissioners felt bound to obey the Pope's declared wishes, although it seemed unreasonable to lay judges to have a prisoner at the bar who was not accused as yet of any definite offence. The legates were most unbusinesslike, and throughout the council were without diplomacy. But then they did not know the language, or not well. The commissioners were extremely capable, and managed the bishops with great skill.

Digitized by Google

of them had already signed, were sufficient. These documents were read, and no distinction of dignity was made between them. The Tome of St. Leo was just as authoritative, it would seem, as the venerable Creed of Nicæa. After that Creed had been read, the bishops cried, "This is the faith of all; so we all believe"; after the letters of Cyril, "So we all believe; Pope Leo believes thus; so Leo and Anatolius believe." After St. Leo's Tome, "This is the faith of the Fathers. It is Peter who has spoken thus by Leo. We all believe so. Leo and Cyril have taught alike. This is the faith of the Fathers. Why was not this read at Ephesus? Dioscorus hid this!" (Mansi vi. 972).

So the bishops set their seal to the claim which St. Leo himself had made to speak with the voice of Peter. The acclamations to the Tome were particularly emphatic, and with reason. The Fathers were but too well aware that if they ventured to disagree with the letter of the Pope, they would be liable to deprivation and exile. Their leader, Anatolius, had been secretary of Dioscorus, and had only just been recognized by the Pope. The Patriarch of Alexandria was on his trial, and with him the heads of the Robber Council, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the Metropolitans of Cæsarea, Ancyra, Berytus, and Seleucia, for the Pope had condemned them. Most of the members of that synod had only been admitted to communion and to the synod by signing the Tome. The most prominent of them had been the bishops from Illyricum and Palestine. These continually pleaded, against the majority of the council, for the restoration of the heads of the

Digitized by Google

Robber Synod, whose case the Pope had reserved to the council. "We have all sinned," they went on declaring; "we all desire pardon." Thrice during the reading of St. Leo's letter they interrupted and asked for explanations. The council was with difficulty induced by the commissioners to allow five days to these bishops, during which they were to be instructed.

At the third session Dioscorus was thrice cited, and refused to appear. Four petitions against him were presented from his own city of Alexandria. I merely mention them, because they were all addressed not to the council simply, but "to the Archbishop and Patriarch of Great Rome, Leo, and to the holy and œcumenical synod." It was well understood that the Emperor intended the council to be the Pope's council.

We ought to remind ourselves that ancient councils were not often parliaments. A council at Rome or Alexandria was the council of the bishop of the city, and its decision was his decision. It advised; it did not disagree. The Bishops of Egypt were unanimous on the side of St. Athanasius. In Africa the Bishop of Carthage had a less monarchical position. But the councils held under St. Cyprian's presidency were always unanimous. Though on a famous occasion that Saint declared that "no one made himself a bishop of bishops," we can well imagine the torrents of eloquence which would have been poured on the unhappy head of any one who had ventured to defend heretical baptism. Similarly in St. Augustine's time, the great councils under Aurelius were habitually unanimous. In the same way

Digitized by Google

the Court bishops under Constans or Valens gave their decision in accordance with the known wishes of the Emperor. The Robber Council had done so. The new council at Chalcedon was prepared to do the same. It was well known that the Emperor's will was for the Pope's decision to be accepted. There was nothing shocking in this. If it was thought impious of Constantius and Valens to enforce Arian views, it was recognized as the duty of Marcian, as it had been of Constantine, Constans, Theodosius, and Gratian, to enforce the Catholic faith under suitable penalties. At Chalcedon the victory of Roman doctrine was guaranteed beforehand. The bishops were free to draw up a decree in accordance with the Tome. We shall see that they were not free to refuse to do so. They were free to judge the heads of the Robber Council, in accordance with directions from Rome. But they were not free in our modern sense—free to be orthodox or heretical, just or unjust, at their own sweet will. Absolute freedom of a council was unknown.

The condemnation of Dioscorus was now, at the repeated request of the council, pronounced in its name by the legates of the Pope. They recited his crimes: he had uncanonically received back Eutyches to communion even before the Robber Synod; he had remained contumacious; he had not allowed the letter of the Pope to be read; nay, he had later pronounced a sentence of excommunication against the Pope; he had thrice been cited, and had refused to appear. "Wherefore," they conclude, "the most holy and

Digitized by Google

most blessed Archbishop of great and elder Rome, by us and the present most holy synod, together with the thrice blessed and praiseworthy Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and base of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the orthodox faith, has stripped him of the episcopal and of all sacerdotal dignity; wherefore this most holy and great synod will vote what is in accordance with the canons against the aforesaid Dioscorus." Each bishop signified his agreement with this sentence, and afterwards signed it. Notice the form: "Leo, Bishop of Rome, by us legates, and by this synod, deposes the Patriarch of Alexandria." The Pope deposes; for the legates and the synod are using his authority.[1]

[1] It has sometimes been denied that this speech of the legates was the formal deposition of Dioscorus, and it has been said that the real deposition of Dioscorus is the short document in Mansi, vi. 1093–4: "The holy and great and œcumenical synod . . . to Dioscorus. Know thyself, . . . that thou art deposed." In this document no mention is made of Papal authority. But it is merely the notification sent by the council to Dioscorus, and was signed by nobody at all. A reference to the Acts of the first session of the Council of Ephesus will furnish us with a parallel. The formal deposition of Nestorius will be found in Mansi, iv. 1212, followed by the signatures of all the bishops (1212–26). Then follows immediately (1227–8) the notification to Nestorius: "The holy synod . . . to Nestorius, the new Judas. Know thyself . . . to be deposed," &c. Not a single signature follows, nor has any one ever supposed this to be a second sentence. Returning to Chalcedon, we find that the sentence given by the legates was delivered at the request of the council. Julian, Bishop of Hypæpæ, moved that the legates shall deliver sentence. Paschasinus puts the question to the synod. Maximus, Patriarch of Antioch, answers in the name of the rest, that all will agree with what the legates declare. The three legates then formally recite the crimes of Dioscorus (as I have said above) and condemn him, not in their own name, or simply in the name of the Pope, but in the name of the synod, viz.: "Pope Leo, by us and the holy synod."

Digitized by Google

As the imperial commissioners had not been present, a copy of the minutes was sent to the Emperor and Empress. To the Emperor the council wrote that Dioscorus had been condemned, first for not allowing the Pope's letter to be read, then for having received Eutyches to communion, though he had been condemned by Rome, and for having absolved some others who had been excommunicated by councils. For all this he might have been pardoned, were it not that he "barked against the Apostolic See itself, and attempted to make letters of excommunication against the holy and blessed Pope Leo himself," persisted in his obstinacy, and refused to obey the threefold summons of the council.[1] To the Empress St. Pulcheria the Fathers wrote praising Christ for having shown forth the truth in the wondrous Leo, and for using him as He had once used Peter, to assert the truth by him. Dioscorus alone had not rejoiced in this truth with his brethren, and, indeed, had refused to let the Pope's letter be read. He had therefore been deposed.[2]

In the fourth session, the five days allowed for the consideration of St. Leo's letter having elapsed, the commissioners announced that each of the

Anatolius and the rest then signify their consent in a series of short speeches (1048–80), then immediately follows the long list of signatures of all the bishops (1081–94). Last of all comes the notification sent to Dioscorus, with no signatures to it, followed by another addressed to the clergy of Alexandria. I have argued all this at inordinate length, because inveterate errors die hard. If confirmation were needed, it would be found in St. Leo's letter (Ep. 103) to the bishops of Gaul, in which he informs them of the sentence on Dioscorus, and appends it :—he gives simply the speech of the legates.

[1] Mansi, vi. 1097. [2] Ibid. vi. 1101.

Digitized by Google

bishops must now give an account of his faith in writing, without any fear, since the pious Emperor, they said, held the faith of the three councils, and the Pope also had sent his letter to Flavian. Without fear, that is to say, of being orthodox, for the Robber Council had acted under compulsion. But it was not, of course, intended that they should be free to cavil at the three councils or at the Tome. On being reminded of the five days' consultation which had taken place since the second session, the commissioners inquired what the council had decided concerning the faith. The Papal legates, as presidents, replied that the council followed the rules of Nicæa and Constantinople, the two letters of Cyril, and, "thirdly," the letter of Leo, Archbishop of all the Churches. All the bishops acclaimed this statement.

The commissioners hearing this, dropped the demand for written declarations of faith, and asked that each bishop should, in the presence of the holy Gospels, declare whether the decisions of Nicæa and Constantinople accorded with the letter of St. Leo.

Anatolius arose even before the legates, to show his promptitude, and made the required declaration. The legates followed, and a great number of bishops, most of whom added that they had already subscribed to the letter. The bishops of Illyricum and Palestine now declared that they fully comprehended and accepted the points which had till now seemed doubtful or difficult in the Tome. After some one hundred and sixty bishops had thus separately testified to St. Leo's conformity with œcumenical decisions, the commissioners invited

Digitized by Google

what Cyril said. Sixtus confirmed what Cyril said!"

The commissioners, totally at a loss how to make the council submit to the legates, and to avoid a complete fiasco, sent a message to the Emperor. After an interval, the imperial command arrived that the proposed committee was to sit, and to make a decree which should leave no doubt concerning the faith—that is to say, asserting the union *in two natures*, not simply *of two natures*. If the bishops would not agree to this, a synod would be held in the West, in which a definition without ambiguity would be drawn up.

So excited were the bishops that even the Emperor's threats were at first of no avail. Shouts were renewed: "Long live the Emperor! Let the definition stand, or we shall go." The Illyrians cried: "Let us know those who contradict. They are Nestorians. Let them go to Rome." Probably it was true that the few bishops who stood by the legates were of Nestorian tendencies.

The commissioners summed up: "Dioscorus said: I accept '*of two natures*,' but not simply '*two natures*.' Archbishop Leo says, There are two natures in Christ united ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως. Which do you follow? most holy Leo, or Dioscorus?"

There was a threat here. To follow Dioscorus meant deprivation and exile. There was also an explanation. The two natures were not two separate persons, but unconfused, inconvertible, inseparable in one Person. There was but one answer possible from those who had just condemned Dioscorus and signed the Tome. The

Digitized by Google

cry arose: "As Leo we believe! Those who contradict are Eutychians. Leo explained rightly." "Then add these words to the definition," argued the commissioners.

This was conclusive. A committee retired into the chapel of St. Anastasia, without further opposition. On its return the famous Chalcedonian definition of faith was read, the faith was saved. *That definition owes its central doctrine, its only words of first-rate importance, to the firmness of the Papal legates and the support given to them by the commissioners and the Emperor* against *the six hundred "Fathers" of the greatest of all ancient councils!*

The definition also accepts the Creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, the two letters of St. Cyril, "to which the synod rightly joins also the letter of the most blessed Archbishop of great Rome, Leo . . . as agreeing with the confession of the great Peter," and as a column against heresy.

Of the rest of the council I need say nothing. Of the famous 28th canon I have written enough in a little book published last year, where I have also quoted from the well-known letter of the council to the Pope.[1] To-day I shall seem to have been rubbing the paint off this renowned council. I do not doubt that most of the bishops were not unwilling to be orthodox; but they did not see clearly. The result in which later ages have rejoiced was produced by the energy of the Emperor in enforcing the uncontested supremacy of the Pope in matters of faith.

A great deal more might be said, and the view

[1] *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, pp. 84–8.

Digitized by Google

I have taken might be enforced by a review of the events of the following years. I will merely add that the council asked for confirmation from the Pope.[1] Now St. Leo at once formally annulled the 28th canon, which legalized the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and he denied that the synod had been given the right to make canons at all.[2] To this decision Anatolius bowed, or rather cringed;[3] for the Emperor kept his Court bishop well in hand, and Marcian himself wrote to St. Leo that he was quite right thus to guard the ancient canons.[4]

But this condemnation of one canon was taken in the East by the Eutychianizers to imply that the Pope had not confirmed the dogmatic decree of the council, and they refused to obey it. The Emperor wrote to St. Leo complaining that he had not sent a formal circular of confirmation, without which he, Marcian, was unwilling to punish recalcitrants.[5] The Pope at once acceded to his request,[6] only expressing his wonder that his former letters had not appeared sufficiently plain. So neither the heretics nor the Emperor himself judged the decision of six hundred bishops to be irreformable until it had received Papal sanction.[7]

[1] Ep. 98 *fin.* [2] Ibid. 104, 105, 106. [3] Ibid. 132.
[4] Ibid. 110. [5] Ibid. 110. [6] Ibid. 111, 114.

[7] The Emperor Marcian, in a letter to the East in defence of Flavian, speaks of "a venerable synod of almost innumerable bishops assembled at Chalcedon, which, while it diligently inquired as to the faith, *by the authority of most blessed Leo, Bishop of eternally glorious Rome,* both determined the foundations of religion, and awarded to Flavian the palm due to his past life and to his glorious death." This accords with the Emperor's promise before the council. The view of his Western colleague, Valentinian III, was vigorously expressed in a well-known constitution (in the name of himself and Theodosius, as was customary) of the year 445: "Let not

Digitized by Google

The history we have sketched surely demonstrates that the council itself did not exaggerate when it began its letter to the Emperor by saying that God had provided it with an invulnerable champion, and had himself prepared the prelate of Rome to victory, arming him as another Peter with the truth; nor, again, when it wrote to Leo himself that they were the members, he the head.

presumption attempt any unlawful act against the authority of that see. For then only will the peace of the Churches be everywhere preserved, if all acknowledge their ruler (*si rectorem suum agnoscat universitas*)." (St. Leo, Ep. 11.) Such was the position accorded to the Pope by the laws of the Empire.

Digitized by Google

V. CONSTANTINOPLE (II)

In spite of the Council of Chalcedon, Eutychianism remained powerful in the East, and supreme in Egypt. Attempts at coercion were abortive. The Emperors Zeno and Anastasius tried comprehensiveness, and imposed a vague formula on orthodox and heretics alike. Needless to say, Rome vigorously protested. The letters of St. Leo's successors upholding the faith of Chalcedon are of great interest, those of St. Gelasius in the closing years of the 5th century being especially forcible and fine compositions. The tenacity of the Popes gave point to their claim that Rome could never fail in faith, and that Peter still spoke by the mouth of his prelates. They boldly tell the Emperor that they are higher even than he, that their mandates are without appeal, that no councils can revise their decisions, that all councils are subject to their approval or condemnation. But the Emperors adhered to their own policy, and a schism of thirty-five years eventually divided the East from the West.

On the death of the Emperor Anastasius in 518, his successor Justin hastened to restore orthodoxy, and to renew communion with the Holy See, in

Digitized by Google

spite of the fact that the whole West was now lost to the Empire, and Rome was under the rule of the great Arian king Theodoric. The history of the reunion is preserved to us in detail in the correspondence of Pope Hormisdas. He imposed a formula, which had been earlier sent to the Emperor Anastasius,[1] to be signed and sent in by all bishops who wished for Roman communion.[2] In this petition the heretics are condemned by name, and the petitioners declare that the promise to St. Peter was seen to have been fulfilled, since religion had always been kept undefiled in the Apostolic See; they beg to be admitted to one communion with the Pope, "in which is the true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion."[3]

Egypt remained Monophysite as before, and as it remains to-day; but the rest of the East was joyfully united with the West. Father Puller, indeed, tells us that the precise formula was not insisted upon. I am sorry he should have fallen into so incomprehensible an error. In no case[4] would Hormisdas

[1] Mansi, viii. 389–93. [2] Ibid. 441–2, &c. [3] Ibid. 407.

[4] Father Puller states (*Primitive Saints*, p. 398): "Legates arrived from Rome, bringing this formulary with them. It contained a very high-flying statement of Hormisdas's claims on behalf of his see, such a statement as no Eastern bishop or saint had ever signed before." I find that people are imposed upon by this writer's high-flying statements, and really think they are reading history. I shall not apologize, therefore, for exposing Father Puller's account of the formula, as an example of his historical method. He has to show that the Easterns took umbrage at the Pope's claims. He can only give a single instance. The Patriarch John prefaces with a few words of congratulation the copy of the petition which he sent in, adding: "For I hold the most holy Churches of your elder and of our new Rome to be one Church; I define that see of the Apostle Peter and this of the imperial city to be one see." Father Puller makes the inconceivable comment:

Digitized by Google

ever allow the formula to be modified, and it was sent in word for word by all the Eastern bishops. But we do not hear that any difficulty was ever made with regard to those parts of the petition which concerned the Apostolic See. We are told

"It will be noticed that by means of this preamble the Patriarch John managed to blunt very considerably the edge of this formulary; for by identifying in some curious fashion his own see of new Rome with the Papal see of old Rome, he managed to claim for the Constantinopolitan See a share in all the special privileges which in the formulary were assigned to the Western apostolic chair" (p. 400). The formulary does not claim any authority for the Roman See. It does claim that Rome has never swerved from the faith. Did the successor of Acacius mean to claim this? It does claim this for Rome as the See of Peter. Does John call Constantinople the See of Peter? It does call the communion of Rome "the true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion," and John was sending in a petition to be admitted to that communion, from which he had till then been excluded. He expresses the new union in a hyperbolical manner (somewhat parallel to the way in which St. Gregory the Great speaks of Antioch, Alexandria and Rome as one see, Ep. vii. 40), to express its closeness and perfection. Father Puller has obviously been hasty here. But on pp. 401–2 he has been more hasty still. He tells us that Pope Hormisdas wrote to the Patriarch Epiphanius (John's successor), allowing him to admit certain Eastern Churches (where a difficulty was made about expunging the names of former bishops, who had been perfectly orthodox) to Roman communion by making a declaration of faith containing nothing about the See of Rome. We are not told why the omission of Roman claims should please the Churches who did not wish to condemn their past bishops, but the wide conclusion is drawn: "The larger portion of the Eastern Church was admitted back to communion with the West on its own terms, rather than on the Pope's terms."

Now we have only to look at the documents to see that Father Puller had not read them. The bishops in question (of Antioch, Jerusalem and Syria Secunda) had prefaced their petition to the Emperor with a paraphrase of the Roman formula or *libellus*, speaking of "the Church of God, which resting upon the Rock of the chief of the Apostles, retaining a right and inflexible confession, confidently with him

Digitized by Google

by Rusticus, Pope Vigilius's nephew, that 2,500 of these petitions were received at Rome.[1]

The famous Justinian took a great part in this reunion, and when he himself became Emperor, he showed great devotion both to orthodoxy and to Rome. He treated Hormisdas with high respect. He received John I at Constantinople with great honour. To John II he wrote: "We allow nothing which concerns the state of the Churches, however manifest and undoubted, not to be made known to your holiness, who is the head of all the Churches, for in all things we are anxious that the honour and authority of your see may increase."[2] To the same Pope he sent a *libellus* of faith, expressing his desire "to follow in all things the Apostolic See."[3]

exclaims always, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'" (Mansi, viii. 511). The Emperor (ibid. 510) bases his plea for indulgence on a precedent set by Pope Anastasius (ibid. 189). Hormisdas sent a plain answer. Epiphanius is to use his judgement. He must transmit to the Apostolic See a list of all whom he reconciles, enclosing the contents of the *libelli* they send in (Ibid. 1032). This profession must be faithful to the original formula, "eodem tamen, ut dixi, tenore conscriptam" (ibid. 1036). Similarly in his letter to the Emperor the Pope says that Epiphanius may admit to communion those who are worthy, *libelli tamen, qui a nobis interpositus est, tenore servato* (ibid. 520). It would be difficult to contradict Father Puller more categorically. Nothing can be more certain than that not a bishop of the East was admitted to full Catholic communion except on the terms of Rome. If ever document was "of faith" in the East, it was this document of Hormisdas, and, I repeat, there is no evidence of any objection whatever having been made to it, except in so far as it implied the omission from the diptychs of former bishops who had been really orthodox, and had been merely in unavoidable schism through the fault of the Emperor. Father Puller's blunder is such a big one that a public withdrawal would be desirable.

[1] Migne, P.L. vol. 67, 1251–2; Mansi, viii. 579.
[2] Mansi, viii. 795 [3] Ibid. 846.

Digitized by Google

Pope Agapitus also came to Constantinople, where he deposed the Patriarch Anthimus for heresy. The Emperor had defended the Patriarch, and had to purge himself by again offering a *libellus*. That which he had given to John II being insufficiently explicit for this occasion, he had to present to Agapitus the formula of Hormisdas.[1] Agapitus died at Constantinople, and after his death a great synod was held by the new Patriarch Mennas, in the presence of the Roman clergy who had been attending the Pope.

In the year 537[2] Pope Silverius was hastily deposed on a false charge of treachery to the Emperor by Belisarius. He was clothed in a monk's frock, and sent into exile at Patara in Lycia. The bishop of that city was shocked, and himself went to Constantinople, and protested to the Emperor's face that there were indeed many kings, but there was but one Pope over the Church of the whole world; yet he had been expelled from his see. Justinian listened to this protest by an Eastern bishop, and ordered Silverius to be sent back to Rome to have a fair trial.[3]

But, meanwhile, the deacon Vigilius, who had made earlier unsuccessful attempts to obtain the Papacy, had become Pope. He persuaded Belisarius to give Silverius into his charge. The deposed Pope was placed by him in the Island of Palmaria, where

[1] Mansi, viii. 857.

[2] For the history which follows the best guide is a long and admirable article by Mgr. Duchesne, "Vigile et Pélage," in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, vol. 36, October, 1884, pp. 369–440. The sketch I give here is too short to be at all adequate.

[3] Liberatus, xxii. P. L. 68, 1040; Mansi, ix. 696.

Digitized by Google

he soon died, it was believed, of starvation. We keep his feast as that of a martyr.

It would have been more defensible from an ecclesiastical point of view had Justinian claimed to put a bishop to death for treachery, rather than to depose him. But the Emperor had been an autocrat for so long that he was now beginning even to issue definitions of faith, as his heretical predecessors had done. He set forth an edict condemning various opinions of Origen, and even Origen himself. It was a very bad precedent to condemn a man who had died in the communion of the Church. But neither the Eastern Patriarchs nor the Pope made any difficulty about approving this action of an orthodox Emperor who was also a learned theologian. Justinian went further. In order to conciliate the Monophysites he drew up an edict condemning the writings and the person of Theodore of Mopsuestia, together with certain writings of Theodoret, and the letter of Ibas to Maris; these three points have become famous as the "three chapters." Theodore of Mopsuestia had been the teacher of Nestorius. His writings were beyond doubt Nestorian and more; but he had lived and died in the communion of the Church, and had resisted no decision of the Church. Theodoret had defended Nestorius without sharing his heresy, and had attacked and misrepresented St. Cyril. It was therefore easy to condemn some of his writings. But he himself had been restored to his bishopric by St. Leo, and received by the Council of Chalcedon. To condemn a part of his writings would only conciliate the Monophysites if they understood the condemnation to cast a slur on

Digitized by Google

the Council of Chalcedon. As for the letter of Ibas, it had been read at Chalcedon, and in spite of its partial defence of Nestorius and abuse of St. Cyril, it had not been condemned, whilst a Papal legate and a bishop had pronounced it satisfactory so far as the faith of the writer was concerned.

Consequently the West was firm in its refusal to condemn the three chapters. Their defenders naturally went too far in their defence, and represented all those who condemned them as enemies of the Council of Chalcedon. Those who took Justinian's side were equally ready to assume that the defenders agreed with the doctrines of Theodore, and approved of Ibas and Theodoret's abuse of St. Cyril. As a matter of fact both sides of the dispute were perfectly orthodox.

Pope Vigilius was said to have attained the goal of his ambitions by the favour of the Empress Theodora, the protectress of the Monophysites, on condition of making terms with that heresy. But once seated on the throne of Peter, the executioner of St. Silverius kicked away the steps by which he had ascended, and forgot all the promises he had made, if he had made any. It was clear that no Pope in the West could be expected to condemn the three chapters. The Emperor determined to isolate him from his surroundings. He was kidnapped in Rome, and put on board ship; after a delay of ten months at Syracuse, he arrived at Constantinople on January 25, 547, and Justinian received him with the high honours due to his position.

Meanwhile the Patriarch of Constantinople, Mennas, had refused to sign the edict, saying that

Digitized by Google

he would do nothing without the Apostolic See. At length he signed under great pressure, having obtained Justinian's promise that he should receive back his signature if the Roman Bishop did not approve.[1] The Patriarch of Antioch wrote to Vigilius that he had signed only because threatened by the Emperor with deposition.[1] The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem also signed under compulsion.

Pope Vigilius, while yet on his journey, sent to the Patriarch Mennas a protest against the Emperor's action, and commended Dacius, Archbishop of Milan, who had long been resident at Constantinople owing to the troubles in Italy, for having broken off communion with Mennas.[2] Still, when Vigilius arrived in Constantinople, Justinian received him with high honour. The Pope excommunicated Mennas, who was afraid to retract his signature. But within four months the Pope's strength of mind was broken, some said by threats and even by cruelty, others said by bribery. Vigilius attributes his own change of mind to his further study of the question. He held an inquiry, in which seventy bishops took part. Against the will of all the Western bishops present he issued on April 11, 548, a solemn decision, known to history at the *Judicatum* of Pope Vigilius. The greater part of this document is lost. We know that he absolutely refused on the one hand to compromise his dignity by simply accepting the Emperor's definition of dogma, while on the other hand he condemned the three chapters in exactly the same

[1] Facundus, *Defensio*, iv. 4 (P. L. 67, 625).
[2] Ibid. iv. 3.

Digitized by Google

manner as the Emperor. By this Justinian was satisfied, and Vigilius hoped to conciliate the Westerns by reiterating his loyalty to the Council of Chalcedon.

He soon found that he was mistaken. The Western bishops insisted that the condemnation of the three chapters and the adherence to Chalcedon were incompatible. The unfortunate Vigilius now found himself in full communion with Mennas and the Easterns whom he had himself excommunicated for their subserviency to the Emperor, while he was deserted by his own Western bishops, and even very soon by his own deacons. There was no thought, of course, on the part of the Westerns or of the Papal Court of contesting the Pope's authority. It was on account of the authority of St. Leo and the confirmation by so many Popes that they looked upon the Council of Chalcedon as inviolable; while they condemned the condemnation of the three chapters on the authority of Vigilius himself when yet free from the pressure put upon him by the Byzantine Court.[1] The *Judicatum* they looked

[1] When the controversy broke out, two Roman deacons, Pelagius (afterwards Pope) and Anatolius, had written to the African canonist Ferrandus for his opinion. This learned disciple of St. Fulgentius was then near his death, and his great fame was at its height. He gave his decision that nothing could be done against the Council of Chalcedon: "There the Apostolic See which has the primacy over the Universal Church was present by its legates, there were the pontiffs of other venerable Churches . . . and an immense crowd of pastors from lesser cities," &c. How could any man appeal to a higher authority, "having before him the Apostolic See in its legates, by the consent of which all the definitions of that council have received invincible strength"? Again, "Universal councils, principally those which have received the consent of the Roman Church, hold the place of second authority after the books of the canon" (Ferrandus,

Digitized by Google

upon as a disgraceful betrayal of the faith, attributable to bribery and fear. No one respected Vigilius, nor did he deserve respect; yet his decision was in reality perfectly orthodox. But the Illyrian and Dalmatian Churches refused to accept it, though immediately subject to the Pope; Africa was equally obdurate. Vigilius wrote a long letter in his own defence to Gaul. At length in 550 he obtained the Emperor's consent to withdraw the *Judicatum*. But he was obliged to deliver to Justinian a written promise on oath that he would condemn the three chapters as soon as he found it possible without causing a schism. However the Emperor soon became impatient. He deposed the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who had withdrawn their adhesion to his view when the Pope withdrew the *Judicatum*. He also set up a new Primate at Carthage, and persecuted the adherents of the three chapters on various pretexts. At length Vigilius himself with his Western adherents were submitted to the utmost indignities. They were dragged with violence even from the church in which they had taken refuge. The scandalized populace delivered them, and the Pope soon after escaped to an inviolable asylum, the famous church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon, opposite Constantinople, in which

Ep. 6; P. L. 67, 924–6). The Africans stood by this opinion. Pontianus, an African bishop, wrote to Justinian: "We know what the Lord said to blessed Peter: Upon this rock I will build my Church," &c. (P. L. 67, 996). Victor Tununensis and Liberatus simply treat Vigilius as a heretic before his elevation, and therefore not Pope at all. Facundus of Hermiane in his *Defensio trium capitulorum* opposes Vigilius to Vigilius, and the whole argument of his bitter *Contra Mocianum* implies the supremacy of the Apostolic See and the necessity for communion with it.

Digitized by Google

the great council which he was defending had sat under the special protection of the virgin martyr. Justinian could not dare to touch him when there, for he would seem really to violate the Council of Chalcedon, as he was accused of doing.

Vigilius now stood firm. He wrote a testament addressed to the world,[1] describing the violence to which he had been subject, and his devotion to the four councils. The Patriarch Mennas, together with the Metropolitans of Cæsarea, Ephesus, Antioch of Pisidia and Tarsus and others, came to him and humbled themselves, signing a written document in which they declare that they accept all that has been decided in the four councils under the presidency of elder Rome; they receive also all the letters of Popes and *all the constitutions of the Apostolic See*, both concerning the faith and concerning the confirmation of the aforesaid councils. They anathematize any one who contradicts. They deny that they have issued any *libellus* contrary to the decree of either Emperor or Pope, but any that have been issued shall be delivered up to Vigilius. They are innocent with regard to the violence done to him, but they are ready to beg pardon, as though it were their own act.[2]

This most remarkable document is the act of the greatest Eastern bishops, addressed to a Pope who was being insulted and ill-treated by the Emperor, whose personal character was by no means without stain, who was not obviously in the right, and who had already twice contradicted himself. Only the

[1] "Vigilius, Bishop of the Catholic Church, to all the people of God" (Mansi, ix. 50–5).

[2] Mansi, ix. 62.

Digitized by Google

firmest belief in the supreme authority of the Pope in matters of faith and the necessity of communion with Rome could have produced such a profession. Mennas died soon after, and his successor, Epiphanius, with the new Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch and the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, offered a similar profession to Vigilius. They make known to the Apostolic See that they hold the true faith, they condemn former heresies by name, they accept the four councils, *all the letters of the prelates of the Apostolic See*, including those of St. Leo, whether concerning the faith or concerning the four councils or any one of the four. Finally, they beg for a conference in common on the subject of the three chapters.[1]

Justinian desired such a conference, but he would not consent that it should contain as many bishops from the West as from the East, so Vigilius refused to hear of it. A general council was proposed. Vigilius eventually consented to this, but absolutely refused to attend it.

The council met on May 5, 553. No bishops could come from Gaul or Spain, for political reasons. In Italy many bishops had died since Vigilius had left, six years before, and no more had been created. Soon after his departure Rome had been taken by Totila, and left deserted for some months without an inhabitant.[2] It had only just been recovered for the Emperor by Narses. Aquileia was in the hands of the Franks. The Illyrian and Dalmatian bishops would not come, while the Emperor would not

[1] Mansi, ix. 64.

[2] A vivid account will be found in Dudden's *Gregory the Great*, 1906, vol. i. p. 32, also in Duchesne, *loc. cit.*

Digitized by Google

permit the Africans to do so, except such as agreed with himself. The Western bishops who were with the Pope did not attend, and Vigilius would send no legates. Eutychius of Constantinople presided, and about 150 bishops were present. All were, of course, devoted to the Emperor's views. A letter of the Emperor to the council explained that it was called in order to condemn the Nestorianism of the three chapters, for Pope Vigilius had condemned them in his *Judicatum*, had deposed his own two deacons, Rusticus and Sebastian, for resisting his decision, and had written letters to Scythia and to Gaul confirming it, but had afterwards refused all proposals for a common discussion or a council. After hearing this letter, the president, with the principal members of the synod, went themselves as a deputation to the Pope,[1] but he refused to attend, and a few days later, May 14th, published his own decision, known as the *Constitutum* of Pope Vigilius, and sent it to the Emperor. Justinian absolutely refused to receive it,[2] saying that, if it was the same as the *Judicatum*, it was unnecessary; if it was different, the Pope contradicted himself. The council therefore did not read it, but on June 2nd issued its final decree, with canons condemning the three chapters under anathema. In accordance with the Emperor's instructions they removed the name of Vigilius from the diptychs,[3] declaring at the same time that they retained their union with the Apostolic See. The Emperor confirmed the decree, and made it a law of the Empire. Vigilius was sent into exile.

It is clear that the council was nothing but a

[1] Mansi, ix. 191. [2] Ibid. 349. [3] Ibid. 366.

Digitized by Google

packed assembly under the Emperor's thumb. It professed to follow the former decision of the Pope, and refused to hear his change of mind. It was Vigilius's own fault that his character inspired no respect, and that his changes of policy rendered obedience impossible. His *Constitutum* of May 14th condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, both in person and writings, but defended Ibas and Theodoret. No one may teach anything contrary to this decree, or raise any new controversy. Any contradiction of it is declared null and void.[1]

But by December 8th Vigilius had succumbed to circumstances, and gave in his adhesion to the Council. In the following February, 554, he solemnly confirmed it,[2] and withdrew the *Constitutum*. He was then allowed to return to Italy, in order to try his best to appease the West. But he died at Syracuse January 7, 555.

No objections to Papal infallibility can possibly be based on the case of Pope Vigilius. Beyond all question his decisions were all of them equally orthodox and correct. But his shilly-shallying brought the Papacy to a humiliation comparable to that which the city of Rome had suffered in his absence. His successor, Pelagius I, had been one of the chief defenders of the three chapters. He was a great man; the Emperor wished him to be

[1] This document is very long (Mansi, ix. 61–106). It is signed by sixteen bishops and three deacons besides the Pope. It concludes thus: "We establish and decree that nobody having any ecclesiastical order or dignity shall have permission to write, or publish, or teach anything contrary to what we have asserted or established in this present constitution with regard to the aforesaid three chapters, or after this definition to move any question further," &c.

[2] Mansi, ix. 413 and 435.

Digitized by Google

Pope, and he accepted the final action of Pope Vigilius.[1] But in the West he was silent about the Council, and obliged no one to accept it. Many African bishops chose schism and exile rather than communion with those whom they thought betrayers of the Council of Chalcedon. But soon the whole West was united, with the exception of the Illyrians, who held out until St. Gregory the Great and later in a schism, which might well be justified in its commencement, but was unjustifiable and unreasonable when the fifth council had been accepted by East and West as perfectly consistent with that of Chalcedon.[2]

The whole controversy had been useless. It had caused schisms in the West and many persecutions,

[1] On this account he found it difficult even to get consecrated. Only two bishops could be found instead of three. The monasteries, the wise, the nobles, says the *Liber Pontificalis* (109), held aloof from his communion at first.

[2] Lest it should be supposed that these schismatics despised communion with Rome and with the whole Catholic Church, it is right to give their own reasons for the division as found in the letter written by St. Gregory the Great when deacon for Pope Pelagius II to Elias, Patriarch of Aquileia-Grado, the leader of the dissidents. They declared that "they could not move or change one jot or tittle of the decrees of Chalcedon," and concluded: "Let us therefore ever hold with the Apostolic Church of the See of the Romans," "ita sapiamus semper, sicut sapit apostolica Romanorum sedis ecclesia." They said "they were taught by the Apostolic See and out of the archives of the holy Church of Rome not to consent . . . it was the doctrine of Rome, through St. Leo and his successors, that the dead should not be condemned." These passages are cited by Gregory from a joint letter of the Istrian bishops to the Pope (Mansi, ix. 437–441). When St. Gregory urged the Emperor Maurice to chastise the schismatics, they wrote that they would suffer death "rather than be torn from the ancient Catholic communion" (Mansi, x. 465). But though they claimed to communicate with past Popes and the Church of old, they were separated from the Catholics of their own day.

Digitized by Google

and yet the heretics had been in no way conciliated, and the definitions of the council were perfectly valueless and commonplace. The interference of an orthodox Emperor in theological matters where he had no place had been nearly as disastrous as that of his heretical predecessors. The following Popes, especially Pelagius I and Pelagius II, did their best for the dignity of the Apostolic See; but the wisdom and sanctity of St. Gregory the Great, forty years after the council, were needed in order to restore all the prestige of authority and holiness and purity of faith which the weakness of the wretched Vigilius had squandered. But the exception proved the rule. No council has more emphatically testified than the fifth council that under ordinary circumstances the Pope must preside, that his decision should be the ground of the council's decree, and that his confirmation is a *sine quâ non* if a council is to have œcumenical authority.

Digitized by Google

VI. CONSTANTINOPLE (III)

OF the sixth council I will say less, because I have written two long articles on the subject which are to appear in the *Dublin Review* for July and October; and I must refer to them for a justification of my peculiar views on the subject.[1]

Catholic truth teaches that our Lord Jesus Christ, having a perfect Human Nature, has a human will, distinct from the Divine Will, though always in accordance with it, and human operations as well as Divine operations. But this truth is not obvious or easy to grasp. When discussions arose in the East, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, most properly referred the matter to Rome. Pope Honorius did not understand the matter at all, and wrote back, fully approving the view suggested by Sergius, that is to say, that it was right to affirm one Will of Christ, lest it should seem that He had a corrupt will like that of fallen man, and that the expressions "one operation" and "two operations" should be avoided, as liable to misunderstanding. Sergius thereupon got the Emperor Heraclius to issue an edict—known

[1] (1906.) In these articles I give full references which I therefore omit here.

Digitized by Google

as the *ecthesis*—which declared as nearly as possible what the Pope had laid down.

This was disastrous, for Honorius had not spoken *ex cathedra*, and was mistaken, though undoubtedly well-meaning. He had not addressed the Church, and above all he had not bound all Christians to accept his definition. Nay, he had defined nothing, but had refused to define. If such a letter were *ex cathedra*, far more would all modern Papal encyclicals be *ex cathedra*, which is absurd.

Nor in his own day was Honorius held to have defined. In those days Popes were accustomed to define dogmas and to bind consciences. But in that case they made it clear that they were explaining the unalterable faith of the Roman Church, that they spoke with the voice of Peter, that they invoked his authority, that all were anathema and outside the Church who contested their doctrine. In this case Honorius said nothing of the sort.

Honorius died before the publication of the *ecthesis* of Heraclius, so that he was unable to disown it. The Roman envoys who came to Constantinople to obtain the Emperor's consent to the election of his successor, Severinus, refused to sign it, since they said the Roman Church was subject to no decrees, and to no councils, but judged all others. They would present the document to the new Pope, and that was all. The clergy of Constantinople admired their courage. But the chief protest was a famous letter published by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, St. Sophronius, on his enthronization. He died shortly after, having first given a solemn charge on Mount Calvary to Stephen, Bishop of Dora, the senior prelate of his patriarchate, to go in person to

Digitized by Google

Rome, in order to get the *ecthesis* condemned. Sergius died almost immediately after its issue. The Emperor Heraclius lived just long enough to see the storm that was arising, and on his death-bed he disowned the *ecthesis*, and laid all the blame on Sergius.

Pope Severinus reigned only two months, but he is said to have had time to condemn the *ecthesis*. His successor, Pope John IV, condemned it, but at the same time made an apology for Honorius, using the testimony of the secretary who had composed the letter, that by "one will" he had meant *one human* will, as opposed to a higher human will and a corrupt will of the flesh. He did not, however, attempt to defend the prohibition of the orthodox expression "two operations" together with that of "one operation."

The new Patriarch Pyrrhus upheld the *ecthesis* on the authority of Honorius. But Pyrrhus was deposed and exiled to Africa by the new Emperor Constans. In Africa he had a public disputation with the great protagonist of the orthodox, St. Maximus Confessor. He owned himself beaten, submitted to Rome, and laid a recantation on the tomb of the Apostles—all this apparently out of policy, not conviction; for later, when he found it possible to get back the Emperor's favour, he returned to his vomit. St. Maximus says of him that he was rejected by the See of Rome, and that "any one who anathematizes those who have rejected Pyrrhus anathematizes the Catholic Church, and excommunicates himself, if he is indeed in communion with the Roman See and the Catholic Church of God. . . . If he wishes neither to be a heretic

Digitized by Google

nor to be accounted one, let him not make satisfaction to this or that individual, but let him hasten before all things to satisfy the Roman See. For if that see is satisfied, all will call him orthodox. For he only speaks in vain who thinks he ought to persuade or entrap persons like myself, and does not satisfy and implore the most blessed Pope of the most holy Church of the Romans, that is, the Apostolic See, which from the Incarnate Word of God Himself, and also by all holy synods, according to the holy canons and definitions, has received universal and supreme dominion, authority, and power of binding and loosing over all the holy Churches of God in the whole world."

I quote these words because St. Maximus is one of the chief Byzantine writers, and has always been revered in the East as a great Saint. He was long secretary of the Emperor ; then he retired from the world and became abbot of a monastery at Constantinople. We find him the great champion of orthodoxy and of the Holy See, and in this cause he died.

A new Patriarch Paul was appointed in place of Pyrrhus. He sent a confession of faith to Rome, in which he upheld the *ecthesis*, and appealed to Honorius and Sergius. This confession was rejected by Pope Theodore. Paul felt the blow, and understanding that it was maintained at Rome that Honorius had not really taught one will, he persuaded the Emperor to withdraw the *ecthesis* and to issue an order that henceforth no one should use the expressions "one will" or "two wills," "one operation" or "two operations." Thus orthodoxy and heresy were put under the same ban. But it was clear

Digitized by Google

that Honorius was followed. He had agreed with Sergius that it was best to speak neither of one nor two operations. Paul now applies the same rule with consistent logic to one and two wills. To defend Honorius was henceforth impossible if this document, known as the *typus* of Constans, was to be condemned. And condemned it was, and promptly, for though it professed to be a measure of discipline only, to prevent controversies, yet it imposed the severest penalties, and prevented the teaching of the Catholic faith. Pope Theodore died, and the new Pope, St. Martin, assembled a famous council, the Lateran Council of 649, in which he condemned Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and the other Monothelites, together with the *ecthesis* and *typus*. Of Honorius nothing is said, either in praise or in blame. The decision of the council was a formal exposition of the errors and of the faith, and beyond doubt a decision *ex cathedra*. St. Martin sent it throughout the world. He appointed legates in the East to depose and create bishops, and supported the orthodox so far as his power reached.

But the Emperor Constans would brook no such opposition. An attempt to murder the Pope at Mass having failed (it was believed by a miracle), St. Martin was kidnapped and carried to Constantinople. There he was loaded with chains, dragged through the streets half naked, and half starved in prison. Exiled to the Crimea he soon died.

St. Maximus and two of his disciples had their hands cut off and their tongues cut out, and died of misery and want in exile. The tyrant was afraid to stay in Constantinople, and was murdered in Africa not long afterwards.

Digitized by Google

The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus was orthodox, but was so occupied with wars that it was many years before he could turn his attention to ecclesiastical affairs. Several orthodox Patriarchs succeeded one another at Constantinople, and it does not seem that the *typus* was enforced. But no communication was possible between East and West, owing to the wars. A state of informal schism was the result. At length the Emperor, being at leisure, wrote to the Pope to send representatives to a general council which he would summon to Constantinople. It met in October, 680, and the Papal legates presided. There is no doubt that the Easterns were most anxious for reunion, and nearly all were perfectly orthodox. St. Maximus had once written: "The ends of the earth, and all in every part of it, who purely and rightly confess the Lord, look directly towards the most holy Roman Church and its confession and faith, as it were to a sun of unfailing light," and this seems to represent the real feeling of the Eastern bishops.

Pope Agatho sent a long dogmatic letter, after the example of St. Leo, for the council to receive. It explained the whole doctrine, repeatedly invoked the authority of St. Peter, and repeatedly asserted that the Roman Church had never fallen into any error, and must be implicitly obeyed. Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, with a few followers, alone made a stand. He put forth a confession of Monothelite errors, and substantiated them by a volume of citations from the Fathers. These were verified and examined and found to be inconclusive. The Pope had also sent a collection of Patristic quotations. These were therefore similarly verified and

Digitized by Google

examined. The result of the council was that it accepted Pope Agatho's letter, only adding the name of Honorius to the heretics condemned. This was unavoidable, because it was to Honorius that Macarius appealed, and in fact *the whole responsibility for the past disastrous contentions lay upon that unfortunate Pope.* The legates made no difficulty, nay, they seemed to have been leaders in the condemnation. Honorius had not invoked his Papal authority; he had not declared to the world the doctrine of the Roman Church. It was, indeed, his great fault that he had not done so. There was no inconsistency in condemning him, and yet affirming in the strongest way the infallibility of the Roman Church.

This is just what the council did. In its solemn definition it "faithfully accepts and greets with uplifted hands" the Papal letter. In the address to the Emperor, signed by all the bishops, they declare that they have conquered Macarius, the champion of error, because with them fought the prince of the Apostles, for his successor assisted them: "The ancient city of Rome offered you a divinely-written confession, and caused the daylight of dogmas to arise by the parchment from the West—and the ink shone, and by Agatho Peter spoke." In the letter to the Pope, also signed by the whole council, we read: "Christ, our true God, has revealed your holiness as a wise physician mightily driving away the disease of heresy by the medicine of orthodoxy. . . . We leave to you what is to be done [with the heretics] since you occupy the first see of the Universal Church . . . the writing of the true confession from your paternal blessedness to the most

Digitized by Google

pious king, . . . we recognize as pronounced by the chiefest head of the Apostles." They beg the Pope to confirm their decision. But Agatho was already dead. In all these letters Honorius is condemned with the other heretics. The new Pope, St. Leo II, duly confirmed the condemnation, and reasserted the inviolability of Roman faith. This will not have surprised the Emperor, for the Pope was but replying to a letter in which Constantine Pogonatus had asserted the infallibility of Rome with equal strength.

On the whole I conclude that no council has by acts and word more fully recognized the authority and infallibility of Rome than the sixth council which condemned — rightly condemned — Pope Honorius.

Digitized by Google

VII. NICÆA (II)

A CERTAIN dislike of the Western Church showed itself at Constantinople eleven years after the sixth council in a synod famous as the synod *in Trullo* or Quinisext. The canons of discipline which it passed confirmed the usages of the East; but in several cases the preambles to them implied disapprobation of the Roman practice where it differed from that of the Greeks. For this cause they were not received at Rome. The cruel Justinian II attempted to kidnap Pope Sergius, as his predecessors had kidnapped Vigilius and Martin, but he failed ignominiously. The attempt shows how important it was thought to be that Rome should sanction the discipline of the Eastern Churches, for it cannot have been seriously expected that the Pope would promulgate these canons throughout the West.

The fleeting reign of the usurper Philippicus brought a sudden reversion to Monothelitism, and the condemnation by the Emperor of the sixth council. When he fell, the Patriarch of Constantinople, John, wrote to Pope Constantine to obtain

Digitized by Google

the renewal of the interrupted communion between East and West.[1] He says that, as God has made in the most wonderful of His works, the human body, a head which is above all the other members and cares for all of them, so the apostolic primacy is the head of all, and must care for the healing of the other members when they have suffered violence. He reminds the Pope of the charge to St. Peter, his predecessor, to confirm his brethren. This was in 712.

Ten years later arose the strife about images which led to the seventh council. In 726 the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, issued an edict ordering images to be removed from the churches. It does not appear that he had any ecclesiastical party on his side, and we can only presume that he was urged by the example of the Jews and of the Mussulmans, whose Caliph had just destroyed all the images in the Christian churches of his dominions. Leo proceeded by way of persecution, but was firmly resisted by the Patriarch of Constantinople, St. Germanus. This Saint wrote to Pope St. Gregory II. His letter is lost, but the Pope's answer, praising the Patriarch in the warmest manner, is preserved in the acts of the seventh council. St. Gregory condemned the new heresy at Rome in a council. We hear of an appeal in 757 to Pope Paul by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The persecution continued throughout the reigns of Leo the Isaurian, Constantine Copronymus, and Leo IV. The Popes were unable to do more than condemn. Meanwhile Germany was being gained to the

[1] Mansi, xii. 196.

Digitized by Google

Church by St. Boniface, and Italy was being for ever lost to the Eastern Emperors. The Popes were corresponding with new protectors, Charles Martel, Pippin, and Charlemagne.

In 780 Constantine Porphyrogenitus ascended the Byzantine throne at the age of fourteen, under the guardianship of his mother, Irene. If the personal character of this famous Empress was not all that could be desired, at least she had been exiled for possessing images, and she always defended their veneration. In 784 the Patriarch John retired to a monastery, in sign of repentance for having consented to the heresy. He was succeeded by Tarasius, who, however, insisted as a condition on an œcumenical council being held to promote orthodoxy and ensure complete union with the West. Pope Hadrian I gladly consented. The council met in 786 at Constantinople; but owing to riots caused by the iconoclastic party, it was transferred to Nicæa, and began its regular sessions in the next year. About 350 bishops were present. Two Papal legates, priests only, held the first place; but the active chairmanship was undertaken for them by Tarasius, who made an opening speech.[1] After this a letter from the Emperor, or rather the Empress, was read. In this it is said that the letter of Pope Hadrian must be read, according to synodal rule, "and by listening to it, together with the two quaternions sent from the patriarchs and bishops of the East, you will know what is the sense of the Catholic Church." The council is evidently not assembled to discuss the propriety of venerating images, but to condemn the opposite view; precisely

[1] Acts in Mansi, xii. 992.

Digitized by Google

as the preceding Emperors had summoned council after council to prohibit images.

In accordance with this, the first session is concerned with the reception of certain bishops and monks who declared their repentance for the heresy in which they had been involved. In the second session the Pope's letter was read.[1] It is a long document, which prescribes the doctrine to be held by the council. He compares the Emperor and Empress to Constantine and Helena, who promulgated the orthodox faith, and exalted "your mother, the Roman Church." He exhorts them to follow the traditions of the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, the princes of the Apostles, and to embrace their Vicar, and so on. The last part of the letter complained of, but admitted, the raising of Tarasius, a layman, to the Patriarchate, and objected to his having used the title *œcumenical Patriarch*, the very harmless and unmeaning style, at which St. Gregory the Great had taken such umbrage, and about which he and other Popes wrote so mistakenly and violently. It is probable, I think, that this part of the Pope's letter to the Emperor was not read in the council. Then was read a shorter letter from Hadrian to Tarasius,[2] again complaining of his appointment, but accepting it, and praising him for defending the use of images.

These having been read, the two legates rise[3] and ask: "Let the most holy Tarasius, Patriarch of the royal city, tell us whether he consents to the letters of the most holy Pope of elder Rome." It was a short question, but it raised the whole subject

[1] Acts in Mansi, xii. 1056. [2] Ibid. 1077. [3] Ibid. 1083.

Digitized by Google

before the council, the rehabilitation of Constantinople in orthodoxy, and its reunion with Rome.

The answer of Tarasius was that St. Paul had praised the pure faith of the Romans; it was necessary to accept this testimony, and he would be imprudent who should resist it; Hadrian partakes of that faith, and approves the ancient faith of the Church; Tarasius also had studied the matter, and recognized the veneration of images; he agrees and confesses and confirms the letter, and will remain in its doctrine. The holy synod cried: "All the holy synod believes so, thinks so, dogmatizes so." The legates ask formally: "Does the holy synod accept the Pope's letters, or not?" They cry: "We follow, we receive, we accept." The deputy of Antioch expresses his joy at the union of Constantinople and Rome, and that Irene had embraced the holy Roman Church, and rejoices in the letter of Hadrian. The metropolitans and bishops follow, most of them stating that they believe according as is contained in the letter of Pope Hadrian; and lastly the abbots present give their consent.

Gallican writers have actually tried to interpret the acts of this council in favour of their own views. But they could not show that a single minute was devoted to an examination of the letter of the Pope, or that it was accepted (as might well have been done, as at Chalcedon) because it was in accordance with the true faith. It was taken *as* the true faith. No former council had dealt with images. Rome alone had defended them. The Bishops simply declare their adhesion to the faith of Rome, which had been praised by St. Paul,

Digitized by Google

according to the text so often quoted by the ancients to the glory of the Roman Church (Rom. i. 8).

In the third session the letter of Tarasius to the bishops of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem inviting them to the council, was read. The Papal legates added that a similar one had been sent to the Pope. The bishops of the Patriarchate of Antioch had sent a reply, which was read, in which they declared that they would accept the council as œcumenical, although no bishops could be present from Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, for these patriarchates had not been represented in the sixth council; yet this was no prejudice to the council, "more especially as the most holy and apostolic Pope of Rome agreed, and was present by his envoys."[1] This letter is then formally accepted by the legates in the Pope's name, and the bishops of the East who wrote it received into communion.[2] A formal definition of faith was read and passed in the seventh session. Tarasius wrote a letter to the Pope, in which he says that Hadrian had, so to speak, conversed with the Apostles, and had learned the truth from them, and hastened to uproot the tares of heresy. His letter had been a royal banquet to the Fathers. As an eye he had pointed out the way to the whole body.[3] The Pope, however, did not at once give a solemn confirmation to the council, and the reason seems to have been really his anxiety how it might be received in the West, which was highly irritated with the Eastern Emperor and Empress. A bad translation made it easy for Frankish Councils, especially the famous Council of Frankfort, to reject

[1] Mansi, xii. 1134. [2] Ibid. 1146. [3] Ibid. xiii. 458.

Digitized by Google

the seventh council; and an assembly of doctors at Paris was even distinctly unfavourable to Hadrian's own decision. But all this is outside my present subject, for the acknowledgement in theory of the Papal power by the Western Church of that day is generally admitted.

In the East there was a recrudescence of iconoclasm after the death of Irene in 803. The great supporters of orthodoxy were the monks of Studium, under their celebrated Abbots Plato and Theodore, who appealed continually to the decision of the council and to Rome. The testimonies of St. Theodore to the Papal prerogatives are well known. To Pope Paschal[1] he wrote :—

"Hear, O apostolic head, divinely appointed Shepherd of Christ's sheep, keybearer of the kingdom of heaven, *rock of the faith, upon whom is built the Catholic Church. For Peter art thou, who adornest and governest the chair of Peter* . . . Hither, then, from the West, imitator of Christ, arise and repel not for ever (Ps. xliii. 23). To thee spake Christ our Lord: 'And thou being one day converted, shalt strengthen thy brethren.' Behold the hour and the place. Help us, thou that art set by God for this. Stretch forth thy hand so far as thou canst. Thou hast strength with God, through being the first of all."[2]

This doctrine, which could not be more strongly worded, is grounded by St. Theodore upon the immemorial practice of the Fathers. For instance,

[1] So he had written earlier to Leo III against the "Mœchians": "Since to great Peter Christ our God gave the office of Chief Shepherd after entrusting him with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to Peter or his successor must of necessity every novelty in the Catholic Church . . . be referred . . . Save us, most divine Head of all Heads, Chief Shepherd of the Church under heaven . . . " (Bk. I. Ep. 23, P. G. 99, 1017; cp. Ep. 34, pp. 1021 and 1025).

[2] Letter of St. Theodore and four other Abbots to Pope Paschal (Bk. II. Ep. 12, P. G. 99, 1152–3).

Digitized by Google

when he had received the Pope's reply to the above letter, he wrote :—

"In truth we have seen that a manifest successor of the prince of the Apostles presides over the Roman Church. We truly believe that Christ has not deserted the Church here (at Constantinople), for assistance from you has been our one and only aid *from of old and from the beginning* by the providence of God in the critical times. You are, indeed, the untroubled and pure fount of orthodoxy *from the beginning*, you the calm harbour of the whole Church, far removed from the waves of heresy, you the God-chosen city of refuge."[1]

And to the Emperor Michael :—

Let the Emperor "order that the declaration from old Rome be received, *as was the custom by the tradition of our Fathers from of old and from the beginning.* For this, O Emperor, is the highest of the Churches of God, in which first Peter held the chair, to whom the Lord said : 'Thou art Peter . . . prevail against it.'"[2]

Of the Pope's relations to councils we have such a declaration as the following :—

"Let him (the Patriarch Nicephorus) assemble a synod of those with whom he has been at variance, if it is impossible that representatives of the other Patriarchs should be present, a thing which might certainly be, if the Emperor should wish the Western (Patriarch) to be present, *to whom is given the authority* (κράτος) *over an œcumenical synod ;* but let him make peace and union, by sending his synodical letters to the prelate of the first see."[3]

---

[1] Bk. II. Ep. 13, from the same to the same, P. G. 99, 1153.

[2] Bk. II. Ep. 86, P. G. 99, 1331. So again in a letter of Theodore and Plato to Basil, an Abbot at Rome: "It would be good that, according to our intention and desire, they (the "Mœchians") should be synodically censured by the supreme Apostolicus, (ὑπὸ τοῦ κορυφαιοτάτου Ἀποστολικοῦ) *as in the past and from the beginning*" (Bk. I. Ep. 35, p. 1029).

[3] P. G. 99, 1420. Necessity of communion with the Apostolic See, and its infallibility are well expressed in Bk. II. Ep. 63, "to his son Naucratius": "I witness now before God and men, they have torn themselves away from the Body of Christ, from the supreme see (τοῦ κορυφαϊκοῦ θρόνου), *in which*

Digitized by Google

And in a letter written in the name of all the Abbots of Constantinople "to the iconoclastic synod" :—

"We venerate images . . . not because we are assured that we are right by the second holy synod of Nicæa or by that which earlier decided divinely, but *from the very coming of our Lord and God* in writing and without writing we have been made firm and rest securely upon that see to which Christ saith: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." [1]

Christ placed the keys of the faith, against which the gates of hell (I mean the mouths of heretics) have not prevailed, and never will until the consummation, according to the promise of Him who cannot lie. Let the most blessed and apostolic Paschal rejoice therefore, for he has fulfilled the work of Peter" (P. G. 99, 1281).

[1] Bk. II. Ep. 1, P. G. 99, p. 1117.

Digitized by Google

VIII. CONSTANTINOPLE (IV)

WE have arrived at the beginning of the 9th century, fifty years before the rivalry between Photius and Ignatius for the possession of the Patriarchate of Constantinople blazed out. Of this famous contest I will not speak in detail. I will only point out how the whole history establishes the supremacy of the Apostolic See, though it has no concern with doctrinal infallibility.[1]

From the time of the appointment of Ignatius as Patriarch of Constantinople in 846, there was a strong party against him, led by Gregory Asbestas, Archbishop of Syracuse. Ignatius deposed the latter, who appealed to Rome. Thereupon we find Ignatius also writing to Rome, together with the Emperor Michael and his mother Theodora. The brother of Theodora, Bardas, obtained the exile of Ignatius, on a false charge of treason. Ignatius was the son of a former Emperor, Michael Rhangabis. In his place was set Photius, a near

[1] The second and third volumes of *The Lives of the Popes during the Early Middle Ages* by the Rev. Horace Mann, have appeared since this lecture was delivered. The reader may especially be referred to the third volume of that learned and careful work for a fuller treatment of the history of Photius's relations with the Papacy.

Digitized by Google

connection of the imperial family, the most learned man of his time, of first-rate political ability, of charming appearance and manners. Ignatius was loaded with chains and sent into exile. But the people cried for his return. As you might expect, Bardas and Photius could think of no better expedient than an appeal to Rome. They sent a splendid embassy to Pope Nicolas I. This great Pope gathered from their one-sided statements that all was not straight. He decided nothing, but sent two legates to the East. These were ill-treated, shut up for one hundred days, and threatened, until they consented to acknowledge Photius as Patriarch. In 861 Photius celebrated a great council in presence of the Papal legates. We see up to this point that Photius rested wholly on Rome. But in the synod the letter of Pope Nicolas was read only in so far as it dealt with dogma, the part concerning Ignatius being necessarily suppressed. Ignatius appealed to the Pope, but his appeal was not admitted by the council, although he invoked the letter of St. Innocent I defending St. Chrysostom, and the Canons of Sardica (which had long been a part of Eastern canon law), to prove that an appeal to Rome necessarily suspended judgement. But the legates were there, and the plea was insufficient.

Ignatius escaped and hid himself, and sent a petition to Rome. Pope Nicolas refused to consent to his deposition, and in 863 assembled a council at Rome, in which he deposed Photius and all those who had been ordained by him, while Gregory of Syracuse he degraded from all sacerdotal rank without hope of restitution. At the

Digitized by Google

same time he restored Ignatius and those of his partizans who had been deposed.

Photius meanwhile strengthened his position by acting as an excellent Patriarch. He published writings in defence of the faith, and encouraged missionaries to Bulgaria, Russia, &c. This made another cause of dissension between Rome and the Byzantines. Bulgaria depended upon Illyricum, which had anciently been a dependency of the Holy See, governed, at least since the beginning of the 5th century, by a Papal legate. But for about a century it would seem that those parts of the Eastern dependencies of Rome which still belonged to the Eastern Emperor had been (like Sicily and South Italy) governed by the Bishop of Constantinople. The Popes did not admit this as a right; and now they claimed that Bulgaria should be directly subject to Rome, and not to Constantinople, and they urged it, above all, on account of the dangers to faith which lay in subjection to the Byzantine Emperor and his Court bishop.[1]

When the sentence of Nicolas against Photius was known, Bardas promised to depose Photius. Photius then proposed to do without the Pope, and got the Emperor Michael to write to Nicolas refusing his interference. This is merely what heretics had always done, and it does not appear that Photius really denied theoretically the prerogatives of Rome. But the Pope wrote back affirming his primacy in the strongest terms, and proposed to try the case at Rome. He also wrote to the

[1] On this question the best authority is A. Lapôtre, S.J., *Jean VIII*, 1895, ch. ii.

Digitized by Google

bishops of the East, warning them not to be deceived by Photius.

In April, 866, Bardas was put to death by the Emperor Michael, his nephew, who wished to reign by himself. Photius stopped the Papal legates whom Nicolas had sent to Bulgaria, and made violent complaints of the Pope's conduct. He published a famous book, in which he accused the Western Church of heresy with respect to the procession of the Holy Ghost, thus beginning the unending controversy over the *filioque* in the Creed.

In 869 Photius held a council in which he excommunicated Pope Nicolas and all his adherents. Since Dioscorus after the Robber Council of Ephesus, no such absurdity had been heard of. To make his sentence more respectable, signatures were forged, and it was pretended that the council represented the whole Church.

Nicolas died November, 867, and about the same time the Emperor Michael was murdered.

This changed the whole state of affairs. The new Emperor Basil had no wish for a rupture with Rome, and restored Ignatius. The Emperor wrote to the Pope, and so did Ignatius. The Patriarch's letter is remarkable. It is written at the moment of his triumph, and when the Emperor was on his side. He begins thus [1]:—

"Art has provided many physicians for the wounds in the limbs of men, . . . but of wounds in the members of Christ our God and Saviour, the Head of us all, and of His Spouse, the Catholic and Apostolic Church, the Supreme Chief and most powerful Word, Orderer, Healer, and Master, the God of All, has produced one only and pre-eminent and most

[1] Mansi, xvi. 47.

Digitized by Google

universal physician, that is, your fraternal holiness and fatherly goodness. Wherefore He said to Peter, the great and chief Apostle: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' And again, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.' For such blessed words He did not circumscribe and define to the Prince of the Apostles alone by a kind of chance, but through him he transmitted them to all who, after him as his successors, were to be made chief pastors, and divine and sacred pontiffs of elder Rome."

In consequence of these letters Pope Hadrian II held a synod at Rome in 869, in which he condemned Photius, his acts and his council. This was followed in September by a council at Constantinople which is counted as the eighth œcumenial council,[1] in which Ignatius was confirmed, and Photius condemned. All the bishops had to accept a form of the *libellus* of Pope Hormisdas, enlarged to suit present circumstances.[2] The Papal legates presided, and all was carried out according to the Pope's wishes. It has sometimes been noticed that the theory which had grown up in the East, that the constitution of the Church is essentially the five Patriarchates, came to the fore in that council. But three of the five had already been swallowed up by Mohammedanism, so that the theory was already antiquated.[3]

So matters stood for nearly eight years, until the

[1] Only about sixteen bishops were present at the first session. The number increased up to 107.

[2] It is incomplete in the Greek acts, which are abridged.

[3] The reason why the idea is made so prominent by many speakers at the council was apparently because the number of bishops was so small that it was important to emphasize the representative character imparted by the presence of legates from the great sees.

Digitized by Google

death of Ignatius. Then Photius got round the Emperor, and was restored. Naturally he at once attempted to get confirmed by Rome. The Pope was a strong man (John VIII), and it may seem surprising that he accepted the appointment, on condition that Photius condemned his own former acts. By this act of mercy and of policy John VIII obtained the cession of Bulgaria to the Roman Patriarchate. But Photius would not unsay anything he had said. He curtailed and interpolated the Pope's letters, and in a council (879) made out that he was wholly approved by Rome.[1] This was more than John VIII had bargained for, and Photius was condemned, if not by him, at least by his successors Marinus, Hadrian III, and Stephen V. In 886 the Emperor Basil died, and his successor Leo the Wise made peace with Rome after the seven years' schism, and turned out Photius once more. The new Patriarch Stephen wrote to Pope

[1] This great council of the Patriarchate of Constantinople has been treated by the Greeks as of the highest rank, and even as œcumenical, on account of the presence of representatives from the other Patriarchs. But it was not so intended. Photius presided, but he had to excuse himself for having assumed the Patriarchate before Rome had given leave. The legate Peter clothed him solemnly in the Patriarchal vestments, on behalf of the Pope, and it is remarkable how clearly the Papal prerogatives were recognized, though the council was obviously full of dislike to Rome, and the legates were absolutely subservient to Photius. The letters read from John VIII were interpolated with a formal condemnation and reprobation of the council of 869. It is on this ground that the Greeks refused to receive that council, though the Latins regard it as the eighth œcumenical. So far as my argument is concerned, the one council is as good as the other, for both afford plenty of proofs of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiffs over Constantinople, and of the Byzantine tradition on the subject.

Digitized by Google

Stephen V humbly begging for mercy to himself and for the bishops who had been in unavoidable schism. After some delay, he was confirmed by Pope Formosus, and unity was restored. Photius died soon after. But he had sown seeds, both of disobedience to Rome and of dislike of the West, which bore bitter fruit. He did not accuse Rome of heresy as to the Holy Ghost, for Rome had not adopted the *filioque*. But Rome accepted the challenge and supported the expression, while the Greeks continued at intervals to take up again the view of Photius.

Photius was the sixtieth bishop of Constantinople. Of his predecessors, 22 were heretics, 21 were deposed, rightly or wrongly, by Emperors, or councils, or Popes. The religious history of Constantinople is the history of the opinions of the Emperors. The eight Greek œcumenical councils are those which were held under orthodox Emperors, and which could therefore be directed and confirmed by Rome, and thereafter accepted by the whole Church.

These councils, apart from Roman influence, did nothing or next to nothing for the faith, while history tells us that Rome did everything. It is a history with a very obvious moral, and that moral is not in favour of Gallican views, is not in favour of the authority or infallibility of councils apart from the Pope.

Digitized by Google

IX. THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND HISTORY

COUNCILS are an obvious and unavoidable ecclesiastical institution, and from this point of view councils are a necessary part of the constitution of the Church. But they were not divinely instituted, as the Papacy was divinely instituted. There is no promise to them of infallibility, as there is to Peter, and they are not the rock on which the Church is built. Great councils approach to infallibility just in so far as they can justly claim to represent the whole Church. For the whole teaching body of the Church is infallible, and were it perfectly represented at a council, the council would be infallible. At councils like those of Trent and of the Vatican it may well be said that the Church was fully represented. But even so, a Papal confirmation and promulgation is needed, in order to remove all doubt.

But the eight Greek councils we have been reviewing had no claim to represent the Church as a whole, and the greatest of them all, Chalcedon with its 630 bishops, was only kept from admitting heresy by the firmness of an Emperor devoted

Digitized by Google

to the See of Peter. But once confirmed by the Popes, and received throughout the Church, these councils are chief among the charters of the faith.

It was the great schism of the West which gave rise to the 15th-century doctrine that councils are the supreme rulers of the Church, higher than the Pope himself. A mild reflection of this doctrine is the Gallicanism of the great historians and canonists of the seventeenth century, of Tillemont, Fleury, Van Espen, for example. Such great names, supported, I fear, to some extent by the learning of the French Benedictines, the editors of the Fathers, could not but have an echo at the time of the Vatican Council.

It has not, I hope, been out of place for me to deal with history to-day, for the controversies which raged around the Vatican Council were mainly concerned with the history of the proposed dogma, rather than with the logical connection of the dogma with admitted principles of theology. On the theological side the infallibilists were too strong to be attacked with advantage. For this reason it was the less difficult for those who had opposed the dogma in the council, to turn round and accept it cordially after the conclusion of the council. They had merely to revise their view of a few controverted points of history, out of which the case of Honorius was really the only one which presented grave difficulty. The Gallicans had frequently professed not only deference and obedience to the Holy See, but also a firm belief in the infallibility of the Roman Church. The only question was how far this implied the infallibility of each individual Pope when speaking as Pope.

Digitized by Google

The definition made it clear that even a Pope, speaking to the whole Church, is not infallible in his teaching, unless he brings his authority into play, to bind the consciences of all Christians. It was evident that an ordinary Papal encyclical would not be *ex cathedra* or infallible, still less would a brief to an individual or a statement in private. A few infallibilists in France[1] had spoken with ridiculous exaggeration of the infallible judgement and even inspiration of the Supreme Pontiff. But the majority of the bishops and all theologians held the simple and logical view which was proclaimed by the council. Cardinal Manning is often referred to as an extreme infallibilist; but any one who will take the trouble to read his Pastoral letter of 1870 in *Petri Privilegium*, will see that this is a mistake. In his interpretation of the decree, Manning was, on the whole, at one with those who believed themselves to be minimizers.

EVERY BISHOP OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD, as is well known, accepted the council. There were protests, but they were not from bishops, but from German university professors—they were not in the name of theology, but of history. These men formed a schism, which was protected by the Governments of Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, &c., and especially of Switzerland. A salary was paid to the so-called "Old Catholic" pastors by the State.[2]

The name was intended to signify the position

[1] Cp. *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*, by Wilfrid Ward, 245–7.

[2] An interesting summary of the history of the Old Catholic movement will be found in the *Kirchenlexicon* (Wetzer und Welte), vol. i. pp. 642–59.

Digitized by Google

they assumed. The dogma of 1870 was a new dogma, which they had neither believed nor taught before. They remained as they had been before; they were the Old Catholics of the times before the council, unchanged, unswerving. The rest were New Catholics.

The facts did not correspond with the intention. The name was soon an obvious misnomer. Their body was a little one, not "Catholic," not everywhere; and was not long before it was divided against itself, and weakened by secessions. Instead of remaining unchanged, innovations were made in doctrine and practice. Above all the permission of marriage to the clergy and the introduction of a German liturgy destroyed even the external resemblance to the Catholicism of the sixties. The simple attitude of protest was soon dropped. Instead of continuing to regard Jansenism as a deadly heresy, they induced the Jansenist Church of Holland to supply episcopal orders for their new sect, which had obtained the adhesion of no bishop of the Catholic Church. Less successful attempts were made for union with the Easterns and with the Church of England. Two years after the Council, began the Kultur Kampf, as the movement was called which attacked Catholic education and the independence of the clergy, and banished religious orders from Germany. The Governments which attacked the Catholics subsidized and protected the Old Catholics. Where a few of these could be got together, they were given a right to use the parish church, and the Catholic people, who would not share it with them—for they would have been obliged to use one altar with schismatics

Digitized by Google

and to partake of the same Holy Sacrament, reserved in the same tabernacle—were driven to worship in hired rooms or barns. Priests and bishops were imprisoned, while the sectaries were protected. The bravery and union of the German Catholics, aided by the wisdom of Leo XIII, defeated the persecutors, and Bismarck went to Canossa. The assistance granted by politicians to the Old Catholics ceased, and the sect lost all importance in Germany. In Switzerland the persecution had been equally acute, and the new movement had been even more vigorously supported by the Protestant cantons. But after a time the numbers (which at their highest had been multiplied by six in the official estimates) rapidly diminished. At the present moment the Old Catholic movement is almost forgotten on the Continent, though there are a few old churches in Germany which are still in their hands until their present pastors die or return to the Church.

I should not have mentioned these facts but that I have been asked to say a few words about Dr. Döllinger, as his authority is still occasionally quoted against the possibility of accepting the dogma of Papal infallibility.[1]

Dr. Döllinger was himself the very soul of the opposition to the acceptance of the Vatican definition. The professors who initiated the Old Catholic movement either were his disciples, or had been encouraged by his example and his words. He protested, and was of necessity excommunicated by the Archbishop of Munich.

[1] On Dr. Döllinger see Lord Acton's article, "Döllinger's Historical Work" (*Engl. Hist. Rev.*, Oct., 1890), and Michaël, S.J., *Ignaz von Döllinger, eine Charakteristik*, 1892.

Digitized by Google

His position was essentially that of the Old Catholics. He declared that, though he had been a defender of the Papacy, he had never taught Papal infallibility. He should continue as he had ever been. If before the council he was admitted to have been a good Catholic, he was still so, for he had not altered his mind a whit. The council had not been closed, but interrupted by the storming of the Porta Pia. The close of the council or a new council must be awaited.

This sounds a dignified and logical position. But it was the reverse. In the first place, Dr. Döllinger clung to the belief in the unity of the Church. He declared that he was unjustly excommunicated and suspended, but he submitted. He lived for twenty years longer, and never again said Mass, never again administered the sacraments to others, never himself received the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist. He encouraged the Old Catholics, he gave them advice. He saw that they were few, and he hoped that by moral support, from union with the East and the English, some consent on Catholic dogmas might be arrived at, and that eventually explanations might be made with Rome. But he himself would not communicate with them, though he would not condemn those who did. "*Ich bin isoliert*" ("*I stand alone*") was his famous and profoundly melancholy saying. The Catholic Church in which he had once believed, and which he had defended, went on without him, and prospered. While he stood without, he saw the German Centre party fight with Bismarck and come forth victorious. He saw Catholicism more united since the council than it had ever been before. He saw

Digitized by Google

the Papacy more respected by the world under Leo XIII than it had been reviled under Pius IX. He was excommunicated by his own Church, he could unite with no other. He stood alone, and against the whole world. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* It was anything but a dignified attitude. It was a position in which it is rare for any one to find himself, except he be a madman or a crank. Not a single man, woman, or child shared his position.

Nor was it a logical attitude. He had appealed to the fact that before the council there was no consent to the dogma throughout the Church. He had taught the infallibility of the Church, and opposed it to the infallibility of the Pope. Now there was an absolute consent of the infallible Church against himself.

In the second place, he claimed to stand where he had always stood, and where the Catholic Church had always stood. It was the others who had moved in 1870. But like his disciples, the Old Catholics, he stultified his own position by moving, by moving swiftly and far. In 1863 Döllinger had publicly defended the Immaculate Conception. At the Bonn Conference of 1874 he insisted on the denial of it being agreed to. He taught on this occasion that the Bible is the one rule of faith, and put forward propositions as to the sacraments and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass which go far towards Protestantism. It is sufficient to remark that they satisfied the Lutheran delegate from Denmark. He denied that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, and frankly accepted the view of the Greeks on the subject. He not only denied Papal infallibility, but

Digitized by Google

he reduced Papal jurisdiction within the narrowest bounds. His view on this subject was not in the least that of the Gallicans of the 19th century, or of Bossuet and his followers at an earlier date, nor was it one which Bossuet would have tolerated as Catholic doctrine. Döllinger made a false claim, when he pretended to represent the Catholicism of his own younger days.

In the third place, it must be admitted that he had begun to shift his position even before the council. For six or seven years he had been in a state of irritation with Rome, he had been collecting all that he could find in history against the Popes —and there is a great deal to find—his mouth was full of the familiar objections, the Jesuits, the Inquisition, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, Vaticanism, Alexander VI, and the rest of the usual Protestant catchwords. He had spoken and published things which might have shown which way the wind blew—though nothing actually scandalous, until in 1869 he published the letters to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg, which were afterwards enlarged and published as *The Pope and the Council* by Janus. This once famous little book is not a work of serious history. Some of the mistakes were so obvious that they had to be subsequently corrected by one of the authors (for Döllinger was assisted in the work by Friedrich and Huber). But it is interesting as showing how far the writers, and also their friends who initiated the Old Catholic movement, were from being the old-fashioned Catholics they represented themselves to be. There is extremely little about infallibility in the book, but a great deal about the Papacy in

Digitized by Google

general. Much is simply against Catholic doctrine as habitually taught and believed. So far is Janus from assuming a Gallican position, that general councils are referred to in the most contemptuous terms. The Papacy is represented as the cause of all the evils of Christendom since the 9th century. I have not read the publications of the Protestant Alliance, but Dr. Littledale's *Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome* is the only book I know which shows a hatred of the Papacy equal to that of Janus. An Anglican layman of wide reading, who for many years had based his position on the example of Döllinger, and had greatly admired his seemingly unanswerable argument that if he was a Catholic before 1870, he was a Catholic also after that date, since he had not changed—this layman, I say, was persuaded after many years by another Anglican to read *The Pope and the Council.* He read it, and declared that his only reason for not submitting to the Church of Rome was now destroyed. If this was the teaching of Döllinger in 1869, he was not then a Catholic. My friend sought a priest in communion with Rome, and "went over," as the phrase runs. He died ten days ago, a fervent Catholic.

In the fourth place it is clear that Dr. Döllinger's protest was not directed against the actual doctrine defined by the Vatican Council, but against an imaginary doctrine of his own. Listen to the words of Janus (I quote the English translation) :—

(P. 47.) "Papal infallibility, when once defined by the Council as an article of faith, will give the impulse to a theological, ecclesiastical, and even political revolution, the nature of which very few—and least of all those who are urging it

Digitized by Google

on—have clearly realized, and no hand of man will be able to stay its course. In Rome itself the saying will be verified: 'Thou wilt shudder thyself at thy likeness to God.'

"In the next place, the newly coined article of faith will inevitably take root as the foundation and corner stone of the whole Roman Catholic edifice. The whole activity of theologians will be concentrated on the one point of ascertaining whether or not a Papal decision can be quoted for any given doctrine, and in labouring to discover and amass proof for it from history and literature. Every other authority will pale beside the living oracle on the Tiber, which speaks with plenary inspiration, and can always be appealed to."

Now the Vatican Council positively declared on the contrary that the Pope is *not* inspired, and showed that he cannot "always be appealed to," since he is only able to give an infallible definition after he has discovered what is the teaching of the Church by ordinary human means of investigation. Janus goes on in the same absurd strain: "What use in tedious investigations of Scripture, what use in wasting time on the difficult study of tradition, which requires so many kinds of preliminary knowledge, when a single utterance of the infallible Pope may shatter at a breath the labours of half a lifetime, and a telegraphic message to Rome will get an answer in a few hours or a few days, which becomes an axiom and article of faith." But Papal infallibility is in no way a short cut to the truth. It does not make it easier to answer debated questions. The definition simply expresses the truth that whenever the Chief Pastor uses his authority to bind the whole Church to believe a certain point of doctrine under pain of heresy, by God's providence he never will actually cause the Church to accept a falsehood for a truth, or in any way to change her faith. If we grant that the successor of Peter has

Digitized by Google

indeed the right to speak to the whole Church with authority above any other ordinary authority on earth, his infallibility is a rigid corollary from that of the Church. His authority binds the Church, and if he can be wrong, and if only a general council can correct him, then the Church must be bound to heresy if he makes a mistake, until a council can meet. And who is to call the council? In the meantime there will be divisions, revolts and anarchy.

Dr. Döllinger in his later days had neglected, and had apparently forgotten, his theology. You will say, "But *Janus* was written before the council. Surely after the council he saw that he was tilting against a phantom?" That is the extraordinary point. He never revoked what he had said—he added to it, even. He would not listen to the other side, but persisted in attacking views which even the most violent partizans like Louis Veuillot would not have acknowledged—views which his bugbears the Jesuits would have joined him in rejecting as impious, heretical, and ridiculous. It was as easy before the Council as afterwards to know what was the doctrine which had been taught by most theologians for many centuries. It was easy for him to know that such theologians pursued the usual methods of argument and proof, and that they did not telegraph to Rome, reply paid, when in doubt. It was easy to read the Vatican decrees and perceive that the doctrine he attacked had been expressly excluded. But he would not read, nor listen, nor discuss, nor learn: he was too full of bitterness.

In the fifth place, it would seem that Dr. Döllinger himself, after twenty years of isolation, in the last

Digitized by Google

months of his life, was beginning to realize the truth of the points I have been urging. It is a certain fact that he took some steps towards submission before he died.

It has been stated on good authority that it was Sir Peter le Page Renouf who visited him in the autumn of 1889, and explained to him that the definition regarded the *official* and not the *personal* infallibility of the Pope, as the witness to the actual belief of the Church. Döllinger was persuaded to compose a form of submission.

I was myself in Rome in January, 1891, just a year later. The late Father Lockhart, of the Order of Charity, told me some interesting details. He said that Döllinger, before his death, had sent a form of submission to Rome, with the remark that it would certainly not be considered sufficient. On the contrary, Father Lockhart told me that all that was required was his acceptance of the Council's definitions. He could not be bound to any particular interpretation of them. Father Lockhart, as a friend of Döllinger's, had received a notice from the Vatican that it was supposed he would be a *persona grata* to the aged Professor, and that he was to hold himself in readiness to proceed at once to Munich, with full powers to absolve him from excommunication. He believed that his mission was certain. He was ready to start when the news arrived of the sudden death of Dr. Döllinger.

Thus the hand of God prevented the reconciliation. It was tragic—to me it seems terrible. But I have some consolation in the thought that the old man was feeling tired of standing out against the world. In the supplemental volumes of the

Digitized by Google

Encyclopædia Britannica[1] we read: "In his latest moments he refused the sacraments at the hands of a Roman Catholic priest." This is evidently an error. On January 9, 1890, being almost 92 years of age, he had a stroke and lost consciousness, which he never recovered. Until this stroke he was not in danger, so that he cannot have refused reconciliation. Next day his friend and disciple, the Old Catholic Friedrich, administered extreme unction. He had a right to give absolution, for in the hour of death every priest, schismatic, heretic, suspended or excommunicated, has faculties.

Dr. Döllinger had fallen into many heresies, but it is probable that he did not himself realize how far he had moved from the position of a Catholic. The very absurdity of his position—resisting the Church on a point of faith, while he obeyed her on a point of discipline, and respected his excommunication—may give us some possibility for hope that he found mercy with Him who knows the weaknesses and contradictions and obscurities of human thought.

So much for the protests which were made against the Vatican decrees in the sacred name of History. Violent and savage they were. They were not the first attacks the Church has suffered: they will not be the last. "The rain fell, the floods came, the winds blew, and they beat upon that House of God; and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock."

[1] Vol. xxvii. p. 505.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

Digitized by Google