BERKELEY
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

Times Aug. 1. 1912

PAPALISM. A Treatise on the Claims of the Papacy as set forth in the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*. By EDWARD DENNY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Peter's Vauxhall. 9 × 5¾, xxiii. + 760 pp. Rivingtons. 21s. n.

[This is one of the most learned works published in recent years on the controversy, which apparently must go on without abatement, though perhaps with improved temper, between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. Mr. Denny's work, like the books recently published by Lord Halifax and the Rev. T. A. Lacey, has sprung from the attempt made in 1895 to secure Rome's recognition of Anglican orders as a preliminary to further proposals for reunion between the two communions. That attempt, as every one knows and most people expected, proved abortive. The Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, issued in 1896, plainly asserts the terms on which Leo XIII. considered reunion possible. They imply unconditional submission to the supreme authority of the Pope. In Mr. Denny's judgment the Encyclical completely justifies the position of both the Eastern and Anglican Churches with regard to Rome; and in his examination of the monarchical position claimed by its Bishops Mr. Denny provides a valuable survey of the testimony of Scriptures, the Fathers and Councils, and the history of the primitive Church.]

H. G. Burrows.

Per ardua ad astra.

No. 1364.

THE CLAIMS OF THE PAPACY.

PAPALISM. By EDWARD DENNY. Rivington. 21s. net.

In 1895 Archbishop Maclagan said, "Reunion is in the air; on every side we hear the cry for unity." In 1896 the hopes were dashed to the ground by the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*. Then there were a few years of polemics. Now we have had a year or two of reminiscences, ending with Lord Halifax's most notable book. Meanwhile Mr. Denny, whose work on Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction was one of the most valuable contributions to the earlier period of this debate, has, it seems, been accumulating facts, investigating, criticising, testing, and now he gives us a book, worthy of the great age of English anti-Roman controversy, on the modern claims of Papalism.

Two points we may note at starting. This book, thoroughly original and independent, must be regarded as supplementary or complementary to Mr. Puller's investigation of the Roman claims in the light of early Church history. And it represents very much of that patient study of the Fathers—that wide knowledge, that scrupulous accuracy, which we learned years ago to associate with the Chair of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, when it was occupied by the beloved and venerated William Bright, so continually a contributor to our own columns. Mr. Denny is Mr. Puller's colleague in letters and Dr. Bright's worthy disciple. His book may claim a place on our shelves beside the great contributions to ecclesiastical history of the Caroline Divines, beside Andrewes and Laud, Mountague, Chillingworth, Cosin, and Jeremy Taylor. The object of Mr. Denny's investigation is to test the claim put forward in the *Satis Cognitum* that Rome has always had, by Divine authority, and has always been admitted by all true Catholics to possess, a real supremacy over all the Churches. [illegible] Denny says, the meaning of that Encyclical is [illegible] itself. Not only is unconditional submission [illegible] but "there is no possibility of any doubt remaining [illegible] of any that the position of the Pope, as care- [illegible] the Divin in the Encyclical, is claimed to be *iure* [illegible] Office *iure ecclesiastico*, and an essential part of [illegible] Christian re[illegible]tution of the Church, so that the Papal [illegible] of the tremend[illegible] existed from the beginning of the [illegible] Church, its perpe[illegible]tion upon which the stability of the [illegible] depend. It is cle[illegible] and the maintenance of its unity [illegible] to that this, and nothing [illegible]t the *Satis Cognitum* required [illegible] whom its author made should be accepted by all to [illegible] any ingenious theory of [illegible]ppeal. There is no room for [illegible] which is embodied in the [illegible]opment; for the doctrine [illegible] terms is declared to have been *Cognitum* in such plain [illegible] belief of every age.' What Pius [illegible] venerable and constant [illegible] *Satis Cognitum*, St. Peter was—th[illegible] is, that, according to [illegible] have been in every age." [illegible] the Roman Bishops

The *Satis Cognitum* appealed to the [illegible] Scriptures, the Fathers, and the history of the early Church. To these, then, says Mr. Denny, the Romanists shall go. He submits the claim to the threefold test. His conclusion is that the monarchical position claimed for the Roman Bishops is in the trinkets of [illegible] consideration of [illegible] other point of great [illegible] and us; and so lo[illegible]aims of St. Leo and their reception Puller's are written, th[illegible] that she has lost none of the glory of her literary heritage.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/papalismtreatise00dennrich

PAPALISM

PAPALISM

A TREATISE

ON THE CLAIMS OF THE PAPACY

AS SET FORTH IN

THE ENCYCLICAL *SATIS COGNITUM*

BY

EDWARD DENNY, M.A.

SOMETIME VICAR OF ST. PETER'S, VAUXHALL,
AND AUTHOR OF 'ANGLICAN ORDERS AND JURISDICTION'

RIVINGTONS
34 *KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN*
LONDON
1912

BX1805
D4

PREFACE

THE closing years of the nineteenth century will be memorable in the annals of Christendom for the growth amongst Christian people of a desire for unity. In various ways was this manifested. Writers in different parts of the world discussed the present position of the Christian religion, so full of sadness to the thoughtful observer. Conferences were held between men belonging to different portions of the Church and also to communities which are separated from its organic unity, all tending to show that the greatest interest was being taken in a question which only apathy could have allowed to be neglected for so long. The words used by the late Archbishop of York (Dr. Maclagan) in a memorable sermon preached at the opening service of the Church Congress at Norwich in 1895, 'Reunion is in the air; on every side we hear the cry for unity'[1] well expressed what was certainly the fact. Leo XIII., the venerable Bishop of Rome, the first of the Patriarchs of the Catholic Church, displayed an earnest desire to put an end to a state of affairs which must be hostile to the religion of Jesus Christ. He addressed the Encyclical *Præclara* to 'all princes and peoples' on the subject of unity, and with special reference to England he wrote a letter *Ad Anglos* urging upon the English people the duty of continual and earnest supplication for the restoration of unity. A revival of interest in the English Church took place in France, where a number of theologians appeared anxious to obtain more accurate knowledge with regard to it, a very important matter, owing to the strange ignorance on the subject which there, as elsewhere on the Continent, prevailed. These Divines were devoting considerable attention to questions affecting it, seeking information from competent sources, instead of being contented to accept without hesitation the erroneous statements which had so long passed

[1] *Official Report of the Church Congress, Norwich*, 1895, p. 5.

current amongst them as accurate. All this necessarily gave much encouragement to all who long for the time when Christians shall be able to present a united front to the irreligion and indifference which are growing day by day in strength. It was hoped that this more satisfactory condition of affairs would ultimately, if encouraged by the various authorities concerned, bring about a change for the better in the relations at present existing between the English Church and the rest of Western Christendom, and thus be a step towards the final reunion of all Christian people.

De Maistre, a French Ultramontane, long ago had pointed out the part which the Church of England seemed destined to play in this great work when he said, 'If ever Christians are to approach one another, as everything invites them to do, it appears that the movement ought to proceed from the Church of England.'[1] Many thought that the time was near at hand when the opportunity would be afforded to the English Church to undertake the work which De Maistre thought it especially competent to perform.

Such was the state of things at the close of 1895. The hopes which were thus filling the minds of many were much strengthened when it became known that Pope Leo had appointed a commission to consider the question of Anglican Orders which the practice of the Roman Church treated as invalid. The recognition of their validity by the Roman authorities was felt by English Churchmen to be an essential preliminary to any steps being taken towards the healing of the breach between the English Church and the Roman Church, inasmuch as the practice of the latter Church is regarded by the members of the former as an unjust aspersion on its true character. Hence the news of the action which it was supposed his Holiness was about to take was a source of much satisfaction to the friends of reunion. Whilst, however, this was so, it was also clear that even if the traditional conservatism of the *Curia*, so powerful a force in preventing changes in the practice of Roman authorities, as well as the inevitable opposition of the English Papists to any recognition of Orders in the continued denial of the validity of which they had a vested interest, was

[1] De Maistre, *Considérations sur la France*, chap. ii.

overcome, with the result that the whole question might be approached by the Roman authorities without any reference to the previous 'decisions' of their tribunals on the subject, so that their validity might be admitted by those authorities (a result which few of those who had studied the history of the past were sanguine enough to anticipate), the grave question of the position of the Papacy would still remain to be considered and dealt with. That had been the cause of the final separation of East and West in the eleventh century, and of the breach between England and Rome in the sixteenth. Since those days the claims of the Papacy had been formulated in the *Vatican Decrees*, and thus the question had become even more complicated, as the language of those *Decrees* appeared *prima facie* to be only capable of the meaning attached thereto by the Ultramontanes. No doubt the situation had been rendered more difficult by those *Decrees*; at the same time it was not forgotten that while it was impossible for Rome to technically rescind those *Decrees*, yet as the Council which was responsible for them had merely adjourned, there still remained a possibility that it could give such explanations of its own *Decrees* as would show that they were not contradictory of Holy Scripture, the consent of the Fathers, and the witness of the history of the Primitive Church. The question therefore presented itself to many, Would the then Pope pave the way for some such a course of action by some authoritative statements in an Encyclical Letter which would show that those *Decrees* were patient of some such explanation? It is true that the previous declarations of his Holiness did not present much encouragement to those who hoped that this course would be adopted. The Encyclical *Præclara* had plainly maintained the Papal claims, whilst the Letter *Ad Anglos* certainly conveyed the impression, to say the least, that what Pope Leo desired was an unconditional submission to those claims. These documents were indeed couched in gracious language, and, as was to be expected coming from the saintly prelate they did, full of charity, but there was not the slightest indication in either of them that any attempt was likely to be made by him to bring about reunion on any other basis. Yet the attitude of the Pope, so unlike that which had been hitherto associated in the minds of

English Churchmen with the Papacy, no doubt did continue to inspire some of those who were taking an especial interest in the question of reunion with the hope that he would thus be led to take advantage of the growing feeling on the subject, a feeling which had found its expression in the sermon of the late Archbishop of York, already quoted, when his Grace said, 'An eminent Pope of the seventeenth century declared that his predecessors in the Papal Chair were responsible for the loss of England. We may well hope that the day will come when another Pope may have the glory and honour of reconciling these two great branches of the Catholic Church.'[1]

Some months passed away when at length on 28th June 1896 the Pope issued the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* which expressed clearly and plainly the terms on which his Holiness considered that reunion should take place. The subject of the Encyclical was unity, and it dealt, as was to be expected, exhaustively with the position of the Papacy in the Church. That was the question which lay at the root of all those breaches of intercommunion between the various portions of the One Body which all lamented, and it was one which, when treating on the subject of unity, the Bishop of Rome, the first Patriarch in the Church, the successor of those whose pretensions in the past had been the cause of the separations which had arisen, could not ignore when addressing an *Encyclical Letter* to the world on a subject which was known to be of the deepest interest to himself personally. A perusal of this document at once shattered whatever hope had been entertained that Pope Leo would take 'the line of explanation,' as it may be called, so that a way might be prepared by which the *Decrees* of the *Vatican Council*, the last official utterance of the Roman Church on the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs, might receive such an official interpretation as would enable a basis to be found for some action in the direction of reunion which, in combination with 'explanations' on both sides, could be accepted by those portions of the Catholic Church which through the usurpations of the Papacy in the past were no longer in communion with the See of Rome as well as by that other large portion thereof which looked to it as its centre.

[1] *Official Report, etc.*, p. 12.

There could be no doubt as to the meaning of Pope Leo's *Encyclical*. All must indeed recognise that in the early parts of it there is a luminous exposition of the nature of the Church, and that there are expressions in it which indicate that ardent love for souls which filled the heart of its illustrious author, but when it comes to the crucial point of all, viz., the statement of the conditions which the Papacy holds to be necessary for bringing about the reunion of Christendom, none could fail to see that one condition, and one only, was so set forth, viz., absolute submission to the claims of Papalism which are expressed in the *Encyclical* in the most definite terms. It is impossible for any one who has read this momentous document to be ignorant of the terms on which the Pope was labouring to bring about his heart's desire. They are simplicity itself—unconditional submission to the supreme authority of the Pope. Further, there is no possibility of any doubt remaining in the minds of any that the position of the Pope as carefully set forth in the *Encyclical* is claimed to be *jure divino* and not *jure ecclesiastico*, and an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, so that the Papal office necessarily existed from the beginning of the Christian religion, its occupants ever discharging the duties of this tremendous position upon which the stability of the Church, its perpetuation, and the maintenance of its unity depend. It is clear that the *Satis Cognitum* required that this, and nothing less, should be accepted by all to whom its author made his appeal. There is no room for any ingenious theory of 'development'; for the doctrine, which is embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* in such plain terms, is declared to have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age.' What Pius X. *is*, that, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, St. Peter *was*, *that* the Roman Bishops have been in every age. The absolute supremacy over the Church that is claimed therein *that* St. Peter exercised, *that* the Roman Pontiff has exercised in every age; as he is the 'Master' of the 'Episcopal College' *now*, so St. Peter *was* the 'Master' of the 'Apostolic College.' So the Roman Pontiffs have from the very first occupied the like position, Pius X., St. Peter, and the Roman Pontiffs in every age being 'Vicars of Christ,' exercising that authority which Christ exercised during His mortal life—authority 'real and sovereign which the whole

community is bound to obey.' The importance of this is obvious. Any portion of the Church which, or any individual who, desires to be united to Rome must *ex animo* accept the position thus definitely described and nothing less. Naturally such claims as these which those to whom Leo XIII. appealed, are so affectionately entreated to embrace, need the gravest consideration. Pope Leo in the *Satis Cognitum* made clear the course which such consideration should pursue, for his Holiness therein appealed to Holy Scripture, the Fathers, the Councils and the history of the Church in the past in support of the allegations which he made as to the position of the Roman Bishop in the Divine Constitution of the Church. By the testimony of the witnesses thus appealed to, let those allegations be tested. The authoritative character of such testimony cannot be denied. Is it such as Leo XIII. affirmed it to be, or does it, on the contrary, prove that Papalism is no part of the original 'deposit,' but an accretion thereon which, like an unnatural monstrosity, may, nay must, be discarded as spoiling its proportions as set forth by the Divine Wisdom? The following pages are designed to afford assistance to those who desire to apply this test, which it will be allowed on all hands must be conclusive as to the validity of the Papalist claims. The many and great obligations I am under to others are manifest especially in the matter of translation of the passages cited in the work. To one of the many writers to whom I am indebted especial acknowledgment is due, viz. the late Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, to whom my obligations are innumerable. Dr. Bright in old Oxford days, now, alas! more than thirty-five years ago, endeavoured to implant in those who were privileged to attend his lectures a desire to study the history of the early Church. The enthusiasm with which he used to make the various episodes in the past live before us could not but be infectious, whilst his accuracy and care to avoid overstatement served as a constant warning to treat evidence fairly on all controversial points. Not the least of the obligations which he placed us under was the ungrudging way in which he devoted his time and learning to the elucidation of any point, however trivial, which his pupils brought before him; help continued long after we left Oxford,

as I personally can testify. The memory of our 'Master' must always be a precious recollection to all those privileged to receive instruction from him, and an incentive, surely, to devote whatever powers we may have to the furtherance of the interests of the Church of which he was such a faithful servant, and for which he laboured so unceasingly to the greater glory of God. It need hardly be said that the investigation undertaken in this work does not in any way claim to be exhaustive. It is merely to exhibit in as concise a manner as possible the evidence on the subject, and to draw the conclusion which such evidence necessitates. That conclusion will be found to be briefly this, viz., that the monarchical position claimed in the *Satis Cognitum* for the Bishops of Rome *jure divino* is in absolute contradiction to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, the witness of the Fathers and Councils, and the evidence afforded by the history of the first age of the Church, and consequently cannot be part of the institution of Christ. It is not without pain that these latter words are written. It can never be other than a cause of sorrow to any who 'labour for peace' to find that any portion, still more the greatest portion, of the Catholic Church advances in these latter days claims untenable in the light of evidence which cannot be gainsaid, because such a course of procedure must hinder that reunion which in the interest of true religion is so much to be desired. Only one thing, indeed, could do more harm to the cause of peace, and that is the betrayal of the truth by the acceptance of such untenable claims, for reunion itself can only be accomplished by the triumph of the Truth. However much the separation of East and West, and the further breach between England and Rome, must be lamented in the face of the growing aggressiveness of unbelief, and the increase of indifference amongst professing Christians, the *Satis Cognitum* affords complete justification of the position which the Eastern and English Churches have been compelled to take up with reference to the Papacy, they have by it taken their stand in this matter on historical truth. Naturally they would desire to be in communion with that See which the ancient custom of the Fathers recognised as the first in honour, rank, and influence; yet when, as a condition precedent to such com-

munion, Christians are called upon to make submission to claims which loyalty to the Divine Constitution of the Church compels them to reject, they are content to be in the same position as Polycrates and the Asiatics in the days of Pope Pius' predecessor, St. Victor, of St. Cyprian and the Africans, of St. Fermilian and the Asiatics in the days of St. Stephen, of St. Meletius of Antioch in the days of yet another of his predecessors, St. Damasus, and many another Eastern saint in those of others. They know full well that as none of these were 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*,' they themselves are still sheltered in the '*edifice*,' safe in the '*fold*,' and subjects of the '*Kingdom*,' though Rome recognises them not. Hence the reassertion in such unambiguous terms of the claims of the Papacy can but have the effect of adding yet another proof of the justice of the attitude they have been forced to maintain in the past with respect to them. A further remark must be made: as the *Satis Cognitum* not only does not show any sign of the abandonment, tacit or otherwise, of the claims of the Papacy, but, on the contrary, solemnly reaffirms them, it can hardly be a matter for surprise that the question of the validity of Anglican Orders should be found to have been treated in a similar manner. When an examination of the *Litteræ Apostolicæ de Ordinationibus Anglicanis* is made, it is found that the old 'decisions' of the Roman tribunals are held to be binding. The 'investigation,' which it was hoped would be conducted entirely untrammelled by the past action of the Roman authorities, is shown to have been practically a mere form, in that there was no admission in its course of even the possibility of going behind the former 'decisions' of the Holy Office which had dealt with the matter. All that appears to have been done was to attempt to support these 'decisions' by reasons the futility of which has been exposed in the *Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliæ ad Litteras Apostolicas Leonis Papæ* XIII., *de ordinationibus Anglicanis. Universis Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Episcopis inscripta*, a document for which all Anglicans must be grateful to its illustrious authors. In fact, the triumph of the *Curia* is manifest in both the *Satis Cognitum* and the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, the latter being, so far as the English Church is con-

cerned, the inevitable sequel of the former, the same principle being embodied in both documents, viz., the determination to adhere at all hazards to the claims made by the Papacy in the past. It cannot be doubted that these two documents have put back the cause of reunion. Great has been the disappointment to many who had hoped, in spite of the warnings afforded by the past history of the Papacy, that the Pontificate of Leo XIII. would see some definite steps taken towards the restoration of that intercommunion between the various portions of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which would be such a powerful assistance both to the complete reunion of all Christian people and to the discharge of the great commission wherewith the Church has been entrusted by her Divine Head. Yet it cannot be that the prayers and efforts of the 'peacemakers' will be useless. Surely, too, the late Archbishop of York in Westminster Abbey, when preaching before the Bishops attending the 'Lambeth Conference' on 30th June 1897, expressed what must continue to be the attitude of those who long that peace should be restored. 'From many sides,' said his Grace, 'and unexpected quarters the growing desire is more frequently and more freely expressed for the drawing together of the separated branches of the Church of Christ; a desire, the existence of which, we may well attribute to the working of the Holy Ghost. It is for us to seek His guidance, with a ready will to follow where He leads or to pause where He bars the way. If only we are a willing people in the day of His power, He will guide us into all the Truth.'[1]

[1] *The Lambeth Conference of* 1897, p. 122. S.P.C.K., 1907.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE, ... v

CHAPTER I

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY FOUNDED BY CHRIST IN HIS CHURCH

Section I. The Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, . . . 1
„ II. The nature of the Church, ... 7
„ III. Did Christ appoint a Visible Head of the Church here on earth? 10
„ IV. To whom did Christ commit the Supreme Authority in His Church? 16
„ V. The Episcopate the continuation of the Apostolate, . 18

CHAPTER II

WAS ST. PETER APPOINTED BY CHRIST TO BE 'THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH'?

Section VI. The Papalist interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' . 27
„ VII. The Patristic interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' . 29
„ VIII. The first appearance of the germ of the Papalist interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' . . . 36
„ IX. What is the true interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church'? 38
„ X. St. Pacian's alleged witness to the Papalist interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' 43
„ XI. St. Cyril of Alexandria's alleged witness to the Papalist interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' . . . 44
„ XII. The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence, . . 50

CHAPTER III

THE PAPALIST DOCTRINE OF THE SUPREMACY OF PETER OVER THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

PAGE

Section XIII. Of the nature of the 'Primacy' alleged to have been conferred by Christ on St. Peter, . . . 52
,, XIV. Origen on 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' 54
,, XV. 'The Gift of the Keys,' 57
,, XVI. The Injunction 'Feed My Lambs, Feed My Sheep,' . 65
,, XVII. The Injunction, 'Confirm thy Brethren,' St. Luke xxii. 32, 71
(*a*) The Papalist interpretation of the text, . 71
(*b*) The Patristic interpretation of the text, . 73
(*c*) The Scriptural testimony against the Papalist interpretation of the text, . . . 77
(*d*) The history of the Papalist interpretation of the text, ... 78

CHAPTER IV

ON THE TITLES BESTOWED UPON ST. PETER

Section XVIII. The title 'The Rock,' 81
,, XIX. The title 'The Keybearer,' 83
,, XX. The title 'Pastor,' 84
,, XXI. On the titles given by St. Chrysostom to St. Peter, . 84
,, XXII. The teaching of St. Chrysostom as to the position of St. Peter, ... 86
,, XXIII. On two statements made by St. Leo and St. Gregory as to the position of St. Peter, ... 94

CHAPTER V

ST. LEO THE GREAT AND THE 'PAPAL PRETENSIONS'

Section XXIV. The alleged Supremacy *jure divino* of the Bishop of Rome over the Church, ... 97
,, XXV. The historical position of St. Leo the Great, . . 98
,, XXVI. The *Edict* of Valentinian III., ... 99
,, XXVII. St. Leo and St. Hilary of Arles, ... 103
,, XXVIII. St. Leo's pretensions not admitted in the East, . . 105

CHAPTER VI

THE INFLUENCE OF FORGERIES ON THE 'PAPAL PRETENSIONS'

Section XXIX. The *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, . . . 109
,, XXX. Forged passages attributed to the Greek Fathers, . 114

CHAPTER XV

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST. CYPRIAN

			PAGE
Section	LXXIII.	*The Root and Womb of the Catholic Church*,	260
„	LXXIV.	*Petri cathedra, ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*,	264
„	LXXV.	The way in which 'communion with the Catholic Church' is maintained,	271
„	LXXVI.	St. Cyprian and the case of Basilides and Martial,	277
„	LXXVII.	St. Cyprian and the controversy as to Rebaptism,	280

CHAPTER XVI

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST. JEROME

Section	LXXVIII.	St. Jerome and St. Damasus,	285
„	LXXIX.	St. Jerome and the position of the Apostolate,	289

CHAPTER XVII

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST AUGUSTINE

Section	LXXX.	The *Principatus Apostolicæ Cathedræ*,	293
„	LXXXI.	St. Augustine and the Donatists,	296
„	LXXXII.	St. Augustine on 'The Unity of the Church,'	299
„	LXXXIII.	St. Augustine and the case of Apiarius,	301
„	LXXXIV.	Did St. Augustine make agreement with the Roman Church the test of being a Catholic?	311
„	LXXXV.	St. Augustine and Pope Zosimus,	320
„	LXXXVI.	St. Augustine and the authority of a General Council,	323

CHAPTER XVIII

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE EASTERNS—PART I

Section	LXXXVII.	'The testimony' of Maximus the Abbot,	326
„	LXXXVIII.	'The testimony' of St. Basil,	331
„	LXXXIX.	'The testimony' of St. Chrysostom,	345
„	XC.	'The testimony' of St. Cyril of Alexandria,	348

CHAPTER XIX

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE EASTERNS—PART II

Section	XCI.	Alleged 'Appeals' of Easterns to Rome,	350
„	XCII.	The 'Appeal' of St. Athanasius,	353
„	XCIII.	The 'Appeal' of St. Chrysostom,	359
„	XCIV.	The 'Appeal' of Flavian of Constantinople,	363
„	XCV.	The 'Appeal' of Theodoret,	369

CHAPTER XX

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE EASTERNS—PART III

			PAGE
Section	XCVI.	'The Pontifical Legate Philip's' assertion at the Council of Ephesus,	372
„	XCVII.	'The pronouncement of the Council of Chalcedon and the voice of the Third Council of Constantinople,'	375
„	XCVIII.	The *Formula of Hormisdas*,	384
„	XCIX.	Liberius and Arianism,	384
„	C.	Zosimus and Pelagianism,	390
„	CI.	Honorius and Monothelitism,	395
„	CII.	How was the *Formula of Hormisdas* accepted by the Easterns?	405
„	CIII.	The Confession of Michael Palæologus,	413
„	CIV.	Conclusion as to 'the testimony' of the Easterns,	417

CHAPTER XXI

'THE MASTER' OF 'THE EPISCOPAL COLLEGE'

Section	CV.	'The power of the Bishops' according to the *Satis Cognitum*,	419
„	CVI.	The relations alleged to exist *jure divino* between the Bishops and the 'Roman Pontiffs,'	422
„	CVII.	Were any powers conferred on Peter apart from the Apostles?	426
„	CVIII.	Did the Apostles receive their Apostolic powers through Peter?	429
„	CIX.	Do Bishops 'separated from Peter and his successors' lose all jurisdiction?	432
„	CX.	Did St. Cyprian make St. Peter and his successors the centre of unity?	433
„	CXI.	Did St. Optatus of Milevis make St. Peter and his successors the centre of unity?	438
„	CXII.	'Subjection and obedience to Peter' the test of being 'in communion with Peter,'	444
„	CXIII.	'The subjection to the Roman Pontiffs of the Bishops collectively as well as individually,'	451

CHAPTER XXII

GENERAL COUNCILS AND 'THE MASTER' OF 'THE EPISCOPAL COLLEGE'

Section	CXIV.	The testimony of the first four Œcumenical Councils,	462
„	CXV.	The statement of Hadrian, P. II., with reference to the judgments of the Roman Pontiff,	463

PAGE

Section CXVI. The 'judgments' of the Roman Pontiff not admitted to be decisive, ... 466
„ CXVII. The witness of the case of Acacius against Hadrian's allegation, ... 467
„ CXVIII. The witness of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, A.D. 869, against Hadrian's allegation, . . 471
„ CXIX. Have sentences been passed upon the Roman Bishops? The case of Vigilius, P., . . . 474
„ CXX. The Bishops of the 'Italian Diocese' and the conduct of Vigilius, ... 481
„ CXXI. Have sentences been pronounced on the Roman Bishop? The case of Honorius, . . . 482
„ CXXII. The statement of Pope Nicholas I. concerning the authority of 'the Apostolic See,' . . . 492

CHAPTER XXIII

'THE EPISCOPAL COLLEGE' SUPERIOR TO THE BISHOP OF ROME

Section CXXIII. The testimony of the Reforming Synods of the West in the fifteenth century, ... 495
„ CXXIV. The witness of the Council of Pisa, A.D. 1409, . 499
„ CXXV. The witness of the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414, . 502
„ CXXVI. The witness of the Council of Basle, A.D. 1431, . 514
„ CXXVII. Conclusion from the evidence afforded by the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle, . . 521
„ CXXVIII. Is 'Papal confirmation' of the Decrees of an Œcumenical Council necessary? 522
„ CXXIX. Did the First Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, receive 'Papal confirmation'? 523
„ CXXX. Did the First Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, receive 'Papal confirmation'? . . . 525
„ CXXXI. Did the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, receive 'Papal confirmation'? 527
„ CXXXII. Did the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, receive 'Papal confirmation'? 528
„ CXXXIII. Did the Second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, receive 'Papal confirmation'? . . . 529
„ CXXXIV. Did the Third Council of Constantinople A.D. 680, receive 'Papal confirmation'? . . . 530
„ CXXXV. Did the Second Council of Nicæa, A.D. 787, receive 'Papal confirmation'? 532
„ CXXXVI. The evidence of the 'subscriptions' of the Bishops to the Acts of a Council, ... 533
„ CXXXVII. The meaning of the confirmation of the Decrees of a Council, ... 534
„ CXXXVIII. The Papalist argument sought to be based on the rejection by the Roman Bishops of the decrees of certain Councils examined, ... 537

PAGE

Section CXXXIX. Why the Church rejected the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 449, ... 538
„ CXL. Why the Church rejected the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, ... 539
„ CXLI. Why the Church rejected the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754, ... 541
„ CXLII. The position of Canon XXVIII. of the Council of Chalcedon, ... 542
„ CXLIII. Pope Gelasius on the authority of the First See, . 543
„ CXLIV. Value of Papalist assertion as to the relation of the Roman Pontiffs to Councils, . . . 546
„ CXLV. Value of the Papalist appeal to Holy Writ as showing the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff over the Episcopal College, ... 547
„ CXLVI. Papalism asserted to be the belief of the Church in every age, ... 549

CHAPTER XXIV

THE PAPALIST CONCEPTION OF THE POSITION OF THE BISHOPS

Section CXLVII. The power of the Bishops 'limited' and 'dependent,' 551
„ CXLVIII. The power of the Roman Bishops 'supreme,' 'universal' and 'independent,' 554
„ CXLIX. The teaching of St. Thomas as to the relative positions of the Bishops and the Pope, . . . 557
„ CL. The teaching of Pope Innocent III. as to the relative positions of the Bishops and the Pope, . . 560
„ CLI. The Bishops according to Papalism 'Vicars' of the Roman Pontiff, ... 561
„ CLII. The actual position of the 'Roman Pontiff' that of 'Universal Bishop,' 568
„ CLIII. The actual position of the Bishops in the Church according to Papalism, ... 586

CHAPTER XXV

CONCLUSION

Section CLIV. The Papalist claims recapitulated, . . . 589
„ CLV. Result of the investigation as to the validity of the Papalist claims, ... 591
„ CLVI. Papalism of necessity must be rejected by Catholics, 593

NOTES

Note 1. On St. Cyprian and the authority of Councils, . . 599
„ 2. On 'Decretals,' 605
„ 3. On St. Peter and the conversion of Cornelius, . . 605
„ 4. On a statement by St. Optatus on 'The Gift of the Keys,' . 606
„ 5. On Tertullian's interpretation of 'The Gift of the Keys,' . 607
„ 6. Some of the Forged Decretals cited by Melchior Cano, . 607

PAGE

Note 7. On the letter of Pelagius, P. II., to the Bishops of Istria, . 607
„ 8. On the 'old text' of St. Chrysostom's *Homilies on the Acts*, 608
„ 9. On the genuineness of St. Chrysostom's *Homilies on the Acts*, 609
„ 10. On Valentinian's statement as to the 'Primacy of the Apostolic See,' 609
„ 11. On the Vicariate of Arles, ... 609
„ 12. On the *Donation of Constantine*, ... 612
„ 13. The spurious character of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* admitted by Roman Catholics, ... 612
„ 14. Forgeries in the interests of Papalism, ... 621
„ 15. On the influence exercised by the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century, . 622
„ 16. On the subjects discussed at the Council of Florence, . 622
„ 17. Isidore and Bessarion after the Council of Florence, . 623
„ 18. On the Gallicans and the Florentine Council, . . 623
„ 19. On the phrase *Sacro approbante Concilio* used at the Vatican Council, ... 623
„ 20. On the meaning of the word προέδροις in Eusebius, *Vita Constant.* iii. c. 12, ... 624
„ 21. On the phrase 'by the grace of God and of the Apostolic See,' 624
„ 22. On the title 'Pope,' 624
„ 23. On the title 'Patriarch,' 626
„ 24. On the extent of the 'Roman Patriarchate,' 626
„ 25. On the Council *in Trullo* and the 'Sardican Canons,' . 629
„ 26. On the interpolation in the Synodal Letter of the Council of Sardica, ... 629
„ 27. On the position of the Bishops of Thessalonica, . . 630
„ 28. Why St. Meletius presided over the Council of Constantinople, ... 631
„ 29. On the distinction between invalid and irregular Ordinations, 632
„ 30. On the forged passages attributed to St. Cyril of Alexandria, etc., ... 633
„ 31. On the statement with reference to St. Cyril of Alexandria in the Synodal letter of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to the Emperor, ... 635
„ 32. St. Basil on Western pride, ... 636
„ 33. On the convocation of the *Latrocinium*, . . . 636
„ 33B. On the 'Legates' of the Middle Ages, . . . 637
„ 34. On the title δευτέρα σύνοδος as applied to the Ephesine Synod at the *Latrocinium*, ... 638
„ 35. Innocent, P. III., on the dignity of the See of Constantinople, 638
„ 36. On the position held by the Latin Patriarch of CP. in the thirteenth century, ... 639
„ 37. On the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians, . . 639
„ 38. On St. Ignatius' statement as to the position of the Church of Rome, ... 642
„ 39. On Funk's allegation as to the reason why every Church must 'resort to' the Roman Church (*St. Irenæus* III., iii. 2), . 643

PAGE

Note 40. On Tertullian's expression *Pontifex Maximus*, . . 645
„ 41. At what date did Milan become a Metropolitical See? . 648
„ 42. What St. Ambrose meant by agreement with the Catholic Bishops, that is, with the Roman Church, . . 649
„ 43. On the 'interpolations' in the treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* of St. Cyprian, ... 651
„ 44. On the tract *De Aleatoribus*, ... 662
„ 45. On St. Augustine's statement *Securus judicat Orbis terrarum*, ... 664
„ 46. On the case of Marcion, ... 664
„ 47. On the meaning of Canon XVII. of the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, A.D. 418, ... 645
„ 48. On P. Innocent I.'s method of advancing his pretensions in the West, ... 666
„ 49. On two passages from St. Augustine sometimes cited in support of Papalism, ... 666
„ 50. On the position of Theophilus of Alexandria, . . 667
„ 51. On the case of Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome, ... 668
„ 52. On Sozomen's statement with reference to St. Julius, P. and St. Athanasius, ... 670
„ 53. On the case of Paul of Samosata, ... 671
„ 54. On the 'Appeal' of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, . . 673
„ 55. On Theodoret's letter to St. Leo the Great, . . . 675
„ 56. On Pope Vitalian and the *Typus*, ... 677
„ 57. On the identical treatment of Pope Agatho's letter and Macarius by the Sixth Synod, ... 677
„ 58. On St. Augustine's statement with reference to the acquittal by Zosimus of Cœlestius and Pelagius, . . . 679
„ 59. On the Seventh Synod and Pope Hadrian's letter to the Emperor, ... 679
„ 60. On Baronius and the condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth Synod, ... 684
„ 61. On the way in which a Council attains Œcumenical authority, ... 685
„ 62. On the Quinquennial Faculties required by Roman Catholic Bishops, ... 690
„ 63. On the *Pallium*, ... 691
„ 64. On the foundation of the Church of the English, . . 695

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Epistola Encyclica—*Satis Cognitum*, . . . 697
Appendix B. Constitutio Prima Dogmatica *De Ecclesia Christi*—edita in sessione quarta Sacrosancti Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani, ... 719

INDEX, ... 725

ERRATA

Page 5, footnote 1, *for* '1299' *read* '1296.'
,, 20, footnote 1, *for* '*Life*' *read* '*Library*.'
,, 22, footnote 8, *for* '281' *read* '581.'
,, 25, footnote 1, *for* '66' *read* '61.'
,, 28, footnote 2, *for* '4' *read* '484.'
,, 47, line 22, *for* 'teachings' *read* 'teaching.'
,, 54, line 31, *for* 'been true, been' *read* 'been true, have been.'
,, 79, line 37, *for* '(Kensick)' *read* '(Kenrick).'
,, 85, line 9, *for* 'prefecturam' *read* 'præfecturam.'
,, 98, footnote 3, *for* '763, 777' *read* '758 *et seq.*'
,, 101, footnote 2, *for* '*op cit*' *read* '*A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*.'
,, 118, footnote 1, *for* '1002' *read* '991.'
,, 138, lines 6, 9, and 14, *for* 'Maximus' *read* 'Marinus.'
,, 166, footnote 3, *for* '1252' *read* '1258.'
,, 182, footnote 2, *for* 'Mansuetudine' *read* 'Mansuetudini.'
,, 200, line 17, *for* 'refuted' *read* 'rejected.'
,, 206, footnote 3, *for* '1171' *read* '1172.'
,, 217, footnote 1, *for* '486' *read* '487.'
,, 217, footnote 3, *for* '1030, 1031' *read* '1031, 1032'; *for* '740' *read* '743'; *for* '790' *read* '795'; *delete* '1028'; *and for* '1266' *read* '1271.'
,, 268, footnote 1, *add* '*vide* also *infra* 1144, footnote 1.'
,, 269, line 15, *for* 'was "original" See' *read* 'was the "original" See.'
,, 318, footnote 2, *for* '1245' *read* '1251.'
,, 320, *for* 'SECTION LXXXVI' *read* 'SECTION LXXXV.'
,, 327, line 31, *for* 'bases' *read* 'basis.'
,, 333, line 12, *for* 'described' *read* 'subscribed.'
,, 337, footnote 1, *for* '*Church*' *read* '*Age*.'
,, 339, line 7, *for* 'confession' *read* 'confusion.'
,, 374, line 41, *for* 'opinions' *read* 'opinion.'
,, 421, line 29, *for* 'arguments' *read* 'argument.'
,, 436, line 37, *for* 'as' *read* 'and.'
,, 505, line 13, *for* 'repealed' *read* 'repeated.'
,, 609, line 4 from bottom, *for* 'Primatical' *read* 'Primatial.'
,, 643, footnote 5, *for* 'Batifol' *read* 'Batiffol.'
,, 657, line 40 and footnote 2, *for* 'Batifol' *read* 'Batiffol.'
,, 687, line 17, *for* '525' *read* '325.'

CHAPTER I

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY FOUNDED BY CHRIST IN HIS CHURCH

SECTION I.—*The Encyclical Satis Cognitum*

1. It is clearly a great advantage when any question as to which there is controversy has to be studied, to have access to documents which will authoritatively set forth the point or points disputed. Especially is this the case with regard to the authority and position which is asserted by the Roman Church to belong *jure divino* to the Bishops of Rome. The real character of the claims thus made is so often apparently ignored or glossed over by interested persons, that there is a very considerable haziness with regard to them prevalent, even amongst those who in other respects are well-instructed Christians; consequently, when confronted with the allegations of Romanists, they too frequently find themselves embarrassed by the confidence with which these allegations are advanced, and unable to judge of the accuracy of the way in which the Papalist position is set out in them. Hence they sometimes are led on to accept that of which had they known at first the real character, they would have been able to submit to the test whether or not it was in accord with the evidence afforded by the facts.

2. When therefore Pope Leo XIII. published to the world the Encyclical, *Satis Cognitum*, the importance of the document can hardly be overestimated. It is nothing less than a comment on, and explanation of, the Decrees on the subject of the position and authority of the Roman Bishop, contained in the Constitutio Dogmatica Prima, *De Ecclesia Christi*,[1] which was promulgated by Pope Pius IX. in the Fourth Session of the *Vatican Council*, held on July 18, 1870, an explanation issued by the one authority that on *Papalist* principles is final, by him who is the 'Teacher of all Christians,' exercising that care for the flock which is his in virtue of his office as Supreme Pastor, speaking *ex cathedrâ* as the successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate. It is thus a document of the highest authority, and must be regarded by all as an exposition of the Roman doctrine as to the Papacy, the accuracy of which it is not possible for any to question.

[1] *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 482-7.

When then such a document has been officially communicated to the whole world, there can be no doubt that it must form a convenient basis for a treatise dealing with the Papal Claims, and that is the course adopted in the following pages.

3. The 'plan' of the work is very simple. The various statements made in the *Satis Cognitum* with regard to the Papacy will be discussed in detail, an endeavour made to set clearly out their real significance, and then evidence will be adduced which will show whether these statements are, or are not, in accord with the great principle embodied in the words of St. Vincent of Lerins in his famous *Commonitorium*: 'In the Catholic Church care is especially to be taken that we hold that what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all: For this indeed is truly Catholic, as the very force and meaning of the word signifies, comprehending as it does in general all truth universally. And this will indeed be ours if we follow Universality, Antiquity, and Consent. We shall follow Universality if we confess that to be the one true faith which the whole Church throughout the world confesses; Antiquity also if we in no respect recede from those tenets which it is manifest that our holy Elders and Fathers held; and Consent, if in this antiquity we follow the definitions and opinions held by all or nearly all the ancient Bishops and Doctors.'[1] This principle is an intelligible one, and will always, when borne in mind, enable any attempt to make the acceptance of any 'novelty' a condition of membership of the Catholic Church to be successfully withstood.

4. The course, therefore, which is adopted in the following pages will have necessarily one or other of these two results. On the one hand, if the various statements in the *Satis Cognitum*, in which is embodied and set forth the official teaching of the Roman Church with regard to the position and authority of the Roman Pontiffs, are found, when tested by this principle, to be in accord with it, there will then be no possibility of doubting that this teaching with regard to such position and authority has formed part of 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,'[2] with the necessary consequence that every 'real and genuine Catholic' is bound to accept it *ex animo* as 'the doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one is able to deviate, his faith and salvation being preserved.'[3] On the other hand, if the result of such

[1] S. Vincent Lirinensis, *Commonitorium Primum adv. Hæreses*, c. ii. Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, Series Latina, vol. l. 640. In this work, when references are given to this edition of the Fathers, the *Series Latina* will be denoted by the letters P.L., the *Series Græca* by the letters P.G.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39. Authorised translation, published by the Art and Book Company, London. All quotations in this treatise are from this translation. The text of the *Satis Cognitum* will be found in Appendix A.

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sessio iv. c. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484. The text of the *Constitutio* is given in Appendix B.

testing be that the statements in question are found to be in no way 'the same doctrine, the same sense, the same judgment,' held by the Church Catholic everywhere from the beginning, 'which, whilst it has in accordance with the laws of growth in the progress of time developed after its own order and unfolded its proportions, has yet remained the same uncorrupted and entire, full and perfect, with no loss of what is proper to it, no variety of definition,'[1] but on the contrary to embody 'novelties,' the introduction and growth of which can be clearly traced, then it is plain that 'a real and genuine Catholic' is compelled to refuse to admit that any such position and authority belong to the Bishops of Rome, and to reject as uncatholic all claims made by them which have such position and authority as their basis.

5. Before proceeding to discuss the various statements made in the *Satis Cognitum* in the manner proposed, there are one or two points suggested by its superscription which call for a few remarks. First, the *Satis Cognitum* is addressed by Leo XIII. to his 'Venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries, in peace and communion with the Apostolic See.' It will be noted that all those 'Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries' who are not 'in communion with the Apostolic See' are pointedly excluded from those to whom the document is addressed. There is no difficulty in discovering the reason for the exclusion; it is plain from what is stated later that it is because those who are in such communion are alone within 'the fold,' and since the object of the *Satis Cognitum* is to forward the efforts which the Pope had already made 'to bring back to the *fold*, placed under the guardianship of Jesus Christ, the Chief Pastor of souls, sheep that have strayed,'[2] it is to these alone that the Pope addresses himself with the object that they may aid in the work.

6. The fact that the Pope does thus limit 'the fold' to that portion of the Church which is 'in communion with the Apostolic See,' whilst it serves to set the keynote for the whole document, serves also to remind thoughtful persons that though 'Patriarchs' are mentioned amongst those to whom the *Satis Cognitum* is addressed, yet there are not included amongst them the occupants of the four Eastern Patriarchal thrones, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. It is no doubt true that certain prelates who are called Patriarchs of these Patriarchates did officially receive the *Satis Cognitum*, as well as those other Bishops of the Latin Church, on whom the Pope has thought fit to confer the title of Patriarch, such as those of Lisbon, and Burgos in Spain,—but who clearly occupy a different position to that of a Patriarch in the ancient meaning of the word—yet who are these Bishops bearing these lofty titles? They are mere occupants of those

[1] S. Vincent Lirinensis, *op. cit.*, c. xxiii.; P.L. l. 667-668.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 3.

titular Sees which have been erected by Papal authority within the limits of jurisdiction of the legitimate holders of the ancient Catholic Sees, and who, consequently, unless the Papalist contentions with regard to the Papacy be true, as is of course assumed by Leo XIII., are intruders destitute of all 'mission' and 'jurisdiction.'

7. It is itself significant that the legitimate occupants of the four Eastern Patriarchal thrones must be on Papal principles excluded from 'the fold,' because they do not admit the monarchical position claimed by the Bishops of Rome to be part of the Divine Constitution of the Church; whether they are right or wrong in so doing is not here the question, inasmuch as the answer to such a question must depend upon the result of the testing to which it is proposed in the following pages to submit the Papalist claims, but note should be taken of the fact; it is one that is often forgotten or ignored, yet it must be admitted that it is proof that Anglicans do not stand alone in repudiating those claims. This rejection by these illustrious Bishops has, it may be noted, considerable evidential value as to the validity of the claim so rejected, inasmuch as it is the action of 'the unchanging East,' a rejection which it is well to remember has been reaffirmed so recently as August 1895 in an *Encyclical Patriarchal and Synodical Letter*[1] addressed by the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Metropolitans. Bishops, Clergy, and orthodox Laity, 'of the most Holy, Apostolic, and Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople,' in reply to the statements made by Pope Leo XIII. in the Encyclical *Præclara* addressed to 'all princes and peoples' on the 24th April 1895.

8. Secondly, it will be noticed that in this superscription the See of Rome is designated by the title 'The Apostolic See.' It is no doubt true that under certain circumstances such a designation might be legitimately used to denote the See of Rome as it might any See which can trace its foundation to any of the Apostles. It was so used by the Council of Ephesus when describing the course of action adopted by Celestine, the then occupant of the Roman See,[2] which was before that Council, as a title by which that See might be specified and at the same time honour done to it by recalling its Apostolic origin, but the context in which this title is here used in the *Satis Cognitum* precludes this meaning being intended. It has been already noted that the *Satis Cognitum* is addressed to certain persons who are distinguished from all others who claim to hold the same offices as those which they are described as holding, by the fact that they are 'in communion with the Apostolic See'; therefore it follows that 'the Apostolic See' is a title to

[1] This *Encyclical* has been printed with an English translation by the Very Reverend Archimandrite Eustathius Metallinos, under the title of *The Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union*, Manchester, 1896.

[2] *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, J. Dom Mansi, iv. 1299.

which the See of Rome alone is entitled, otherwise the question would at once arise as to which Apostolic See was intended, and thus from the Papalist point of view such a designation would not sufficiently clearly denote that See communion with which is an essential condition to being within 'the fold.'

9. This use of the title is in fact in strict accordance with the Roman practice, which has endeavoured to claim it as the unique privilege of the Roman See with the object of supporting the Papalist contention that the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church is inherent *jure divino* in that See. Such jurisdiction, indeed, having alone any right to be described as 'Apostolical,' in that the Bishops of that See are the 'legitimate successors' of the Apostle St. Peter, and as such possess 'by the institution of Christ' that jurisdiction which that Apostle exercised after the Ascension, the power of the other Apostles, which they derived through union with their 'Master,' to whom they were subject, being personal, ceasing with their deaths, and incapable of being transmitted to the occupant of any See which they may have founded.

10. This practice affords an excellent example of the way in which the Bishops of Rome have arrogated to themselves the sole right to make use of titles which previously were much more widely applied, as being applicable to themselves alone as the 'legitimate successors' of St. Peter. Formerly many Sees were called Apostolic: especially was this the case with regard to all Churches which could claim Apostolic foundation. Tertullian, for instance, says: 'Come now, thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, go through the Apostolical Churches in which the very seats of the Apostles at this very day do preside in their own places; in which their own authentic writings are read speaking with the voice of each and making the face of each present to the eye: Is Archaia near to thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel to Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy thou hast Rome, where we also' (*i.e.* the African Church to which the writer belonged) 'have an authority at hand.'[1] In this passage Tertullian not only applies the title to several other churches besides that of Rome, but he does so in the same connection without making any distinction between the sense in which he uses it of the former and that in which he applies it to the latter; not only is this the case, but his whole argument clearly shows that he is entirely ignorant that it was, as on Papalist principles it is, applicable to the latter in any sense in which it was not equally applicable to the former.

[1] Tertullian, *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cap. xxxvi.; P.L. ii. 49. On the foundation of the African Church from Rome, *vide infra*, n. ~~1299~~ 1296

11. St. Augustine makes a like use of the title. 'The Christian society,' he says, 'is diffused by propagation all over the world by the Apostolic Sees and the succession of Bishops in them.'[1] So again, 'the universal Church continued from the Apostolic Sees by certain succession down to the present Bishops.'[2] In fact, this usage of the title was so marked in the writings of St. Augustine that Pope Pelagius I. especially remarks, as being the teaching of the 'most blessed Augustine,' that he was mindful of the judgment of the Lord by which He set the foundation of the Church on the Apostolic Sees, and declares that whosoever detaches himself from the authority and communion of the prelates of those Sees is in schism, and proves that there is no other Church save that which is solidly rooted in the Pontiffs of the Apostolic Sees.[3]

12. Later the same usage is found. At the first Session of the Seventh Œcumenical Council, Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, made an application to be received into the communion of the Catholic Church in the following terms:—'I, Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, purposing to be united to Adrian, most holy Pope of Elder Rome, and to Tarasius, most blessed Patriarch, and to the most holy Apostolic Sees, that is of Alexandria, Antioch, and the holy City, and also to all orthodox High Priests and Priests, make this my written confession and offer it to you who have received the power from Apostolic authority.'[4] But although this title was thus applied to Sees which could trace their foundation to an Apostle, yet it was by no means confined to this usage, it being, in fact, used of any Bishopric as signifying the Apostolic office of a Bishop, as, for example, by St. Paulinus of Nola, of Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste.[5] Hence Thomassin says: 'It must be confessed that the name of Pope, of Apostle, of Apostolic Prelate, of Apostolic See, was still common to all Bishops even during the three centuries which elapsed from the reign of Clovis to the Empire of Charlemagne.'[6]

13. No doubt in the West Rome was materially assisted in the ultimate success of her efforts to arrogate to herself, as her unique prerogative, this title by the circumstance that she alone in Western Christendom could boast of Apostolic foundation, whereas in the East, on the other hand, there were many Sees which shared that privilege. She would thus quite naturally come to be regarded by Westerns as '*the* Apostolic See' in distinction from the other Sees in the West, and the fact forgotten that there were other Sees in the Church which had an

[1] S. Aug., *Ep. ad Fratres Madurens.* Ep. cxxxii. 3; P.L. xxxiii. 1028.
[2] *Contra Faustum Manichæum*, lib. xxviii. cap. ii.; P.L. xlii. 485.
[3] Pelagius, P. I., *Ep. ad Episcopos Tusciæ*, Ep. vii.; P.L. lix. 598.
[4] Mansi, xii. 1008.
[5] S. Paulinus, *Ep. ad Alypium*, iii. 1; P.L. lxi. 162.
[6] Thomassin, *De l'ancienne discipline de l'église*, Pt. i. lib. i., chap. iv. p. 39.

equal right to that honourable appellation, a condition of affairs materially assisted by the fact that these Sees were in the East.

Section II.—*The Nature of the Church.*

14. The earlier portion of the *Satis Cognitum* contains a description of the nature of the Church. Premising that the reason why the Son of God became Incarnate is, 'that nothing can be communicated amongst men save by means of external things,'[1] and that the divine mission of the Incarnate God should be perpetuated to the end of time, the *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to state that He commissioned the Apostles and their successors to the end of time to teach and rule all nations. He ordered the nations to accept their teaching and to obey their authority. But this correlation of rights and duties in the Christian commonwealth not only could not have been made permanent, but could not even have been initiated except through the senses, which are of all things the 'messengers and interpreters.' Therefore the Church thus begotten is called in Holy Writ a *body* and even the body of Christ (1 Cor. xiii. 17), 'and precisely because it is a body, is the Church visible; and because it is the body of Christ is it living and energising.'[2] Hence those who imagine that the Church is invisible or a human institution 'are in grievous and pernicious error.' Moreover, the Church as the mystical Body of Christ must remain to the end of time as it was founded, 'the union consequently of visible and invisible elements, because it harmonises with the natural order and by God's will belongs to the very essence of the Church, and must necessarily remain so long as the Church itself shall continue.'

15. Christ, the Lord, having instituted and formed the Church, if men desire to know what its nature is, the main thing is to see what Christ wished and what in fact He did, and therefore it is the Unity of the Church which must be principally considered, and this is consequently the subject of the *Satis Cognitum*. Christ willed that His Church should be one, and instituted it to be 'unique and indivisible after that manner which in the symbol of our faith we profess, I believe in one Church.'[3] Hence Christ, speaking of this 'mystical edifice, mentions only one Church which He calls *His own, I will build my Church*; any other Church except this one, since it has not been founded by Christ, cannot be the true Church,' and this is evident from the purpose of the Divine Founder, which was that He might transmit to it the same mission and mandate which He received from the Father, and that they should be perpetuated throughout all ages, so 'it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and at all times.' Of this Church the Son of God decreed that it should be 'His mystical body with which He

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 4. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 5. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

should be united as the Head after the manner of the human body which He assumed, to which the natural head is physiologically united.' This body, necessarily one, is 'compacted and fitly joined together' and is a living body 'the members of which cannot possibly live unless united to the head and drawing from it their vital force.' If besides the one Church men wish to set up another, 'another head like to Christ must be invented, that is, another Christ.'[1]

16. He who made this one Church 'gave it unity, that is, He made it such that all who are to belong to it must be united by the closest bonds, so as to form one society, one kingdom, one body,' a unity so perfect that it might in some measure shadow forth the union between Him and His Father. As 'agreement and union of minds is the necessary foundation of this perfect concord amongst men,' 'He ordained in His Church *Unity of Faith*.'[2] This Unity of Faith is preserved by means ordained by Christ. Christ proved His Divinity and the divine origin of His mission by His miracles. He was the supreme Teacher, commanding with absolute authority that the assent of faith should be given to His teaching, and promising eternal rewards to those who believe, and eternal punishment to those who do not. 'When about to ascend into heaven, He sends His Apostles in virtue of the same power by which He had been sent from the Father; and He charges them to spread abroad and propagate His teaching,' furnishing them with the means of carrying out the mission by sending them the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, to remain with them for ever, so that they became ambassadors of Christ Himself, whom those whom they taught were bound to obey. And as 'the apostolic mission was not destined to die with the Apostles themselves, or to come to an end in the course of time, since it was intended for the people at large, and instituted for the salvation of the human race,' 'it was consequently provided by God that the *Magisterium* [or teaching authority] instituted by Jesus Christ should not end with the life of the Apostles, but should be perpetuated.' Therefore the Apostles consecrated Bishops to succeed them, whom they required to ordain others, endowing them with like authority and confiding to them the office and mission of teaching. 'Wherefore as Christ was sent by God and the Apostles by Christ, so the bishops and those who succeeded them were sent by the Apostles.'[3]

17. And as the mission of teaching whatever Christ had taught necessarily remains perpetual and immutable, so on the other hand it is also necessary that the duty of accepting and professing all their doctrine should likewise be perpetual and immutable. Hence the condemnation by the Church of heretics who were held by the Fathers to be outside Catholic communion and alien from the Church. This Unity of Faith is then preserved by means of the Episcopal succession,

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 8 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.*, p. 12. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

through which, as St. Irenæus says, 'the doctrine of the Apostles, . . . the true faith is known to us' (*Contra Hæreses*, lib. iv. cap. 33, n. 8), and Tertullian: 'It is therefore clear that all doctrine which agrees with that of the Apostolic Churches,—the matrices and original centres of the faith, must be looked upon as the truth, holding without hesitation that the Church received it from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God . . . we are in communion with the Apostolic Churches, and by the very fact that they agree amongst themselves, we have a testimony of the truth (*De Præscrip* , cap. xxxi.).'[1] Christ having thus instituted in 'the Church a *living*, *authoritative*, and *permanent Magisterium*,' 'as often, therefore, as it is declared on the authority of this teaching that this or that is contained in the deposit of divine revelation, it must be believed by every one as true,' he indeed 'who dissents even in one point from divinely revealed truth absolutely rejects all faith, since he thereby refuses to honour God as the supreme truth and the *formal motive of faith*.'[2]

18. But the Church has not only the office of guarding Christian doctrine and propagating it in its integrity and purity; in it continues the mission of the Saviour for ever; 'it alone supplies those means of salvation which accord with the ordinary counsels of Providence.' And as the one faith was delivered by Jesus Christ to the magisterium [the teaching authority of the Church], so also 'the power of performing and administering the divine mysteries, together with the authority of ruling and governing, was not bestowed by God on all Christians indiscriminately, but on certain chosen persons,' 'the Apostles and their legitimate successors.'[3] 'Wherefore Jesus Christ bade all men, present and future, follow Him as their leader and Saviour; and this not merely as individuals but as forming a society organised and united in mind.' Consequently 'He established in the Church all those principles which necessarily tend to make organised human societies, and through which they attain the perfection proper to each. That is, in it (the Church) all who wished to be sons of God by adoption might attain the perfection demanded by their high calling, and might obtain salvation.' 'The Church therefore is man's guide to whatever pertains to Heaven.'[4] God made the Church more perfect than any other society, for 'it is *divine* in its origin and *supernatural* in its end, and in the means proximately adapted to the attainment of that end; but it is a *human* community inasmuch as it is composed of men'; and so it is called 'the *House of God*, the *city placed upon the mountain*,' 'the *fold*,' 'the *kingdom which God has raised up*, and which will *stand for ever*,' and 'the *Body of Christ*—that is, of course, His mystical body, but a body living and duly organised and composed of many members; members indeed which have not all the same

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 15 *sq.*
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 19 *sq.*
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 22 *sq.*
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

functions, but which, united one to the other, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the head.'[1] As it is necessary that any true and perfect human society must be governed by a supreme authority, Christ gave to His Church a supreme authority to which all Christians must render obedience. 'For this reason, as the unity of the faith is of necessity required for the unity of the Church, inasmuch as it is the *body of the faithful*, so also for this same unity, inasmuch as the Church is a divinely constituted society, unity of government, which affects and involves *unity of communion*, is necessary *jure divino*,'[2] hence 'men can fall away from the Unity of the Church by schism as well as by heresy.'[3] Such is a brief epitome of the earlier portion of the *Satis Cognitum*, and so far as the truths thus expounded are concerned, they form part of the faith of all who believe in One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, visible and not invisible, divine and not human in its origin and mission.

Section III.—*Did Christ appoint a Visible Head of the Church here on Earth?*

19. The *Satis Cognitum* then proceeds to the consideration of a most important subject, viz. the nature of the supreme authority which all Christians are bound to obey. As will be seen, it is in fact the main point with which the *Satis Cognitum* is concerned and which it is intended to lay down authoritatively for the guidance of all men. 'Certainly,' the *Satis Cognitum* says, 'Christ is a King for ever; and though invisible, He continues unto the end of time to govern and guard His Church from heaven. But since He willed that His kingdom should be visible He was obliged [*debuit*] when He ascended into Heaven, to designate a vicegerent on earth.'[4] Now, this obligation to appoint a vicegerent on earth which is here alleged to be incumbent on Christ as the invisible King of the Church, implies that, according to the will of God, it is essential that there should be a single individual who should be the head of the Church Militant here on earth. To be so essential it would be necessary that the Church on earth should be a separate entity, entire and complete in itself, and which consequently requires to possess a head to itself. But the contrary is the fact. The Church Militant here on earth is but a portion, and that the smallest, of a great whole, made up of the Church Triumphant, the Church Expectant, together with itself. Hence it is obvious that *primâ facie* the appointment of a visible head for the portion of the One Church here on earth is inconsistent with the unity of the Church, for that is One Body, and can therefore have but one Head, just as the human body can possess but one head. Such a

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 23 *sq.*
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

condition of things would involve the consequence that the Church Militant is another Church separate from the divinely constituted Society, and thus a mere human invention.

20. But men are not left to draw this conclusion for themselves, as the *Satis Cognitum* rightly says, 'The nature of this supreme authority' 'can be ascertained only by finding out what was the evident and positive will of Christ.'[1] That will is revealed to man in the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the Church in all ages. If the New Testament be examined not only will there not be found anything with reference to the necessity, and consequent appointment by Christ, of a visible head of that portion of the Church which is on earth, but there is contained therein much which is incompatible with any such necessity.

21. St. Paul, who uses the image of the body to signify the Church, clearly lays down that all those Christians who are on earth are members of the one body which has Christ for its Head. He says of Christ, He is 'the Head from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure of every part maketh increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love.'[2] 'The God of our Lord Jesus Christ the Father of Glory hath put all things beneath His feet and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church which is His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.'[3] 'As the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also is Christ,' 'Now ye are the Body of Christ and members in particular.'[4] St. Paul is then careful to enumerate certain members of this One Body, placing in the '*first*' place the 'Apostles';[5] he makes no mention of any visible head: had one been appointed by Christ he would have been of necessity compelled to mention here the fact, as otherwise he would convey to those to whom he wrote the entirely erroneous impression that no 'vicegerent of Christ' had been appointed by Him, and that the 'Apostles' holding the first place in the Body were all members under the one Head Whom he had just named.

22. The Unity of the Body is thus made by St. Paul to consist in the union of the members thereof with the Head Who is Christ, its life being derived from Him: and this is accomplished through the instrumentality of certain appointed means, the Sacraments, by means of which the union between the Head and the members is brought about and sustained. In the first instance, by Baptism we are made His members, for 'by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 25.
[2] Ephesians iv. 15-16.
[3] *Ibid.*, i. 17, 22-23.
[4] 1 Cor. xii 12, 27.
[5] 1 Cor. xii. 28.

been all made to drink into one Spirit.'[1] And thus, as St. Hilary says, 'The Apostle teacheth from the nature of the Sacraments that this is the unity of the faithful, writing to the Galatians, as many as have been baptized unto Christ have put on Christ, there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus [Gal. iii. 27, 28]. But that in so great a variety of nations, conditions, sexes they are one, is this from consent of the will or from the unity of the Sacrament in that they have both one baptism and all have put on one Christ? What has concord of minds to do here, seeing they are thereby one, that by nature of one Baptism they are clothed with one Christ?'[2]

23. The unity thus initiated is both strengthened and sustained by means of the 'Bread of life.' for 'we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread'[3]—and so St. Cyril says: 'In order . . . that we ourselves, too, although differing both in souls and bodies, through that which is personal to each, might come together and be commingled into an unity with God and one another, the Only Begotten contrived a way devised through the wisdom befitting Him, and through the counsel of the Father. For by One Body, His Own, blessing through the Mystical Communion those who believe in Him, He makes us incorporate with Himself and with one another. For who should separate and remove from a natural oneness with one another, those who through the One Holy Body are bound up into oneness with Christ? For if we all partake of the One Bread we are all made one Body, for Christ cannot be divided, Wherefore the Church is called also the Body of Christ, and we, too, "are members in particular," according to the mind of Paul. For we all, being united by One Christ through the Holy Body, in that we have received in our own bodies Him, the One and Indivisible, owe our members more to Him than to ourselves. But that by partaking of the Holy Flesh we obtain that union with Christ which is in a manner bodily, Paul will testify, speaking of "the mystery of godliness which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, but is now revealed unto His holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be co-heirs and concorporate and co-partakers of His promise in Christ" [Eph. iii. 3-5]. But if we are all concorporate with one another in Christ, and not only with one another, but with Himself, in that He is in us through His Own Flesh, how are we not clearly one, both with each other and with Christ? For Christ is the bond of oneness, being in One, God and Man. But as to His Oneness in Spirit, we all having received One and the same Holy Spirit, are in a moment mingled with each other and with God. For although in us, being many, Christ giveth the Father's and His Own Spirit to dwell in each of us, yet He

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 13.
[2] S. Hilar., *De Trinitate*, viii. 8; P.L. x. 242.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 17.

is One and Indivisible, holding together in oneness through Himself, the spirits which in their several existences are severed from oneness, and making all to appear as one in Himself. For as the power of the Holy Flesh of Christ maketh those concorporate in whom It is, in like way, I deem, the One Indivisible Spirit of God, dwelling in all bringeth all together in the spiritual unity. . . . For since One Spirit dwelleth in us, God the One Father of all will be in us through the Son, holding in oneness, both to one another and to Himself whosoever partaketh of the Spirit.'[1] The members thus 'holding the Head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment, ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.'[2]

24. St. Paul throughout his teaching as to the Unity of the Body, which is the Church, never in the remotest way alludes to any necessity for there being a visible head to that portion of the mystical Christ which is here on earth, or to any such separation existing between the members of the Body who have departed out this life and those who still abiding on earth constitute the Church Militant as would constitute the latter a separate entity, and so requiring such a visible head. On the contrary, he lays down that all who are in Union with Christ 'holding the Head' are the One Body, language which is indeed inconsistent with any idea that such a visible head had been of necessity appointed by Christ, as it would otherwise have been inconceivable that he should have framed his argument as he does, not only without any reference to such an appointment, but also in such a manner as to exclude it. St. Augustine clearly expresses the truth as taught by the Apostle when he says: 'Since the whole Christ is made up of the Head and the Body, the Head is our Saviour Himself, Who suffered under Pontius Pilate, Who now after He is risen from the dead sitteth at the right hand of God, but His Body is the Church, not this Church or that, but the Church scattered over all the world; nor that only which exists amongst men now living, for those also belong to it who were before us, and who are to be after us to the end of the world. For the whole Church made up of all the faithful, because all the faithful are members of Christ, has its Head situate in the heavens which governs the body; though it is separated from their sight, yet it is bound to them by love.'[3]

25. Perhaps in answer to what has been here said it may be alleged that it is true that Christ is the invisible Head of the Church and that the *Satis Cognitum* admits this, only postulating a vicegerent on earth who should rule in His name. But is this any answer? The *Satis Cognitum* quotes in support of this position St. Thomas as

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *In Joan.* xvii. 21; lib. xi. cap. xi.; P.G. lxxiv. 560-561.
[2] Col. ii. 19.
[3] S. Aug., *Enarratio in Psalm.* lvi. 1; P.L. xxxvi. 662.

follows: 'Should any one say that Christ is the one head and one shepherd, the one spouse of the One Church, he does not give an adequate reply. It is clear, indeed, that Christ is the author of grace in the Sacraments of the Church; it is Christ Himself Who baptizes; it is He Who forgives sins; it is He Who is the true Priest Who hath offered Himself on the Altar of the Cross, and it is by His power that His Body is daily consecrated upon the Altar; and, still, because He was not to be visibly present to all the Faithful, He made choice of ministers through whom the aforesaid Sacraments should be dispensed to the Faithful, as said above (cap. 74).' 'For the same reason, therefore, because He was about to withdraw His visible presence from the Church, it was necessary that He should appoint some one in His place, to have charge of the Universal Church. Hence before His Ascension He said to Peter, Feed My sheep (St. Thomas, *Contra Gentiles*, lib. iv. cap. 76).' [1]

26. In considering this argument of St. Thomas in support of his contention that it was necessary for Christ to appoint a visible Head of the Church, it is of the greatest importance to remember St. Thomas's position. He wrote at a time when Papalism had become the belief of the Roman Church, when the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*[2] and other notorious forgeries in the interests of Papalism were universally held in the West to be genuine; there can be no doubt therefore that St. Thomas was necessarily influenced by these facts, and so when he asserts that it is 'not an adequate reply to say that Christ is the one head, etc.,' the 'Angelic Doctor' is simply laying down the accepted belief of his day of the Roman Church on the subject which he held to be *de fide*, and consequently considered that it was incumbent upon him to support by some argument. It is clearly useless to appeal to the great authority of St. Thomas in a matter with regard to which he had no option but to defend teaching as to the Catholicity of which he could have no doubt owing to the circumstances of his age and the erroneous *data* which he had before him.[3]

27. Next as to the contention itself. It is certainly irreconcilable with the language of the Sacred Scriptures. Our Lord speaks of Himself as the 'One Shepherd' of the 'One Flock';[4] and St. Peter calls Him 'the Shepherd and Bishop'[5] of the souls of Christians clearly in the sense of the One Shepherd of the One Flock: whilst St. Paul's argument as to the relation of the Body, the Church,[6] to the Head, Jesus Christ, is, as has been seen,[6] inconsistent with the idea of the appointment of a single individual with whom, as supreme Pastor and

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 25.
[2] On the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, *vide infra*, nn. 229 *et seq.*
[3] On the way in which St. Thomas was deceived by forgeries, *vide infra*, n. 247.
[4] St. John x. 16. [5] 1 St. Peter ii. 25. [6] *Vide supra*, nn. 22 *sq.*

visible Head of the Church, it would be necessary that all Christians should be in communion in order that the unity of the One Flock might be maintained.[1] The significance of this is great. It would have been impossible for the Apostle in treating of the subject of the Unity of the Church to have omitted to lay down definitely and clearly such a condition as this. He omitted to do so; and, moreover, used language which, on the hypothesis that the Papal doctrine be true, was most misleading, and this with regard to a matter of such vital importance in that for any member of the Church to ignore it, would result in his being placed 'outside the edifice,' 'separated from the fold,' and 'exiled from the kingdom.' If Papalism were true, it would have been impossible for the great Apostle to have been so remiss or worse; if a visible Head had been appointed by the institution of Christ, it would have been incredible that such an appointment should not have been named by him when writing of the position which Christ holds as the Head of the Church, and the relationship of the 'vicegerent' to the Christ duly pointed out, nor would it have been possible for him to place in the first rank of the ministry of the Church 'the Apostles,' not only in the passage already referred to, but in the place where he names the ministry which is divinely ordained 'for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the love of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'[2] It is obvious that if one of the Apostolic College had been appointed visible head of the Church on earth, St. Paul must have named him in this connection, so that the vital distinction between the Apostolate and their 'Master' should not be in effect denied, and thus the people misled with regard to a 'doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation.'[3]

28. Further, that St. Paul, *the* Apostle, as he is designated by the Fathers, for example, by St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom,[4] was entirely ignorant of the existence in the Church of any office superior to that which he held himself, is shown not only by the argument on which comment has already been made, but by the fact that had there been a 'vicegerent' of Christ, possessing 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,'[5] communion with whom is an essential condition to the retention of the right and power of ruling by Bishops and consequently by the Apostles to whom the

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

[2] *Ephes.* iv. 12-13.

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, *ubi supra*.

[4] S. Aug., *Contra duas Epist. Pelag.*, lib. ii. c. 5; P. L. xliv. 589. 'So when Apostle is said, if it be not expressed what Apostle, none is understood save Paul': St. Chrysost., *Hom.* lv. *in Act. Apost.*; P.G. lx. 383. 'When you say Apostle, at once think of him [*i.e.* Paul] just as when they say Baptist, think of John.'

[5] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.

Bishops succeed, and obedience to whom as 'Master' exercising the same authority over the Apostles as Christ had exercised when on earth he, as one of them, would have been bound to render, he must have been careful to recognise the position of this supreme authority both by his words when he set forth the authority which he claimed to possess, and by his actions as one who was in subjection to such supreme authority, whereas on the contrary both the language referred to and his actions are utterly irreconcilable[1] with the hypothesis that any such unique monarchical office existed in the Church in his 'age,' which it must have done if Papalism were true.

29. Fourthly, it is to be noted that St. Thomas assumes that the sole way in which it is possible for Christ to exercise the power of government, now that He has withdrawn His visible presence from amongst men, is by committing that 'power which He exercised during His life' to a single individual to be exercised by him and his successors, who would be each in succession His 'Vicar,' visible to all the faithful. But it is clearly a pure assumption thus to lay down that our Lord had no option but to appoint this particular method of exercising His authority here on earth; no reason can be assigned why He should be thus necessarily limited in His power in this matter, and as a matter of fact it will be seen that He thought fit to make choice of another and different mode by which He should carry on this part of His work.—It may be added that the text which St. Thomas quotes, St. John xxi. 15 *sq.*, in proof of his assertion is otherwise interpreted by the majority of the Fathers,[2] and is thus useless as a basis on which to rest a statement which is irreconcilable with the actual facts.

Section IV.—*To whom did Christ commit the Supreme Authority in His Church?*

30. The Papalist allegation with regard to the supreme authority ordained by Christ in His Church is then disproved by the evidence. An investigation into the witness afforded by the New Testament will reveal the means which Christ as the King of the Kingdom of God did actually ordain in order that His supreme authority should be exercised in the Church on earth. Of Himself as Man He declared, 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth,'[3] being 'delivered unto Him by His Father.'[4] As God of One Substance with the Father our Lord possessed essentially the supreme power; as Man He possessed that supreme power by delegation from His Father. It is this latter to which He refers in the text just quoted and which He in turn committed, unimpaired and unrestricted, in all its fulness in the commission, 'As

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 31, 910 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 132 *et seq.*
[3] St. Matthew xxviii. 18.
[4] *Ibid.*, xi. 27.

My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.'[1] His mission from the Father is an abiding one, and the power which He as Son of Man ever possesses by this mission, He delegates to the Apostles. They were not the recipients of some new commission deriving its origin, power, and extent from Himself.[2]

31. The commission is exhaustive in its terms, there being no clause by which any portion of the power and authority which He possessed as Son of Man was excluded from the grant then made. Those who thus received this authority held it by the very terms of the grant *in solidum*,[3] becoming thereby co-rulers of the whole Church. As St. Chrysostom says, 'The Apostles were designated rulers (ἄρχοντες), rulers who received not nations and particular cities, but all being entrusted with the world in common (πάντες κοινῇ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐμπιστευθέντες),'[4] 'every one of them being made by Christ a Bishop of the whole world.'[5] Our Lord therefore by His own direct appointment is represented not by an individual but by the Apostolic College, the Apostolate being thus the instrument which He ordained as that by which He, the invisible King, exercises His supreme Power. It is in accordance with this fact that St. Paul declares that, in virtue of the Apostolic office which he held, 'not of men, neither by man but by Jesus Christ and God the Father,'[6] he had 'the care of all the Churches,'[7] and exercised as Vicar of Christ the power of government both in inflicting the punishment of excommunication on the incestuous Corinthian[8] and in declaring that out of compassion he could readmit him into the bosom of the Church out of which he had been cast.[9] This power he delegated to others[10] to be exercised by them without reference to any third party, and so far from recognising any single individual as having been entrusted by Christ with the supreme power over the Church as its Visible Head, and so his 'Master' as of the rest of the Apostolic College, having that 'real and sovereign authority' over him which 'Christ exercised during His mortal life,' he withstood a fellow Apostle who 'was in the Lord before him' when the occasion required.[11]

32. Moreover, when the Acts of the Apostles is examined there is no reference, explicit or implicit, to any visible Head of the Church, who as Supreme Pastor governed the Church, a fact which on Papalist principles is inexplicable, for the Acts contains the history of the early days of the Church after the day of Pentecost, and if Christ had

[1] St. John xx. 21.

[2] This is clear from the words used by our Lord; cp. Westcott, *in loc.*, *The Speaker's Commentary*, New Testament, vol. ii. p. 298.

[3] Cp. *infra*, n. 36.

[4] S. Joan. Chrysost., *De Utilit. Lectionis Scripturarum in Princip. Actorum*, iii. § 4. P.G. li. 93.

[5] Soto *in Senten.* iv. p. 548.

[6] Gal. i. 1.

[7] 2 Cor. xi. 28.

[8] 1 Cor. v. 3 *sq.*

[9] 2 Cor. ii. 10.

[10] 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2; Titus i. 5.

[11] Galatians, ii. 11.

appointed such a visible head, then, of all times, when Christ had just withdrawn His visible presence, would His Vicar have been required to discharge the duties of the responsible office which had been entrusted to him. No such reference is likewise to be found in the Epistles, whilst on the other hand passages abound which plainly prove that there were in the Church ministers of Christ, stewards of the mysteries of God, acting 'in Christ's stead,' a fact which in itself is conclusive against the argument which St. Thomas seeks to draw from the admitted truth that Christ did appoint ministers of the Sacraments to exercise His priestly office, and that, therefore, it was necessary that He should also, and did, appoint a single individual as His representative to exercise the power of government which is His as King. For the existence of the former is clearly established in these writings, and the latter is not even mentioned, a condition of things simply inconceivable on the hypothesis, inasmuch as references to the fact that Christ was represented in His office as King by His divinely-appointed Vicar, possessing by His appointment the supreme power of jurisdiction to which all Christians would be bound to render obedience, and instances of the exercise of such power, could not fail to be recorded in the documents dealing with the history of the Church any more than the fact that Christ is represented in His Priestly and Prophetical offices by those whom He had appointed for that purpose could fail to appear in these documents.

33. No authority in the Church superior to that of the Apostolate is found in the New Testament. This, according to the terms of the commission, as has been shown, is the Supreme Authority instituted by Christ in His Church, and as it is evident that such supreme authority must abide until the end of time in order that by it Christ may exercise His power as King, the terms of the commission are such as to secure its continued existence by providing for the transmission to others of the same power in all its fulness which Christ delegated to His Apostles. For as the grant of that power was absolute, it necessarily included that same power of delegation which He exercised when He bestowed it upon them. To this, indeed, He Himself testified when He promised that He would be with them 'always, even unto the end of the world,'[1] a promise incapable of fulfilment if they had not the power of delegation by which the abiding of the Apostolate in the Church throughout all time could alone be secured.

Section V.—*The Episcopate the continuation of the Apostolate.*

34. The power of delegation being thus inherent in the Apostolate, it was in due course made use of by them; St. Paul, for instance, as

[1] St. Matthew xxviii. 20.

already noted, appointed Timothy to exercise the Apostolical authority at Ephesus and Titus at Crete. The functions of those who thus received the delegated power were the same as those which the Apostles themselves exercised, but which, owing to the growth of the Church, it was impossible for them to perform over so wide an area, and thus this power was, as time went on, delegated in turn by those who had thus received it to others. So St. Irenæus writes of those to whom the Apostles delegated their Apostolical powers as 'Bishops to whom the Apostles delivered the Churches,'[1] 'committing to them their own place of *magisterium*.'[2]

35. To this, too, the Fathers who came after St. Irenæus bear witness. For example, St. Cyprian says: 'Christ says to the Apostles, and thereby to all prelates who by vicarious ordination are successors of the Apostles, He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that heareth Me heareth Him that sent Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me.'[3] And he expressly identifies the Bishops with the Apostles, saying that 'the Lord chose Apostles, that is, Bishops.'[4] To the same effect St. Firmilian, Bishop of Capadocia, the contemporary of St. Cyprian, says: 'Christ breathed on the Apostles only, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained; the power then of remitting sins was given to the Apostles, and to the Churches which they, sent by Christ, established, and to the Bishops who succeeded them by vicarious ordination.'[5] St. Jerome likewise declares that 'with us Bishops occupy the place of Apostles,'[6] and that 'Bishops are the successors of Apostles';[7] whilst St. Augustine says, when commenting on the seventeenth verse of Psalm xliv., 'Instead of the Apostles . . . Bishops were constituted. . . . Think not, therefore, that thou [the Church] art deserted because thou seest not Peter, because thou seest not Paul, because thou seest not those through whom thou hast been born; thy ancestry hath grown up to thee from among thy offspring':[8] thus expressly identifying the Bishops and the Apostles, the former representing the latter, an identification likewise asserted by Theodoret in his words, 'They who are now called Bishops were named Apostles.'[9] Another writer, St. Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona,

[1] S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæreses*, lib. v. c. xx. 1; P.G. vii. 1177.
[2] *Op. cit.*, lib. iii. iii. 1; P.G. vii. 845.
[3] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Florentium*, Ep. lxvi. 3; *S. Thascii Cæcilii Cypriani Omnia Opera*. Recensuit Gul. Hartel, p. 731.
[4] *Ep. ad Rogatianum*, Ep. iii. 3; Hartel, p. 471.
[5] S. Firmilian, *Ep. ad Cyp. inter Epp. S. Cypriani*, lxxv. 17; Hartel, p. 820.
[6] S. Hieron., *Ep. ad Marcellam*, Ep. xli.; P.L. xxii. 476,
[7] *Ep. ad Evangelum*, Ep. xliv.; P.L. xxii. 1193.
[8] S. Aug., *Enarratio in Psalm.* xliv. (17); P.L. xxvi. 513.
[9] Theodoret *in* 1 Tim. iii. 1; P.G. lxxii. 604.

who was probably born about thirty years after the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, dying in extreme old age before A.D. 392, and who was well versed in the writings of St. Cyprian,[1] uses similar language, 'Bishops' who 'are named Apostles.'[2] Succeeding thus to the Apostles they are the 'prophets'[3] who are joined to the Apostles as the foundation of the Church, 'Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone,'[4] and therefore St. Cyprian says, 'the Church is settled upon her Bishops,'[5] and 'the Church is in the Bishop.'[6]

36. As the Bishops succeed to the Apostles, it follows that the Episcopate succeeds to the Apostolate, consequently as the Apostolate was one shared in full by all the Apostles, so St. Cyprian[7] declares that 'the Episcopate is one; it is a whole in which each enjoys full possession' [*Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*], or, as Archbishop Benson expresses the meaning of the passage, the authority of the Episcopate is held by each Bishop as 'a tenure upon a totality like that of a shareholder in some joint property,'[8] St. Cyprian here making use of the legal phrase, '*in solidum*, which signifies that every part of the one Episcopacy is so committed to every single Bishop that he is nevertheless charged with taking care of the whole.'[9] The use of this phrase by St. Cyprian is of the utmost significance, for as an eminent member of the legal profession at Carthage before his conversion, he had full knowledge of the exact meaning which the phrase bore, with which also those for whose benefit he wrote his famous treatise would be familiar.

37. There is no difference between the power of the Apostolate and that of the Episcopate in governing the Church, it is the same in extent and authority. As Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, the celebrated theologian who wrote under the name of Peter Aurelius, says: 'Christ instituted the Episcopal office not maimed or mutilated, but a full, entire, and perfect office, the highest and most perfect image of His own highest and most perfect Priesthood. For the Bishop represents Christ and acts as His substitute on earth as the Fathers constantly affirm. As, therefore, the Priesthood of Christ contains the whole sacerdotal authority and the full power of feeding the flock, so that the various powers included in that plenitude and fulness may be distinguished and discerned but cannot be dissociated or in any way separated without grievous sin, so the Episcopate in its very nature

[1] *Preface to the Epistles of St. Cyprian and the Works of St. Pacian, Life of the Fathers*, St. Cyprian, p. xxvi. *sq.*

[2] S. Pacianus, Ep. i. *Ep. ad Sympronianum*; P.L. lxiii. 105.

[3] *Vide infra*, n. 842.

[4] Ephesians ii. 20.

[5] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad lapsos*, Ep. xxiii; Hartel, p. 566.

[6] *Ep. ad Florentium*, Ep. lxvi. 8; Hartel, p. 733.

[7] S. Cyprian, *De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate*, n. 4; Hartel, p. 212.

[8] Benson, *Cyprian, His Life, His Times, and His Works*, p. 382.

[9] Leslie, *Answer to the Bishop of Meaux*, Works, vol. iii. p. 231. Oxford, 1832.

contains the plenitude of the Priesthood and the fulness of the pastoral office, and the office has been endowed with such dignity by Christ that he who should endeavour to separate and sever the great power belonging to so high a dignity, would be as guilty as if he should disjoin the properties of Christ's Priesthood and of His actual divine nature, and should obliterate the most excellent image of Christ on earth. For Christ received the fulness of the Priesthood from the Father when He was sent by Him, therefore He gave the fulness of the same Priesthood, or both the powers of the Episcopate [*i.e.* of order and jurisdiction], at the same time to the Apostles when He sent them as the Father had sent Him. Afterwards they handed down the same fulness and authority to the Bishops, sending them as they themselves had been sent by Christ, which same fulness the Bishops lastly transmitted to those that came after them, sending them as they had been sent by the Apostles.'[1]

38. The Bishops thus represent Christ, hence St. Cyprian says of the Bishop in each Church, 'There is for the time one High Priest in the Church and one judge for the time in Christ's stead.'[2] They are, therefore, 'Vicars of Christ,' and anciently were so considered. For example, the writer of the *Questiones Vet. et Nov. Testamenti*, probably Hilary the Deacon, says that 'God's Bishop must be more pure than other men . . . for He is His Vicar';[3] so also St. Basil says that 'the Bishop [καθηγούμενος] is nothing else . . . than he who represents the person of the Saviour, since he also has been made mediator between God and man,'[4] and the writer under the name of St. Ambrose, probably also the Hilary above named, says, 'The Bishop represents the Person of Christ . . . is the Vicar of the Lord.'[5] Later writers use similar language; for instance, Hormisdas, in an Epistle to the Bishops of Spain, writes, 'As Christ is the Head of the Church and the Bishops [*Sacerdotes*] the Vicars of Christ, evident care ought to be taken in their selection;'[6] and Amularius Fortunatus likewise says, 'The consecration of a Bishop falls to the Lord's Day, He is the Vicar of the Apostles, yea even of Christ,'[7] whilst amongst the Councils which apply the title to Bishops are those of Compiègne[8] in 835, and of Meaux in 845, the Fathers of which latter Synod say of themselves, 'All we are Vicars of Christ, albeit unworthy.'[9]

39. To complete the evidence, the same position is found to be

[1] Peter Aurelius, *Vindiciæ Cens. Sorbon.*, tom. ii. p. 87; quoted *Tentativa Theologica*. Eng. trans. by Landon, p. 44.

[2] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lix.; Hartel, p. 672.

[3] Pseudo-Aug., *Quæstiones de utraque mixt.*, P.L. xxxv. 2386.

[4] S. Basil, *Constitutiones Monasticæ*, c. 22; P.G. xxvi. 1409.

[5] Pseudo-Ambrosius, *Com. in* 1 Cor. xi. 10; P.L. xvii. 240.

[6] Hormisdas, *Ep. ad universos Episc. Hispaniæ*, Ep. xxv.; P.L. lxiii. 423-424.

[7] Amularius Fortunatus, *De Eccles. Off.*, lii., c. 2, Bibl. P.P.M., tom. x. 376.

[8] Mansi, xiv. 647.

[9] Mansi, xiv. 815.

assigned to them at the beginning of the Sub-Apostolic Age. St. Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, says, 'Every one whom the Master of the household sendeth to be a steward over his own house, we ought to receive as Him that sent him; plainly therefore we ought to regard the Bishop as the Lord Himself.'[1] 'Yea, and it becometh you not to presume upon the youth of your Bishop, but according to the power of God the Father, to concede to him all homage . . . yet not to him but to the Father of Christ, the Bishop of us all . . . for a man does not so much deceive the Bishop who is seen, as cheat that Other Who is invisible.'[2] 'In that you are subject to your Bishop as to Jesus Christ, it is evident to me that you are living not after the way of man but according to Jesus Christ,'[3] the position indeed being exactly that claimed by St. Paul in virtue of his Apostleship, as 'an ambassador of Christ,' which enabled him to act 'in Christ's stead,'[4] the position bestowed, as has been shown, upon the Apostolate by the commission 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.'[5]

40. From the place thus occupied by the Episcopate *jure divino* in the Church necessarily follow certain consequences:—

First, that each Bishop sharing the one Episcopate in its entirety possesses as Vicar of Christ supreme authority 'in his diocese.'[6] Wherefore St. Cyprian says in his Epistle to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, 'Every Bishop hath in the government of the Church his own choice and free-will, hereafter to give an account of his conduct to the Lord,'[7] and he makes use of similar language in his speech at the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256,[8] saying, 'Every Bishop according to his recognised liberty and power possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another, than he himself can judge another.'[9] And it must be noted that the very title Bishop is applied by St. Peter to our Blessed Lord,[10] as St. Pacian says, 'The Apostle Peter hath named our Lord Bishop.'[11] As so applied it implies that as Christ had supreme jurisdiction over all Christians, so the one Episcopate, having by delegation that supreme jurisdiction, every Bishop possessing that one Episcopate *in solidum* exercises as the representative of Christ that jurisdiction within the limits of his diocese.

41. Secondly, inasmuch as the Episcopate is one, every part thereof being committed to each single Bishop, it is incumbent on

[1] S. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Eph.* n. 6; P.G. v. 650.
[2] *Ep. ad Magnes.* n. 3; P.G. v. 654, 655.
[3] *Ep. ad Trall.*, n. 2; P.G. v. 676, 677.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 20. [5] *Vide supra*, n. 30. [6] *Vide supra*, n. 38.
[7] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Stephanum*, Ep. lxxii. 3; Hartel, p. 778.
[8] *Vide* on this Council, *infra*, n. 281.
[9] S. Cyprian, *Sententiæ Episcoporum numero*, lxxxvii. *De hæreticis Baptizandis*, Hartel, p. 430. On St. Cyprian's recognition of the power of Synods, *vide* note 1.
[10] 1 St. Peter ii. 25.
[11] S. Pacian, Ep. i. *Ep. ad Sympronianum*; P.G. lxiii. 1057.

each Bishop to watch not only over his own diocese, but to oppose heresy and schism in all other parts of the one Church. We have an instance of the way in which this duty was discharged in the case of Marcian, Bishop of Arles, 'who had joined himself to Novatian and . . . departed from the unity of the Catholic Church.' Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, wrote both in his own name and that of the Bishops of the Province both to St. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, and to St. Cyprian, the two great Metropolitans in the West, there being at that time no Metropolitan in Gaul, informing them of Marcian's conduct in order to obtain their assistance in enforcing the excommunication which Marcian had *ipso facto* incurred by joining a schismatical body, which excommunication they were apparently unable to enforce by his deposition. St. Cyprian, having received a second letter from Faustinus, wrote to St. Stephen, who was nearer the scene where the difficulty had occurred, and who, moreover, was Bishop of that Church whence the Gallic Church had been founded, some of the Sees quite recently,[1] and who, it would appear, had taken no notice of the letter he had received, telling him in plain terms what his duty in the case was. 'It is ours,' he says, 'to advise and come in aid ['to the servants of God left without peace and communion'], who, considering the divine clemency and holding the balance in the government of the Church, do so exercise towards sinners a vigorous authority as yet not to deny the medicine of the divine goodness and mercy in raising the fallen and curing the wounded. Wherefore it behoves you to write a very full letter to our fellow Bishops established in Gaul that they no longer suffer the froward and proud Marcian, an enemy both to the mercy of God and the salvation of the brethren, to insult our college because he seemeth as yet not to be excommunicated by us.' 'Let letters be written from thee to the Province, and to the people dwelling at Arles, whereby, Marcian having been excommunicated, another may be substituted in his room; and the flock of Christ, which to this day is overlooked, scattered by him and wounded, be again collected together. Suffice it that many of our brethren in these parts have, in these last years, departed without peace: at all events, let the rest who survive be holpen, who both groan day and night and, entreating the mercy of our God and Father, implore the solace of our help.' 'For, therefore, dearest brother, is the body of Bishops so large, bound together by the glue of mutual concord as the bond of unity, that if any one of our college should attempt to introduce heresy, and to rend and lay waste the flock of Christ, the rest may come in and aid, and as good and merciful shepherds gather the Lord's sheep into the fold. . . . We should secure to ourselves with prompt and kind humanity such of our

[1] Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, iv. 711. Paris, 1701 *sq.*

brethren, as tossed upon the rocks of Marcian, seek the safe harbour of the Church. . . . For what greater or better office have Bishops than by diligent solicitude and wholesome remedies to provide for cherishing and preserving the sheep? . . . For although we are many shepherds yet we feed one flock, and ought to gather together and cherish all the sheep which Christ has sought by His own Blood and Passion. . . . Since then Marcian . . . joining himself to Novatian, has become an enemy to mercy and pity, let him not pronounce but receive sentence, nor act as though judge of the college of Bishops for that himself has by all the Bishops been judged.'[1]

42. It is because of this duty, resulting from sharing *in solidum* the one Episcopate, that St. Chrysostom relates in praise of St. Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, that he was careful in his performance of it, saying, 'He was perfectly taught by the grace of the Spirit that a governor of the Church ought to take care not only of the particular Church committed to him by the Spirit, but also of the universal Church which is dispersed over the whole world, and this he learnt from our holy prayers, for if we pray for the universal Church which is extended from one end of the world to the other, much more ought we to look to the salvation of all, to take care in like manner of all, and to be solicitous and concerned for all.'[2]

43. On the same ground could St. Basil write to Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria, 'It was with reason, and like a spiritual brother taught true love by the Lord, that you censured me for not informing you of all things both small and great which take place here, for it is your duty to take care of what goes on here, as it is mine to refer our affairs to your love.'[3] St. Cyril, of Alexandria, in like terms addressed his brother Atticus of Constantinople, 'Does your Piety think that we are so remiss as not to endeavour to make ourselves acquainted both with your good reputation, and how the flocks of the Saviour are directed? For one is the solicitude of Priests, though we be divided in position.'[4] Therefore, too, could St. Augustine write then to Pope Boniface, 'To sit on our watch towers and guard the flock, belongs in common to all of us who have Episcopal functions, although the hill on which you stand is more conspicuous than the rest.'[5]

44. Thirdly, inasmuch as a Bishop shares with all his brother-Bishops the one Episcopate in joint tenure, and thus is not only ruler of his diocese as the representative of Christ, but lies also under the obligation, since the Episcopate is one, of exercising general vigilance

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Stephanum*, Ep. lxviii. nn. 1, 2, 3, 4; Hartel, p. 744 *sq.*

[2] S. Chrysostom, *Hom. in S. Eustathium*, 3; P.G. lv. 602.

[3] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Petrum Episc. Alexandriæ*, Ep. cclxvi.; P.G. xxxii. 992.

[4] S. Cyril Alexand., *Ep. ad Atticum*, Ep. lxxvii.; P.C. lxxvii. 355.

[5] S. Aug., *Ad Bonifacium contra duas Epp. Pelagianorum*, lib. i. c. 1, 2; P.L. xliv. 588.

over the whole flock of Christ, the power which he thus possesses as Bishop can be exercised in conjunction with others who with him share the one Episcopate *in solidum* in Synod. For example, when the Bishops of a Province are assembled in Synod, the joint-holding of the Episcopate by the members of the Council enables them to exercise jurisdiction over the whole province as co-rulers thereof: again the Synod of a Patriarchate has jurisdiction for the same reason over that Patriarchate, its members being co-rulers of such Patriarchate, its authority though *the same in essence* being greater than that of a Provincial Synod inasmuch as there is a more full representation of the one Episcopate, whilst the one Episcopate assembled *as a whole* in an Œcumenical Council has the supreme authority in the Church, since such a Council possesses the authority of the Episcopate vested in the Bishops *in solidum*, all of whom are there present or duly represented, an authority *the same in essence* as that exercised by the Patriarchal Council within the limits of the Patriarchate, and that of the Provincial Synod in the Province, and that of the individual Bishop within his Diocese; consequently to a Council of this character all other Councils, even those of a Patriarchate, must yield in authority.[1]

45. Hence it is that St. Augustine declares, 'Who can fail to be aware . . . that Councils which are held in the several provinces and eparchies, themselves must yield, beyond all possibility of doubt, to the authority of Universal Councils which are assembled out of the whole Christian world';[2] and to the same cause St. Athanasius attributes the authority of the Council of Nicæa saying, 'the assembly at Nicæa is more than those at local Synods inasmuch as the whole is greater than the part.'[3] Such a Council as the instrument of, and representing, the one Episcopate, possesses the authority of Christ delegated to that one Episcopate, and it is in it that the Bishops exercise that Œcumenical jurisdiction which is theirs as co-rulers of the whole Church in virtue of their holding *in solidum* the one Episcopate, that one Episcopate wielding in such Council the same authority as the one Apostolate to which it has succeeded *jure divino*.

46. Fourthly, the one Episcopate is the means whereby the Church in all parts of the world is knit together in one whole. The Bishop of the Diocese is the local centre of Unity, as the representative of Christ the Chief Pastor, with whom all that dwell within the limits of that Diocese must be in communion, for 'They are the Church, who are a people united to the Bishop and a flock adhering to their own

[1] On the way in which Councils which have not been truly representative of the whole Body of the Episcopate have attained Œcumenical rank, *vide infra*, note 66.

[2] S. Aug., *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. ii. cap. 3; P.L. xliii. 128, 129.

[3] S. Athanasius, *Ad in Africa Episcopos Ep. Synodica*, P.G. xxvi. 1092.

Shepherd. . . . The Bishop is in the Church and the Church is in the Bishop, and if any be not with the Bishop, . . . he is not in the Church,'[1] 'schisms and heresies arising in the Church because the Bishop who is one and presides over the Church is by the proud presumption of some persons held in contempt, and a man honoured by the favour of God is by man deemed unworthy.'[2] Therefore communion with the lawful Bishop of the Diocese is the means where those who dwell within its limits 'acknowledge and hold fast to the womb of the Catholic Church,'[3] in that through such communion they are in communion with the rest of the Church, because 'the Church which is Catholic and one is not separated nor divided, but is in truth connected and joined together by the cement of the Bishops mutually cleaving to each other,'[4] there being 'one Church from Christ throughout the world divided into many members, and one Episcopate diffused throughout an harmonious multitude of many Bishops.'[5] The Episcopate itself being one and undivided is thus itself the instrument of Unity as well as the possessor of that supreme authority by which that Unity is protected and preserved.

47. From what has been set forth in the foregoing discussion of the question as to the supreme authority founded by Christ in His Church, it is to be concluded that the argument which St. Thomas uses, and which the *Satis Cognitum* adduces in support of its allegation with regard to that question, is in itself without any value, not merely because that Doctor lived at a time when Papalism already dominated the West and consequently was simply the mouthpiece of the opinions held at that time, but also on its merits considered in itself, since it has been shown that there was no necessity whatever incumbent on our Lord to adopt the particular course which St. Thomas declares to have been compulsory upon Him, and that on the contrary the evidence proves that as a matter of fact our Blessed Lord adopted an essentially different one, delegating, not to a single individual, but to the one Apostolate, and to its continuation the one Episcopate, as representing Himself, that position and power which the Father bestowed on Him as the Son of Man. Hence we conclude that the supreme authority founded by Christ in the Church is 'the One Apostolate,' abiding to the end of time as 'the One Episcopate.'

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Florentium*, Ep. lxvi. 8; Hartel, p. 733.
[2] *l.c.*, 4.
[3] *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlviii. 3; Hartel, p. 607.
[4] *Ep. ad Florentium*, Ep. lxvi. 8; Hartel, p. 733.
[5] *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. 24; Hartel, p. 642.

CHAPTER II

WAS ST. PETER APPOINTED BY CHRIST TO BE 'THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH'?

SECTION VI.—*The Papalist interpretation of the words, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.'*

48. The *Satis Cognitum* having laid down that Christ 'was obliged to designate a vicegerent on earth,' a statement which has been shown to be contrary to the fact, proceeds to assert that our Lord 'appointed Peter to be the Head of the Church; and He also determined that the authority instituted in perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by his successors, in whom the same permanent authority of Peter himself should continue. And so He made the remarkable promise to Peter and to no one else: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church*" (Matt. xvi. 18).'[1]

It is important to notice what the *Satis Cognitum* adduces this text to prove. The allegation is that Christ appointed St. Peter to be the Head of the Church, the position and authority which by that appointment he so held being then instituted in perpetuity, and is therefore by that institution inherited by his successors. It will be seen that this text is thus, so to speak, 'The Charter of the Papacy'; our Lord, according to the Papalist interpretation, conferring by these words the supreme authority in the Church on St. Peter *and his successors*. That this is the case is corroborated by other statements in the *Satis Cognitum*: 'From this text it is clear that by the will and command of God, the Church rests upon St. Peter just as a building rests on its foundation. Now the proper nature of a foundation is to be a principle of cohesion for the various parts of the building. It must be the necessary condition of stability and strength. Remove it and the whole building falls. It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church, and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity. How could he fulfil this office without the power of commanding, forbidding, and judging, which is properly called *jurisdiction*? . . . It was necessary that a government of this kind, since it belongs to the constitution and formation of the Church as its

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 25, 26.

principal element—that is, as the principle of unity and the foundation of lasting stability—should in no wise come to an end with St. Peter, but should pass to his successors from one to another, "these successors" being "the Bishops of Rome."'[1]

49. It must be admitted that if this interpretation of this text be the true one, it is one of the most important dogmatic statements in Holy Writ, authoritatively setting forth the Charter of Government of the Church of God, the 'principal element' in its constitution. Hence it would necessarily follow that words which the Eternal Wisdom chose as those which should declare His will on so momentous a matter must, from the very beginning of the Christian religion, have 'ever been understood by the Catholic Church' as being those by which Christ conferred on St. Peter and his 'successors in the Roman Episcopate,' that primacy of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, which would be the essential prerogative of 'the Head of the Church,' 'the vicegerent' of the King of the Kingdom of God. It will not be denied that there is no other passage in the New Testament that could be adduced as the proof of the doctrine declared to be *de fide* by the Vatican Council and reiterated *ex cathedrâ* by Pope Leo XIII. in the *Satis Cognitum*. Hence it would follow that it would be impossible for the Fathers to affix any other interpretation to the 'Charter text'; it, and it alone, must have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' from the beginning of the Church's history, for to have done so would have inevitably misled those who read their words with regard to a doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation;[2] in fact, no other interpretation could be admitted, since such an interpretation would on the hypothesis be contrary to our Lord's meaning and therefore heretical.

50. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that on the Papal theory, the *exact* position claimed to belong *jure divino* to Bishops of Rome in the *Satis Cognitum*, as an integral part of the grant to St. Peter, bestowed in these words on St. Peter by our Lord, must be found recognised 'always, everywhere, and by all,' for the *Satis Cognitum* is careful in its language to deliberately exclude any such notion as that a 'germ' might have been so recognised in the early ages, which ultimately 'developed' into the position now asserted to belong to the Roman Pontiffs, for it expressly declares 'that in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age.'[3]

51. Hence, even, for example, if evidence of a belief that such 'full

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 26, 30.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii.; *Collectio Lacensis*, viii. 48*h*
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church' was universally believed by the Fathers to have been conferred by the words on St. Peter alone, was forthcoming, it would be of no value for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*, for according to that document it has ever been believed by the Church as part of the Catholic Faith that it was so conferred, not merely on Peter personally, but on his 'successors.' Again, if evidence could be produced that *all* the Fathers interpreted the text of *some* special position being conferred on St. Peter by our Lord, it similarly would be of no avail for such purpose, unless it were the *exact* position declared to belong to him, not as a personal privilege, but as an official grant to him and his 'successors.' Nothing less than this would be in conformity with the teaching of the *Satis Cognitum*. It is needful to definitely state this as it is not uncommon to find quotations from certain Fathers in which the passage is held to have a personal reference to St. Peter, brought forward as evidence that they held the Papalist interpretation thereof, whereas such quotations cannot legitimately be so made use of as in themselves not setting it forth, as they do not refer to the 'legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate,' which, as has been seen, is an integral part of such interpretation, and also because, as will be proved, whatever Patristic authority may be produced for applying the text to St. Peter, yet the large majority of the Fathers do not so interpret it, and consequently the use sought to be made by the fautors of the Papacy of these quotations is unjustifiable and *nihil ad rem*.

Section VII.—*The Patristic interpretations of the words, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.'*

52. Since then the Papalist use of this text that the interpretation so affixed to it, and that interpretation alone, should have been the sole one which the Fathers 'in every age' have given and recognised, insomuch as on a matter of such vast importance 'universality, antiquity, and consent' would of necessity be found witnessing to its truth, it is startling to find that so far from this being the case there are several different interpretations of these words to be found in the writings of the Fathers, amongst which are the following:—

53. The first interpretation is that the text means that the Church was built upon Peter. This is the one adopted by seventeen Fathers. Of these, Origen, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, says, 'The chief share in feeding the sheep was delivered to Peter, and upon him, as upon a rock, the Church was founded.'[1]

St. Jerome: 'As He being the light gave to the Apostles to be

[1] Origen, *Comment. in Epist. ad Rom.*, lib. v.; P.G. xiv. 1053.

called the light of the world, and they obtained the other names from the Lord, so also to Simon, who believed on the Rock (Petra), He gave the name Peter (Petros), and after the metaphor of a rock it is rightly said, I will build My Church upon thee.'[1]

St. Hilary: 'The blessed Simon who, after the confession of the mystery, lay as a foundation for the building up of the Church';[2] and again, 'Peter upon whom He was about to build His Church against which the gates of hell would prevail nothing.'[3]

St. Cyril of Alexandria: 'He called him Peter, a name derived from Petros, a rock, for on him He was going to lay the foundation of His Church.'[4]

54. Another interpretation given of these words in the Fathers is that the rock on which the Church is built signifies all the Apostles whom St. Peter represented when he made his memorable confession, and this is found in the writings of eight Fathers. Amongst these are Origen, who says: 'But if you think that the whole Church was built by God upon Peter alone, what would you say about John the son of Thunder, or each of the Apostles? Or shall we venture to say that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter, but shall prevail against the other Apostles and those that are perfect"? Are not the words in question, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and "upon this Rock I will build My Church," said in the case of all and each of them?'[5]

55. St. Jerome: 'But you say that the Church is founded upon Peter, although the same thing is done in another place upon all the Apostles, and all receive the kingdom of heaven, and the solidity of the Church is established equally upon all, nevertheless one is therefore chosen that by the appointment of a head an occasion of dissension may be taken away.'[6]

And Theodoret, who says: 'And this number of cubits agrees with the holy Apostles, who were the bases and foundation of the Church, for He says, "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church."'[7]

56. A third interpretation is that these words are to be understood of the Faith which St. Peter had confessed, that is, that this Faith, this profession of faith, by which we believe that Christ is Son of the living God, is the eternal and immovable foundation of the Church. Of all

[1] S. Hieron., *Comm. in Matt.* (xvi. 18), lib. ii. cap. xvii.; P.L. xxvii. 117.
[2] S. Hilar., *De Trinitate*, vi. 20; P.L. x. 172.
[3] *Tractatus in Psalmum* cxxxi.; P.L. ix. 750.
[4] S. Cyril Alex., *in Joann. Evan.* (i. 42), lib. ii. cap. i.; P.G. lxxiii. 219.
[5] Origen, *Com. in Matt.* xvi. 18; P.G. xiii. 1000.
[6] S. Hieron., *Adv. Jovianum*, i. c. xxxvi.; P.L. xxiii. 247. On this passage *vide infra*, n. 596.
[7] Theodoret *in Ezekiel.* xliii. 16; P.G. lxxxi. 1232.

the interpretations given this is the one which is by far the most customary, no less than forty-four writers adopting it, amongst whom are 'the Easterns,' St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact, and 'the Westerns,' St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory the Great. Of these St. Gregory of Nyssa says, 'That is upon the confession of Christ, because He said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,'[1] St. Chrysostom: 'Having said to Peter, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonas," and of having promised to lay the foundations of the Church upon his confession; not long after He says, "Get thee behind me, Satan";[2] and again, since he had said Son of God to point out that He was Son of God as the other son of Jonas, of the same substance of Him that begat Him; therefore He added this, "And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church"; that is, upon the Rock of his confession.'[3] And Theodoret: 'For for this cause our Lord Jesus Christ permitted the chief of the Apostles, whose faith He had defined to be as a certain basis and foundation of His Church, to vacillate and to err, teaching two things at the same time, not to trust in self and to strengthen the vacillating';[4] and again the same writer says: 'Let us hear the great Peter crying out, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Let us hear also Christ the Lord confirming this confession, for upon this Rock, He says, I will build my Church. Therefore the most wise Paul, the most illustrious Architect of the Church, defined not another but the very same foundation, for I, he says, as a wise master-builder, have laid the foundation, for other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus.'[5]

57. From 'the Westerns' it will suffice to give the following quotations:—

St. Hilary, who says: 'Upon this rock of the confession is the building up of the Church. . . . This faith is the foundation of the Church: through this faith the gates of Hell are powerless against it. This Faith hath the keys of the heavenly Kingdom.'[6]

St. Ambrose: 'Faith, then, is the foundation of the Church, for not of the human person of St. Peter but of faith is it said that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, but confession [of the true faith] hath overcome hell, and the confession hath shut out more than one heresy; for whereas the Church as a goodly vessel is often beaten

[1] S. Gregor. Nyssenus, *De Adventu Domini in carne*, cited by Friedrich, *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*, i. 8.

[2] S. Chrysostom, *Com. in Epist. ad Galat.* cap, i.; P.G. lxi. 611.

[3] *Hom.* liv. *in Matt.* xvi. sect. 2; P.G. lviii. 534.

[4] Theodoret, *Ep.* lxxxii.; *Ad Eulalium Epis. Persicæ Armeniæ*; P.G. lxxxiii. 1249.

[5] Theodoret, *Ep. ad Joannem Œconomum*, Ep. cxlvi.; P.G. lxxxiii. 1396.

[6] S. Hilar., *De Trinitate*, vi. 36, 37; P.L. x. 186-87.

upon by many waves, the foundation of the Church must hold against all heresies.'[1]

And St. Gregory the Great, who says: 'Persevere in the true faith and make firm your life on the confession of Blessed Peter, chief of the Apostles.'[2]

58. This interpretation, it may be added, has in its favour the fact that it is that adopted by two Liturgies—one Eastern and one Western. The former is the Liturgy of St. James in the general intercession for the quick and the dead in the *Anaphora*, which comes after the invocation of the Holy Ghost and the expression of the purpose for which that Invocation is made, which is 'the last step according to the mind of the Eastern Church necessary to a valid consecration,'[3] consequently this interpretation is made use of at a very solemn period in the service. The words are as follows: 'The Priest prays with reference to the 'Holy Body of Thy Christ,' and the precious Blood of Thy Christ, 'that they may be to those that partake of them for remission of sins and eternal life, for the edification of soul and body, for bringing forth good works, for the confirmation of Thy Holy Church which Thou hast founded upon the rock of faith that the gates of Hell may not prevail against it.'[4]

59. The Western Liturgical witness is the Missal of the Roman Church in which for the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul a Collect is given in which these words are used: 'Grant, we beseech, Almighty God, that Thou wouldst not suffer us whom Thou hast established on *the rock of the Apostolic Confession* to be shaken by any disturbance.' The witness of these Liturgies is of great value, as they embody the ancient belief of the Churches in which they are respectively used, and thus prove that this interpretation has the authority of both East and West.

60. A fourth interpretation is that these words are to be understood of that Rock Whom St. Peter confessed, *i.e.* Christ, so that according to the promise here made the Church was built upon Christ Himself. Sixteen Fathers thus interpret these words. Amongst whom are the following:—

St. Ambrose, who says: 'That starry sky . . . is the high firmament of heaven, nor is this other firmament unlike it, of which it is said, Upon this Rock will I build My Church. . . . They sucked oil out of the firm Rock, for the Rock was the Flesh of Christ, which redeemed heaven and the whole world';[5] so again he says, 'This Rock is Christ,

[1] S. Ambros., *De Incarn. Domini Sacram.*, cap. v. 34; P.L. xvi. 827.

[2] S. Gregor. M., *Ep. ad Theodlindam Reg.*, Epist. lib. iv., Ep. xxxviii.; P.L. lxxvii. 712.

[3] Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, General Introduction, vol. i. p. 503.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. pp. 579, 583, 591.

[5] S. Ambros., *Ep. ad Horontianum*, Ep. xliii. 9; P.L. xvi. 1132.

for they drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ.'[1]

St. Jerome: 'Was there any other province in the whole world which admitted the preaching of pleasure, into which the wily serpent crept, save that which the teaching of Peter had founded upon Christ the Rock?'[2] And again, 'Upon this Rock the Lord founded His Church, from this Rock the Apostle Peter derived his name. . . . The foundation which the Apostle, as its architect, laid is our Lord Jesus Christ alone; on this foundation firm and stable . . . the Church of Christ is built.'[3]

61. So St. Augustine gives this as what he describes in his *Retractationes* as his most frequently expressed opinion: 'And I say unto thee because thou hast said unto Me, thou hast spoken, now hear; thou hast given a confession, receive a blessing therefore, and I say unto thee that thou art Peter because I am the Rock; for neither from Peter is the Rock, but from the Rock Peter; because not from the Christian is Christ, but from Christ the Christian, and upon this Rock I will build My Church; not upon Peter which thou art, but upon the Rock which thou hast confessed. But I will build My Church, I will build thee, who in this answer representest the Church.'[4]

62. So again, 'The Gospel just read is of the Lord Jesus Christ Who walked upon the waters of the sea, and of the Apostle Peter who walking there through fear lost his footing, and sinking from want of faith, rose again by his confession. It teaches us to see the sea, the present world, but the Apostle Peter, the type of the one only Church, for this Peter, first in order of the Apostles, most ready in the love of Christ, often answers singly for all. He it was, at the question of the Lord Jesus Christ whom men said He was, when the disciples gave in answer the various opinions of men, and the Lord again inquired and said, But whom say ye that I am?—Peter it was that answered, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. One for many he gave the answer, being the oneness in the many. Then the Lord said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee but My Father which is in heaven. Then He added, and I say unto thee. As if He would say, because thou hast said unto Me, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, I also say unto thee, thou art Peter; Simon he was called before, but this name of Peter was given him by the Lord, and that in figure to signify the Church, or because Christ is the Rock, Peter is the Christian people, for the Rock [Petra] is the chief name. Therefore Peter is from Petra;

[1] S. Ambros., *Expos. in Lucam* [ix. 20], vi. 97; P.L. xv. 1694.
[2] S. Hieron., *Adv. Jovin.* ii.; P.L. xxiii. 335.
[3] *Comment in Matt.* (vii. 26), lib. i. cap. viii.; P.L. xxvi. 50.
[4] S. Aug., *Sermo in die Pentecostis*, cclxx. 2; P.L. xxxviii. 1239.

not Petra from Peter; as Christ is not called from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. Thou art therefore, said He, Peter, and upon this Rock which thou hast confessed, upon this Rock which thou hast recognised, saying, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, I will build My Church, that is upon Myself, the Son of the living God, I will build My Church, upon Me will I build thee, not Me upon thee.'[1]

63. A fifth interpretation found in the Fathers is, by this Rock is to be understood the faithful themselves who, believing that Christ is the Son of God, are constituted the living stones out of which the Church is built. For example:—

Origen says: 'The Rock is every disciple of Christ, from Whom they drank who drank of the spiritual Rock which followed them, and on every such rock every ecclesiastical word is builded, and the plan of life, according to His pattern.'[2] So also St. Ambrose in the passage already referred to combines this with other meanings: 'Great is the grace of Christ Who hath imparted to His disciples almost all His names. . . . The Rock is Christ, for they drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ. To His disciple also He denied not the grace of this name that he also should be Peter because from the "Petra" he hath the solidity of steadfastness, the firmness of faith. Strive therefore thou too to be a rock. Seek thou the rock, not without thee but within thee. Thine act is a rock, thy thought is a rock. On this rock thy house is built that no storms of spiritual wickedness have power to overthrow it. Thy rock is faith; the foundation of the Church is faith. If thou art a rock thou wilt be in the Church, for the Church is on the Rock; if thou art in the Church the gates of hell shall not prevail against thee.'[3]

64. A consideration of the references made to, and the expositions of, the words *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church*, given by the Fathers, renders it quite plain that they were very far from being unanimous in the interpretation which they gave of them; but not only so, it is further clear that in several instances the same Father in different places in his writings adopts different interpretations of these words. Amongst these Fathers St. Augustine is found who expressly refers to his so doing in his *Retractationes* in a very significant manner. His words are as follows:—'I said in a certain place concerning the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded on him as on a rock, which meaning is also sung by the mouths of many in the words of the blessed Ambrose, where he says of the Rock, "At his song the rock of the Church wipes away his crime." But I know that I have afterwards most frequently so expounded the saying of the Lord, Thou art Peter,

[1] S. Aug., *Sermo in Matt.* xiv. 24, 33; *Sermo* lxxvi. c. i.; P.L. xxxviii. 479.
[2] Origen's *Com. in Matt.*, tom. xii.; P.G. xiii. 997.
[3] S. Ambros., *Expos. in Lucam*, lib. vi. 97-98 (*in Luc.* ix. 20); P.L. xv. 1691.

and upon this Rock I will build My Church, as to be understood of Him Whom Peter confessed saying, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, and so Peter named from this Rock would typify the person of the Church which is built upon the Rock and hath received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, for it was not said to him Thou art the Rock [*Petra*], but thou art Peter. But Christ was the Rock Whom Simon confessing, as the whole Church confesses Him, was called Peter, but of these two meanings let the reader choose the more probable.'[1]

65. From this passage it is evident that St. Augustine himself considered the interpretation which he gives in his later writings to be the correct one. Moreover, it is plain that the great Doctor held it to be a matter of indifference which interpretation was the right one, otherwise he could not have told his readers to make his choice between them. But this is not all; as a choice is to be made between the *two*, St. Augustine by so doing necessarily held the two interpretations to be mutually exclusive, consequently it follows that he himself had abandoned the one which he had formerly advocated, viz. that this saying had a personal reference to St. Peter.

66. Could St. Augustine have taken this course had the 'venerable and constant belief of the Church in' his 'age' been that the meaning of the text was what the Papalist doctrine claims it to be? Surely the answer must be in the negative. To hold that the words have a personal reference to St. Peter in no way necessitates the acceptance of the Papalist doctrine, but to reject any such personal reference, and to use his great influence as a teacher in the way he does in the passage with regard to it, is absolutely incompatible with a belief on his part in the Papalist doctrine which necessitates such personal reference. His action would thus have shut him out of the 'one fold' by denying the Charter of its Government, and have caused also all those who might be influenced by his writings to deny a doctrine of the Christian Religion which it is necessary to salvation to believe. St. Augustine, it must be concluded, knew nothing of the momentous character which Papalism attributes to the text of which he thus treats.

67. The evidence here given is sufficient to prove that the Papalist interpretation of the text does not possess that 'universality, antiquity, and consent' which of necessity it must have if it were the correct one. It is inconceivable that this should be the case if by these words St. Peter had been appointed by our Lord the foundation of the Church; the removal of which would involve the whole edifice built thereon in ruins, if this be the Charter by which Peter, and his 'legitimate successors,' 'the Bishops of Rome,' was then appointed to be the 'Head of the Church by Jesus Christ' as the *Satis Cognitum*

[1] S. Aug., *Retractationes*, lib. i. cxxi.; P.L. xxxiii. 618.

declares.[1] If the Fathers had believed it to be a doctrine of Catholic truth 'that Christianity is wholly based on the Sovereign Pontiff,' that 'without the Sovereign Pontiff the whole edifice is undermined,' and that 'The Sovereign Pontiff is the necessary, the only, the exclusive foundation of Christianity'; that 'to him belong the promises'; that 'with him disappears unity, in other words, the Church,' as De Maistre[2] well expresses the Papalist doctrine as to the legitimate successors of St. Peter; it is impossible that they should have so grievously erred as to give any but the Papalist interpretation.

To do otherwise would have been to deceive the faithful, and to lead them into error with reference to the true meaning of the passage which it would be necessary to their salvation that they should rightly apprehend; besides which, if they had so given other interpretations, the gates of hell would have assuredly prevailed against the Church.

68. The Fathers did take this course, and that they did so is conclusive proof that it has not been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' that by the words, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, Peter was constituted the foundation of the Church, 'the principle of unity and foundation of lasting stability,' whose supreme power of government should therefore abide to the end of time in 'the Pontiffs who succeed' him 'in the Roman Episcopate.' The Papalist interpretation is consequently a novelty, and by that fact stands condemned as erroneous and contrary to the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

Section VIII.—*The first appearance of the germ of the Papalist interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.'*

69. If an investigation is made as to the time when the idea, which is asserted in the *Satis Cognitum*, that the government of the Church, alleged to be confided to Peter, has passed to his successors the Bishops of Rome 'from one to another,' because, and in virtue of this saying of our Lord, was first broached, it will be found that it has its origin in a statement made by one of the Bishops of Rome. The words referred to are found in an Epistle written to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona in Spain, in the year A.D. 385, by Siricius, an Epistle which is the first authentic Papal 'Decretal,'[3] and is as follows:—

'We bear the burden of all who are heavy laden, or rather the blessed Apostle bears them in us, for he, as we trust in all things, protects and defends those who are heirs of his government.'[4]

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 25, 26 *sq.*

[2] De Maistre, *Du Pape*. Discours Préliminaire, § ii.; liv. iv. cap. v. [*E. T.*, pp. xxv, 320.]

[3] On the *Papal Decretals*, *vide* note 2.

[4] Mansi, iii. 655.

70. St. Leo adopted and developed the idea, saying, for example, in a sermon preached on the anniversary of his consecration, that the 'whole Church in Peter's See receives Peter, and slackens not in love to so great a Shepherd even in the person of so unworthy an heir.'[1] It is most significant that this novelty makes its first appearance in the writings of Popes, as it is in accordance with the tendency which the history of the Church reveals, on the part of the occupants of Sees seated in great centres of civil authority, to endeavour to increase the power of such Sees. An instance of this tendency is seen in the way in which the ambition of the Bishops of Constantinople, a Bishopric which at first was simply a suffraganate of Heraclea, was stimulated by the fact that Constantinople became the residence of the Emperor, the Imperial City, the New Rome. Little by little the See of Constantinople advanced its pretensions and obtained additional influence, so that by the date of the Fourth Œcumenical Council it had not only thrown off all dependence on Heraclea, but obtained an extensive jurisdiction, within the limits of which were several Metropolitans, over whom the Bishop of that See exercised practically Patriarchal rights, rights which were recognised and, indeed, extended by the Council just named.[2] The result being that Constantinople became, as the second See in Christendom, the rival of that of Old Rome.

71. It is not therefore a matter of much surprise that the Bishops of the old Imperial City should be influenced by the fact that that city was the former mistress of the world, especially when they became, through the withdrawal of the Emperor first to Milan and then to Ravenna, as the chief personages remaining, the natural heirs of that universal dominion which was the proud boast of ancient Rome. The position thus by circumstances becoming theirs was strengthened by the fact that the barbarian monarchs who subjugated Italy did not venture to take up their abode in the City. It is then quite in the natural order of things that, as a matter of history, the Bishops of Rome are found advancing great claims for their See; it is equally natural that they should make use of the connection between the city and the 'First Apostle' St. Peter, which, at all events as early as the fourth century, was accepted in Christendom as an undisputed fact.

72. In the West the claims so put forward found acceptance sooner or later. The prestige of 'Rome,' with which every nation at some period of its history had had political connection, the fact that missionaries from Rome had brought in many cases the knowledge of the Gospel to them, and the unique privilege which Rome possessed in the West of being an 'Apostolic See,' all tended to make this inevitable.

[1] S. Leo, M., *Sermo* ii. *in Anniversario Ordin. suae*; P.L. liv. 144.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 404 *et seq.*

But in the East this was not the case, and it is a remarkable fact, to which attention has been drawn by one well qualified to speak, that none of the Greek Fathers for the first six centuries connect the position of the Bishop of Rome with the promise to St. Peter.[1] The source then whence the assertion of these claims first appears shows that such assertion cannot be held to be evidence in support thereof, on the well-known principle that 'no one is able to be judge in his own cause,'[2] and especially must this be the case in the present instance, in which, as has been shown, the general consensus of the Fathers in interpreting the 'Charter text' is plainly incompatible with that interpretation which is essential to the validity of these claims.

Section IX.— *What is the true interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church'?*

73. In discussing this question it must first be pointed out that even if our Lord did mean the word 'rock' to apply to St. Peter personally, it does not in the least degree follow that it would be a necessary consequence that He thereby constituted certain individuals as *the successors* of St. Peter in any such unique position. This is clear from the marked contrast between the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' and those by which the Great Commission was conferred on the Apostolate, 'As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you,' inasmuch as the latter necessarily bestows the power of handing on to others the full powers thus delegated, whereas the former does not.

74. Secondly, that supposing our Lord did mean that His Church should be built on Peter, it is plain that He did not then bestow on him a unique privilege in which the other members of the Apostolic College had no share, for St. Paul expressly says, 'Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Head corner-stone.'[3] And in the *Apocalypse* it is said, 'The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.'[4] The metaphor is here applied to the Apostles on the ground that through their labours the Church was founded, in that they brought to men the knowledge of the Gospel, and by baptism made them members of the one Body which is the Church; the expressions foundations and founders 'come back to the same meaning.'[5] If then our Lord's saying does apply to St. Peter, it simply assigns to him a position the same in *kind* as that which the

[1] Bp. Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 91, 4th edit.
[2] Benedict XIV., *De Synod. Dioces.*, lib. vii. cap. iv.
[3] Ephes. ii. 20. [4] Rev. xxi. 14.
[5] Cornelius à Lapide, *in Apoc.* xxi. 14.

other Apostles occupied. St. Peter, who had been their representative in the great confession he had just made, would as their representative receive from Christ the promise which was the reward of that confession.

75. Whilst, however, the position occupied by St. Peter in virtue of this promise would be the same *in kind*, yet *in order* he would be the possessor of a special privilege. As he had been the first to proclaim on the part of the Apostolate the foundation doctrine of the Christian Faith, so, as such, he, 'the 'rocklike' Apostle, to whom had been given the name Peter, as being especially appropriate to him because of the steadfastness and firmness of the faith which had constituted him the mouthpiece of the Apostles, would rightly be regarded as the first in order of the founders of the Church.

This position is precisely the position which St. Peter is represented as occupying in the very early days of the Church. He, as representing the Apostolate, was the instrument through whom, after the descent of the Holy Spirit, the first addition was made to the little band of the disciples from amongst the Jews, and, in the persons of Cornelius and his household, the first Gentiles admitted to the Church.[1]

76. But although St. Peter thus occupied this prominent position at the beginning of the Church's existence, it is plain he ceased to do so as time went on. As Bishop Lightfoot remarks with regard to the place given to him in the Acts: 'In the first part he is everything, in the subsequent record he is nowhere at all. He is only once again mentioned in the Acts (xv. 7), and even here he does not bear the chief part. When the Church at large as an expansive missionary Church is concerned, Paul, not Peter. is the prominent personage; when the Church of Jerusalem appears as the visible centre of Unity, James, not Peter, is the chief agent (Acts xii. 17, xv. 12, xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 9-12), Peter retains the first place as missionary evangelist to the Hebrew Christians, but nothing more.'[2] This fact, whilst it is quite consistent with the interpretation of the text under notice, is clearly incompatible with anything more than such a position of first in order as belonging to St. Peter.

77. But though this interpretation might *per se* appear to be legitimate, yet there is a grave difficulty in the way of its acceptance as being the meaning which our Lord intended to convey by these words. If reference is made to the Old Testament it will be found that in it the word Rock always signifies God Himself wherever it is used in a similar way to that which is in our text, viz. as a foundation on which to build—*e.g.* 'Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee.'[3] 'There is none holy as the Lord: for there is none beside thee: neither is there any

[1] *On St. Peter and the Conversion of Cornelius, vide* note 3.
[2] Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i.; *St. Clement of Rome*, vol. ii. 490.
[3] Deut. xxxii. 18.

Rock like our God.'[1] 'The Lord is my Rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer; the God of my Rock . . . for Who is God, save the Lord? and Who is a Rock, save our God?[2] 'Be Thou my strong Rock for a house of defence to save me, for Thou art my Rock and my fortress';[3] 'He only is my Rock and my salvation; He is my defence: I shall not be greatly moved. . . . He only is my Rock and my salvation. . . . In God is my salvation and my glory: the Rock of my strength and my salvation is in God.[4] 'Is there a God beside Me? Yea, no Rock. I know not any.'[5]

78. This usage of the word Rock in the Old Testament is carried on into the New, in which the word is similarly used of God Incarnate. St. Paul says 'They drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ,'[6] Whom he declares to be the foundation on which the Church is built, 'for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ';[7] as Theodoret says, commenting on this passage: 'Other foundation can no man lay than this [Christ]. This foundation was laid by Peter, or rather by our Lord Himself, for when Peter had said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," our Lord says, "On this Rock I will build My Church." Do not therefore call yourselves by the names of men, for the foundation is Christ.'[8] Consequently Christ is 'the Rock' on which He Himself declares the 'wise man' built the house against which the rains, floods, and storms beat in vain, 'for it was founded upon a Rock';[9] for as Cornelius à Lapide says, 'Mystically Christ is the Rock . . . he builds on Christ who does what he hears from Him.'[10]

79. The great Spanish commentator Alphonsus Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, held this to be the meaning of the passage under consideration, 'What is that rock upon which the Church is founded? Some say this rock is Peter, but it is not true that the Church is built upon Peter, for that upon which it is built is the foundation. And thus Peter would be called the foundation of the Church; but it is false, for Christ alone is the foundation. . . . Peter is a member and not head nor foundation of the Church. Secondly, it is clear, because since the foundation of the Church should abide for ever, because the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, as appears in the passage, it is necessary that the foundation should be even more lasting, and Peter was, whether regarded simply in himself, or in the successors of Peter, not immortal. Concerning Peter, it is manifest that after these words

[1] 1 Sam. ii. 2. [2] 2 Sam. xxii. 2, 3, 32. [3] Psal. xxxi. 2, 3.
[4] Psal. lxii. 2, 6, 7.
[5] Isaiah xliv. 8 (margin), and *vide* Wordsworth on Matt. xvi. for other examples.
[6] 1 Cor. x. 4. [7] 1 Cor. iii. 11.
[8] Theodoret in 1 Cor. iii. 2; P.G. lxxxii. 248, 249.
[9] St. Matt. vii. 24, 25; St. Luke vi. 47, 48.
[10] Cornelius à Lapide in Matt. vii. 25.

he denied the Lord thrice, in which Satan prevailed against him, and so already the gates of hell would have prevailed against the Church, since they had prevailed against the foundation by overturning it, and yet they never have prevailed against the Church; therefore Peter was not the foundation of the Church. Concerning the successors of Peter it is manifest, because many of them entering canonically on their office fell into heresy, and others into the *cultus* of idols, and could be deposed and condemned by the Church when found erring from the faith as in *Decretis* 40 cap. distinct. *Si Papa*. Therefore the Church does not err and the Pope errs. And yet if the Pope were the foundation of the Church, it were necessary that, he failing, the Church should perish; and it does not fail, but on the contrary corrects and punishes the erring Pope or brings him back to the truth. Therefore the Pope is not the foundation of the Church, but the Church is the foundation of the Pope and his Mother.'[1]

80. It may be added that the interpretation that Christ is the Rock in no way militates against the third interpretation which has been given above, which is that given by the majority[2] of the Fathers, viz. that the Faith which Peter confessed, the profession of faith by which we believe that Christ is the Son of the living God, is the eternal and immovable foundation of the Church, inasmuch as it is really a more definite way of stating that which is embodied in that opinion; He in Whom the faith is professed being necessarily the basis of that faith, and consequently the real foundation of the Church. Hence Dionysius the Carthusian gives the two interpretations as equally expressing the meaning of the words, saying, 'And upon this rock, that is, upon the firmness and foundation of his Faith [*i.e.* upon that of Peter], or upon this Rock which thou hast confessed, that is Myself, the chief corner-stone, the lofty mountain of which the Apostle says other foundation can no man lay, etc.'[3]

81. The interpretation of the 'Rock' in the text as meaning Christ thus has practically the authority of the majority of the Fathers, besides which, it is that which harmonises with the use made of the word in other instances in Holy Scripture in which it has the like signification of a foundation, and on these grounds, therefore, it is the meaning which our Lord intended His utterance to bear.

The reason why the name of Peter was given to Simon Barjona is 'because he is the worthy confessor of the true Rock, which is Christ, so therefore He bestows on him a new name on account of the confession of his faith, and he is called Peter who is named Simon.'[4]

[1] Tostatus Alphonsus, Abulensis, *Opera*, tom. xxi. p. 304. Ed. Venet, 1728.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 56 *et seq.*
[3] Dionysius Carthus. *in Quat. Evangel. Enar.*, fol. lxx. Ed. 1533.
[4] *Ibid.*

82. It may be added that the fact that Christ is thus the unique foundation of the Church does not militate against the Apostles being also 'foundations,' as they are designated in Holy Scripture. They are foundations in a secondary and derived sense, just as our Lord declared of them, 'Ye are the light of the world,'[1] although He Himself is the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' In neither case is the unique position of Christ trenched on, their position is solely dependent upon His, and in this way they may be even entitled 'Rocks' as St. Jerome says, 'The Rock is Christ, Who granted to His Apostles that they may be called rocks.'[2]

83. The evidence which has been set out above proves that the passage of Holy Scripture which the *Satis Cognitum* adduces as the grant of 'the Petrine Privilege' is of no value for that purpose. This conclusion involves the rejection of the use sought to be made of it by the *Satis Cognitum*, a rejection which it is to be noted is in accord with the rule laid down for the Roman Church for the interpretation of the Holy Scripture in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which was, by implication, authorised by the Council of Trent,[3] which is as follows:

'I also admit Holy Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to (*juxta*) the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'[4]

84. It is not, therefore, without significance that there is a grave difference between the passage just quoted and that dealing with the same subject in chapter ii. *De Revelatione* of the *Constitutio Dogmatica de fide Catholica*, passed at the third Session of the Vatican Council held on 24th April 1870, in which it is stated, 'That is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which Holy Mother Church hath held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Holy Scripture, and therefore it is permitted to no one to interpret Holy Scripture contrary to this sense, nor likewise *contrary* (*contra*) *to the unanimous consent of the Fathers*.'[5] There is, as has been shown, no 'unanimous consent of the Fathers' in favour of the Papalist interpretation of our text, so that the conclusion according to the teaching of Trent is obvious: the Vatican Council by the substitution of the word '*contra*' (contrary) for the word '*juxta*' (according to) does away with the necessity of drawing that conclusion. Was this change made because those who had the control of that Council were aware of the impossibility of reconciling with the clause in the Creed of Pius IV.

[1] St. Matthew v. 14. [2] S. Hieron. *in Amos*, vi. 12; P.L. x. 1065.
[3] *Tridentini Concil.*, session xxiv. c. xii.
Bulla S.D. N.D. Pii II., *Pii* IV. *super forma juramenti professionis Fidei.*
[5] *Concil. Vatican.*, sessio iii. cap. ii., *De Revelatione*, *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. p. 251.

the dogmatic statement as to the 'Thou art Peter,' which they intended to cause that Council to frame, and which took shape in the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima De Ecclesiâ Christi*?

SECTION X.—*St. Pacian's alleged witness to the Papalist interpretation of 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.'*

85. If it be argued that the *Satis Cognitum* does quote 'the Fathers' in support of the position it lays down with regard to this text, it is to be replied, first, that supposing it were true that the Fathers quoted did hold the Papalist doctrine, it is the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers that is required if that doctrine be part of the one Faith, that and nothing else, as has been already stated,[1] anything short of that is incompatible with the Papalist contention. It has been proved not only that no such unanimous consent exists, but that the majority of the Fathers take an essentially different view of the meaning of our Lord's saying to that which is necessary to Papal allegation with regard to the position of St. Peter and his successors in the Roman Episcopate.

86. Premising this of the two quotations which the *Satis Cognitum* here adduces, the first is an extract from the Epistle addressed by St. Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona, to a Donatist nobleman named Sympronian against 'The Treatise of the Novatians.' The *Satis Cognitum* quotes as follows, 'To Peter the Lord spoke to *one*: therefore, that He might establish unity on one.'[2] The words are cited in proof, it is to be observed, of the meaning assigned to the 'remarkable promise to Peter and to no one else,' already given above.[3] Now the sense thus sought to be affixed to these words is contradicted by the context.

St. Pacian had been discussing the power granted to Bishops, of which our Lord had spoken in St. Matthew xviii. 18, and which Sympronian had denied; he then proceeds: 'All thou seekest then, thou hast in Matthew. Why didst not thou who teachest a Bishop read the whole? Look at the first head of that command. According to the relation of Matthew himself the Lord spake a little alone to Peter (He spake to one that from one He might lay the foundation of unity), afterwards delivering the very same command in common to all. He still begins in the same terms as to Peter, And I say also unto thee, He saith; that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.'[4]

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 49.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 26.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 48.
[4] S. Pacian, *Ep. ad Sympronianum*, Ep. iii. cap. xi.; P.L. xiii. 1071.

St. Pacian in this passage regards the words in St. Matthew xvi. as addressed in common to all the Apostles, and not to Peter and 'his successors in the Roman Episcopate' alone, as the *Satis Cognitum* asserts. All the Apostles having, according to St. Pacian, the power bestowed upon them, Peter being addressed as their representative, the symbol of the unity of the Apostolate, in fact his doctrine on this point is that of St. Cyprian,[1] whom he defends in these letters.

There is not a syllable in St. Pacian's writings which implies that he held that in Peter and his successors, the Bishops of Rome, there resided by the institution of Christ a unique authority, differing in essence from that possessed by the rest of the Apostolic College and the Episcopate which succeeded to it. The Apostolic authority was regarded by him as the highest existing in the Church, and he held that authority to be exercised by the Bishops, of whom he says, 'We bishops have received the name of Apostles . . . we are sealed with the title of Christ' in that there has been 'granted unto Bishops' the name even of His only Beloved, for 'the Apostle Peter hath named our Lord Bishop.'[2] The Bishops, he declares, 'sit in the chair of the Apostles'; their authority is thus supreme, for he says, 'What shall be denied to the Bishops, in whom operateth the Name of God?'[3]

87. It is in accordance with this principle that he treats of the matter in hand, viz. the schismatical action of Novatian in permitting himself under the influence of Novatus to be made Bishop of Rome, as a sin against the 'singleness of the Priesthood,'[4] *i.e.* of the Episcopate, for in this sense is the word used; there being only 'for the time One Priest in the Church,' as St. Cyprian says,[5] One Bishop, that is, in each See. Had St. Pacian regarded him whom he calls 'Bishop of the City' as the sole 'Vicar of Christ,' the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' he would have been compelled to take a very different view of Novatian's proceedings. That he does not do this, but simply treats Cornelius as a Bishop and no more, is a proof that to him as to St. Cyprian,[6] in whose writings he was so well versed, Papalism was unknown.

SECTION XI.—*St. Cyril of Alexandria's alleged witness to the Papalist interpretation of the words 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.'*

88. The other quotation which the *Satis Cognitum* gives in this connection is from the writings of St. Cyril of Alexandria, and is as follows: 'Without any prelude he mentions Peter's name and that of

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 571.

[2] S. Pacian, *Ep. ad Sympronianum*, Ep. i. cap. vii.; P.L. xiii. 1057. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ad Sympronianum*, Ep. iii. cap. xv.; P.L. xiii. 1073.

[5] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lix. 5; Hartel, p. 672.

[6] *Vide infra*, nn. 544 *et seq.*

his father (*Blessed art thou, Simon, son of John*), and He does not wish him to be called any more Simon; claiming him for Himself according to His divine authority. He aptly names him Peter, from *petra* the rock, since upon him He was about to found His Church' (S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *In Evang. Joan.*, lib. ii. in cap. i. v. 42.[1] Do the words thus cited support the interpretation of our Lord's saying which the *Satis Cognitum* declares to be the true one? That is *the* question, and not another. A Father may apply the saying to St. Peter personally, but it does not in any way follow, and it is not to be assumed, that (1) the position which that Father recognises as belonging to Peter is *that* which Papalism asserts to have been granted to him *jure divino*; or (2) that he also applies it to the Bishops of Rome as his successors in such unique position. 'The remarkable promise to Peter' is adduced in the *Satis Cognitum* in proof of its allegation that our Lord 'appointed Peter to be head of the Church,' and that 'He also determined that the authority instituted in perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by his successors,' in whom the same permanent authority of Peter himself should continue, his 'legitimate successors' being 'the Pontiffs who succeed Peter in the Roman Episcopate.'[2] The citation from St. Cyril is made in proof of *this* interpretation, and this fact must be carefully borne in mind in the consideration of this and of any other passages from the Fathers which may be similarly made use of.

89. Premising therefore this, it is first to be observed that St. Cyril in the passage quoted does not in any way connect these words *Thou art Peter, etc.*, with the Bishops of Rome. Nor is his application of the text to St. Peter personally of any use for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*, for the reason that he interprets the passage otherwise elsewhere in his writings. For example, he says: 'For this reason the divine word tells us that Peter, the chosen among the holy Apostles, was blessed. For when the Saviour, being in the parts of Cæsarea Phillipi, inquired whom do men say that the Son of Man is, and what report concerning Him hath gone through the land of the Jews, or the cities bordering on Judæa, discarding the puerile and unseemly opinions of the vulgar; with great wisdom and understanding he cried out, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and speedily received the recompense of his true conception concerning Him, Christ saying, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven, and I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Calling, I imagine, nothing else the Rock, in allusion to his name, but the immovable and stable faith of the disciple on which the Church of Christ is founded

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 26. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 26, 30, 31.

and fixed without danger of falling, and remains for ever inexpugnable to the very gates of hell.'[1]

90. The like interpretation is found elsewhere in his writings: 'But why say we that they are named foundations of the earth? For the foundation and immoveable support of all is Christ, Who upholds all and binds together all that is built upon Him solidly. For on Him are we all built, a spiritual house, jointed together through the Spirit unto a holy temple, His dwelling-place: for He dwelleth in our hearts through faith. But Apostles and Evangelists who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, and have become a confirmation of the faith, may be considered the next and adjoining foundations and nearer to Him than we; for where we have resolved that it is our duty to follow their traditions, we shall maintain our faith in Christ straight and unperverted. For in a certain place when the divine Peter wisely and unblamably confessing his faith in Him said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, it was said by Him, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, calling, I imagine, the unshaken faith of the disciple the rock. And it is said, too, in a certain place by the voice of the Psalmist, His foundations are upon the holy hills. Well may we liken to the holy hills the holy Apostles and Evangelists whose knowledge is firmly fixed like a foundation to those coming after them, not permitting those that have been enclosed in their net to fall away to a reprobate faith.'[2]

91. In these passages St. Cyril interprets 'the "rock" of the unshaken faith' of the Apostle; another meaning is given by him viz. that Christ himself is the Rock. Commenting on Isaiah xxxiii. 16, the great Doctor says: 'It is surely probable that our Lord Jesus Christ is likewise named to us as the Rock in whom the Church, as it were a cave or fold of sheep, is understood a firm and immoveable mansion in well-being. For thou art Peter, saith the Saviour, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. To him then that dwelleth on this Rock bread shall be given and the water of faith supplied; for to them that dwell in the Church Christ the Bread of life is given from God the Father, and the faithful water of holy Baptism, making, that is, faithful and stable, those that are thought worthy of it. For the grace of holy Baptism is given to those that are cleansed through holy Baptism.'[3]

92. The conclusion that must be drawn from these statements by St. Cyril is that it is impossible that he could have believed that the saying Thou art Peter, etc., was the promise that St. Peter should be 'the foundation on which the Church rests,' 'the necessary condition

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *De SS. Trinitate Dialogus*, iv.; P.G. lxxxv. 865.
[2] *In Esai*, xlii. 23, lib. iv. Orat. ii.; P.G. lxx. 940.
[3] *In Esai*, xxxiii. 16, lib. iii.; P.G. lxx. 722.

of stability and strength' to the Church, as the foundation is to a building. Had he so believed he would by these statements have misled those who read his interpretations of the passage, and this in regard to a doctrine of Catholic truth 'from which none can deviate without loss of faith and salvation.'[1] Had this passage been the Charter of the Church's government, he would have here inevitably been compelled so to have treated it, and the fact that he gives three different interpretations of it proves that he was entirely ignorant that it possessed any such character. The conclusion thus arrived at is materially strengthened by the fact that in two of the passages quoted he says of *St. Peter's faith*, 'I imagine' that it is the foundation of the Church. On the hypothesis that the Papalist theory be true, there was no room for any exercise of opinion, for according to it, it is an Article of Faith that St. Peter himself is the divinely appointed foundation; to treat the meaning of this passage as not being determined, is incompatible with any such theory. The very form in which the interpretation is stated would thus be especially worthy of condemnation, for it would draw away the attention of those who read it from the unique foundation to his faith, and cause them to place it in the position which the person of him who possessed it occupies by the institution of Christ. Error, and that with regard to a doctrine *de fide*, would be the necessary result of St. Cyril's teachings.

93. Further, the passage quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* does not in any way assert that Peter had 'a primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church' and that 'in the same primacy by the institution of Christ the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter,'[2] which the *Vatican Decrees* (of which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts that they 'set forth the venerable and constant belief of every age') declare to be *de fide* under anathema. In it St. Peter is merely regarded as being in some sense the foundation of the Church, which is, as has been shown,[3] true of all the Apostles, as St. Cyril himself says of them, 'they are become, as it were, foundations after "Christ" of the Universal Church.'[4] Had St. Cyril believed that St. Peter was by divine appointment *the* foundation of the Church whose office it was by his supreme power of jurisdiction to support and guard the Church in all its strength and indestructible unity, it could not but have been but that here he could have used words which would have plainly expressed such belief, besides which the fact that he has given other interpretations of the words and declared that Christ is the Rock, prevents any meaning being affixed to the language he does employ

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv., *Constitutio Dogmatica De Ecclesia Christi*, cap. iii.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

[2] *Ibid.*, cap. ii; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

[3] *Vide supra*, n. 74.

[4] S. Cyril Alex., *in Esai*, liv. 11; P.G. lxx. 1209.

here, which necessitates, as the Papalist allegation requires, the rock being interpretated of St. Peter alone.

94. Again, the Papalist use of this passage is further proved to be erroneous by the position which St. Cyril asserts belongs to the Apostolate. He says, commenting on the words, '*As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.*' 'In these words our Lord Jesus Christ elected the guides and teachers of the world, and the stewards of the divine mysteries, whom He bids forthwith to shine like lights and to illumine, not merely the land of the Jews according to the measure of the legal command, stretching from Dan even to Beersheba, as it is written, but rather all that is beneath the sun, and those that are in all countries scattered and there dwelling. Truly, therefore, doth Paul say that no man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God. For our Lord Jesus Christ called unto the most glorious Apostolate before all others, His own disciples, and fixed the earth that was all but shaken and entirely falling, revealing, as God, her foundations and those that were able to bear her up. Wherefore He said by the voice of the Psalmist concerning the earth and the Apostles, "I bear up the pillars of it." For the blessed disciples became, as it were, the pillars and foundations of the Truth, to whom indeed He also says, that He sends as His Father sent Him, at once showing the dignity of the Apostolate and the incomparable glory of the power given to them.'[1]

95. Commenting on another passage, Gen. xlix. 16, the great Doctor says of the Patriarch Dan, that he signifies 'a Judge that he may set forth in his own person the glorious and renowned choir of the holy Apostles, who are set for the government of believers, and have been by Christ Himself appointed to judge. . . . When the shadow of the law was, as it were, contracted and the spiritual and true worship introduced by Christ, the world needed more illustrious judges, and the divine disciples were called to this, and took the place of the teachers according to law. Therefore, unto the Mother of the Jews, Jerusalem, I mean, was it said of God by the mouth of the Psalmist, "Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children," that is, thy children exercising judgment have taken the place of the fathers: but unto our Lord Jesus Christ, Thou shalt make them rulers over all the earth. Which any one may see accomplished. For we have had for governors and received for Œcumenical Judges the holy disciples, by whose teaching the very mystery of Christ is spoken, since these are both dispensers of the saving word and directors of practice.'[2]

96. The language used by St. Cyril in this passage proves that he held that the supreme jurisdiction in the Church was possessed by the

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *in Joan.* xx. 1, lib. xii.; P.G. lxxiv. 708, 709.
[2] *Glaphyrorum in Gen.*, lib. vii.; P.G. lxix. 361, 364.

Apostolate. He declares the glory of the power given to the Apostles to be *incomparable*, that is, there is no power which can be placed in the same category with it, let alone exceed it; that the Apostles have the government of believers; that they are Œcumenical judges, receiving their appointment from Christ Himself, that is, that they have universal jurisdiction *jure divino* as governors of the Church, from which it clearly follows that no one of them had a jurisdiction differing in essence from that then possessed by the rest of the Apostolate, still less that there was one who is by institution of Christ, their 'Master,' as the *Satis Cognitum* declares St. Peter to have been. In fact there was not, in St. Cyril's opinion, even any distinction of *rank* amongst the Apostles, for in the letter which, in the name of the Council which he held at Alexandria, A.D. 430, he addressed to Nestorius, he said: 'Equality of honour maketh not unity of natures. Peter at least and John were of equal rank with each other as Apostles and holy disciples, but the two are not one person.'[1] Clearly no one of the Apostles could have been on an equality with the Supreme Pastor[2] of the One Flock, the 'Master' of the Apostolic College. St. Cyril is thus in complete contradiction to the position declared by Papalism to belong *jure divino* to St. Peter.

97. St. Cyril, who thus held that the Apostles had entrusted to them by the institution of Christ the government of the Church, lays down also that all Bishops succeed to them with like authority. 'In Christ they [the Apostles] have become fathers of many nations and of a countless seed as Abraham in Isaac. But we shall make this application not only to the holy Apostles of old, but also to those who have succeeded to them in the office of Priesthood, and the government of churches, or indeed to every holy and good man.'[3] Again, commenting on St. John x. 1, 9, he says: 'He teaches that the preservation of their dignity shall be given those only who are called by Him to the ruling of the people. Therefore He calls Himself the door, as introducing of His own proper will the man of understanding and piety to the leading of reasonable flocks. But thief and robber He calls him that gets up by some other way, that by force and tyranny thinks that he can take the honour not given unto him, such as were some concerning whom He speaks by one of the prophets. "They have set up kings, but not by Me; they have governed, but not by My spirit." By these words they signify that if they have a pleasure in ruling the people, they must, believing and receiving the divine message, run to this through Him, that they may have an untroubled and firmly fixed government, as was the case with the holy Apostles,

[1] S. Cyril Alex., Ep. iii. *Ad Nestorium*, Ep. xvii; P.G. lxxvii. 112.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.
[3] S. Cyril Alex., *De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate*, lib. ix.; P.G. lxviii. 357.

and with the teachers of the holy Churches after them, by whom the doorkeeper opens, that is, either the angel that is appointed to preside over the Churches and to co-operate with them that exercise the Priest's office unto the good of the people; or again, the Saviour Himself, Who is at once the door and the Lord of the door.'[1] 'They who secure the government by the gift of God, and through Christ come unto this, with great authority and grace shall rule over the most sacred fold.'[2] That is, as he says elsewhere, 'the holy Evangelists and Apostles, and all the rest who after them have been put in charge of the holy churches,' 'who from age to age govern the churches.'[3]

98. As then St. Cyril did not believe that the care of the government of the whole Church was committed by Christ to St. Peter as the one Supreme Pastor, but on the contrary, held that to the Apostles was delivered *jure divino* the supreme jurisdiction in the Church, having no one of their number as their 'Master,' but all possessing an equality of rank, so also the Papalist dogma that there was one Bishop, 'the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate,' holding *jure divino* such a position in the days of St. Cyril, was clearly unknown to him. St. Cyril, as these passages show, used language incompatible with any such dogma being 'the venerable and constant belief of the age' in which he lived.

99. Hence it follows that the *Satis Cognitum*, by quoting the passage under notice in the connection it does, endeavours to affix to it a meaning which it will not bear, and which is incompatible with the teaching of the author elsewhere in his works. The importance of this conclusion is obvious. He knew nothing of these words *Thou art Peter* being the Charter of the Government to the Church, words of unique and transcendent import adduced by the *Satis Cognitum* as the very basis of the Papal Monarchy. As he was thus ignorant of the 'basis,' so he was necessarily ignorant of that which Papalism seeks to build upon it, viz. the Papal Monarchy itself. The one perforce involves the other, a circumstance which gives the explanation of that which would otherwise be inexplicable, viz. the anxiety of the *Satis Cognitum* to affix to St. Cyril's words the signification which, as has been shown, is alien from the intention of the writer.

Section XII.—*The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence.*

100. The investigation which has been made in this chapter into the question, Was St. Peter appointed by Christ to be the Head of the Church? produces the following results. First, that the Papalist inter-

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *In Joan.* (x. 1); lib. vi.; P.G. lxxiii. 1021.
[2] *In Joan.* (x. 9); lib. vi.; P.G. lxxiii. 1028, 1029.
[3] *In Esai.* xxx. 25 (cap. xxxiii. 21); P.G. lxx. 685 (736).

pretation of the words of Christ, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' is necessary to the Papalist dogma with reference to St. Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate. It is according to Papalism the basis on which such dogma rests, the Charter of Government to the Church given by Christ Himself.

Secondly, that if the Papalist interpretation be true, it will of necessity be the 'venerable and constant belief of every age' of the Church. It would be impossible that it could be otherwise, for the Church could not have been ignorant of the exact meaning of words of such momentous importance.

Thirdly, that so far from this interpretation being that which has this universal consent from the beginning of the Christian Religion, there are several interpretations of these words to be found in the Fathers, a fact which conclusively proves that they cannot have been intended by Christ to contain the Charter of Government to the Church.

Fourthly, that the origin of the Papalist interpretation can be distinctly traced to Papal and, therefore, non-impartial sources.

Fifthly, that on the evidence the interpretation which appears to be that which is most probably correct as being in accord with the usage of Holy Scripture, is that 'the Rock' is Christ Himself, and that even if the interpretation that 'the Rock' meant St. Peter does express the meaning intended by Christ, the words would simply signify that Peter should be a foundation of the Church as all the Apostles of the Lamb were to be, the promise that this should be the case being here made to them in Peter who had in his glorious confession just acted as their representative.

Sixthly, that the words of St. Pacian and St. Cyril which are adduced in the *Satis Cognitum* in support of its allegation with reference to these words cannot be so used, as these Fathers plainly did not hold the Papalist dogma enshrined in that document.

From these results the inevitable conclusion to be drawn is that the Papalist interpretation of the text which is embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, viz. that by these words our Lord designated Peter to be Head of the Church and His Vicegerent, a designation which included in it that of his 'successors the Bishops' of Rome in whom the same paramount and supreme authority should continue, is erroneous and contrary to the true meaning of our Lord's words.

CHAPTER III

THE PAPALIST DOCTRINE OF THE SUPREMACY OF PETER OVER THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

SECTION XIII.—*Of the nature of the 'Primacy' alleged to have been conferred by Christ on St. Peter.*

101. The word 'Primacy,' which is applied to the position which is asserted by Papalism to belong *jure divino* to St. Peter, is an ambiguous one, and it is necessary to have a clear insight into the meaning in which the term is used by Papalists if an erroneous impression is not to be derived from such use. The word might, for example, be used simply to denote a position of honour accorded to St. Peter, or it might convey the meaning that he as holding such place of rank had a power of giving advice or of influence of the kind possessed by the head of a constitutional state, a position differing essentially from that of an absolute Ruler, or it might be used to describe a position the same in character as that which according to modern idea is associated with, and indeed is a necessary prerogative of, an absolute monarch. In which sense is then this word 'Primacy' used by Papalism as descriptive of the office held by St. Peter according to the institution of Christ? The question is not to be observed as one of mere antiquarian or historical interest; on the contrary, it is one of practical concern in the present, as in any other, age of the Church's history. For it must be always borne in mind, it is the same authority thus alleged to belong to St. Peter which is asserted by Papalism to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs as the 'legitimate successors' of Peter 'in the Roman Episcopate,' and which by the *Vatican Decrees* it is declared under anathema must be admitted to so belong to them by the institution of Christ.[1]

102. It is not then a matter for surprise to find that the *Satis Cognitum* is clear and distinct in its teaching as to what is meant by the Papalist use of the word Primacy. Any attempt to explain the term in a minimising sense is carefully guarded against by the express denial that the possession by St. Peter of 'a primacy of honour,' or 'the shadowy right of giving advice and admonition which is called

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. ii.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

direction,' would be sufficient to enable him to discharge the duties of the office alleged to belong to him by the will and command of God.

It must be allowed that in taking this course Pope Leo adopted the only one consistent with Papalism; no exception can be taken to it. Granted that it is the office of St. Peter according to the Divine constitution of the Church to support it as the foundation on which it rests, and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity, any mere 'primacy of honour' or 'right of direction' would be a wholly inadequate description of his position and power, and the use of such terms would convey a meaning different in essence to the sense in which 'Primacy' is used by Papalism.

103. The Supreme Authority instituted by Christ in the Church must indeed necessarily possess the Supreme power therein, for it cannot be supposed that such an authority would be constituted by our Lord without being at the same time endowed with the power which would enable it to perform the functions for which it was so constituted. That Supreme Authority was, as has been shown,[1] the Apostolate, and the very terms of the commission which constituted it in this position included the grant of the Supreme power which Christ Himself had exercised on earth. 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.'[2] Papalism, however, declares that Peter alone is the Supreme Authority in the Church, consequently the *Satis Cognitum* in thus repudiating 'a primacy of honour' or 'right of direction,' as an adequate or rightful description of the Supremacy which it asserts belongs *jure divino* to St. Peter, is simply doing what Papalism, if it be true, must necessitate.

104. The *Satis Cognitum* further in so doing is in direct accord with the teaching of the *Vatican Council*. The *Decrees* of that Council pronounce condemnation on all those who say that Peter received a 'primacy of honour only and not of true and proper jurisdiction,'[3] and it is difficult to understand how the idea thus condemned could be supposed by any to satisfy the Papal claims. A primacy of honour coupled with the right of giving advice and admonition might well belong *jure ecclesiastico* to the Bishop, 'to whom the Fathers naturally assigned privileges,'[4] but it would differ in *essence* from a Primacy of jurisdiction *jure divino*, and the recognition of the one in no way satisfies the demand that the former must be admitted. It is the more necessary to insist on this because any testimonies which may be adduced from the writings of the Fathers in support of the view that they held that St. Peter was first in rank in the Apostolic College,

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 30 *et seq.*

[2] St. John xx. 21.

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. i.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vi. 483.

[4] τὰ πρεσβεῖα, *Concil. Chalced.*, Can. xxviii., Mansi, vii. 370, on which *vide infra*, n. 412 *et seq.*

or that the Bishop of Rome was recognised by them as first in order in the Episcopate, cannot be adduced in proof of the Papalist doctrine, a fact which obviously has an important value when any quotations from the Fathers alleged in support of that doctrine have to be considered.

105. The *Satis Cognitum* does not, however, confine itself merely to the negative position that such a primacy of honour and right of direction is not that which Peter received, but lays down clearly the nature of the power which it asserts was conferred on him as the foundation on which the Church rests—it is 'the power of commanding, forbidding, and judging which is properly called *jurisdiction*.' It is a power which is described as 'unconquerable,' 'supreme and absolutely independent,' so that 'having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church';[1] it is thus, as the *Vatican Council* decreed, 'a primacy of jurisdiction over the Universal Church.'[2]

The *Satis Cognitum* forms an authoritative explanation of the *Decrees* of the *Vatican Council*; it precludes any attempt to minimise their meaning, and sets the seal of the Papal authority on the Ultramontane, and it must be admitted, *primâ facie*, meaning assigned to those decrees. There is, then, no ambiguity in the language used in the *Satis Cognitum* to set forth the nature of the power alleged by Papalism to have been bestowed on St. Peter by Christ Himself: the acceptance of anything *less* than what is stated therein will not satisfy the Papal demand.

Section XIV.—*Origen on 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'*

106. The words of our Lord upon which the position alleged in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to St. Peter as the unique foundation of the Church is based, have been already considered[3] and shown not to have borne in the first age of the Church the interpretation which Papalism seeks to affix to them, a fact which is fatal to its truth, as it must, if it had been true, been the 'venerable and constant belief of' that 'age' as of every other age in the history of the Church. The true nature of the Supreme Authority constituted by Christ in His Church has also been set forth.[4] Consequently the premiss which is essential to the Papalist doctrine as to St. Peter's unique prerogatives has been itself disproved, whence it follows that the whole claim therein made is necessarily without basis and therefore untrue.

107. But premising this, it will be well to consider another allegation

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 26, 28.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 483.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 48 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 30 *et seq.*

in the *Satis Cognitum* with reference to this alleged power conferred on St. Peter, viz. that 'the words—*and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*—proclaim and establish the authority of which we speak.' It will be observed that this statement *assumes* that Peter is '*the* Rock' on which the Church is built in the words which immediately precede the citation here made; this has been proved[1] not to be the case, hence the words now quoted cannot apply to an authority the very existence of which requires that the disproved assumption should be the meaning of our Lord's words. The citation does, indeed, contain a promise that the Church shall not succumb or in any wise fail, but it is to the Church as built upon Himself, 'the Rock,' that the promise is made, and to this fact the quotation from Origen bears witness, which the *Satis Cognitum* here adduces in proof of the conclusion it draws from the words of our Lord under notice, viz. that Christ 'confided His Church to Peter that he might safely guard it by his unconquerable power.'

108. The quotation from Origen is given as follows in the *Satis Cognitum*:[2] 'What then is *it*?' writes Origen. 'Is it the Rock upon which Christ builds the Church, or the Church itself? The expression indeed is ambiguous as if the rock and the Church were one and the same. I indeed think that this is so, and that neither against the rock upon which Christ builds the Church, nor against the Church shall the gates of hell prevail (Origen's *Comment in Matt.*, tom. xii. n. 11).' 'For the Church, as the edifice of Christ, Who has wisely built His house upon a rock, cannot be conquered by the gates of Hell, which may prevail over any man who shall be off the rock and outside the Church, but shall be powerless against it' (*ibid.*).

109. Now, the connection in which the passage is cited in the *Satis Cognitum* implies that Origen in the context interprets the rock of St. Peter, for in that document it is stated that the meaning of the words '*and the gates of hell*,' etc., is that 'notwithstanding the wiles and intrigues which they bring to bear against the Church it can never be that the Church, committed to the care of Peter, shall succumb or in any wise fail,' and the citation is made in support of the conclusion, 'therefore God confided His Church to Peter so that he might safely guard it with his unconquerable power.'[3] The *Satis Cognitum* had just previously laid down that from the text to which Origen refers in the quotation, 'it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon Peter just as a building rests upon its foundation'; that is, that Peter is the rock, hence it is as the unique foundation of the Church that it is his office to support the Church and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity.[4]

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 52 *et seq.*, 74.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 26, 27 *et seq.*
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

110. The whole argument of the *Satis Cognitum* plainly requires that Origen by 'the rock' should in the passage quoted mean St. Peter, for it is as the rock that the *Satis Cognitum* alleges the Church to have been confided to him. That this is not the case is plain from the words which precede the citation given, which absolutely prohibits any such idea being here attributed to him. 'But,' says Origen, 'if you think that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter alone, what would you say about John the son of Thunder or each one of the Apostles? Or shall we venture to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter, but shall prevail against the other Apostles and those that are perfect? Are not the words in question, the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and upon this rock will I build My Church, said in the case of all and each of them? Are then the keys of the kingdom of heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed men receive them? And if the words, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, are common to the others also, why not both all which goes before and all which comes after, said as if to Peter? For in this place the words, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and the rest, seem to be said to Peter; but in the place in John, the Saviour giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples by breathing on them says, Receive ye the Holy Ghost and the rest.'[1]

111. Origen here plainly denies that St. Peter was *the* rock, the unique foundation of the Church. He places all the Apostles on an equality as the foundations of the Church, in the sense, that is, of Ephesians ii. 20.[2] From this it follows that Origen did not hold that the Church was by the words 'Thou art Peter,' etc., confided to St. Peter alone, but, in whatever sense the Apostles are the foundations of the Church, to each and all of the Apostolate. He is entirely unconscious of the Ultramontane idea asserted by the *Satis Cognitum*, in support of which he is therein quoted.

112. The practice of citing passages divorced from the context which prohibit the meaning which it implied by such quotation that they bear, is one which unfortunately is not unfamiliar in the Roman controversy, and a grave question arises in the present instance. Pope Leo XIII. claimed to be 'the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' and in the *Satis Cognitum* he not only declared that it is intended for the 'fuller instruction' of those whom he regarded as alone within the fold, but also in calling upon those who are not of 'the fold,' as he conceived it to be, viz. those not in communion with himself, as to hear his 'voice,' he proclaimed that it is the formal enunciation of what he, the 'Supreme Pastor,' in the discharge of the office, taught as the truth

[1] Origen *in Matt.* xvi., tom. xiii. 11; P.G. xiii. 1000, 1001.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 74.

with regard to 'the way in which the Divine Founder of the Church willed that the unity of the Church should be preserved,' the neglect of which had caused them to wander away from the Spouse of Jesus Christ.[1]

113. Hence it would be natural to suppose that, as such Teacher, Pope Leo would not rely on the accuracy of any quotation submitted to him for use in such an important document to be sent forth *ex cathedrâ* without first personally investigating the whole passage in which the quotation stands, or that at any rate every care would be taken to avoid any unfair use of citations in proof of so weighty a matter as that which forms the subject of the *Satis Cognitum*. Any other method of quotation would, to say the least, tend to mislead those whom Pope Leo intended to instruct with regard to a truth of the Catholic Faith as to which, on Papalist principles, they have erred and so are outside the Church, 'separated from the fold' and 'exiled from the kingdom.' How came then 'the Teacher of all Christians' from his Chair to thus make this citation? It is a grave question complicated further by the fact that it is not the only instance[2] in which a quotation is made in the *Satis Cognitum* so as to convey to its readers an erroneous impression of the writer's meaning, and it must be admitted this method of procedure leaves a very unpleasant impression on the mind.

Section XV.—'*The Gift of the Keys.*'

114. The *Satis Cognitum* cites three passages of Scripture in proof of its allegation that St. Peter was invested by Christ with that jurisdiction over the universal Church which, as has been seen,[3] Pope Leo in that document authoritatively declared to belong *jure divino* to St. Peter as the foundation on which the Church rests. The first of these is 'To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' In these words the *Satis Cognitum* says that Christ 'promised to give to St. Peter power and authority over the Church, "the Keys" constituting the usual sign of governing authority,' in which sense also the *Satis Cognitum* declares that our Lord used the words which follow, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth it shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven'; this metaphorical expression of binding and loosing indicated the power of making laws, of judging, and punishing; and the power is said to be of such amplitude and force that God will ratify whatever is decreed by it. Thus it is supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church.'[4] Pope Leo assumed here that this promise had reference to St. Peter

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 41.
[2] *Vide infra*, n. 1105.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 2, 48 *et seq.*
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 27, 28.

alone and consequently was fulfilled to him alone, so that on him alone our Lord conferred 'the jurisdiction of supreme pastor and ruler over the whole flock.'[1]

115. In considering the passage thus cited it is first necessary to inquire what is the meaning of 'The gift of the Keys.' In such inquiry it is evident the scriptural use of the term will determine its signification; consequently the passage in Isaiah xxii. 20-22, in which the substitution of Eliakim for Shebna in the stewardship of Israel is declared is of crucial importance. It is there said, 'I will call my servant Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, and I will clothe him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand, and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah, and the key of the house of David will I lay upon thy shoulder so he shall open and none shall shut, and he shall shut and none shall open.' The promise then in the saying of our Lord means, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, that St. Peter should be appointed Steward of the household of the King of the Israel of God, the representative of Him 'that hath the key of David,'[2] and consequently having authority 'to bind' or 'loose,' *i.e.* having legislative and judicial authority of so full a nature that its exercise will have the Divine ratification.

116. But was this office of Steward conferred on Peter alone, as the *Satis Cognitum*, in conformity with the *Vatican Decrees*, alleges? The answer is obviously in the negative, inasmuch as all the Apostles are 'Stewards,' since our Lord, in answer to Peter's question, 'Speakest Thou this Parable unto *us*, or even to all?' said, 'Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season?'[3] All of those on whose behalf St. Peter asked the question were to be stewards, and therefore to have 'the keys,' which are the badge of stewardship, and thus to have committed to them the government of the Kingdom. This promise, in fact, was expressly renewed to the whole Apostolic College when the Lord said so, using the same words as He did to describe the like power promised to St. Peter, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,'[4] 'the keys' being the instruments of the binding and loosing power, for, as the Council of Trent says, 'the keys are granted not only to loose but to bind';[5] the power of binding and loosing being the result of the gift of the keys.

117. If the question be asked, Why, then, was the promise made

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. i.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 482.
[2] Rev. iii. 7.
[3] St. Luke xii. 41, 42.
[4] St. Matt. xviii. 18.
[5] *Concil. Trid.*, sess. xiv.; *De Pœnitentia*, cap. viii.

in the passage under notice to St. Peter alone? The answer is given by St. Augustine in his statements on the subject. 'Among these [Apostles],' says that great Doctor of the Church, 'to Peter everywhere alone was it vouchsafed to represent the Church (*gestare personam Ecclesiæ*). On account of the character which he alone bore of representing the Church was it granted to him to hear the words, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." For these keys not one man but the unity of the Church received. Hereby, then, is the excellence of Peter set forth that he was an emblem of the Church in its universality and unity, when it was said to him, I give to thee what was given to all. For that ye may know that the Church did receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven hear in another place what the Lord said to all the Apostles, "Receive the Holy Ghost," and then instantly, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained" (St. John xx. 22, 23). This appertaineth to the keys, of which it was said, "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven" (St. Matt. xviii. 18). But this He said to Peter that ye may know that Peter then represented the whole Church. Hear what is said to him, what to all, if he will not hear thee tell it to the Church, "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shalt be bound in heaven."'[1]

118. And again: 'As in the Apostles, the number itself being twelve, that is, four divisions into three, and all being asked, Peter alone answered, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And it is said to him, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, as if he alone had received the power of binding and loosing; the case really being, that he singly said that in the name of all, and received this together with all, as representing unity itself, therefore one in the name of all, because unity is in all.'[2]

119. So again: 'The Church therefore which is founded on Christ received in Peter's person the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins,' and, after proceeding to draw out the two states of life typified by St. Peter and St. John respectively, he adds, 'Therefore for all Saints inseparably belonging to the Body of Christ, Peter, the first of the Apostles, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, for binding and loosing sins, in order to guidance through this most stormy life; and for the same all Saints in order to the unbroken repose of that most secret life, did John the Evangelist recline on the bosom of Christ. Since it is neither the former alone but the whole Church which bindeth and looseth; nor did the latter for himself alone imbibe from the fountain-head of the Lord's bosom

[1] S. Aug., *Sermo* ccxcv. cap. ii.; P.L. xxxviii., 1349.
[2] *Tract. in Joan.*, cxviii. 4; P.L. xxxv. 1940.

those sublime truths which by his preaching he was to give forth again.'[1]

120. The same teaching is expressed elsewhere in St. Augustine's writings. 'Peter appears in many places of Scripture because he personates the Church, especially in the place where it is said, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Whether, then, did Peter receive the keys and Paul not? Did Peter receive them, and did not John and James receive them? But when in signification Peter represented the person of the Church, that which was given to him alone was given to the Church. Peter therefore represented the Church (*figuram gestabat Ecclesiæ*), the Church is the Body of Christ.'[2]

121. From these quotations it is plain that St. Augustine held that these words of our Lord were addressed to St. Peter in a representative capacity. No promise was in them made that he should be the recipient of any power different in essence to that which should be bestowed on the whole Apostolate; on the contrary, the promise was one in virtue of which all the Apostles should have bestowed on them the power of which 'the keys' were the appropriate symbol and instrument. To Peter, the first named in the roll of the Apostles given in Holy Scripture at the time when our Lord called 'the twelve' to Himself, the first to proclaim, in their name, the truth as to His Divinity which that Apostolate had believed, to him thus acting on their behalf and accepted as their representative was the promise made.

122. St. Augustine in thus teaching simply reproduces, as was natural in an African Father, the idea of a symbolical character belonging to St. Peter, which is found in the teaching of an earlier Father of the same part of the Church, St. Cyprian, who in fact in the matter was his master and teacher, and which, through his influence with the Church in Africa, obtained great hold there.[3] It is, therefore, as 'Primus inter pares,' and consequently the natural representative of the Apostolic College, not as its 'Master,' that to Peter were these words of our Lord addressed, a promise fulfilled when He Who made it gave the great commission to the Apostolate, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; whose soever sins ye retain they are retained.'[4]

123. In accordance with this, other Fathers and ancient writers teach that the keys 'were granted to all the Apostles.' *E.g.* Origen says in a passage already cited, 'Are then the keys of the kingdom of heaven

[1] S. Aug., *Tract. in Joan.*, cxxiv. 5, 7; P.L. xxxv. 1974, 1977.
[2] *Sermo* cxlix, cap. 7; P.L. xxxviii. 802.
[3] On a passage in the writings of St. Optatus on the Keys, *vide* note 4.
[4] St. John xx. 21, 22.

given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed men receive them? And if the words, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, are common to the others also, why not both all which goes before and all which follows after, said as if to Peter? For in this place the words, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," and the rest, seem to be said to Peter; but in the place in John the Saviour giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples by breathing on them says, Receive ye the Holy Ghost and the rest.'[1]

St. Jerome uses like language in a passage also cited above, saying: 'But you say that the Church is founded on Peter, although the same thing is done in another place upon all the Apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the solidity of the Church is established equally upon all.'[2]

And St. Hilary: 'O blessed and holy men [*i.e.* the Apostles], and who for the reward of your faith obtained the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and loosing in heaven and in earth.'[3]

St. Ambrose also: 'Therefore the Lord gave the Apostles that which was previously part of His own judicial authority. . . . Hear Him saying I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. To thee He says, I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that you may bind and loose. . . . What was said to Peter is said to the Apostles.'[4]

And Theophylact: 'They who have obtained the grace of the Episcopate as Peter had have authority to remit and bind, for though "I will give thee" was spoken to Peter alone, yet the gift has been given to all the Apostles. When? When He said, Whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted, for this I will give thee indicates a future time —the time, that is, after the Resurrection.'[5]

To the same effect St. Gaudentius of Brescia says: 'All the Apostles when Christ rises receive the Keys as Peter, nay rather, they receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven with Peter when He saith Receive the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted.'[6]

And our own Teacher, the Venerable Bede, declares: 'And I will give to thee the Keys; this power without doubt is given to all the Apostles, to whom by Him after the Resurrection is said generally, Receive the Holy Ghost; to the Bishops also and the Presbyters, and to the whole Church, the same office is committed.'[7] These quotations

[1] Origen, *in Matt.* (xvi. 18), tom. xiii. 11; P.G. xiii. 1000.
[2] S. Hieron., *Adv. Jovin.* i. cap. xxvi.; P.L. xxiii. 247.
[3] S. Hilar., *De Trinitate*, v. 33; P.L. x. 157.
[4] S. Ambros., *Enarratio in Psalm.* xxxviii. 37; P.L. xiv. 1037.
[5] Theophylact, *Enarratio in Matt.* cap. xiv. 19; P.G. cxxiii. 320.
[6] S. Gaudentius Brescię Epis., *Sermo* xvi.; P.L. xx. 959.
[7] Ven. Beda *in Matt.* xvi.; *Expositio*, lib. iii.; P.L. xcii. 79.

will suffice to show that the general teaching of the Fathers is incompatible with the Papalist doctrine as to the gift of the Keys to St. Peter. Had that been true, the interpretation of our Lord's saying, on which that doctrine is based, must have been the one which they would have unanimously proclaimed, as being of necessity in such a vital matter the sole one which the Church in every age has held.

124. But it may be said, does not the *Satis Cognitum* support its teaching as to the Gift of the Keys, by quoting from the works of the great Eastern Doctor, St. Chrysostom? It is true that a citation is made in the *Satis Cognitum* for this purpose, but as a matter of fact St. Chrysostom in no way differs from the general consensus of the Fathers on this point. The passage quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* in this connection is, 'The Son committed to Peter the office of spreading the knowledge of His Father and Himself over the whole world. He who increased the Church in all the earth, and proclaimed it to be stronger than the Heavens, gave to a mortal man all power in Heaven when He handed him the Keys (S. Joannes Chrysostomus, *Hom.* liv. in Matt. v. 2).'[1] The words as thus quoted look very convincing, but a very slight investigation shows that the Papalist use made of them is contrary to St. Chrysostom's belief.

125. In the first place, the quotation is taken from a Homily on the celebrated passage in St. Matthew, in which St. Chrysostom, as he does elsewhere, interprets 'the Rock,' not of Peter, but of 'the faith of his confession.' Hence it is clear he did not believe that passage to bear the sense which the *Satis Cognitum* ascribes to it, a sense which is essential to the allegation made by Papalism as to the position of Peter as having supreme jurisdiction over the universal Church inasmuch as the supreme authority is alleged to have been conferred on him because the Church was confided to him, the ground for this being stated to be that 'by the will and command of God,' as 'is clear from this text,' 'the Church rests upon' him 'just as a building rests on its foundation.'[2] This being the case, whatever position St. Chrysostom may in the passage have desired to say that St. Peter occupied, it is plain that it cannot be that which the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* assert to have been conferred on him by the institution of Christ, because the words which are adduced in those documents as the very basis of the position therein asserted are held by him to have quite another signification.[3] It is inconceivable that St. Chrysostom could have so interpreted the text had it possessed the supreme dogmatic importance which, if the Papal theory were true, would necessarily belong to it as the Charter of Government to the Church.

126. Additional proof that St. Chrysostom's words under notice do

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 27.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 56.

not bear the meaning which alone would justify their use in the connection in which they are quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* is given by the language which he employs with reference to other Saints in his writings. For instance, he says of St. Paul, 'Who then was better than all men, who else but the tentmaker, the teacher of the world, the planter of the Church, the wise architect? . . . If therefore he receive a greater crown than the Apostles, and be greater than they, it is manifest that he shall enjoy the highest honour and pre-eminences,'[1] and 'that he excelled all men who have been since men first were.'[2]

In another place the great Doctor declares him to be 'the tongue of the world, the light of the Church, the foundation of the Faith, the pillar and ground of the truth,'[3] and in another speaks of him as 'the Apostle of the world,'[4] and, again, as having 'the care of the whole world.'[5]

127. Again, St. Chrysostom, whilst he says in his Homily on St. John xxi. referring to St. Peter, 'At the same time, to show that he must be of good cheer, Jesus putteth into his hands the chief authority among the brethren, saying, If thou lovest me preside over thy brethren'; and that in contrast to St. James, who received only the throne of Jerusalem, 'He appointed him teacher, not of the chair, but of the world,' a little further down in the Homily he associates St. John with St. Peter, declaring 'but since *they were about to receive the charge of the whole world*, it was necessary that they should no longer be closely associated, for assuredly this would have been a great loss to the world.'[6]

Now, had he believed that St. Peter occupied the position which Papalism asserts belongs to him *jure divino*, he would have been prevented from saying that another Apostle had also committed to him the charge of the whole world. On the other hand, his statement that such a charge was delivered to both, proves that he held that both were equal in power as sharing the One Apostolate and thus possessing each of them Œcumenical jurisdiction as co-rulers, the position which, as has been shown, he declares to be that held by St. Paul.

128. St. Chrysostom's teaching thus is in accord with that of St. Cyril, who says with reference to the confession made by St. Thomas on the first Low Sunday: 'To him who so believed and was thus disposed, at the end of the Gospel He says, Go and make disciples of

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom. De Petitione Filiorum Zebidæi*, viii.; P.G. xlviii. 772.

[2] *Hom.* ii. *De Laud. S. Pauli*, i.; P.G. l. 5.

[3] *Hom.* i. *in Rom.* xvi. 3; P.G. li. 191.

[4] *Hom.* xxi. *in Ep.* i. *ad Cor.* ii.; P.G. lxi. 171.

[5] *Hom.* xxv. *in Ep.* ii. *ad Cor.* xi. 28; P.G. lxi. 571. For other instances of the use of like language of St. Paul and also of St. John by St. Chrysostom, *vide* n. 175, 183 *et seq.*

[6] *Hom.* lxxxviii. *in Joan.*, xxi.; P.G. lix. 479.

all nations. But if He bids one who thought thus to make disciples of all nations and appoints him œcumenical doctor, He willeth that we should have no other faith.'[1] In fact, St. Chrysostom plainly teaches the same doctrine as that taught by St. Cyprian[2] with reference to the One Apostolate, and the language quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* cannot therefore bear the meaning which that document by its use of them seeks to affix to them.

129. To sum up, according to the Fathers the promise of 'the gift of the Keys' was made to St. Peter as the representative of the Apostolate which he had just been in his memorable confession, 'the Keys' being the instruments of the binding and loosing power then promised, as it was afterwards to all the Apostles,[3] the promise being fulfilled on the first Easter night when the Lord bestowed the great commission upon the whole Apostolic College, St. Peter and the rest.[4] 'The gift of the Keys' so given being to the Church as a whole of which the Apostles were the ministers. To use the words of Alphonsus Tostatus, 'The keys were given to the whole Church. But because the Church could not dispense them, being a community and not an individual person, He delivered them to Peter in the name of the Church. . . . The keys were not given to Peter and to the other Apostles as determinate persons but as the ministers of the Church; and thus the keys were given rather to the Church than to them.'[5] Or, as the Fathers of the Council of Basle say: 'Why these words *Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum* were said to one the Holy Doctors explain to be that He might designate the unity of the Church, and it is for this reason that the commencement begins from unity, namely, that the Church might be shown to be one, and Peter, when he received the keys, according to St. Augustine, signified the Church. . . . For the Church herself is the one Chief, and this jurisdiction is given by the Lord to the unity of the Faithful, not to each, and He willed therefore to begin from one that He might designate its unity and unanimity.'[6]

130. As then the Apostles received 'the gift of the Keys' which was given to the Church and, as its ministers, exercised the power thus bestowed, so the Bishops who succeed to the Apostles possess and exercise that power. Therefore St. Ambrose expressly asserts as to the gift of the Keys, 'All we Bishops [*Sacerdotes*] have in Peter

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *in Joan.* (xx. 28); P.G. lxxiv. 753.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 35 *et seq.*

[3] St. Matt. xviii. 18.

[4] On Tertullian's interpretation of 'the gift of the Keys,' *vide* note 3.

[5] Tostatus Alphonsus, Abulensis, *Op.*, tom. v. 357.

[6] *Response of the Council of Basle to the Messengers of Eugenius IV.* Joannes de Segrovia, *Historia Gestorum Generalis Synodi Basiliensis*, lib. iii. cap. xxv.; in *Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Sæculi Decimi Quinti*, tom. ii. p. 244.

received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,'[1] and the Council of Compiègne declares that Bishops are 'The Key-bearers of the Kingdom of Heaven.'[2] On the evidence which has been adduced the conclusion is that the first of the passages of Holy Scripture cited in the *Satis Cognitum* in this connection has not that exclusive reference to St. Peter which the Papalist doctrine requires it should.

SECTION XVI.—'*The Injunction, Feed My Lambs, Feed My Sheep.*'

131. The *Satis Cognitum* next adduces the words of our Lord in St. John xxi. 15 *sq.* as being the fulfilment of the promise which it has asserted to be made to St. Peter alone, 'laying upon him,' it says, 'the injunction, *Feed My lambs—Feed My sheep.* That is, He confides to him without exception all those who were to belong to His fold.'[3] Supreme jurisdiction over the universal Church is thus asserted to have been conferred by our Lord in these words on St. Peter, 'as Shepherd of the Christian flock he has received the power of governing all men for whose salvation Jesus Christ shed His blood.'[4]

132. In support of the interpretation here given of these words the *Satis Cognitum* quotes a passage from St. Ambrose which is as follows: 'The Lord does not hesitate. He interrogates, not to learn but to teach. When He was about to ascend into heaven, He left us, as it were, a vicegerent of His love . . . and so because Peter alone of all others professes his love, he is preferred to all—that being the most perfect he should govern the more perfect' (S. Ambrosius, *Exposit. in Evang. secundum Lucam*, lib. x. nn. 175, 176).[5]

With regard to the use here made of this citation, it is sufficient to remark—First, that St. Ambrose did not believe that our Lord by the words under notice conferred on St. Peter those unique prerogatives which Papalism asserts belong to him, as it is necessary should be the case if the citation is to be of any value for the purpose for which it is made. This is proved by the fact that when St. Ambrose comments on our Lord's words elsewhere, he says, 'It was said to him thrice, Feed My sheep, as though he had covered his sin by his exceeding love. . . . Finally, some have said that the triple question as to his love was put because the denial had been triple, that the profession of love repeated as often might blot out the fall of the triple denial.'[6]

Secondly, St. Ambrose, so far from in any way limiting the commission contained in the charge, 'Feed My lambs, Feed My sheep,' to St. Peter and his 'legitimate successors,' 'the Bishops of Rome,' expressly says that to the Episcopate likewise was the commission given. 'The

[1] S. Ambros., *De Dignitate Sacerdotali*, c. i.; P.L. xvii 569.
[2] Mansi, xiv. 647. [3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 28. [4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.* [6] S. Ambros., *Apol. David*, c. ix. 50; P.L. xix. 871.

honour and sublimity of the Episcopate can be equalled by no comparisons; certainly it was said by the Lord to blessed Peter, 'Peter, lovest thou Me?' and he said, 'Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee'; and when he had been asked three times and had replied with a triple answer, it was repeated three times by our Lord, 'Feed My sheep,' etc., which sheep and which flock not only then did blessed Peter receive but also with him all we received,'[1] that is, 'all we Bishops,' as is plain from the context.

So also St. Augustine interprets this saying in a sermon for the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, 'What was commended to Peter, what was enjoined to Peter, not Peter alone, but also all the other Apostles heard and held preserved, and most of all the partner of his death and of his day, the Apostle Paul. They heard that and transmitted it for our hearing; we feed you, we are fed together with you. . . . Therefore hath the Lord commended His sheep to us because He commended them to Peter.'[2]

133. As St. Chrysostom is also cited in the *Satis Cognitum* in this connection, his testimony must next be considered. The quotation given is as follows: 'Why has He shed His blood? To buy the sheep which He handed over to Peter and his successors (S. Joannes. Chrysostomus *De Sacerdotio*, lib. ii.).'[3] Two points are clear from the way in which this citation is made. It is implied that St. Chrysostom teaches first that the sheep were committed to St. Peter alone amongst the Apostles, and secondly, that St. Peter has certain successors who occupy a like unique position, these successors being according to the *Satis Cognitum* those who succeed him in 'the Roman Episcopate.'[4] These two allegations, it must be carefully borne in mind, are, as has been already observed,[5] according to Papalism as set forth in the *Satis Cognitum*, inseparably bound up together, it being asserted that the Roman Pontiffs, as the 'legitimate successors' of Peter, possess *jure divino* the same supreme power in the Church which was bestowed on Peter by these words in fulfilment of the promise made to him alone of 'the Keys.'

134. Does St. Chrysostom interpret the words 'Feed My lambs, Feed My sheep,' of St. Peter in the sense which the *Satis Cognitum* by its citation alleges he does? Plainly not, for the great Doctor says: 'Peter, if thou lovest Me, saith He, feed My sheep, and by asking thrice, He asserts that this is an infallible proof of love. But this is said not only to Priests, but also to each of us who are entrusted with even a little flock. Do not despise it because it is little, for My Father saith He is well pleased in them. Each of us hath a sheep (*i.e.* his own soul);

[1] S. Ambros., *De Dignitate Sacerdotali*, cap. ii.; P.L. xvii. 570.
[2] S. Aug., *Sermo* ccxvi. cap. iv.; P.L. xxxviii. 1354.
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 28. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 30. [5] *Vide supra*, n. 101.

this let him lead to the fitting pastures.'[1] Had he held that our Lord by these words conferred the unique position and power in the Church on St. Peter which the *Satis Cognitum* by its citation of the passage under notice practically asserts he did, it would have been clearly impossible for him to thus interpret our Lord's words. Further, the treatise itself from which the extract is taken was written to his friend St. Basil who had been lately elevated to the Episcopate, and there can be no question that St. Peter is therein mentioned by him simply as a type of the Chief Pastors of the Church holding the Apostolical office to which St. Basil had been appointed, for he says, addressing St. Basil personally, 'You are young to be set over all that is God's, and to do those things in which [Christ] said that Peter would be able to outdo the Apostles, for He saith, Peter, lovest thou Me more than these? Feed My sheep.'[2] That is, you, as Bishop, have the same office as that committed to St. Peter by the words, Feed My sheep, and so are one of his successors.

135. St. Peter is thus regarded by St. Chrysostom as the typical Bishop, and not as possessing any prerogative conferred on him by our Lord which placed him in the office of Supreme Pastor of the One Flock. In so doing he is in accord with that idea as to the representative character of Peter of which St. Cyprian[3] and St. Augustine[4] are the chief exponents. Whence it is plain that by 'the successors of Peter' in the citation made in the *Satis Cognitum* St. Chrysostom means *all Bishops* who have *in solidum* the one undivided bishopric 'diffused in the peaceful number of many Bishops,'[5] each of whom sits in the 'one chair built by the Lord's voice upon Peter.'[6]

Of each Bishop he could say as did St. Hilary in irony of the Bishops who condemned St. Athanasius, 'O worthy successors of Peter,'[7] or as St. Gaudentius said of St. Ambrose in his presence, 'He will speak by the Holy Ghost of which he is full . . . and like a successor of the Apostle Peter will be the spokesman of all the Priests who stand around.'[8] The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence here adduced is that the citation given by the *Satis Cognitum* does not bear the meaning which Pope Leo in quoting it intended to convey was that of the writer.

136. Another great Eastern Doctor, St. Basil, supports St. Chrysostom in the interpretation he gives of these words of our Lord.

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* lxxvii., *in Matthaeum*; P.G. lviii. 709.
[2] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. n. 2; P.G. xlviii. 633.
[3] *Vide infra*, nn. 556, 571, 856.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 117 *et seq.*
[5] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. 24; Hartel, p. 642.
[6] *Ep. ad Plebem universam*, Ep. xliii. 5; Hartel, p. 594.
[7] S. Hilar., *Frag. Hist.*, ii. 18; P.L. x. 634.
[8] S. Gaudentius Bresciæ Epis. *Sermo* xvi.; P.L. xx. 958.

'And,' says he, 'we are taught this (*i.e.* obedience) by Christ Himself constituting Peter pastor after Himself of the Church, for "Peter," saith He, "dost thou love Me more than these? Feed My sheep." And conferring on all pastors and teachers thenceforward the same equal authority, it is a sign that all in like manner bind and loose.'[1] As does also our own Bede who says: 'That which was said to Peter, "Feed My sheep," was in truth said to them all. For the other Apostles were the same that Peter was, but the first place was given Peter, that the unity of the Church may be commended. They are all shepherds, but the flock is shown to be one which was both then fed with unanimity by all the Apostles, and is since then fed by their successors, with a common care.'[2]

It is to be noted that the interpretation given by these Fathers is in harmony with St. Peter's exhortation 'To feed the flock of Christ which is among you,'[3] and that of the Apostle of the Gentiles addressed to the elders at Miletus, 'Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.'[4]

137. St. Augustine, it may be added, knew nothing of the Papalist teaching sought to be drawn from this passage in St. John, or he could never have given what, if that had not been the case, would have been such a misleading interpretation of it as the following: 'As the Lord laid down His life for us, so we ought, for the edifying of the people, to lay down our lives for the brethren. Accordingly, speaking to Peter when it was His will to make him a good shepherd, not in Peter himself but in His Body, He said, "Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep." This once, this twice, this a third time, even to Peter's grief. And when He had questioned Peter as much as He judged him meet to be questioned, that he might thrice confirm him who had thrice denied, and when He had a third time given him charge to feed His sheep, He said to him, "When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whether thou wouldest, but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." And the Evangelist hath expounded what the Lord meant, saying, "Thus spake He, signifying by what death he should glorify God." That charge comes to this, "That thou lay down thy life for My sheep."'[5]

138. Lastly, some of the Fathers, it is true, do see in these words a special reference to St. Peter as an individual, but it is one of a widely different character to that which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to be con-

[1] S. Basil, *Constitutiones Monasticæ*, cap. xxii. 5; P.G. xxxi. 1410.
[2] Ven. Beda, *Hom. in Vig. Petri et Pauli, Hom.* xv.; P.L. xciv., 244-5.
[3] 1 Peter v. 2. [4] Acts xx. 28.
[5] S. Aug., *Tract* xlvii. *in Joan. Evang.* (x. 14, 21); P.L. xxxi. 1733, 1744.

tained in them; it is that which is very clearly set forth by St. Cyril, as follows: 'May not some one say with reason, "Why asked He the question of Simon alone, though the other disciples were standing by? And what is the meaning of Feed My sheep, and the like?" We say then that Peter had been already elected to the Divine Apostolate, together with the other disciples, for our Lord Jesus Christ Himself named them Apostles, as it is written. But the plot of the Jews having taken place, and he in the meantime committed a certain fault, for Peter overwhelmed with terror thrice denied the Lord, Christ makes good what had happened and demands in various terms the triple confession, setting this as it were against that, and providing a correction equivalent to the faults. For some one may grant that the sinning in word and the force of a crime, lying in the tongue alone, might in the same mode be wiped away. But He bids him say if he loves Him more than the rest. For in truth, as one that had met with great forbearance, and received remission of his offence from a more bountiful hand, might he not with reason gather upon himself a greater love than that of the rest, and answer his Benefactor with a supreme affection? For all the holy disciples stand in the crime of being put to flight when the cruelty of the Jews inspired them with intolerable fear, and the savage soldiers who came to seize Jesus threatened them with a horrible death; but the offence of Peter in the triple denial was over and above this peculiarly his own. Therefore, as having received a fuller remission than the rest, he is required to say if he loves Him more. It is according to the Saviour's word, "To whom much is forgiven, he loveth much." Again, the Churches are thus instructed thrice to demand confession in Christ from those who, approaching Holy Baptism, make their choice to love Him. Whilst the study of this passage would instruct teachers that by no means can they please the Chief Shepherd of all, that is Christ, save by making the health of the reasonable sheep, and their continuance in well-being the subject of their care. Such an one was divine Paul, being weak with the weak, and naming as the boast of his Apostolate, his joy and crown, those who through him had believed, and had made their choice to be of good report by the splendour of their deeds. For well he knows that this was the plain fruit of perfect love in Christ. This may be seen by plain and clear reasoning. For if He died for us, how should He but esteem the safety and life of us all worthy of the utmost care? And if they who rise against the brethren and hurt their weak conscience, really sin against Christ, how is it not true to say, that such as train the minds of those already believing, and of those who expect to be called unto this, and who by all manner of assistance are zealous to preserve their promises in the faith, show piety to the Person of the Lord Himself? Therefore, by the triple confession of

the blessed Peter, the offence of triple denial was done away. But by the Lord saying, "Feed My sheep," *a renewal, as it were, of the Apostolate already conferred upon him, is understood to take place*, wiping away the intervening reproach of his falls, effacing the littleness of human infirmity.'[1]

139. Similarly, Basil of Seleucia says: 'To Peter, who through fear of the damsel had denied the Lord, refraining from reproach, He granted forgiveness, showing how sinners should be borne with. "Peter," He says, "lovest thou Me?" "Thou knowest," is his answer, "that I love Thee." "Feed My sheep." Hast thou become sensible of thine infirmities? Dost thou know the slip thine arrogance has made? Hast thou learned from experience not to trust to thyself? Dost thou know the meaning of natural strength? Hast thou learnt from experience how universal is the need of grace? Grant then to others the pardon of which thou hast been taught thine own need, that thou mayst not lightly esteem the medicine of repentance, of which thou hast admired the motive in thyself.—"Feed My sheep."'[2]

So also St. Gregory Nazianzen says when arguing with the Novatians: 'Receive you not [to penitence] even the great Peter, because at the Passion of the Saviour he experiences a weakness to which man is liable? But Jesus received him and by a triple question and confession healed the triple denial.'[3]

140. What then is the testimony of the Fathers as to the use of these words of our Lord made in the *Satis Cognitum*. According to Pope Leo XIII. they form one of 'the Charter texts,' constituting Peter and 'his successors,' 'the Roman Pontiffs,' the supreme power and authority which embraces the whole Church. Had our Lord's words been intended to mean this, it is plain that the Fathers must have given with one accord the Papalist interpretation. They could not but have known their tremendous import, and to have given any other interpretation of them would have not only to err themselves, but to cause those of whom they were the teachers to fall into similar error with regard to a doctrine a right faith in which is necessary to salvation. They did give other interpretations, and their complete ignorance of the 'Papalist' interpretation is further emphasised by the fact that some of them regard our Lord's words as a renewal of the Apostolate he had already received, granted to him after his triple confession of love of Him Whom He had thrice denied, a renewal which according to the Canon Law[4] could confer no new right but only preserve the old.

141. The evidence therefore afforded by the testimony of the

[1] S. Cyril Alex., *in Joan.* xxi. (15, 17); P.G. lxxiv. 749, 752.
[2] Basil Seleuciensis, *Oratio* xxviii.; P.G. lxxx. 320.
[3] S. Greg. Naz., *Oratio* xxxix., *In Sancta Lumina*, cap. xviii.; P.G. xxxvi. 556, 557.
[4] *Decret. Greg.*, lib. xi., Tit. xxx. 4.

Fathers, the Papalist use of this passage in St. John is condemned in like manner as its use of the passage as to the Gift of the Keys. Yet the advocates of Ultramontanism, as for example Mgr. Freppel, Bishop of Angers, late Professor at the Sorbonne, call it, and the Gift of the Keys, 'the Charter of investiture of the papacy';[1] the fact that they do so is a sad witness to the incompatibility of Papalism with historical Christianity. 'The venerable and constant belief of every age,' to which appeal is made in the *Satis Cognitum*, cannot be adduced in support of the Ultramontane teaching; on the contrary, the belief of antiquity with regard to the meaning of these so-called 'Charter texts,' as has been shown, proves the truth of the statement made by Cardinal de Cusa. 'We know that Peter received no more authority from Christ than the other Apostles. For nothing was said to Peter which was not also said to the others. If it was said to Peter, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, was it not said to the others, Whatsoever ye shall bind? And though it was said to Peter, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church? yet by the Rock we must understand Christ Whom Peter confessed. . . . And if it be said to Peter, Feed My sheep, yet it is clear that that feeding is by word and example. Thus also, according to Augustine, the same command was given to all . . . Nothing else is proved to have been said to Peter which imports power, therefore we rightly maintain that all the Apostles were equal to Peter in power.'[2]

Section XVII.—*The Injunction*, '*Confirm thy Brethren*,' St. Luke xxii. 32.

(a) *The Papalist interpretation of the Text.*

142. The third text which the *Satis Cognitum* adduces in support of its allegation as to the unique position held by St. Peter (and 'his successors') *jure divino*, in the Church is St. Luke xxii. 32.

These words of our Lord are quoted as proving that 'since all Christians must be clearly united in the communion of one immutable faith, Christ the Lord, in virtue of His prayers, obtained for Peter that in the fulfilment of his office he should never fall away from the Faith —But I have asked for thee that thy faith fail not (*Luke* xxii. 32); and He furthermore commanded him to impart light and strength to his brethren as often as the need should arise, "Confirm thy brethren" (*ibid.*). He willed then that he whom He had designated as the foundation of the Church should be the defence of its faith.'[3]

[1] S. Cyprien. Par M. l'Abbé Freppel, Prof. à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, 1865. (Cours fait à la Sorbonne), p. 277 quoted Benson *Cyprian, His Life, His times, His Work*, p. 201.

[2] N. de Cusa, *De Concordantia Catholica*, lib. ii. cap. xiii., p. 726.

[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 28.

143. The interpretation here given of these words, it will be observed, assumes that the text 'Thou art Peter,' etc., signifies what the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to be its meaning. It has been shown above,[1] that this is contrary to the evidence; hence, inasmuch as the use made in the *Satis Cognitum* of the passage under notice requires as its basis that the interpretation so proved to be erroneous should be that which our Lord intended, the conclusion is inevitable that the use here made of it is in itself unwarranted and contrary to the true sense of Christ's words, even if no other proof existed. Such proof, however, is forthcoming, and the words themselves will be shown to signify something quite different.

144. Next, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, our Lord by these words made a grant of a power to Peter and his 'legitimate successors,' 'the Roman Pontiffs,' by virtue of which he and they have never fallen from the faith and also imparted life and strength to their brethren throughout the existence of the Church in discharge of a duty there named which is essential to the office of 'Supreme Pastor.'[2]

It is admitted that this power so asserted to have been bestowed must be of the utmost importance. The Papalist theory is clear and definite as to this. According to it these words imposed on 'the Supreme Pastors' a duty, for the performance of which the necessary power was simultaneously bestowed, unique in character, viz. that of preserving the unity of the Faith by their decisions in matters of faith and morals, which 'of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are irreformable,'[3] decisions to which they, as Supreme Judges, have authority to compel the members of the One Flock to render obedience.

145. It cannot be denied that such a prerogative, if it exists, bestowed, as it is asserted to have been, 'by the institution of Christ,' and therefore essential to the continued existence of the Church, must inevitably be found in active use from the first beginning of the Christian religion. The *Vatican Council*, if the Papalist allegation be true, in no way overstates the position when it says that 'all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have venerated and followed their Apostolic doctrine' (*i.e.* of the Roman Pontiffs), 'knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of His disciples, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted confirm thy brethren."'[4]

The inaccuracy of this statement in its historical aspect will be

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 100. [2] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 28, 30.
[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.
[4] *Ibid.*, 486.

shown more conveniently later;[1] it will suffice here to consider whether the evidence proves, as is required by the Papalist allegation, that the text has been interpreted 'from the very beginning of the Christian religion' in the sense asserted by the *Satis Cognitum*.

(b) *The Patristic interpretation of St. Luke* xxii. 32.

146. In considering the evidence afforded by the writings of the Fathers on this point it is necessary to remember that any extracts from these writings, in which the words of this text are applied to St. Peter in connection with the position which they assign to him on the ground of the texts in St. Matthew and St. John which have been already considered, must be interpreted in accordance with the interpretation which they have elsewhere given of those texts.

For example, it has been shown that St. Ambrose did not regard the words in St. John xxi. 15 as conferring on St Peter the unique position of 'Supreme Pastor,'[2] or that he held St. Peter to be '*the* Rock';[3] consequently, when St. Ambrose says, as he is quoted in the *Satis Cognitum*, 'Could not Christ, who confided to him the Kingdom by His own authority, have strengthened the faith of one whom he designated a rock to show the foundation of the Church' (S. Ambrosius, *De Fide*, lib. iv. n. 56),[4] it is plain that the strengthening of Peter's faith, of which he speaks simply, has reference to the discharge of the duties of the office which he held in common with the other members of the Apostolic College who, as S. Jerome tells us, 'may be called Rocks,'[5] and are designated by the Apostle[6] the foundation upon which the Church is built. St. Ambrose in this passage so uses both these terms of one of them, St. Peter.

147. That the meaning of St. Ambrose's words here cited cannot be that sought to be affixed to them by the *Satis Cognitum* is corroborated by his exposition of the text elsewhere. He says: 'Peter is winnowed that he may be forced to deny Christ, he falls into temptation, he speaks something full, as it were, of chaff; but he spake in word that he might be better established in affection. At last he wept and washed away his chaff, and by these temptations he obtained Christ's intercession for him. . . . At length Peter is set over the Church after being tempted by the devil. And so the Lord signified beforehand that which came to pass afterwards, in that He chose him a Shepherd of the Lord's flock. For He said to him, "When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." Therefore the holy Apostle Peter

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 758 *et seq.*, 773 *et seq.*, 784 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 132.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 57.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 28, 29.
[5] S. Hieron., *in Amos* vi. 12; P.L. x. 1065.
[6] Ephesians ii. 20.

was converted into good corn and was winnowed as wheat, that he might be one bread into the family of God for one food.'[1]

From this it is plain that St. Ambrose did not in any way hold that our Lord in this text signified that He would confer any unique prerogative on St. Peter, but merely that office of ruling which, as has been shown,[2] he held to have been committed to the Episcopate by the words 'Feed My lambs,' and that so far as the words had any special application to St. Peter alone, they were a prophecy that he should be converted after his fall and thus be of the one bread of the Family of God.

148. Next it is to be observed that the interpretation given of this passage in the *Satis Cognitum* was unknown in the first six centuries of the history of the Church, a fact which is conclusive against it.

In fact, 'the most famous and most usual [interpretation] which forty-four of the most ancient and subsequent Fathers and doctors declare,'[3] was that which was generally accepted, viz. that it had reference to St. Peter's fall.

149. It is thus St. Chrysostom interprets it: 'Where he [Peter] should have prayed and have said, "Help us that we be not cut off," he is confident in himself and saith, "Though all men should be offended in Thee, yet will I never; though all shall undergo this, I shall not undergo it," which led him on little by little to self-confidence. Christ, then, out of a desire to put down this, permitted his denial. For since he neither submitted to Him nor to the Prophet [Zechariah] (and yet for this intent He brought in the Prophet besides that he may not gainsay), but, nevertheless, since he submitted not to His words, he is instructed by deeds. For as proof that for this intent He permitted it that He might amend this in him, He saith: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." For this He said sharply reproving him, and showing that his fall was more grievous than that of the rest and needed more help. For the matters of blame were two: both that he gainsaid and that he set himself before the others, or, rather, a third too, that he attributed all to himself. To cure this, then, He permitted the fall, and therefore He leaves the rest and addresses Himself earnestly to him. "For, Simon," saith He, "Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat, that is, that he may trouble, confound, and tempt you, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." And why, if Satan desired all, did He not say concerning all, "I have prayed for you"? Is it not quite plain that it is for the reason I have mentioned before, that is, as reproving him and showing that his fall was more grievous than that of the rest, that He directs His words to Him? And wherefore said He not "I have

[1] S. Ambros., *In Psalm.* xliii. 41; P.L. xiv. 1109. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 132.
[3] Friedrich, *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*, i. 5.

not permitted," rather than "I have prayed"? He speaks from this time lowly things on His way to His Passion, that He may show His Humanity. For He that has built His Church upon Peter's confession and has so fortified it that ten thousand dangers and deaths are not to prevail over it, He Who gave him the keys of heaven and hath put him in possession of so much authority, and in no manner needed prayer for such ends (for He did not then say "I have prayed," but with His own authority "I will build My Church and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"), how should He need to pray that He might brace up the shaking soul of a single man? Wherefore then spake He thus? For the cause which I mentioned, and because of their weakness, because they had not yet the fitting opinion about Him. How, then, was it that he denied? He said not that thou mayst not deny, but that thy faith fail not, that thou perish not utterly. For this came from His care.'[1]

150. The interpretation here given by this great Doctor is plainly the right one. Our Lord, to Whom all the future was known, was fully aware of the efforts which the enemy of souls would make to cause the disciples to be false to Him, that Satan desired to have them[2] and, sifting them as wheat, would assail them with temptation under which they should all fall and desert their Master. The special danger to which St. Peter, under the stress of the temptation, would be exposed owing to his impulsive and undisciplined nature, was also known to Him, and to him He therefore conveyed a warning by the words, 'I have prayed for thee.'[3] He was fully aware that the warning would be neglected and that St. Peter would grievously fall, but that his faith would not be utterly lost was too as part of the knowledge He possessed of the future, and He foretold that he would be converted. Hence when the Apostle came to himself the remembrance of the fact that his Lord had foretold his conversion would both prevent him from giving way to despair and also be a powerful incentive to true repentance, since he would thus be assured that forgiveness would be granted of that sin which he had committed, the awful character of which was borne into his soul by the loving look of Him against Whom he had sinned. And then, when thus pardoned, it would be specially incumbent on him to make amends for the terrible scandal he had caused by his fall by being careful to exhibit to his brethren an example of real penitence, which, manifesting itself in steadfast endurance unto the end, would be a source of strength to them when they were exposed to the dangers of temptation. All the rulers of the Church have the duty of strengthening their brethren laid upon them. St. Peter, as one of them, shared it, in common with the other members

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* lxxxii., *in Matt.* xxvi.; P.G. lviii. 711.
[2] ὑμᾶς. [3] σοῦ.

of the Apostolate; the obligation to do so, peculiar to Peter, simply resulted, therefore, from that which was peculiar to him, viz. the fact that he had personally, by his sin, placed a special stumbling-block in the path of his brethren, and of this our Lord spoke when He said, 'When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren.'

151. It is in harmony with this that St. Chrysostom, in commenting upon the part taken by St. Peter in the choice of St. Matthias to take the place of Judas in the Apostolic College, makes use of this text in connection with the discharge of his duty as an Apostle. He says: 'They remained at Jerusalem after the Resurrection, both Peter and "James and John," no longer only the latter together with his brother mentioned, but together with Peter the two; and "Andrew and Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, and James (the son) of Alphæus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas (the brother) of James." He has done well to mention all the disciples; for since one had betrayed Christ and another had been unbelieving, he hereby shows that, except the first, all of them were preserved. . . . "And in those days," it says "Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples and said." Both as being ardent and as having been put in trust by Christ with the flock, and as having precedence in honour, he always begins the discourse. . . . But observe how Peter does everything with the common consent; nothing imperiously. . . . He defers the decision to the whole body . . . they were "an hundred and twenty," and he asks for one out of the whole body; with good right as having been put in charge of them; for to him had Christ said, "And when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren."'[1]

152. In this passage St. Chrysostom, having mentioned St. Peter's fall, speaks of his having been put in charge of the flock, an obvious reference to St. John xxi. 15, 'Feed My sheep.' It has been already shown[2] that St. Chrysostom interprets those words not as conferring on St. Peter that unique office with regard to the flock which Papalism asserts they do, but merely one which is shared by the Episcopate. Then, having thus set out St. Peter's position, he proceeds to say that he had a precedence, indeed, but of what? Of jurisdiction, or of honour? The latter, which is quite consistent with the position of a member of the Apostolic College, but not with that of its 'Master,' for clearly to mention merely 'a precedence of honour' as a reason for St. Peter's speaking first involves that he did not know that the Apostle possessed 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction,' which would necessarily belong to the 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' otherwise he would have inevitably given that as the one all-sufficient ground, not for merely

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* iii., *in Act. Apostol.*; Trans. Oxf. *Library of the Fathers*, pp. 36, 37, 43.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 134 *et seq.*

speaking first, but for the sole appointment by St. Peter, as Christ's Vicar, of a disciple to fill the vacancy in the College.[1]

153. This action of speaking first St. Chrysostom then interprets as being a fulfilment of the injunction 'When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren'; that is, he who had sinned but who was now converted, at the critical moment in the history of the Church, comes forward as the one of all the surviving members of the Apostolate who had fallen from Christ the most, so manifesting the truth of the prophecy of Christ that he should be converted. Thus he undid in the most direct manner the harm done by his failure under temptation, strengthening the brethren by encouraging the one hundred and twenty to take a step which would amongst other things be a proof of their belief in the permanence of the mission of their Master and the certainty that His promises would be fulfilled. St. Peter thus discharged his obligation as one of the Rulers of the Church, the faithful discharge of which was especially incumbent on him as the one amongst them who had been so false to his position as to deny Christ in a way which had been specially marked.

(c) *The Scriptural testimony against the Papalist interpretation of St. Luke* xxii. 32.

154. Additional evidence that St. Peter had no office of strengthening the brethren other than that which, as has been said, he shared in common with the rest of the Rulers of the Church, is afforded by the fact that the word στηρίζειν, used by St. Luke in the passage (or its compounds) is also used by the same writer with reference to the work of St. Paul and others in the Acts of the Apostles.[2]

So St. Paul and St. Barnabas are related to have confirmed [ἐπιστηρίζοντες] the disciples of Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch.[3] So St. Jude and St. Silas confirmed [ἐπεστηρίξαν] the brethren of Antioch.[4] So St. Paul confirmed [ἐπιστηρίζων] the Churches of Syria and Cilicia,[5] and the disciples in Galatia and Phrygia,[6] whilst St. Paul used the word στηρίξαι to describe the purpose for which he sent Timothy to the Thessalonian Church.[7]

155. It is, moreover, specially worthy of note that the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans says of himself: 'I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, that you may be established,'[8] εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, words which show that he regarded himself as one who should be the instrument whereby a gift of strength should be conferred on the Christians of Rome. A fact which is

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 179.
[2] *Cp.* Salmon, *The Infallibility of the Church*, p. 343. Second edition.
[3] Acts xiv. 22.
[4] *Ibid.*, xv. 32.
[5] *Ibid.*, xv. 41.
[6] *Ibid.*, xviii. 23.
[7] 1 Thess. iii. 2.
[8] Romans i. 10.

specially interesting, as the Roman Christians on Papalist principles were the peculiar charge of Peter, who was actually at this very time, according to the Papalist figment of his twenty-five years' tenure of the Roman See, seated in 'the Chair' which he had placed there. St. Paul's statement therefore would have been, if the Papalist interpretation of St. Luke xxii. 32 were true, in a very special manner an infringement of the prerogatives of Peter, whilst, on the other hand, it would accurately describe the result of the faithful discharge of that Apostolic office which he held in common with St. Peter and the rest of the Apostolic College, and be perfectly consistent with the position of joint-founder with St. Peter of the Church at Rome, which was his privilege.[1]

(d) *The history of the Papalist interpretation of St. Luke* xxii. 32.

156. Melchior Cano, in the course of the chapter in his work *De Locis Theologicis*,[2] in which he sets out 'the patristic proof' of the Papalist interpretation of this text, cites twenty passages from 'Popes' as giving the testimony of the writers of the first centuries to the divine privileges of the Pope in matters of Faith. On examination of this imposing *catena*, eighteen[3] of the twenty are found to be cited from the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*.[4] He also cites two letters of St. Athanasius, one to Pope St. Mark and the other to Pope St. Felix, both of which are admittedly apocryphal. The good faith of Melchior Cano in making these citations is not to be called in question, but the fact that the sole early witnesses he can produce are 'forged' throws a vivid light on the untenability of the Papalist interpretation of the text; had it been the true one it would have been 'the venerable and constant belief of the Church in every age,' and consequently genuine testimony to that effect would have been abundant from the very first.

157. The earliest instance of the use of the text as referring to the Bishops of Rome is that made by Pope Agatho in his letter to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, which he sent by his deputies to the Sixth Œcumenical Council in A.D. 680. In this letter Agatho quotes it in the following manner. He asserts that the Roman Church had never erred from the way of truth, and had always held fast the true rule of faith, and then, with reference to the living tradition of the Apostles of Christ which the Church everywhere holds, says: 'The true rule of faith which both in prosperity and adversity the Apostolic Church of Christ, the spiritual mother of your peaceful empire, which

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 468 *et seq.*

[2] Lib. vi. cap. iv. *Theologiæ Cursus Completus*, tom. i. 334, 337.

[3] *Vide* note 6, *Some of the Forged Decretals cited by Melchior Cano.*

[4] On the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, *vide infra*, nn. 229 *et seq.*

by the grace of the omnipotent God will be shown never to have swerved from the faith of the Apostolic tradition, nor has succumbed, depraved by heretical novelties, but as from the beginning of the Christian faith, she receiving it from her founders the chiefs of the Apostles of Christ, it will remain unto the end unfalsified according to the divine promise of the Lord, the Saviour Himself, which He spake in the Holy Gospels to the chief of His Apostles, saying: "Peter, Peter, Satan has asked that he might sift you (*vos*), as he who sifts wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." Let your clemency also consider that the Lord and Saviour of all whose is the faith, Who promised that the faith of Peter should not fail, admonished them to confirm his brethren, which, as is known to all, the Apostolic Pontiffs, my predecessors, always did."'[1]

158. This statement of Agatho's asserts that the Roman bishops have always, as all know, strengthened their brethren in their faith as a necessary consequence of the injunction to Peter. The Sixth Synod, unfortunately for Agatho's interpretation of the passage, which met at the very time this letter was brought to the Emperor, did not know what the Pope declares all knew, for by that Synod one of his predecessors, Honorius, was condemned as a heretic.[2] Evidently by their action in so doing the Fathers of the Council were entirely ignorant that the text was the grant of any such prerogative to 'Peter' and his successors in the Roman Episcopate, as is alleged by the fautors of Papalism. This itself is a sufficient disproof of the interpretation under notice, as the Fathers could not have been ignorant of that which, if Papalism be true, must have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' of the Church.

159. Moreover, not only is the interpretation sought to be affixed to this text by the *Satis Cognitum* following the *Vatican Decrees*[3] disproved by the fact that the Fathers knew it not, which would have been impossible had the text been one of 'the Charter texts,' fixing the character of the government of the Church, for in that case they would necessarily have with complete unanimity been compelled so to interpret it, but also by its very wording. 'When thou art converted' are words which are as much an integral part of the injunction as the text. The significance of this is great; for, as the Archbishop (Kenrick) of St. Louis in the United States says in a speech which he prepared for, but did not deliver at, the *Vatican Council*, 'If the former words, "I have prayed for thee," and the latter words, "strengthen thy brethren,"

[1] Mansi, xi. 242. As to the alleged use of this text in the Papalist sense by P. Pelagius II., *vide* note 7, *On the Letter of Pelagius, P. II. to the Bishops of Istria.*

[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 795, 950.

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486.

demonstrate that the heavenly power and office passed to the successors of Peter, it does not appear why the intermediate words, "when thou art converted," ought not also to pertain to them and in some sense to be understood of them'[1]; a consequence of the Papalist use of the passage which is so absurd as to suffice in itself to prove that such use cannot be that intended by our Lord when He spoke it.

160. To conclude, the three passages cited from the Holy Scriptures in this connection by the *Satis Cognitum* have been considered, and what is the result of the examination?

The evidence shows that these texts adduced to prove that our Lord conferred a unique and sovereign position in the Church on Peter and 'his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate' were not interpreted in the early Church in the sense required by the Papalist contention. Hence, as it is admitted that if the Papalist contention be true, the meaning so required must have been the 'venerable and constant belief of every age' of the Church, it follows that the use made in the *Satis Cognitum* of these texts is contrary to their real meaning, and consequently that 'the Primacy' over the universal Church alleged to have been bestowed 'by the institution of Christ' on Peter and 'his successors in the Roman Episcopate' is no part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, and therefore is to be rejected.

[1] Friedrich, *op. cit.*, i. p. 200.

CHAPTER IV

ON THE TITLES BESTOWED ON ST. PETER

Section XVIII.—*The Title 'The Rock.'*

161. The *Satis Cognitum* next, having stated that on the ground of the 'Injunction' which has been considered in the previous chapter Christ 'willed that he whom He had designated as the foundation of the Church should be the defence of the faith,' proceeds to allege that for that reason He also 'willed that Peter should participate in certain names, signs of great things which properly belong to Himself alone: in order that identity of titles should show identity of power,'[1] and the titles specified are 'Rock,' 'Key-bearer,' and 'Pastor.'[2]

The text St. Luke xxii. 32 has been shown in the foregoing Section not to have the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to belong to it, and therefore the ground on which the assertion is based does not exist; consequently, whatever may be the reason why these titles are borne by St. Peter, it is not the one alleged in the *Satis Cognitum*.

162. As to the first of these titles, 'The Rock.' The words, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church,' have also been considered,[3] and it has been shown that the text has been variously interpreted by the Fathers, and that consequently it could not possibly be the 'Charter of government' to the Church; if it had been, it would of necessity have been always held to have meant what the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Council* declare to be the meaning intended by our Lord. But further, so far from the title 'The Rock' being exclusively applied to St. Peter as the allegation of the *Satis Cognitum* requires, St. Jerome, for example, says: 'Christ was the Rock, and He bestowed it upon the Apostles that they should be called Rocks.'[4]

163. In support of the allegation now under notice the *Satis Cognitum* cites a passage from the '*Hom. de Pœnitentia*, n. 4, in Appendice Opp. S. Basilii,' as follows: 'When he heard "*Thou art a rock*," he was ennobled by the announcement. Although he is a rock, not as Christ is a rock, but as Peter is a rock. For Christ is by His

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 29. [2] *l.c.* [3] *Vide supra*, nn. 49 *et seq.*
[4] S. Hieron., *In Amos*, vi. 12; P.L. x. 1065.

very being an immovable rock; Peter only through this rock. Christ imparts His gifts and is not exhausted. . . . He is a priest and makes priests; He is a rock and constitutes a rock.'[1] But these words clearly do not assert that Peter was constituted 'the' Rock; that is, that the title belonged to him exclusively *jure divino*, which it is essential to the Papalist contention that they should do; but 'a' rock, a statement which is, of course, consistent with the right of others to possess the like title, a right which, according to St. Jerome's words quoted above, all the Apostles had, an opinion also expressed by a writer who, like the author of the quotation given in the *Satis Cognitum*, is classed with St. Basil.

164. The writer says: 'The Church of God whose foundations are upon the holy hills, for it is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, one of these mountains was Peter, on which Rock the Lord promised that He would build His Church. For sublime and lofty minds lifted high above earthly things are fitly styled mountains. But the lofty mind of blessed Peter is named a lofty rock because it was deeply rooted in the faith and firmly and unhesitatingly bore the blows inflicted by temptation. All those who acquire knowledge of the Godhead through greatness of mind and of actions proceeding from mind perfected in sound life, they are the tops of the mountains on which the house of God is built. . . . It may be that he is speaking of an escape from the evils he specified above [Is. ii. 19], to wit, entering into the hole of the rock; that is, the steadfastness of faith in Christ. That is where Moses was placed when about to see God . . . but collate whatever is said in Scripture concerning the Rock that the passage may be cleared up for thee.'[2]

165. This passage is inconsistent with any belief on the part of the writer that St. Peter is the Rock in the sense of being *the* foundation on which the Church is built. He is a lofty rock, but there are others who are 'tops of the mountains.' The writer thus agrees with St. Cyril.[3] It is also important to note that he is not only careful to point out that his interpretation is not necessarily the right one, but also bids his readers to search the Scriptures in order to see what is their teaching concerning the Rock. It is evident from this that he was absolutely ignorant of the Papalist interpretation of the text, for *that* on Papalist principles is the one which he must have given instead of sending his readers to the Scriptures to find out for themselves the meaning of the Rock. Had he believed that 'from this text it is clear that by the will and commandment of God the Church rests upon St. Peter just as a building rests on its foundation,' as is asserted in the *Satis Cognitum*,[4]

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 29.
[2] Pseudo-Basil, *Comm. in Esai.* ii. 66, 85; P.G. xxx. 223, 257.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 89, 90.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 26.

there would have been no doubt in his mind as to the meaning of the words. This he would have been bound to set forth in unmistakable language, since to do otherwise would have been to be a false teacher with regard to a doctrine, belief in which is essential to salvation.

166. The quotation given in the *Satis Cognitum* is not taken from a genuine work of St. Basil and consequently cannot claim his authority, so that even if it had supported the Papalist contention, his authority could not be claimed in support of it. It may be well, however, to state here that the great Eastern Doctor knew nothing of the prerogative of the supreme government of the Church being conferred by our Lord on St. Peter in the words under notice, to be transmitted to his 'legitimate successors' 'in the Roman Episcopate,' an assumption with which this allegation that the title 'the Rock' was bestowed by our Lord on St. Peter is bound up. Full proof of this will be given later in this treatise.[1]

167. The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence given is that the title 'The Rock' was not bestowed on St. Peter as his prerogative in a sense incapable of being shared by any other as is asserted by Papalism, so that such title cannot be adduced in proof of the position for which the *Satis Cognitum* alleges it.

Section XIX.—The Title '*The Key-bearer.*'

168. As to the second of the titles which the *Satis Cognitum* brings forward in support of the Papalist contention—'The Key-bearer'—to legitimately do so would require that Christ as King of the Church bestowed the Keys on St. Peter alone. This has been shown to be contrary to the facts.[2] The gift of the Keys according to the evidence was granted to all the Apostles, with the necessary consequence that *all* the members of the Apostolic College are 'Princes of the Christian Commonwealth,' so that St. Jerome designates them 'Princes of our discipline and leaders of the Christian doctrine.'[3]

169. St. Cyril, too, evidently held that the Apostles occupied such a position in the Church, for he says of the 'glorious and renowned choir of the holy Apostles' that they 'are set for the government of believers and have been by Christ Himself appointed to judge,' and 'that we have had for governors and received for Œcumenical judges the holy disciples.'[4]

It is plain that there was no room in the Church for any position higher than that which is set forth in the language just quoted, and

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 678 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 115 *et seq.*
[3] S. Hieron., *Adv. Jovin.*, lib. i. 26; P.L. xxiii. 216 and *vide supra*, n. 94.
[4] S. Cyril Alex., *Glaphyrorum in Gen.*, lib. vii.; P.G. lxxiv. 753.

very being an immovable rock; Peter only through this rock. Christ imparts His gifts and is not exhausted. . . . He is a priest and makes priests; He is a rock and constitutes a rock.'[1] But these words clearly do not assert that Peter was constituted 'the' Rock; that is, that the title belonged to him exclusively *jure divino*, which it is essential to the Papalist contention that they should do; but 'a' rock, a statement which is, of course, consistent with the right of others to possess the like title, a right which, according to St. Jerome's words quoted above, all the Apostles had, an opinion also expressed by a writer who, like the author of the quotation given in the *Satis Cognitum*, is classed with St. Basil.

164. The writer says: 'The Church of God whose foundations are upon the holy hills, for it is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, one of these mountains was Peter, on which Rock the Lord promised that He would build His Church. For sublime and lofty minds lifted high above earthly things are fitly styled mountains. But the lofty mind of blessed Peter is named a lofty rock because it was deeply rooted in the faith and firmly and unhesitatingly bore the blows inflicted by temptation. All those who acquire knowledge of the Godhead through greatness of mind and of actions proceeding from mind perfected in sound life, they are the tops of the mountains on which the house of God is built. . . . It may be that he is speaking of an escape from the evils he specified above [Is. ii. 19], to wit, entering into the hole of the rock; that is, the steadfastness of faith in Christ. That is where Moses was placed when about to see God . . . but collate whatever is said in Scripture concerning the Rock that the passage may be cleared up for thee.'[2]

165. This passage is inconsistent with any belief on the part of the writer that St. Peter is the Rock in the sense of being *the* foundation on which the Church is built. He is a lofty rock, but there are others who are 'tops of the mountains.' The writer thus agrees with St. Cyril.[3] It is also important to note that he is not only careful to point out that his interpretation is not necessarily the right one, but also bids his readers to search the Scriptures in order to see what is their teaching concerning the Rock. It is evident from this that he was absolutely ignorant of the Papalist interpretation of the text, for *that* on Papalist principles is the one which he must have given instead of sending his readers to the Scriptures to find out for themselves the meaning of the Rock. Had he believed that 'from this text it is clear that by the will and commandment of God the Church rests upon St. Peter just as a building rests on its foundation,' as is asserted in the *Satis Cognitum*,[4]

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 29.
[2] Pseudo-Basil, *Comm. in Esai.* ii. 66, 85; P.G. xxx. 223, 257.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 89, 90.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 26.

there would have been no doubt in his mind as to the meaning of the words. This he would have been bound to set forth in unmistakable language, since to do otherwise would have been to be a false teacher with regard to a doctrine, belief in which is essential to salvation.

166. The quotation given in the *Satis Cognitum* is not taken from a genuine work of St. Basil and consequently cannot claim his authority, so that even if it had supported the Papalist contention, his authority could not be claimed in support of it. It may be well, however, to state here that the great Eastern Doctor knew nothing of the prerogative of the supreme government of the Church being conferred by our Lord on St. Peter in the words under notice, to be transmitted to his 'legitimate successors' 'in the Roman Episcopate,' an assumption with which this allegation that the title 'the Rock' was bestowed by our Lord on St. Peter is bound up. Full proof of this will be given later in this treatise.[1]

167. The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence given is that the title 'The Rock' was not bestowed on St. Peter as his prerogative in a sense incapable of being shared by any other as is asserted by Papalism, so that such title cannot be adduced in proof of the position for which the *Satis Cognitum* alleges it.

Section XIX.—The Title '*The Key-bearer*.'

168. As to the second of the titles which the *Satis Cognitum* brings forward in support of the Papalist contention—'The Key-bearer'—to legitimately do so would require that Christ as King of the Church bestowed the Keys on St. Peter alone. This has been shown to be contrary to the facts.[2] The gift of the Keys according to the evidence was granted to all the Apostles, with the necessary consequence that *all* the members of the Apostolic College are 'Princes of the Christian Commonwealth,' so that St. Jerome designates them 'Princes of our discipline and leaders of the Christian doctrine.'[3]

169. St. Cyril, too, evidently held that the Apostles occupied such a position in the Church, for he says of the 'glorious and renowned choir of the holy Apostles' that they 'are set for the government of believers and have been by Christ Himself appointed to judge,' and 'that we have had for governors and received for Œcumenical judges the holy disciples.'[4]

It is plain that there was no room in the Church for any position higher than that which is set forth in the language just quoted, and

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 678 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 115 *et seq.*
[3] S. Hieron., *Adv. Jovin.*, lib. i. 26; P.L. xxiii. 216 and *vide supra*, n. 94.
[4] S. Cyril Alex., *Glaphyrorum in Gen.*, lib. vii.; P.G. lxxiv. 753.

declared to belong to the Apostles. Assuredly they were thus all equally 'Princes of the Christian Commonwealth,' and if the title 'Key-bearer' signifies such position, they have an equal right to that title. They all, and Bishops as their successors,[1] not Peter alone, must be 'Key-bearers.'

Section XX.—The Title '*Pastor*.'

170. The meaning of the passage Feed My lambs, Feed My sheep, has already been discussed. It has been shown that the sense which the *Satis Cognitum* seeks to affix to it is not that which our Lord intended.[1] Consequently there is no need to adduce again what has been already said in order to prove the title 'Pastor' does not belong to St. Peter in the unique sense that he is the One Supreme Shepherd of the One Flock as the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* apply it to him.

171. The three titles asserted by the *Encyclical* to have been bestowed by our Lord on St. Peter because He 'willed that Peter should participate in certain names, signs of great things which properly belong to Himself alone: in order that identity of titles should show identity of power,'[2] have been considered. Each of them has been proved not to belong to St. Peter as a unique privilege, but to be equally the possession of others; it follows that the *Satis Cognitum* statement with reference to these titles is without foundation and so erroneous.

Section XXI.—*On the Titles given by St. Chrysostom to St. Peter.*

172. The interpretation sought to be affixed to the so-called 'Charter texts' by the *Satis Cognitum* having been disposed of, and its contention that support of that interpretation is to be found in certain titles alleged to have been bestowed by Christ on St. Peter alone having been shown to be without foundation, the passage from St. Chrysostom which Pope Leo cited in support of his position might not unnaturally be left unnoticed, since, if the quotation did bear the meaning assigned to it, it would not make true that which the evidence has shown to be erroneous.

Yet in view of the attempt which is frequently made to represent that great Eastern Doctor as a fautor of Papalism, it will be well to consider it, as such consideration will show that the writer's real position is inconsistent with any belief in Papalism.

173. The quotation is given as follows :—

'He was pre-eminent among the Apostles: he was the mouthpiece of the Apostles, and the head of the Apostolic College . . . at the same time showing him that henceforth he ought to have confidence, and as

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 130. [2] *Vide supra*, nn. 131 *et seq.* [3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 29.

it were blotting out his denial, He commits to him the government of his brethren. . . . He saith to him, If thou lovest Me, be over My brethren' (S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* lxxviii. *in Joan.* xxi. 14).[1]

174. On this it is to be remarked in the first place the Greek word προστασία is represented in English translation of the passage in *Satis Cognitum* just given, by the word 'government,' a word which implies considerably more than is necessitated by the original. The word 'presidency' would be an accurate rendering of it, as would also be the word 'prefecturam' in Latin text of the *Satis Cognitum.* The same remark applies also to the words 'be over,' by which the word προίστατο is represented, which means rather 'preside over,' which too would give the sense of the word 'præesto' in the Latin text. There is a great difference between 'presidency' and 'government.' The latter word implies of necessity 'jurisdiction,' the former does not, and in this sense St. Cyril of Jerusalem calls both St. Peter and St. Paul 'the presidents—προστάται—of the Churches.'[2] That 'presidency' is the English word which accurately represents St. Chrysostom's meaning is borne out from the context of the passage which, as already shown,[3] proves that St. Chrysostom did not here assign to St. Peter any such unique and sovereign position as the *Satis Cognitum* by its citation of these words in this connection necessitates he should have done: and the passage is thus in harmony with the general tenor of his teaching.

175. It must be remembered that the Fathers by no means apply to St. Peter alone high-sounding titles. St. Chrysostom himself, for example, declares that St. Paul is 'a chief (κορυφαῖος) and leader of the Choir of the Saints.'[4] That 'the whole world had him for its Apostle,'[5] who had the care not of a single household, but of cities and peoples and of the whole world';[6] whilst of St. John he says that he is 'the pillar of the Churches throughout the world, who hath the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'[7]

176. Other ancient writers use similar language of others of the Apostles. Hesychius, presbyter of Jerusalem, for example, says of St. James, 'How shall I praise the servant and brother of Christ, the chief captain of the new Jerusalem, the chief of the priests, the exarch of the Apostles, the Corypheus amongst the heads, the one who surpasses in splendour the lights, who is superior amongst the stars.'[8] St. Andrew, the same writer declares to be 'the firstborn of the Apostolic

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 29.
[2] S. Cyril Hieros. *Catech.*, vi., xv.; P.G. xxxiii. 501.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 134 *et seq.*
[4] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxxii., in Rom. xvi. 24; P.G. lx. 678.
[5] *Hom.* xxi., in 1 Cor. ix. 2; P.G. lxi. 171.
[6] *Hom.* xxv., in 2 Cor. n. 2; P.G. lxi. 571.
[7] *Hom.* i., *in Joan.*, n. 1; P.G. lix. 25.
[8] Hesychius Hieros. Presby. v., *In Jacobum Fratrem Domini*; P.G. xciii. 1479.

Choir, the first made pillar of the Church, the Peter before Peter, the foundation of the foundation, the beginning of the beginning.'[1]

It is plain that no argument can be based upon the application of high-sounding titles to any one of the Apostles in the writings of the Fathers; such would come naturally to those who lived in the East where the use of hyperbolical language is customary.

Section XXII.—*The teaching of St. Chrysostom as to the position of St. Peter.*

177. But, it may be said, is it not the case that, in his Homily on the account in the Acts of the Council of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostom distinctly recognises St. Peter's position as supreme Ruler of the Church when he says, '*he* it was who had been charged with the government,' and that consequently whatever explanation may be given of his use of titles for St. Peter in particular instances, yet the Papalist interpretation of them does after all accurately represent the Doctor's teaching with regard to that Apostle's position in the Church?

A reference, however, to the context of the words thus alleged makes it plain that it was not St. Peter who, according to St. Chrysostom, was on this occasion 'invested with the chief rule' (τὴν ἀρχήν). The passage is as follows: 'There was no arrogance in the Church. After Peter, Paul speaks and none silences him; James waits patiently and does not start up. Great is the orderliness. No word speaks John here; no word the other Apostles, but held their peace, for he [ἐκεῖνος] was invested with the chief rule and they think it no hardship. . . . Peter indeed spoke more strongly, but James here more mildly, for thus it behoves the one high in authority to leave what is unpleasant for others to say while he himself appears in the milder part . . . wherefore saith he, my sentence is not to trouble them which from the Gentiles do turn unto God . . . and he says well with authority, My sentence is.'[2]

178. It is difficult to understand how any one acquainted with the whole passage could refer ἐκεῖνος to any one save he who 'waited patiently,' who 'spoke more mildly, as the one high in authority,' and whose 'sentence' was given 'with authority'; that is, St. James. In fact, the view which St. Chrysostom takes of St. James's position is identical with that taken by Hesychius, who says, 'Peter harangues but James legislates, a few words settled the greatness of the inquiry, "I decide that we trouble not those who are of the Gentiles."'[3]

[1] Hesychius Hieros. Presby. v., *In Jacobum Fratrem Domini* ; P.G. xciii. 1479.

[2] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxxiii., *in Act. App.* c. 2. On the text used by Bishop Gore, whose translation is here given (*Roman Catholic Claims.* Preface to third edition, p. xv.), see note 8.

[3] Hesychius, *op. cit.* ; P.G. xciii. 1480.

179. Another passage from St. Chrysostom's writings is sometimes alleged as though that he believed St. Peter to possess the position of Supremacy over the Apostles, in that in his comment on the election of St. Matthias he states that St. Peter might himself have elected the successor of Judas to the Apostolate. This statement is said to be taken from his third Homily on the Acts already quoted.[1] Now, according to the text which the translators of the Homilies on the Acts in the 'Library of the Fathers' call 'the Old Text'[2] and which they used for the purpose of their translation, the passage is as follows:

'And in those days, it says, "Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples and said." Both as being ardent and as having been put in trust by Christ with the flock, and as having precedence in honour, he always begins the discourse. . . . Why did he not ask Christ to give him some one in the room of Judas? It is better as it is. For in the first place they were engaged in other things. Secondly, of Christ's presence with them, the greatest proof that could be given them was this: As He had chosen when He was among them, so did He now, being absent. Now this was no small matter for their consolation. But observe how Peter does everything with common consent. But observe how he consoles them concerning what is passed. In fact, what had happened had caused them no small consternation. For if there are many now who canvass the circumstances, what may we suppose they had to say then? Men and brethren, says Peter. For if the Lord called them brethren, much more he [Men, he says], they all being present. See the dignity of the Church, the angelic condition! no distinction then, neither *male* nor *female*; I would that the Churches were such now . . . he appositely brings in the Prophet, saying, For it is written, etc. . . . So that this, he says, is not my counsel but His Who hath foretold these things. For that he may not seem to be undertaking a great thing, and just such as Christ had done, he adduces the Prophet as a witness. *Wherefore it behoves of these men who have companied with us all the time.* Why does he make it their business too? That the matter might not become a matter of strife, and that they might not fall into contention about it, for if the Apostles themselves once did this, much more might those. This he ever avoids. Wherefore at the beginning he said, *men and brethren, it behoves* to choose from among you. He defers the election to the whole body, thereby both making the elected objects of reverence, and himself keeping clear of all invidiousness with regard to the rest. . . . Then why did it not rest with Peter himself to make the election himself? what was the motive? This, that he might not seem to bestow it of favour, and besides he was not yet endowed with the Spirit. *And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias.* Not he

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 151.

[2] On this text see note 8.

appointed them, but that it was he that introduced the proposition to that effect, at the same time pointing out that this was not his own, but from old time by prophecy, so that he acted as exponent, not as preceptor.'[1]

180. In this passage St. Chrysostom regards St. Peter as occupying the position of an Apostle according to the interpretation which he gives of the passage in St. John having precedence in honour in the Apostolic College, and thus the first position in the flock consisting of the one hundred and twenty disciples, men and women, and therefore presiding over them gathered together. To this flock, according to St. Chrysostom, the absolute choice of the successor of Judas is committed; everything is done with the common consent. The place occupied by St. Peter, in St. Chrysostom's view, is not that of a 'Sovereign' 'Master' whose choice would at once be accepted as final, so that there could not possibly be any strife or contention as to it, but that of a Chairman who, whilst not making the election, naturally introduced the proposition by which Joseph and Matthias were appointed as those with reference to whom the lots should be cast. He does not even suggest the name of one as the person to be appointed, which in his position he might well have done; it is the choice of the whole body. It did not rest with him to make the election himself. His action, in fact, whilst quite consistent with a position of *Primus inter pares*, is absolutely inconsistent with that of a monarch having an identity of power with that of Christ, and so doing a 'great thing just as Christ had done,' of Whom it is recorded, of 'His disciples *He* chose twelve whom He also named Apostles.'[2]

181. It is true that in the corrupt Benedictine text there occurs the statement, 'Was it not lawful for Peter himself to elect? It was indeed certainly lawful, but he did not do it lest he should seem to favour any one';[3] but these words do not occur in the old and genuine text. Even if they be St. Chrysostom's, the context as given in the same text makes it clear that they cannot be understood in the sense which it is sought to affix to them, for, according to it, St. Chrysostom says of the Apostles, 'Why of themselves do they not make the election?'[4] This plainly excludes the idea that St. Peter held the position with reference to the Apostolic College which Christ occupied when on earth, a fact which is emphasised by the statement 'he did did not say simply thus: "Instead of Judas *we* elect the man,"' a statement which shows that had 'Peter himself elected' the successor of Judas, he would have acted as the representative of the Apostles;

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* iii., *in Act. App.*, n. 1, 2; Trans. Oxf. *Lib. of the Fathers*, pp. 37, 40.

[2] St. Luke vi. 13.

[3] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* iii., *in Act. App.*; P.G. lx. 36. For a full discussion of this passage in the Benedictine Text, *vide* Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, 372 *sq.* Third edit.

[4] *Ibid.*

the election would thus have been that of the whole Apostolate. The Apostles, however, instead of electing, preferred to leave the matter to the common consent, St. Peter as their mouthpiece signifying this decision on their part. The distinction which is drawn is not between St. Peter and the Apostolate, but between the Apostolate and the multitude, and the election is deferred to the latter instead of being carried out by the former, just as in Acts vi., at the election of the 'Deacons,' a like distinction is drawn between the twelve and the multitude, and the latter and not the former 'chose' the seven. As St. Chrysostom says in commenting on this, 'They leave the decision to them. . . . They might indeed themselves have made the election as moved by the Spirit. . . . It is the people that draw them, not the Apostles that lead them.'[1]

182. The interpretation of the passage in this unsatisfactory text as here given is in agreement with the learned Bossuet's. He used this text and in it says: 'Our anonymous writer in the last place brings forward the third Homily of Blessed Chrysostom in the Acts of the Apostles and lays great stress on it. There the holy Doctor expounds the decision of Peter concerning the co-optation of one of the disciples into the Apostolic College. . . . In which place our anonymous writer dreams that Chrysostom wished to lay down that Peter could of his own right have carried through the whole business without even consulting his brethren, which is far from being the opinion of Chrysostom and his times. Chrysostom desired to say that it was lawful for Peter, chief of the sacred Band, as he first spoke concerning the election, also at the same time to have designated and chosen some one on whose election the rest could readily have agreed. This indeed would be to choose not solely but first. But this did not Peter. He says indefinitely, "It is necessary that one of these should be made a witness with us of the Resurrection of Christ." Chrysostom therefore notes the modesty of Peter who was unwilling to anticipate the judgments of others.'[2]

If, then, Bossuet considered this to be the meaning of St. Chrysostom's word so given in the unsatisfactory Benedictine text, it follows that the genuine 'old text' can still less be said to bear the sense which Ultramontane writers seek to affix to St. Chrysostom's words, a sense which, it is to be observed, would be opposed to, and incompatible with, his general teaching as to St. Peter's position in the Apostolate,[3] teaching with which the non-Papalist interpretation given above is in complete harmony.[4]

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xv., *in Act. App.*, c. 3; P.G. lx. 115.

[2] Bossuet, *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, Pars. iii. lib. viii. c. xvii., tom. ii. 10. Edit. Lugani, 1756.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 134 *et seq.*, 149 *et seq.*

[4] On the genuineness of this Homily, *vide* note 9.

183. It has, however, been said that St. Chrysostom does definitely call St. Peter 'the Master of the disciples' in his comment on the occasion when St. Paul 'withstood him to the face'[1] at Antioch, saying: 'Wherefore Paul reprehends and Peter endures that when the Master is silent under reproach the disciples may more easily change their opinion.'[2]

When quoted in this manner, isolated from the context, the citation gives an entirely erroneous impression of the writer's meaning. A consideration of the whole passage of which the quotation forms a part proves that the meaning of the words quoted is simply this: St. Peter, having allowed circumcision when preaching at Jerusalem, changed his teaching on the subject when at Antioch. On the arrival, however, at that city of certain Jews from Jerusalem who had heard the doctrine which he had taught there, and had, as his disciples, accepted it, he again changed his course, fearing to perplex them 'with two objects in view, both to avoid offending those Jews and to give Paul a good opportunity for animadversion.'[3]

184. This is not the place to comment on the latter of these two reasons, for which few would care to be responsible and which is contrary to the opinion of Tertullian,[4] St. Cyprian,[5] St. Cyril of Alexandria,[6] St. Augustine[7] and others who consider that St. Peter's motives were wrong and that he sinned in dissembling. It is only necessary to show that 'the disciples' referred to in the citation of which Peter is called 'the Master,' are not, as the argument Papalists base upon the quotation requires should be the case, 'all the disciples,' *i.e.* the whole Church. This is clear from the context. The disciples of whom he is said to be 'the Master' are merely those who had come from Jerusalem, who 'had heard the doctrine he had delivered there,' and who are expressly described a few lines further on as 'Peter's disciples,' 'The Jewish Party,' 'The Jewish Christians.'[8] It is thus evident that the passage not only does not support in any way the Papalist contention, but by the expressions used in the context contradicts it, in that Peter's disciples are in it confined to a section of Christians, whereas on Papalist principles he is 'the Master' of *all.*

185. If any additional proof were needed that St. Chrysostom did not consider St. Peter to possess that supreme office and the whole Church which is asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to him *jure divino*, it is to be found in the way in which he regarded that Apostle's

[1] Galatians ii. 11.
[2] S. Chrysostom, *Com. in Ep. ad Gal.* ii. 11 *sq.*; P.G. lxi. 641.
[3] *Ibid*
[4] Tertullian, *De Prescript.* 23; P.L. ii. 35.
[5] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Quint.*, Ep. lxxi.; Hartel, p. 771 *et seq.*
[6] S. Cyril Alex., *in Julian.* ix. *ad finem*; P.G. lxxvi. 1001.
[7] S. Aug., *De Bapt. contra Donatist.*, ii. 2; P.L. xliii. 128.
[8] S. Chrysostom, *l.c.*

connection with Antioch. This is to be gathered from a sermon preached by him before the Bishop at Antioch, when he said: 'Since I have mentioned Peter, another Peter occurs to me, our common Father and Teacher; who being his successor in virtue has also inherited his seat, for this too is one of the privileges of our city that it received at the beginning for its teacher the first of the Apostles. For fitting it was that the city which before the whole world encircled her brows with the name of Christian, should receive as Pastor the first of the Apostles. But though we received him for our teacher we did not keep him to the end. For we have not indeed the body of Peter, but we keep the faith of Peter as himself, and having the faith of Peter, we have Peter himself.'[1]

186. St. Chrysostom's language is incompatible with any belief on his part that our Lord conferred on St. Peter a power of jurisdiction differing in *kind* from that which was possessed *jure divino* by the other members of the Apostolate in that it was 'full and supreme,' identical with that which Christ Himself exercised over the Apostolic College, and so over the whole Church, or that any such sovereign jurisdiction had been transferred with the Apostle from his See at Antioch to 'Royal Rome.' The distinction conferred on Antioch by the Episcopate of Peter, according to St. Chrysostom, remained. For there the faith of Peter, *i.e.* that which he professed in his memorable confession, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' was still preserved, and therefore Antioch, where Peter had been Bishop, held a position equal to that which 'Royal Rome' held, though, unlike the latter, it did not possess the body of the Apostle.

Had St. Chrysostom believed that Peter was the Master of the Apostolic College to whom was committed, by the institution of Christ, the government of the Church, and that unique and sovereign position was by like institution possessed by 'his successors,' 'the Roman Pontiffs,' he could not have thus spoken, for in that case his language would have been misleading, and this too with regard to a doctrine a right faith in which is declared to be necessary to salvation.

187. The significance of this is enhanced by the fact that the Bishop of whom he was speaking, Flavian, was not in communion with Rome, and necessarily regarded by the Roman Bishop as an intruder into a See of which that Bishop recognised Paulinus to be the legitimate occupant. Therefore he whom St. Chrysostom declares to have been the successor of Peter in virtue and to have inherited his seat, was according to the Papalist doctrine embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* 'outside the edifice,' 'separated from the fold,' 'exiled from the kingdom,' a position, be it observed, shared by St. Chrysostom at the very moment he was speaking.

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom.* ii., *In Inscriptionem Actionum*, ii. 6; P.G. lii. 86.

188. Lastly, it is clear that St. Chrysostom considered that the Apostolate held the chief place in the Church, for he says:

'But the apostolic magistracy (ἀρχή) is greater than all these. How is this manifest? Because the Apostle is before all these, and as the Consul amongst earthly magistracies so the Apostle has the pre-eminence in spirituals. Let us hear Paul enumerating the authorities and setting forth that of the Apostles in the highest place. What does he say then? God placed some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers and pastors. You see the summit of the dignities (κορυφὴν ἀρχῶν). You see the Apostle sitting in the highest place and no one before him or above him, for he says first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers and pastors; then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues, the apostle is not only the chief (ἀρχήν) of the other dignities (ἀρχῶν), but also their root and foundation, and as the head is placed in the chief place of all; not only as the chief and ruler of the body, but also its root . . . so also the Apostolate, not only as governing and ruling excels all other gifts, but also retains, comprehended in itself, the roots of all.'[1]

189. The magistracy of the Apostolate is here put by St. Chrysostom in the place of supremacy in the Church. It is not only the summit of dignities in mere precedence, but it is the root and foundation of all others. Could there be a more explicit contradiction of the Papalist allegation that Peter has, 'by the institution of Christ,' 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' that he 'is the Master of the Apostolic College,' 'the supreme Pastor and Judge of all the faithful,' 'having full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church?' St. Chrysostom's statements are definite. Not only does he make no reservation safeguarding any unique authority as the prerogative *jure divino* of St. Peter, but his whole argument shows that he was absolutely unconscious of the existence of any such position belonging to him. It is the Apostolate, not Peter, which according to St. Chrysostom is the root and foundation of all the authorities in the Church, comprehending the whole of them in itself; hence it is the Apostolate, not Peter, that possessed in the belief of this Doctor of the Church the full and supreme power of jurisdiction in the Church. It is the Apostles who were designated 'rulers' (ἄρχοντες) who received not nations and particular cities, but all being entrusted with the whole world' (πάντες κοινῇ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐμπιστευθέντες).[2] As possessing this jurisdiction, they, the Apostolic College, are the source whence the other members of her hierarchy derive their offices in the Church, with the respective powers and authority thereto attached, necessary for the due performance of the duties of their offices.

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom. De Utilitate lectionis Scripturarum in princip. Actorum*, iii.; P.G. li. 92.

[2] *l.c.* P.G. li. 93.

190. The conclusions arrived at from consideration of the evidence afforded by the writings of St. Chrysostom prove that he was entirely ignorant of the Papalist doctrine as to the position of St. Peter, a doctrine asserted to be 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' a doctrine which, if Papalism be true, is a dogma with reference to which Perrone says truly in that case, is 'the principal point of the matter on which the existence and safety of the Church herself altogether depends';[1] this teaching of Catholic truth from which the *Vatican Decrees* declare 'no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation.'[2]

The passages quoted in, and in particular the titles he gives to St. Peter alleged by, the *Satis Cognitum*, when examined, are found not to support the Papalist doctrine, but to be in harmony with his teaching elsewhere on the subject.

191. An important consequence follows from this fact. As has been before noted, the object of the *Satis Cognitum* in that portion of it which has been under consideration in the previous pages is to establish a basis for the allegations made therein as to the position of the Bishops of Rome as the 'legitimate successors of Peter.'

Since then St. Chrysostom did not hold that there was divinely bestowed on St. Peter 'a real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,'[3] as he did not believe that St. Peter occupied *jure divino* a monarchical position in the Church, possessing a power 'supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church,'[4] it is clear that he was equally ignorant of any similar position belonging *jure divino* to the 'Roman Pontiffs' as his 'legitimate successors.' Confirmation of this will be given later.[5] It need only be remarked here that whilst the *Satis Cognitum* does attempt to cite St. Chrysostom as a witness to, and in support of, its allegation as to the 'Supremacy of Peter' over the Church, an attempt which has been proved in the foregoing pages to be unjustifiable, it is not without significance that it does not attempt to adduce him as one of the 'Holy Fathers' of the East, who are asserted by it to give evident testimony to the Papalist doctrine with regard to the Supremacy of the Bishops of Rome over the Church as the Successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, which it is the object of the *Satis Cognitum* to set forth as a necessary part of the One Faith.

[1] Perrone, *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, Tractatus de locis theologicis, Part i. sect. 2, de Petri Primatu, p. 316.

[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii.; *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 483.

[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 28. [5] *Vide infra*, nn. 911, 913.

SECTION XXIII.—*On two statements by St. Leo and St. Gregory as to the position of St. Peter.*

192. The portion of the *Satis Cognitum* which has hitherto been under consideration concludes with two quotations, both taken from the writings of Popes, viz. St. Leo the Great and St. Gregory the Great.

Reasons have already[1] been given to show that in a question such as that under notice, affecting as it does the claims which the Bishops of Rome make on behalf of their See, statements made by its occupants cannot in equity be allowed to be adduced as evidence in support of those claims. This applies with special force to St. Leo, who was the first to formulate the 'Petrine ideas,' which by the fifth century governed the mind of the authorities of the Roman Church in their efforts to aggrandise the See, of which, by that date, St. Peter had come to be regarded the sole founder and first Bishop. An essential condition to the success of these efforts was the amplification of the 'privileges of St. Peter,' and to this end no one contributed more than St. Leo. His historical position as 'the Father of the Papacy' will come under consideration later;[2] it will suffice now to say that in his works can undoubtedly be found the germ which ultimately developed in those claims to be Absolute Monarch over the Church, which are embodied in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum*.

193. One of the passages in his writings, in which St. Leo thus amplifies to the utmost the privileges of St. Peter, is that quoted by the *Satis Cognitum* in this place. 'From the whole world Peter alone is chosen to take the lead in calling all nations, to be the head of all the Apostles and of all the Fathers of the Church. So that although in the people of God there are many priests and many pastors, Peter should by right rule all of those over whom Christ Himself is the chief Ruler' (Sermo v. cap. 2).[3]

194. A statement such as this here made is obviously of an essentially different character to those which are made by St. Cyprian[4] and St. Augustine[5] with regard to St. Peter's position. It is not in harmony with the general tradition of the whole Church before St. Leo's time, nor with that of the East then and since. It embodies merely what had come to be the accepted ideas on the subject in the Imperial City, ideas which St. Leo, it cannot be doubted, fully believed to be in accord with historical facts. Such ideas would also in themselves appeal strongly to him as affording the natural basis for

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 72.
[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 202 *et seq.*
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 29, 30.
[4] *Vide infra*, nn. 556, 570-1.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 117 *et seq.*

that authority which he never lost an opportunity of asserting and enforcing as the legitimate right of the See which he occupied.

195. The citation made from the works of St. Gregory the Great is as follows :—

'It is evident to all who know the Gospel that the charge of the whole Church was committed to St. Peter, the Apostle and Prince of all the Apostles, by the word of the Lord. . . . Behold! he hath received the keys of the heavenly kingdom—the power of binding and loosing is conferred upon him : the care of the whole government of the Church is confided to him' (Epist. lib. v., Epist. xx.).[1]

196. The impossibility on any principle of equity of accepting statements of Popes as evidence in a matter of this kind necessarily applies also to this quotation from St. Gregory's works. The 'Petrine idea,' moreover, had by this date become firmly rooted at Rome, and had been made use of with much insistence by previous Popes. St. Gregory is thus simply a witness to the Roman belief of his age, and consequently a witness of no value as to the truth of the Papal pretensions. So far as the statement quoted is itself concerned, it, like that of St. Leo just considered, is out of harmony with what has been shown to be the belief of the Church of the first age, and the general teaching of the Fathers; it represents the current belief of the Roman Church of his day two centuries and more after the days of St. Leo, when his teaching had naturally had time to bear fruit. His testimony is therefore valueless for the purpose adduced.

197. Yet even at this period of the Church's history, it is not without significance to note that St. Gregory could say of St. Paul, that 'he was made the head of the nations because he obtained the *principatum* of the whole Church,'[2] as well as say of St. Peter, 'Surely Peter, first of the Apostles, is a member of the universal Church ; Paul, Andrew, John, what else are they but the heads of particular communities? and yet all are members under one Head.'[3]

198. In the former of these passages, St. Gregory gives St. Paul the position which was his in harmony with the ancient belief as to the Unity of the Apostolate, by virtue of which each Apostle had Œcumenical jurisdiction, and in the latter, whilst he gave St. Peter the first place, he regards all four Apostles, whom he names, as *members* of one body, and so on an equality, a position inconsistent with the idea embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* that St. Peter was 'Master' *jure divino* 'of the Apostolic College.' No doubt, as in the citation made by the *Satis Cognitum*, St. Gregory advanced pretensions in the interests of his See going beyond the teaching of these passages, and difficult to

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 30.
[2] S. Greg. M., *Exposit. in* 1 *Reg.* cx. v.; P.L. lxxix. 303.
[3] *Ep. ad Joan. Const. Episc.*, lib. v. Ep. xviii.; P.L. lxxvii. 740.

SECTION XXV.—*The historical position of St. Leo the Great.*

202. The prominent part which St. Leo played in the advancement and development of Papalism has been already alluded to in the previous chapter. He is the first to lay down 'a definite theory of Papal power at any rate in the matter of jurisdiction, and the theory as it appears in him is on the highroad to justify universal absolutism. Indeed, the whole bent of Leo's mind tended in that direction. The Imperial instincts of Rome are dominant in him, all that sense of discipline, order, government—all the hatred of ununiformity, individuality, eccentricity. These are the elements which make up Leo's mind. He is above all things a governor and an administrator.' 'To him the papal authority had come down as the great inheritance of his position; it was identified in his mind with the order, the authority, the discipline, which he loved so dearly; it suited exactly his Imperial ambition—in a word, his "Roman" disposition and character.'[1] As Milman says, 'Leo was a Roman in sentiment as in birth. All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone.'[2]

203. St. Leo was, therefore, *the* man to extend and amplify the power and influence of the Roman See, and the circumstances of the time in which he lived were such as materially assisted him in the attainment of his object in this direction. The very misfortunes of the Empire became in the hands of a man of such a character an instrument ably used to that end. Rome, threatened by the barbarian hordes, deserted by the secular prince, found in him the representative of spiritual power, the protector of its greatness, and to its people he appeared in consequence the legitimate heir of the power and influence exercised by the Imperial City in the ancient world.

204. So again the troubles caused to the Church by the heresy of Eutyches were the means by which he as a theologian was enabled to advance the influence of the Roman Bishop in the East where it was weakest. During the prevalence of Arianism, his predecessors, with the exception of Liberius,[3] had been amongst the most steadfast champions of the orthodox faith. In them Athanasius found firm support in his efforts to withstand the progress of a heresy which, had it been successful in overthrowing orthodoxy, would have destroyed

[1] Bp. Gore, *Leo the Great*, pp. 99, 101.
[2] Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. i. p. 230, 4th ed.
[3] *Vide infra*, nn. ~~763, 777~~ 758 et seq

the religion of the Cross. Another heresy, that of Nestorius, found in Celestine one of its ablest opponents. Such a past would naturally cause the Eastern Christians, when harassed by yet another heresy, to be greatly influenced in their treatment of St. Leo's efforts to aggrandise his See by the memory of the services rendered to orthodoxy by his predecessors in that See, services to which he added in their new trouble the assistance which he ungrudgingly gave them for the defence of the Truth.

Indeed, it would have been a matter of great surprise if it had been otherwise. Inestimable was the service rendered by him to the Church by means of his 'Tome' in which the great verity that the Son of Mary is perfect God and perfect Man is set forth with such definiteness and care that it 'is theologically invaluable and well deserved to be solemnly approved at Chalcedon, to become the great test of Anti-Monophysite orthodoxy, and to be read in Italian and Gallican Churches in Advent.'[1]

205. St. Leo had thus exceptional opportunities for advancing, during his Episcopate, the interests of his See, the power and influence of which were to him a trust which he had received for the welfare of the Church, inasmuch as his See was held by him to be the possessor of the privileges which, according to the 'Petrine idea' that had become at this date dominant at Rome, had been conferred by Christ on Peter as its first occupant. Of these opportunities St. Leo made the fullest use, and in doing so he employed language, as in the quotation cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, with regard to the powers which he asserted to belong to that See which goes beyond that which had been used by his predecessors, and presents a strong contrast to the teaching of the great Saints of the rest of the Church in the previous centuries.

Section XXVI.—*The Edict of Valentinian III.*

206. St. Leo found in Valentinian III., who ruled the Western Empire, a facile tool of which he availed himself in the strenuous efforts he made to effect the aggrandisement of his See. Doubtless under his influence, Valentinian issued an *Edict*, dated July 8th, A.D. 445, conferring on the Bishops of Rome extensive powers, nothing less, in fact, than a coercive jurisdiction over the Church within the limits of the Western Empire. 'We decree,' said the Emperor, 'by this perpetual Edict, that it thall not be lawful for the Bishops of Gaul or of the other provinces, contrary to ancient custom, to do aught without the authority of the Venerable Pope of the Eternal City; and whatsoever the authority of the Apostolic See has enacted, or

[1] *Eighteen Sermons by S. Leo the Great*, etc. Trans. by W. Bright. Translator's Preface, p. xiii.

may hereafter enact, shall be the law for all. So that if any Bishop summoned to trial before the Pope of Rome shall neglect to attend, he shall be compelled to appearance by the Governor of the Province, in all respects regard being had to what privileges our deified parents conferred on the Roman Church. Wherefore your illustrious and eminent Magnificence is to cause what is enacted above to be observed in virtue of this present Edict and law, and a fine of ten pounds is at once to be levied on any judge who suffers Our commands to be disobeyed.'[1]

207. The influence of this *Edict* on the development of the Papacy was of a far-reaching character. It will be observed that the *Edict* refers to one issued by Gratian, one of his predecessors, under the following circumstances:—

A Synod was held at Rome in A.D. 378[2] at which Bishops from all parts of Italy were present under the presidency of Damasus. The Synod addressed a letter to the Emperor Gratian with the object of obtaining from him power to deal effectually with the scandal arising from the contumacy of ecclesiastics who flouted the judgments of the Church authorities. Valentinian I. had already, by an Imperial constitution promulgated between 367 and 372,[3] given some coercive power to this end to the ecclesiastical authorities. The Synod, it would appear, asked that the provision of this law should be renewed, requesting the Emperor that he should order 'that any one who had been condemned by the judgment of Damasus, or of themselves "who were Catholics" and unjustly retained possession of his Church, or when summoned by episcopal order refused to attend, should be brought to Rome by the Prefects of the Prætorium of Italy or the Vicarius of Rome, or if a question of the kind arose in more distant parts, its examination should be committed to the Metropolitan by the local authorities; provided that if the offender himself was a Metropolitan he should be compelled to go at once either to Rome or to those judges whom the Roman Bishop should appoint.'[4]

208. Gratian in the *Rescript* which he issued in reply to the request ordained as follows: 'We will that whosoever has been condemned by the judgment of Damasus which he had given with the advice of five or seven Bishops, or who had been condemned by the judgment or advice of those Bishops who are Catholics, if he unjustly desire to retain his church, or he who summoned to the judgment of the

[1] *Constitutio Valentiniani Augusti;* P.L. liv. 656 *sq.*

[2] So Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 111; Tillemont, *op. cit.*, v. 776, and Mansi, iii. 624, 627. Hefele gives A.D. 380 as the date, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 91 [E.T. ii. 291], as does also Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, p. 214. Fr. Puller thinks that A.D. 382 is the correct date, *op. cit.*, pp. 510-528. Third edit.

[3] Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

[4] *Epistola Concilii Roman ad Gratianum et Valentinianum Imperat.* Mansi, iii. 626.

Bishops (*sacerdotale judicium*) had through contumacy not gone, should either by the illustrious men, the Prætorian Prefects of Gaul and of Italy, be remitted to the episcopal judgment, or summoned by the Proconsuls or Vicars, come under prosecution at the city of Rome; or if the insubordination of any in such case should arise in the more distant parts, let the whole pleading of the cause be submitted to the consideration of the Metropolitan of the Province to which the Bishop belongs, or if he himself is a Metropolitan, let the cause be necessarily taken to Rome or to those judges whom the Roman Bishops shall appoint.[1] . . . But if the condemned Bishop should suspect from any cause the fairness of his Metropolitan or of any of his other judges, it shall be lawful for him to appeal to the Bishop of Rome or to a Council of fifteen of the neighbouring Bishops.'

209. Gratian, it will be observed, in the *Rescript* includes in the sphere within which the power granted by him should be exercised, the whole Western Empire. He names the two Prætorian prefectures then existing in the West, those of Italy and Gaul, the third prefecture, that of Eastern Illyricum, having at the division of the empire between Gratian and Theodosius ceased to belong to the West. The prefecture of Italy included the 'Dioceses' of Rome, Italy, Western Illyricum, and Africa; that of Gaul, the 'Dioceses' of Gaul, Spain, and Britain.[2] Of these divisions some were administered directly by the Prefects, others by their vicars, whilst proconsular Africa, and at the time of the *Rescript*, the 'Diocese' of Spain, were administered by Proconsuls directly responsible to the Emperor. This accounts for the various officials being named in the *Rescript*. Whether Gratian in his *Rescript* enlarged the sphere of this jurisdiction beyond what the Bishops had asked and his predecessor Valentinian I. had already granted, may be a question. Fr. Puller considers that the Emperor was simply defining more clearly the boundaries of this jurisdiction which the Synod had mentioned in their letter.[3] Others think that he did by his language grant more than was asked for.[4] The result, however, is the same, viz. that throughout the whole Western Empire the Bishop of Rome obtained, either by this *Rescript* or by the previous one of Valentinian I., by it renewed, two new powers which certainly did not belong to him before. These two powers were, first, all accused

[1] *Rescriptum Gratiani Augusti ad Aquilinum Vicarium Urbis.* Mansi, vi. 628, 629.

[2] Gieseler, *op. cit.*, second period, div. I. chap. iii. § 96, n. 5. [E.T. i. 426.]

[3] Puller, *l.c.*

[4] *e.g.* Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 113. The point in difference being the meaning to be attached to the phrase '*longinquioribus partibus*' in the Synodal letter and in the *Rescript* respectively. Did they mean the same thing? Did the Synod think only of the 'remoter parts' of Prætorian prefecture of Italy (and it is noteworthy that they did not mention the officials of the Gallic prefecture), or did they use the phrase as Gratian did in the *Rescript* as meaning the remoter parts of the much wider region he contemplates in the *Rescript*? Perhaps the former is the more probable.

Metropolitans throughout the West were either to be summoned to Rome and tried there, or he might appoint judges to try the cause elsewhere; secondly, all Bishops throughout the Western Empire who had been tried by Synods of local Bishops might appeal from an adverse decision either to the Bishop of Rome or to a tribunal consisting of fifteen Bishops in their own neighbourhood. It is obvious that this placed the Bishop of Rome in a more powerful position than he had hitherto occupied. His whole relation to the Metropolitans was altered, for it is quite clear from the case of Cæcilian[1] of Carthage in A.D. 313, that the then Bishop of Rome had no inherent right to try him as a Metropolitan under his jurisdiction,[2] nor was any such power recognised by either the Council of Nicæa or that of Sardica. For the Canons of the latter (if they be genuine[3]) did not allow the Bishop of Rome to hear appeals from Provincial Synods *at Rome*,[4] which the *Rescript* expressly allows. It must be borne in mind that the source of this extensive jurisdiction was not ecclesiastical but civil. It was an act of the state, and therefore the jurisdiction so conferred was 'civil' in nature. Further, that the jurisdiction so bestowed depended upon its grantor for the maintenance and continuance of its exercise in the countries named in the grant. Hence such jurisdiction could only endure so long as the grantor maintained his own authority over the said countries, and would necessarily come to an end when the jurisdiction which was its source ceased to be effective in such countries.

210. Valentinian's *Edict* made a considerable addition to the large powers conferred by Gratian on the Roman Bishop. (1) In the first place, Gratian's *Rescript* had only given certain powers with reference to the causes in which Metropolitans or Bishops were concerned; by the terms of the new *Edict* the Bishops of Gaul and elsewhere were prohibited from doing aught without the authority of the Roman Bishop; secondly, by it the force of law was given to the enactments, past and future, of the Roman Bishop; thirdly, any Bishop summoned to trial before the Pope of Rome, should be compelled by the civil power to attend; fourthly, the specification in Gratian's *Rescript* of the then Bishop of Rome, Damasus, might be held to make the jurisdiction conferred a personal grant to him. Valentinian's *Edict* plainly declares that grant thereby made is to 'the Bishop of Rome,' and not merely to the occupant of that See at the date of the grant.

[1] *Vide infra*, 603.

[2] At this time the only Metropolitans in the West were the Bishop of Rome and the Primate of Carthage.

[3] On the genuineness of these Canons, *vide infra*, nn. 331 *et seq.*

[4] *Vide infra*, n. 326.

211. Like the *Rescript* of Gratian, that of Valentinian had no reference to the Eastern Empire, but within the confines of the Western it conferred on the Roman Bishops a jurisdiction practically Imperial in extent and power. In those days the secular prince wielded autocratic authority, and it is easy to see that a grant of this nature would be understood to make the Bishops of Rome in the West, within the spiritual sphere, as absolutely 'sovereign' as the Emperor in the temporal sphere. The Bishops would thus be his subjects, exercising whatever authority they used in subjection to him, and consequently as his 'Vicars,' in the same way as the Prefects and other civil officers were representatives of the Emperor in the authority they exercised.

212. As in the case of Gratian's *Rescript*, it is important to note that the jurisdiction thus conferred by the state was necessarily secular in nature,[1] that being the sole kind of jurisdiction which it lies in the power of the civil authority to bestow. So too, like Gratian's, it could only be in force where the Imperial rule was effective; hence it is interesting to remember that as Britain ceased to be a part of the Western Empire on the withdrawal of the Imperial troops in 409, and the establishment by the natives of states of their own, a proceeding in which Honorius, the legitimate Emperor of the West, appears to have acquiesced,[2] and never became again part of that realm, it follows that the jurisdiction conferred by this *Edict* on the Bishops of Rome was never in force in that country.

Section XXVII.—*St. Leo and St. Hilary of Arles.*

213. The immediate cause of the issue of Valentinian's *Edict* is stated in the document itself to have been the conduct of St. Hilary of Arles in resisting the precepts of the Roman Bishop. There can be no doubt that it was this case which induced St. Leo to obtain this grant of power from the civil authority.

St. Hilary, as Metropolitan of Arles, had in his Provincial Synod A.D. 444 deposed Celidonius, Bishop of Besançon, for having, while yet a layman, married a widow.[3] Celidonius had recourse to Rome, with the result that St. Leo, apparently 'without further examination, at once admitted him to communion.'[4]

214. St. Hilary on hearing this, at once, in the middle of winter, journeyed across the Alps to Rome, and besought St. Leo with the greatest respect to uphold the discipline of the Church according to the immemorial practice of the Church, formally complaining that

[1] On Valentinian's allegation as to 'the Primacy of the Apostolic See,' *vide* note 10.
[2] *Cp.* Lingard, *History of England*, ch. i. p. 42. Sixth edit.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. x. ch. i. sect. 165. [Eng. trans. iii. p. 172.]
[4] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, tom. xv. p. 72.

Bishops canonically condemned in Gaul were seen in Rome attending the altar. St. Hilary was careful to expressly disclaim any intention on his part of pleading his cause, he had come to Rome simply to inform St. Leo of what had taken place, and to beseech him to maintain the rules of discipline. If he refused to do that, he would trouble him no further. St. Hilary's position in so doing was practically identical with that adopted by the Bishops of Africa in the case of Apiarius,[1] viz. that Leo had no right to take cognisance of the case at all, no appeal being permitted from the Gallic Synods to the Roman Bishop.

215. St. Hilary's remonstrance was in vain. St. Leo held a Synod, probably in 445, wherein he declared the sentence of the Gallic Synod to be invalid and restored Celidonius to his Bishopric.[2] Such a course went far beyond any action which could be based on the Sardican Canons;[3] and it is not without significance that no appeal to these Canons was made on either side with reference to this matter. St. Hilary seeing that his remonstrances would have no effect, secretly left Rome, where he had been placed under a guard in consequence of the displeasure caused to the Romans by the inflexible firmness wherewith he maintained his position that St. Leo had no right to take cognisance of the case.

216. St. Leo wrote a severe letter to the Bishops of Vienne about St. Hilary, informing them that the 'Council of Rome forbade St. Hilary to encroach on the rights of others, deprived him of even the authority which he had over the Province of Vienne, prohibiting him from being present at any ordination, declared him to be cut off from communion with the Holy See; and represented it as an act of grace that he was left in his church, and not deposed.'[4] St. Leo further proceeded to propose to appoint as 'Primate,' if they approved of him, Leontius the Bishop of Fréjus, but the Gauls did not accept this proposal,[5] and Leo found it necessary to restore to the See of Arles during the Episcopate of Ravenius, the successor of St. Hilary, most of 'the privileges' which had been bestowed upon it by Zosimus.[6]

217. St. Hilary made several attempts to appease St. Leo, and was seconded by the efforts of Auxiliaris, the Prefect of Gaul. In one of the latter's letters to St. Hilary there is an interesting passage which shows that the occupants of the Roman See at this date were considered to be uplifted with pride. 'Men,' he says, 'will scarcely

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 609 *et seq.*
[2] Hefele, *ubi supra.*
[3] *Vide infra*, nn. 325 *et seq.*
[4] Fleury, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, bk. xxvii. cap. v. tom. ii. p. 395. Edit. Paris, 1856.
[5] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
[6] On the position of the See of Arles, *vide* note 11 *On the Vicariate of Arles.*

endure us to speak with that boldness which an honest conscience would prompt us to make use of, and the ears of the Romans are somewhat delicate. If you would humour them a little, you would gain a great deal without losing anything. Comply with me thus much and disperse these little clouds by a slight change in your position.'[1] Notwithstanding the appeal thus made to him, St. Hilary stood firm on principle. He would not consent to any compromise with reference to rights which he held belonged to his Church. He remained amongst his people, discharging his duties as Bishop with fidelity, until his death in 449. There is 'neither proof nor probability' that Leo 'restored him to his communion from which he had cut him off';[2] he was thus on Papalist principles not in the 'One Flock,' yet he continued to be recognised as the legitimate Pastor of the Diocese, and, dying in the odour of sanctity, so that even Leo called him 'of holy memory,' is venerated as a Saint by the Church, and his name occurs in the Roman Martyrology.

218. St. Leo appears to have had some doubts as to whether the Gallic Bishops would acquiesce in his encroachment on the rights of their Church, and obtained from Valentinian the *Edict* which has been considered above. There can be no question that the *Edict* was of great assistance to the Bishops of Rome in their efforts to bring the Metropolitans and Bishops of the various Provinces in the West into subjection to their authority. In Gaul itself its effect was soon manifest. St. Leo's successor, in a dispute which had arisen between Leontius of Arles and Mamertus of Vienne, made use of the jurisdiction confessed by the *Edict*, declaring that 'it had been decreed by the law of Christian Princes [*i.e.* this *Edict* of Valentinian] that whatever the Pontiff of the Apostolic See has pronounced upon his own investigation to be done by the Churches and their rulers for the peace of all the Lord's priests, and the observance of discipline in the removal of confusion, is to be reverently received and steadily complied with, nor can anything which is supported by ecclesiastical and royal ordinances be uprooted.'[3] The statement is plain, and is valuable as showing how largely the vast claims gradually developed by the Papacy rest upon a purely Erastian foundation.

Section XXVIII.—*St. Leo's pretensions not admitted in the East.*

219. St. Leo was undoubtedly successful where his predecessors Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine failed,[4] but his success was confined to the West. St. Leo's pretensions were not admitted in the East,

[1] Fleury, *op. cit.*, bk. xxvii. ch. vi. tom. ii. p. 396. Edit. Paris, 1856.
[2] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xv. 89.
[3] Hilar., P., Ep. xi.; P.L. lviii. 30.
[4] *Vide infra*, nn. 609 *et seq.*

where the Bishop of Rome, although regarded as the first of Patriarchs, was not considered to possess a jurisdiction differing in nature from that of the other Patriarchs, by virtue of which he had a right to their obedience.

The Eastern Patriarchates were ruled by their own Patriarchs, whose office was therein held to be the highest in the Church, though even their authority was subject to that of Councils.

220. These Patriarchs deposed Bishops; for example, Gerontius, Bishop of Nicomedia, was deposed by St. Chrysostom,[1] who also 'going into Asia deposed fifteen bishops and consecrated others in their stead.'[2] To them appeals for assistance were made from outside the limits of their own jurisdiction; for example, Athanasius, Bishop of Pyrrha, in the Patriarchate of Antioch, having been condemned by his own Patriarch Domnus, entreated St. Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, to interfere on his behalf, and in consequence of their action his cause was reheard.[3]

221. Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, divided or united dioceses, and his authority to do this act, which implies superior jurisdiction, was duly recognised in the case of Synesius, Metropolitan of Pentapolis, who was ordered by him to divide a Bishopric which had before been united by his authority. Synesius, who experienced some difficulty in carrying out Theophilus' decree, fully recognised its binding character. This is plain from his own words. 'Nevertheless,' says he, in a letter to the Patriarch, 'that which you judge proper must without difficulty prevail. For if it were your own judgment which made them think a certain course right, in changing that judgment you must make justice change also; and thus all your pleasure must be for the people, the rule of justice and right. Obedience is life and disobedience causes death.'[4]

222. It would be difficult to find any language which would express a more complete subjection of a Metropolitan to his Patriarch than this used by Synesius. And it is worthy of note that the obedience which this Metropolitan thus asserts to be due to his Patriarch is claimed for the decree of one who at the time when he issued it was *not* in communion with Rome. Evidently, Theophilus, who made the decree, Synesius, who obeyed it, and the people who demurred to the action of the Patriarch, had no idea that action was altogether invalid inasmuch as he was not in communion with 'Peter's successors,' and consequently had no jurisdiction; *that* was not the 'venerable and constant belief of' that 'age.'

223. The Eastern Churches were, in fact, entirely self-governing. As Gieseler says, speaking of the end of the period which closed with the

[1] Fleury, *op. cit.*, bk. xxi. ch. vii. tom ii. 146. Edit. Paris, 1856.
[2] Mansi, vii. 293. [3] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xiv. 647-8. [4] *Ibid.*, xii. 542-3.

Council of Chalcedon, 451, the four Patriarchs of the East 'in their dioceses [*i.e.* Patriarchates] were looked upon as ecclesiastical centres to which the other Bishops had to attach themselves for the preservation of unity, and constituted along with their diocesan Synod, the highest court of appeal in all ecclesiastical matters of the diocese; while on the other hand they were considered the highest representatives of the Church, who had to maintain the unity of the Church universal by mutual communication and without whose assent no measures affecting the interests of the whole Church could be taken.'[1]

224. Such being the position of the Eastern Churches, it would have been futile for St. Leo to have adopted in his dealings with them the line towards Easterns which he found so successful within the limits of the Western Empire. Claims which might be accepted in the latter, in which his See was the only one which was recognised as being 'Apostolic,' supported as these claims were by the vast powers conferred on its Bishop by the civil power, would have had no chance of acceptance in the East. Western pretensions were, owing to the rival political claims of Rome and Constantinople, necessarily regarded with suspicion, and any attempt at interference by the Bishop of Old Rome would be jealously scrutinised by the Eastern Churches, possessed as they were of four out of the five Patriarchal Sees. Hence St. Leo, a man of great political insight, knew full well that to take the same line as he did in the West would have been fatal to any development of his influence in the East, and thus his dealings with the Easterns are very different, and, it may be added, quite inconsistent with that absolute monarchy which in the *Satis Cognitum*, in accordance with the *Vatican Decrees*, is declared to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs as the legitimate successors of St. Peter in the Roman Episcopate.

225. An example of St. Leo's attitude towards Easterns is to be found in the way in which he recognised the unrestricted power of the Emperor to summon a General[2] Council. Writing to the Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople, he says: 'The most clement Emperor, solicitous for the peace of the Church, willed that a Synod should be assembled, though it evidently appeared that the matter which was to be considered in no way required to be treated by a Synod.'[3] If the position of Leo the Great was that of Leo X., as the principles of Papalism demand should be the case, it is clear that a statement of this kind is inconsistent with such position. Either St. Leo was conscious of no such right as his namesake and successor asserted to belong to the Papacy, or he knew that the Easterns would

[1] Gieseler, *op. cit.*, second period, div. 1, § 94. [E.T. vol. i. pp. 429-30.]
[2] *Vide supra*, Section lvii., *On the convocation of the Council of Chalcedon.*
[3] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Flavianum Epis. C. P.*, Ep. xxxvi.; P.L. liv. 810.

repudiate any such pretended prerogative as not belonging to his See, and consequently carefully avoided advancing a pretension which would have exposed him to a repulse which, with his sagacity, he would realise would form an effectual hindrance to any further development of the power of his See in that part of the Church.

226. Again, he was careful to lay stress on the *authority of the Synod* which he had held at Rome in his application to the Emperor for the convocation of a Synod at Rome.[1] The same kind of reference to Synodical authority is also found in the way in which he speaks of a letter written by him as being sent 'not only by the authority of the Apostolic See, but also by the unanimity of the Holy Synod which had assembled in good numbers with us.'[2] This manner of speaking of the authority of the Synod is quite different to the claim of absolute authority as residing in the Roman Bishop embodied in Valentinian's *Edict*, without doubt at his suggestion. The Easterns had great regard for Synodical action, but would have repudiated the naked assertion of supreme power as inherent in the Roman See, hence the reason of a joint reference to such Synodical authority, and that of 'the Apostolic See'; though on Papalist principles the former could add no weight whatever to the latter.

227. Other evidence to the same effect is afforded by much of St. Leo's conduct in connection with the Council of Chalcedon, which will come under notice later.[3] Not only then were St. Leo's pretensions new in themselves, affording important evidence of the great advance of the Papal ideas which had been gradually forming at Rome in his time, and to which he was the first to give expression in theological language, but they were not accepted by the Four Patriarchates of the East. This is conclusive against their validity, for they do not satisfy the test which St. Leo's contemporary, St. Vincent of Lerins, lays down as that by which Catholic truth may be ascertained, 'Universality, Antiquity, and Consent.'[4]

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Theodosium Augustum*, Ep. xliii.; P.L. liv. 825.
[2] *Ep. ad. Martinum et Faustum Presbyteros*, Ep. lxi. cap. i.; P.L. liv. 874.
[3] *Vide infra*, nn. 424, 437 *et seq.*
[4] S. Vincent Lirinensis, *Commonitorium adversus Hæreses*, cap. ii.; P.L. l. 64.

CHAPTER VI

THE INFLUENCE OF FORGERIES ON THE PAPAL PRETENSIONS

Section XXIX.—*The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.*

228. The *Satis Cognitum* next proceeds to adduce in support of its allegations certain statements made by two Councils, viz. that of Florence, held in 1439, and the Fourth of the Lateran, held in 1215. These statements will be subjected to examination, but inasmuch as by the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries the claims of the Bishops of Rome had both been greatly developed and obtained wide acceptance in their developed form in the West through the weight attached in an uncritical age to the many forgeries put forth in the interests of the Papacy, it will be advisable first to consider some of these forgeries whose effect was so pernicious.

229. The *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* occupy a pre-eminent position in these forgeries. They made their appearance in the ninth century, the date of the forgery being probably not earlier than 829 or later than 853. Hinschius, in his standard work on these *Decretals*, places their compilation at the later date.[1] They could not have been forged before the first of these two dates because passages from the Synod of Paris held in that year are inserted in them, and although it has been thought that 845 would be the limit of time in the other direction, because about that date Benedictus Levita compiled the three last books of the *Capitularia regum Francorum*, in which these forgeries are largely made use of, yet if he were, as some think, the forger, the fact just alluded to would be easily accounted for by his having his materials before him previously to the actual issue of the completed work.

230. The forgery was introduced into France, Isidore, Bishop of Seville, being alleged to be the compiler of the collection. The name of this illustrious Bishop would especially commend itself to the forger for this purpose, not only because he was a man of much learning, but he had drawn up a collection of canons, in which he had inserted some pieces which were not in the celebrated one of Dionysius Exiguus which was in general use in the West.

The author of this fabrication is not known; some moderns have thought that Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, may have had something to

[1] Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ*, Pref. pp. 143-163. Lipsiæ, 1863.

do with it,[1] as it was calculated to serve his ends. Others have thought that Benedictus Levita of Mentz was the forger, as the instrument of Autocarius, the Archbishop of that city, who was said to have discovered the collection in the registry of his church as one brought by his predecessor Archbishop Riculf from Spain. Perhaps Riculf did receive a genuine collection from Spain, and it may be that 'this genuine collection was afterwards transformed into the pseudo-isidorian which was then put forward pretending to be the other.'[2] The authorship of Benedict would not be inconsistent with Rheims being its place of origin, for Hinschius considers that Benedict had not completed it till after the death of Autocarius, which took place in 847. It may thus not have been finished at Mentz but in France, where it made its first appearance.

231. The fabrication commences with a series of letters, some sixty in number, which are ascribed to various Bishops of Rome from Clement (A.D. 95) to Melchiades (A.D. 314). All these letters are forgeries, and, according to Hinschius,[3] all are the work of the Pseudo-Isidore, with the exception of two letters from Clement to James, which in whole or in part are more ancient forgeries. The latter part of the work commences with the celebrated Donation of Constantine.[4] It consists of (*a*) *Decretals* covering the period between Sylvester and Gregory II., whose episcopate began in 715, of which thirty-nine are spurious; and (*b*) the acts of several Councils, many of which are unauthentic. The forgery is a clumsy one, betraying itself by the glaring anachronisms it contains, and the ignorance of antiquity which it manifests. The *Decretals* have visible marks of falsity. All are in the same style, which suits the ninth century much better than the first three; long, and full of commonplaces, and, as has been discovered in examining them carefully, full of different passages from St. Leo and St. Gregory, and other authors posterior to the Popes whose names they bear.[5]

232. The object of the Forger is very clear. He made the *Decretals* represent the Bishops of Rome as exercising from the earliest times the authority which during the course of centuries they had gradually succeeded in usurping to themselves. These documents, purporting to date from primitive times, would thus be evidence that the Pope was the Supreme Judge and Lawgiver to the Church. Had the documents been genuine the statements in them would have been of the greatest value; the fact that it was necessary to forge them in order to obtain

[1] Salmon, *op. cit.*, ch. xxiii. p. 452. Second edit.

[2] Gieseler, *op. cit.*, iii. ii. pt. i. ch. i. § 20, note 12. [E.T. ii. 331.]

[3] Hinschius, *op. cit.*, Preface lxxxi. cap. ii. *De Collectione Isidori Mercatoris. De Prima parte Collectionis.*

[4] *On the Donation of Constantine*, *vide* note 12.

[5] Fleury, *op. cit.*, livre xliv. c. xxii. tom. iii. p. 157. Edit. Paris, 1856.

precedents in the past for the exercise of Papal jurisdiction, is most significant. It proves that the pretensions embodied in them were absolutely unknown in the early ages of the Church, for otherwise there would necessarily have been abundant evidence that such pretensions were both admitted and exercised from the beginning of the Christian religion. Hence not only would there have been no need to fabricate proofs that they were so admitted and exercised, but it would have been a suicidal policy to have forged testimony in the place of producing the genuine evidence.

233. The nature of the powers ascribed to the early Popes in these forgeries can be judged from the following facts. It is laid down that it is unlawful to hold even a Provincial Council without the precept of the Pope. The Decrees of all Councils are declared to require Papal confirmation. The binding character of Papal Decretals is asserted. With regard to appeals, it is provided that Bishops cannot be judged finally save by the Pope alone; every Bishop, every Priest, and in general, every person who finds himself harassed, is stated to have the right on every occasion to appeal directly to the Pope.[1] These provisions make the Pope both the Legislator for, and the Supreme Judge of, the whole Church from the beginning.

234. The injury done to the Church by the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* is simply incalculable, so great was the use made of them. Almost immediately after their fabrication it became evident that this would be the case. Nicholas, P. I., so soon as he became acquainted with their existence, appealed to them as authoritative in a dispute which he had with Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, with reference to the case of Rothad, Bishop of Soissons, who had been deposed by the former in the capacity of Metropolitan.

Some of the Frankish Bishops having expressed doubts as to the genuineness of the Decretals cited, Nicholas declared that the Roman Church had with reverence preserved them from antiquity in its Archives,[2] and that therefore they were to be accepted even though they were not inserted in the Codex of the Canons, to which evidently the Bishops had referred.

235. The following facts show this statement made by Nicholas was a deliberate falsehood: (*a*) In 860, Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières, had, in a letter to Nicholas, said that Pope Melchiades, the contemporary of Constantine, was reported to have said that no Bishop could be deposed without the consent of the Pope, and he requested Nicholas to send him a copy of the *Decretal* preserved at Rome.[3] Lupus evidently

[1] *Cp.* Fleury, *op. cit.*, *Discours sur l'Histoire de l'Église du onzième au treizième siècle* prefixed to livre lxv. tom v. p. iv. Edit. Paris, 1856.

[2] Nicholas, P. I., *Ep. ad universos Episcopos Galliæ*, Ep. lxxv.; P.L. cxix. 901.

[3] B. Lupus, *Ep. ad Nicholaum*, Ep. cxxx.; P.L. cxix. 608-9.

knew of 'the False Decretals,' indeed it is not improbable, if Benedict was the forger, that Wenilo, Archbishop of Sens, at whose inspiration he wrote, may have been a party to the forgery. Now, as Nicholas never omitted to make use of every opportunity to advance the claims of the Papacy, it is certain, if he had known that these *Decretals* were in the Archives of the Roman Church, that he would have at once produced the particular *Decretal* asked for, inasmuch as to have done so would have necessarily much assisted him in his efforts to assert 'Papal Supremacy.' Nicholas did not do so,[1] hence it is plain no such documents existed; (*b*) secondly, when Nicholas enumerated in a letter to Hincmar the earliest of the Papal *Decretals*, he placed first the *Decretal* of Siricius, thus showing that it was the most ancient known at Rome;[2] and (*c*) thirdly, in this very case of Rothad, he appealed at first, in justification of his action, to the Sardican Canons.[3]

236. Rothad, it is probable, brought 'the False Decretals' with him to Rome when he arrived in June 864,[4] and they then would come to the knowledge of Nicholas. In any case he must, between the time of his letters to Hincmar and the Synod just mentioned and Christmas Day 864, have obtained copy of them, for he declared in a sermon on the eve of that day that 'although the Bishops had no right to hold a Synod without the precept of the Apostolic See, they had summoned Rothad there, and even if he had not appealed to the Apostolic See, they ought not, as you well know, to have opposed themselves to so many and great Decretals and unadvisedly depose a Bishop.'[5]

237. The result of the use of these fabrications by Nicholas was that he attained his object. Hincmar, though he was one of the most learned and powerful ecclesiastics of the day, acquiesced in the restoration of Rothad to his See by Arsenius, Bishop of Orba, as legate of Nicholas. Yet it would seem possible that he was not convinced by Nicholas's assertion of the genuine character of the documents, the authority of which he urged in justification of his action. Had he been, he would not have said in his Chronicle of the time that Rothad was 'canonically deposed by five Bishops of the province, but irregularly, and with might, restored by Pope Nicholas.'[6]

238. This case, which is the first in which 'the False Decretals' were

[1] Nicholas, P. I., *Ep. ad Wenilonem Arch. Senonensem et coepiscopos ejus*, Ep. i.; P.L. cxix. 769-70.

[2] *Ep. ad Hincmarum*, Ep. xxxii.; P.L. cxix. 822.

[3] *Ep. ad Hincmarum*, Ep. xxxiii.; P.L. cxix. 824; and *Ep. ad Episcopos Synodi Silvanectensis*; P.L. cxix. 828.

[4] Hinschius, *op. cit.*, *De Patria Collectionis*, p. ccvii.

[5] Nicholas, P. I., *Sermo quem de Rothadi causa . . . in missa fecit . . . die vigiliarum Nativ. Domini* (A.D. 864); P.L. cxix. 890-1.

[6] *Annales de S. Bertin*, quoted Milman, *op. cit.*, bk. v. ch. ix. vol. iii. 186, note 9. Fourth edit.

appealed to, is an instance of the way in which conscious fraud has been used to advance the designs of the Papacy. Nicholas's conduct in employing the fabrication as genuine is worse than that of the forger. 'In Rome, where such documents had never been heard of, it is difficult to imagine by what arguments a man, not unlearned, could convince himself, or believe that he could convince himself, of their authenticity. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, of which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent; yet there is no holy indignation at fraud, no lofty reproof of those who dared to seat themselves in the pontifical chair and speak in the names of Pope after Pope. There is a deliberate, artful vindication of their authority. Reasons are alleged from which it is impossible to suppose that Nicholas himself believed their validity, on account of their acknowledged absence from the Roman archives. Nor did the successors of Nicholas betray any greater scruple in strengthening themselves by this welcome, and therefore only, unsuspicious aid. It is impossible to deny that at least, by citing without reserve or hesitation, the Roman Pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud.'[1]

239. The fraud appears so evident to any one who now examines it carefully in the light of the evidence afforded by authentic documents, that it seems almost incredible that it should not have at once been exposed. Yet in an uncritical age it succeeded in imposing on the Latins, and for seven centuries these gross fabrications were regarded as genuine. These forged documents were of the greatest use to the Papacy. 'It is undoubted,' says Van Espen, 'that the Roman Curia supported this collection of false Decretals with the utmost zeal, and laboured that these Decretal letters might everywhere be received as authentic and as emanating from these early and most holy Pontiffs, and that the authority claimed in them for the Roman Pontiffs might be recognised by all.'[2]

240. The *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, being accepted as genuine, were naturally embodied in the various collections of Canons, etc., which were formed in the eleventh and following centuries. Burchard, Bishop of Worms, made great use of them in the collection which he put forth in the eleventh century, about A.D. 1020, as did also Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, in the *Decretum*, or Body of Canons, which he compiled for the Gallican Church. Their influence became still more widespread and pernicious when Gratian drew up his *Decretum*. In this celebrated work Gratian moulded into one harmonious body the collections of

[1] Milman, *op. cit.*, bk. v. ch. iv. vol. iii. pp. 197-8. 4th edit.

[2] Van Espen, *Comment. in Canonicis juris Vet. et Novi. De Primis Decretalium Collectionibus Dissertatio* 1, Sect. 1, vol. iii. p. 453. Lovanii, 1753.

Dionysius Exiguus, Isidore, and Ivo, amplifying it by new laws, new constitutions of Pontiffs, and quotations from the Fathers.

241. The *Decretum* rapidly attained great authority, owing to the ignorance of the times and to the fact that the famous University of Bologna gave to it its sanction, so that it was publicly recited in the schools, and daily commented on. It will be easily understood how this came about, when it is remembered that out of the 324 quotations which Gratian makes from the Popes of the first four centuries, 315 are taken from these spurious documents,[1] and 'that for five hundred years the Canonists drew from this *Decretum*, as from a Body of Public Law, or authentic repository of the Canons of the Church, almost every citation from the Councils and Fathers to be found in their writings.'[2] At the same time the *Decretum*, containing as it did passages taken from these fabricated documents purporting to show that the Popes exercised supremacy over the whole Church from the very first, became, in the hands of those who were ever pushing forward the claims of the Papacy, a useful and potent instrument.

242. It is true that the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* have long since been admitted by Roman writers to be spurious,[3] but the evils introduced through their means into the Church abide. Whilst the forgery was still undetected, the Papalists naturally made the greatest use of them—the Roman Pontiffs strenuously pressed their authority. In the new *Decretals* which they issued they took these fraudulent compositions as their basis. They inserted in them 'and willed to be taken for law the new principles asserted in these forged Decretals as if they had been transmitted to us by Apostolic tradition,'[4] and these later Decretals are still held to be authoritative. The effect of the forgery is well described by the words of the candid Père Régnon, S.J., who, in his review of Hinschius's edition of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, says 'the impostor obtained his end. He changed the matter of discipline [viz. the question of appeals in Episcopal causes] according to his wish, but he did not resist the general decadence of the age. God did not bless the imposture. The false decretals produced nothing but evil.'[5]

Section XXX.—*Forged passages attributed to Greek Fathers.*

243. As the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* were by no means the first,[6] so they were not the last forgeries in the interests of the advancement

[1] Salmon, *op. cit.*, 453.

[2] Antonio Pereira, *Tentativa Theologica*, trans. by Landon, p. 55. Edit. 1847.

[3] *Vide* note 13, and for some of the contents of these Forged Decretals, *vide* the same note.

[4] Van Espen, *l.c.* [Tom. iii. 454. Lovanii, 1753.]

[5] *Études Religieuses*, Nov. 1866, quoted E. G. Wood *The Regal Power of the Church*, p. 26 n. 2, where the change wrought by the forgery is concisely set out.

[6] *Vide* note 14.

of the Papal system. Gratian himself, in addition to using the forged Decretals and the fabrications of others who preceded him, had incorporated also into the *Decretum* fresh corruptions of his own with that object. But amongst such forgeries a catena of spurious passages from the Greek Fathers and Councils, put forth in the thirteenth century, had probably, next to the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, the widest influence in this direction.

244. The object of this forgery was as follows:—The East had been separated from the West since the excommunication by Pope Leo IX. of Michael Cerularius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and that of the former by the latter in July 1054, in which the other Eastern Patriarchs concurred. The Latins, especially the Dominicans, who had established themselves in the East, made strenuous efforts to induce the Easterns to submit to the Papacy. The great obstacle in the way of their success was the fact that the Orientals knew nothing of such claims as those which were advanced by the Roman Bishops. In their belief the highest rank in the Hierarchy of the Church was that of Patriarch. This was clearly expressed by the Patrician Bahanes at the Council of Constantinople, 869. 'God,' he said, 'hath placed His Church in the five patriarchates, and declared in His Gospel that they should never utterly fail, because they are the heads of the Church. For that saying, "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," meaneth this, when two fall they run to three; when three fall they run to two; but when four perchance have fallen, one, which remains in Christ our God, the Head of all, calls back again the remaining body of the Church.'[1]

245. They were ignorant of any autocratic power residing *jure divino* in the Bishop of Rome. They regarded Latin authors with suspicions as the fautors of the unprimitive claims of the Bishop of Old Rome; hence if they were to be persuaded that the Papalist pretensions were Catholic, and thus induced to recognise them, the only way would be to produce evidence provided ostensibly from Greek sources. Accordingly a Latin theologian drew up a sort of *Thesaurus Græcorum Patrum*, in which, amongst genuine extracts from Greek Fathers, he mingled spurious passages purporting to be taken from various Councils and writings of Fathers, notably St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and Maximus the Abbot.[2]

246. This work was laid before Urban IV., who was deceived by it. He was thus able to use it in his correspondence with the Emperor, Michael Palæologus, to prove that from 'the Apostolic throne of the Roman Pontiffs it was to be sought what was to be held, or what was to be believed, since it is his right to lay down, to ordain, to disprove, to command, to loose and to bind in the place of Him who appointed

[1] Mansi, xvi. 140-1.

[2] On Maximus *vide infra*, nn. 652 *et seq.*

him, and delivered and granted to no one else but him alone what is supreme. To this throne also all Catholics bend the head by divine law, and the primates of the world confessing the true faith are obedient and turn their thoughts as if to Jesus Christ Himself, and regard him as the Sun, and from Him receive the light of truth to the salvation of souls according as the genuine writers of some of the Holy Fathers, both Greek and others, firmly assert.'[1]

247. Urban, moreover, sent this work to St. Thomas Aquinas. The angelic doctor had no suspicions as to the genuineness of the work, yet was evidently surprised at some of its contents; and in his report thereon to the Pope said: 'I have read with great attention, most Holy Father, the book which you entrusted to me. In it I found many things useful for the defence of our faith. But I think it right to say that the benefit which may be drawn from it might be diminished with many by this fact, that certain things contained in it as the authority of the Holy Fathers seem to be doubtful, which might give material for errors and give occasion for contention and calumny.'[2]

248. The doubts to which St. Thomas here gives expression had reference to passages referring to the Trinity and the Procession of the Holy Ghost, not to those which had reference to the Papal position, which he accepted as genuine. The testimony of these 'extracts' was to him of great value, as he believed that he had in them irrefragable proof that the great Eastern theologians, such as St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and the Fathers of the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, recognised the monarchical position of the Pope as ruling the whole Church with absolute power. Consequently he made use of these fraudulent documents in all honesty in setting forth the prerogatives of the Papacy. The grave result followed that, through his authority, the errors which he taught on the subject of the Papacy were introduced into the schools, fortified by the testimony of these fabrications, and thus were received as undoubted truth, whence resulted consequences which can hardly be fully estimated.

249. It was improbable that the Greeks, who had ample means of discovering the real character of these forgeries, should finally accept them and the teaching based on them; but in the West itself there were no theologians competent to expose the fraud, so that these forgeries were naturally held to be of weighty authority. The high esteem attached to the writings of St. Thomas was an additional reason why this should be the case. It is not then a matter for any surprise that the idea which is enshrined in the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, which is the burden of later forgeries, and embodied in the spurious catena of

[1] Raynald, *Annales Ecclesiastici ab anno* MCXVIII., ad ann. 1263, 31. [Tom. iii. 109.]

[2] S. Thomas Aquinas, *Opusculum* vi. *Contra errores Græcorum Proœmium. Opera Omnia*, vol. xv. 239. Rome, 1874.

Greek[1] writers recognised as authoritative by the greatest doctor of the age, viz., that the Pope is the universal Bishop of the Church, to whom obedience was due as to Christ Himself, the supreme Legislator, and absolute Monarch of the Church, had become universally accepted in the West by the dates of the Councils to which the *Satis Cognitum* here appeals in support of its contentions. This fact is alone quite sufficient to show the real value of the witness of those Councils for the purpose for which it is adduced.

[1] On the influence of these forged documents on Sir Thomas More and others, *vide* note 15.

CHAPTER VII

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE AND OF THE FOURTH COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN AS TO PAPALISM

SECTION XXXI.—*The circumstances of the convocation of the Council of Florence.*

250. The statement quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* from the Council of Florence will next be considered. The history of this Synod will be found to still further heavily discount the value of any statement made by it relative to the position of the Roman Bishop. The condition of Eastern Christendom was pitiable in the extreme. The followers of the False Prophet had, by the date of the accession of John Palæologus, obtained possession by conquest of much of the territory that had owned the sway of the Eastern Emperor. Not a single 'province' in Asia remained, and the Sultan Murad II. was the virtual master of the whole empire. Under these circumstances the Eastern Emperor turned to the West, the sole quarter whence assistance could be obtained, and in doing so he was fully conscious that such assistance would not be forthcoming so long as the division between 'East' and 'West' existed. His father, Manuel II., had already opened negotiations, and John Palæologus succeeded in bringing them to a successful conclusion with Eugenius P. IV., and the convocation of an Œcumenical Council was arranged for.

251. No doubt Eugenius was the more inclined to agree to the Emperor's proposal that a Council should be summoned owing to recent events in the West. The Councils of Constance and Basle had declared that the authority of an Œcumenical Council was superior to that of the Pope,[1] and there was a widespread feeling that the abuses connected with the Papacy should be corrected, and the power which it had gradually usurped curtailed. Eugenius, face to face with the latter of these two Councils, hoped that if the churches of the East and the West could be united through the means of a Council in which his influence was predominant, the prestige which would accrue to him would be of great assistance in withstanding the influence of the Council; besides which, he would also feel that the Easterns themselves would naturally be on the side of him who had been the means

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. ~~1092~~ 1009.

of bringing about a reconciliation which enabled them to appeal successfully to the West for help in the dire straits to which they were reduced at home. On the other hand, the Council of Basle, with which Eugenius was in conflict, was also sensible of the advantage which would accrue to its authority if the Easterns could be induced to support their views. So great, indeed, was the rivalry between Pope and Council, that each sent a fleet for the Bishops, which would have engaged each other in a naval fight in the Bosphorus had not the Emperor restrained them.

Section XXXII.—*The proceedings of the Council.*

252. It will be seen that from the first the object which both Emperor and Pope had at heart was a political one, to the attainment of which religious considerations were necessarily subordinated. Further, when the Eastern Bishops arrived in Italy, many influences combined to render them incapable of exercising an independent judgment on the questions submitted for their consideration. The great contrast between the luxury, liberty, and comfort enjoyed in the West, and the miserable condition of their own home, exposed as it was to the ravages of the unbelievers, was not without its effect on the weaker Greeks, whilst the fact that they received payment for their expenses from the Pope proved a powerful weapon in the hands of the Papal party, of which they were not ashamed to take advantage. The promised pay was kept in arrear, payment thereof being practically made conditional on the acceptance of the Roman contentions. A notable instance of this is the treatment of Mark, the Metropolitan of Ephesus and Vicar of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was one of the most strenuous upholders of the Eastern position by Christopher, the distributor of the Papal donation. He ordered that nothing should be given to Mark, with the insulting remark, 'He eats the Pope's bread and opposes the Pope';[1] whilst care was taken to withhold the final instalment of the money due from all the Bishops until the last decree of the Union was signed, the full significance of which can be estimated by the fact that their poverty effectually prevented any attempt to return home save at the Papal expense.

253. The Council first assembled in 1438 at Ferrara, and was transferred in 1439 to Florence. It was attended by the Emperor himself, who was accompanied by many Eastern Bishops. On the other hand, but few Western Bishops were present with the Pope at first. Throughout the whole proceedings grave divergencies of opinion manifested

[1] *Vera Historia Unionis non veræ seu Concilii Florentini exactissima narratio per Sylvestrum Synopulum* [*Syropulum*]. *Transtulit in sermonem Latinum, Robt. Creygton,* Hagæ Comitis, 1660, sect. ix. cap. ii. p. 23.

themselves between the Easterns and Westerns,[1] the former of whom had an uncompromising champion in Mark of Ephesus. The strongest pressure, however, was brought to bear on the Easterns, not only by the unscrupulous tactics of the Latins which have been mentioned, but by their own Emperor. He had arranged for the Council with the definite purpose of bringing about the Union for his own political ends, and his anxiety to prevent a failure by every means in his power was great, and consequently he used his personal influence to the utmost to compel the Bishops to come to an agreement with the Latins. Added to this, discord arose in the ranks of the Easterns through the Latinizing tendencies of some of their number, such as Isidore, Metropolitan of Russia, and Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa,[2] and this inevitably gave the Latins great advantage in the discussions of the various questions.

Section XXXIII.—*The Council rejected by the Easterns.*

254. The result of a Council conducted under such conditions as these was a foregone conclusion. The Union was indeed accomplished in word, but the acceptance of the decrees by which it was brought about was merely formal, and was never recognised by the East. On the return home of the Eastern Bishops, the greatest discontent was manifested by their flocks at what had taken place. They had expected their Bishops to return home victorious, and bitter were their feelings on learning that the hated Latins had overcome the successors of Basil, the Gregories, and Chrysostom. The Bishops themselves, freed from the tyranny which had weighed so heavily on them in Italy, bewailed their action with heartfelt sorrow. 'We have sold our faith,' said they; 'we have exchanged Orthodoxy for Heterodoxy, and losing our former pure faith have become Azemites. May our hands which have signed the unjust decree be cut off! May our tongues which have spoken consent with the Latins be plucked out!'[3]

255. Anthony, the Metropolitan of Heraclea, who had signed the decree, when offered the throne of Constantinople, then vacant by the death of the Patriarch Joseph, declined to accept it, saying, 'I have come here not to be elected but to disburden my conscience before the Council, a thing I stand in need of very much. I, as you yourselves know, did not agree with those who approved of the Union, but I did sign the decree, though involuntarily. And since then has my conscience constantly smitten me. Bowed down with remorse, I have

[1] For the subjects discussed at Florence, *vide* note 16.

[2] For the after history of these two prelates, *vide* note 17.

[3] Ducas, *Historia Byzantina a Joanne Palæologo I. ad Mehemetem II.*, c. xxxi. pp. 120, 121. Edit. 1649.

been seeking an opportunity of throwing this weight off my soul. I thank God that He has spared me to see you all together in this assembly, and that now I can free myself of my burden by telling you all I wished to say. I repeat, therefore, that I regret the Union, that I find the Florentine decree contrary to the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church, and give myself over to be judged by the Church as guilty of having signed that which ought not to have been signed.'[1] Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Cyzicus, was then elected, but many of the Bishops and others withdrew from his communion.

256. In 1443 the Patriarchs Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch, and Joachim of Jerusalem assembled in Jerusalem, and denounced the Council of Florence as lawless, 'in which the Greeks received Latin dogmas contrary to the ancient Canons of the Orthodox Church'; they declared Metrophanes to have unlawfully usurped the Patriarchate, deposed all the Latinizing clergy he had ordained, threatened them with excommunication in case of resistance, and commissioned the Metropolitan of Cæsarea to carry out the decree; to preach publicly against the unjust Union, and to reprove and correct all the heterodox thinkers.[2] Mark of Ephesus wrote conjuring all Christians to depart from the Florentine Union, as did also others, whilst the proceedings of the Council were put in their true light by Syropulus. The antagonism of both clergy and laity to the Union increased, notwithstanding the Emperor's efforts to maintain it for political purposes, and even the Emperor is said to have returned to Orthodoxy before his death, 31st October 1448, under the influence of the aged Mark.

257. John Palæologus was succeeded by Constantine, and a year and a half after his accession (A.D. 1450) three Patriarchs, Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch, and Theophanes of Jerusalem, held a Council in the Church of S. Sophia at Constantinople, which was attended by many Metropolitans and Bishops. At this Council the Latinizing Gregory Mamma, one of the most active promoters of the Florentine Union, who had succeeded Metrophanes as Patriarch of Constantinople, was deposed, the orthodox Athanasius being appointed to the vacant throne, and the Decree of the Council of Florence was solemnly rejected in the name of the whole Eastern Church.[3]

258. Dread of the success of the efforts of the Sultan Mahomet II. to obtain possession of Constantinople induced the Court to make another effort to fulfil the Florentine treaty with a view to obtain help against

[1] Syropulus, *op. cit.*, sect. xii. c. ii. p. 333.

[2] Allatius, *De Ecclesiæ Orientalis et Occidentalis perpetua consensione*, liv. iii. cap. iv. 1, p. 939 *et seq.*

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 1380, 1389. Allatius doubts the validity of the Council, but Dorotheus, P. of Jerusalem, repelled his objections in his *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* (Tom. ii. bk. x. ch. ix. pp. 915-917).

the Infidel from the West. An embassy was sent from Constantinople professing repentance and offering to return to the communion of the Roman Church. In response, Isidore, the ex-Metropolitan of Russia, now a Cardinal, was sent by Pope Nicholas v., the successor of Eugenius, to carry out the reconciliation. The Decrees of Florence were again signed in S. Sophia on 12th December 1452. Only a few ecclesiastics and laity attached to the Court complied, the mass of the clergy and people would have nothing to do with it, abjuring the Pope and his communion, cursing the Union and its upholders. Constantine's object was not attained, no help was forthcoming, and Constantinople fell into the hands of the Infidel on 29th May 1453.

259. The Mussulman conquerors, though they sorely oppressed the Christian community, left the Orthodox faith untouched. The celebrated Gennadius, on whom the mantle of Mark as the defender of Orthodoxy had fallen, was, by order of the Sultan, chosen Patriarch of Constantinople. Such was the end of the boasted union accomplished by the Council of Florence. 'Surely,' says a Greek writer, Amyrutzius quoted by Allatius, 'no one will seriously call this Synod an Œcumenical one, which has purchased a rule of faith with money, and has only been able to pass its resolutions simoniacally by a prospect of financial and military assistance.'[1] A Council whose decisions, obtained by such means as those employed at Florence, were repudiated with scorn by the whole Eastern Church, and have never been to this day accepted in the East, has no claim, it is clear, to be regarded as Œcumenical.[2]

Section XXXIV.—*The Decretum Unionis.*

260. From what has been said it is evident that the statement quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* from the *Decretum Unionis* of the Council of Florence has not Œcumenical authority, and consequently has no more weight as evidence for the purpose for which it is cited than any other statement of like import which might be quoted from Western Councils of a similar date. This might very well be held to preclude any necessity for any examination of the statement cited itself, were it not that a consideration of its wording will afford proof that the Eastern Bishops, when they gave that assent, under the strongest external pressure, which was afterwards repudiated, to the *Decretum*, did not assent to the teaching contained in the citation for the sake of which it is adduced in the *Satis Cognitum*.

261. The quotation given in the *Satis Cognitum* is as follows:—

> 'We define . . . that the Holy and Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the Primacy of the Church throughout the world:

[1] Allatius, *Op. cit.*, iii. cap. 1, 4, p. 882.

[2] On *The Gallicans and the Florentine Council*, *vide* note 18.

and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that full power was given to him, in Blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church, as is also contained in the acts of Œcumenical Councils and in the sacred canons (*Conc. Florentinum*).[1]

262. The Latin text of the concluding words of the citation, as given in the *Satis Cognitum* is as follows:—*quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur*. In citing thus the *Decretum Unionis*, did Pope Leo XIII. give this clause in the form actually agreed upon by the Council? What is the evidence on this important point?

The Greek text of this clause runs thus:

καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται.

i.e. 'In such manner as is determined in the Acts of the Œcumenical Councils and in the Sacred Canons.'

Noting first that the word *continetur* translated in the authorised English translation of the *Satis Cognitum*, 'contained,' can scarcely be considered to be the Latin equivalent of the Greek word διαλαμβάνεται, of which the English would rather be as just given above, 'determined,' or 'decided,'[2] there is a very grave difference between the meaning of the Latin given in the *Satis Cognitum* and the Greek text of the *Decretum*. The latter lays down the rule by which the position accorded to the Pope in the *Decretum* is to be defined, the former merely refers to the Acts of the Œcumenical Councils and the Sacred Canons in confirmation of the prerogatives alleged in the *Decretum* to belong to that position.

263. The question naturally arises, how comes it to pass that there exists this important variation between the Latin and the Greek texts of the *Decretum*? It has usually been thought that originally the Latin text ran 'quemadmodum *et* in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris Canonibus continetur.' As already observed, the Latin word *continetur* can hardly be regarded as the equivalent of the Greek διαλαμβάνεται, and this itself is important, because the history of the proceedings leaves no doubt that every word in the clause was, as far as possible, deliberately chosen by the Easterns with a view to maintain their ancient privileges. But this 'divergence,' which, even if it stood by itself, would need explanation, becomes more significant if the other 'divergence' existed from the first in the Latin text. If the supposition be correct that the Latin text did run as just quoted, it would,

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 30, 31.

[2] *Vide* Liddell and Scott, *sub v.* διαλαμβάνω.

apart from its rendering of διαλαμβάνεται, be held to represent the same meaning as the Greek, 'quemadmodum' being used in the sense of 'juxta eum modum qui.' Flavius Blondus, secretary to Eugenius IV., so gives it,[1] and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester,[2] Pighius,[3] and others so quote it after him. The crucial 'divergence' now existing between the two texts would, if this be the case, thus have come into existence later with an obvious purpose, from the Papalist point of view. Modern researches, however, seem to show that from the beginning, in the Greek and Latin 'originals' of the *Decretum*, the texts which have such very different meanings had their respective places.[4]

264. If this be the case, it follows that the Decree to which the Greeks agreed was essentially different in signification to that which was drawn up in Latin. It is clear that for the Greeks the *original Decretum* was that expressed in the Greek language, and, indeed, inasmuch as the object of the Decree was to formally bring about the union between the Easterns and Latins by means of a formula setting forth, amongst other points, the prerogatives claimed by the Papacy in such terms as the former could agree to, the Greek text has a clear claim to be regarded as the authentic form of the *Decretum*.

265. It is certain that the Easterns understood the *Decretum* in the sense expressed by the Greek text, they would never have accepted the formula in any other. The Latins had proposed that the definition of the Pope's position should run *juxta dicta Sanctorum*, according to the sayings of the saints, a phrase open to the widest interpretation by the Latins owing to the spurious passages attributed to Saints, which, it has been shown,[5] had obtained great circulation and authority in the West. The Emperor himself had pointed out the objectionable character of the proposed expression, saying, 'If any of the Fathers gives the Pope an honourable title, does that mean that he admits the special privileges of the Roman Bishop?'[6]

The words were dropped, those in the Greek text of the *Decretum* being substituted for them. It is to be observed that the phrase which was discarded had been proposed as a definition of the position to be affirmed by the Council to belong to the Pope, hence it follows that the substituted words must be used for that purpose. Now the Greek text exactly does this, whereas the Latin, if it differed from the beginning from the Greek, would have avoided laying down any limitation of the Papal prerogatives by fixing a standard by which any claim to such prerogatives was to be judged and decided. It would have thus failed to meet the difficulty raised by the Easterns,

[1] *Historiar. ab inclinat. romanorum Imperii*, lib. x. dec. 3. Venet., 1483.
[2] *Assertiones Lutheranæ confut.*, Art. 25. De Primatu, p. 134. Antwerp, 1523.
[3] *Hierarch. Ecclesiæ Assertio*, lib. iv. c. 24, p. 239. Colon., 1544.
[4] *Vide* Dollinger, *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees.* [E.T. p. 41 n. 1.]
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 243 *et seq.* [6] Mansi, xxxi. 875, 876.

who were most anxious to have specified in the *Decretum* a provision of this character, both for the preservation of their ancient rights and to guard against the use of any testimonies save such as were authoritative, recognised by East and West alike, in any dispute which might arise in the future as to the extent of the prerogatives attaching to the 'See of Elder Rome.'

266. There can be no question as to what the Easterns meant by 'the Œcumenical Councils and Sacred Canons' which were specified in the *Decretum*. They had already objected to recognise the Council of Constantinople A.D. 869 as Œcumenical,[1] and had thus expressly limited the number of Councils which they recognised as possessing that character to seven, the number the Easterns so recognise to this day. By so doing, they effectually prevented the inclusion amongst the Councils referred to in the *Decretum* as giving the rule by which the prerogatives of the Roman Bishops were to be determined all Councils held since the Seventh, a result of this being that those Councils in the West, in which the Papal influence had been predominant, could not be appealed to for this purpose.

267. They went back to the Councils universally acknowledged as Œcumenical. They had in mind in doing this no doubt especially the Sixth Canon of the first Nicene Council,[2] the Third of the first Council of Constantinople,[3] the Twenty-eighth of Chalcedon,[4] and the various Acts by which these Councils had asserted their power and rights as the supreme authority of the Church, such as the adoption of the ὁμοούσιον,[5] the condemnation of Nestorius,[6] the treatment of 'The Tome' of S. Leo,[7] and of 'The Three Chapters,'[8] the condemnation of Honorius,[9] etc., hence their insistence that the clause should be incorporated in the *Decretum*.

268. If, then, the Latin text did, from the first, differ from the Greek, it follows that at the very time of drawing up of the *Decretum*, the Latins changed the sense of the additional clause, so as to make it useless for the object for which the Greeks required its insertion. Had the Greeks been aware of this, or apprehended that the Latin did not agree in meaning with the Greek text which expressed the sense in which they accepted the *Decretum*, it is clear from the circumstances under which the clause was inserted in it, they would never have given their assent thereto.

269. On the other hand, although Hefele[10] and others consider that the Latin text did thus differ from the first from the Greek, the

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 919.
[2] *Vide infra*, n. 311 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide infra*, n. 346.
[4] *Vide infra*, n. 412 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide infra*, n. 295.
[6] *Vide infra*, n. 367 *et seq.*
[7] *Vide infra*, n. 452 *et seq.*
[8] *Vide infra*, n. 935 *et seq.*
[9] *Vide infra*, n. 751.
[10] Hefele, *op. cit.*, vii. 754, 756; quoted Robertson, *op. cit.*, vol. viii. p. 104, n. γ.

fact that Blondus quotes it as running 'quemadmodum et' seems a great difficulty in way of accepting this view. It would be hardly probable that one occupying the official position he did would misquote the Latin text. The only explanation that could be offered for his action would be that if in the Latin text the words did stand 'quemadmodum etiam,' and he did not so cite them, it was that he was too honest to do so, and therefore retranslated the passage from the Greek himself.

270. Whether the Latin text differed from the Greek from the first, or was afterwards altered, the object of making the difference is obvious, for, as De Marca long ago pointed out, 'The Greek words accepted in their genuine sense prescribe the method of the exercise of the Pontifical authority similar to that which the Gallican Church preserves, but from the corrupted reading of the Latin text it is drawn out that the power of the Pope is plenary, and that that is proved by the Acts of the Councils and the Canons.'[1]

271. Next, it is to be observed that the citation made in the *Satis Cognitum* from the *Decretum* very significantly stops short at the following important words: 'Renewing, moreover, the order laid down in the Canons of the other Venerable Patriarchs, that the Patriarch of Constantinople be second after the most holy Roman Pontiff, the Patriarch of Alexandria the third, the Patriarch of Antioch the fourth, and the Patriarch of Jerusalem the fifth, all their privileges and rights being preserved.'[2] These words are also omitted in the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima* of the Vatican Council. These omissions in these Papalist documents are significant, as they place a material limitation on the statements which precede them as to the powers possessed by the 'Roman Pontiffs.'

272. (*a*) In the first place, they show that, according to the *Decretum*, the Bishop of Rome is to be regarded not as possessing an office in the Church unique in character but as one of the five Patriarchs, the first indeed amongst them, but still only a Patriarch. The ancient equality of office held by the Bishop of Old Rome and the four chief Bishops of the East is thus recognised. (*b*) In the second place, the Greeks, by requiring the reservation of all their privileges and rights to the Patriarchs to be explicitly inserted in the *Decretum*, safeguarded themselves against assenting to the usurpations of the Roman Bishop which trenched on those privileges and rights. The Latins strongly objected to the presence of the word 'all,' but the Greeks would not yield.

273. This clause, and that with reference to the Acts of the

[1] De Marca, *De Concord. Sacerd. et Imperii*, lib. iii. cap. viii. 5, tom. ii. 62. Bambergæ, 1768.

[2] Mansi, xxxi. 1031, 1032.

Œcumenical Councils and the Holy Canons together, were no doubt held by the Easterns to greatly circumscribe the practical effects of the part of the *Decretum* defining the position of the Pope. They, as has been said, recognised only the first seven Councils as Œcumenical; they knew what privileges and rights were by those Councils secured to the Patriarchs, privileges and rights which were wholly inconsistent with the idea that the Pope was, *jure divino*, absolute sovereign over the whole Church advanced by the Latins, and in support of which they adduced forgeries which in the West passed current as authentic documents, a position which, for instance, would involve the right of receiving appeals from decisions of Bishops, no matter how high in the Hierarchy of the Church. This claim was regarded as of the utmost value by the Papalists, but it is one quite incompatible with the privileges and rights of the Patriarchs as determined by those Councils.

274. On the other hand, the corruption of the Latin text of the *Decretum*, whether such corruption took place at the time of drawing it up or at a later date, is proof that the Latins themselves regarded the Greek text as at least not sufficient to provide for the recognition by the Greeks of all that they considered to belong *jure divino* to the Papacy. They held too that the spurious documents and Canons which they believed to be genuine were included in the clause of the *Decretum* referring to the Œcumenical Councils and Holy Canons.

275. To sum up, the statement quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* from the *Decretum Unionis Græcorum* of the Council of Florence is of no value for the purpose for which it is adduced, for the following four reasons:—(*a*) First, because the Council was held at a time by which the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* and other forgeries in the interests of Papalism had obtained universal acceptance in the West as authentic documents, so that their influence made it impossible for any Council in which the Latins were predominant to arrive at a true decision as to the proper position of the Roman Bishop; (*b*) secondly, because the Council is not Œcumenical; (*c*) thirdly, because the statement given in the *Satis Cognitum* is a misquotation of a character which completely alters the sense of the *Decretum* as assented by the Easterns at the Council; and (*d*) fourthly, because other words which place a further limitation on the powers belonging to the position assigned therein to the Pope, and which immediately follow 'the citation' given, are omitted.

SECTION XXXV.—*The Fourth Lateran Council*, A.D. 1215.

276. The statement quoted by the *Satis Cognitum* from the Fourth Council of the Lateran is as follows:—

> 'The Roman Church, as the mother and mistress of all the faithful, by the will of Christ obtains primacy of jurisdiction over all other Churches.'[1]

It is first to be noted with reference to this declaration that it was made at a Council which has no claim whatever to Œcumenical authority. It was a purely Western Council. It is true that amongst the names of the 412 Bishops who assisted at the Council in November 1215 will be found those of two claimants to the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and of a 'Patriarch of Jerusalem,' but these prelates were not the occupants of the ancient Sees, but simply holders of the titular Patriarchates created by the Latins, intruders within the jurisdiction of the true Patriarchs. The East took no part in the proceedings of the Council, and thus it had not even that *appearance* of being Œcumenical that the Florentine Council possessed through the presence of Easterns taking part in its deliberations. It was a purely Western Synod.

277. As a Western Council it simply enunciated the opinions which at that time prevailed in the West as to the position of the Roman Bishop. It has already been remarked that the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* and other fictions and forgeries had a considerable part in developing and rooting the Papal idea in the West, and by the date of this Council that pernicious influence had had great effect, so that any declaration of the character under notice would by Westerns be held to be in accord with the testimony of antiquity, which in an uncritical age was believed to be enshrined in the fabrications so plentifully existing at that time. The *Lateran Council* thus simply lays down as authoritative the opinion thus formed, hence its statement is valueless for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*.

278. It is interesting to note the great advance which Papalism had made by the date of this Council, and the corresponding diminution in power and prerogatives suffered by the Episcopate, shown by the proceedings of this Council. The Pope, Innocent III., who had summoned the Synod drew up seventy chapters which were read in the Council. No debate followed upon them, and the silence of the Bishops was taken for their assent. They were in fact 'Decrees' of Innocent, and the manner of their promulgation in the Synod emphasised the different position Bishops now occupied in a Synod to that which they possessed in the primitive Councils: *Sacro universali Synodo*

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

approbante was the phrase used to describe the part which the Fathers had been permitted to take in the matter.

279. It may be added that no claim was made at the Council of Florence that this Council should be regarded as Œcumenical; the Greeks, as already noted,[1] only admitting that the first seven General Councils held before the disruption between East and West had the right to be so considered.[2] This objection on their part was, it would seem, admitted to be valid at first by the Romans, inasmuch as in the first editions of the proceedings of that Council it is styled the Eighth Œcumenical,[3] as it is also in the Licence of Pope Clement VI. authorising the publication of such proceedings.[4]

280. To sum up. This Council was a purely Western one. Papalism was predominant in the West when it was convoked; the Bishops present had no legislative voice; the so-called Canons were but Papal Decrees; in fact, they were not published 'as Canons of Lateran for more than three hundred years afterwards, viz. by Cochlæus in 1538.'[5] The statement cited in the *Satis Cognitum* has no more weight for the purpose for which it is advanced than any other made by a Pope of the Middle Ages, *i.e.* absolutely none; for by that time it is admitted that the Papalist idea was universally in the West regarded as true; and of that idea, it may be added, Innocent III., the Pope in question, was one of the ablest champions.

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 267.
[2] *Cp.* Mansi, xxxi. 551, 552, 553, 554.
[3] *Cp.* Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad. ann. 869, lxiv. tom. xvi. 183.
[4] Launoii *Epistolæ*, Liv. viii. Ep. xi. tom. v. pt. ii. p. 632. Col. Allobrog. 1731.
[5] Landon, *A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church*, vol. i. 329. Edit. 1893.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WITNESS OF THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325, AS TO PAPALISM

SECTION XXXVI.— *Why does not the Satis Cognitum cite 'the testimony of the formal Acts of the early Œcumenical Councils?*

281. A consideration of the various circumstances connected with the two Councils of Florence and of the Lateran has shown that the citations made from the *Decrees* made at those Synods in the *Satis Cognitum* in proof of the allegation that 'the Pontiffs who succeed Peter in the Roman Episcopate receive the supreme power in the Church *jure divino*,'[1] cannot be regarded as possessing Œcumenical authority, or even as untainted witnesses to the primitive tradition with reference to the position of the Roman Bishop in the hierarchy of the Church. Why, therefore, were these quotations so adduced in the *Satis Cognitum* in place of testimony from the formal Acts of the first four General Councils universally recognised as Œcumenical?—Councils, too, which have always been held in greatest reverence by the Church, as St. Gregory the Great testifies, when he said of them, 'Because with the heart it is believed unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation, I acknowledge and venerate the Four Councils as the four Books of the Holy Gospels.'[2]

282. If the supreme government of the Church, with the tremendous powers belonging thereto, claimed to be inherent *jure divino* in the Roman Bishops be really the principal element in the constitution and formation of the Church, it must inevitably be found in active being from the very beginning of the Christian religion. Hence the formal Acts of these early Councils of the undivided Church would necessarily bear witness to it. Their testimony would be most valuable, witnessing to the venerable belief of the first age in such prerogatives. How comes it, then, that instead of the testimony of the formal Acts of these Councils, there is cited that of those held under Western influences, at a late date when, as has been shown, erroneous ideas on the subject of the prerogatives of the Roman Bishops had become wellnigh universally in the West regarded as true? There must be some weighty

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 30.

[2] S. Gregor. M., *Ep. ad Joan. Ep. C.P., et cæteros Patriarchas*; *Epp.*, lib. i. *Ep.* xxv.; P.L. lxxvii. 478.

reason for adopting this course, instead of that which would have appealed with powerful force to all who believe that the Church is a Divine Society, whose history from the first furnishes sure evidence as to the nature of the 'Deposit' committed to her trust as 'the pillar and ground of the Truth.' An inquiry into the Acts and consideration of the Canons and Acts of these Councils will give an answer to this question; such inquiry will therefore be the subject of the succeeding sections.

Section XXXVII.—*By whom were the Œcumenical Councils convoked?*

283. Before proceeding to consider in detail the witness afforded by these Œcumenical Councils with regard to Papalism, attention must be drawn to the fact that not one of them was convoked by the Pope. In each case the Emperor was the summoning authority. Hefele, who admits this,[1] endeavours to destroy the evidential value of this fact against the historical character of the Papalist claims, by saying that 'even in the case of the early Synods there is a certain participation of the Popes in convoking them.' The evidence which he alleges does not, however, justify him in making this modification of his original statement that 'the first eight Œcumenical Councils were convoked by the Emperors.'

284. For example, the sole evidence, (for the *Liber Pontificalis* attributed to P. Damasus is a composition of the sixth century,[2] and therefore of no value as an authority on the point), which he adduces to prove that the Nicene Council was summoned by both Constantine and Sylvester is a statement made by the Sixth Council to that effect. Clearly this 'witness' is more than three hundred years too late to be of any value.

285. Further, the extent of the 'participation' in the convoking these Œcumenical Councils, which Hefele considers the Popes to have had, appears to have been no more than that which might be attributed to any Bishop who may have been consulted with reference to their being convoked. For he says, 'even Rufinus, in his continuation of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, says that the Emperor summoned the Council of Nicæa at the suggestion of the Priests (*ex sententia sacerdotum*), and certainly if several Bishops were consulted on the subject, amongst them must have been the chief of them all, the Bishop of Rome.'[3] It is clear, however, that 'consultation with' is an essentially different matter to 'convocation by'; but further, the position of one of several Bishops whose opinion was taken whether or not a Council should be

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. 3. [E.T. vol. i. p. 8. Second edit.]
[2] *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. p. 714, sub. v. *Liber Pontificalis*.
[3] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. vol. i. p. 9. Second edit.]

summoned, which Hefele's comment on Rufinus's statement involves, was that occupied by the Bishop of Rome, is of course consistent with the ancient belief as to the place held by the Episcopate in the Church. On the other hand, it is absolutely inconsistent with that unique sovereign office in the Church which, according to Papalism, belongs *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome, and is a witness to the fact that neither the Emperor who 'consulted' that Bishop, nor the person so 'consulted,' knew anything about such a prerogative.

286. Hefele's failure in this question only serves to emphasise the fact that the testimony of history is in direct conflict with the statement made by Pope Leo. x. in the Bull *Pastor Æternus* in the Fifth Council of the Lateran, quoted in the *Satis Cognitum*,[1] that 'the Roman Pontiff alone, as having authority over all Councils, has full jurisdiction and power to summon, to transfer, to dissolve Councils, as is clear not only from the testimony of Holy Writ, from the teaching of the Fathers and of the Roman Pontiffs, and from the decrees of the Sacred Canons, but from the teaching of the very Councils themselves.'

The statement of Leo x. which Leo xiii. thus adduced in the *Satis Cognitum* being unhistorical, is, as might be supposed, supported by its author by various citations of an unhistorical character. For example, as 'proofs' quotations are given from the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*[2] and other fictions.

287. Amongst these passages are the following:—It is asserted 'that in the Alexandrian Synod, Athanasius being there present, we read that it was written to Felix, the Roman Pontiff, by the same Synod, that the Nicene Synod had decreed that Councils ought not to be celebrated without the authority of the Roman Pontiff.'[3] Leo says also, 'Nor does it escape us that the same Pontiff Leo transferred . . . the second Synod of Ephesus to Chalcedon . . . and that the First Council of Ephesus showed the greatest reverence towards Celestine, and that of Chalcedon to the same Leo, the Sixth to Agatho . . . and reverently and humbly submitted themselves to the instructions of the same Pontiffs, and the commands put forth and made by them in the holy Councils . . . and the Fathers of the ancient Councils were accustomed to humbly seek and obtain the subscription and approbation of the Roman Pontiffs for the confirmation of those things which had been done in their Councils, as is clear from the custom of the Councils of Nicæa, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Sixth Constantinople, and the Seventh Council held at the same Nicæa, and the Roman Synods held under Symmachus.'[4]

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39. [2] On these forgeries *vide supra*, nn. 229 *et seq.*

[3] Ps. Athanasii *Ep. ad Felicem*, P. Hinschius, *op. cit.*, p. 479.

[4] On these Synods under Symmachus, *vide* Hinschius, *op. cit.*, *De Collectionis Parte tertia*, p. cv.

288. These absurd statements, based on Apocryphal documents, form the basis of the statement which is quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* from the Bull of Leo x., which, it may be added, concludes as follows: 'And since it is necessary for salvation that faithful Christians should be subject to the Roman Pontiff, as we are taught by the divine Scriptures and the testimony of the holy Fathers, and by the constitution of Boniface P. VIII., of happy memory, which begins *Unam Sanctam*, for the salvation of the same souls of the faithful and the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, and of this Holy See, and for the unity and power of His Spouse, the Church, we renew and approve, the present Holy Council approving, the same Constitution.'[1]

289. It is strange that in an *Encyclical* issued by the 'Supreme Teacher of all Christians,' such a document should be quoted as a conclusive authority. That it is so used is but another proof that it is impossible to make Papalism harmonise with historical facts; that it should be necessary to thus adduce it in support of the claims made in the *Satis Cognitum*, which, if the Papalist allegation that the Roman Pontiffs possess *jure divino* the supreme power in the Church would necessarily follow, affords a crushing refutation of the statement in that *Encyclical*.

SECTION XXXVIII.—*Œcumenical Councils incompatible with Papalism.*

290. Another preliminary question of considerable importance next demands consideration, viz., If the position of the Roman Pontiff in the Church be that asserted by the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to him by the institution of Christ, the question at once arises, Why were any such Councils held at all? If the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff extends to the whole Christian Commonwealth, if he possesses *jure divino* the supreme power of jurisdiction in its plenitude, a real and sovereign authority, which the whole community is bound to obey, if from his judgment, the judgment of the Supreme Judge of all the Faithful, there is no appeal, if, in his Apostolic Primacy there is comprehended the supreme power of teaching, so that his definitions *ex cathedra* as to faith and morals are irreformable of themselves [*ex sese*], and not from the consent of the Church,[2] Councils in the ancient sense of the term are clearly superfluous.

For what possible need could there be for the adoption of such a cumbrous method of procedure as the convocation of Bishops from all quarters of the Church, with all its attendant disadvantages and difficulties, for the purpose of determining matters, the *decisive* judgment on

[1] Leo x., Bulla *Pastor Æternus* Mansi, xxxii. 1049.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38; *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. caps. iii., iv., *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 483-7.

which could, if Papalism were true, have been obtained by an application to the Supreme Pontiff for a definitive decree thereon? Such a decree would have been at once accepted by the whole Church as finally deciding all matters, emanating as it would from the supreme authority constituted by Christ in His Church, obedience to which is a condition to membership in the one Flock under the One Supreme Pastor, who wields that authority.

291. That this argument cannot be met is shown by the significant circumstance that when the claims of the Papacy had become fully accepted in the West, the Councils which were held by the command of Popes, and have (though possessing no right to the title) been dubbed Œcumenical by Roman authorities, have been mere assemblages for the registration of the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs. So clearly was this felt to be the case, that of one of these Councils, that of Vienne, held in 1311, a contemporary writer, Walter de Hemingburgh, said, 'In the whole Council, which does not deserve to be called a Council, because the Lord Pope did everything out of his own head, the Holy Council neither answering nor assenting, there were one hundred and thirty *Pastoral Staves*,'[1] an apt description of the real worth of the title 'Bishop' borne by the members of the 'Synod.'

292. At previous Latin Councils, the Third and Fourth of the Lateran, the Pope had already proceeded to promulgate the Canons as his own decrees, '*Sacro Universali Synodo approbante*.'[2] This phrase,[3] it is plain, has a very different meaning from that of the formula which the Bishops used in the Councils of the primitive Church when they affixed their signatures to the Acts thereof: 'Ego *definiens* subscripsi.' The ancient Councils drew up by their own authority their decrees and promulgated them in their own name. Their voice was a *decisive* one, hence the Bishops who composed them held the position, which, in the formula they thus used, they asserted belonged to them. Such a position the Bishops present in 'Papal Councils' do not occupy; therefore the Pope stands forth in them as the one authoritative legislator, who in the plenitude of his sovereign power decides finally what seems good to him, merely as a matter of ceremonial calling together the Bishops, who are subject to him as to their 'Sovereign' 'Master,' to express their opinions by 'votes' which have no legislative power whatever. The uselessness of Councils, if Papalism be true, is thus clearly manifest.

293. It cannot be objected to this argument that there was no necessity for the exercise of the authority of the One Supreme Pastor

[1] Walteri de Hemingburgh, *Chronicon.*, ii. 293. Edited by Hans Claude Hamilton. London, 1849.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. 11. [E.T. vol. i. p. 67. Second edit.]

[3] On the use of a similiar phrase at the Vatican Council, *vide* note 19.

in early days, a Council being sufficient to deal with such matters as these arose. For, in the first place, the Papalists deny that any Council possesses Œcumenicity which has not been 'confirmed' by the exercise of this supreme authority by 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' which proves the futility of the plea, since, according to Papalism, that authority was exercised in this way in the case of all the Œcumenical Councils.[1] Secondly, the state of the Church during the prevalence of the Arian, Macedonian, Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies was such in each case as demanded both an appeal to the Supreme Pastor for an *ex cathedra* decision and for the exercise by him of that office of 'the Apostolic Primacy' which he is alleged to have possessed by the institution of Christ from the beginning of the Christian religion. The very foundation of the Church's faith was attacked; the truth of the Incarnation was at stake. If any case has ever arisen in the whole history of the Church when it was absolutely incumbent upon 'the successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate' to discharge the duty of their office, it was when Christendom was being devastated by these heresies: yet no appeal of this character was made, nor did the Church regard any opinion or judgment passed by the Roman Bishop as final.[2]

294. From what has been said it is manifest that the fact that General Councils were convoked at all is itself proof that Papal Supremacy, as set forth in the *Satis Cognitum* in accord with the *Vatican Decrees*, which De Maistre declared to be 'the capital dogma without which Christianity cannot exist,'[3] was unknown to the primitive Church.

295. This is, of course, especially clear in the case of the summoning of the Council of Nicæa, the first of such Councils. The circumstances of the time were such as to demand on the part of the Church some decisive action. Arianism was rampant, and the Church was agitated by it. The question raised was one of the utmost gravity. If ever there was an occasion when the Supreme Pastor, the teacher of all Christians, might have been expected to exercise his office of maintaining the Faith, it was in this age. Why did he not discharge the duty incumbent upon him, and so protect the flock from the ravages of heresy? Or if he were slow to do so, *proprio motu*, which, on Papal principles, would be an impossibility, why did not Constantine appeal to St. Sylvester for a final decision *ex cathedra* on this point of faith which would have closed the controversy, being accepted by the One Flock as 'irreformable of itself'? Neither Roman Bishop nor

[1] On the truth of this allegation, *vide infra*, n. 784, and note 65.

[2] *Vide*, for example, the treatment of *The Tome* of St. Leo by the Council of Chalcedon, *infra*, nn. 452 *et seq.*

[3] De Maistre, *Du Pape*, liv. iv. ch. v. p. 427. Troisième édit. [E.T. pp. 320, 321. Edit. 1850.]

Emperor, it is clear, knew of any such office belonging to the former. The Emperor submitted this grave question, threatening the very existence of the Church, not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the judgment of the Episcopate gathered together. The 'One Episcopate' in its corporate capacity, not the 'successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate,' was in that age recognised as possessing that authority to which all would necessarily defer, and thus would peace be restored to the Church. The course then adopted is, indeed, irreconcilable with the statement of the *Satis Cognitum* that 'in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age.'[1]

296. Nor will it in any way diminish the force of this argument if it be attempted to reply to it by asserting that Sylvester may have given a decision *ex cathedra* against Arianism, but that all record of it has perished in the lapse of ages. On the contrary, if the supposition be admitted, for the sake of argument, to be true, the argument is greatly strengthened, for it is clear that Constantine did not hold such 'decision' to be final, or he would not have convoked the Council to pronounce on the question. Besides which, if such 'Papal' pronouncement did exist, the Council evidently did *not* consider it to be of the slightest consequence, not even examining it to see if it was in accordance with the Faith, as other Councils did the dogmatic letters of other Popes.[2] Hence it follows that if the supposition under notice were true, it is plain that the argument against which it is directed, so far from being even impaired by it, is materially strengthened.

Section XXXIX.—*On the Presidency of the Council of Nicæa*, A.D. 325.

297. According to the Papalist argument, the Bishop of Rome of necessity has the right to preside at an Œcumenical Council either personally or by deputy. It is, of course, true that the first of the Patriarchs would be the natural President of such a Council, and the fact of his so acting would not in any way lend support to the Papal pretensions. But on Papalist principles an Œcumenical Council without such presidency, personally or by his representatives, would be impossible. Hence if there be found any Council held by the Church to be Œcumenical at which the Bishop of Rome did not so preside, that fact is fatal to the Papalist theory.

298. Who, then, presided at the Council of Nicæa, the one of all those recognised as Œcumenical which, from its being the first, holds a unique position? It is certain that the Emperor Constantine

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 452 *et seq.*, 749 *et seq.*

occupied the place of honour and opened the series of the principal sessions. But probably this was merely an honorary and not the actual presidency. The real President, there does not appear any reason to doubt, was Hosius, Bishop of Cordova. He was one of the leading personages of his day, and possessing in a marked degree the Imperial confidence, had acted for the Emperor on other occasions.[1] Moreover, he was advanced in years, and was also the senior member of the Episcopate present at the Council. He had, too, been a Confessor under Maximinian, and was recognised both by the Orthodox and the Arians as a high authority. St. Athanasius says of him: 'Of what Synod was he not President?'[2] and of him Theodoret, the historian, similarly says: 'Of all the Bishops he is the most illustrious. What Council can be mentioned in which he did not preside, and convince all by the power of his reasoning?'[3] The Arians, too, testify to the same fact, saying 'he is the President of Councils, and his letters are everywhere attended to.'[4] Further, in the two lists of signatures of the Bishops present at the Council given by Mansi, the name of Hosius comes first.[5]

299. The evidence here given would seem to be conclusive as to the place Hosius occupied, but did he do so as the representative of Sylvester? Was he 'the Papal Legate' by whom the Bishop of Rome exercised that *right* of presidency which was his *de jure*, as a prerogative inherent in the office of the 'Supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' 'the Vicar of Christ'? This, on the Papalist theory, Hosius must have been. If he was not, then his presidency is a clear proof that 'Papalism' was unknown to the Fathers of this Council.

300. There appears to be no ground for supposing Hosius to have acted as Sylvester's 'legate.' That Bishop was absent from the Council on account of his age, and Eusebius, whose evidence is peculiarly valuable, as he was present at the Council, plainly states that 'Presbyters of his were present and *supplied his place*.'[6] He does not say that Hosius discharged any such office. So, too, Socrates says that Presbyters 'filled his place.'[7] Moreover, in the list of signatures already mentioned, those of the two Roman Presbyters, Vitus and Vincentius, come after that of Hosius; and whilst they are expressly declared to have acted in Sylvester's name, no such statement is attached to the signature of Hosius.

[1] *Cp.* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. x. cap. vi.; P.G. xx. 891.
[2] S. Athanasius, *Apologia de Fugâ suâ*; P.G. xxv. 649.
[3] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. ii. cap. xii.; P.G. lxxxii. 1032.
[4] S. Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*, § 42; P.G. xxv. 744.
[5] Mansi, ii. 692, 697.
[6] Eusebius, *De Vitâ Constant.*, iii. 7; P.G. xx. 1061.
[7] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 8; P.G. lxvii. 61. *Cp.* also Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. cap. xvii.; P.G. lxvii. 912.

301. It is probable that Hosius, apart from the reasons already given which marked him out as *the* man for the post, was appointed President of the Council by Constantine himself. This would have been in accordance with the course which was probably adopted at the Council of Arles in 314, a Council which, like that of Nicæa, had been summoned by the Emperor. At that Synod Maximus, Bishop of Arles, presided, although Sylvester was represented by two Priests, Claudianus and Vitus, and two Deacons, Eugenius and Cyriacus. Maximus was no doubt appointed to preside because he had been one of the three judges from Gaul whom Constantine had ordered to decide the question with regard to the Donatists which was before the Council, a fact which would naturally suggest him to Constantine as the fitting person to be selected for that office. The name of Maximus, it must be added, occupies, in the list of signatures of the members of the Council,[1] the same position as that of Hosius in the Nicene list. The two cases are thus parallel.

It is difficult to treat as serious the 'argument' sometimes put forward that Hosius must have presided at Nicæa, because Gelasius of Cyzicus, who wrote a history of that Council in the fifth century, says, 'And Hosius was the representative of the Bishop of Rome, and he was present at the Council of Nicæa with the two Roman priests, Vitus and Vincentius.'[2] Not merely is Gelasius no 'authority' on such matters, since what he added to the writers from whom he compiled his work is largely either doubtful or untrue, but his untrustworthy character as an historian is nowhere more clearly manifest than in the very passage whence these words are quoted. They are simply an interpolation, completely altering the sense of the extract from Eusebius, in the midst of which they occur. The extract itself is too shamelessly corrupted, for he makes the words quoted above,[3] with reference to the presbyters who supplied the place of Sylvester, apply to the Bishop of Constantinople, as follows: 'And of the *now* Imperial city, the prelate Metropolitanus was absent through old age, but presbyters of his were present and supplied his place.'[4] It is surely absurd to attempt to set statements made by such a writer against those of one like Eusebius, who was a contemporary writer, or indeed to regard them as possessing any historical value whatever. Since, then, he is the first to broach the idea that Hosius represented Sylvester and presided in that capacity, it is clear that it may be dismissed as unworthy of any credence.

302. To conclude, on the evidence it would appear that the President of the Council was Hosius, and that he did not occupy that position

[1] Mansi, ii. 508-511.
[2] Gelasius, *Historia Concilii Nicæni*, ii. 5; P.G. lxxxv. 1229.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 300.
[4] Gelasius, *l.c.*

as 'legate' of Sylvester. Obviously this is inconsistent with the 'monarchical' position declared in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to the Bishop of Rome, whence it follows the Fathers of Nicæa knew nothing of it. This would have been impossible did such a position belong to the Roman Bishop by the institution of Christ from the very beginning of the Christian faith, which Papalism requires should be the case. Finally, confirmation of the conclusion here arrived at with reference to the position of Hosius is found in the fact that he presided at the Council of Sardica, a Council which was also summoned by the Emperor, and which was probably intended to be Œcumenical, but which did not attain that rank. At this Council, as at Nicæa, the Bishop of Rome was not present, two Presbyters, Archidamus and Philoxenus[1] being his representatives, and in the list given by St. Athanasius,[2] Hosius' signature is placed before theirs, exactly as in the Nicene lists. He would thus appear to have occupied at both Councils the same place, viz., that of President, and that *not* as representing the Roman Bishop.[3]

Section XL.—*Canon IV.*

303. The Fourth Canon of this Council bears on the subject under consideration. It is as follows:—

> 'The Bishop shall be appointed by (the Bishops) of the Eparchy (province); if that is not possible on account of pressing necessity, or on account of the length of journeys, three (Bishops) shall meet and proceed to the imposition of hands (consecration) with the permission of those absent in writing. The confirmation of what is done belongs by right in each Eparchy (province) to the Metropolitan.'[4]

304. By this Canon the Council clearly lays down (*a*) that the Provincial Synod is the sole ecclesiastical body concerned with the consecration of the Bishops of the Province, and (*b*) that the Metropolitan possesses the right of confirmation. Both these rights are regarded in the Canon as absolute. The Fathers of Nicæa evidently had no knowledge of the prerogative asserted to belong to the Pope of confirming the election of Bishops.[5] Bishops in that age did not consider that they were Bishops 'by the grace of the Apostolic See.'[6]

305. Vincenzi, a learned Roman Professor, is evidently conscious that the evidence of this Canon, as it stands in the received text, is against the Papal claims, for he devotes a chapter of his work, *De*

[1] Mansi, iii. 66. [2] S. Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ananos*, § 50; P.G. xxv. 357.
[3] On a statement of Eusebius, *De Vitâ Constant.*, iii. c. 12; P.G. xx. 1068. *Vide* note 20.
[4] Mansi, ii. 670. [5] Sixt. c. 16. *De elect.*, i. 6.
[6] *Vide* note 21 on this phrase.

Hebræorum et Christianorum Sacra Monarchia, to an endeavour to show that this is one of those Canons which have been corrupted, and proposes to amend it in order that it may be made to square with these claims. He considers that it should read, 'that no one should dare to ordain without the knowledge of the Apostolic See and the Metropolitan.'[1]

There is no ground for Vincenzi's allegation that the received text is corrupt, and the fact that so learned a writer should think it necessary, in the interests of Papalism, to impeach its genuine character is testimony which needs no comment.

Section XLI.—*Canon V.*

306. The next Canon affords similar proof. It is as follows:—

> 'As regards the excommunicated, the sentence passed by the Bishops of each Province shall have the force of law in conformity with the Canon, which says, "He who has been excommunicated by some shall not be admitted by others." Care must, however, be taken that the Bishop has not passed this sentence of excommunication from narrow-mindedness, from a love of contradiction, or from some feeling of hatred. In order that such an examination may take place, it has appeared good to order that in each Province a Synod shall be held twice a year, composed of all the Bishops of the Province; they will make all necessary inquiries, that each may see that the sentence of excommunication has been justly passed, on account of some determined disobedience, and until the assembly of Bishops may be pleased to pronounce a milder judgment on them. These Synods are to be held—the one before Lent, in order that, having put away all lowmindedness, we may present a pure offering to God, and the second in the autumn.'[2]

307. The Council here declares that the Provincial Synod is the tribunal to which appeals are to be made; the principle, in accordance with which it so decreed, being that all such matters should be decided on the spot, since there the best evidence could be obtained. The African Bishops in the following century so understood this Canon, as is clear from their letter to Pope Celestine,[3] in which they rejected the claims which had been put forward by him and his predecessors to receive appeals, a claim based by them on certain Canons, which they alleged to be Nicene, but which, if genuine, were Sardican.

308. The Canon knows of no right of appeal to the Roman Bishops, or of any right inherent in 'the Papacy' to receive such appeals. If it be argued that the Canon makes no reference to this point, there is an

[1] Vincenzi, *De Hebræorum et Christianorum Sacra Monarchia*, pars. ii. cap. ii. p. 173. Romæ, 1875.

[2] Mansi, ii. 670.

[3] *Vide infra*, n. 620.

obvious reply. According to Papalism, the Pope has 'real and sovereign authority, which the whole community is bound to obey,'[1] and is *jure divino* 'supreme judge of all the faithful, to whose judgment recourse may be had in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction . . . [and] whose judgment may be reviewed by no one.'[2] Hence if this was 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' as is asserted,[3] it was 'the belief' of the Nicene age. Consequently it would have been impossible for the Fathers of this Council not to have so worded this Canon as to safeguard this great privilege, which in the Papal theory belongs 'by the institution of Christ' to the Roman Bishop.

309. Vincenzi, seeing that this Canon also is incompatible with the Papal claims, of which he is so strenuous an advocate, asserts that a Canon dealing with appeals to the most blessed Bishop of the Roman Church has been abstracted from the code of Canons[4]—a method of getting over the difficulty not without significance. It need hardly be said that there is no justification for the learned writer's allegation. Hefele has treated exhaustively of the number of Canons enacted by the Council of Nicæa,[5] and has proved that only the twenty Canons which have been universally held to be Nicene are genuine; a fact which throws a lurid light on the means which Vincenzi has felt compelled to adopt in order to make the proceedings of the Nicene Council harmonise with Papalism. No comment is necessary.

310. This Canon affords evidence that 'the Papacy' was non-existent in the primitive Church in yet another way. It directs that the provincial Synods shall be summoned twice in each year, without any proviso that the permission of the Sovereign Pontiff shall be obtained. This direction is in absolute contradiction to the statements in the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* that Councils ought not to be celebrated without the permission and the authority of the Roman Pontiff.[6] Being incorporated by Gratian in his *Decretum*,[7] the claims embodied in them were gradually forced on the Church, and Provincial Synods, ceasing to possess any real authority, fell into disuse. This had a disastrous result, inasmuch as what would have proved a great safeguard of the inherent rights of the Episcopate against the encroachments of the Papacy was thus destroyed, a fact which no doubt had great weight with the Fathers of Basle when they enacted in the Fifteenth Session of that Council that Provincial Synods should be held every three years.[8]

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39. [4] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars. ii. cap. iv. p. 189.
[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. ch. ii. sect. 41. [E.T. i. 355 *et seq.*]
[6] *Cp.* Julii Ep. ii.; Hinschius, *op. cit.*, p. 459. [7] I. xvii. 2.
[8] Mansi, xxix. 74-75.

SECTION XLII.—*Canon VI.*

311. The Sixth Canon of this Council is of great value as a witness on the question under consideration. It is as follows:—

> 'Let the ancient customs prevail which are in use in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the Bishops of Alexandria have authority over all these, since this also is customary for the Bishop of Rome. The prerogatives which they formerly possessed must also be preserved to the Churches of Antioch and in all the other Eparchies. This is altogether certain, that if any one has become a Bishop without the approval of the Metropolitan, the great Synod commands him not to remain a Bishop. But when the election has been made by all with discrimination and in a manner conformable to the rules of the Church, if two or three oppose for pure love of contradiction, the vote of the majority shall prevail.'[1]

312. The occupant of the See of Alexandria possessed by ancient custom a jurisdiction of considerably greater extent than that of a mere Metropolitan. A Metropolitan exercised authority over a single Province only, the Alexandrian Bishop had under his jurisdiction several Provinces, viz., the four which formed the civil 'Diocese' of Egypt, one of the five included by Constantine in the Præfectura Orientis[2] when he divided the Empire into Dioceses. These Provinces were Egypt properly so called, Libya, Thebais or Upper Egypt, and Pentapolis.[3] Each of these Provinces had its own Metropolitan, who thus was under the authority of the Bishop of Alexandria; consequently, as Hefele considers,[4] this Canon confirmed to that Bishop the rights of a superior Metropolitan. There is no doubt that the Pope[5] of Alexandria had thus an extensive jurisdiction, within the limits of which he not only ordained the Metropolitans who were under him, but also their suffragans, who, according to the ordinary rule, would have been ordained by their own Metropolitans. This right, however, was subject to the condition that the election of these suffragan Bishops was confirmed by the Metropolitan[6] of the Provinces of which their Sees formed a part.

313. The Council having thus confirmed the privileges of the Bishop of Alexandria, proceeds in the Canon to give the reason by which it was guided in so doing—viz., 'since this also is customary for the Bishop of Rome.'

[1] Mansi, ii. 669-672.

[2] Gieseler, *op. cit.*, ii. 1, ch. iii. § 93, note 5. [E.T. i. p. 426.]

[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. ch. ii. sect. 42. [E.T. i. p. 389.] Subsequently to the date of the Nicene Synod this 'Diocese' was 'divided into six Provinces—Pentapolis (*Libya Superior*), *Libya Inferior*, Thebais, Egypt, Augustamnica (the eastern part of Egypt), and Arcadia or Eptanomis (Middle Egypt),' *ibid.*, *l.c.* [E.T. i. p. 390.]

[4] *L.c.* [E.T. i. p. 393.] [5] On the title 'Pope,' see note 22. [6] Hefele, *l.c.*

The meaning is clear. Because a certain authority is by ancient custom exercised by the Bishop of Rome, therefore the Synod ordains that the like authority, which by ancient custom the Bishop of Alexandria has in like manner exercised, shall still continue to belong to that Bishop.

314. The Canon is plainly inconsistent with the monarchical position declared by the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff.

The Fathers of Nicæa in it assign the position occupied by the Bishop of Rome by ancient custom as the ground for the recognition and confirmation by the Synod of a like position which by similar custom was enjoyed by the Bishops of Alexandria. Now if the Fathers of the Council had known that the Bishops of Rome possessed 'by the institution of Christ' 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church,' a jurisdiction essentially different in nature from that which the Bishops of Alexandria had been accustomed to exercise within the limits of their Patriarchate[1]—to use a term which in this technical sense came into use later—they would have been under an obligation to have safeguarded this unique position held by the Roman Pontiff. Not to have done so would have in that case been to violate the Divine Constitution of the Church, for by the Canon the existence of any distinction between the power exercised by the two Bishops named is implicitly denied, the authority of both being placed on the same level and as having the same origin and sanction, viz. ancient custom.

315. The incompatibility of this Canon with even the earlier claims put forth for the Roman See, far short though they fall from those embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, was clearly perceived by the fautors of those claims. 'Versions' of the Canon were produced which had for their object the removal of the inconvenient testimony as to the true position of the Roman Bishop, which in its genuine wording it afforded.

316. One of these 'versions' was that cited by Paschasinus at the Council of Chalcedon,[2] viz.—'The Roman See always had the primacy, but let Egypt also maintain its position, so that the Bishop of Alexandria may have power over all, since this also is the custom of the Roman Bishop. Similarly, let those who are placed over Antioch and over the Churches of the larger cities have primacy.'[3]

Another version is that of the Prisca, 'which is regarded as a com-

[1] On the title 'Patriarch,' see note 23.

[2] *Vide infra*, n. 425.

[3] Quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum. Teneat autem et Ægyptus ut Episcopus Alexandriæ omnium habet potestatem, quoniam et Romano episcopo hæc est consuetudo. Similiter autem et qui in Antiochia constitutus est et in exteriis provinciis primatus habeant ecclesiæ civitatum ampliorum. [Mansi, vii. 443.]

pilation from the text,' ascribed to the Secretaries of Atticus of Constantinople, sent by that Patriarch to the African Bishops at their request, and 'an Italian version which the Ballerini entitle *Antiquissima*.'[1]

This is as follows:—'It is the ancient custom that the Bishop of Rome should have the *principatus* that he should rule with solicitude the suburbicarian regions and all his Province. Of all things which are in Egypt let the Bishop of Alexandria have the care. Similarly also concerning Antioch and in the other Provinces, let their due privileges be preserved to the Metropolitan Churches.'[2]

317. There is no doubt that these 'versions' do not represent the true text, for not only do they differ from the Greek, which must be held to be the original, but also from the Latin text known as the 'Vetus,' which the Ballerini consider to have been made from a Greek codex extant long before the Council of Chalcedon,[3] as well as from that which is contained in the Acts of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 419, which, it is evident from a speech made by Aurelius, was made from the copy of the Nicene Statutes which, brought home by the Africans who had attended the Nicene Council, was preserved in the Church of Carthage.[4]

318. The object of these 'versions,' which were of Italian origin, was clearly to get rid of the fact contained in the authentic text of the Canon, that the Fathers of Nicæa held that there was a strict analogy existing between the powers exercised by the Bishops of Rome and of Alexandria respectively, which justified the course they adopted in confirming the privileges of the latter. That it was necessary to make these 'versions' affords proof positive that the genuine text is incompatible with even the claims advanced by the Papacy in the fifth century; still more is the authentic Canon incompatible with the monarchical position claimed for the Roman Pontiffs in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum*. These versions themselves, it may be added, bear witness against the latter.

In the first, the word *primatus* is used of the position of the Bishop of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and of the greater cities, which shows that the *nature* of the authority possessed by all these prelates was the same. In the second, the *principatus* belonging to the Roman Bishop is defined as the power of governing certain portions of the Church, a right of like nature belonging to the

[1] *Cp.* Bright, *The Roman See in the Roman Church*, pp. 482-3; *Additional Note on the Sixth Nicene Canon*.

[2] Antiqui moris est, ut urbis Romæ Episcopus habeat principatum, ut suburbicaria loca et omnem provinciam suam sollicitudine gubernet. Quæ apud Ægyptum sunt Alexandriæ Episcopus omnium habeat sollicitudinem. Similiter autem et circa Antiochiam, et in cæteris provinciis privilegia propria serventur Metropolitanis ecclesiis. [Mansi, vi. 1127.]

[3] *Cp.* Bright, *op. cit.*, p. 481.

[4] '*Apud nos*,' Bright, *op. cit.*, p. 482.

Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch in other parts of the Church. Besides which, the *principatus* itself is declared to rest on 'ancient custom.' Both versions are thus incompatible with any monarchical position belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff, and therefore themselves afford valuable testimony to the fact that the Roman claims in the fifth century differed essentially in nature from those embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees*.

319. 'Versions,' however, as time went on and Papalism evolved itself, were clearly perceived to be of no use in doing away with the witness of the genuine Canon. Hence 'interpretations' were resorted to in order to make the decree of the Nicene Fathers less directly antagonistic to the later claims of the Papacy.

Bellarmine, for example, 'explains' the Canon as follows:—'That the Bishop of Alexandria ought to govern these provinces because the Roman Bishop has been accustomed to do so, *i.e.* because the Roman Bishop, previous to any definition of Councils, has been accustomed to allow the Bishop of Alexandria the government of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, or has been accustomed to govern these provinces through the Alexandrian Bishop.'[1] That such an 'interpretation' of the Canon as this should be seriously put forward in the interests of Papalism is a fact the significance of which is obvious.

320. The uselessness of all such 'interpretations' for the purpose for which they have been made is practically confessed by that strenuous upholder of Papalism, Vincenzi. That learned writer admits that in the Canon as it stands in the received text, 'no difference is placed between the Roman Church and the other Churches, viz. the Alexandrian, the Antiochene, and the Cæsarean, as regards the peculiar privileges of each,'[2] and proceeds to endeavour to destroy the force of this inconvenient testimony against Papalism in the following manner.

He asserts that the Canon as it exists in the received text 'has undergone manifest falsifying,' 'having been falsified in all its parts.'[3] He accordingly would 'restore' it 'into its ancient form,' which he conceives to have been as follows:—

'Let the ancient customs hold good, that the Roman See should have the Primacy of honour in the first grade, that the Alexandrian See should keep the Primacy of honour in the second place, that the Antiochene See should have the Primacy of honour in the third place, that the See of Cæsarea should possess the Primacy of honour in the fourth place, with the attributes proper to each.'

321. Having effected this 'restoration,' he ingenuously adds:

[1] Bellarminus, *De Summo Pontifice*, lib. ii. c. 13, tom. i. 641. Colon. Agrip., 1620.
[2] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, ii. cap. iii. p. 180.
[3] *L.c.*, p. 181; and ii. cap. ix. p. 243.

'Although I do not think I have given the exact words of the Canon, I am confident that I have arrived at the sense.'[1]

The value of the admission here made by Vincenzi is very great, the more so as it is undesigned. It is the testimony of an acute writer, whose object is to defend the claims of the Papacy, that the Canon in its genuine form cannot be reconciled with those claims; it is thus an important corroboration of the conclusion arrived at above, viz. that the Fathers of Nicæa knew nothing of Papal supremacy.[2]

322. The various points connected with the Council of Nicæa which bear on the subject of Papalism have now been considered, and the evidence afforded by that Council must be held to be adverse to the claims made for the Papacy. The importance of this cannot be overestimated. The Nicene Council was the first of the great Œcumenical Synods, and the fact that the Fathers of that Council knew nothing of the monarchical position, which is declared in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* to belong to the Roman Pontiff *jure divino*, cannot but be a conclusive proof that such was not 'the venerable and constant belief' of the Church in 'the age' of that famous assemblage. Had it been part of the deposit that the Bishop of Rome was 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' with full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, the Council itself would have been needless, and, if convoked, it is inconceivable that so illustrious a gathering of the Episcopate should have acted in the way it did, completely ignoring the divinely appointed position of 'the successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate.'

[1] Vincenzi, *l.c.*, p. 181.

[2] On the extent of the *Roman Patriarchate*, *vide* note 24.

CHAPTER IX

THE WITNESS OF THE SARDICAN CANONS AS TO PAPALISM

SECTION XLIII.—*The text of the three Canons on trials of Bishops.*

323. Before proceeding to consider the witness of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, the second of the Œcumenical Councils, it will be convenient to examine certain Canons which are attributed to the Council of Sardica, to which appeal is frequently made as proving the existence of Papalism in the age of the Council of Nicæa.

The Council of Sardica was the next great Council held after that of Nicæa, probably within twenty years of its date. Hefele seems to have proved that the date which was at one time assigned to this Council, A.D. 347, is too late, and that A.D. 343 or 344 is the correct one, basing his argument on certain *Paschal Letters* of St. Athanasius with a very ancient preface discovered in an Egyptian monastery in 1852.[1]

324. The 'Canons' which are cited in connection with the Papal claims are those numbered III., IV., and V.,[2] which are as follows:—

> Canon III. Hosius the Bishop said: 'This also must necessarily be added, that Bishops do not cross from their own province into another province in which they are not Bishops, unless, perchance, they have been invited by their brethren, lest we seem to shut the door of charity. That if in any province any Bishop have a cause against his brother and fellow-bishop, neither shall call in Bishops from another province as arbiters. That if any of the Bishops has been condemned in any cause, and considers that he has not a weak but a sound cause that a judgment may be had anew on it, if it please your Piety, let us honour the memory of the Apostle Peter, that it should be written by those who have tried the cause to Julius,[3] Bishop of Rome, so that, if necessary, a fresh court may be opened by Bishops bordering on the province, and he

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. iv. sect. 58. [E.T. ii. 88.]

[2] VII. in Dionysius, Isidore, and the *Prisca*. *Ibid*, bk. ii. sect. 64. [E.T. ii. p. 119 note 13.]

[3] The name Julius was probably a later interpolation. It is not in the *Prisca* or the Isidore. Mr. C. H. Turner, of Magdalen College, Oxford, says that 'all manuscripts representing collections other than that (or those) of Dionysius Exiguus agree in omitting it.'—*The Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1902, p. 376.

may appoint judges. But if it cannot be proved that his cause is such as to require re-hearing, the first decision is not to be questioned, but what has been done is to stand good.'

Canon IV. Bishop Gaudentius said: 'If pleasing to you, it shall be added to this judgment which you, Hosius, have brought forward, which is full of pure love, that if a Bishop has been deposed by the sentence of those Bishops who were in the neighbourhood, and he desires again to defend himself, no other shall be appointed to his See until the Bishop of Rome has judged and decided thereupon.'

Canon V. (VII.). Hosius the Bishop said: 'Does it please also that if a Bishop has been accused and the Bishops of that region have judged him, and deposed him, and since his deposition he has appealed and had recourse to the Bishop of the Roman Church, and is willing that he should hear him; if he should consider it just that the examination of the matter should be renewed, let him deign to write to his fellow-bishops who are nearest the province, that they may carefully and with diligence investigate all things and give a just sentence in accordance with the truth in the matter. But if any one who asks that his cause should be heard again should move with his petition the Bishop of the Romans that he should send Presbyters *de latere suo*, that it should be in the power of that Bishop as he considers and determines to be right to send those who, with the Bishops, should judge, having the authority of him by whom they were sent. But if he should consider the Bishops sufficient for the termination of the matter, he shall do as seems fit to his most wise counsel.'[1]

SECTION XLIV.—*The meaning of 'the Sardican Canons.'*

325. What is the meaning of these Canons? It is to be observed—(*a*) First, that the three Canons are intimately bound up together, setting forth a particular course of procedure to be adopted under certain defined circumstances. The two latter Canons are, as it were, dependent on the first, being added by way of explanation with the view of avoiding certain difficulties which might arise in the event of the first Canon being acted upon;

(*b*) Secondly, that it is decreed that any Bishop who has been deposed by his comprovincial Bishops should have the right, if he considers that he has a good cause, to appeal, either himself directly, or through the judges who have condemned him, to the Bishop of Rome, who is chosen for this purpose out of honour of the memory of St. Peter;

[1] Mansi, iii. 24.

(*c*) Thirdly, that the Bishop of Rome may, it he think fit, appoint a re-hearing of the case before a court composed of Bishops living nearest to the province of the condemned Bishop;

(*d*) Fourthly, he may, also at his discretion, on the application of the appellant, send some presbyters who, as exercising his authority, shall judge with the Bishops;

(*e*) And lastly, it is further decreed that, pending the decision of the matter by the tribunal newly constituted by these Canons, the See from which the appellant has been deposed shall not be filled up.

The right thus conferred by these Canons is one which is strictly limited in its scope. In the first place, it is granted to Bishops alone, and to them only in a single case which is clearly specified, viz. the case of the deposition of a Bishop by his comprovincials, as Hefele admits.[1] All cases in which a Bishop receives a sentence other than that of deposition, all cases whatsoever with regard to priests and laymen, are left untouched by the Canons, and consequently were left to be dealt with in the manner hitherto prescribed, viz. by the Provincial Synod.

326. Next, the power conferred by these Canons on the Bishop of Rome, in connection with the right thus granted, is of very limited nature. It is not the power to receive 'appeals' in the strict sense, because, as De Marca says, an appeal 'transfers the entire cognizance of the cause to the superior judge, who discusses and decides the question in his own tribunal.'[2]

Now these Canons do not permit the Roman Bishop so to act. They prescribe that if a condemned Bishop in the specified instance has recourse to the Bishop of Rome, that Prelate may either receive or reject the application. If he takes the latter course, the sentence of the Provincial Bishops stands good, but if he adopts the former, he has no power to transfer the whole process with its investigation to Rome, there to decide it himself, as Hefele admits.[3] He is bound to send the case to a court composed, not as he should think fit to ordain, but according to the prescription laid down in the Canon by which the power under which he acts is granted to him, viz. of Bishops near the Province in which the case has arisen. These Bishops are to take cognizance of the case with, or without, the assistance of Presbyters sent by himself should he think fit to do so.

Moreover, although the See was not to be filled up pending the decision of the tribunal presented, yet this provision in no way interfered with the other effects of the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Provincial Bishops. Indeed, the fact that it was

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. 64. [E.T. ii. 125.]

[2] De Marca, *De Concordia Sacerd. et Imperii*, bk. vii. c. 2, § 6, tom. iii. 299. Bambergæ, 1788.

[3] Hefele, *l.c.*

necessary to enact this special provision plainly shows that, had it not been inserted in the Canon, the See would have been treated as vacant notwithstanding the exercise by the deposed Bishop of the right granted therein of recourse to the Roman Bishop. This is the one effect of the deposition which is by special decree suspended during the process permitted by these Canons; consequently this provision itself proves that the right granted by these Canons was of 'revision' not one of 'appeal,' for the force of the latter is, as De Marca says, 'to suspend in the *interim* the previous sentence.'[1]

Section XLV.—*The Privilege a grant, and not a right inherent* jure divino *in the Roman See.*

327. It is important to note that the restricted right embodied in these Canons was clearly not inherent *jure divino* in the See of Rome. The Synod held that it was something not already possessed by that See, but which they could grant to the Bishop of Rome. The Bishops might have declined, had they so chosen, to agree to Hosius' proposal, as he himself recognised by the form in which he made it, 'If it please your Piety.' Had even this limited power belonged to the Bishops of Rome 'by the institution of Christ,' they would have been arrogating to themselves a position which they did not possess, and infringing on the Divine Constitution of the Church: hence it is clear that still less were the enormous prerogatives asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* to belong to the 'Roman Pontiff' by the disposition of the Lord from the very beginning of the Christian religion known to the Sardican Fathers.

328. It may be further added in proof that the power so granted was not a recognition of a right exercised 'by ancient custom,' but the institution of one hitherto unknown, that, had it been otherwise, it would have been so stated. This is plain from the reference made by the Fathers of Nicæa to ancient custom when explaining and confirming in their Sixth Canon the rights of the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and the greater Sees.

329. Finally, when these Canons were alleged by Roman Bishops, in furtherance of the claims put forward on behalf of their See, they sought to ascribe them to the Nicene Council (with a view to which, in one copy of the Canons, the name Sylvester was inserted in Canon III.), a practice of which Zonaras says, 'the Bishops of Rome falsely say that this is a Canon of the first Council of Nicæa.'[2]

Now this proves, (*a*) First, that the Bishops of Rome of the fifth century were themselves fully aware that even the restricted right

[1] De Marca, *l.c.*

[2] Zonaras, *ad Can.* v. *Conc. Sardic.* Beveridge, *Synodicon*, p. 487.

conferred by these Canons was not possessed by them *jure divino*; had it been, they would never have adduced them as authoritatively justifying certain action on their part, as Zosimus and Boniface in the case of Apiarius,[1] and as St. Leo did both in a Synodal letter to Theodosius[2] and a personal letter[3] to the same Emperor in which he makes a reference thereto, and Felix[4] P. II., with reference to the case of Acacius, though these Canons did not, as has been seen, grant any power to order a Bishop to come to Rome to be tried. (*b*) Secondly, that they also knew that only an Œcumenical Council, which that of Sardica was not, was competent, as the supreme authority in the Church, to bestow any such privilege on their See.

330. In fact, if Papalism were true, it would be worse than useless to adduce them in the way in which they have been repeatedly used by Roman Bishops, for: (*a*) First the power named in them is of such a restricted nature that it would necessarily have been included in that 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs as 'the successors of Peter.' Consequently to have so used these Canons would have been to implicitly deny that they possessed, by the institution of Christ, that 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church towards which the faithful, whether as individuals or altogether, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world,'[5] which the *Satis Cognitum* declares to have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age';[6] and (*b*) further, that since this restricted privilege was plainly the grant of a Synod, it would inevitably follow that the greater power, in which the lesser would, as has been just said, be included, has never been conferred, even by a Synod, on the Roman Bishops. The conclusion therefore is that the Roman Bishops, by their use of these Canons, bear witness that Papalism as set forth in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* forms no part of historical Christianity, and is therefore untrue.

Section XLVI.—*Are the 'Sardican Canons' genuine?*

331. It has been assumed in the foregoing argument that the Sardican Canons are authentic, but there are grave reasons for believing that the Council of Sardica did not enact any Canons, and con-

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 609, 611, 614.
[2] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Theodosium Aug.*, Ep. xliv.; P.L. liv. 831.
[3] *Ep. ad Theodosium Aug.*, Ep. xliii.; P.L. liv. 825. [4] Mansi, vii. 1053-1055.
[5] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.
[6] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

sequently that these so-called 'Sardican Canons' are spurious. These reasons may be stated as follows:—

(1) St. Athanasius, who was present at the Synod and had perfect knowledge of its proceedings, gives a full account thereof in his *Apology against the Arians*,[1] in which he makes no mention of the enactment of any Canons. In view of the fact that the Council dealt with his case, on which the Canons, if genuine, would have an obvious bearing, he would have been specially careful to note them. Nor does any of the other contemporary documents concerning the Synod extant in St. Athanasius' works contain any reference to these Canons.

(2) The historians Socrates,[2] Sozomen,[3] and Theodoret,[4] who furnish accounts of the matters decided by the Council with reference to St. Athanasius, make no allusion to these Canons, which they would naturally have done in this connection, as they, if genuine, would have been enacted with obvious regard to his case.

(3) The *Encyclical Letter* of the Council makes no mention of these Canons, yet as the object of this Letter was to obtain the assent of the Bishops who were unable to be present, that by attaching their signatures thereto complete unanimity of opinion might be established with 'all our fellow-members throughout the world,'[5] it is surely improbable that the Synod could have ignored in this document these Canons, in view of their importance to Bishops, had the Fathers enacted them.

(4) The *Encyclical Letter* is addressed 'to Bishops,'[6] and professes to be a summary of all that 'had been performed, done, and determined' by the Synod. These Canons are not mentioned in it, yet the Synod, in writing to the Bishop of Rome (amongst the others), upon whom they had by these Canons conferred a new privilege, would inevitably give them an important place in their report to him.

(5) The Eusebians who had separated from the Orthodox, and held a Synod at Philippopolis, on the ground that they could not allow the decisions of the Synods of Tyre and Antioch to be re-opened, certainly knew nothing of these Canons. For if genuine they were plainly directed against their contention that these decisions were final according to the constitution of the Church, conferring as they did a certain new privilege of 'review,' albeit of limited character, on the chief Western Bishop; hence they would certainly have strenuously protested against them.

332 (6) The African Bishops at the date of the dispute in the case of

[1] S. Athan., *Apologia contra Arianos*; P.G. xxv. 249 *seq.*
[2] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. c. 20, 21; P.G. lxvii. 233-244.
[3] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. c. 11, 12; P.G. lxvii. 1060-1065.
[4] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. c. 6; P.G. lxxxii. 997-1017.
[5] Mansi, iii. 57 *seq.* [6] *Ibid.*

Apiarius[1] were ignorant of them, for had they known of their existence when the Roman Bishops cited them as Nicene they would obviously have replied that they were Sardican, and thus did not possess the authority of the Nicene Council, whereas the ground they did take was that the Canons cited did not occur in the authentic catalogues of the Nicene Canons, which they received from Constantinople and Alexandria in compliance with their request.[2] This would appear conclusive, for although Gratus of Carthage would appear not to have been present at Sardica,[3] yet his name and those of thirty-six other African Prelates occur in the list attached to the Letter, given by St. Athanasius,[4] of the Synod 'sent to those who were unable to attend,' 'of those Bishops who subscribed in the Council and the others also.' Gratus and the other African Bishops would have thus had copies of these Canons sent to them for their confirmation by their subscription thereto, hence in the archives at Carthage a copy would have been preserved for reference, especially considering the importance of these Canons relating to the new privilege conferred by them on the Roman Bishop. It has been sought to overthrow this argument by alleging that Gratus did know of the Sardican Canons, in that at the Council of Carthage, held between the years 345 and 347, he quoted a 'statutum' of the Synod of Sardica against a Bishop ordaining a layman from another diocese, referring to 'Canon XVIII.' of that Council, so that this is a proof that these Canons are authentic. It is, however, to be replied that the Fifth Canon of this Synod proposed by Privatus, in the support of the enactment of which Gratus is alleged to have made the observation referred to, differs from all the other Canons of the Council in that the words 'universi dixerunt, placet, placet' are wanting.[5] This renders it probable that this particular Canon is spurious. Nor would it be any answer to say that 'Gratus episcopus dixit' with the authority of the Sardican Council implies the assent of the Bishops to the proposal of Bishop Privatus, for such assent, in order to the enactment of a Canon by a Council, must be signified in such Council as is done in the case of all the other Canons attributed to this Synod. Further, this 'Eighteenth Canon of Sardica' does not appear to refer to laymen at all, even if the word 'ecclesiasticus' bears in certain cases the meaning of 'a member of the ecclesia of another city,' because in obvious connection with it the next Canon runs, 'Hosius the Bishop said, and we all decree this, that if the Bishop of another diocese

[1] *Vide infra*, nn. 610 *et seq.*

[2] Mansi, iv. 511-513.

[3] His name is not in the list of the Bishops present at the Synod who subscribed there *in judicio*, given in Fragment ii. of S. Hilary, P.L. x. 642. Nor does the reference to Gratus in Canon VIII. of these Sardican Canons necessitate his presence at the Synod, for it merely says, 'we have learnt they despise and contemn the salutary counsels of our most holy brother and fellow-bishop, Gratus.'—Mansi, iii. 33.

[4] S. Athan., *Apol. contra Arianos*, § 50; P.G. xxv. 357.

[5] Mansi, iii. 147.

ordains "alienum ministrum" without the consent of his own Bishops, such ordinations shall be invalid. Moreover, if any has presumed to do this he ought to be admonished and corrected by our colleagues and fellow-bishops.'[1] Clearly the 'alterius Episcopi civitatis ecclesiasticum' of the 'Eighteenth Canon' 'is the 'alienus minister' of this Canon, and this is corroborated by the fact that in the *Prisca* 'ecclesiasticum' is rendered 'clericum.' As Van Espen says[2] both Canons refer to the ordination of one already ordained (a minister of the Church), there is no prohibition expressed of the ordination of a layman under like circumstances, hence a citation of the Eighteenth Canon would be no argument in favour of the enactment of the Canon alleged to have been proposed by Privatus.

Secondly, the African Bishops, at the very Council at which 'the Sardican Canons' were adduced as Nicene by Faustinus the legate of Zosimus, and their genuineness questioned,[3] repeated and renewed a number of decrees made in previous years by African Synods. The Canons thus treated formed the collection called by Justellus[4] *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*. Canon v.[5] of these Canons—against usury—is a re-enactment of Canon XIII.[6] of the Council of Carthage, by which the Canon under notice is supposed to have been passed. Now, as the Fathers thus knew of Canon XIII., it would follow that they must also have known of 'Canon v.' if it had been enacted, and so of the supposed reference made by Gratus to 'the Sardican Canon XVIII.' in support thereof and thus of the Sardican Canons, the conclusion is that 'Canon v.' is spurious, and that the remark attributed to Gratus was not made by him, and the objection is of no value. The conclusion arrived at is strengthened by the fact that there is other evidence that St. Augustine, who was one of those who took part in the Carthaginian Synod of 419, did not know of the Sardican Canons. He certainly knew of Canon XI. of the Council of Carthage 345(7 ?),[7] yet he evidently knew nothing of 'Canon v.,' for had he had knowledge of it he would have known of Gratus' remark, and he would have had at hand a powerful argument against the Donatists, who ostentatiously showed a letter which they asserted had been addressed by the Council of Sardica to Donatus,[8] for he could have said that the letter could not have emanated from the orthodox Synod of Sardica, but must have come from the heretical Synod of Philippopolis, since Gratus, a former Bishop of Carthage, had been present at the true

[1] Mansi, iii. 37.
[2] Van Espen, *Commentarius in Canones et Decreta*, p. 278. Edit. Colon. 1755.
[3] *Vide infra*, n. 610.
[4] Justellus, *Bibliotheca juris Canonici Veteris*, tom. i. 321. Paris, 1661.
[5] Mansi, iii. 147. [6] *Ibid.*, 149. [7] S. Aug., *Ep.* lxv.; P.L. xxxiii. 234.
[8] S. Aug., *Ep.* xliv. 6; P.L. xxxiii. 176. *Contra Cresconium Donat.*, iii. 341; P.L. xliii. 516.

Council of Sardica, as was plain from 'Canon v.' of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 345(7?).

333. (7) Again, that the African Fathers knew nothing of these 'Sardican Canons' is further proved by the fact that in their letter to P. Celestine in A.D. 425,[1] they say that by no ordinance of the Fathers had the Church in Africa been deprived of the power of finally judging cases in Council, and that the Bishop of Rome should send any legate, on his part, they could find ordained by no Council of the Fathers.[2]

(8) The Roman Synod, under Damasus, A.D. 378,[3] which petitioned the Emperor Gratian to grant certain powers to the Roman Bishop,[3] would, had the Fathers present at it known of these Canons, have supported their application by a reference to them.

(9) These Canons were also unknown to the Fathers of Constantinople in 381, and to those of Chalcedon in 451, at both of which the matter of appeals was dealt with.[4] The testimony of the latter is especially weighty, as Paschasinus and the other two Roman Legates at the Synod had received special instructions to oppose any proposals which might infringe upon the prerogative of the Roman Bishops; consequently when Canons IX. and XVII. were under discussion they would necessarily have adduced these Canons had they been genuine, as showing that the procedure proposed to be adopted in these Canons was contrary to the provisions already laid down by Canons of a great Council which had conferred certain privileges on the Bishop whom they represented, and that, therefore, it would be impossible for them to assent thereto.

(10) It is remarkable that Innocent P. I. did not, in the case of St. Chrysostom,[5] make any allusion to them, though, if genuine, they would have naturally been invoked by him, since it would have been an opportunity for exercising the jurisdiction conferred by them in a case which concerned Eastern Patriarchs, one of them, he of Constantinople, already a rival, as the Bishop of New Rome, of his See. This is the more remarkable as Innocent does mention the action taken by the Council of Sardica in favour of St. Athanasius,[6] especially when taken in connection with the fact that St. Leo the Great, in the case of Flavian, did appeal to those Canons, though as Nicene.[7]

(11) Neither did Innocent P. I. make use of them in the case of the two Macedonian Bishops, Bubalius and Taurianus, in A.D. 414. These Bishops had been condemned by the Bishops of Macedonia, and had gone to Rome. The Macedonian Bishops, hearing that Innocent was

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 620 *et seq.*
[2] Mansi, iv. 516.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 207.
[4] *Vide infra*, nn. 342, 404, 409.
[5] *Vide infra*, nn. 718 *et seq.*
[6] Innocent, P. I., *Ep. ad clerum et Populum, C.P.*, Ep. vi.; P.L. xx. 505.
[7] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Theodos.*, Ep. xliii.; P.L. liv. 825; *Ep. ad Theodos.*, Ep. xliv. cap. 3; P.L. liv. 831.

inquiring into the case, wrote to him complaining of his action. Before they received a reply the two Bishops returned, bringing with them forged letters purporting to come from Innocent, probably declaring them to be innocent. The Macedonian Bishops wrote again objecting to Innocent's action. Innocent, in his reply,[1] made no mention of these Canons, which, on the supposition that they are genuine, is inexplicable, as clearly he would then have done so as authorising his action.

(12) If Innocent, in his letter to the African Bishops[2] in A.D. 416, referred to these Canons, though this is more than doubtful,[3] the argument from these cases would be all the stronger, since this would be evidence that they were in existence and known at Rome, which, indeed, is clear from the Canons sent to Gaul referred to below;[4] but to put them forward to Gallic Bishops was a very different matter to doing so to African, who would be quick to discover their true character if forged.

334. (13) These 'Canons' appear to have originally existed only in Latin, as was the case with Canons of African Synods.[5] The earliest Greek text is that preserved in A.D. 556 by John Scholasticus, who was afterwards entrusted with the See of C.P. by the Emperor Justinian, given by Justellus.[6] The Latin text is found 'in three most ancient collections in the West, the *Prisca*, that of Dionysius Exiguus, and Isidore, the genuine and the false.'[7] Now these Collections differ much from each other in the translations which they give of Canons which are known to have originally existed only in Greek, but here they 'strikingly agree,' whilst at the same time they 'strikingly differ' from the Greek text.[8] This circumstance is inconsistent with a 'Sardican' origin of these Canons, inasmuch as both Greeks and Latins took part in that Synod, and any Canons enacted by it would have been like the Synodal letters, drawn up in Greek, from which a Latin translation would have been made, so that it would have been in agreement with, and not different from, the Greek text.

(14) The style in which the Canons are drawn up is also an argument against their enactment by the Council of Sardica. The formulæ 'Hosius episcopus dixit,' 'universi dixerunt, placet,' etc., are distinctly African. Hosius, who presided at Sardica, was also president of the Nicene Synod.[9] It is therefore unlikely that a Synod over which he presided would have adopted an entirely different

[1] S. Innocentius, P. I., *Ep. ad Rufum et Episcopos Macedon.*; P.L. xx. 538, 539.
[2] *Ep. ad Episcopos Carthaginiensis Concilii*, Ep. xxix.; P.L. xx. 583.
[3] *Vide infra*, n. 636. [4] *Vide infra*, n. 334.
[5] Justellus, *Bibliotheca juris Canonici veteris*, pref., tom. i. 19. Paris, 1661.
[6] *Ibid.*, tom. ii. 603.
[7] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. sect. 64. [E.T. ii. 109.] [8] *Ibid.*
[9] *Vide supra*, n. 298.

structure for its Canons, a structure which in that century was only used by African Synods.

(15) This method of drawing up these Canons points to an African origin. Now, it is plain from the case of Apiarius and Canon XVII. of the Synod of Carthage, 418,[1] that discontented Africans, in the early years of the fifth century, went to Rome. A person of this sort would be a likely one to be the forger, and would naturally use the method of drawing up Canons familiar to him, and might well base their contents on the *Rescript* of Gratian, A.D. 378,[2] as Friedrich[3] supposes, a document no doubt held in high esteem at Rome, thus providing an ecclesiastical instead of civil origin for that right of interference with other Churches claimed by Rome. Such a forgery would naturally be of great value to the Roman Bishops for that purpose.

Innocent, however, used them as Nicene. He sent them as Nicene to Gaul; the Sardican Canons 'following the Nicene without a breach and being numbered continuously with them, and having as colophon to the whole 'expliciunt canones cccxviii. episcoporum Niceni transcripti in Urbe Romae de exemplaribus Innocentii episcopi';[4] and if he referred to them in the Letter to the African Bishops noted above, such reference implies the same, which his successor Zosimus distinctly asserted.[5]

Now these 'Canons,' as they stand, are clearly intended to be 'Sardican,' for all the Bishops named in the Latin text as proposing Canons, or who are casually mentioned in them, were either present at or connected with Sardica.[6] The interesting question arises, were they so intended when they were first fabricated and used by Innocent? There would be no difficulty in supposing that this was the case. To a scholar with historical feeling, the Sardican colouring would undoubtedly have presented an obstacle to the use of them as Nicene, but such was not Innocent. On the other hand, it has been suggested that the Sardican colouring was added after the exposure of the fraud in Africa, to give them some, though secondary, authority. The fact that in the *Commonitorium*, which Zosimus sent to Africa, the name Hosius alone occurs, points to these 'Canons' having been first compiled in a simpler form, with the name Hosius in a number of places, and as being really intended to be Nicene. Perhaps the process of elaboration is also seen in the insertion of the name 'Julius' in Canon III., if, as seems probable, no name was in the original draft.

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 609. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 207 *et seq.*

[3] *Cp.* art. 'Are the Canons of Sardica Genuine,' by the Bishop (Wordsworth) of Salisbury in *The Guardian*, No. 2934, Feb. 26, 1902, p. 316.

[4] *Vide* MS. Brussels burgund., 8780-8793, cited by Friedrich, *Die Unächtheit der Canones von Sardica*. *Cp.* the *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1902, p. 377, art. 'The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons,' by C. H. Turner.

[5] *Vide infra*, 610. [6] *Cp.* The Bishop (Wordsworth) of Salisbury, *l.c.*

335. Whichever may be the solution of this question, it is clear that the facts here adduced throw grave doubts on the genuineness of these Canons—doubts which would appear to be strengthened by the fact that the first known use of them in the West (they were never acted on in the East)[1] was by Nicholas P. I., who alleged them in justification of his action in annulling the deposition by Hincmar, Bishop of Rheims, in a Synod held at Soissons, of Rothad, Bishop of that See,[2] though he afterwards alleged as more suitable for his purpose the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*.[3] Were these 'Canons' suffered to drop into oblivion from a consciousness that they were a fraud? For, if they be genuine, it is difficult to suppose that no case occurred until nearly five hundred years after their enactment in which they could be authoritatively appealed to and the procedure prescribed by them acted on. So completely had they been ignored that Hincmar was ignorant of their existence, and filled up Rothad's See notwithstanding his recourse to Nicholas P. I. If the conclusion here shown to be possible—that 'the Canons' are spurious—be correct, the argument against Papalism, which has been drawn from their contents in the earlier part of this chapter, remains unaffected, or rather is strengthened. For if they be not genuine they would represent the extreme limit of the claims made for the Roman Bishop at the date of their fabrication in the Roman interest, claims which have been shown to fall far short of those embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees*.[4]

[1] On the Council *in Trullo* and the Sardican Canons, *vide* note 25.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 234 *et seq.* [3] *Ibid.*
[4] *On the Synodal Letter of the Council of Sardica*, *vide* note 26.

CHAPTER X

THE WITNESS OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 381, AS TO PAPALISM

SECTION XLVII.—*The convocation of the Council.*

336. The cause of the convocation of this Council is very instructive. The Arians had under Emperor Valens greatly increased in strength, the throne of Constantinople being for forty years in their hands. So powerful indeed had they become, that Catholics had not possession of a single Church in the Imperial City.

Valens died in A.D. 378, and his successor Gratian issued an *Edict* of toleration in A.D. 379, by which the position of Catholics was much improved. Under the guidance of St. Gregory Nazienzen, who had been given to them, not as a Bishop, but as a Diocesan administrator,[1] they were enabled to worship in a Church which was made out of a house of a relative, and 'to which he gave the significant name of Anastasia.'[2]

By St. Gregory's unceasing labours the Nicene faith once more obtained a firm hold in Constantinople, and the enmity of the Arians was consequently increased, St. Gregory being naturally a special object of their hatred. To the difficulties of a position already sufficiently arduous, was added the opposition of his false friend Maximus, the Cynic who succeeded in getting himself consecrated Bishop, and laid claim to the See of Constantinople.

337. Such was the state of affairs when Theodosius I., a Catholic, who had received from Gratian the dignity of joint-Emperor, with the government of the East, determined to put an end to religious dissensions and to require all his subjects to confess the Orthodox faith. What steps did he take to accomplish his object? Did he call upon the Bishop of Rome, as the supreme judge of all the faithful, to condemn by a final and irreformable judgment the fautors of Arianism together 'with its Pneumatochean offshoot,' and once for all settle by his decision the question of the position of Maximus?

Obviously, on the supposition that Papalism be true, such a course would not only have been the correct one to adopt, but also the only remedy for the existing evils. For St. Damasus, the then Bishop of

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. vii. sect. 95. [E.T. ii. 340.]

[2] *Ibid.*

Rome, as 'the legitimate successor of Peter' in the Roman Chair, possessing 'a real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' could alone give a decision admittedly incapable of review by any other authority, and therefore final. An assemblage of Bishops, however great, would not possess on Papalist principles any such final authority, for whatever decision they arrived at on these principles would derive all its authority from 'Papal confirmation,'[1] which might be refused.

338. Theodosius, instead of submitting the questions troubling his people to 'the Supreme judge,' summoned a Council to decide all necessary matters, which met in May A.D. 381. He did not even invite Damasus to be present at the Synod, which, in fact, was composed entirely of Easterns.[2] He further convoked the Council *proprio motu*; evidently he knew nothing of the idea that to the Popes alone belongs the right of convoking Œcumenical Councils, and this is clearly perceived by Baronius[3] and other Papal writers, who have accordingly striven to show that Damasus really summoned the Council, an attempt in which, the facts being what they are, they egregiously fail.

Section XLVIII.—*The Presidency of the Council.*

339. The President of the Council was St. Meletius, Bishop of Antioch. Now this Prelate was at this time not in communion with the See of Rome, by which Paulinus was regarded as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch.[4] From this it follows, if Papalism be true, that the Council was presided over by one who was 'outside the edifice,' 'separated from the fold,' 'exiled from the kingdom,'[5] and yet is recognised as Œcumenical by the Church. This fact itself is a plain proof that Papalism cannot have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age'[6] of the Church, because in that case a Council presided over by one who was not a member of 'the One Flock under the one Chief Shepherd,'[7] would necessarily have been held to share the schismatical position of its President, and therefore St. Meletius would not have been permitted to occupy the position he did, or if he had been so permitted to act, the Council would have been repudiated as schismatical.

340. The conclusion here drawn is further strengthened by the fact that on the death of St. Meletius the Council, notwithstanding the

1 *On Papal Confirmation of Councils, vide infra* n. 1017 *et seq.*
2 *On the position of Ascholius of Thessalonica*, who attended the Synod, *vide* note 27.
3 Baronius, *Annales Eccl.*, ad ann. 381, nn. 19, 20, tom. v. 499-500. Lucæ, 1729.
4 *Vide infra*, n. 592. 5 *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35. 6 *Ibid.*, p. 39.
7 *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

advice of St. Gregory Nazianzen, who succeeded[1] him in the office of President, declined to be party to an agreement which had been made 'during the lifetime of St. Meletius, that when either of the two orthodox Bishops of Antioch, Meletius or Paul, died, no new Bishop should be elected in his place, but the survivor should be universally acknowledged.'[2] Instead of doing this, the Fathers of the Council permitted a successor to be chosen by the Bishops of the Dioceses of Antioch and Asia, and confirmed the election made of Flavian. In so doing they entirely ignored Paulinus, who on 'Papal' principles was the true Bishop of the See, being in communion with the 'Chief Shepherd,' the Bishop of Rome, and treated the See as vacant by the death of St. Meletius, whom they regarded as the legitimate occupant of the Antiochene throne. Clearly the Fathers of Constantinople knew nothing of the claim made in the *Satis Cognitum* that those who are not in communion with the Bishop of Rome have no 'right and power of ruling'; and of what also, if Papalism were true, would be the fact, viz., that, as Vincenzi asserts,[3] St. Flavian was an intruder into the Antiochene Church.[4]

Section XLIX.—*The case of Maximus the Cynic.*

341. The first act of the Synod was to investigate the case of Maximus the Cynic, whose consecration to the See of Constantinople was alleged to be uncanonical and irregular. In the result the Council pronounced that he had never been made a Bishop, so that all his episcopal acts were invalid,[5] a decision which they afterwards embodied in the Fourth Canon.

It is evident that the Council were ignorant that 'since by the divine right of the Apostolic Primacy the Roman Pontiff presides over the universal Church,' 'he is the supreme judge of the faithful,' 'to whose judgment in all cases pertaining to ecclesiastical discipline recourse may be had.'[6] For the Synod, presided over, as has been seen, by one who, on Papal principles, was not a member 'of the One Flock under the Chief Shepherd,' acted as the supreme authority from which no appeal was possible; filling up the See, which they declared to be vacant, by the consecration of St. Gregory Nazianzen, and afterwards, on his death, by that of Nectarius.

[1] On the reason why he so presided, *vide* note 28.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvii. sect. 96. [E.T. ii. 346.]

[3] The Greek Church commemorates him on September 26th, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, *sub v.* 'Flavianus I. of Antioch,' vol. ii. 531.

[4] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, cap. viii. p. 231.

[5] *Vide* note 29.

[6] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

SECTION L.—*Canon II.*

342. By the second Canon the Council decreed that

'The Bishops of another Diocese shall not pass over to foreign Churches and introduce confusion among them; but, in accordance with the Canons, the Bishop of Alexandria shall govern the affairs of Egypt only, and the Eastern Bishops shall have charge of the affairs of the East only, whilst the rights of the Antiochian Church, as declared in the Sixth Canon of Nicæa, shall be preserved; and the Bishops of the diocese of Asia (Ephesus) shall only have jurisdiction over Asia, those of the dioceses of Pontus over Pontus, and those of the dioceses of Thrace over Thrace. Unless summoned, the Bishops shall not go beyond their own dioceses for the purpose of ordination or any other ecclesiastical function. While, however, the existing Canon with regard to the dioceses is observed, it is clear that in each eparchy (province) the Provincial Synod must rule in accordance with the decisions of Nicæa. But the Churches of God among the barbarian nations shall be governed according to the custom prevailing from the times of the Fathers.'[1]

343. The Council here (*a*) first prohibited Bishops from interfering in other dioceses. The prohibition no doubt in the first place applies to the chief Bishop of a civil 'Diocese,' or, as he was afterwards called, Patriarch or Exarch, but it clearly equally prohibits any such interference by the Bishops under his jurisdiction. The prohibition is couched in absolute terms, which would have been impossible for the Council to use had it been 'the belief of the age' in which it was held that the Roman Pontiff possesses *jure divino* 'full,' 'supreme,' 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' 'truly episcopal' jurisdiction over all churches. Such action in that case would have been *ultra vires*, an infringement of the Divine Constitution of the Church, hence the conclusion must be drawn that Papalism was unknown to this Council, and therefore cannot be true.

344. (*b*) Secondly, the Council, by this Canon, enacted 'that in each eparchy (province) the Provincial Synod must rule in accordance with the decisions of Nicæa.' The rights of the Provinces comprised in the different Patriarchates needed special protection, owing to the tendency of the Patriarch to arrogate power to himself, and by this Canon the Council sought to safeguard these rights.

The Canon, by thus carefully confining the power of the Patriarchs, thereby, too, excluded any appeal to Rome. The Council thus showed that it held itself competent to deal with these matters as the supreme authority in the Church without any reference to any external power,

[1] Mansi, iii. 727. Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvii. sect. 98. [E.T. ii. 355.

and the position which it confirms to the Provincial Synods is as opposed to Papalism as is the Canon of Nicæa,[1] to which it refers.

345. The Sixth Canon ascribed to this Council probably, as Hefele says,[2] was not the act of this Council, but of the subsequent one held in the next year at Constantinople, which was largely composed of the same Bishops.[3] It confirms the evidence afforded by the Canon under consideration, that the Papal Monarchy was unknown in the days of the Council, for it lays down that 'if the comprovincial bishops are not in a position to punish a bishop for the offences with which he is charged, they (the accusers) shall have recourse to the larger Synod of the Bishops of the Diocese (Patriarchate), who must be summoned for the purpose.'[4] The Court so constituted is treated as the final tribunal, an appeal even to an Œcumenical Council being prohibited. That an appeal lay of right to the Bishop of Rome as 'the Supreme Judge of the Faithful' was evidently not within the knowledge of the Fathers of both these Councils.

Section LI.—*Canon III.*

346. The text of the Canon is as follows:—

> 'The Bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is the New Rome.'

Constantine had a great dislike for Rome, and, after considering other sites, determined to build Constantinople as the Imperial City. It was founded in A.D. 327, 328, or 329, and solemnly consecrated 11 May A.D. 330.[5] It was natural that both the Emperor and the Bishop of the See should desire that Constantinople, thus elevated to be the seat of the Imperial Government, and the residence of the Emperor as New Rome, should hold the same place in ecclesiastical rank as it did in civil, viz. that it should have precedence immediately after Old Rome.

347. The Council, in decreeing that this should be the case, acted in accordance with the principle which was expressed in the Ninth Canon of the Council of Antioch *in Ænceniis* in 341, whereby it is enacted that 'the Bishops of every Province must be aware that the Bishop presiding in the Metropolis (the civil capital) has charge of the whole Province; because all who have business come together from all quarters to the Metropolis. For this reason it is decided that he should also hold the foremost rank, and that without him the other Bishops should, according to the ancient and recognised canon of our Fathers, do nothing beyond what concerns their respective dioceses and the

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 303 *et seq.*
[2] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. ii. 366.]
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvii. sect. 102. [E.T. ii. 378.]
[4] Mansi, iii. 559.
[5] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, *sub v.* 'Constantine,' vol. i. 631-632.

districts belonging thereto, for every Bishop has authority over his own diocese, and must govern it according to his conscience and take charge of the whole region surrounding his episcopal city, ordaining priests and deacons, and discharging all his duties with circumspection. Further than this he may not venture without the Metropolitan, nor the latter without consulting the other Bishops.'[1]

348. The Council in this Canon places, so far as the ground of their respective positions in the ecclesiastical hierarchy is concerned, both the See of Old Rome and that of New Rome on exactly the same level. They assign as the reason why the See of Constantinople should be elevated above the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch, which had been recognised as occupying by ancient custom the second and third places respectively, the fact that Constantinople was the new Capital of the Empire, and therefore had a right to the next place after the See seated in the ancient Capital. This plainly shows that the position held by the latter rested, in the opinion of the Fathers of the Council, on a political basis. Hence it follows that they knew nothing of the monarchical position asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Bishops of Rome. For otherwise to have adduced the position held by the Bishop of 'Old Rome' as the reason for the elevation of him of 'New Rome' to a pre-eminence of rank next to him would have been not merely misleading, but an explicit denial of the unique prerogative belonging to the Roman Pontiff as 'Vicar of Christ,' by virtue of which he exercises 'in the Church the power which He exercised during His mortal life,' being, as the successor of Peter, 'Master' over the Episcopate as He was over 'the Apostolic College.'[2]

Had Papalism been 'the venerable and constant belief of the Church' in this 'age,' the Fathers of Constantinople, if they desired to advance the See of New Rome to a rank which should be next that of 'the Apostolic See,'[3] would of necessity have been careful to emphasise the essential difference between the position occupied *jure divino* by the Roman Pontiff and that which by their act they conferred on the See of Constantinople, the former being one of 'sovereign authority,' whereby the Roman Bishop had 'full power of ruling and governing the Universal Church' as an essential element in the Divine Constitution of the Church, whilst the latter was a mere honorary precedence granted by the Synod, and not inherent in the See by the institution of Christ.

349. Vincenzi with his usual acuteness perceives that this Canon cannot be harmonised with Papalism. He accordingly denies that this Council enacted it, asserting that the Synod was concerned only

[1] Mansi, ii. 1399.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.
[3] On the title 'Apostolic See,' *vide supra*, nn. 8, 9.

with the condemnation of Macedonianism. He argues that of the Canons ascribed to it, I., II. and III. (which he counts as one), and IV. were the work of the Synod held at Constantinople in the following year, A.D. 382,[1] the rest being forgeries intruded into the Codex of the Canons by some unknown pen.[2] There is of course no foundation for thus treating the Canon, which the learned theologian admits to be irreconcilable with Papalism. The first four Canons are recognised as genuine by all the great commentators on the Councils. It may be added that with regard to the Canon under comment, Hefele, after noting that 'Baronius took pains to discredit the genuineness of this Canon,' states, 'but he is certainly wrong, as it is not only given in the old collections of Canons, but also by Socrates and Sozomen, who testify that this Council published such a decree.'[3]

350. The fact that a writer like Vincenzi is forced to fall back upon such a method of dealing with historical documents affords the testimony of a competent, though unwilling, witness that the genuine Canons of this Council cannot by any ingenuity or special pleading be so interpreted as not to conflict with prerogatives asserted in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop. The importance of this witness is great, and may well be considered conclusive on the point.

[1] Hefele (*op. cit.*, bk. vii. sect. 98. [E.T. ii. pp. 352, 353, 368]) refers Canons V. and VI. to the Council of C.P. 382, and Canon VII. to a much later date: it was adopted, with an addition, by the Council *in Trullo* in its Ninety-fifth Canon.

[2] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, cap. viii. p. 231.

[3] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* [E.T. ii. 357.] Hefele gives references to Socrates v. 8, and Sozomen vii. 9.

CHAPTER XI

THE WITNESS OF THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, A.D. 431, AS TO PAPALISM

SECTION LII.—*Cyril, Celestine, and Nestorius.*

351. Nestorius, who had succeeded Sisinnius as Patriarch of Constantinople on April 10, A.D. 428, soon after put forth the heresy which has been named after him. His denial of the Unity of the Person of Christ, and consequently that Mary was 'θεοτόκος,' spread widely, especially amongst the Monks of Egypt. St. Cyril of Alexandria found it necessary to actively oppose its advance; setting forth, both in Sermons and in a letter to the Monks, the Catholic doctrine that the Logos united with the Human Nature was born of Mary. This treatise was brought to Constantinople, and occasioned considerable excitement. St. Cyril then wrote his first letter to Nestorius, in which he insisted that unfavourable reports had come to the East with reference to Nestorius, and that it was his duty to pacify all those who had taken offence at the use of the expression θεοτόκος.[1]

352. Meanwhile Celestine, Bishop of Rome, had written to Cyril inquiring as to the genuineness of certain sermons of Nestorius, at which he and the neighbouring Bishops, who had read them, were greatly scandalised. If Papalism be true, such an inquiry, emanating from the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, whose office it is to teach and rule the Pastors of the whole Church with their flocks in the way of salvation, would demand an immediate answer from his subordinate. Cyril, however, did not reply for nearly a whole year, some four months after he had written a second time to Nestorius. Finding his correspondence with the Patriarch useless, he wrote to Celestine. He gives as his reason for so doing that 'long standing customs of the churches' induce him to communicate to him the facts with reference to the question. There was a recognised obligation on all Bishops to communicate their needs to each other,[2] but St. Cyril not improbably refers to the traditional relation existing between the See of Alexandria, as the Church of St. Mark, the disciple of Peter, and the See of Rome,[3] of which St. Peter was one of the founders, a connection of which

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ix. ch. i. sect. 129. [E.T., iii. 19.]
[2] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xiv. 345.
[3] *Vide infra*, n. 1258.

St. Cyril, anxious to gain the support of the Bishop of Old Rome in a controversy involving the conduct of the Bishop of New Rome, would naturally be glad to make the most. After describing the sad condition of things at Constantinople, and the grief of the Bishops at Nestorianism, he said: 'I was unwilling to break off communion with him until I had laid these particulars before you. Be so good, therefore, as to formulate your opinion[1] as to whether we ought still to communicate with him, or to tell him plainly that if he persists in his opinions he will be abandoned by everybody. It would be proper for you to send to the Bishops of Macedonia and the East a written exposition of your views on this point; and that your Holiness may be thoroughly informed both as to his opinions and those of the Fathers, I send you the books in which the passages are marked. I have got them translated as well as they could be done at Alexandria. I send you also the letters I have written.'[2] St. Cyril's language shows that he had already made up his mind as to the proper course to be pursued, and that his object was to have the Bishop of Rome, the first of his 'fellow-ministers,' on his side.

353. In consequence of St. Cyril's communication, Celestine held a Council at Rome, and on the 11th of August A.D. 430, in a Synodal Letter, he wrote informing him of the result of the Council, and authorising St. Cyril, 'the authority of our See, having been combined with yours, and acting authoritatively in our stead, will carry out this sentence with due severity; that is, that unless within ten days after receiving our admonition, Nestorius anathematises his heterodox doctrine in writing, and positively declares that he holds that faith with regard to the Nativity of Christ our God which both the Roman and the Church of thy Holiness, and all Christians in general, hold, your Holiness is to provide for the Church there (Constantinople), and he is to understand that he is in every way separated from our body.'[3]

Celestine also communicated 'our sentence, or rather the divine sentence of Christ our Lord,' as he calls it in his letter, to John of Antioch, Rufus of Thessalonica, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Flavian of Philippi.

354. Celestine wrote also on the same date to Nestorius himself, warning him that 'if he persisted in his stubbornness of perverse disposition, and did not preach the things which Cyril, their brother, preached together with him, the Clergy of Constantinople and all should understand that he was separated from the College [of Bishops], with whom he could not hold communion, and that he was clearly to understand that if he did not preach concerning Christ our God the things which both the Roman, the Alexandrian, and the whole Catholic

[1] τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν. The Latin translation is, *quid hic sentias prescribere.*

[2] Mansi, iv. 1011.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1017-1022.

Church holds, and which the most holy Church of the City of Constantinople held firmly until his days, and condemned openly and by written acknowledgment the perfidious novelty which tends to put asunder that which the venerable Scripture joins, within ten days from the receipt of this admonition, he would be cast out from the communion of the Universal Church.'[1]

Celestine, it will be noted, sets forth, as that which is required of Nestorius, agreement not with a definition of faith put forth by himself as the infallible teacher of all Christians, but with the teaching of 'the Roman, the Alexandrian, and the whole Catholic Church.'

355. Cyril, having received Celestine's letter, after a delay of some weeks summoned a Council at Alexandria, 'most likely in November' A.D. 430, in whose name he wrote a Synodal Letter, commonly called 'The Third Epistle of Cyril to Nestorius.'[2] In this he said: 'Therefore, together with the holy Council assembled in great Rome under the presidency of our most holy and reverend brother and fellow-minister, the Bishop Celestine, we notify to you by this third letter charging you to abstain from such stupid and perverted dogmas as you hold, and teach and choose the right faith which has been delivered down to the Churches from the beginning, through the holy Apostles and Evangelists who have been eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word. And if your Piety does not, according to the time set forth in the letter of the above-mentioned, our most holy and reverend brother Celestine, Bishop of the Church of the Romans, know that you will have no portion with us or rank amongst God's Priests and Bishops.' Cyril adds: 'It will not be sufficient for your Reverence merely to agree to the symbol of the faith which was once set forth through the Holy Spirit by the great and holy Council which formerly assembled at Nicæa . . . you must, in express words, solemnly declare that you anathematise these your foul and profane opinions, and will hold and teach, as we all do, the Bishops and Doctors and Heads of the people in the West and the East, and both the holy Council at Rome hath agreed, and we all, with the letter written to your Reverence by the Church of the Alexandrians, as being correct and blameless. And we have subjoined in these our letters what you must hold and teach and from what abstain.'[3]

356. St. Cyril in this letter refers to the authority of the Roman *Council* as that to which the Synod of Alexandria joins itself, and it is with the doctrine of the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, 'the Bishops and Doctors and Heads of the people in the West and East,' that Nestorius is summoned to express his agreement, not to submit to

[1] Celestinus, P. I., *Ep. ad Nestorium*; Mansi, iv. 1025-1036.
[2] Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, vol. ii. p. 293.
[3] S. Cyril Alex., *Ep.* iii. *ad Nestorium*; P.G. lxxvii. 112.

an *ex cathedra* decision of Celestine as supreme judge, and this too, in a way, settled by St. Cyril and his Council and not by Celestine. The authority of the *two* Councils is thus appealed to as conclusive, and not any supreme authority inherent in the Roman See; and further, in a letter to the Monks of Constantinople, St. Cyril uses language which shows that he did not regard Celestine's authorisation to combine the authority of his See with that of his own, as granting to him any 'authority' of a *nature* differing from that which, as Bishop of Alexandria, he possessed. For in this letter he says that, as Nestorius 'had continued in his heresy, or even adding blasphemy to blasphemy, and introducing strange and foreign dogmas which the holy Catholic Church has not known, we have thought fit to admonish him with a third letter, viz. this which is sent forth from us, and from our most holy and religious brother and fellow-minister, Celestine, Bishop of Great Rome.'[1]

357. This association of the two letters of St. Cyril and Celestine would necessarily have been impossible had the latter prelate possessed, 'by the institution of Christ, full and supreme power of jurisdiction in the universal Church,' and 'the whole plenitude of this supreme jurisdiction,' because in that case his letter would have possessed a unique authority which the letters of no other Bishop could have; an authority to which Nestorius, as well as every other member of the Church, would be bound to render obedience.

358. St. Cyril's letter to John of Antioch confirms the conclusion drawn from the other parts of the correspondence on the subject, viz. that he knew nothing of any sovereign position belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop. He does not ascribe the sentence which Celestine authorised him to execute to Celestine alone, but to 'the holy Roman Synod,' which, he says, has given a plain direction, 'with which all must comply who do not wish to be cut off from communion with the whole West,' adding that 'he himself should follow what they had judged, fearing lest he should be cut off from the communion of so many.'[2] St. Cyril thus ascribes the judgment to the Council, and describes the result of non-compliance as being, not separation from the 'One Flock under One Supreme Shepherd,' but from 'the communion of so many,' 'the whole West.' And it is significant that it is on the risk of this new breach with the West, Egypt, and perhaps Macedonia, that John of Antioch himself lays stress in his letter to Nestorius, urging him not to continue in his present attitude. Papalism would require that the direction should have been received by Cyril as the act of the Supreme Judge. No Synod, however numerous, could add to the authority of the Supreme Pastor; 'the Supreme

[1] Mansi, iv. 1097, 1098.

[2] S. Cyril Alex., *Ep. ad Joannem Antiochinum.* Mansi, iv. 1051.

Judge' had spoken, and the sovereign Ruler and infallible guide must be obeyed, under penalty of being separated from the One Flock. That St. Cyril did not do so corroborates the conclusion drawn from the rest of the letters which have been discussed.

359. The whole attitude of the mind of St. Cyril shows that he knew nothing of Papalism, and it is not surprising that, St. Cyril's own language being incapable of being twisted into harmony with the claims of the Papacy, the busy forgers, in the Roman interest, compiled 'extracts' of their own as from his writings, by means of which they succeeded, in a less critical age than the present, in deceiving many, amongst them St. Thomas Aquinas, into believing that the great Patriarch of Alexandria taught that the Pope is the sovereign Ruler and supreme Teacher of the Church;[1] that it was thought necessary to do this is conclusive proof that the genuine writings of St. Cyril afford no support to Papalism.

Section LIII.—*The convocation of the Council of Ephesus.*

360. Before, however, the deputies from Alexandria arrived at Constantinople, the Emperor Theodosius II. had, on 19th November A.D. 430, summoned an Œcumenical Council to be held at Ephesus at Pentecost in the following year. His circular Letter was addressed to all Metropolitans, requesting them to bring with them some of the Bishops of their respective Provinces, whom they judged fit.

In this Letter the Emperor refers to the controversy which had arisen in the Church, and prohibited any new step to be privately taken by any individual whomsoever before the Holy Synod had assembled and 'the common sentence of the same which will be given by all.'[2]

361. The terms of this summons, as well as its issue, prove that the Emperor did not regard the Bishop of Rome of his 'age' as the sovereign ruler of the Church possessed of 'supreme power' over it, as otherwise he would have merely applied to Celestine for a formal decision *ex cathedra* on the question disturbing the peace of the Church, and enforcing the decision when so given with the civil arm would have speedily put an end to the troubles which beset the Church, had any one been found to disregard the judgment of the Supreme Pastor and Teacher of all Christians.

That the Emperor's action was taken after Celestine's letter to Cyril corroborates the conclusion drawn from it, for if it had been an *ex cathedra* judgment in a matter of faith, the cause was closed and could not be reopened, since on Papal principles none can review the judgment of the Apostolic See.[3]

[1] On these forgeries *see* note 30.

[2] *Ep. Impp. Theodosii et Valentiniani ad Cyrillum Alex.* Mansi, iv. 1111-1116.

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

The Letter convoking the Council shows that in that age the sole means of finally terminating a controversy of this character was an Œcumenical Synod, wherein 'a common sentence' would 'be given by all,' not a judgment by the Bishop of Rome as 'Supreme Judge of all the Faithful,' assembling it may be a number of Bishops around him, but in no way deriving his power or authority to give such decision from the Council.

362. Additional testimony to this is furnished by the fact that the convocation of the Council at once put an end to the carrying out of the sentence of Celestine and St. Cyril with their Synods, and arrested its effect. The Emperor had called into existence a higher authority, and what had been done was superseded by the assembling of an Œcumenical Synod, so that after discussion and examination of the question by those of whom the Emperor in his letter to St. Cyril says 'it behoves them to be its judges who preside over the priesthood everywhere,'[1] 'the common sentence of all' might be given: as Bossuet says, 'All is suspended after that the authority of the Universal Council is awaited.'[2] The Bishops collectively, 'the One Episcopate,' are thus clearly shown to be superior to any other authority in the Church, which is a direct contradiction to the assertion in the *Satis Cognitum* that 'the Roman Pontiffs, whose jurisdiction extends to the whole Christian commonwealth, must have all its parts, even taken collectively, subject and obedient to their authority.'[3]

363. Lastly, the fact that the Council was summoned by the Emperor is inconsistent with, and opposed to, the Papal pretension as to the prerogative of the Roman Pontiff in this matter of convening Councils.[4] It must be added that there is no evidence whatever that Celestine was ever consulted before the Imperial citation was issued; on the contrary, the evidence makes it certain he was not. It is probable that the Emperor was moved to convoke the Council by the demands of both the Orthodox at Constantinople and Nestorius[5] that the controversy should be settled in this way.

Section LIV.—*The Presidency of the Council.*

364. On Monday the 22nd of June A.D. 431, the Council assembled under the presidency of Cyril. It is alleged that he occupied this position because Celestine had delegated to him power to act in his stead, and therefore he presided as his deputy. Even if this were true, it would prove nothing from the 'Papal' point of view, as the Council

[1] *Ep. Impp. Theod. et Valent.*, *ubi supra*.

[2] Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars iii. lib. vii. cap. x. vol. ii. p. 15. Lugani, 1766.

[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.

[4] *Vide supra*, n. 286.

[5] Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 7; P.G. lxxxvi. 2433.

might well admit 'the deputy' of the First Bishop to have the place which, if present, he would, in accordance with ancient custom, have the right personally to occupy; whilst, on the other hand, if Cyril presided in right of his own See, this would be a legitimate argument against the Papal claim that the Pope, as 'Vicar of Christ' and 'Supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' has necessarily the right to preside over an Œcumenical Council.

365. Now, in considering this question, it is to be observed that in the absence of the Bishop of the First See in rank at a Council which had to investigate charges against the Bishop of the Second See in rank, the office of President would naturally fall to the Bishop of Alexandria, and direct evidence would be required that he presided in virtue of a delegation from Celestine. There is no such evidence. It is of course true that Celestine had, as has been seen,[1] authorised Cyril to combine the authority of his See with that of his own for a specific purpose, but that 'commission, so to call it, had been exhausted.'[2] There is nothing whatever in Celestine's letter so authorising him delegating Cyril to preside at the Council, as indeed there could not have been, as it was written some months before the Emperor convoked the Synod, and consequently neither Celestine who wrote the letter nor Cyril to whom it was addressed could have had in mind what was not then contemplated.

366. In the next place, Celestine did formally commission the Bishops Arcadius and Projectus and the Presbyter Philip to represent him, and in the Acts of the Council the term 'legate' is applied to them only. No doubt the Council recognised him as 'managing the place of Celestine,' in the same way as Flavian of Philippi was recognised as occupying the place of Rufus of Thessalonica,[3] as it was through him that the negotiations with the West with reference to Nestorius had taken place, and as they were aware he had been commissioned to act as his representative in giving the formal notice to Nestorius of what Cyril considered to be the decision of the 'Holy Roman Synod';[4] but the statements of the 'legates' are explicit as to the fact that they were commissioned to supply his presence,[5] they so subscribed the Acts of the Council at the Third Session;[6] in the Synodal Letter addressed to the Emperor they are designated as those 'who supply the presence of the most holy Bishop Celestine, most beloved of God,'[7] and also in the Synodal Letter to Celestine as those who by 'their presence exhibited Celestine's to them *and filled the place of the Apostolic See*.'[8] In the subscriptions to the Synodal Letter to the Church of Constantinople, St. Cyril signed in the capacity of 'Bishop

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 353.
[2] Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, vol. ii. p. 311.
[3] Mansi, ii. 1224, 1280.
[4] *Ibid.*, iv. 1051.
[5] *Ibid.*, 1295.
[6] *Ibid.*, 1299.
[7] *Ibid.*, 1302.
[8] *Ibid.*, 1337.

of Alexandria' first before any of the Legates, whilst Philip, who signed next, is expressly entitled Presbyter of the Church of the Apostles [*i.e.* Rome], and Arcadius and Projectus, who signed fourth and fifth (after Juvenal of Jerusalem), are entitled 'legates,'[1] designations which describe their position as representatives of Celestine. This evidence would appear conclusive that Cyril presided at the Council, and did so in right of his See.[2]

Section LV.—*The case of Nestorius.*

367. What attitude did the Council adopt towards Nestorius? The period of ten days of grace named by Celestine had expired on the previous 17th December. On Papalist principles Nestorius was therefore a heretic upon whom a final decree, which might not be 'reviewed,' had been passed by the 'Supreme Judge of the Faithful.' Did the Fathers of Ephesus consider the matter closed and Nestorius 'outside the fold'? Certainly not. It having been decided to open the Council, four Bishops were sent to notify Nestorius of the determination come to. On the opening of the Synod two deputations were sent to him; he was thus thrice summoned to take his seat[3] with the other bishops; his rank as one of God's priests and bishops was duly recognised, and even after he declined to obey the three citations to attend the Council, he was still spoken of by St. Cyril and other Bishops as the 'most pious,' 'the most religious bishop.'

368. In the next place, the Synod having thus shown that it considered Nestorius to be still holding his rank as Bishop of Constantinople, proceeded to investigate the case *de novo*. The sentence which Celestine and Cyril, with their respective Synods, had pronounced was thus further ignored. First, the Creed of Nicæa was read, and then the Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius. Then, in answer to Cyril's question, 'I am persuaded that I have in nothing departed from the orthodox faith or the Nicene Creed; wherefore I beseech your Holinesses to set forth openly whether I have written this correctly, blamelessly, and in accordance with the Holy Council,'[4] all the Bishops present in order gave their judgment that 'the Nicene Creed and the Second Letter of Cyril in all things agree and harmonise.' Both question and answer are significant in view of the fact that this Letter had already received the approval of Celestine.

Then was read the reply which Nestorius had sent to the Letter of Cyril which had just been read, and he was anathematised by all the bishops. Afterwards Celestine's Synodal Letter and Cyril's Third Letter

[1] Mansi, iv. 1303.

[2] On the statement with reference to Cyril in the Synodal Letter to the Emperor, *vide* note 31.

[3] Mansi, iv. 1131-1132.

[4] *Ibid.*, 1138, 1140.

were read without remark. This is also significant, as the former, on Papalist principles, was an *ex cathedra* condemnation of Nestorius, and so final, and the latter contained the notification of this final decision. The Council should therefore have treated the question as decided. Instead of this, they proceeded to submit it to a thorough investigation.

369. Passages from various Fathers were read 'in which the ancient faith respecting the union of the Godhead and manhood in Christ was expressed.'[1] Then, 'in opposition to these patristic passages, there were read twenty passages, some longer and some shorter, from the writings of Nestorius, in which his fundamental views were expressed in separate parts and *in concreto*.'[2] It was not till this process of investigation had been carefully gone through that the Synod proceeded to the condemnation of Nestorius.

370. The sentence is as follows:—'The Holy Synod said: Since, in addition to other things, the most impious Nestorius has neither been willing to obey our citations nor to receive the most holy and God-fearing Bishops sent by us to him, we have necessarily proceeded to the examination of his ungodly doctrines. And having discovered from his letters and treatises, as well as discourses delivered in this metropolis which have been testified to, that he holds and teaches impious doctrines, we, necessarily impelled by the Canons (ἀναγκαίως κατετειχθέντες ἀπό τε τῶν κανόνων) and in accordance with (ἐκ) the letter of our most holy Father[3] and fellow-minister Celestine, the Bishop of the Church of the Romans, we have come with many tears to this sorrowful sentence against him, viz. that our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he has blasphemed, decrees by this most holy Synod that Nestorius is excluded from the Episcopal dignity and every priestly assembly.'[4]

371. It is plain that the judgment was the deliberate act of the Synod itself. The whole procedure adopted by the Fathers shows this. Had they regarded Celestine's sentence as one which was final and incapable of review, as that of the sovereign authority of the Supreme Judge, all that they could have done in that case would have been to inquire whether Nestorius had, before the expiration of the ten days named in Celestine's letter, signified his agreement therewith, and in the event of it being shown that he had not done so, simply announced that Nestorius had been 'separated from the Fold' and was 'exiled from the Kingdom.' This would have been

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ix. ch. ii. sect. 134. [E.T. iii. 48.]

[2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* [E.T. iii. 50.]

[3] In view of the use which it has been sought to make of this title by Papalists, it may be well to note that Cyril was entitled 'our most holy' or 'most pious Father' many times by the Bishops of the Council [Mansi, iv. 1140 *et seq.*], and the expression was also applied to others. Mansi, vi. 1055 *et seq.*; vii. 265, 493.

[4] Mansi, iv. 1211, 1212.

their simple duty as subject to the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' who rules and governs the Universal Church. The course they adopted was, as has been seen, entirely incompatible with any such belief on their part. If it be sought to base an allegation that they in their Synodal Decree of deposition merely acted as Celestine's delegates on the mention of his letter in the sentence, it is enough to reply that they had shown by their acts that they had not obeyed it, regarding Nestorius as a legitimate Bishop until they had deposed him, and the mention of the letter is quite sufficiently accounted for by the fact that they regarded the See of Rome as the first in rank, and thus being of special dignity in the Episcopate, so that it had a special interest in that maintenance of the faith, which was a duty incumbent on all the members of the One Episcopate. Besides this, they would also desire to have the support of that See in what they had done, affecting as it did the position of the occupant of the throne next in rank to it, and possessing powerful friends at the Court and amongst those Easterns who were jealous of the part which the See of Alexandria had taken in the matter, which would tend to elevate that See and lessen the influence of Antioch, the Bishops of which Patriarchate would be opposed to the result of the Synod, as they soon showed.

372. That the deposition was the act of the Council is further emphasised by the *Edict* in which it was announced the next day to Nestorius, viz. : 'The Holy Synod assembled at Ephesus, by the grace of God and pursuant to the decree of our most pious Emperor, to Nestorius the new Judas: Know that for thy impious doctrines thou wast deposed by the Holy Synod agreeably to the laws of the Church, and declared to be excluded from all ecclesiastical dignities, on the 22nd day of this present month of June.'[1] As the sovereign authority, the Synod had passed against him 'a canonical and apostolical judgment,'[2] and deposed him.

373. That the Fathers of the Council had the right to act as they did was admitted by Celestine in his letter, which was brought by the legates of the Western Church to the Synod. In it Celestine says: 'The charge of the teaching committed [to the Apostles] has descended in common to all the Priests [*i.e.* Bishops] of the Lord. We are all engaged in it by an hereditary right who throughout the world preach in the name of the Lord in their stead to whom it was said, Go, teach all nations: You are to observe, brethren, that the order which we have received is a general order. He willed also that we should all execute it who committed the duty to them all in common; it is necessary that we should all follow in due course our predecessors. We ought all to enter into their labours to whom we all succeed in honour. . . . We must act by labouring in common,

[1] Mansi, iv. 1227, 1228. [2] *Ibid.*, 1288.

that we may preserve that which has been entrusted [to us] and hitherto retained by the Apostolical succession. For this is now required of us, that we should walk according to the Apostle. . . . We must take up spiritual arms. . . . The blessed Apostle Paul admonishes all who are now stationed in the place where he ordered Timothy to remain. . . . The same place, then, the same cause even now requires that very duty which Timothy understood as incumbent on him, lest any one should think otherwise. Let us be of one mind.'[1]

374. Celestine clearly acknowledges that the Bishops were appointed by Christ in the persons of the Apostles as the teachers of His Church, and places himself in their rank.[2] He recognises their right and duty as regards the preservation of the faith as successors of the Apostles sharing in common the Apostolical Commission. In fact, that the 'One Episcopate' succeeds to the 'One Apostolate' in power and obligations.

375. At the conclusion of his letter, Celestine says that what he had 'previously ordained' was to be 'carried out' by his legates, and that he does not doubt but that the Council will assent to it, since what is being done appears to be decreed 'for the safety of the Church Universal.'[3] Firmus, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a leading member of the Synod, said with reference to this, that Celestine 'had already given a sentence and formal regulation' (*ψῆφον καὶ τόπον*) which the Council had followed 'by pronouncing a canonical and Apostolical judgment against Nestorius.'[4]

The expression used has a manifest reference to the position declared by Celestine in his letter to belong to the Bishops. The judgment was the 'common' judgment of the successors of the Apostles, and so 'Apostolical,' whence the course of procedure adopted by the Fathers, 'understanding' (as Bossuet rightly says) 'as they did that all depended on the common judgment.'[5]

376. No doubt the legates made strong statements with regard to the Pope's position, declaring that St. Peter 'up to this time and always lives and exercises judgment on his successors,' and that they had been sent to 'execute' Celestine's sentence with others, magnifying the position of the Prelate they represented. But it is clear that the delegates of a Bishop of Rome cannot, any more than the occupants of the See themselves, be considered as competent witnesses to the position actually possessed by the Roman Bishops; *that* has to

[1] Celestinus, P., *Ep. ad Concil. Ephesinum.* Mansi, iv. 1283, 1288.
[2] Fleury, *Histoire Eccl.*, bk. xxv. ch. xlvii. tom. ii. p. 342. Edit. Paris, 1856.
[3] Mansi, *l.c.* [4] *Ibid.*, iv. 1288.
[5] Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars iii. lib. vii. ch. vii. tom. i. 19. Lugani, 1766.

be learnt from independent sources. In this case, how did the Fathers of Ephesus treat Celestine's action with regard to Nestorius. It has already been shown that the Synod did not act as 'a simple mandatarius' of the Pope; that, notwithstanding Celestine's sentence, as Tillemont says, 'Nestorius was always regarded and treated as Bishop of Constantinople until he was deposed at Ephesus, and he was deposed there, not in virtue of the Pope's judgment which was read there, but of proofs adduced of his false doctrine.'[1]

377. Further, St. Cyril was careful to designate the legates as 'those who represent the Apostolical See and all the holy Synod of the Bishops of the West,' thus plainly showing that he knew nothing of any 'real and sovereign authority, which the whole community is bound to obey,' belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop, for otherwise there would have been no need to make any mention of any Synod, since they would have represented 'the Supreme Pastor,' having jurisdiction over, not merely the West but, the Universal Church, and their character, as *his* agents, would alone have been considered.

So, too, he required their assent to the 'decision of the Synod' by signing the minutes, 'in token of Canonical agreement with us all.' And the Fathers of the Council having said, 'Since the legates have spoken suitably (ἀκολουθῶς) [having, that is, accepted the judgment of the Synod, as had been expected], let them make good their own promise, and confirm what has been done by signing,' the confirmation thus requested being the canonical assent for which St. Cyril had asked. This they did, one of them, Projectus, expressly declaring that he 'entirely assented to the just judgment of this holy and Œcumenical Synod.'[2]

378. The same fact that the deposition of Nestorius was the act of the Synod, as representing the one Episcopate, is indeed witnessed to by Philip, one of the legates, who said 'that the sentence against Nestorius is established according to the decree of all the Churches, for the priests (*i.e.* Bishops) of the Eastern and Western Churches are present in this sacerdotal assembly, either themselves, or certainly by their legates.'[3]

It is also directly asserted in the Synodal Letter to the Emperor Theodosius, wherein they state that their judgment is the one and common sentence of the whole world, 'inasmuch as the sentence of the Holy Synod of the whole West brought by the legates is in agreement with that of the Synod.'[4]

379. Again, in the letter which John of Antioch, with the Bishops of his Patriarchate, addressed to the other Patriarchs, viz. their 'most holy and reverend brethren and fellow-members Sixtus [III. of Rome],

[1] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xiv. 364.
[2] Mansi, iv. 1297-1300.
[3] *Ibid.*, 1296, 1298.
[4] *Ibid.*, 1301.

Cyril [of Alexandria], and Maximianus [of Constantinople],' the like evidence is found. 'To excel,' say they, 'in the right path and so to lead the people placed under their hand, should be the study and aim of all who have received the Priesthood and been entrusted with the divine ministry of the Episcopate by Christ the Saviour of us all. This being so, in the past year, by a decree of the most pious and Christian Emperors, a holy Council of most religious Bishops was convened at Ephesus, in the matter of Nestorius. They, having sat together with the legates sent by Celestine of blessed memory, who was Bishop of the holy Church of the Romans, deposed the above-mentioned Nestorius as teaching profane doctrine and scandalising many, and in regard to the faith did not stand upright. We also who attended thither and then found this done, were grieved at it. For this cause a difference having arisen between us and the Holy Council, and much having been done and said in the meantime, we returned to our own churches and cities, not then agreeing with the Holy Synod in subscription to the vote of deposition passed against Nestorius, but the churches being set at variance. Since, then, all should have care that they should be united by the removal of all variance between them, and as the most pious and Christian Emperors have decreed that this should be, and have therefore sent the most excellent tribune and notary Aristolaus, it has been agreed for the removal of all contention, and that peace may be given to the Churches of God, that we too should agree to this sentence of the Holy Council passed against Nestorius, and should hold him deposed and anathematise his impious doctrines, inasmuch as the Churches with us have ever held the right and pure faith, as hath your holiness, and ever guard this and hand it down to the people. We also agree to the ordination of the most holy and reverend Bishop of the holy Church of Constantinople, Maximianus, and we are in communion with all the most reverend Bishops throughout the world, as many as hold and keep the orthodox and blameless faith.'[1]

380. In this letter the deposition of Nestorius is ascribed to the Synod. It is by the recognition of this act of the Fathers that the reconciliation was effected and the Antiochenes claimed as a right communion, not with the Bishop of Rome as the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, the divinely appointed centre of Unity, but 'with all the most reverend Bishops throughout the world' who were orthodox and thus not *mediately* through restoration to communion with the 'Master' of 'the Epicopate,' but *directly* 'with all,' the Bishop of Rome included amongst them, and not specified as occupying any unique and sovereign portion.

The evidence of this letter is weighty as bearing contemporary

[1] Mansi, v. 285.

witness to the fact that the Synod and not Celestine condemned and deposed Nestorius, and that consequently in that age an Œcumenical Council and not the Roman Pontiff was held to be the Supreme Judge of the Faithful.

381. The evidence therefore is conclusive, that whatever claims were made by the Roman legates on behalf of Celestine as Bishop of Rome at the Council, the acts of the Synod manifestly show that the Fathers in no way accepted them. Acts are more conclusive than words, hence there was no need for the Council to make verbal denial of the statements which (*more Romano*) the legates made. And it may be added that no one acquainted with the ways of Easterns would infer from their courtly silence that they admitted the accuracy of the legates' assertions, even if their acts had not eloquently shown that they did not.

Section LVI.—*The 'Eighth' Canon.*

382. The Synod in last session, held on the 31st July, made an important decree, which is sometimes styled the 'Eighth Canon.' A complaint had been laid before the Synod by the Bishops of Cyprus against the Bishop of Antioch, who claimed rights of superiority over them—especially the right of ordination—that is, that Cyprus was within the limits of his Patriarchal jurisdiction.

On the death of the Metropolitan Troilus, Archbishop of Constantia, the Bishop of Antioch had obtained from Duke Dionysius, the Proconsul, a prohibition of the election of new Metropolitan until the question had been decided by the Synod which had just been convoked. This prohibition the Bishops of Cyprus had disregarded, and had in Provincial Synod chosen Rheginus as their Archbishop. They now declared to the Synod that the pretensions of the Antiochene Prelate were contrary to the Apostolical Canons and the definitions of the most holy Nicene Council.[1]

383. The Synod investigated the matter, and in their seventh session decreed that 'If, as it is asserted in memorials and orally by the religious men who have come before the Council, it has not been a continuous ancient custom for the Bishop of Antioch to hold ordinations in Cyprus, the prelates of Cyprus shall be preserved in the full and free privilege to make by themselves the ordinations of Bishops in their island, according to the Canons and custom. The same rule shall be observed in other Dioceses and Provinces everywhere, so that none of the most religious Bishops shall intrude into any other Province which has not heretofore from the beginning been under the hands of himself or his predecessors.'

[1] Mansi, iv. 1465-1468.

'But if any one has invaded a Province and subjected it by violence to himself, he shall restore it, that the Canons of the Fathers be not transgressed and the arrogance of secular dominion creep in under the appearance of priestly (*i.e.* episcopal) office, and we thus lose little by little that liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men, purchased for us with His Own Blood. The holy and Œcumenical Council has therefore decreed that the rights which have heretofore and from the beginning belonged to each Province shall be preserved to it intact and without restraint, according to the custom which has prevailed of old; and each Metropolitan has permission to take a copy of these things now transacted for his own security. But if any one shall introduce any regulation contrary to that which has been defined, the most holy and Œcumenical Council has decreed that it shall be without effect.[1]

384. The Synod, it will be observed, after dealing with the case of Cyprus which was before it, lays down a general law by this 'Canon.' By it the rights of Metropolitans are further safeguarded, and Patriarchs forbidden to add to their jurisdiction Provinces which had not hitherto been subject to them.

But further, the highest rank in the hierarchy here recognised by the Fathers as existing in the Church was that of Patriarch, the word Diocese used in the 'Canon' signifying 'the countries and provinces put under Patriarchs.' Had the Bishop of Rome possessed *jure divino* 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction,' 'which is truly Episcopal,' over all churches, the Synod would have been compelled, if they made such a regulation at all, to insert it in some clause disclaiming any idea of trenching on so unique a prerogative bestowed on the Roman Pontiffs by the institution of Christ, and so infringing the Divine Constitution of the Church. The wording of the decree is absolute, and thus proves that this Œcumenical Council knew nothing of that Papal Monarchy which is asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to be 'no newly conceived opinion, but the venerable and constant belief of every age.'[2] The Fathers of Ephesus, indeed, recognised the Roman Bishop as one of the Patriarchs, first indeed in rank and influence, whose opinion would necessarily have great weight, especially as being the prelate through whom, as Bishop of the old Imperial City, Easterns maintained relations with the Western Bishops, but not possessing any jurisdiction different in nature to that wielded by the other three Patriarchs who at this time were recognised by the Church.

385. Moreover, it is not improbable that the singular expression having reference to the danger lest 'the arrogance of secular dominion' should come to affect the affairs of the Church, and thus the rightful liberties of different portions of the Church be injuriously curtailed,

[1] Mansi, iv. 1459, 1460. [2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

was intentionally inserted by the Eastern Bishops with the object of erecting a barrier against encroachments on the part of the Bishop of Rome. The following circumstances seem to point to this. The Deacon Besulas represented at the Synod the African Church as the deputy of Capreolus, who had succeeded Aurelius in the See of Carthage. Now Aurelius was president of the African Synod in 424 when the case of Apiarius was dealt with, a case in which Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine attempted a great encroachment on the rights of the African Bishops. The Ephesine Fathers may well have been told of this case by Besulas, which would afford a rational explanation of the use of this singular phrase, for, as has been pointed out,[1] these words ἐξουσίας τῦφος κοσμικῆς bear a remarkable resemblance to those which were used by the African bishops in their letter to Celestine at the close of the dispute, viz.—Do not send clerics to carry out your orders, *ne fumosum typhum saeculi in ecclesiam Christi . . . videamur inducere.*

The arrogance of Rome was not unknown in the East,[3] and the opportunity of protecting their churches which the Cypriote case afforded, by such a formal reminder (which would have been specially clear to Celestine) that their position with regard to any encroachments attempted by the See of Rome was that of the Africans as the adoption of language used by them would be, may well have been taken by the Fathers of the Council.

[1] Bright, *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*, with Notes, pp. 138-139; and *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 169-171.

[2] Mansi, iv. 516.

[3] *Vide* note 32.

CHAPTER XII

THE WITNESS OF THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 451, AS TO PAPALISM

SECTION LVII.—*The convocation of the Council.*

386. This, the Fourth Œcumenical Council, was convoked by the Emperor Marcian and not by the Bishop of Rome, who alone, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, has full jurisdiction and power to summon such Synods.[1] There are, moreover, certain circumstances connected with the convocation of this Council which further emphasise the contradiction of the statement of the *Satis Cognitum* afforded by this fact.

After the miserable fiasco of the *Latrocinium*, St. Leo the Great wrote a Synodal Letter to Theodosius II., dated 13th October A.D. 449, begging him, 'with groans and tears,' that 'he should order a general Council to be celebrated in Italy.' His request was on behalf of 'all the churches of our parts' and 'all the Bishops' thereof, thus including himself amongst them.[2] In the following year he wrote, under date 16th July, in a similar tone: 'If any dissent from the purity of our faith and the authority of the Fathers, let your Clemency grant a universal Council in Italy, as the Synod which on account of this matter had assembled at Rome besought with me.'[3]

387. After the death of Theodosius, Marcian, his successor, as the husband of Pulcheria, who was 'orthodox,' wrote to Leo expressing his determination to hold a Synod.[4] St. Leo, in reply to a second letter from him to the same effect, now lost, wrote on the 23rd April A.D. 451, having changed his mind on the subject, deprecating the convocation of a Synod. 'It would not be right,' he wrote, 'to respond to the demand of a few folk and give occasion for new disputations and allow a new inquiry to be made as to whether the doctrine of Eutyches were heretical or not, and whether Dioscurus had rightly judged or not.'[5]

Again, on the 9th of June in the same year, in a letter to Marcian, after saying that he himself had wished a Synod should be held,

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[2] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Theodosium Augustum*, Ep. xliv. 6; P.L. liv. 829. 'Omnes partium nostrarum Ecclesiæ, omnes Mansuetudinẽ vestræ cum gemitibus et lacrymis suppleant sacerdotes ut . . . generalem Synodum *jubeatis* infra Italiam celebrari.'

[3] *Ep. ad Theodosium Augustum*, Ep. lxix.; P.L. liv. 892.

[4] *Ep. Marciani ad Leonem*, Ep. lxxiii.; *inter Epp. S. Leonis*; P.L. liv. 903, 905.

[5] *Ep. ad Marcianum Augustum*, Ep. lxxxii.; P.L. liv. 918.

but that the necessities of the present time would not allow many of the Bishops, whose presence was most desirable, to leave their dioceses exposed as they were to the ravages of war, he begged the Emperor to defer the holding of the Synod to a more peaceful time.[1]

388. An Imperial *Edict* addressed to the Metropolitans summoning an Œcumenical Council had, however, already been issued, dated the 17th of May. On hearing of this, St. Leo wrote on the 24th June, expressing his dissatisfaction, saying, 'We believe that your Clemency could grant this to our wish, that the present necessity that you should order the Synod of Bishops [*sacerdotalem Synodum*] be deferred to an opportune time, so that bishops being summoned out of all the Provinces there might be a truly Œcumenical Council,' yet at the same time that he might not seem to oppose his pious desire, he sent three legates[2] who should supply his place.[3]

389. The correspondence is instructive. Leo desired to have a Synod in Italy; he begged the Emperor Theodosius to convoke one there; he strengthens his petition by stating that the Bishops of all the Churches of the West desire such a Synod; he recognises that it is the right of the Emperor to 'order' an Œcumenical Synod to be held. Finding that Marcian had determined that the Synod should be held in the East, notwithstanding that he, no doubt, was fully acquainted with his wish through Pulcheria that it should be held in Italy, he changed his mind and opposed its convocation, but in vain. He was unable to prevent the Emperor using the power which admittedly belonged to him, and the Synod was convoked in the East. The whole course of events shows that the Emperor knew nothing of Papalism as 'the venerable and constant belief of that age.'

390. If it be said that Marcian in his first letter to St. Leo stated that he was favourable to the holding of a Synod, σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος, it is clear that he means that the Synod had been 'suggested' by St. Leo in his letters to Theodosius, and not as in any way deriving his authority to convoke a Council from him, an idea of which the whole correspondence is a refutation.[4] Nor, it may be added, do the Emperor's words, in the same letter in which he speaks of St. Leo as having 'the oversight and first place in the faith' (Ἐπισκοπεύουσαν καὶ ἄρχουσαν τῆς θείας πίστεως), recognise Leo as the Supreme Teacher and Judge of the Faithful, since all Bishops, by virtue of their share in the One Episcopate, are of necessity Guardians of the One Faith entrusted to their care; but simply that, as one of them, Leo, as occupying the first See, 'the hill on which' he stood

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Marcianum Augustum*, Ep. lxxxiii.; P.L. liv. 920.

[2] 'We may call them "legates" if we detach from that term its mediæval associations.' Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, ii. 516. On the 'Legates' of the Middle Ages see note 33*b*.

[3] *Ep. ad Marcianum Augustum*, Ep. lxxxix.; P.L. liv. 930.

[4] On the convocation of the *Latrocinium*, *vide* note 33.

being 'more conspicuous than the rest,'[1] as St. Augustine said to one of his predecessors, Boniface, the faithful discharge of this duty was especially incumbent upon him.

Section LVIII.—*The Presidency of the Council.*

391. The Council had been convoked to meet at Nicæa, but the place of meeting was altered to Chalcedon, where it was opened on the 8th October A.D. 451. Certain Imperial Commissioners, ἄρχοντες, or *judices*, it is clear, managed the business of the Synod, taking in that respect the place ordinarily occupied by a President, so that Synod, in the Synodal Letter to Leo, said: 'The believing Emperors presided for the sake of order.'[2] There can be no doubt that the legates of St. Leo held the first place amongst the members of the Council, and they are so recognised in the Synodal Letter to him.[3]

392. But there is, of course, nothing 'Papal' in this. St. Leo admittedly was the first Bishop in the Ecclesiastical hierarchy, and thus it would be fitting that they should be recognised as having the 'hegemony' over the rest of the members of the Synod. Further, the prominent part taken by St. Leo in opposition to Eutychianism would the more induce the bishops to acquiesce in their taking the position as representing the Bishop of Old Rome, especially as the antecedents of Anatolius, the Bishop of Constantinople, the second See, had not been altogether satisfactory, and the conduct of the Bishop of Alexandria, the third See, was to be examined, thus making it important that the fact that the West, whom St. Leo's legates represented, should have great prominence in the Council. Then, too, the delegates of a Bishop who, as has been seen,[4] made great claims for his See, were not likely to abandon the advantages which would be gained from taking the position which might, as has been noted, be said to belong of right to him on whose behalf they were commissioned to act.

Section LIX.—*The case of Dioscurus, Patriarch of Alexandria.*

393. The first business which came before the Synod was the case of Dioscurus, Bishop of Alexandria. At the first session Paschasinus, Bishop of Libybæum, one of the Roman legates, demanded that Dioscurus should go out from the Council, stating that if he did not, he and his colleagues would depart. In spite, however, of this demand, and of the complaint of Bishop Lucentius, another of the legates, that 'it was not to be endured that such an insult should be offered to us and to you that he should sit here when he is brought forward to be judged,' Dioscurus was not expelled. The Imperial Commissioners rebuked the legates, saying: 'If you hold the char-

[1] S. Aug., *Ad Bonifacium contra duas Epp. Pelagianorum*, lib. i. c. 1, 2; P.L. xliv. 588.
[2] Mansi, vi. 147. [3] *Vide infra*, n. 433. [4] *Vide supra*, nn. 202 *et seq.*

acter of a judge you ought not to plead as an accuser.' The result was that, instead of being driven out, Dioscurus was ordered to sit in the middle of the assembly, being thus accorded the same position in the assembly as Eusebius of Dorylæum, his accuser, and that he took an active part in the proceedings, being treated throughout them as a Bishop.

At the close of the session the Imperial Commissioners pronounced judgment as follows: — 'The faith shall be more fully examined in to-morrow's assembly. But since it appears from the Acts which have been read, as well as from the confession of some who were of most note in the Council, that Flavian of holy memory, and the most pious Bishop Eusebius were unjustly condemned, it seems to us but just (so please it God and the Emperor) that the Bishop of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia, who presided at the Council, should undergo the same punishment and be deprived by the holy Council of the Episcopal dignity, as provided by the Canons; and that it be understood that a report will be made to the Emperor of all that passes here.'[1]

394. Dioscurus, however, was still cited as a Bishop[2] to attend the third session of the Council, to answer the complaints formally laid against him at the Synod. Dioscurus refused to obey the citation, thereupon the Council proceeded to pass sentence. The procedure adopted is important. The legates, as occupying the first place in the Synod, put the question what was now to be done, and the whole Council declared their consent[2] to the pronouncement of the canonical punishment. Thereupon the legates said, 'Wherefore Leo, most holy and blessed Archbishop of great and elder Rome, by us and the present most holy Council, together with the thrice blessed and sacred Apostle Peter, who is the rock and ground of the Catholic Church and of the orthodox faith, hath stripped him of the dignity of Bishop and severed him from all sacerdotal dignity, this most holy and great Council will, therefore, decree what is in conformity with the Canons upon the aforesaid Dioscurus.'[3]

The language here used by the legates is such as might have been expected from 'Roman' legates, but the question is not what they '*more Romano*' said, but how the Council regarded this utterance. On 'Papal' principles Dioscurus was no longer Bishop, his deprivation had taken place, 'the Supreme Judge of all the Faithful' had spoken by his legates, and nothing could be added to the authority of the sentence, the cause was finished. Did the Fathers so regard the matter? It is clear that they did not. Even the words of the legates, 'Petrine' in tone as they are, are not in accord with the Papalist claim.

[1] Mansi, vi. 936. [2] *Ibid.*, 1035. [3] *Ibid.*, 1047.

Not only were they the result of the judgment of the Council which the legates had carefully asked for just previously, but, in the concluding sentence, the final Decree is admitted to belong to the Council. This position of the Synod is emphasised by the language used by the different Bishops in recording their judgment. 'Anatolius, Bishop of Royal Constantinople, New Rome, said: Being in all things of the same mind with the Apostolic See, I, too, give my vote for the deposition of Dioscurus, who has shown himself incapable of all sacerdotal ministration, because he has in all things disobeyed the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and being thrice canonically summoned, refused to obey.' Similarly the other Bishops gave their sentence *as judges*, saying: 'I agree,' 'I am of the same mind,' 'I declare,' 'I decree'; and when any of them mention their agreement with Leo, they couple with him Anatolius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, as, for example, Theodorus, Metropolitan of Tarsus, who said, 'Whence he has been justly condemned by the greatest Sees, as well of great Rome as of New Rome, by Leo and Anatolius, Archbishops of the most holy Churches, with whom I agree.'[1]

395. Further, the Act of Deposition is expressly ascribed to the Council in the document handed to Dioscurus. 'The holy and great and Œcumenical Synod . . . to Dioscurus, learn that because thou hast despised the divine Canons and hast been disobedient to this holy and Œcumenical Council, that, in addition to those other offences in which thou hast been found out, thou hast been thrice summoned by this holy and great Council, according to the divine Canons, to answer to the charges laid against thee, and thou hast not come, thou wast on the 13th of October deposed by the holy Œcumenical Synod from the Episcopal office, and deprived of all spiritual functions.'[2]

396. The Fathers thus acted as 'judges'; the Council was held by them to possess the supreme authority, and so acted. The words of the legates were regarded by the Synod as expressing their 'vote' on the subject in hand, *not* as the final decree of 'the Master' of the Episcopate, ruling them with supreme power. The sentence of the Council is so worded as to show that the authority whence it emanated was the Synod, and that it was final as that of the authority which is supreme in the Church. Hence the See thus declared vacant was filled up by the election of Proterius, Archpriest of the Church of Alexandria. Had the unique prerogatives which Papalism declared to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop been held to so belong to that prelate by the Fathers of Chalcedon, they could not have so completely ignored them, for by so acting they would have infringed upon the Divine Constitution of the Church, whence it follows that they knew nothing of the existence of such divinely possessed prerogatives.

[1] Mansi, vi. 1047 *et seq.* [2] *Ibid.*, 1094-5.

SECTION LX.—*The case of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus.*

397. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, had been one of those who suspected that the anathematisms attached to the Third Letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius were 'Monophysite.' He had, however, been convinced that he was mistaken in thus regarding them by a series of treatises which St. Cyril put forth in defence of himself against the charge of Monophysitism, and became reconciled to his Patriarch, John of Antioch. At the *Latrocinium* Dioscurus had deposed him as being a Nestorian. This was done in his absence, and no opportunity of defence, or of being interrogated with respect to his faith on the point at the Synod, was afforded him. He was exiled, and his writings were prohibited. Theodoret's own Patriarch, Domnus of Antioch, and Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, were likewise deposed, and naturally Theodoret turned to the only remaining Patriarch, him of Rome, for protection against the unjust proceedings of the Patriarch of Alexandria at the *Latrocinium*. Legates from St. Leo had been present at the Pseudo-Synod and were thus fully cognisant of the unlawful character of its proceedings, they themselves even being compelled to fly from Ephesus and return to Rome.

398. Consequently Theodoret, in three letters written to Leo, to the priest Renatus, and the deacon Hilarus, the two legates just referred to, appealed (ἐπικαλεῖσθαι) to Leo, desiring, as is clear from his second letter to Anatolius, a Patrician of Constantinople, whom he asked to obtain leave for him to go to the West to be judged by 'the Bishops who dwelt in the West,'[1] that his cause should be decided by the Western Bishops.[2] The result was St. Leo, and, doubtless, 'the Bishops who dwelt in the West,' at a Synod held by the former—*occidentale concilium* as it is called by his deacon Hilarus,[3] A.D. 440—rejected all that had been done at the *Latrocinium*, and thus declared the deposition of Theodoret invalid.

399. Now what was the position according to Papalist principles? It must be remembered that on these principles it was the judgment of Leo, not that of the Council, for the Council on the principles embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* had no judicial voice in the matter. Therefore Theodoret ought at once to have been reinstated in his See, the whole community being bound to obey the sovereign authority of the Supreme Judge, whose judgment is final and irreversible.

400. This, however, was far from being the case. (*a*) The orthodox Emperor Marcian, who, as the husband of Pulcheria, had ascended the throne, did not so regard the matter, for when he

[1] Theodoret, Ep. cxix.; P.G. lxxxiii. 1327-30.

[2] *Cp.* Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xv. 294.

[3] Hilarus Diaconus, *Ep. ad Pulcheriam Augustam, inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. xlvi.; P.L. liv. 837-840.

recalled the Bishops who had been exiled with Flavian on account of the faith, amongst whom was Theodoret, they were not to be restored to their Sees until the close of the Synod which was about to be held.[1]

(*b*) The Council of Chalcedon similarly acted. At its first session, when Theodoret was introduced, his status was not held to have been restored to him. He was only allowed to sit 'in the middle,' and the right of speech and reply was expressly withheld from him and his opponents until later.[2] In the eighth session the Fathers demanded that he should anathematise Nestorius, and when he apparently hesitated, they insisted with emphasis that he should at once pronounce a distinct anathema on that heresiarch and his adherents, crying out 'he is a Nestorian, out with him.'[3] When he had done this, the Imperial Commissioners said, 'All doubt respecting Theodoret is now removed, for he has anathematised Nestorius before you; he was received by Leo, most holy Archbishop of Rome, and has cheerfully accepted the definition of faith accepted by your Piety, and has also subscribed the Epistle of the aforesaid most holy Archbishop Leo; it remains that your Reverences should decree that he may be restored to his Church, as the most holy Archbishop Leo has already assured him.' Accordingly, after such exclamations as, 'Theodoret is worthy of the Bishopric; the Church must again receive the orthodox teacher,' the votes of the Legates, Patriarchs, and certain of the more distinguished Bishops were taken, the remainder giving their assent by acclamation, saying, 'This is a just decision, this is Christ's decision, we all approve it.' Thereupon the Commissioners delivered the judgment, 'in accordance with the decree of the holy Council, Theodoret shall again be put into possession of the Church of Cyrus.'[4]

401. From what has been said, it will be seen that the restoration of Theodoret to his See of Cyrus was the act of the Synod. On Papalist principles the supreme judge had given his decree, and this 'judgment of the Roman Pontiff' *was* reviewed, nay, entirely disregarded by the Council. Theodoret was regarded as a heretic until he had satisfied the test by which the Fathers thought fit to try his orthodoxy. The whole proceedings of the Council in this case are, in fact, incompatible with the monarchical position which the *Satis Cognitum* declares belongs to the Roman Pontiff *jure divino*.

Section LXI.—*Canon I.*

402. The Canons of various Councils which had obtained general acceptance in the Church had been collected in a Codex which had

[1] Pulcheria Augusta, *Ep. ad Leonem, inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. lxxvii.; P.L. liv. 907.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 189. [E.T. ii. 301.]
[3] Mansi, vii. 187-188.
[4] *Ibid.*, 189 *et seq.*

been quoted as authoritative at this Synod. This Codex contained, besides the Canons of the Œcumenical Councils, those of the Councils of Ancyra, Gangra, Antioch (A.D. 341), and Laodicea, which were not of Œcumenical rank. It is evident that it did not contain those of Sardica, as Leo had recently quoted them as Nicene in his forty-third and forty-fourth Epistles, written in October A.D. 449, to the Emperor Theodosius,[1] notwithstanding the exposure which a like proceeding on the part of his predecessors, Zosimus and Boniface, had received.[2] Had these Canons been included in the Codex, it would obviously have been suicidal on St. Leo's part to have thus described them, as their real origin would have been clearly seen on a reference to the Codex.

The Canons contained in this Codex now were, by Canon 1. of the Council, confirmed by Œcumenical authority, 'in order,' as Hefele says, 'to raise them to the position of universally and unconditionally valid ecclesiastical rules.'[3]

403. Now, in these Canons not only is there no recognition of the Papal Monarchy, but they contain provisions which are absolutely inconsistent with its existence. For example, by the Twelfth Canon of the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), it is decreed 'if any presbyter or deacon being deposed by his own Bishop, or a bishop deposed by the Synod, shall dare to trouble the Emperor, it is right that he be referred to a greater Synod of Bishops, and set forth before more Bishops that which he thinks appertains to justice, and await their examination and judgment. But if despising these he trouble the Emperor, let him be judged unworthy of pardon, nor let him have room for defence nor hope of future restitution.'[4]

The final Court here provided is the Synod of the 'Diocese,' or of a Patriarchate. There is no provision recognising any right to appeal therefrom. Hence the right to receive appeals in all causes asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome as the Supreme Judge of the One Flock, was clearly unknown to the Fathers of this Council, as otherwise they would have guarded themselves from enacting a Canon which, as it stands, would, if Papalism were true, have violated the Divine Constitution of the Church. It is not surprising that Vincenzi says, with reference to the provisions of this Canon, *hic petra scandali*,[5] yet it, as well as others likewise incompatible with Papalism, received by this Canon Œcumenical authority from the Fathers of Chalcedon.

Section LXII.—*Canon IX.*

404. By the Ninth Canon three tribunals are recognised, viz. the

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Theodosium Imp.*, Ep. xliii.; P.L. liv. 825; *Ep. ad Theodosium Imp.*, Ep. xliv. cap. 3; P.L. liv. 831.

[2] *Vide infra*, 610.

[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 200. [E.T. iii. 386.]

[4] Mansi, ii. 1304.

[5] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars ii. cap. xiii. p. 293.

Bishop in certain cases, the Synod of the Province in others, and thirdly, it is enacted that 'if a Bishop or Cleric has a difference with a Metropolitan of the Province himself, let him choose either the Exarch of the Diocese or the See of Constantinople, and bring the dispute before this.'[1]

It will be observed that the Council conferred by this Canon an important power on the Patriarch of Constantinople, the extent of which can only be adequately understood when it is remembered that the Council in this Canon by the word Exarch means Patriarch: This is clear for these two reasons: (1) First, because the Fathers of Chalcedon did not in this Canon insert any provision drawing a distinction between Exarch and Patriarch, which they would have done if they had not intended the former term to include the latter; and because (2) Justinian, in his 123rd *Novel*, c. 23, by which he gave civil sanction to the regulation laid down in this Canon, uses the word 'Patriarch' instead of 'Exarch.'[2]

It is probable, however, as Hefele says, that the Council only had the Eastern Churches in view in making this Canon,[3] as to have allowed appeals from the West to the Patriarch of Constantinople, thus setting aside the Roman Patriarch, would have been inconsistent with the position admitted by Canon XXVIII. of this Synod to belong to the Roman See by grant from the Fathers.[4]

405. The prerogative here bestowed on the Patriarch of Constantinople is essentially new, in that Metropolitans under the jurisdiction of other Patriarchs could be tried by him, a more extensive right, be it observed, than that granted to the Bishops of Rome by the Canons of Sardica,[5] assuming that they are genuine; and, further, the grant thus made to the Patriarch of Constantinople has the authority of an Œcumenical Council, which that of Sardica was not.

406. Further, in this Canon there is not a word about any appeal lying to the Bishop of Rome. The judgment of the Exarch of the 'Diocese' or of the Patriarch of Constantinople, as the case might be, is treated as final. Now, the *Satis Cognitum* declares that 'in the decree of the *Vatican Council* as to the nature and authority of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age.'[6] In the *Decree* here referred to, it is asserted that 'since, by the divine right of the Apostolic Primacy, the Roman Pontiff presides over the Universal Church, we teach and declare that he is supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdic-

[1] Mansi, vii. 361.
[2] Beveridge, *Synodicon*, i. p. 122.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 200. [E.T. iii. 395.]
[4] *Vide infra*, 411.
[5] *Vide supra*, 326.
[6] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

tion recourse may be had to his judgment.'[1] This statement is definite. It is inconceivable if the Fathers of Chalcedon had held this to be 'of faith,' which they were bound to do according to the *Satis Cognitum* if Papalism be true, that they should not, when bestowing this new privilege on the Patriarch of Constantinople, have taken the greatest possible care to avoid even appearing in any way to trench on a prerogative belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff. Hence it follows that they knew nothing of any such right being inherent in the See of Rome.

407. Moreover, it appears from the *Epitome of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, given by Evagrius in his *Ecclesiastical History*,[2] that the Canons of this Council, with the exception of the twenty-eighth, were enacted at the sixth and seventh sessions. If this be the case, as Baluze[3] and the Ballerini[4] maintain, the Canon was enacted in the presence, and with the consent, of the Roman legates, and the argument just stated is materially strengthened, for they had been expressly ordered by St. Leo to 'in every way preserve and defend his prerogatives';[5] they would therefore have been bound, in obedience to their instructions, to have protested against its enactment. Further, in any case St. Leo himself did not raise any objection to it when he received it with the rest of the Canons, which on the hypothesis that the position of the Roman Pontiff in the Divine Constitution of the Church is that embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, he would have been bound to do, as in that case the Canon undoubtedly infringed the rights of the Roman See.

408. That this Canon is incompatible with the Papal Monarchy is thus plain. Further confirmation of this is found in the fact that P. Nicholas I. found it necessary to 'explain it' as follows:—'Let us now call to mind the Canons of the Council of Chalcedon, which thus decrees—"if a Cleric has any cause against his own Bishop or against another, let him be judged by the Provincial Synod, but if a Bishop or Cleric has any complaint against the Metropolitan of the same Province, let him apply to the Primate of the Diocese, or to the See of the Royal City of Constantinople." When it said "Let him apply to the Primate of the diocese," the same holy Synod laid down a precept and established the rule. But when it added by a disjunctive conjunction, "or to the See of the Royal City of Constantinople," it is quite evident that it conceded this according to permission. Moreover, whom the holy Synod would call the Primate of the diocese except the Vicar of the first Apostle no one at all understood. For he

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.
[2] Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. ii. cap. xvi.; P.G. lxxxvi. 2547.
[3] Mansi, vii. p. 658 *et seq.* [4] S. Leo M., *Opp.*, ii. p. 503 note, and p. 514.
[5] Mansi, vii. 443.

is Primate who is held to be both first and supreme. Nor, indeed, does it matter that mention is made of Diocese in the singular number, because it avails to have said "Primate of the Diocese" as if it had asserted him to be Primate of the Dioceses, for Holy Scripture is full of this way of speaking . . . here it is said Diocese in the singular, but this, on account of the unity of peace and of the faith, it willed to be understood as if it were in the plural.'[1]

On the principle here adopted by Nicholas, any document can be made to mean the exact opposite to its real meaning. That he should have thus attempted to explain away the Canon is a proceeding on which no comment is necessary, save perhaps the remark that the course adopted by Vincenzi, in denying altogether its authenticity,[2] however contrary it is to the evidence, is at least more straightforward than to endeavour, by reading into the Canon that which its wording explicitly excludes, to affix thereto a signification utterly contrary to the intention and known mind of its framers.

Section LXIII.—*Canon XVII.*

409. The Council in its Seventeenth Canon states that controversies between Bishops with reference to the boundaries of their respective jurisdictions are to be brought before the Synod of the Province, but if in any case a Bishop believes that his own Metropolitan has wronged him, he shall bring the dispute before the Exarch of the Diocese or the See of Constantinople, as was said before[3] [Canon IX.]. This Canon need not detain us, as the remarks in the previous section as to the incompatibility of Canon IX. with the Papalist claims equally apply to it.

Section LXIV.—*Canon XXVIII.*

410. This famous Canon, which was enacted by the Council in its fifteenth session, is as follows:—

> 'We, following in all things the ordinances of the holy Fathers, and recognising the recently read Canon of the 150 religious Bishops, do ourselves adopt the same determination and resolution in regard to the privileges (πρεσβείων) of the most holy Church of Constantinople, New Rome, for the Fathers naturally assigned privileges to the See of Elder Rome, because it was the Imperial City, and, moved by the same purpose, the 150 religious Bishops awarded the same privileges to the most holy See of New Rome, judging with good reason that the city which is honoured with the sovereignty and the Senate, which enjoyed the same privileges with the elder Imperial

[1] Nicholas, P., *Ep. ad Michaelem Imperatorem*, Ep. lxxxvi.; P.L. cxix. 945.
[2] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars ii. cap. xiii. p. 293 *sq.*
[3] Mansi, vii. 359.

Rome, should also in ecclesiastical matters be magnified as she is, holding the second place after her, and so that for the Pontic, Arian, and Thracian dioceses the Metropolitans only, together with those Bishops of the neighbouring dioceses who live in barbarian territories, shall be consecrated by the aforesaid holy See of the Holy Church of Constantinople; it being understood that each Metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses shall, in union with the Bishops of the Province, consecrate the Bishops of the Province as is ordained by the holy Canons. But, as has been said, the Metropolitans of the said dioceses themselves shall be consecrated by the Archbishop of Constantinople, harmonious elections being made according to custom and reported to him.'[1]

411. The Fathers of Chalcedon here plainly declare that the reason why the Bishop of Old Rome enjoyed certain privileges was that such privileges were conceded to him by 'the Fathers,' on the ground that Old Rome was the Imperial City. It is not said that any 'Council' made any formal grant of these privileges, obviously because at the foundation of the Christian Church Old Rome occupied the position of the Imperial City, as the residence of the Emperor and the seat of government, so that to the Bishop of the See therein seated 'the Fathers' quite naturally conceded certain privileges as to one who held a See which thus was placed in a position unique in opportunities for influencing the whole civilised world.

On the other hand, Constantinople was quite a modern capital, raised to the dignity of the Imperial City by the Emperor Constantine. The See of Constantinople had been a mere suffragan of the metropolitan of Heraclea, and if the Bishop thereof was to enjoy the same privileges as he of the See of Elder Rome on the same ground, it was necessary that the Church should by a formal act assign to the See such privileges, since there was no 'custom' in existence to that effect.

412. The Bishops of Constantinople had for a long time been making efforts, since Constantinople had been elevated to the dignity of New Rome, to place their See in a position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy corresponding to that which the city now held in civil rank. They would find justification for this in the principle that the ecclesiastical should follow the civil division of provinces, a principle embodied in the Ninth Canon of the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341), which the Council of Chalcedon itself had already recognised not only by its own Canon XVII., but also by giving Œcumenical sanction by its first Canon to the Canon of Antioch just referred to.

The Fathers of Chalcedon in our Canon lay down that the Fathers of Constantinople had made the grant of these 'privileges,' and expressly adopted their determination that the See of Constantinople should

[1] Mansi, vii. 370.

enjoy the same 'privileges' as that of Elder Rome, thus placing the 'See' in the ecclesiastical hierarchy in that position which the 'City' held in the civil sphere, which 'enjoyed the prerogatives of Old Rome.'[1]

413. Whilst thus confirming 'the grant' made by the Fathers of Constantinople, they proceeded to make it more effective by recognising the position which the Bishops of Constantinople had, favoured by the circumstances of their See, made good for themselves in the neighbouring dioceses,[2] by which they had acquired jurisdiction over a territory in which three Exarchs had wielded independent authority—viz. the Pontic, Arian, and Thracian Dioceses. The Council thus formally acknowledged that the Bishops of Constantinople had a right to the second part of Patriarchal dignity—προστασία—administrative power, as well as the first part προεδρία, priority of honour.[3] Thus by this Canon 'the Patriarch of Constantinople found himself possessed of greater powers than any of his brethren—the Roman See scarcely at that time excepted.'[4]

414. No doubt the Patriarchal jurisdiction which Constantinople had arrogated to itself was a violation of the Canons, and this affords an instructive example of the tendency of Bishops occupying prominent thrones to aggrandise their Sees; but it existed *de facto*, and was upheld by the civil power. The Fathers therefore, in confirming the practice as to the consecration of the Metropolitans of the three Dioceses which had obtained recognition and become customary, whilst they violated the letter of the Nicene rule, 'let the ancient customs hold good,' might well, therefore, consider that they were acting in accordance with its spirit.

415. Moreover, the Fathers of Chalcedon were supported in their action by the principle on which the position of the several Patriarchal Sees had been hitherto determined, as is evident from the order of precedence which was recognised as existing amongst them. That order was, first Rome, secondly Alexandria, thirdly Antioch. Now Alexandria was the second[5] city in the Empire, whilst Antioch, 'the Metropolis of Syria, without dispute deserved the third place in the habitable world that was under the Roman Empire.'[6] Hence the See of Antioch, that 'most ancient and truly apostolical Church,' as it is styled in the Synodal Letter of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 382, 'to Damasus, Ambrose, and the Bishops of the West,'[7] over

[1] *Codex Theodos.*, xvi., ii. 45.

[2] *Vide* Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, Gen. Introduction, vol. ii. pp. 217, 228.

[3] *Cp.* De Marca, *op. cit.*, *Dissertatio De Primatibus*, Appendix, tom. iv. 176. Bambergæ, 1789.

[4] Neale, *l.c.*

[5] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, ii. 42.

[6] Josephus, *Opp.*, bk. iii. ch. ii.

[7] Mansi, iii. 581 *seq.*

which St. Peter had presided for seven years, was placed after Alexandria, over which no Apostle had been Bishop. So, too, Jerusalem, 'the Mother of All the Churches,'[1] was for a long time 'a simple suffragan of the metropolitan of Cæsarea,'[2] and was not constituted a Patriarchal See until the Council of Chalcedon, when there were assigned to it as its Patriarchate the Three Palestines, a part of the 'Diocese' of Oriens, which had hitherto been under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch.[3] It was thus not only last in order of precedence but smallest in area.

416. Another example of the working of the same principle is the case of the See of Ephesus. This See, founded by St. Paul, and occupied by St. John 'until the time of Trajan,'[4] never attained to higher rank than that of Exarchate, whilst many other Sees which traced their origin to the labours of Apostles, remained suffraganates to Bishops, whose thrones, being placed in cities which possessed the status of a civil metropolis, had the ecclesiastical rank of Metropolitan.

417. It is of course true that Churches which could boast of Apostolic foundation were recognised at an early period as having special influence in the Church through being the first established, and thus the roots[5] of the whole Church and depositaries of Apostolical tradition, and consequently preserving the means by which heresy could easily be detected. They would thus be, and were, held in especial regard. Pre-eminently was this the case with reference to the See of Rome, because it was founded by St. Peter and St. Paul, the two most prominent members of the Apostolate, who both suffered martyrdom there. In the West, moreover, the influence of this See was greatly increased, in that it was the *sole* 'Apostolic See' in that part of Christendom, whereas there were many such Sees in the East. Yet this reverence, however great, which such Sees naturally received from the rest of the Church, is something essentially different to the bestowal of jurisdiction or even of precedence on the same ground. Concessions of that nature, as has been shown, the evidence proves, were made on the ground of the civil status of the cities in which the Sees so honoured were situate. If this principle had not been adopted by the Church, Jerusalem would naturally have ranked first amongst the Patriarchal Sees; Rome, as the foundation of 'the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul,' second; Antioch, as founded by St. Peter, third; and Ephesus would, as the foundation of St. Paul, and the See of the beloved Apostle, certainly have ranked higher than Alexandria, if indeed the latter attained Patriarchal rank at all, since it owed its

[1] Mansi, iii. 588. [2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. 42. [E.T. i. 405.]
[3] *Ibid.*, bk. xi. sects. 195, 199. [E.T. iii. 355 *seq.*, 378.]
[4] S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres*, bk. iii. cap. iii. sect. 4; P.G. vii. 855. [5] *Vide* n. 11.

foundation, not to an Apostle, but merely to St. Mark the Evangelist. The actual position then occupied by these Sees respectively in the hierarchy of the Church shows, as has been said, that the grant made to the Patriarch of Constantinople, on the ground assigned, was in strict accordance with the principle which had been acted upon hitherto by the Church in matters of this kind.

418. This Canon affords clear evidence that to the Fathers of Chalcedon the existence of the Papal Monarchy as part of the Divine Constitution of the Church was unknown. Had it been otherwise, it would have been impossible for them to have placed the Bishop of Constantinople, as the Bishop of New Rome, on the same level as the Bishop of Elder Rome in the matter of privileges, merely reserving to the latter precedence. It is incredible that an Œcumenical Council could have thus violated the divinely conferred prerogatives possessed by the Roman Pontiffs, and when bestowing any new rights on the See of Constantinople, the Fathers would necessarily, in order to avoid a proceeding which, on the hypothesis that the position ascribed to the Roman Bishop in the *Satis Cognitum* is that which Christ appointed, would be nothing short of an impious attempt to alter the Divine Constitution of the Church, have made it clear that the rights so conferred were essentially different in nature to those which, according to 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' were, 'by the institution of Christ,' inherent in the Roman See.

419. This, indeed, is to understate the position. Surely if the Papal Monarchy were an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, it would be impossible for any Bishops, however numerous or exalted in rank, to have attempted to confer any privileges on any ground whatever, whether on the Bishop of Constantinople or the Bishop of Jerusalem, as the Fathers of Chalcedon did. To have done so would clearly have been *ultra vires*, for the Pope, on this hypothesis, would alone, in virtue of his supremacy, have either the right or power to constitute 'Patriarchates,' or alter their boundaries, as he alone possessed plenary jurisdiction over the whole Church.[1]

420. The Roman legates had absented themselves from the session at which our Canon was enacted. This abstention was deliberate, as they had had ample warning that the question of the position of the Church of Constantinople would come before the Synod. Not only must the enactment of the Ninth and Seventeenth Canons, by which

[1] So indeed 'the Popes since the eleventh century have not only made Metropolitans, but Patriarchs and Primates; all on the foundation of the false Decretals' (Fleury, *Discours de l'Histoire de l'Eglise du onzième au treizième siècle. Op. cit.* tom. v. p. iii. Edit. 1836). On these *Decretals, vide* note 13. And it is asserted in Gratian's *Decretum* 'that the Church of Rome instituted all Patriarchal supremacies, all Metropolitan primacies, episcopal Sees, all ecclesiastical orders and dignities whatsoever. *P. Nic.* II., *Dist.* xxii., cap. i.' Quoted Barrow, *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*, pp. 274, 275. Edit. 1851.

the Council had conferred special privileges on that See, have foreshadowed what was coming, but they had the direct statement of the Imperial Commissioners that the right of the Church of Constantinople to ordain in the Provinces, which was the mark of a Patriarchal jurisdiction, would be examined in due course by the Synod.[1] They had, indeed, been requested to take part in the transactions relating to this matter, which was one which the Church of Constantinople desired to have settled, and which the Imperial Commissioners had ordered the Council to take into consideration. This they had refused to do, alleging that they had no instructions on the matter proposed.

421. The legates no doubt, when adopting this course, thought that their absence would prevent the enactment of any Canon which would give the authority of the Synod to the known claims of Constantinople. Having failed in doing this, they complained, in the sixteenth session of the Council, held the following day, that wha had been decreed in their absence was contrary to the Canons and ecclesiastical order, and requested that this should now be read. This accordingly was done by the consistorial secretary Beronicianus, at the command of the Imperial Commissioners. After this Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople, having first remarked that it was customary at Synods, after the principal subjects had been discharged, for anything else that was necessary to be discussed and established, said that the Church of Constantinople had another matter needing settlement, in the transactions regarding which the legates had been requested to take part, which they had declined; that the Imperial Commissioners had commanded the Synod to take the matter into consideration, and that after their departure all the Bishops had risen and demanded this discussion, which had accordingly taken place in an orderly and canonical manner.[2]

422. After the Canon had been read, together with the signatures of the Bishops who had subscribed it, Lucentius, one of the legates, asserted that many of the Bishops had been tricked into signing or forced to sign. All the Bishops, however, cried out, 'No one was forced.' Lucentius then declared that by this Canon 'the ordinances of the 315 Bishops of Nicæa had been set aside, and that those of the 150 had been followed, which had not been received into the number of the Synodal Canons.'[3] The ground taken by the legates for objecting to the Canon is significant, viz. that its contents are contrary to the Nicene Canons. This, it will be seen, was that which St. Leo himself took. Dealing, as the Canon did, with the subject of authority, had the Church of this age held that the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, was the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, the Master of the Episcopal College, exercising authority over

[1] Mansi, vii. 313. [2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* [3] *Ibid.*, vii. 442.

the whole Church, it is certain that this 'venerable and constant belief' would have been cited as an insuperable objection to the Canon. It was not; hence the conclusion is inevitable that the Papal Monarchy was unknown to that 'age' of the Church.

423. The statement with regard to the status of the Canons of the Second Œcumenical Synod is curious, in view of the fact that at the first session of the Council, when the Acts of the *Latrocinium* had been read, the Oriental Bishops having exclaimed 'Why, did not Flavian receive his position,' Paschasinus had stated 'we will recognise the present Bishop, Anatolius of Constantinople, as the first (after us) by God's will, but Dioscurus made Flavian fifth.'[1] These words explicitly recognise the precedence conferred on Constantinople by the Canon of the 150 Fathers, the authority of which Lucentius now disowned.

424. Aetius asked that the legates should communicate any instructions on the point raised, and accordingly the Presbyter Boniface read the following:—'The decision of the holy Fathers (at Nicæa) you must not allow to be violated, and you must in all ways preserve our prerogatives in your person, and if any, taking their stand in the importance of their cities, should endeavour to arrogate anything to themselves, you must resist this with all decision.'[2] It will be seen that although the legates had alleged the want of instructions as their reason for declining to be present when the business which the Church of Constantinople desired to be brought before the Synod came before the Fathers, that business was the very kind which St. Leo ordered them to resist. Certainly it is impossible to justify either the legates' statement or their action in the face of their admission that they had received the written command which they read to the Synod.

425. The Imperial Commissioners now requested the two parties to produce the Canons on which they respectively relied. The legate Paschasinus thereupon read a version of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa, 'which,' as Hefele says, 'departs from the genuine Greek text in one point in a very remarkable manner,'[3] being in fact a 'version' corrupted in the Roman interest.[4] It commenced as follows: 'The Roman Church has always held the Primacy.' Now their object in citing this 'version' was to prove to the Imperial Commissioners that the Nicene Canon had been violated, the prerogatives of Rome having been infringed by the Twenty-eighth Canon, to which they objected. In thus using it they desired, therefore, to convey to the Imperial Commissioners that 'the Primacy' had always been admitted by the Fathers to belong to the Roman Bishop as a unique prerogative. They used it, that is in the sense which Hefele, whose usual acuteness

[1] Mansi, vi. 607.
[2] *Ibid.*, vii. 442.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 201. [E.T. iii. 425.]
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 315 *et seq.*

seems to have deserted him here, says it bears, viz. that 'it ascribes the Primacy to the Bishop of Rome.'[1] Unfortunately, however, if the desire of the compiler of this version was to make the Nicene Council recognise some special privilege of a unique nature as belonging to the Roman Bishop, he defeated his own object by using, in the Canon, the same word 'Primatus' to describe the position held by other great Churches; hence an examination of this corrupted text would have shown that it was useless for the purpose for which the legates adduced it.

426. However, such an examination was needless. The Imperial Commissioners had called upon both parties to produce the Canons on which they relied. Clearly the most conclusive method of meeting the Roman legates' contention was to show that the evidence on which they based their position was not genuine by producing the authentic text of the Canon, the spurious version of which the legates had brought forward, and then to produce the Canons of 'the Second Synod,'[2] by which their contention would be materially strengthened. This course the Easterns adopted. The consistorial secretary, Constantine, read from a MS. handed to him by Aetius the Greek text of the Sixth Nicene Canon, and then a 'synodicon of the Second Synod,' 'which consisted of three Canons of Constantinople massed together as one constitution,'[3] the third of which accorded precedency next after the Bishop of Rome to the Bishop of Constantinople.

427. It is true that Hefele[4] thinks that the Ballerini 'have made it probable'—a cautious statement—that the Greek text of the Sixth Canon was inserted later for comparison in the Acts of the Council by a transcriber who had observed the difference between that text and the Latin text of the legates. This is a significant way of getting over the difficulty presented by the Greek text; a little consideration will show how futile it is. The circumstances of the case, as has been shown, would render the production of the authentic Greek text the best argument against the Roman contention, based as it was on a spurious version. Further, it is inconceivable that the Greeks, who had the genuine text preserved in their archives, should have permitted a spurious Latin version to be accepted as authentic by the Imperial Commissioners and the Synod, when the simple production of the genuine Greek text would be sufficient to prove its true character, and thus confute Paschasinus conclusively and at the same time courteously, all need of argument being thus avoided.

428. Then the Imperial Commissioners requested the Bishops of

[1] Hefele, *l.c.*

[2] On the title '*δευτέρα σύνοδος*' as applied to the Ephesine Synod, *vide* note 34.

[3] Bright, *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*, with Notes, p. 227. Second edit.

[4] *L.c.*

Pontus and Asia, who had subscribed the new Canon, to make a solemn declaration that they had done so without constraint, which they all did. Then those Bishops of the same Dioceses, who had not signed, were asked to express their opinion, and though their answers did not explain why they had not signed, they did not assert that it would not be right for the relation of the Bishops of Pontus and Asia to the See of Constantinople to be that laid down in the Canon.

429. The absence of coercion having been thus proved, the Imperial Commissioners summed up the matter as follows:—'From all that has been discussed and brought forward, we perceive that "precedency" (*πάντων τὰ πρωτεῖα*, the first place) and the "chief honour" (*καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρέτον τιμήν*) should be preserved according to the Canons for the Archbishop of Old Rome, but that the Archbishop of New Rome ought to enjoy the same privileges of honour, and that he has the right to ordain the Metropolitans of the Dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. . . . These are our views, let the Synod state its opinion.' The Imperial Commission thus made it clear that they ~~refuted~~ rejected the contention as the basis of which the Roman legates had brought forward their spurious version of the Sixth Nicene Canon, and accepted the evidence which the Easterns had brought forward. In reply to the question of the Commissioners, the Bishops gave by acclamation their assent to 'the right judgment which is decreed.'

430. Lucentius, the legate, however protested, 'The Apostolic See ought not to be degraded in our presence. If, then, anything contrary to the Canons was done yesterday in our absence, we pray your highnesses [the Commissioners] to annul it, otherwise let our opposition be inserted in the Acts, that we may know what we have to inform the Apostolic man, Pope of the Universal Church, that he may be able to take some resolution concerning the injury done to his See, or upon the violation of the Canons.' The Roman legates evidently considered that the Imperial Commissioners had, as has been already said, rejected their contention, and confirmed that embodied in the Canon, which was incompatible with the claim put forward by them that 'the Roman Bishop always had the Primacy,' in the sense of the designation applied to him in their protest, viz. 'Pope of the Universal Church.' Their protest, couched in vigorous language, was a reiteration of their claim, but what was the result? The most illustrious Commissioners (*judices*) said 'All that we previously proposed the whole Synod has sanctioned,'[1] *i.e.*, in the words of Hefele, 'the prerogative assigned to the Church of Constantinople is, in spite of the opposition of the Roman legate, decreed by the Synod.'[2]

431. Attempts are made by Papalist writers to destroy the value of

[1] Mansi, vii. 446-454. *Quod interlocuti sumus tota synodus approbavit.*
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 201. [E.T. iii. 428.]

the evidence against Papalism here drawn from the treatment of this Canon by the Imperial Commissioners and the Fathers of the Council by appeals to certain expressions used in the Synodal Letter to St. Leo. Did not the Fathers, it is urged, call him (*a*) 'the interpreter of the words of Blessed Peter,' (*b*) did not they speak of him as presiding over them as 'head over the members,' and (*c*) as 'the very one entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine,' did they not, by using this language, recognise St. Leo as holding a position which is not only inconsistent with any anti-papal intention on the part of the Fathers in enacting this Canon, but also practically equivalent to the monarchical position asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff?

432. To this argument it is to be replied, first, that the vigorous opposition of the Roman legates to the Canon, and its enactment in the teeth of their protest, proves that neither the legates nor the Fathers of the Council considered the Canon to be compatible with even the claims as put forth at that day, far less though they were than those formulated at the *Vatican Council*; secondly, the Canon is a plainly worded document and speaks for itself. That it cannot be made to harmonise with Papalism is proved by the bitter and continuous opposition which its fautors have maintained against it; thirdly, the people who composed the Synodal Letter were Easterns, and 'Easterns' are not accustomed to weigh words when addressing those with whom they desired to stand well, especially if they desired to obtain any particular object, hence it would be natural for them to use the language of Oriental compliment when seeking the assent of the Roman Bishop to a Canon which they had enacted, bestowing on the See of New Rome privileges equal to those possessed by Old Rome, leaving to the occupant of the latter merely 'precedence,' a Canon which it was evident, from the opposition of his legates, he would not willingly agree to. Diplomacy of an elementary character would urge them to make the attainment of their object as easy as possible, and in the choice of the language they used in their letter considerations of diplomacy would necessarily largely influence them. That this was in fact the case is shown by other expressions which occur. The Fathers say that they were persuaded that he had, with habitual regard, extended to the Church of Constantinople what they had decreed, and tell him that his legates 'had attempted vehemently to resist what had been so decreed, doubtless with the wish that you should have the initiative, and with this good forethought that the successful issue not only of the faith but of good order should be set to your account.'[1] A very complimentary and diplomatic way to describe the action of the legates!

[1] Mansi, vi. 147.

The habit of Easterns of using exaggerated expressions necessarily requires that language of the kind must always be largely discounted.

433. Fourthly, the expressions themselves, if examined, will, however, be found not to signify what Papalists allege they do.

As to (*a*), St. Leo had indeed by his 'Tome' been the 'interpreter' to them of the meaning of the glorious Confession of faith which the Apostle St. Peter had made, in the great mystery of the Incarnation, that true knowledge of the Lord which had come down to them by the line of teachers 'like a golden chain' who had succeeded to the Apostles in discharge of the commission given to them by the Saviour, Go ye and make disciples of all nations. That 'The Tome' was not considered by the Fathers of the Council to possess unique authority as an *ex cathedra* definition of the Fathers and teachers of all nations, and 'therefore irreformable of itself, and not from consent of the Church,' will be shown in the next section,[1] and thus the phrase is a mere complimentary way of expressing a simple fact in no way capable of supporting the Papalist claim.

434. (*b*) The statement that St. Leo had presided over the Council as 'a head over the members,' is an accurate description of the position of the President of a gathering such as is the One Episcopate assembled in Synod. This position might be ascribed to St. Leo in a certain sense, in that his representatives had taken the most prominent part of all the members of the Council in its proceedings, although, as seems to have been the case,[2] the duties usually discharged by the President of an assembly were performed by the Imperial Commissioners. It is in fact an expression which can be accurately applied to the chief member of any body presiding as *primus inter pares*, and there is no question that the 'first place' in the Episcopate was admitted to belong to the Roman Bishop by the Council. This is evident from the Twenty-eighth Canon.

435. (*c*) The third expression, that there was entrusted by the Saviour to St. Leo 'the Guardianship of the Vine,' does not at all imply that the Council held that the Bishop of Rome was 'Guardian of the Vine,' *jure divino*, in any other sense than the Fathers of the Council were themselves. All Bishops, by virtue of sharing the one Episcopate *in solidum*, have this responsibility towards the whole Church.[3] Hence, when the Fathers of the *Fifth Œcumenical Council* pronounced their Synodal judgment on the matter of 'the Three Chapters,'[4] they said of themselves, 'We, therefore, to whom is committed the charge of ruling the Church of the Lord, fearing the malediction which hangs over those who do the work of the Lord

[1] *Vide*, nn. 451 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 391.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 41, 44.
[4] *Vide infra*, 1033.

negligently, hasten to preserve the good seed of faith pure from the tares of impiety.'[1] The language here used is the more significant in that the Fathers were acting in direct opposition to Vigilius, the Bishop of Rome.

436. This position of responsibility towards the whole Church is also attributed to individual members of the One Episcopate. For instance, St. Basil says of St. Athanasius, 'It is sufficient for most of the other bishops if each of them diligently look after that which is under their own charge, whereas this is not sufficient for you who have as great solicitude for all the Churches, as for that, the burden of which in particular was committed to you by our common Lord. This may be said, since you are incessant in conversing, admonishing, writing letters, sending people in all directions with the best suggestions, and wishing to contribute something to this matter myself, I thought it would be a most suitable beginning to recur to your perfection as to the Head of all, and to take you for counsellor and leader.[2]

So again to the same Saint he writes, 'Our Lord has instituted thee the physician of the infirmities in the Churches.'[3]

Of St. Athanasius likewise St. Gregory Nazianzen writes as follows: 'Having gone through the whole set of sacred offices to pass over intervening events, he is entrusted with the presidency over the people, which is the same as saying the rule (ἐπιστασίαν) of the whole world. And I cannot say whether he received the priesthood as the reward of his virtue or to be the source and life of the Church, for she fainting, through thirst of the truth, was like Ishmael to be refreshed, or like Elijah to be revived when the earth in the drought was cooled in the stream, and from her exhaustion to be brought back to life.'[4]

So of St. Cyprian the same writer says, 'he becomes a pastor, and the best and most approved of pastors, for he presides not only over the Church of Carthage, nor over that of Africa, which from him and through him is renowned till now, but also over all the West, I may almost say all the regions of the East, South, and North.[5]

In like manner Sidonius Apollinaris, in his Epistle to Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, says, 'Blessed be the Holy Spirit and Father (of Christ) the Almighty God, that you, a Father of Fathers and Bishop of Bishops, and another St. James of your age, do as from a certain watch-tower of charity, and not from the lower Jerusalem, oversee

[1] Mansi, ix. 368-9.
[2] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Athanasium*, Ep. lxix.; P.G. xxxii. 429.
[3] *Ep. ad Athanasium*, Ep. lxxxii.; P.G. xxxii. 469.
[4] S. Greg. Nazianzen, *Orat.*, xxi. § 7. *In laudem Athanasii*; P.G. xxxv. 1088, 1089.
[5] *Orat.*, xxiv. 12. *In laudem S. Cypriani*; P.G. xxxv. 1184.

all the members of the Church of our God; worthy to comfort all the infirm and to be deservedly consulted by all.'[1]

437. Consideration, therefore, of these expressions thus shows that in themselves they in no way countenance the use which it has been sought to make of them in the Papalist interest, even if it had not been the case that they are mere smooth phrases employed by the Easterns to render less unpalatable the draught which they were presenting, in spite of his opposition, to the Bishop of Rome, whose support they would naturally still desire to have in their contest with Monophysitism, support of great value, since, owing to his influence and pre-eminence of his See in the West, it would secure that of the 'Westerns.'

438. That St. Leo himself regarded Canon XXVIII. as inimical to the claims which he put forward for his See is clear from his action in refusing to receive it. The ground, however, on which he based his objection, as set forth in his letters, is not a little significant, and throws considerable light upon the difference which he thought it necessary to make between the way in which he pressed forward those claims in the East and that which he felt free to adopt in the West. For instance, in his letter to the Emperor Marcian, after using words which, as has been often remarked, seem in the light of history to be a prophecy of what has taken place with reference to his own See, 'He loses his own who lusts after what is not his due,' he says, 'For the privileges of the Churches instituted by the Canons of the holy Fathers, and fixed by the decree of the venerable Nicene Synod, cannot be plucked up by any wickedness or changed by any innovation. In the faithful execution of which work I am bound to show persevering service; since the dispensation has been entrusted to me, and it tends to my guilt if the rules of the Fathers, sanctions which were made at the Nicene Council, be violated, which God forbid, by my connivance, and if the desire of one brother be of more weight with me than the common good of the whole house of the Lord.'[2]

439. To the Empress Pulcheria he writes in like manner: 'Since no one is allowed to attempt anything against the statutes of the Fathers, Canons which many years ago were based on spiritual decrees in the city of Nicæa, so that if any one desires to decree anything against them, he will rather lessen himself than injure them. And if these are kept uninjured, as it behoves, by all Bishops, there will be tranquil peace and firm concord through all the churches. There will be no dissensions concerning the degree of honours; no contests about ordinations, no doubts about privileges; no conflicts about the usurpa-

[1] Sidonius Apollinaris, lib. vi., *Epist.* I. *Ad Lupum papam*; P.L. lviii. 551.
[2] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Marcianum Imp.*, Ep. civ. cap. iii.; P.L. liv. 995.

tion of another's rights; but under the equal law of charity both men's minds and duties will be kept in due order; and he will be truly great who shall be alien from all ambitions, according to the Lord's words, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister.' . . . That consent of the Bishops which is opposed to the sacred Canons established at Nicæa, joining with ourselves your Piety's faith, we declare void, and by the authority of blessed Peter annul it by a declaration which is absolutely general; viz. that in all ecclesiastical causes we obey those laws which the Holy Spirit, by means of the 318 prelates, appointed for the peaceable observance of all Priests [*i.e.* Bishops], so that even if a far greater number decree anything different to what they appointed, whatsoever is in opposition to the appointment of the aforesaid is to be treated with no sort of regard.'[1]

440. St. Leo took a similar line in his letter to Anatolius, in which he says, 'Those holy and venerable Fathers who in the Nicene city established laws of ecclesiastical Canons which are to last till the end of the world, when the sacrilegious Arius with his impiety was condemned, live both with us and in the whole world by their constitutions: and if anything anywhere is presumed upon contrary to what they appointed, it is without delay annulled. I grieve . . . that you attempt to infringe the most sacred constitutions of the Nicene Canons; as if it were a favourable opportunity presented to you when the See of Alexandria may lose the privileges of the second rank, and the Church of Antioch the possession of the third dignity; so that when these places have been brought under your jurisdiction, all Metropolitan Bishops may be deprived of their proper honour. . . . I oppose you that with wiser purpose you may refrain from throwing into confusion the whole Church. Let not the rights of Provincial *primacies* be torn away, nor Metropolitan Bishops be deprived of their privileges in force from old time. Let no part of that dignity perish to the See of Alexandria, which it was thought worthy to obtain through the holy Evangelist St. Mark, the disciple of blessed Peter, nor though Dioscurus falls through the obstinacy of his own impiety, let the splendour of so great a Church be obscured by another's disgrace. Let also the Church of Antioch, in which first, at the preaching of blessed Apostle St. Peter, the name of Christian arose, remain in the order of its hereditary degree, and being placed in the third rank never sink below it.'[2]

441. Similarly in his letter to the Bishops who had been present at the Council of Chalcedon, after he had stated that he embraced with all his heart the definition of the holy Synod which for the confirmation of the faith had been celebrated in the city of Chalcedon, and that

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Pulcheriam Augustam*, Ep. cv.; P.L. liv. 999, 1000.
[2] *Ep. ad Anatolium Const. Epis.*, Ep. cvi. cap. i., iv., v.; P.L. liv. 1003 *sq.*

he had written that they might know by his approval of what was done at the Synod, that he was in agreement with them, that is with regard to the subject of the faith on account of which the general Synod was assembled at the command of the Emperor and in agreement with the Apostolic See,[1] he added, 'but concerning the keeping of the Canons of the holy Fathers which were settled by inviolable decrees in the Nicene Synod, I admonish your holinesses that the rights of churches must remain as they were ordained by the 318 divinely inspired Fathers. Let not evil ambition desire that which belongs to another, for that which the elation of vanity may provide itself by extorted assents, and may consider that its lusts are confirmed by the name of Councils, whatsoever may differ from the Canons of the aforesaid Fathers is invalid and null. How reverently I maintain their rules, and that I will be, God helping me, guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the constitutions of the Fathers, your holinesses can learn from reading my letters, in which I have resisted the attempts of the Bishops of Constantinople.'[2]

442. Now in these letters it will be observed that whilst Leo professes, in characteristic language, to deny in the name of St. Peter validity to this Canon, he does not allege, as the ground of his action, that that Canon was a denial, or an infringement, of the prerogatives which had been granted by the institution of Christ to the Bishops of Rome as the successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, which on the hypothesis that the monarchical position asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* belonged *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff it undoubtedly would be. On the contrary, he takes a very different line. He might put forward in the West such fictions as that which under his influence Valentinian embodied in his *Edict*,[3] but such audacious statements would never meet with credence in the East. With the genius of a statesman he based his opposition on grounds which would both appeal to the Eastern veneration for the Nicene Synod, and be calculated to enlist on his side the powerful support of Alexandria and Antioch, both Sees naturally jealous of the increased power of the See of New Rome. Hence he declared that this Canon is a violation of the decrees of the 318 Fathers of Nicæa, which, as divinely ordained, must be preserved inviolable; which he will obey and guard by his acts, and poses as the defender of the rights of the Bishops of Alexandria and of Antioch, and of the Metropolitans. His action was in fact just what might meet with acceptance in the East, viz. a defence of the Canons; a duty incumbent

[1] But see as to this statement *supra* n. 387.

[2] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Episcopos qui in S. Syn. Chalcedoniensi congreg. fuerunt directa*, Ep. cxiv. cap. i., ii.; P.L. liv. 1027 *sq.*

[3] *Vide infra*, n. 1171.

on all Bishops, and therefore especially becoming him as the Bishop of the See which was universally recognised as being 'first in place.' That St. Leo, who made great claims for his See, as has been seen, in the West, felt constrained to adopt this method of protest and objection is a plain proof both that he knew full well that those claims had no chance of acceptance in the East, still more that the Papal Monarchy was unknown in that age of the Church.[1]

443. What was the result of St. Leo's action? The *Satis Cognitum* declares that 'the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, by the very fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See, is admitted by all to be worthless.'[2] The boldness of this statement is on a par with its 'accuracy,' which may be learnt from the fact that from the day it was enacted by the Fourth Council it has ever been held binding by the Eastern Churches, both as regards the precedence and jurisdiction of the Eastern Patriarchates and the position which those Patriarchates recognise as belonging to the See of Elder Rome.

444. If it is sought to destroy the value of the evidence afforded by this fact by alleging that the Patriarch of Constantinople himself is a witness to the correctness of the statement in the *Satis Cognitum*, on the ground that in a letter to Leo he wrote thus of the Canon: 'As for the privileges which the universal Synod decreed in favour of the Church of Constantinople, let your holiness hold it for certain that there was no fault in me, a man who, from my youth, have loved peace and quiet, keeping myself in humility; it was the Clergy of Constantinople who wished to have that decree enacted, and the Bishops of those districts who agreed on enacting it, and even in this matter the whole efficacy and confirmation was reserved for the authority of your blessedness. Let your holiness rest assured that I did nothing to further the matter, having always held myself bound to avoid the lusts of pride and covetousness.'[3]

445. The answer, however, is plain. All communications had been broken off between the two Patriarchs, and strong pressure was put on Anatolius by the Emperor in order to bring this state of things to an end. The statement quoted is itself not in accordance with fact, as there can be no doubt that the Patriarchs of Constantinople were continually pushing forward the claims of their See. Anatolius himself, for example, had appointed Maximus to be Bishop of Antioch in the place of Domnus, who had been deposed at the *Latrocinium*, an act of jurisdiction over that ancient Patriarchate. Further, we have the definite testimony of Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople,

[1] On Innocent, P. III., and the dignity of the See of Constantinople, *vide* note 35.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[3] Anatolius Epis. C.P., *Ep. ad Leonem inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. cxxxii. cap. iv.; P.L. liv. 1084.

that the *Church* of Constantinople had brought before the Synod the matter with which the Canon dealt. It is evident that Anatolius was not a free agent when he wrote the letter appealed to, which is furthermore corroborated by the letter which he wrote to St. Leo a few weeks after the Synod, in which he takes quite a different line, speaking of the legates as not having known Leo's intention, and so disturbed the Synod after the Twenty-eighth Canon had been enacted; and then, quoting the closing statement of the Imperial Commissioners that the 'ὅρος'—*i.e.* the Canon—of the Holy Council was established, requested Leo (according to the Latin version of the letter) 'honoris gratia' (as Dr. Bright notes[1]) to give it his approval and confirmation.'[2]

446. The consideration of all the circumstances connected with the attitude of Anatolius thus shows that it is useless for Papalists to appeal to his letter; in fact, as Hefele admits, 'Anatolius and his successors practically retained the privileges conceded to their See at Chalcedon, and never gave actual effect to their courteous words and the assurances which they made to the Pope.' . . . 'Protected and supported on this point by the Byzantine Emperors, they remained in possession of the contested prerogatives, and even began to make the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem more and more dependent upon them.'[3] As Duchesne says, 'It was in vain that Pope Leo protested; the concessions of form which they accorded to him did not arrest the progress of the ecclesiastical centralisation around the capital and its Archbishop.'[4]

447. In fact, from the very first it was plain that whatever 'ceremonial satisfactions' the Easterns might accord to St. Leo, they never admitted that the validity of the Canon was in any way affected by the want of his assent to it. Even his letter to the Bishops who had been present at the Synod of Chalcedon was not read in its entirety at the Council held, probably at Constantinople, in 453, that part of it which contained his protest against our Canon being kept back.[5]

Again, within six years after the Synod when Timothy, 'the Cat,' had succeeded Proterius, whose death he had instigated, in the See of Alexandria, the Bishops of Egypt wrote to the Emperor Leo complaining that Timothy 'anathematises the supreme Archbishops—Leo of Rome, Anatolius of Constantinople, and Basil of Antioch,'[6] thus according to the Patriarch of Constantinople, the position assigned to

[1] Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 207.

[2] Anatolius Epis. C.P., *Ep. ad Leonem inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. c. i.; P.L. liv. 979.

[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 207. [E.T. iii. 448.]

[4] Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, p. 124, Paris, 1896; *cp.* also his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 24.

[5] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Julianum Epis. Cosiensem*, Ep. cxxvii. cap. iii.; P.L. iv. 1072, 1073.

[6] Mansi, vii. 529.

him in our Canon. This position, it must be noted, is described as being that of one of the *supreme* Archbishops, Leo being of the number: another proof that the Easterns knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy, as otherwise they could not have placed the three Archbishops in the same category as 'supreme,' since that word, if the statements in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* with reference to the nature and authority of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff were true, could only be legitimately applied to the Bishop of Rome. Further, they wrote directly to Anatolius, their 'most religious Father,' begging him 'to make known their sorrows by Synodical Letters to Leo, most holy Pontiff of the Roman Church, to the Bishops of Antioch, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Ephesus, and such others as should seem good, since this cause is a common injury, that all the Bishops of the world taking cognisance of the presumptuous acts of Timothy and of his insinuations against the holy rules and orthodox religion, may write back by Synodical Letters to the Emperor and to your holiness according to the venerable rules of the Fathers, and give without delay the proper order to be followed.'[1]

448. The Bishops in thus writing place St. Leo on the same level as the Bishops of the other great Sees, so far as the *nature* of the authority possessed by him is concerned, since not only is he named in the same category with them, but their Synodical Letters are treated as possessed of like power, and they assume that the matter complained of is to be determined by the common consent of 'all the Bishops of the whole world' assembled in the various Synods, and expressed in and by their Synodical Letters. They knew of no superior to the Patriarchs, no 'Supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' and it is to the Episcopate that they desire 'the common injury' to be referred, as the sole body which had authority and power to remove its cause.

449. The course the Bishops wished to be taken was adopted. The Emperor referred the case as requested to the Episcopate. Anatolius held a Council, and to the Emperor stated as his sentence: '*I* determine that Timothy is not worthy of the Episcopate'; and replies were received from St. Leo, who spoke for the whole West, and from many Metropolitans speaking in the name of their suffragans, all upholding the Council of Chalcedon, and requiring that Timothy should be deposed.[2]

The matter was thus settled by the common consent of 'all the Bishops of the world,' as the Egyptian Bishops had desired. Their judgment was held to be final, as that of the Church 'diffused throughout the whole world, but actuated ever by One Spirit'; as conclusive, indeed, as if it had been given by an Œcumenical Council.[3]

[1] Mansi, vii. 531-5.

[2] *Ibid.*, 777, 778.

[3] Bossuet, *Def. Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pars iii. lib. ix. cap. xiii. tom. ii. p. 132. Lugani, 1766.

The position occupied by Anatolius in the proceedings is clearly that assured to him by the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon. He is recognised by the Bishops of Sees comprised within the limits of the Patriarchate, which in the Sixth Canon of Nicæa was declared to hold the second place, as the Patriarch to whom they ought to make known their unfortunate position, therefore as the one occupying a See superior to that against the occupant of which they were lodging a complaint, through whom they would be able to obtain the assistance of the Archbishop of the Roman city and other great prelates, consequently they recognise him as holding the second place in the hierarchy; according to him, moreover, the possession of great authority, marked by addressing him *directly*, and St. Leo merely through him.

450. To our Canon civil authority was given by the Emperor Justinian by his 131 *Novel* c. 1., and the Archdeacon of Carthage—Liberatus—when writing some hundred years later, attests the success of the efforts of the See of Constantinople to maintain the position and rights accorded therein to it, when he states 'that although the Apostolic See even now contradicts, that which was established by the Synod endures in every way through the patronage of the Emperor.'[1]

Finally, the Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 690) not only confirmed 'all the holy Canons set forth by . . . the 630 holy and blessed Fathers at Chalcedon,' but further, in its Thirty-sixth Canon, expressly renewed the Twenty-eighth: 'Renewing the decrees of the 630 Fathers assembled at Chalcedon, we decree that the See of Constantinople shall enjoy equal privileges with the See of Elder Rome, and be magnified like it in ecclesiastical matters, being second after it, next to which let the See of the great city of Alexandria rank, then that of Antioch, then that of Jerusalem.'[2]

The evidence shows that, notwithstanding the strenuous opposition of the Popes, the Canon was maintained, and it is curious to note that when the Latin Patriarchate was established at Constantinople, the influence of the Canon was exhibited in the Fourth Lateran Council under Innocent III., a purely Western Council completely dominated by the Pope, held in A.D. 1215, which in its Fifth Canon declared that the Patriarch of Constantinople should rank immediately after Rome, and before Alexandria and Antioch;[3] whilst, more important still, at the Florentine Union in A.D. 1439 the position was expressly awarded to the Greek Patriarch.[4]

[1] Liberatus, *Breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, cap. xiii.; P.L. lxvii. 1014.

[2] Mansi, x. 930.

[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 207. [E.T. iii. 448-9.] *On the position held by the Latin Patriarch of C.P.*, *vide* note 36.

[4] *Ibid.*, bk. vii. sect. 98. [E.T. ii. 359.]

SECTION LXV.—*The Fathers of Chalcedon and 'The Tome' of St. Leo.*

451. The way in which the Fathers of Chalcedon dealt with 'The Tome' of St. Leo affords further evidence of great importance as to the position which they considered to belong to the Bishop of Rome. The circumstances under which 'The Tome' was written were as follows:—When Eutyches, one of the distinguished men who advocated Monophysitism, had been deposed from 'every priestly office' and excommunicated by a Synod held in A.D. 448 at Constantinople, presided over by Flavian, Archbishop of the See, Flavian wrote to his 'most holy and most religious Father and fellow-bishop' Leo, as follows:—'I have sent to your holiness the Acts in his case in which we have deprived him, as one convicted of such things, both of the priesthood and of the presidency over his monastery, and of our communion, that your holiness likewise being acquainted with his case may make manifest his impiety to all the most religious Bishops who are under your Piety, lest through ignorance of the opinions of which he has been convicted they should be found holding intercourse with him as with one of the same views either by letter or otherwise.'[1]

Correspondence ensued between the two Patriarchs, and when the Emperor convoked the Synod held at Ephesus—afterwards known as the *Latrocinium*—St. Leo sent a complete doctrinal treatise on the doctrine of the Person of Christ, by the hands of the Bishop Julius, the Priest Renatus, and the Deacon Hilarus, whom he had appointed his representatives, as he was unable to be present at the Synod personally. There can be no doubt that 'The Tome' was an *Epistola Dogmatica* written by the Bishop of Rome dealing with a question which affected the very foundation of Christianity. There can be no question that, from a Papalist point of view, it possesses the highest authority. For the Ballerini declare that 'among all the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs on a matter of faith, the letter of St. Leo to Flavian is the most celebrated, in which the whole controversy of the Incarnation is exactly discussed and defined.'[2]

452. Now on Papalist principle 'The Tome,' as an *ex cathedra* definition on a point of faith, 'irreformable of itself,' given by the Pope exercising the supreme teaching office which he possessed *jure divino* in virtue of his Apostolic Primacy,[3] was 'of faith' from the date that it was published to the world, 13th June A.D. 449. Hence on these principles it must have necessarily been regarded as binding on the

[1] Flavian, C.P. Episc., *Ep. ad Leonem inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. xxii.; P.L. liv. 727.
[2] S. Leo M., *Opera*, tom. i. p. 798. Edit. Ballerini.
[3] *Cp. Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485-7.

conscience by the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon. The Acts of the Synod, however, prove that the Fathers did not so regard it. The procedure they adopted with regard to it was as follows:—At the second session there were read, first, the Nicene Creed with the anathema against the Arian heresy; then the Creed of Constantinople; then the Second Letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius, which had been approved at Ephesus, and his subsequent letter to John of Antioch; lastly, 'The Tome' of St. Leo.[1] The reading of these documents was received by the Fathers with acclamations, but some passages in the last raised doubts in the minds of certain Bishops of Illyricum and Palestine as being not sufficiently clear of Nestorianism. Thereupon, in order that they might be assured of the orthodoxy of the suspected statements, Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople, read certain passages from the Second Letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius. The Bishops in question were not, however, satisfied, and the Imperial Commissioners therefore adjourned the matter for five days in order that it might be carefully considered. This was accordingly done, and in the fourth session, on October 17th, 'The Tome' was formally accepted by the Council.

453. The manner in which this was done is significant. The Imperial Commissioners put the question: 'As we see the Divine Gospels laid before your Piety, let each one of the assembled Bishops declare whether the expositions of the 318 Fathers of Nicæa and the 150 of Constantinople agree with the letter of the most reverend Archbishop Leo?'

First Anatolius, the Bishop of Constantinople, gave his sentence: 'The letter of the most holy Archbishop Leo agrees with the creed of the 318 Fathers who were at Nicæa and of the 150 who afterwards assembled at Constantinople who confirmed the same faith, and with the proceedings at Ephesus under the most blessed and most holy Cyril by the Œcumenical and most holy Council when it condemned Nestorius; I therefore have agreed to it, and willingly subscribed it.' Other Bishops used like language. For example, Maximus, Patriarch of Antioch, said: 'The letter of the most holy Archbishop Leo agrees with the exposition of Nicæa, that of Constantinople, and that of Ephesus, and I have subscribed it.'

John, Bishop of Sebaste, in the first province of Lower Armenia, said: 'According to my conception, the meaning of the letter of the most holy Bishop of the Church of the Romans agrees with the faith of the 318 and of the 150 afterwards assembled at Constantinople, and with the exposition of Ephesus at the deposition of the impious Nestorius, at which the most blessed Cyril presided, and I subscribe this same letter.'

Seleucius, the most blessed Bishop of Amasea, said: 'We have

[1] Mansi, vi. pp. 962 *et seq.*

found the Synodical Letter of our most holy Father Cyril agreeing with the faith of the 318 holy Fathers. And in like manner we have found the letter of the most holy Archbishop Leo agreeing both with the 318 and with those who were with the most holy Cyril.'

John, the most holy Bishop of Germanicia Augusta on the Euphrates, said: 'In the faith of the 318 who formerly assembled at Nicæa and the 150 at Constantinople, we both have been baptized and baptize, and having found what was set forth and confirmed by the most blessed Cyril in the former Council of Ephesus, as likewise the letter of the most holy Archbishop Leo, to accord with this, we have subscribed it.'[1]

454. The Bishops of Illyricum, already referred to, made their declaration, which was set down in writing on their behalf by Sozon, Bishop of Philippi, as follows: 'We preserve the faith of the 318 Fathers which is our salvation, and we wish to die in it; that of the 150 in no wise differs from it. We, moreover, retain the decisions made by the Council of Ephesus, whose presidents were most blessed Celestine, Bishop of the Apostolic See, and the most blessed Cyril, Bishop of the great city of Alexandria; and we are persuaded that the most holy Archbishop Leo is most orthodox, we have been instructed concerning his letter by his legates Paschasinus and Lucentius, and they have cleared up the seeming differences which arose from modes of expression. For when we met by your order at the house of Anatolius, Archbishop of the great city of Constantinople, they anathematised all such as make a separation between the divinity and flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ which He united with Himself of the holy Virgin, and who do not ascribe to Him the several attributes of the Godhead and the Manhood without confusion, change, or division (ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως), and by this we were satisfied. Being persuaded that the letter is perfectly agreeable to the faith of the Fathers, we gave our consent to it and subscribed it.'[2] A similar declaration was made by Bishop Anianus of Capitolias on behalf of the Bishops of Palestine who had taken the same position as those of Illyricum, stating in writing that they were satisfied with the explanations given by the legates, and 'therefore assented to and subscribed Leo's letter.'[3]

455. A hundred and sixty-one Bishops then gave their assent individually, using such expressions as the following: 'It agrees, and I therefore subscribe'; 'It agrees, and I subscribe as it is correct'; 'As I feel'; 'As I have proved'; 'As I find it agrees'; 'I subscribe.'[4]

After these individual assents, the Imperial Commissioners invited the remaining Bishops to give their votes together, whereupon they signified their assent by acclamations.

[1] Mansi, vii. 27, 28. [2] *Ibid.*, 29, 32. [3] *Ibid.*, 34. [4] *Ibid.*, 49, 50.

The whole procedure proves that before the Council agreed to receive 'The Tome,' the Fathers examined it and compared it with Orthodox standards, in order to prove whether or not it was conformable to them; in fact, they applied to it the identical treatment which the Fathers of Ephesus did to the Second Letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius.[1] This the Fathers compared with the Nicene Creed, and, as a result, therefore approved it, using, in doing so, expressions exactly similar to those which the Fathers of Chalcedon used with regard to 'The Tome.'

456. The importance of this is manifest. It is a direct refutation of the Papalist claim, being absolutely inconsistent with it. If that claim were true it would have been impossible for the Fathers of Chalcedon to have made their subscription to 'The Tome' conditional on the result of their examination of it, to have subjected it to a comparison with the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, and to have made the question of its orthodoxy dependent upon its agreement with the letter of St. Cyril. On Papalist principles 'The Tome,' as an *ex cathedra* definition on a matter of faith of the Supreme Teacher, was *ex sese de fide*; it could not be 'reviewed.' The Fathers of Chalcedon, it is plain, knew of no such powers belonging, 'by the institution of Christ,' to the Roman Pontiffs; they regarded themselves in Synod as the Supreme Tribunal, the supreme teaching authority, as the One Episcopate assembled in Synod, by whom the utterances of all, however high in the hierarchy, were to be judged, and with whose teaching all must agree as 'the truth.'

457. This position is emphasised by the fact that thirteen Egyptian Bishops, whilst pronouncing openly and positively an anathema on Eutyches, declined to subscribe 'The Tome,' on the ground that they could not do so without the consent of the Archbishop of Alexandria, which See, by the deposition of Dioscurus, was vacant,—'Let an Archbishop for Egypt be here appointed, and we will subscribe and assent,'—a position which, of course, it would have been impossible for them to take if Papalism had been true. And it is to be noted that they were urged to subscribe not on the one ground which, according to Papalism, would be true, viz. that it was an *ex cathedra* definition of the Roman Pontiff *ex sese* binding on the whole Church, but on the ground that it would be inadmissible to allow more weight to one single person who was to hold the Bishopric of Alexandria than to the whole Synod. It is thus the Synod's authority that is invoked, as reflected on by the action of these Egyptians, the Fathers had given to 'The Tome' Œcumenical authority, and thus placed it amongst the Church's standards which must be accepted as tests of orthodoxy, and it is the Synod which permitted them to postpone their

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 368.

subscriptions thereto, in accordance with their request. The position is clearly radically different from, and inconsistent with, the prerogatives asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs.

458. The fautors of Papalism, however, are fond of appealing to the exclamation of the Fathers of the Synod when 'The Tome' was read at the second session of this Council, as is done by the *Satis Cognitum* itself.[1] Did not the Fathers, it is said, with an air of triumph, say: 'Peter has spoken by Leo,' and does not this statement prove that they ascribed to it that authority which the *Vatican Decrees* declare to belong in virtue of his Apostolic Primacy *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome. To this it is to be replied—(*a*) it is irrational to adduce an 'exclamation' of the Bishops as authoritative, as a Synod embodies its synodical declarations in Canons, Decrees, or other formal Acts; (*b*) next, the absurdity of making this use of the words in question is apparent from the text of the 'exclamation' of which they form a part. 'This is the faith of the Fathers, this is the faith of the Apostles; we all believe thus, the Orthodox believe thus, anathema to him who does not believe thus; Peter has spoken by Leo; the Apostles taught thus, Leo's doctrine is pious and true, be the memory of Cyril eternal, Leo and Cyril teach the same. Why was not this read at Ephesus? This is what Dioscurus concealed.'[2]

459. The Fathers here couple St. Leo's teaching with that of St. Cyril as a proof that the former is orthodox, as being identical with that of the latter. Such a proceeding on the part of the Fathers would have been presumptuous in the highest degree if Papalism was true, nay, more, blasphemous, as involving a denial of the position belonging to the Roman Bishop by the institution of Christ in the Divine Constitution of the Church. The words, 'Peter has spoken by Leo,' have a much simpler meaning, viz., that St. Leo's letter contained and taught that faith in the Incarnation which St. Peter had first proclaimed as that of the Apostles in answer to the memorable question which our Lord addressed to them at Cæsarea Philippi, as indeed the Fathers themselves say in their decree concerning the faith.[3] They would be true of any Bishop or Pastor who teaches in accordance with that glorious confession, and would be held to be, in the fifth century, especially appropriate to express the orthodoxy of the letter of the one who occupied the See which by that time was universally supposed to have been founded by St. Peter.

460. They have no more dogmatic value than the exclamations of the Fathers of Ephesus when the letter sent by Celestine to the

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 33, *vide infra*, n. 691.
[2] Mansi, vi. 971.
[3] *Vide infra*, n. 462.

Council in condemnation of Nestorius had been read. 'This is a just judgment, to Celestine another Paul, to Cyril another Paul, to Celestine guardian of the faith, to Celestine of one mind with the Council, to Celestine all the Council renders thanks. One Celestine, one Cyril, one faith of the Council, one faith of the whole world.'[1] Yet, as has been seen, the Council examined and decided the case of Nestorius itself,[2] whilst in the 'exclamations' themselves Celestine and Cyril are coupled together, both being described as 'another Paul,' and to their letters which the Synod had before them a like authority is ascribed. The formal Acts of the Council, and they alone, are authoritative, so at Chalcedon.

There is nothing, then, in the 'exclamation' to which Papalists appeal to overthrow the conclusion arrived at from a consideration of the formal acts of the Council with regard to 'The Tome,' which the Fathers 'judged' as their predecessors at Ephesus 'judged' St. Cyril's letter.

461. It must be remembered, further, that St. Leo's own language shows that he did not himself regard his letter as having the unique authority which Papalism would, if it were true, require it should possess. For in a letter to the Empress Pulcheria, dated 16th July A.D. 450, he laid down as a condition to a request that he should recognise Anatolius as the legitimate successor of Flavian, that that prelate should prove his orthodoxy, which was called in question by his association at the *Latrocinium* with Dioscurus, by whom he had been appointed Archbishop of Constantinople, by giving his assent to 'the letter of Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, of holy memory, which he sent to Nestorius . . . *or* by agreeing with my letter which was directed to Bishop Flavian of holy memory.'[3]

462. The Synod, moreover, itself by formal act in the 'Definition of Faith' which it adopted, made clear that it regarded 'The Tome' and the letters of Cyril as possessed of the same dogmatic value. In it the Fathers declared 'that on account of those who endeavoured to destroy the mystery of the Incarnation . . . the Holy Synod receives the Synodal Epistles of the Blessed Cyril both to Nestorius and to the Easterns as being well adapted to refute the error of Nestorius and to explain the sense of the creed. With these the Council has reasonably combined the letter sent by the most blessed and holy Leo, Archbishop of the great and Elder City Rome, which was written to Archbishop Flavian of holy memory against the error of Eutyches, inasmuch as it is in accordance with the confession of St. Peter, and calculated not more to destroy error than to establish the truth.'[4] To treat in this manner

[1] Mansi, iv. 1288.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 367 *et seq.*
[3] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Pulcheriam Augustam*, Ep. lxx.; P.L. liv. 894, 895.
[4] Mansi, vii. 114, 115.

'The Tome' would on Papalist principles be impossible. This formal declaration of the Synod is a plain refutation of the statement of the fourth chapter of the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima, de ecclesia Christi*[1] of the *Vatican Council* that the doctrine therein defined as to the teaching office of the Roman Pontiff as binding under anathema on all Christians has been held 'since the beginning of the Christian Faith,' and is thus an important confirmation of the conclusion which results from a consideration of the treatment by the Fathers of Chalcedon of 'The Tome.'

463. The conclusion arrived at upon the evidence is that the Fathers of Chalcedon, like their predecessors the Fathers of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus, knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy. The proceedings of these four Synods thus furnish a plain answer to the question, 'Why does not the *Satis Cognitum*, following in this respect the *Vatican Decrees*, cite the formal acts of these great Œcumenical Councils in proof of its assertions with reference to the power and position it alleges to be possessed *jure divino* by the Roman Pontiffs?' It is simply because these assertions not only find no support from these Councils, but also their proceedings are of a character utterly inconsistent with, and opposed to, any belief on the part of the Fathers assembled in them in any such 'monarchical position' of the Bishop of Rome, a fact which proves that the bold statements in the *Satis Cognitum* as to 'the nature and authority of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff' are *not* 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,'[2] being unknown to and consequently unrecognised by the Councils by whose labours the faith of Christendom was defended against, and preserved from, the attacks of the great heresies which arose against the foundation mystery of the Incarnation.[3]

[1] *Vide Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486. H87 [2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[3] On the witness against Papalism of the Fifth Œcumenical Council, *vide* nn. 940 *et seq.*, 1030, 1032; of the Sixth Œcumenical Council, *vide* nn. 748 *et seq.*, 950 *et seq.*, 1034-5; of the Seventh Œcumenical Council, *vide* nn. ~~796~~, ~~1028~~, 1038, ~~1266~~.

795 1271

CHAPTER XIII

THE ALLEGED ROMAN EPISCOPATE OF ST. PETER

SECTION LXVI.—*The Papalist meaning of the expression 'the legitimate successors of St. Peter.'*

464. The *Satis Cognitum* having quoted 'the testimony' of the Florentine and Fourth Lateran Councils, which has been discussed above,[1] proceeds to add—'These declarations were preceded by the consent of antiquity, which ever acknowledged without the slightest doubt or hesitation the Bishops of Rome, and revered them as the legitimate successors of St. Peter.'[2]

The assertion here made is that the Bishops of Rome were, 'by the consent of antiquity,' held to be 'successors of St. Peter' in that *Papalist* sense, in proof of which 'the testimony' of the two Councils had just been cited. It is of great importance that this fact should be borne in mind when considering 'the testimony of the Holy Fathers' to which the *Satis Cognitum* appeals in support of this assertion. For it by no means follows that any writer who acknowledges the Bishops of Rome to be successors of St. Peter held them to be so in the Papalist sense. Such an acknowledgment may bear, indeed, an essentially different meaning in the minds of those who made it.

465. Any one who believes that St. Peter was first diocesan Bishop of Rome, so that the Episcopal throne of that See might be styled 'the chair of Peter,' as the 'throne of Canterbury' is styled the 'chair of St. Augustine,' might well call Pius X., the present occupant of the See, 'the legitimate successor of St. Peter,' in the same sense as Dr. Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, is 'the legitimate successor' of St. Augustine and sits 'in his chair.' But in so doing this would not of necessity involve that such person meant, and must be held to admit, that Pius X., as 'the legitimate successor of St. Peter,' possesses full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Church *jure divino*, as the Papalist theory demands.

466. Further, if it were admitted, for the sake of argument, that our Lord did make a grant of supremacy to St. Peter, constituting him 'Master' of the 'Apostolic College,' and conferring on him sovereignty over the whole Church as Supreme Pastor and Judge, it is far from

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 250 *et seq.*, 276 *et seq.*

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

being a necessary consequence that he should have successors in that sovereignty as a result of that grant. For 'the form' in which the grant is alleged to have been conferred prohibits this, showing, as it does, that it would have been clearly a 'personal' grant, and since a privilege which follows the person becomes extinguished with the death of the grantee,[1] Peter could never have had any successors in such 'privilege.'

467. Premising this, it is to be noted that the Papalist contention necessitates that Peter actually held 'the Roman Episcopate' in the sense that a Bishop of any See holds the Episcopate of such See, that is, was 'diocesan Bishop of Rome,' and exercised the office of Supreme Pastor of the One Flock as Pius x. claims to do now, so that the same monarchical power became inherent in that See because of his tenure of it as first Bishop.

This is plain from the *Constitutio Pastor Æternus* of the *Vatican Council*, wherein it is laid down that Peter 'lives, presides, and judges to this day and always in his successors the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by him and consecrated by his blood, whence whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See does, by the institution of Christ himself, obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church.'[2] Unless, therefore, St. Peter was diocesan Bishop of Rome,' he could obviously have no 'successors' in 'the Roman Episcopate': unless he occupied the Episcopal throne of that See, the Roman Bishops could not sit 'in his chair.'

Section LXVII.—*Who founded the See of Rome?*

468. In the *Vatican Decrees* it will be observed that occupancy of the Roman See by St. Peter is associated with his 'foundation' thereof in such manner as to leave the impression that the latter follows *ex necessitate* from the former, *i.e.* that St. Peter founded the Roman See by sitting first in the Episcopal chair of Rome. It will be well, then, to consider the question who was the 'founder' of the Roman See.

The allusion which St. Clement of Rome makes in his Epistle to the Corinthians[3] to those 'champions who lived very near our own time,' 'the good Apostles'[4] Peter and Paul, is vague: it no doubt points to the presence of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome, and when taken in connection with the statement of St. Irenæus that these two Apostles were the founders of the Church of Rome, may well be held to corroborate such statement, but by itself it is far too vague to justify its being used as a proof of this position.

[1] *De regulis Juris* VII. *in Sexto.*
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. ii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 483.
[3] On the *Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians*, see note 37.
[4] S. Clemens Rom., *Ep. ad Corinth.*; P.G. i. 217.

469. The other Apostolic Father who says anything which might bear on the point is St. Ignatius, whose words, however, have only indirect reference to the question. He says, 'I am not going to give directions like Peter and Paul.'[1] There is here no mention of any 'foundation' of the Church of Rome by Peter and Paul, but St. Ignatius would appear to imply that some such relation existed between the Church of Rome and Peter and Paul, the Romans to whom he was writing having had the privilege of receiving 'directions' from the two Apostles, which 'directions' might not unnaturally be referred to the time when the Christians at Rome, through the foundation of the Episcopate there, became an organised part of the Church as 'the Church' of Rome.[2] The reference is, as has been said, indirect, but like that of St. Clement, when taken in connection with the explicit statement of St. Irenæus, might be held to imply that the two Apostles were the founders of the Roman Church.

470. The statement made by the writer next in order of time who can be said to allude to the subject is that contained in a fragment of a letter from Dionysius of Corinth to the Roman Church during the Episcopate of Soter,[3] written about A.D. 165, which has been preserved by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*: 'Therefore you also, by such an admonition, have bound together those [Churches] which were planted by Peter and Paul at Rome and Corinth. For both of these having planted us in Corinth, taught us, and having in like manner taught together in Italy, they suffered at the same time.'[4] This is more definite. Dionysius describes the relationship of the two Apostles to the Church of Rome as being the same as that which they had to the Church of Corinth, both being planted by them, that is, that the Christians in both cities owed their organisation as a local Church—'the Church of Rome' and 'the Church of Corinth' respectively—to their labours.

471. The statements of St. Irenæus about A.D. 185 are clear. He says, 'Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and laying the foundation of the Church';[5] and again, the 'Church founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.'[6] The language of St. Irenæus is explicit. The foundation of the Roman Church is declared to be the work of the two Apostles, and thus not of St. Peter alone.

472. On the evidence it is plain that the earliest writers, and there-

[1] S. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Rom.*, n. iv.; P.G. v. 689.

[2] On the *Statement of St. Ignatius as to the position of the Church of Rome*, see note 38.

[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. iv. c. 23; P.G. xx. 388.

[4] *Ibid.*, bk. ii. c. 25; P.G. xx. 209.

[5] S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.*, iii., i. 1; P.G. vii. 845.

[6] *Ibid.*, iii., iii. 2; P.G. vii. 849.

fore those who would have the most accurate information, viewed the connection of St. Paul with the Church of Rome as identical in nature with that of St. Peter. They are named together in strict equality, either indirectly or explicitly, as the joint-founders of the Roman Church. It is inconceivable that writers of such authority, holding prominent positions in the Church, could have so written had the Papal Monarchy been an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church. In that case the foundation of the Church of Rome would have been ascribed to St. Peter alone, who fixed 'his chair' there as 'Supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' so that as a result his 'Roman Episcopate' the 'Papal rights' became inherent in the Roman See. To have coupled, on the hypothesis that the Roman theory is true, St. Paul in the way they did with St. Peter would not have been merely misleading but opposed to the truth, a denial of the prerogatives which the See of Rome, as the 'See of Peter,' possessed *jure divino*.

It is, then, significant that in the *Vatican Decrees* the part taken by St. Paul in founding the Church of Rome is entirely suppressed. It was no doubt felt that to admit that St. Paul was joint-founder of the Church of Rome with St. Peter would be incompatible with the statements made by the *Council* as to the position and prerogatives of the 'Roman Pontiffs.' The writers who have been quoted were not so hampered, they knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy, and were thus able to state historical facts with regard to the foundation of the Church of Rome. On the authority, therefore, of these unimpeachable witnesses, it is to be concluded that St. Peter was not 'the founder' of the See of Rome.

Section LXVIII.—*Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome?*

473. But was St. Peter Bishop of Rome? The foundation of the Roman Church by St. Peter solely, is, as has been seen, so bound up by the *Vatican Decrees* with his alleged 'Episcopate' there, that the disproof of the former might well be held to involve on the Papalist presumption that of the latter; there is, however, other evidence which makes it clear that a negative answer must be returned to the question proposed.

In discussing the question, it is of great importance to remember that the question is not whether St. Peter was ever at Rome, but whether he was 'the diocesan Bishop of Rome.' Proof of the former is not proof of the latter.

The tradition of antiquity bears unanimous testimony to the fact that St. Peter went to Rome and was there martyred. Of the four writers quoted as witnesses to the 'foundation' of the Church of Rome by

St. Peter and Paul, two, St. Dionysius and St. Irenæus, directly testify to the Apostle's presence in the Imperial City, which is also certainly implied by the words of the other two, St. Clement and St. Ignatius. Further, there is the additional testimony of Caius of Rome, who wrote some fifteen years after St. Irenæus, as follows: 'I can show the trophies of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Road, you will find the trophies of those who have laid the foundation of this Church.'[1] From the context it is clear that Eusebius held that by 'trophies' Caius meant 'tombs,' and that he was right is corroborated by the fact that from very early times churches have existed over these tombs—that of St. Peter in the Vatican, and that of St. Paul in the Ostian Road.

474. It is sometimes sought to ignore the distinction between the questions, the importance of which has been insisted on, and to adduce the evidence which proves that St. Peter was at Rome and suffered martyrdom there as proof of his Roman Episcopate, as if his mere presence at Rome necessarily involved it; the absurdity of this method of argument is self-evident.

Admitting, then, that St. Peter was at Rome and suffered there, so that Tertullian could say of the Church of Rome, 'Happy Church, in which Apostles poured forth their teaching with their blood; where Peter is made equal to the Passion of the Lord; where Paul is crowned with the departure of John [the Baptist]; where the Apostle John, after being immersed in the boiling oil and suffering nothing, was banished to an island;'[2] and of 'the Romans' that they were those 'to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel sealed with their blood,'[3] it remains still to be decided by evidence whether St. Peter was Bishop of Rome.

475. The evidence of the first age of the Church, during which the true tradition would necessarily be preserved, is undoubtedly given by St. Irenæus. Having stated of the Roman Church that it was 'founded and established at Rome by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul,' he says: 'The blessed Apostles then having founded and builded the Church, entrusted the ministry of the Episcopate to Linus. Of this Linus Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anencletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, the bishopric is allotted to Clement.'[4]

St. Irenæus here definitely states that the two Apostles, as joint-founders of the Church, were co-consecrators of the first diocesan Bishop; they organised the local Church by giving it its Bishop, the

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. ii. cap. xxv.; P.G. xx. 209.
[2] Tertullian, *De Prescript. Hæret.*, cap. xxxvii.; P.L. ii. 49.
[3] *Adv. Marcion.*, lib. iv. c. 5; P.L. ii. 361.
[4] S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.*, iii., iii. 2, 3; P.G. vii. 848, 849.

committal of the Episcopate thereof to Linus being the act by which such local Church was brought into being, the Christians at Rome being placed under him as their head, united with whom they constituted 'the Church of Rome.' The two Apostles are placed by St. Irenæus on an absolute equality in the matter, they are the joint-apostolical source of the power and authority committed to Linus, such authority being that of the Episcopate, each conferring on him the same and no other power and authority; they occupied exactly the same position with regard to the Roman Church, and that position was evidently other than that of diocesan Bishop, for not only is it impossible for two Bishops to hold the same See at the same time, but they are definitely excluded from those who held the Episcopate of the Church which they founded, in that they committed the said Episcopate to a third person. It is in accordance with this that St. Irenæus, when enumerating the Bishops of Rome, numbers them 'from the Apostles,' Linus being the first Bishop, Anencletus the second, and Clement the third, a method of enumeration he continues a few sentences farther on, when completing the list of Bishops of Rome, to Eleutherus, by whom he says 'the Bishop's office is now held in the twelfth place from the Apostles.'[1]

476. It has been attempted to destroy the value of the evidence here given by St. Irenæus by alleging that he, in another passage in the same work,[2] calls Hyginus, who in the list just referred to is eighth, 'the ninth Bishop,' and therefore implies that St. Peter was the first. But this allegation is clearly of no weight, for the following reasons. There are five other instances in all in which St. Irenæus makes mention of the numerical order of certain of the names in the roll of Roman Bishops. Three of these occur in the list already referred to, in which he calls 'Clement the third,' Xystus 'the sixth,' and Eleutherus 'the twelfth' 'ab apostolis,'[3] the fourth is in the next chapter, where he designates Anicetus 'the tenth'[4] Bishop, which is according to the same method of reckoning. The fifth is in the same passage as the last instance. In the old Latin version Hyginus is here numbered 'octavus,' which he would be counting Anicetus, as St. Irenæus, as has just been noted, does, the tenth, and is actually his position in the catalogue in the previous chapter. Eusebius, however, citing the Greek, calls him 'the ninth' (ἔνατος),[5] as he does also when quoting the passage used in the allegation under comment.[6]

477. Now it is evident that the Greek in this place is wrong, for (*a*) it is inconsistent with the place assigned in the context to Anicetus, and (*b*) it is contradicted by the list given by St. Irenæus in the previous chapter of all the Bishops on the roll of the Roman Episcopate

[1] *L.c.* [2] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, i., xxvii. 1; P.G. vii. 687. [3] *L.c.*
[4] *Op. cit.*, iii., iv. 3; P.G. vii. 857. [5] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, iv. 11. [6] *L.c.*

to his own days. It cannot be questioned that this formal enumeration of the order of the Roman Bishops must be regarded as decisive as to the order in which he held them to have succeeded to that See. The writer's object is to expose the futility of the contention of the Gnostic heretics that they possessed the truth by giving the succession of the Bishops of Rome, as an example of the successions of Bishops from the Apostles by whom the faith of the Church was proclaimed to men. The whole force of the argument depends upon the exact succession being known and given, so that there could be no doubt as with reference to the true tradition of the Apostles being possessed by the Church, in that it had been handed down from those to whom they had committed it, the Bishops whom they appointed in the local Churches, by the successors of those Bishops. He selects as a typical succession that of the Bishops of the Church established at Rome, a catalogue of whom he proceeds to give as the successors of Linus, 'to whom the Apostles entrusted the ministry of the Episcopate,' as follows: 'To him succeeded Anencletus, and after him in the third place from the Apostles, the Bishopric is allotted to Clement. . . . This Clement again Evaristus [4] succeeds, and Evaristus Alexander [5], then Xystus in like manner is appointed sixth from the Apostles; and after Telesphorus [7], who was also a glorious martyr; afterwards *Hyginus* [8], then Pius [9], and after him Anicetus [10]; Anicetus having been succeeded by Soter [11], the Bishop's office is now held in the twelfth place by Eleutherus.'[1] This formal catalogue, it must be observed, is that which Eusebius adopts in his *History*[2] as the list of Bishops of Rome down to Eleutherus, when, as an historian, he would take especial care to be accurate.

478. Dom Massuet, the learned Benedictine editor of St. Irenæus, holds the opinion here stated. He says, 'ὃς ἦν ἕνατος ἐπίσκοπος. I consider it should read ὃς ἦν ὄγδοος, not ἕνατος ἐπίσκοπος. So certainly read the interpreter, and in my judgment rightly, for in the preceding chapter iii., Irenæus, enumerating in order the Roman Pontiffs, numbers Hyginus in the eighth place, and both here and there assigns to Anicetus the tenth place, which does not agree if you should here read ἕνατος. Nor clearly will you do away with the contradiction by saying that in a way Peter is computed by Irenæus to be amongst the Roman Pontiffs, and in a way excluded, for both in the preceding chapter iii. and in book i. chapter xxvii.; he enumerates the Roman Pontiffs ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων "ab apostolis," by which words he plainly removes Peter from his catalogue.'[3] So clear, indeed, is it that Hyginus was the eighth Bishop, that Dom Massuet does not hesitate

[1] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, iii., iii. 3; P.G. vii. 849, 850.
[2] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, bk. v. c. vi.; P.G. xx. 445.
[3] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, iii., iv. 3; P.G. vii. 857, note 12.

to say 'That Irenæus may agree with Irenæus everywhere ὄγδοος, octavus, must be read not ἔνατος, nonus.'[1]

The allegation is thus disproved. St. Irenæus clearly excludes 'the Apostles' from the Roman Episcopate, and so witnesses against any Roman Episcopate of St. Peter.

479. The testimony of St. Irenæus is especially important, because he had ample opportunities of knowing all the facts of the case. In the first place, he was the disciple of St. Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John. It is impossible that St. John would have been ignorant of St. Peter's Roman Episcopate, or that he would not have informed Polycarp thereof, nor that the latter should not have informed his pupil. Of course, on Papal principles this impossibility must be held to be strengthened by the fact that St. John and St. Polycarp would in turn, by such remissness, have neglected to teach a matter of faith with regard to the Divine Constitution of the Church, viz. that 'the legitimate successors of St. Peter in the Roman Episcopate' are the Supreme Pastors of the Church. Again, some time before he went to Lyons he had lived a considerable period at Rome, and was there when the news arrived that his master, Polycarp, had suffered martyrdom. Later, on the death of Pothinus, he was sent to Rome with the letter addressed by the Martyrs of Lyons to Eleutherus, by whom he was consecrated Bishop of Lyons in succession to Pothinus.[2] He would thus be in a position to know the local tradition of the Church of Rome, and be acquainted with any catalogues of the succession preserved there.

480. It is not improbable, indeed, that St. Irenæus' catalogue is that which Hegesippus[3] tells us he made when at Rome during the Episcopate of Anicetus, *i.e.* some twenty years earlier, and which, with additions to date, he afterwards included in a work published in the Episcopate of Eleutherus, and 'it may,' as Salmon says, 'reasonably be inferred that Hegesippus had published his list of Bishops in the time of Anicetus, to which, in the later work, he merely adds the names of the two Bishops, Soter and Eleutherus, who had succeeded Anicetus.'[4] No doubt the list of Hegesippus was the result of the personal investigations he made at Rome, whither he had journeyed, as he had to other places, for the express purpose of making out lists of the succession of Bishops to men appointed by the Apostles, with the same object in view as St. Irenæus had in drawing up his catalogue, viz. to refute the claims of the Gnostic heretics to possess the truth, and so would be at special pains to be accurate.

[1] S. Irenæus, III., xxvii. 1; P.G. vii. 687, note 45.
[2] Dom Massuet, Dissertatio IV., art. 1; *De S. Irenæi vita et gestis*, c. 12; P.G. vii. 185.
[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 22; P.G. xx. 377.
[4] Salmon, *The Infallibility of the Church*, pp. 358, 359. Second edit.

Anyway, whether St. Irenæus copied from Hegesippus or instituted independent inquiries, 'it would,' as Lightfoot says, 'be a tolerably safe inference from the facts to assume that the series was the same in both writers, as they must have derived their information about the same time and from the same sources.'[1]

481. The testimony, then, of St. Irenæus must be held conclusive against any Roman Episcopate of Peter, for had he held the position of diocesan Bishop of Rome, it is plain that the catalogue of such Bishops which he gives would have commenced with him. The local Church, it is evident, in the days of St. Irenæus knew nothing of any such Episcopate; in neither its tradition nor its archives was there any mention of it. On the contrary, the Roman Church, whilst justly proud of being founded and established by 'two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul,' or 'Paul and Peter' (there is good authority for this reading, which the learned Duchesne[2] adopts), knew that they had entrusted the ministry of the Episcopate to Linus, thus constituting him their first Diocesan, and so placed him first in their Roll of Bishops. And it may be added that the fact that St. Irenæus' statements are incompatible with the Papalist allegation of the 'Roman Episcopate' of Peter receives a significant proof from the manner in which Cardinal Wiseman refers to St. Irenæus' catalogue of the Roman Bishops cited above. The Cardinal quotes it thus: 'To Peter, as St. Irenæus observes, succeeded Linus, to Linus Anencletus, then in the third place Clement'[3] a perversion of St. Irenæus' own statement for a controversial purpose which it would be difficult to too severely condemn.

482. Some twenty years after St. Irenæus wrote, Tertullian's work *De Prescriptione Hæreticorum* appeared. In it he says, with reference to the heretics: 'Let them produce the origins of their Churches, let them unroll the order of their Bishops, running down in succession from the beginning, that their first Bishop may be shown to have had as his ordainer and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of those Apostolic men who had continued steadfastly with the Apostles. For it is in this method that the Apostolic Churches give an account of their beginnings, as the Church of the Smyrnæans relates that Polycarp was installed there by St. John, as that of the Romans doth that Clement was ordained by Peter. So in like manner the rest of the Churches produce those whom, having been appointed to the Episcopate, they possess as transmitters of the Apostolic seed.'[4]

483. In this passage St. Peter is set forth as occupying the same relation to the Church of the Romans as St. John occupied towards

[1] Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i.; *St. Clement of Rome*, vol. i. p. 205.
[2] Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, p. 118.
[3] Wiseman, *Lectures on the Catholic Church*, Lect. VIII., vol. i. p. 278.
[4] Tertullian, *De Prescriptione Hæreticorum*, cap. xxxii.; P.L. ii. 44, 45.

the Church of the Smyrnæans, that is, as the Apostle who was the 'auctor' of the first Bishop of the local Church. Tertullian excludes St. John from the order of the Bishops of Smyrna by calling him the 'auctor' of St. Polycarp, whom he names as the first Bishop of the Apostolic Church of Smyrna. In like manner St. Peter is excluded from 'the order of the Bishops of Rome,' Clement being expressly named as the first in the roll of the Bishops of that See. Tertullian thus is in agreement with St. Irenæus in excluding from the catalogue of the Bishops of the Apostolic Churches their founders; he therefore likewise testifies against 'the Roman Episcopate' of Peter.

484. But it will be noticed that whilst this is the case, his statement with regard to the succession of the Bishops of Rome differs in two important particulars from that of St. Irenæus. In the first place, he does not name St. Paul as 'auctor' with St. Peter of the Episcopate in Rome—the act of entrusting the Episcopate to Clement is assigned to St. Peter alone; and secondly, Clement, who is expressly stated by St. Irenæus to have been third from the Apostles in the list of the Roman Bishops, is here named as the first in the order of such Bishops. How did these differences arise? If the first difference had stood by itself, and St. Peter been named as the sole consecrator of Linus, a plausible explanation might be found in the supposition that the mention of St. Paul might gradually tend to drop out owing to the fact that 'strangers of Rome' had been brought into the Church by St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost; he might thus have come to be regarded as having practically had the more prominent part in the founding of the local Church of Rome, a tendency which would be assisted by the fact that he 'was in Christ' before St. Paul, and held the foremost position amongst the original Twelve. But in view of the second difference, such an explanation cannot be regarded as sufficient.

485. The purpose of Tertullian's argument required that he should be accurately stating the belief of the Roman Church of his time: it is equally certain, as has been seen, that the purpose of St. Irenæus' argument required that he, too, should be accurately stating the belief of the same Church in his time. The whole success of the argument of each writer depended upon his statement being in accord with what he personally knew to be the tradition handed down to, and preserved by, the authorities of the Roman Church. That tradition has evidently undergone a change in the twenty years which intervened between the time of the two statements. The change is a grave one. It is one which had to encounter the evidence existing in the local Church on which St. Irenæus based his catalogue which is corroborated by that afforded by the order of the names in the Canon of the Roman Mass, which, from its place, doubtless records the

original tradition of the order in which the names were mentioned from the beginning at the Divine Mysteries, an order which is in complete agreement with that observed in the catalogue of St. Irenæus. There must be some way by which this change can be accounted for.

486. It is quite probable that the alteration was brought about through the influence exercised by a letter purporting to have been written by Clement to St. James, which was prefixed to the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions*. This romance of the wanderings of St. Peter from Jerusalem to Antioch was composed in Syria towards the close of the second century.[1] In the 'Letter' a description is given of the ordination of the supposed writer 'Clement' by St. Peter, who is also represented 'as having appointed him to sit in his own chair,' not, however, of authority, but 'of discourse.' These Clementine romances, like other Ebionite documents, had a wide circulation, and inasmuch as Gnostic and other errors were refuted in them, their heretical tendencies would not unlikely, in an uncritical age, escape observation, or they might, owing to the historical form in which they were cast, in such an age be thought to have been genuine documents corrupted by heretics for their own ends. Certainly this Syrian romance was much thought of 'in orthodox circles in the fourth and fifth centuries,'[2] and the 'Letter to James' finds a place in the very forefront of the *Pseudo-Isidorian* documents.[3] Rufinus translated the *Clementine Recognitions* apparently without any idea that they were of an heretical character, omitting to prefix the 'Letter to James,' not because of any suspicion attaching to it, but because it was 'later in time'—not, that is, denying that it was composed by Clement, 'but merely that the letter, which purports to be written after the death of Peter, is not rightly prefixed to discourses which claim to have been written some years previously.'[4]

487. The history of this type of literature amongst heretics renders it highly probable that the Clementine literature did not take its present form all at once, passing through various recensions, and it would thus not be at all unlikely that an earlier form of the story would find its way, some time before the end of the second century, to Rome, where heretics always endeavoured to plant their novelties. Their reason for so acting was the obvious one that, being the capital of the Empire, it presented special opportunities for spreading their doctrines, in that people from all parts of the world flocked thither from the necessities of business, and, if influenced by them, would on their

[1] Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, p. 131.

[2] Duchesne, *Les Origines Chrétiennes*, Leçons d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, Première partie. Nouvelle édition, p. 98.

[3] Hinschius, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-36.

[4] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. p. 570, *sub v.* 'Clementine Literature.'

return home act as agents for the diffusion of the heresy they had embraced amongst their own people.

The statement in the 'Letter to James,' that Clement was ordained by Peter and placed in 'his chair,' would in itself present special attraction to the Roman Church. St. Peter was undoubtedly the foremost of the twelve, and had taken the most prominent part in the early days of the Church in extending it, hence the fact that the 'Letter' emphasised the connection of the local Church with this Apostle: making him its 'first Bishop' and the sole 'auctor' of the line of Bishops who succeeded him would naturally induce the Romans to lay hold of that statement and dispose them not to view too critically the context. Then, as Africa was in close connection with Italy, the story would almost equally soon reach the Church there, being, as it was, a daughter of Rome, and so Tertullian would have knowledge of it.

488. If it be said that the suggestion here made is refuted by the fact that Tertullian, as we have seen, explicitly excludes St. Peter from the succession of the Bishops of Rome, whereas the 'Letter to James' speaks of St. Peter having his 'chair' at Rome, *i.e.* being Bishop there, it may be replied that the difficulty thus raised may be overcome by the supposition that one of the earlier and, consequently, less developed forms had reached Africa. The tendency of romances of this character is to become more detailed in their statements in each successive version, and such earlier form might easily have merely stated that 'Peter laid his hands on Clement.' Döllinger, indeed, thinks that the appointment of Clement by Peter must have been chronicled in an earlier Ebionite document, the *Preaching of Peter*, as the fact that 'the *last* discourses and ordinances of Peter being recorded in this document proves that it must have contained an account of the administration of the Roman Church after his death also.'[1] And he says that it was from this document that the statement as to the appointment of Clement by Peter came into the Epistle of Clement to James. This is not unlikely, as one Ebionite forger might well adopt from another who had the same object in view, viz. to exalt St. Peter at the expense of St. Paul, and the writer thinks that it was.

489. The first document in which St. Peter is regarded as actually the first Bishop of Rome is the *Chronicon of Hippolytus*, if, as Mommsen thinks,[2] the list of Roman Bishops known as *Catalogus Liberianus* is derived from it, a catalogue compiled about 354 and extending to the Episcopate of Liberius. Lightfoot also is of opinion that the earlier portion of the *Catalogus* represents that of Hippolytus, the 'Hippolytean nucleus' being the list down to Pontianus.[3]

[1] Döllinger, *The First Age of the Church*. [E.T. 303. Second edit.]

[2] Smith and Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 1656, *sub v.* 'Pope.'

[3] Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. i.; *St. Clement of Rome*, vol. i. p. 264.

The list in the *Chronicon* is no longer extant, only the heading '*Nomina Episcoporum Romæ et quis episcopus quot annis præfuit*' being preserved, but if the *Catalogus Liberianus* does represent it, its date, about A.D. 235, would allow full time for the 'Letter of James' to become well known at Rome, and so the difference between the list in the *Chronicon* and that of Irenæus would be accounted for. If the Ebionite forgery be not the origin of the idea that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, it must be admitted that it is a remarkable coincidence that the change in the Roman tradition should first appear at the very time when the 'Letter to James' became generally known; and Döllinger, in his work, *The First Age of the Church*, written when still in communion with Rome, names this Letter as one of the 'things which have conspired to produce an appearance of error and uncertainty in the succession of the first Roman Bishops.'[1] It certainly furnishes an explanation of what otherwise would appear to be inexplicable in the face of the definite statements of St. Irenæus, and no other solution equally probable has been suggested.

490. Further evidence that the original tradition of the Roman Church was that Linus was its first Bishop is afforded by Eusebius' statements in his *History*. He not only follows St. Irenæus in saying that 'Linus was the first to receive the Episcopate at Rome,'[2] and that Clement was the third, Anencletus being the second in order,[3] but he adopts as authoritative the whole of St. Irenæus' list of the Roman Bishops[4] which has been quoted above. Moreover, whilst he definitely declares that 'James was the first to receive the Episcopate of the Church at Jerusalem,' that 'Peter, James, and John . . . chose James the Just as Bishop of Jerusalem,' and that he first 'obtained the episcopal seat at Jerusalem,' he makes no statement that Peter held a like position at Rome. This must be considered decisive as to the witness of the result of his investigations for his *History*.

491. If it be said that Eusebius does, in his *Chronicon*, say that 'Peter was the first to preside over the Roman Church,'[5] the obvious reply is that the authority of the *History* must be regarded on historical points superior to that of the *Chronicon*. In the latter Eusebius simply records the opinion which he found accepted in his own day, for which he gives no authority; whereas in the *History* he does give the authority on which he relies, viz. that of St. Irenæus, that is, the testimony of one who had had ample facilities for obtaining accurate information on the spot at a time much nearer to the date of the foundation of the Church of Rome than the age in which he wrote. Eusebius' witness, therefore,

[1] Döllinger, *The First Age of the Church*. [E.T. p. 300, note 5. Second edit.]
[2] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, iii. 2; P.G. xx. 216.
[3] *Ibid.*, iii. 21; P.G. xx. 256.
[4] *Ibid.*, v. 6; P.G. xx. 445.
[5] S. Hieron., *Interpret. Chronic. Eusebii* (*Græca Fragmenta*); P.L. xxvii. 678.

as an historical writer, is identical with that of his authority, St. Irenæus, and so against any 'Roman Episcopate' of St. Peter.

492. Lastly, the testimony of St. Irenæus is further corroborated by the fact already noted, that the order in which the first Bishops of Rome are commemorated in the Canon of the Roman Mass, which, as Döllinger says, 'retains the original order of the Greek diptychs, Lini, Cleti, Clementis,'[1] the original Roman Liturgy having been in Greek, out of which the present Latin service developed, the intense conservatism of the Roman Church in Liturgical matters preventing any change being made after the idea that St. Peter was the first, and Clement the second, Bishop of the See of Rome had become the accepted belief of the authorities of that Church.

493. The evidence which has been adduced makes it plain that the local Church of Rome was founded by two Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, by whom conjointly the first Bishop of the See, Linus, was consecrated; the conclusion therefore is that the assertion in the *Satis Cognitum*, that the Bishops of Rome 'succeed Peter in the Roman Episcopate' and are 'the legitimate successors of St. Peter,' and that of the *Vatican Council* that 'they succeed to Peter in this chair' which he 'founded,' have no basis in fact, in that St. Peter was never diocesan Bishop of Rome; whence it follows that the Papalist allegations as to the monarchical powers belonging *jure divino* to the Bishops of Rome in right of such alleged succession are disproved.

A further refutation of Papalist allegation is furnished by the facts which have been given. If to the Bishops of Rome was 'delivered in blessed Peter the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church,' a power which is 'the full plenitude of the supreme power immediate and ordinary over all and every Church,'[2] it would necessarily follow that it would be absolutely necessary for all pastors and faithful to know who, as Vicar of Christ, wielded this jurisdiction 'towards which they were bound, whether singly or collectively, by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience.'[3] Hence the succession of the Bishops of Rome would occupy a unique position, it could not be put on a level with that of the Bishops of other Sees. Yet this is precisely what was done by both St. Irenæus and Tertullian. It is the succession of the Bishops of those Sees, of which the first Bishop had an Apostolic 'auctor,' on which these writers lay stress. There is no consciousness on their part of such a pre-eminent position belonging to the Bishops of the See of Rome in the Divine Constitution of the Church, as to place the succession of those Bishops in an essentially different category as being that of those

[1] Döllinger, *The First Age of the Church*. [E.T. p. 298, note 4.]
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484, 485.
[3] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*

who were the 'Masters' of 'the Episcopal College,' the sovereign rulers of the Church. If these writers had believed the Bishops of Rome to hold *jure divino* in the constitution of the Church the position assigned to them by Papalism, which they would, if the Papal hypothesis were true, be bound to do, it is plain that not only would it have been incumbent on them to avoid any appearance of trenching on those prerogatives, but also, in view of those prerogatives, to give the succession of the Roman Bishops in order to show who, at the date they wrote, was 'the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' communion with whom was essential to membership in that flock. The method in which they make use of the Episcopal succession in the See of Rome is incompatible with a true faith in what Papalism declares to be 'a doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one is able to deviate, his faith and salvation being preserved.'[1]

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

CHAPTER XIV

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST. IRENÆUS

Section LXIX.—'*The Irenæan Passage.*'

494. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to adduce 'the many and evident testimonies of the holy Fathers' of the 'East' and 'West' in support of the assertion that 'the consent of antiquity' acknowledged the position of the Roman Pontiff set forth by 'the declarations' of the Florentine and the Fourth Lateran Councils.

The first writer who is cited is St. Irenæus: 'Most remarkable of these testimonies,' declares the *Satis Cognitum*, 'is that of St. Irenæus, who, referring to the Roman Church, says, "with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority, it is necessary that every Church should be in concord (*Contra Hæreses*, lib. iii. cap. 3, n. 2)."'[1] The quotation thus given, it must be noted, is incomplete. The original Greek is not extant, but the whole passage in the ancient Latin version is as follows: — 'Ad hanc ecclesiam propter potiorem[2] principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, *hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.*'[3] The italicised words are not given in the *Satis Cognitum*, an unfortunate omission, since they have, as will be seen, an important bearing on the real signification of the words which it cites as 'the testimony' of the writer.

495. The context in which the *Satis Cognitum* places the quotation makes it plain that its object is to prove that St. Irenæus witnesses to the existence of a moral obligation on the part of every local Church to be in agreement with the Roman Church, on the ground that that Church possesses 'pre-eminent authority,' *i.e.* authority in that sense in which throughout the *Satis Cognitum* it is asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs, viz., 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,'[4] the power which Christ 'exercised during his mortal life.'[5] On the Papalist theory St. Irenæus was bound

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.
[2] So the *Satis Cognitum*; but all the MSS., except one, read *potentiorem*.
[3] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, III., iii. 2; P.G. vii. 649.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

to hold this, as it is no 'newly conceived opinion, but the venerable and constant belief of every age,'[1] and consequently of 'the age' of St. Irenæus. If he did not do so on that theory, he was outside the one fold of the One Shepherd. Hence it is in this sense that the *Satis Cognitum* quotes St. Irenæus. If his words do not signify this, the quotation is useless for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*, since they would not be a 'testimony' to the Papalist doctrine, in support and in proof of which the citation is made. Moreover, since the *Satis Cognitum* declares this passage to be 'most remarkable,' it is clear that its illustrious author was unable to find any other passage in the works of St. Irenæus (or elsewhere) which would serve his purpose so well. It is, therefore (according to the authority of Pope Leo), *the* Irenæan passage which sets forth the supremacy of the Roman Church. If, therefore, an examination of the passage shows that it has not the meaning sought to be affixed to it in the *Satis Cognitum*, the conclusion is inevitable that St. Irenæus cannot be adduced as a witness to Papalism.

496. What is the argument St. Irenæus is making use of in the passage from his work *Against Heresies*, whence the citation is taken? St. Irenæus is engaged in refuting the teaching of the Gnostics, who boasted that they had a more perfect knowledge of the truth. In order to disprove their contention, he appealed to the 'tradition which is of the Apostles, which is guarded by the successions of Presbyters in the Churches.'[2] 'The tradition of the Apostles,' he says, 'made manifest throughout the world in every Church (*in omni ecclesia*) all may look back upon who wish to see things truly; and we are able to recount those whom the Apostles appointed to be Bishops in the Churches and their successors, quite down to our own time, who neither taught nor knew any such thing as they fondly devise. Yet surely, if the Apostles had known any hidden mysteries which they used to teach the perfect apart and unknown to the rest, they would deliver it to those, even more than others, to whom they were entrusting the Churches themselves. For very perfect and blameless in all things would they have them to be, whom they were leaving to be their actual successors, committing to them their own place of Presidency; whose correct dealing would be a great advantage, their failure, again, an extreme calamity.

'But because it were too long in such a work as this to reckon up the successions in all the Churches (*omnium ecclesiarum*), there is one very great and very ancient and known to all, the Church founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, whose tradition which it hath from the Apostles and her faith proclaimed unto men, coming down even to our own time through the succession of

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[2] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, III, ii. 2; P.G. vii. 847.

her Bishops, we point to, thereby confounding all those who in any way form undue assemblies, on account either of self-pleasing ways or of vainglory or of blindness and wrong opinion.' Then follows the passage given above, which for the present we leave untranslated. Proceeding, the writer gives the succession of Bishops of Rome on which comment was made in the last chapter,[1] amongst whom he specially notes that Clement had 'both seen the blessed Apostles, and conferred with them, and had the doctrine of the Apostles yet sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes.' And that he at a time of tumult in the Church of Corinth had urged them to peace by a letter, his Epistle to the Corinthians, setting forth the tradition which the Church of Rome 'had recently received from the Apostles,' a letter from which those who wish may 'discern the Apostolical tradition of the Church, the Epistle being more ancient than our present false teachers,' which tradition had come down from the Apostles in the Church, and the preaching of the truth through the same succession to his own time, when Eleutherus 'held the Bishop's office in the twelfth place from the Apostles.' And then he adds, 'This is a very full demonstration (*ostensio*) of the unity and sameness of the life-giving faith which from the Apostles even until now hath been preserved in the Church and passed onward in the truth.'[2]

497. The argument is plain. The Churches which have the Apostolical succession from founders who themselves were Apostles, a succession which he designates elsewhere as a *successio principalis*,[3] must of necessity be allowed on all hands to have preserved the truth which they received from their Apostolic founders. To the witness of these Churches, as that of the most ancient Churches 'where the Apostles went in and out,' to whose Bishops whom they appointed they 'delivered' the 'tradition,' he appeals as to an authority which cannot be questioned, as furnishing an unanswerable refutation of the contention of the Gnostics with regard to *their* 'tradition.'

And because it would take too long to give the succession of all these ancient Apostolically founded Churches, he gives that of that Church which is 'very great and very ancient and known of all, the Church founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul.'

498. The reason assigned is significant. It is simply a matter of convenience. All knew that the Church of Rome was founded by the two great Apostles, and the succession of Bishops of that Church would be admittedly a good example of the successions which it would take up too much space in his present volume to give in full. Clearly

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 475 *et seq.*

[2] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, III., iii. 1, 2, 3; P.G. vii. 848 *seq.*

[3] *Ibid.*, IV., xxvi. 2; P.G. vii. 1054.

a Papalist must have adopted a very different course. He would have argued that the true faith was preserved in the Church of Rome because it was the See of Peter, and given a list of its Bishops, not as being representative of other successions in other Apostolically founded Churches, but as being that of the 'Vicars of Christ,' 'the Fathers and Teachers of all Christians,' who, by right of the Apostolic Primacy which they possess as the legitimate successors of Peter, have the supreme power of teaching, so that, in order to prove beyond all possibility of cavil that the Gnostic position was erroneous, it would be sufficient merely to inquire what *they* taught. The whole Church would recognise the futility of Gnosticism, since it was contradicted by the witness of those whose definitions as to faith and morals have, from the beginning of the Christian faith, been acknowledged to be 'of themselves, and not from consent of the Church, irreformable.' The argument would be conclusive if the Papal hypothesis were true. St. Irenæus does not use it. On the contrary, he evidently knew of no such unique prerogative belonging to the 'Roman Pontiffs,' as he adduces the tradition handed down through the succession of the Bishops of Rome, as of the same character and essence as that which any other Church Apostolically founded could give, whatever moral value might be attached to it as being that of a very great and very ancient Church founded by two such glorious Apostles as St. Peter and St. Paul.

499. This identity of nature of the witness of the Church of Rome and that of other Churches who claimed Apostles as their founders in the argument of St. Irenæus, is further shown by the fact that he appeals to the teaching of St. Polycarp, who had been constituted by the Apostles Bishop of the Apostolic Church of Smyrna, who 'always taught those things which he had learnt from the Apostles' by whom he had been trained; and when on a visit to Rome, in the Episcopate of Anicetus, he proclaimed that he had received that one and only truth which had been handed down by the Church. He then makes a like appeal to the witness of the Apostolic Church of Ephesus, 'which had Paul for its founder and John to abide among them until the time of Trajan.'[1] And concludes, 'The proofs, therefore, being so powerful, we ought no more to look for the truth elsewhere which is so easy to obtain from the Church, the Apostles having therein most abundantly supplied, as in a rich storehouse, whatsoever appertains to the truth.'[2]

Rome, Smyrna, and Ephesus are adduced as bearing witness like in nature as Apostolic Churches. The 'proofs' (*ostensiones*) afforded by the witness of the two latter Churches are of like nature with the 'proof' (*ostensio*) afforded by that of the Roman Church, and St. Irenæus holds that these 'proofs' determine the error of the Gnostics.

[1] S. Irenæus, III., iii. 4; P.G. vii. 849. [2] *Ibid.*, III., iv. 1; P.G. vii. 850.

His method of argument is incompatible with Papalism, as being derogatory to, and, indeed, an implicit denial of, the true position of 'the Supreme Pastor,' since it could not have been used for the purpose by any one who believed the Bishops of Rome to be the divinely appointed Teachers of the One Flock, endowed 'with that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed, for defining doctrine with regard to faith and morals.'[1]

500. We are now in a position to arrive at the meaning of the passage which is imperfectly cited in the *Satis Cognitum*. The authorised English translation, 'For with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority, it is necessary that every Church should be in concord,'[2] accurately represents the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* seeks to affix to the words of St. Irenæus by the context in which it is cited, viz. that the Roman Church possesses such 'pre-eminent authority' as compels all other local Churches to agree therewith, thus occupying a unique position of 'sovereignty' essentially different, therefore, from the position of all ordinary Apostolically founded Churches. Is this the real meaning of St. Irenæus' words? That it is not so is clear from the following considerations.

501. In the first place, such an interpretation introduces a new idea alien from the argument in the course of which the words quoted occur. If the Papalist interpretation were correct, clearly there could be no object in making an appeal for the purpose of refuting heretics to the tradition of Apostolically founded Churches. Further, the Church of Rome could not be cited, as it is by St. Irenæus, as a matter of convenience; as one of a class of Churches, viz. those in which the Apostles had appointed the first Bishops, and so a representative of that class. If the impugned interpretation were the true one, there could be no similarity between the witness of the Church which occupies the supreme position of infallibility and that of those which, however illustrious their founders, would be subject to it as their 'sovereign.'

502. Next, the meaning of the words *potiorem principalitatem*, on which it is plain that the *Satis Cognitum* lays stress, must be considered. Now, for the purpose for which they are quoted, they must mean 'supremacy' as defined by the *Vatican Council*. Nothing short of this would be sufficient to satisfy the Papalist doctrine, hence the *Satis Cognitum* declares that the monarchical position alleged to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff, to be 'the venerable and constant belief of every age.' Do, then, the words *potior principalitas* themselves purport that the Roman Church possesses by the disposition of the Lord the sovereignty over all other Churches? Now, the word

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

principalitas in no way signifies any 'power' or 'jurisdiction.' It describes the position held by one who bears the title of '*Princeps*.' This title, expressing the pre-eminence enjoyed by a single citizen, was in use amongst the writers of the later Republic, and is thus applied to both Pompey and Cæsar; and as a title of courtesy, not as an official title, was accorded by popular consent to Augustus and his successors. 'It did not connote the tenure of any special office or prerogative, nor was it conferred by any formal act of the Senate or people. It was a title of courtesy pure and simple, marking out its bearer as the first citizen . . . or rather as the foremost man in the State . . . and it implied not a general pre-eminence as distinct from a specific magisterial rule . . . but a constitutional pre-eminence among free citizens as opposed to despotic rule.'[1] Thus it simply denoted 'the first citizen of the Republic.' The object of applying it to the Emperor was to emphasise the fact that he received the various offices conferred on him from the people, and so that they were not inherent in the office of Emperor to which he had attained. It signified, in short, that he held in the Empire a position of like nature to that of the eminent citizen in the Republic on whom the title *Princeps* had been conferred.[2]

It thus denoted pre-eminence amongst equals, not the possession of 'sovereignty,' or, indeed, jurisdiction of any kind, and was therefore applied to the Emperor to show that, in the opinion of the people, his position was that of first amongst citizens, not an autocrat over them.

The word, therefore, *principalitas*, would here denote 'pre-eminence,' not 'authority' of any kind, and probably the original word used by St. Irenæus was πρωτεία, which, as Father Puller says, is 'the word which seems to keep closest to the fundamental meaning of *principalitas*.'[3] It is the word, too, which is adopted by Funk[4] and Dr. Bright.[5] Further, this pre-eminence is shown by the adjective applied to it being in the comparative degree, to be of like nature with that possessed by other Churches, not an essentially unique prerogative such as that alleged to belong to the Roman Church alone, because Peter placed his 'chair' there so that his 'legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate' became 'Masters' of 'the Episcopal College,' ruling all other Churches with sovereign power. The word, therefore, is in strict harmony with St. Irenæus' argument in which it occurs.

503. What in the mind of St. Irenæus here was the ground of this pre-eminence? There are two causes to which it may be attributed;

[1] Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*, vol. ii. 483, 484, *sub v.* 'Princeps.'

[2] *Vide* Archbishop Benson, *Cyprian: his Life, his Times, his Work*, Appendix A, p. 538.

[3] Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 442. Third edit.

[4] *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 735.

[5] Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 31.

which of these is the correct one can only be determined by means of the context.

(*a*) In the first place, it would fit in with St. Irenæus' argument if the 'pre-eminence' ascribed here by him to the Roman Church means such as naturally belongs amongst the local Churches to those which had Apostles as their founders, and to whose witness he is appealing in his argument. This would receive support from the fact that he applies to the *successio* which they possess the epithet *principalis*,[1] as denoting that they possess the 'succession' immediately from the Apostles, in that their first Bishop had an Apostle for his 'auctor,' and not 'mediately' through one who had been himself ordained by another Bishop, or an Apostle. If this be the sense in which St. Irenæus uses the word, the ascription to the Roman Church of a *potior principalitas* signifies that whilst all Apostolically founded Churches possess 'pre-eminence' amongst all local Churches, such 'pre-eminence' belonging to the Roman Church was *potior*, because it had the privilege of having been founded and established by 'the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul.' Consequently the 'pre-eminence,' naturally the prerogative of all Apostolically founded Churches, would be more marked in the case of the Church of Rome, and therefore more influential. The result would be that the testimony of that Church would have the greater weight for the purpose for which the writer was adducing the tradition which had been handed down from the Apostles.

504. It is clear that, taking this as the correct interpretation of the words under notice, so far from it being possible to base any argument in favour of Papalism from the possession by the Roman Church of such 'more powerful pre-eminence,' St. Irenæus' use of the words testifies against it. For it is essential to the truth of the Papalist position that the Roman Church should possess not merely a 'pre-eminence' like in nature to that inherent in other Apostolical Churches, differing therefrom only in degree by being more influential, but a 'supremacy,' unique and sovereign in nature, belonging to it *jure divino*. Further, Papalism requires that St. Peter should have been the sole founder and first occupier of the See of Rome, so that those who held it after him are his 'legitimate successors' in that 'sovereignty.' St. Irenæus ascribes its foundation to two Apostles, who entrusted the Episcopate thereof to Linus.[2] Such joint foundation, whilst it would, as has been seen, account for the more influential pre-eminence of that Church amongst the class of Churches which, as Apostolically founded, held the first rank and influence amongst all local Churches, is incompatible with the Papalist doctrine.

505. A remarkable confirmation of this is to be found in a state-

[1] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, IV., xxvi. 2; P.G. vii. 1054. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 475.

ment by Funk, a Roman Catholic writer. He says that 'in ascribing to her [the Church of Rome] a *potior principalitas*, he [St. Irenæus] refers unmistakably and indisputably to what he predicated of her in the before-mentioned passage, and *with particular reference to her foundation by Peter*.'[1] The words italicised demand special attention, expressing as they do Funk's idea of what St. Irenæus ought to have said, not what he actually wrote.

St. Irenæus, the learned writer himself had just acknowledged, says that the founders of the Church of Rome were St. Peter and Paul,[2] and asserted that the cause of her *potior principalitas* is her foundation by the Princes of the Apostles; but why does he assert here that it was with particular reference to her foundation by Peter? St. Irenæus gives no ground whatever for such an idea; the two Apostles are coupled together on an absolute equality; in his mind they held exactly the same position with regard to the Church of Rome. Why, then, does Funk omit in the crucial point of his statement of St. Irenæus' argument all mention of St. Paul, and ascribe 'her foundation' to Peter? Clearly because, whilst St. Irenæus' own statement is, as has been shown, incompatible with Papalism,[3] the sole foundation by Peter, here asserted by Funk, is required by the Roman claim that the *principalitas* of the Roman Church is more powerful because it differs in *nature* from any authority enjoyed by other Apostolical Churches, in that it was the result of such foundation through which he conferred on it that 'real and sovereign authority' which he possessed *jure divino* as the 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College.' It is thus only by a material omission that St. Irenæus' words can be made to countenance the Papalist allegation.

An incidental statement such as this of Funk, made, no doubt, in all good faith, serves better than a direct one to show how incompatible St. Irenæus' teaching is with Papalism, and the way in which its advocates habitually in their minds read not what he wrote but what they consider he ought to have written.[4]

506. (*b*) Whilst, however, the interpretation of the words, *potior principalitas*, which has been given, is in harmony with the argument in which the sentence of which they form part occurs, their immediate context, as will be seen from the consideration thereof which follows, renders it difficult to believe that this should have been St. Irenæus' meaning.

(1) In the first place, what is the meaning of the words, *ad . . . necesse est . . . convenire*? The *Satis Cognitum* uses them in such a manner as to require that they should signify 'must accord,' *i.e.* that there is

[1] Funk, *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 734.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 464 *et seq.*

[3] *Vide supra*, n. 478.

[4] On Funk's interpretation of the ground on which every Church must 'resort to' the Church of Rome, *vide* note 39.

a moral obligation for any Church 'to agree with' the Roman Church. This, however, is palpably wrong, for St. Irenæus in his argument regards every Apostolical Church as the guardian of the truth. He says this not only repeatedly as a general proposition, but he makes express mention of the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus as two of this class of Churches in which the tradition from the Apostles can be accurately ascertained. He declares that the *charisma veritatis certum* is attached simply to the *Apostolic Episcopal succession*,[1] there would thus be no difference in the *nature* of the testimony to the truth received from the Roman Church through its *potior principalitas*; hence, according to his argument, there could be no greater moral obligation laid on every other Church to agree with that Church than with any other Apostolical Church.

507. Further, the words *necesse est* do not denote, as the argument of the *Satis Cognitum* requires that they should, a moral obligation or duty. The Greek is not extant, but it is evident that the Latin translator had not before him in the original text the word δεῖ, for in that case he would have used the word '*oportet*' as expressing a moral obligation. *Necesse est* represents the word ἀνάγκη, which signifies a simple necessity, viz. that something which is to be gathered from the context in which the word is used must inevitably take place. What in this case is that something?

508. Now, it is to be noted that the *Satis Cognitum* assigns to the words *ad . . . convenire*, the meaning of 'agree with,' as if St. Irenæus had written *convenire cum*, their real meaning being that which they have elsewhere, viz. 'resort to.' Father Puller, in his learned investigation as to the meaning of 'the Irenæan passage,' says that he finds that 'in twenty-six passages [in the Vulgate] the word *convenire* is followed by the preposition *ad*, and *in every one of these passages* 'convenire ad' *means* '*to resort to*,' or, more accurately, '*to come together to*.'[2]

509. The words by which St. Irenæus explains how it was possible for every Church to resort to that of Rome are of great importance, viz. 'that is, the faithful who are from every quarter'—*hoc est, eos qui undique fideles*. There would, of course, be no difficulty in the way of every Church 'agreeing with' the Roman Church, in that such agreement could be brought about without a compulsory journey of 'every Church' to Rome. Such a journey would, however, be involved in the idea of 'resorting to'; therefore St. Irenæus explains the way in

[1] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, IV., xxvi. 2; P.G. vii. 1053.

[2] Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, p. 26. Third edit. Father Puller in a note shows the futility of the suggestion that the original Greek expression used by S. Irenæus, which has been translated *convenire ad*, was συμβαίνειν πρός, and gives instances of the Greek words rendered in the Vulgate by 'convenire ad.'

which this which would be impossible, as it obviously would, for each local Church in its corporate capacity to accomplish, is brought about. Members, he says, of the various local Churches existing in every quarter are under a certain obligation to 'resort' thither, by which means every Church is represented. These important words are omitted in the *Satis Cognitum*; they are not required if the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* affixes to the words *ad . . . necesse est . . . convenire*, is the true one, and the fact that St. Irenæus thought it necessary to insert them shows that that was not his meaning. They are required, as he meant that every Church must 'resort to' that of Rome as explaining what would otherwise be an absurdity, hence the latter is proved to be the meaning of his words.

510. (2) What was the necessity which compelled this 'resort to' this journey to the Church of Rome? Old Rome was, in the days of St. Irenæus, in reality, as well as in name, the capital of the civilised world, occupying, indeed, a position which no other city has held or ever will hold in the history of the world. The whole of the world-embracing Roman Empire was intimately connected with 'the City.' The Roman citizen, whithersoever he went, retained all the rights and privileges of his citizenship. The 'Colonies,' the Governments of the various Provinces, those conquered states which were permitted to retain some semblance of their former condition, all were brought into close connection with 'the City' through the Roman officials resident in them, and the Roman soldiers by which they were garrisoned; hence the business of the whole world was transacted at Rome, the conflux of people thither was continuous from all parts. Now, in the days of St. Irenæus, every local Church was situate within the confines of the Empire, and would therefore necessarily number amongst its members some who formed portion of the constant stream of persons thus drawn to 'the City,' where they would be compelled to enter into communion with the local Church, *i.e.* to 'resort to' it.

511. The Ninth Canon of the Council of Antioch *in Encæniis* (A.D. 341) affords proof that this was the necessity which compelled a concourse of those from all quarters to the Church of Rome, by the reason which is therein assigned for the pre-eminence which belongs to the Metropolitan of a Province: 'The Bishops of every Province must be aware that the Bishop presiding in the metropolis [the civil capital] has charge of the whole Province, because all who have business come together from all quarters to the metropolis; for this it is decided that he should also hold the foremost rank.'[1]

512. This recourse of the faithful from every quarter would of necessity confer on the Church at Rome a *principalitas*, a pre-eminence amongst the Churches, as, in the Canon just quoted, the conflux to

[1] Mansi, ii. 1311.

the metropolis conferred a pre-eminence on the Bishopric established there amongst the other Sees of the Province. Such pre-eminence would certainly bring with it great influence, so that the Canon recognises as an existing fact that the Bishop of the See seated in the metropolis 'had charge of all the Province.' No doubt this influence was of gradual growth; it possibly first manifested itself in the necessity of an assemblage of the Bishops of a district for the consecration of Bishops to vacant Sees, the summons to which would naturally emanate from the Bishop of the See seated in the most important city of the Province within the limits of which the vacant See was situate, the metropolis being the most convenient place for such an assemblage.

513. Further, the more prominent the position held by a city amongst the cities of the Empire, the more widely would the influence of the Bishop of the See in such city extend. Hence it is evident that the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch, by ancient custom, exercised so great and widely an extended influence that they acquired a position which was recognised as existing by the Sixth Canon of the Council of Nicæa.[1] How great this influence was throughout wide districts beyond the actual limits of what were afterwards recognised as their Patriarchates may be seen from the anxiety which St. Basil displayed that the schism at Antioch, in the days of St. Meletius, should be healed, on the ground that no 'part is more vital to the Churches throughout the world than Antioch.'[2] The same principle is seen at work in the position assigned to the See of Constantinople by the Councils of Constantinople[3] and Chalcedon.[4]

514. It is plain that this unique position of the City of Rome in the civilised world, which entailed that multitudes of the faithful from every quarter should flock thither, and thus as members of the One Church 'resort to' the local Church of Rome, would confer on that Church a pre-eminence of like nature with that belonging to other Churches seated in other great cities of the Empire, but more influential. The local Church, brought into contact with 'every Church' through conflux of their members to Rome, naturally would make its influence felt far more widely than it would be possible for any other Church to do; whilst the 'faithful' themselves would be predisposed to be so influenced by the Church established in 'the City,' the greatness of which was recognised by all.

The context, therefore, in which the words *potior principalitas* are found, makes it more probable that the 'more powerful pre-eminence' which St. Irenæus ascribes to the Roman Church had its origin in the civil rank of Old Rome.

515. Dr. Funk, however, whilst admitting that the passage could be

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 311.
[2] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Athanasium*, Ep. lxvi. 2; P.G. xxxii. 425.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 346. [4] *Vide supra*, n. 412.

thus interpreted 'as referring to it the superior rank of the Church of Rome to the superior rank of the city of Rome,'[1] so that the *potior principalitas* would have a civil origin, objects that it is 'a hazardous conclusion that in fixing the centre of the universal Church people allowed themselves to be guided' by the principle embodied in the Ninth Canon of the Council of Antioch *in Encæniis*, quoted above. To this it is to be replied that the learned writer here assumes that 'people' did 'fix a centre of the universal Church': of this there is not a trace in St. Irenæus, and, so far from there being any proof that 'people' fixed any such centre, the testimony of the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Chalcedon is that various great Sees, amongst them that of Rome, had accorded to them great positions, but in no case was any one See recognised by the Fathers as the centre of the universal Church. The Church, of course, might have done so, 'people' might have 'fixed' such 'a centre,' but such a centre would have had a different origin to that which is ascribed to the position which is said by Papalism to belong to the Roman Church, for *that* Papalism declares to be of *divine* origin 'the institution of Christ.' This objection, therefore, if it could be sustained, would then in no way assist the Papalist claim, but witness against it. As a matter of fact, however, 'people' did not do what Funk says they did, and so the objection is futile.

516. This second interpretation of the words *potior principalitas*, which seems to be demanded by the context, is quite consistent with the argument which St. Irenæus is engaged in advancing. For what is the result which that Father ascribes to the conflux of the faithful to the Roman Church on account of its more powerful pre-eminence? It is to be found in the phrase which closes the statement in which he uses them. 'In which' [*i.e.* the Roman Church[2]], he says, 'that tradition which, from the Apostles, is always preserved by those who are from all quarters'—*in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.* This is the result of the flocking of the faithful from all quarters to the Roman Church. Representing as they did every local Church, they brought with them the tradition which each 'Church' had received, together with the Apostolical succession, when it was founded, so that into the Roman Church with which, as members of the One Church, they would on their arrival in the City enter into communion, there would be poured the teaching of every Church. The Apostolical tradition of the Roman Church would thus be corroborated and preserved. If novelties arose in the

[1] *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 736.

[2] The attempt made by Roman writers to translate these words, 'in union with which,' or 'in subjection to,' is absurd. S. Irenæus' usage of the word in the same chapter shows that it has its natural meaning. *Cp.* Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 35, note 1; and Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 29, note 1.

Roman Church, they would at once be detected and corrected by the witness of every Church to the tradition from the Apostles, brought by the stream of the faithful constantly arriving, who would thus be the means of preserving that tradition in the Roman Church in its pristine purity.

517. Some two centuries after St. Irenæus wrote, St. Gregory Nazianzen, in a famous sermon, used words with reference to New Rome which afford a remarkable parallel to the phrase now being commented on.

Constantinople he declared to be 'the eye of the world, the bond between East and West, to which the extremities of the earth resort from all quarters, and from which they start afresh as from a common emporium of the faith' (ὡς ἀπὸ ἐμπορίου κοινοῦ πίστεως).[1] This Father here assigns as his reason for asserting that Constantinople was 'a common emporium of the faith,' the fact that, owing to its position as the then Capital of the Empire, the faithful from all quarters of the earth had recourse thereto, so that there was to be found the tradition of every church which they brought with them. In Constantinople, therefore, could be found the testimony of all the Churches as to what was the faith which would necessarily be enshrined in the tradition of the local Church with which the faithful would hold communion. When, then, the faithful departed on their return home, they would take back with them to the Churches to which they belonged the united witness of every Church as to the true faith. Irenæus' statement is precisely similar; Old Rome was, in his day, 'a common emporium of the faith,' there preserved by the faithful from all quarters.

518. In both cases, of course, at the time when the writers respectively wrote, the local Church of Rome and that of Constantinople were themselves in possession of the tradition from the Apostles; this is presupposed in both instances. Had the local Church in either case been infected with heresy by, for instance, communicating with heretics, so long as it allowed or taught tenets shown to be erroneous on comparison of the faith it taught with the tradition brought to it from 'every Church,' it could not be said to be a Church in which the tradition from the Apostles was preserved, or 'a common emporium of the faith,' *that* tradition would be brought there, but it would not be preserved there as the tradition of the local Church in its then condition. This would have been the case, for instance, at Rome during the period when Felix was intruded into the See by the Arians and was recognised by most of the clergy in spite of their oath that they would acknowledge no other Bishop but Liberius; and when Liberius, in order to obtain permission to

[1] S. Gregor. Nazian., *Orat.* xliii. 10; P.G. xxxii. 469.

return from his exile to his beloved Rome, signed a formulary which contained a condemnation of the ὁμοούσιον, assented to the condemnation of St. Athanasius, and entered into communion with the Arians.[1] So, too, would it have been the case at Constantinople a short time before St. Gregory Nazianzen preached the sermon quoted above. But by his labours and the active support of the Emperor Theodosius I.,[2] he had succeeded in winning back the Church there to orthodoxy. In such cases heresy would render nugatory St. Irenæus' argument, for the tradition of a Church so infected with heresy would be useless for the purpose for which it is adduced in that argument.

519. The universality of the character of the testimony of the Roman Church, as the depositary of the tradition of the Apostles, and of the tradition brought from every Church, which when compared with it was seen to be identical therewith and at the same time aided in preserving its purity, rendered the tradition of that Church a conclusive proof that the Gnostic position was novel and contrary to the Apostolic faith, as being in effect the testimony of the tradition of the whole Church. Orthodox and heretic alike recognised the position of the Roman Church on which St. Irenæus lays stress. The former went to Rome to find in the local Church the witness of the whole Church on any point which they desired to investigate; the latter went there, too, knowing that if perchance they could poison the Roman Church with the error they had embraced, the influence possessed by that Church would cause that error to become more widely and rapidly spread than if they infected with their heresy any other local Church.

520. St. Irenæus' statement, then, as to the preservation in the Church of Rome of the Apostolical tradition 'by those who are from every quarter,' harmonises well with the meaning of the '*potior principalitas*' attributed by him to the Roman Church in this famous passage, which appears to be required by the immediate context, viz. that whilst it held, owing to its foundation by two Apostles, Peter and Paul, the most prominent position amongst such Apostolical Churches, it had a more powerful pre-eminence than any other, because it was seated in 'the City,' the capital of the civilised world; the special guarantee of the purity of the tradition from the Apostles preserved in the Roman Church, on which the writer lays stress, being, in the way he explains, intimately bound up with the unique position it thus occupied.

521. It is plain that the whole argument of St. Irenæus is in direct opposition to the Papalist position. The Father, in refutation of the Gnostics, appeals to the tradition from the Apostles preserved in the

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 759 *et seq.* [2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. vi. sect. 95. [E.T. ii. 341, 342.]

Apostolical Churches which have the succession of Bishops from a Bishop ordained by an Apostle. The truth which the Apostles had delivered to those whom they entrusted with the Churches had, by means of this succession, been kept undefiled in these ancient Churches; therefore, as Gnosticism was opposed to it, there was clearly no doubt that it was not the tradition from the Apostles, and was not what it claimed to be.

522. Tertullian uses the same line of argument, declaring that all heretics can be and are convicted by the difference which exists between their teaching and that of the Churches founded by the Apostles, teaching, therefore, which has the greater antiquity. He proceeds to say: 'Go through the Apostolical Churches in which the very seats of the Apostles at this very day do preside in their own places in which their own authentic writings are read, speaking with the voice of each, and making the face of each present to the eye. Is Achaia nearest to you? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not from Macedonia thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel to Asia thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy thou hast Rome, where also we have an authority at hand,' as being the nearest Apostolical Church, and, moreover, the one whence the African Church had received its organisation. 'If these things be so that the truth be adjudged to belong to us, as many as walk according to this rule, which the Churches have handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God, the reasonableness of our proposition is manifest which determineth that the heretics are not to be allowed to enter an appeal to the Scriptures, whom we prove without the Scriptures to have no concern with the Scriptures.'[1]

523. Both writers make the faith of these ancient Churches—which, founded by the Apostles themselves, were the depositaries of the tradition from the Apostles—the test by which heresy is condemned, appealing to the tradition so preserved as affording conclusive proof of the novelty and consequent falsity of the tenets of the heretics. Recourse may be had to any one of these Churches for the purpose of accurately ascertaining what the tradition from the Apostles is; all stand on an equality so far as authority is concerned, since all are Apostolical, and, therefore, all proclaim the same faith. The tradition of the Roman Church is an example of this Apostolical tradition Whilst the nature of the authority which it possesses is identical with that of the tradition of the other Apostolical Churches, St. Irenæus points out that it has an additional guarantee of its purity. This is, he says, its preservation not only through the Apostolical succession in that Church of which he is about to give a list, but 'by the faithful' who, obliged to flock from all sides to Rome, are thus, as being

[1] Tertullian, *De Prescript. Hæreticorum*, c. xxxvi.; P.L. ii. 49.

members of the One Body, compelled to have intercourse with the local Church during their residence in the city, and so pour into it the tradition of 'every Church.' Their action thus effectually ensures that the local tradition should be maintained unimpaired, since any error would be detected through the witness of every church so brought to it to the original tradition from the Apostle.

524. The whole argument shows that St. Irenæus knew nothing of the idea that the Roman Bishop, as 'the true Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' possesses 'in virtue of the Apostolic primacy, which, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, he holds over the whole Church, the supreme power of teaching,' so that 'when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . his definitions are of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, irreformable.'[1] If this were true, the Father's argument would have been useless, whilst to attribute the special character of the testimony of the Church of Rome to the 'microcosmic' character of that Church would have been heretical, as involving a denial of the true ground of the authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the Divine Constitution of the Church. Had St. Irenæus believed the doctrine as to the Papacy embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees*, he would necessarily have adopted a very different course of procedure. He would simply have said: 'These heretics are manifestly proved to be wrong by the fact that their doctrine differs from that of the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock. Should there be any case of doubt, recourse ought at once to be had to him for an infallible decision thereon.' A very effective method, much simpler than the appeal to the tradition of the Apostolical Churches. Since neither St. Irenæus nor Tertullian[2] adopted it, the conclusion is inevitable that they were ignorant of it.

525. The conclusion here drawn from the testimony of 'the Irenæan passage' as to the real position of the Bishop of Rome is confirmed by the teaching of the same writer in another part of the work in which that passage occurs. St. Irenæus there says: 'We should hearken to those Presbyters who are in the Church, those who have their succession from the Apostles, as we have pointed out, who with their succession in the Episcopate received a sure gift of the truth, as the good pleasure of the Father, but the rest who withdraw from the *successio principalis* and gather in any place whatever, we must hold in suspicion either as heretics or evil-minded; or as making division, and lifted up and pleasing themselves; or again as hypocrites, so behaving for gain and vainglory's sake. But all these have fallen from the truth.'[3]

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap iii., iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, 484, 487.
[2] On Tertullian's use of the expression 'Pontifex Maximus,' *vide* note 40.
[3] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, IV., xxvi. 2; P.G. vii. 1053, 1054.

St. Irenæus here lays down that it is the duty of Christians to adhere to those who have their succession in the Episcopate from the Apostles, not following those who separate from them. The proof, therefore, of being in the Church, according to the Father, is communion with those Bishops who possess the *successio principalis*, *i.e.*, the Bishops of the Apostolical Churches; this is in strict harmony with the teaching of the argument which was last considered. The Apostolic Sees are those which possess the pre-eminence and exercise the greatest influence in the Church as depositaries of the tradition from the Apostles; communion therefore with these Sees is the mark of being in the unity of the Church. St. Irenæus, had he believed the doctrine of the Papal Monarchy embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, would have been bound to have given advice of an essentially different character. He would have said, 'We must hearken to the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, the successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, and adhere to communion with him, as otherwise we shall be 'outside the edifice,' 'separated from the fold' and 'exiled from the Kingdom.' The position taken by St. Irenæus is plainly alien from that which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age.'

Section LXX.—*St. Polycarp and Anicetus P.*

526. The celebrated controversy as to whether the Easter festival should be kept on whatever day the Paschal full moon fell, or on the Sunday following it if that day was a week day, arose in the second century. The Churches of Proconsular Asia and the neighbouring provinces followed the former custom, the rest of the Church the latter. It was inevitable that this divergence should cause a difficulty. From time to time amongst the faithful who were compelled to come to Rome for the purpose of transacting business at the seat of government, the centre of the civilised world, were members of Churches which followed what may be called the Oriental custom, which was alleged to have its origin in a rule laid down by St. John. When at Rome they continued to observe the custom which prevailed at home, hence whenever the 14th Nisan did not fall on a Friday, they would be celebrating Easter on a different day to that on which the members of the local Church did. In the Episcopate of Anicetus, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome (probably about A.D. 157[1]) with reference to certain slight differences as to which he desired to come to an understanding with Anicetus. On all save the one on this point the result was successful. St. Irenæus says on this subject: 'On account of this point [the Easter business], however, they contended a little. Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp no longer to observe that

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. ch. ii. sect. 37. [E.T. i. 309. Second edit.]

which he had always observed with John the disciple of our Lord and with the rest of the Apostles with whom he had intercourse. Nor could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe, as he said he was bound to observe, the custom of his predecessors, which things being so they maintained communion with each other, and Anicetus, out of respect for him, yielded to Polycarp the office of celebrating the Eucharist, and they departed from one another in peace; both those who observed, and those who did not observe, maintaining perfect ecclesiastical peace.[1]

527. The point to be noted is that Polycarp did not come to Rome as an 'ambassador' from the Orientals to take 'the decision' of Anicetus on the point in dispute,[2] that he might submit to it as being authoritatively binding on the Church as being the decision of the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, under penalty of being separated from the Church. On the contrary, the question was, according to St. Irenæus, discussed on terms of equality by the two Bishops; each failed to persuade the other; each maintained the custom of their predecessors, and they remained in communion with each other. The perfect peace between them was emphasised by the fact that the Bishop of Rome, to whom belonged, as Bishop of the Diocese, the right of being celebrant at the Holy Mysteries, yielded it to Polycarp out of respect to him. Now on Papalist principles Polycarp ought to have submitted the question to Anicetus as the one who possessed *jure divino* full power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, whose decision as Supreme Judge would be final, and when that decision had been given obeyed it; and in the event of disobeying it he would have been excommunicated, so that he would have been separated from the Church, no longer being in communion with the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock. Polycarp's action proves that neither Anicetus nor himself knew anything of the Papal Monarchy; and St. Irenæus by the way in which he records the facts, of which as a disciple of Polycarp he must have had full knowledge, shows that he was equally ignorant.

Section LXXI.—*St. Irenæus and St. Victor, Bishop of Rome.*

528. The feeling which animated Anicetus and Polycarp continued between the two parties they represented, and until the death of the former the Orientals who happened to be at Rome observed their own custom as to the day on which they celebrated the Easter festival with the sanction of the local Bishop. Soter, however, who succeeded Anicetus in A.D. 165, it would appear from the fragment of the letter from St. Irenæus to Victor preserved by Eusebius quoted in the pre-

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 24; P.G. xx. 508.

[2] As Funk asserts. *Historisch-politische Blätter*, p. 745. I am indebted to my friend, the Rev. H. E. Hall, Vicar of St. Peter's, Staines, for the translation of Funk's article which I have used.

ceding section, made a regulation that all Christians sojourning at Rome should keep Easter at the same time as the local Church, though without considering that the custom of the Orientals was any ground for breaking off communion with those Churches which observed it. The same position of affairs continued during the Episcopate of Eleutherus, but Victor, his successor, adopted a different line. It is not improbable that he was led to do so by the attempts made by Blastus, head of a sect which arose in Rome, to introduce Ebionite Quartodecimanism into Rome, a proceeding which would naturally dispose Victor to regard with aversion all Quartodecimans in general.[1]

529. Victor took steps to obtain support in an effort to establish uniformity of practice by the suppression of the Oriental custom, by writing letters in the name of his Church to the different Metropolitans asking them to convoke their Synods for the discussion of the question, with a view to the observance universally of the Western custom. It is noticeable that he did not issue 'in virtue of his Apostolic Primacy,' a command that the universal Church should henceforth observe that custom, he did not 'command' Synods to be held in order that his decree binding on the whole Church should be promulgated in them. On the contrary, it is clear from the letter which Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, wrote to 'Victor and the Church of the Romans' in the name of his Synod, that he *asked* the Metropolitans to hold Synods. The word which Polycrates uses is ἠξιώσατε, 'you requested,' a word which plainly implies that Victor had no jurisdiction to compel the convocation of such Synods, and fitly expresses a request made by one Church to another with regard to such a matter.

530. Numerous Synods were accordingly held, and unanimously, with the exception of those of Asia Minor, declared that it was a rule of the Church that 'the mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's Day.' This decision was communicated to all the faithful by Synodal letters. A very great number of the Bishops of Asia, however, defended in their Synod the custom thus condemned. Polycrates, the eighth Bishop of the See of Ephesus, who presided over it, in the Synodical Letter which he wrote to Victor, expressed plainly their intention to maintain which they had received from their forefathers, declaring it to be 'according to the Gospel' and the 'rule of faith.' Victor had in his letter to him threatened to withdraw from communion with them, a fact which makes the more significant the words of Polycrates by which he declared, in the name of his Synod, that he was not 'frightened by those who intimidate us, for those who are greater than I have said we ought to obey God rather

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. ch. ii. sect. 37. [E.T. i. 313. Second edit.]

than man.'[1] Bishops who could thus act and write evidently knew nothing of communion with the Roman Pontiff being an essential condition of membership of the One Flock; hence they would regard any breach of communion with the Roman Bishop in the same light as they would a similar breach with any other Bishop, doubtless as a matter for regret, but not as involving the awful consequences of separation from the One Fold, and exile from the Kingdom of God, asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to be the result of loss of communion with the Supreme Pastor, the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate.

531. What followed? Victor 'endeavoured to cut off from the common unity the Churches of all Asia and the neighbourhood, and denounces them by letter, proclaiming all the brethren in those parts to be utterly separated from communion. But this was not the opinion of all the Bishops. They immediately exhorted him, on the contrary, to pursue that course which was calculated to promote peace, unity, and love to one another. There are also extant their writings sharply rebuking Victor.'[2]

There are four points in this account given by Eusebius of these proceedings:—(1) First, that Victor 'endeavoured' to bring about the general excommunication of the Asiatics; (2) secondly, that he did cut them off from communion with the local Church of Rome, a matter which was within his right, as every diocesan had the power to decide with what dioceses he should hold communion; (3) thirdly, that although he notified that the Asiatics were no longer in communion with him to the other Bishops, he did not succeed in his attempt to obtain similar action on their part; (4) fourthly, that his own action in separating the Asiatics from his communion was preceded by the ecclesiastical decree unanimously drawn up by the various Synods in different parts of the Church contrary to the 'Johannean' practice to which the Asiatics continued to adhere, and communicated to all the faithful by Synodal letters.

532. Victor's action is inexplicable on the hypothesis that the Papal Monarchy is *jure divino*. If that were so, he must have adopted, in discharge of his duty as Supreme Shepherd, a very different course. He, the Supreme Judge, having 'supreme jurisdiction' which is 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' and 'truly Episcopal,' over the Asiatic churches, would have commanded them by his 'real and sovereign authority, which the whole community is bound to obey'—which could receive no increase of authority from Synods—to conform their usage to his judgment, which could not be reviewed. A man, too, of his temperament would certainly not fail to use to the uttermost whatever authority he possessed. His action shows that, however harshly

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. v. 24; P.G. xx. 497. [2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*

he may in his intolerance have pressed the matter, he evidently had no idea that any such 'sovereign' power was possessed by him as the *Satis Cognitum* declares to belong *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome.

533. The Bishops to whom he wrote in announcing his action, in like manner were equally ignorant of any such sovereignty belonging to the Roman Bishop. They declined to support his action, which consequently failed in its object. On Papalist principles they were bound to render Victor obedience: his judgment was given, they had no power to review it, carry it out they must: not only did they not do so, but they severely rebuked him. They held themselves to be on an equality with him: he had erred by his action against peace, unity, and love, and they as brothers told him so. Papalism was certainly not 'the venerable and constant belief' of their 'age.'

534. Was St. Irenæus an exception to these Bishops? Did he regard the separation of the Asiatics from the communion of the Roman Church by Victor as the decision of the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, finally separating them from the Church, and so requiring that all Bishops throughout the world should accept it? On the contrary, he 'becomingly admonished him not to cut off whole churches of God which keep the tradition of ancient custom,' and reminding him of the opposite action of his predecessors in the matter, specially of the toleration which Anicetus and Polycarp had exhibited towards each other; and not content with this, he wrote letters of like purport to very many other rulers of Churches respecting the question moved,[1]—thus on Papalist principles not only disobeying the real and sovereign authority of the Roman Pontiff himself, but encouraging others to like insubordination, a course of procedure on his part which on these principles must have resulted in separation of himself and them from the One Fold. This action on the part of St. Irenæus corroborates the conclusion arrived at above[2] as to the true meaning of 'the Irenæan passage.' The Roman Church was indeed an Apostolical Church; it possessed, as seated in 'the City,' a more powerful pre-eminence than any other, its tradition from the Apostles was there preserved with a special guarantee for its purity by those who were from every quarter, but his conduct in the Paschal controversy proves that he did not hold it to possess unique authority, so that its Bishop had supreme power of jurisdiction over him, 'towards which he was bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and of true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church diffused throughout the world.'[3] His action therefore also, at the same time, conclusively negatives the interpretation sought to

[1] Eusebius, *l.c.*

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 496 *et seq.*

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

be affixed by the *Satis Cognitum* to the passage. 'The testimony' therefore of St. Irenæus is conclusive against Papalism being 'the venerable and constant belief' of 'his age.'

Section LXXII.—*The citation by the Vatican Council of 'the Irenæan passage.'*

535. The 'Irenæan passage' is more frequently quoted by modern Roman Councils[1] than any other Patristic statement,[2] and, as in the *Satis Cognitum*, it is very rarely cited in its complete form. A conspicuous instance of this is found in the citation made in the second chapter of *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi* of the Vatican Council. It is there quoted as follows:—*Hac de causa ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles.* This is translated by Cardinal Manning as follows:—'Wherefore it has at all times been necessary that every Church—that is to say, the faithful throughout the world—should agree with the Roman Church, on account of the greater authority of the Princedom it has received.'[3] This translation no doubt represents the meaning attached to the words by the use sought to be made of them by the Vatican Fathers, but its inaccuracy will be seen from the consideration of the passage in the preceding section.[4] It need only be added that to translate *undique* 'throughout the world' is to desert its natural meaning 'from all quarters,' which is, moreover, that which is required by the phrase *ad convenire*, implying a journey from home, in the sentence in which it occurs.

536. The Decree proceeds thus: *ut in ea sede e qua venerandæ communionis jura in omnes dimanant, tanquam membra in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent.* This Cardinal Manning translates: 'That all being associated in the unity of that See whence the rights of communion spread to all might grow together as members of one head in the compact unity of the body.'[5] The words *e qua venerandæ communionis jura in omnes dimanant* are taken from a letter of the Council of Aquileia, A.D. 381;[6] the whole of the remainder occurs neither in the passage of St. Irenæus whence the former part was cited, nor in the letter just named. At the end of the sentence

1 *E.g. Concil. Provin. Parisiensis*, 1849, tit. i. cap. i. *Collectio Lacensis*, iv. 9. *Concil. Prov. Turonensis*, 1849, Decretum ii., *ibid.*, p. 253; *Concil. Provin. Ariminensis*, *ibid.*, p. 315*a*; *Concil. Provin. Lugdunensis*, 1850, Decret. ix., *ibid.*, 468*a*; *Concil. Prov. Burdegalensis*, 1850, tit. xv. cap. i., *ibid.*, p. 576*a*, and others.

2 *Vide* Schneemann, *S. Iren. de eccl. Rom. principatu Testimonium. Collectio Lacensis*, iv., Appendix, p. 7.

3 H. E. Manning, *The Vatican Council and its Definitions*, Appendix, p. 213.

4 *Vide supra*, nn. 501 *et seq.*

5 *Op. cit.*, pp. 213, 214.

6 *Ep. inter Epp. S. Ambrosii*, xi. 4; P.L. xvi. 986.

thus constructed two references are given, 'S. Iren. adv. Hær., l. iii. cap. 3, et Concil. Aquil. a 381 inter Epp. St. Ambros., Ep. xi.,' implying that the whole sentence is to be found in these two passages. The result of this ingenious proceeding is that not only is the Irenæan passage given in an incomplete form, and used in a sense which is, as has been shown,[1] to be opposed to the real meaning of the Father's words; but further, in order to affix this meaning to it, words are added some of which are not to be found in the letter to which a reference is given, whilst those which are there do not bear the sense in which the Vatican Council here makes use of them, as is proved by the following facts.

537. (1) First, this Council was summoned by Gratian at the request of Palladius and Secundianus, two Illyrian Bishops[2] accused of heresy. It was intended to be Œcumenical, but at the request of St. Ambrose the Eastern Bishops were relieved from the obligation to attend. This Synod thus convoked was presided over by St. Valerian of Aquileia. On the proposal of St. Ambrose, the Metropolitan of Milan,[3] the Synod acted in a judicial capacity by pronouncing an anathema and sentence of deposition upon Palladius, Secundianus, and Attalus. The Synod evidently regarded itself as the final authority, as it addressed a circular letter to all the Western Bishops announcing the sentence.[4] The Aquileian Fathers therefore could not have meant that the Bishop of Rome had alone the right to decide the question who were to be in communion with the Church; *they* separated these heretics from the unity of the Church, and therefore the Bishop of Rome was no longer to hold communion with them.

538. (2) Secondly, the Synod was entirely composed of Western Bishops, many of whom acted 'as plenipotentiaries for whole Provinces,'[5] Spain and Rome alone not being represented. As Westerns they might well—in view of the fact that Gratian, to whom they were writing, had bestowed upon the Roman Bishop coercive jurisdiction[6] over the Bishops in the Roman world over which he ruled—make use of language such as this in a letter to him. This would be the more likely when the object they had in addressing the Emperor is borne in mind. The Synod desired to put an end to the proceedings of Ursinus, the Antipope, who in union and in combination with the Arians, especially Julianus Valens, who had intruded into the See of Puttau, was endeavouring to disturb the Church of Milan with their detestable assembly.[7] They feared that Ursinus would obtain access to Gratian with a view to being placed in the Roman See in the stead of Damasus, who had

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 496 *et seq.*
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. vii. sect. 101. [E.T. ii. 375.]
[3] On the date when Milan became a Metropolitical See, *vide* note 41.
[4] Mansi, iii. 599 *seq.*
[5] Hefele, *l.c.*
[6] *Vide supra*, n. 209.
[7] *Ep. inter Epp. S. Ambrosii*, xi. 3; P.L. xvi. 986.

been elected after a violent contest. Clearly the proceedings of Ursinus and the possibility of a reversal of the result of the election would entail great inconvenience and uncertainty as to which of the two possessed the powers bestowed on the Roman Bishop. True, they were solely of state origin and had no ecclesiastical validity whatever, yet they had a considerable effect on the position of the Roman Bishop in the Western Empire in regard to his relations with other Western Bishops.

539. The Council therefore wrote to Gratian as follows:—'It were fit that your Clemency should be besought not to suffer the Roman Church, the head of the whole Roman world, and that sacred faith of the Apostles, to be disturbed, for thence emanate the rights of venerable communion to all . . . we therefore entreat you to get rid of this most importunate person, and thus restore the sense of security which has been interrupted, both to our Bishops and to the people of Rome, who, ever since the Prefect of the City has sent in his report, have remained in uncertainty and suspense.'[1]

The Emperor, who had granted the powers, was the person to act as requested, and the words cited from the letter by the *Vatican Council* are a plain reminder to him of his responsibility in the matter. They are thus incompatible with the Papalist doctrine of the Papal Monarchy in support of which they are quoted.[2]

540. Further evidence that the use made by the *Vatican Council* of the citation from this letter is contrary to the belief and intention of the Fathers who wrote it, is afforded by the following facts. Maximus, 'the Cynic' had been uncanonically intruded into the See of Constantinople. He had been compelled to flee from that city, and ultimately made his way to Milan soon after Easter A.D. 381. St. Damasus, the Bishop of Rome, had written strongly against him, yet, notwithstanding this, he was received into communion by St. Ambrose at a Council held at Milan in May A.D. 381.[3] A Synodal letter was written to the Emperor Theodosius upholding his claim, the final decision, however, being reserved until the Synod about to be held at Aquileia. At that Council, no reply having been received from Theodosius, the matter was again postponed. After the Synod, the Bishops of North Italy received information, either from Theodosius or other trustworthy sources, that the Council of Constantinople had condemned Maximus,[4] and appointed Nectarius as successor to St. Gregory Nazianzen in the See of New Rome. Thereupon St. Ambrose convoked another

[1] *Ep. ad Gratianum Imp. inter Epp. S. Ambrosii*, xi. 5; P.L. xvi. 986.

[2] If the date adopted by Father Puller, A.D. 382, as that of the Council of Rome, which applied to Gratian that the law enacted by Valentinian I. between A.D. 367 and 372 (*vide* n. 207) should be put in force, be correct, then the Fathers refer in their letter to the *Edict* of that Emperor.

[3] This is probably the *Concilium nuper* referred to in the letter quoted below, *vide* Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 534, 535.

[4] *Vide supra*, n. 341.

Council, which met at Milan, probably in December 381.[1] This Council addressed two Synodal letters to Theodosius I., in one of which the writer of the letter, probably the President of the Synod, St. Ambrose, declares Maximus, who had pleaded his cause before them at a 'Council lately held,' had been duly consecrated by Catholic Bishops, and ought not to be excluded from his claim to the Bishopric of Constantinople; and this in the face of the fact that Damasus had energetically refused to recognise Maximus.

541. The language of the letter, too, is further evidence that St. Ambrose and the Synod did not believe that the 'Prelate of the Roman Church' held the position asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* to belong to him *jure divino*. For the Council says thereon: 'We therefore determined that nothing ought to be determined rashly until that Synod, attendance at which appeared to have been prescribed to the Bishops of the whole world[2] [*i.e.* the Council of Aquileia]. But at the very time those who avoided a general Council are reported to have held one at Constantinople. Now, knowing that Maximus had come into these parts to plead his cause in the Council (which, even if a Council had not been proclaimed, would have been according to the law and custom of our ancestors, as both Athanasius of holy memory and but lately Peter, Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, and many of the Orientals did, who seem to have had recourse to the judgment of the Churches of Rome, of Italy, and those of all the West), knowing, as I said, that he was willing to have his cause against those who denied that he was a Bishop tried, they certainly ought to have awaited our judgment also upon him. We do not claim for ourselves the chief part in the inquiry, but we ought to have a share in a common decision. . . . But since our mediocrity has learnt that Nectarius has been recently ordained, we do not see how our communion with the Eastern regions remains firm. . . . Nor do we see how it can be maintained unless either he who was first ordained [*i.e.* Maximus] be restored to Constantinople, or at least a Council of ourselves and the Orientals, to be held in the city of Rome, respecting the ordination of the two. For, may it please your Majesty, it does not seem too much to ask that they should submit the question to the consideration of the Prelate of the Roman Church and of the neighbouring and Italian Prelates, when they so far waited for the judgment of Ascholius alone as to invite him to Constantinople from the Western parts [*i.e.* Thessalonica]. If consideration was given to this single one, how

[1] So Father Puller, who appears to have established this as the correct date, *op. cit.*, p. 538.

[2] The passage is corrupt. The translation given gives the meaning of the text as amended in accordance with a suggestion of Mr. C. H. Turner, adopted by Father Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 537, note. Third edit.

much more ought it to be given to so many. As for ourselves, having received instructions from the most blessed Prince, the brother of your Piety, to write to your gracious Majesty, we require that the judgment may be common and the consent unanimous where the communion is one.'[1]

542. The Synod in this letter (1) considers that the proper tribunal to which any Oriental who desires to obtain the judgment of the West in a cause in which he was interested is a Council, that being the means by which the judgment of the Churches of Rome, of Italy, and those of all the West is delivered; (2) secondly, the Synod claims for the Western Bishops a share in the decision in the case of Maximus, but not the chief part—and amongst the Western Bishops and in the same category with those of Italy and the whole West they place the Roman Prelate; (3) thirdly, the Synod declares that if Maximus be not restored to the See of Constantinople, the matter ought to be brought before a Council of East and West, to be held at Rome, no doubt for the convenience of the Westerns, who experienced great difficulty in attending Councils convoked to meet in the East; (4) fourthly, they remind the Easterns that they ought to raise no objection to this being done, as they had made a point of obtaining the presence of one Western at the Council of Constantinople, and therefore ought to be desirous to consider the wishes of 'so many'; and (5) fifthly, they required that the judgment in the case should be the common act of all.[2]

543. It is clear that the Synod did not recognise any right of final appeal lying to the Bishop of Rome as the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, whose judgment can be reviewed by none. The Churches of Rome, Italy, and the whole West are classed together as forming the proper authority from which Easterns in the past had had a just right to obtain the opinion of the Westerns. They knew of no unique prerogative of the Bishop of Rome of finally deciding any disputed question belonging to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, as they denied that 'all' the Westerns, including the Bishop of Rome, had any such right. The supreme authority they recognise is a Synod of both East and West, the common and unanimous judgment of which would express the decision of the one communion. Had the Papalist doctrine embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees*, with reference

[1] *Ep. ad Theodosium inter Epp. S. Ambrosii*, Ep. xiii.; P.L. xvi. 990-993.

[2] This principle was also enunciated in the letter *Quamlibet* which the Fathers of the very Council, which wrote the letter from which the citation in the *Vatican Decrees* under notice above is taken, sent to the Emperor Theodosius I. with reference to the Antiochene dissension, 'We beg of you most clement and Christian princes, to give orders that a Council of all the Catholic Bishops should be held at Alexandria, that they may more fully discuss among themselves and define the persons to whom communion is to be imparted and the persons with whom it is to be maintained.'—*Ep. ad Theodosium, etc., inter Epp. S. Ambrosii*, Ep. xii.; P.L. xvi. 989.

to the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, been such that the Fathers of the Council were obliged to believe, under pain of loss of salvation, they would have been bound to have worded these letters in an essentially different way. As it stands, it is incompatible with any belief on their part that the Bishop of Rome, as the Vicar of Christ, the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, is the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, possessing sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey. Further, even this moderate claim, put forward by the Westerns, was not admitted by the Easterns. This was plainly intimated in the letter which the Emperor Theodosius wrote to St. Ambrose and the other Bishops in reply to their letters, 'that the reasons they had alleged were not sufficient to assemble an Œcumenical Council, that the affairs of Nectarius and Flavian were in the East, and all the parties there present, and so ought to be judged there without carrying the matter to the West, and changing by innovations the bounds which their fathers had placed: that this was not a reasonable request: that assuredly the Prelates of the East had some cause to be offended at it, and even that whatever judgment was passed in the absence of the parties would always leave place for fresh difficulties. That for the affair of Maximus they had shown a little too much warmth against the Easterns, or too much readiness in believing falsehoods palmed upon them.'[1] The Eastern Emperor accurately expressed the opinions of the 'Prelates of the East,' who asserted in no ambiguous terms their right to deal with their own affairs without any interference on the part of the Westerns.[2] Much more would they have repudiated the idea, had it been asserted, that they were bound to believe that the final decision on the question in hand belonged *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff, and to order themselves accordingly. Clearly the Papalist doctrine was not the 'venerable and constant belief of' this 'age.'

The conclusion, therefore, to be drawn from the evidence adduced is without doubt that the use by the *Vatican Council* in the *Pastor Æternus* of the words taken from the Synodical letter of the Council of Aquileia is inconsistent with the meaning of its context, with the circumstances under which it was written, and with the statements made elsewhere by St. Ambrose and others who were its authors.[3]

[1] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, tom. x. 150.

[2] *Vide infra*, n. 1024.

[3] On what St. Ambrose meant by 'agreement with the Catholic Bishops, that is, with the Roman Church,' *vide* note 42.

CHAPTER XV

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST. CYPRIAN

SECTION LXXIII.—*The Root and Womb of the Catholic Church.*

544. The writer to whose testimony the *Satis Cognitum* next appeals, as proving that 'Papalism' as embodied in it was the doctrine of 'antiquity,' is St. Cyprian. It is not surprising that Papalists should endeavour to make out that St. Cyprian held the Papalist doctrine, as he was the foremost Bishop of his age. His testimony is especially valuable. Living in the third century, when the traditions of the Apostolic age must be acknowledged to have been well known, Bishop of a great Church owing its foundation to that of Rome, and having intimate connection with it through the constant intercourse going on between Rome and Carthage, predisposed therefore to recognise to the full the just claims of the Roman Bishop, it is clear that his witness must be all-important as to the truth of the Papalist claims. Hence the efforts made to show that he recognised the Papalist position; for it is obvious that his 'testimony' would be that of one of the best informed witnesses of the early age of Christianity. Are those efforts successful? In considering this question, it must be remembered that for an affirmative answer to be returned to it, St. Cyprian must be proved to have believed that the Roman Bishop is the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, possessed *jure divino* of the prerogatives asserted to be his by the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum*. What those prerogatives divinely conferred on 'the legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate' are alleged to be has already been sufficiently shown. Nothing less than this will be sufficient for the Papalist case. Papalism, if true, must have been the 'venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of St. Cyprian. His contemporaries in the Roman See must have been recognised by him as occupying the same position by the institution of Christ in the Church as that claimed for Pius X. Do the 'proofs' advanced in the *Satis Cognitum* substantiate this position?

545. Three quotations from St. Cyprian are given by the *Satis Cognitum* as his testimony to the 'consent of antiquity' to Papalism. Two are cited in close conjunction, as follows:—'St. Cyprian also says of the Roman Church that "it is the root and mother of the Catholic Church, the chair of Peter, and the principal Church whence sacerdotal

unity has its source"' (Epist. xlviii. ad Cornelium, n. 3; and Ep. lix. ad eundem, n. 14).[1]

The whole sentence is a 'combination,' as the references show, of words taken out of two separate letters written to Cornelius during the Novatian schism. In order to accurately arrive at St. Cyprian's meaning, each of the constituent parts of the sentence so constructed must be considered separately in connection with its context.

546. First, then, as to the words 'the root and mother of the Catholic Church.' The context of this passage is as follows:— 'Certain persons,' says St. Cyprian, 'however, sometimes disturb men's minds by their reports representing some things otherwise than the truth is. For we, furnishing all those who sail hence with a rule lest in their voyage they in any way offend, know well that we have exhorted them to acknowledge and hold fast to the womb (*matricem*) and root of the Catholic Church. But as our province is of wide extent (for it has Numidia and Macedonia annexed to it), lest the fact of a schism in the City might perplex with uncertainties the minds of those absent, we determined, having by aid of those Bishops [Caldonius and Fortunatus, whom the African Bishops had sent to Rome] ascertained the exact truth and obtained better authority for approving your ordination, then at length all scruples being removed from the breast of every one, to send Epistles to you from all, everywhere throughout the province (as is being done), that so all our colleagues might approve of and hold to thee and thy communion, that is, as well to the unity as the charity of the Catholic Church.'[2]

547. St. Cyprian wrote the Epistle whence this quotation is taken under the following circumstances. Cornelius had been duly appointed Bishop by the local Church. The Novatians, however, set up a party against him, and there appears to have arisen some doubt as to whether Cornelius had been canonically appointed in the minds of the Africans, in consequence of which two Bishops were sent by them to investigate the matter on the spot. Pending their return, the Africans had determined to address their letters to the Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of Rome. The authorities of the Church of Adrumetum had, however, since his election, sent their letters to Cornelius, and on St. Cyprian bringing the determination of the Fathers to the knowledge of that Church, they changed their practice in accordance with it. Cornelius wrote to St. Cyprian complaining of this, the ground of his complaint being that to address letters to the Presbyters and Deacons of his Church was to imply either that the See was vacant, or that there was some doubt as to the rightful occupant of it. Further, in connection with this, a report to the effect that St. Cyprian and the Africans had ordered any members of their flocks

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

[2] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlviii. 2; Hartel, p. 607.

sojourning at Rome not to recognise him as the legitimate Bishop of the See had reached him.

548. St. Cyprian, in his reply, explains that the regularity of the election of Cornelius having been disputed, the Bishops of Africa sent two Bishops to Rome for the purpose of either making peace, or, if not, to bring back with them an exact account of the position there, and pending their return, they determined to make no change in the way in which they were addressing their official letters, *i.e.* to continue to make their communications in the same form as was customary in the case of vacant Sees.

Polycarp, Bishop of Adrumetum, was present at the Synod at which this course was adopted, but had not transmitted the decision of the Fathers to his Church, the authorities of which were consequently ignorant of it. On St. Cyprian, however, making it known to them, so that 'there might be no difference of proceeding in any of the Churches settled here,'[1] they at once conformed to it, hence the change of which Cornelius had complained.

As to the other point, St. Cyprian proceeds to show that there was no ground for it, that, in fact, any such report 'represented things otherwise than the truth is.'

What he had done was to give to all who sailed from Carthage a general rule, by observing which they would avoid offending in any way on their journeys; viz., they were 'to acknowledge and hold fast to the root and womb of the Catholic Church.' The meaning is clear: they were to avoid schism wherever they might be brought in contact with it; they were to remain Catholics, adhering to the womb, the Catholic Church, in which all Christians are formed; to the root, the Catholic Church,[2] in which all Christians grow, since all Churches are 'but that one primitive Church from the Apostles whence they all spring.'[3]

549. That this is St. Cyprian's meaning here is shown by the language he uses in another epistle to Cornelius with reference to the schismatic action of the Novatians whom Caldonius and Fortunatus had been sent to bring back to the 'unity of the Catholic Church,' represented at Rome by the local Church, against the legitimate Bishop of which they had set up another. 'The self-willed and inflexible obstinacy of the adverse party,' says he, 'has not only refused the arms and embraces of her who is their root and mother, but also, with discord increasing and widening worse and worse, appointed a Bishop for itself.'[4] Each local Church formed an

[1] S. Cyprian, *l.c.*

[2] This use of the 'genitive of apposition' is common in S. Cyprian. *E.g.*, *Ep. ad Cæcilium*, Ep. lxiii. 1. 'The root and origin of the tradition of the Lord,' (Hartel, p. 701), *i.e.*, 'the original tradition received from our Lord.' *Cf.* Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 46; and Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 83, third edit.

[3] Tertullian, *De Prescript. Hær.*, c. xx.; P.L. ii. 32.

[4] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlv. 1; Hartel, p. 600.

organised unity under one Bishop, who is thus its head. There could be but one legitimate Bishop of a See, therefore, for the Novatians to set up another Bishop in opposition to the canonical Bishop, Cornelius, was 'to set up an adulterous and opposed head,' 'contrary to the mystery of divine appointment and of Catholic unity once delivered.'[1] They thus separated themselves from 'their root and mother' 'the Catholic Church,' to which, as 'the mother whence they had departed,' St. Cyprian consequently exhorted Maximus and the Confessors, who had joined the Novatians, to return.[2]

550. The Africans, according to the instructions they thus received, were to abide in the Catholic Church when on their travels, by communicating with the legitimate Bishop of the local Church where they might for the time be sojourning. A rule of this kind would necessarily embrace the case of the Church at Rome. There had been a vacancy in that See, consequently all African Catholics on arriving there would, in compliance with the rule, seek to find out who had been legitimately appointed Bishop of the See, a point as to which the African Bishops, at the particular time when they left home, were awaiting a full report from the representatives whom they had sent to Rome with that object. Cornelius, therefore, would at once understand that, so far from the African travellers being ordered not to recognise him as the legitimate occupant of the See, the general rule by which they were exhorted to guide themselves in order that they might avoid in any way countenancing schism, would compel them to admit his claim and reject that of Novatian, and that thus the falsity of the report was proved.

The whole argument clearly has reference to the legitimate Bishop, the true head of the *local* Church, in which schism had broken out through the setting up by the Novatians of 'an adulterous and opposed head,' by appointing another Bishop in opposition to Cornelius. There is no other reference, therefore, whatever in the words *ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem* to the local Church of Rome, save that as the local representative of the One Church all those Catholics who sojourn in Rome must hold to its communion in opposition to the Novatian and his adherents.

551. The letter from which the citation is taken shows also that St. Cyprian and his co-prelates in Africa themselves acted in obedience to the principle enshrined in this rule in their own dealings with Cornelius. As soon as they were assured as to 'the truth and dignity of the Episcopate' of Cornelius, 'of the just method and excellent purity of his ordination,' they determined to send letters to him according to the custom by which Bishops recognised and so confirmed the legitimate character of the Episcopate of any newly consecrated Bishop, that by so doing they all might approve of and hold fast to him and his com-

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlv. 1; Hartel, p. 600.
[2] *Ep. ad Confessores Romanos*, Ep. xlvi. 1; Hartel, p. 604.

munion, 'that is as well to the unity as to the charity of the Catholic Church.'[1] Recognising him as the legitimate occupant of the See, they would proclaim the schismatical character of the position of the Novatians, and, to use an expression he used in his Epistle to Jubianus as to the re-baptism of the followers of Novatian on their reconciliation to the Church (in which there is not the remotest reference to the Church of Rome), be holding to 'the head and root of the One Church'[2] represented at Rome by the legitimate Bishop Cornelius and the local Church, as it was at Carthage by himself and his flock.

552. The conclusion therefore arrived at on consideration of the passage taken into its context, and in connection with the circumstances which called forth the letter whence it is quoted, shows that the *Satis Cognitum* applies to the Roman Church alone words which St. Cyprian uses of the Catholic Church as a whole, of which the Church at Rome was merely the local representative.

Section LXXIV.—*Petri cathedra, ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*

553. The remainder of this composite quotation is taken from another Epistle to his 'dearest brother' Cornelius.[3] In this letter St. Cyprian says: 'On reading your second letter, brother, which you subjoined to the first, I was much surprised that you were somewhat moved by the menaces and threats of those who had come to you; when, as you have written me, they assailed you . . . but if the case be so, dearest brother, that the audacity of men most abandoned is to be feared, and what the bad cannot accomplish by right and equity they can by temerity and desperation, then is the vigour of Episcopacy, and the majestic and divine power of governing the Church, perished. . . . We must not, however, therefore yield because they threaten . . . with us, dearest brother, must the strength of faith abide immovable, and our courage firm and unshaken. . . . Nor does it matter whence alarm or peril come to a Bishop, who lives exposed to alarms and perils, and yet is made glorious by these very alarms and perils. . . . Ecclesiastical discipline is not on that account to be abandoned, or priestly censure to be relaxed, because we are harassed by revilings or assailed by alarms.' Having dwelt on the opposition raised against himself as Bishop at Carthage by those whom he had in his mind when writing thus, he proceeds to point out a special act which they committed, as to which he complains, viz., that they, in addition to having Fortunatus, 'a renegade from the Church' and 'excommunicate,' 'ordained a pseudo-Bishop for them by heretics, dare to set sail and

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlviii.; Hartel, p. 607.
[2] *Ep. ad Jubianum*, Ep. lxxiii. 2; Hartel, p. 779.
[3] *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lix. 2; Hartel, p. 683 *seq.*

to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons to the *Petri cathedram atque ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*[1] These last words are those which form the part of the composite sentence in the *Satis Cognitum.*

554. The whole tone of the letter shows that it is one from one who regards himself as on an equality with his 'dearest brother,' whom he rebukes for apparently allowing himself to be influenced by the statements of an abandoned faction. He does this on the ground that it is necessary for all Bishops to be firm in administering discipline, because of the danger that 'the majestic and divine power of governing the Church' possessed by the Episcopate should perish, if there was any yielding to the threats of heretics. The same belief, that the Episcopate governs the Church, is embodied in his further statement in the letter, where he says that 'it had been decreed by our whole body, and is alike equitable and just, that every cause should be heard where the offence has been committed,[2] and a portion of the flock has been assigned to the several shepherds, which each is to rule and govern, having hereafter to give an account of his ministry to the Lord; it therefore behoves those over whom we are set not to run about from place to place, nor by their crafty and deceitful boldness, break the harmonious concord of Bishops, but there to plead their cause, where they will have both accusers and witnesses of their crime; unless, perhaps, some few desperate and abandoned men count as inferior the authority of the Bishops constituted in Africa, who have already given judgment concerning them, and have lately, by the weight of their judgment, condemned these persons' consciences, entangled in the bonds of many sins. Already has their cause been heard, already has sentence been given concerning them; nor does it accord with the authority of Prelates to incur blame for the laxity of a changeable and inconstant mind.'[3]

555. St. Cyprian thus declares that the Episcopate is the supreme governing power of the Church, and that the proper way in which that supreme power is exercised, in cases such as that of Fortunatus and his abettors, is by the local Synod. St. Cyprian sets forth clearly, that to the Bishops of each Province, as De Marca says, 'belong the examination and decision of causes, and the government of their flock, they having to give an account of their administration to God; and that it is not lawful to appeal to Rome or elsewhere; and that the authority of the African Bishops is not inferior to the authority of the other Bishops.'[4] St. Cyprian, it is plain, knew nothing of any 'real and

[1] S. Cyprian, *l.c.*; Hartel, *l.c.*

[2] Compare the like statement made by the African Bishops a century and a half later in their letter to Celestine, *vide infra*, n. 620.

[3] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lix. n. 14; Hartel, pp. 683-4.

[4] De Marca, *De Concord. Sacerd. et Imp.*, lib. vii. cap. i. sect. ii. tom. iii. 285. Edit. Bambergæ, 1788-89.

sovereign authority' belonging by the institution of Christ to the Roman Bishop, and he explicitly contradicts the *Vatican Decrees*, which declare that the Roman Pontiff 'is the supreme judge of all the faithful, and that in all causes which appertain to ecclesiastical jurisdiction recourse may be had to his judgment.'[1] The whole position taken up by St. Cyprian in this letter is incompatible with the Papalist contention, and as he asks that his Epistle should be read by Cornelius to his clergy,[2] it is further evident that that contention was unknown to them, or he would never have made such a request.

556. (*a*) It follows from what has been said that when St. Cyprian in this letter speaks of the 'chair of Peter,' he has no idea of any sovereignty over the universal Church belonging *jure divino* to him who occupied it. The real meaning of the expression can be gathered from other parts of his writings, and is in harmony with the doctrine which has been shown to be that of the letter in which it is found.

To St. Cyprian all Bishops are successors of Peter, that Apostle being regarded by him as the representative Apostle, and so the representative Bishop. For example, in his *Epistle to the Lapsed*[3] he says, 'Our Lord, whose precepts and warnings we ought to observe, determining the honour of a Bishop and the ordering of His own Church, speaks in the Gospel and says to Peter, I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Thence the ordination of Bishops and the ordering of the Church runs down the course of time and line of succession, so that the Church is settled upon her Bishops, and every act of the Church is regulated by her Bishops.'

All Bishops upon whom the Church is settled are here held to be successors of Peter, he being regarded as the representative Apostle, in whom the Episcopate was founded.[4]

557. Elsewhere, also, St. Cyprian shows this is the position he assigns to the Bishops. For example, he says in an Epistle to the people of his diocese, with reference to certain schismatics who had set up a separate altar at Carthage: 'They promise to bring back and recall the

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

[2] S. Cyprian, *Ep. cit.*, n. 19; Hartel, p. 689.

[3] *Ep. ad Lapsos*, Ep. xxxiii. 1; Hartel, p. 566.

[4] The same idea is found in other writers. S. Hilary of Poitiers, for instance, calls the Bishops who condemned S. Athanasius successors of Peter when he says in irony, 'O worthy successors of Peter and Paul' [*Frag. Hist.*, ii. 18; P.L. x. 634]; and S. Gaudentius said of S. Ambrose in his presence 'He will speak of the Holy Ghost of which he is full . . . and like a successor of the Apostle Peter will be the spokesman of all the priests around' [*Sermo* xvi.; P.L. xx. 958]. So Gildas, also, the British historian, describes the British Bishops as sitting in 'the seat of Peter the Apostle. [Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, note C, vol. i. p. 334. Edit. 1858.]

lapsed to the Church, who have themselves departed from the Church. There is one God and one Christ, and one chair founded by the word of the Lord on Peter. Another altar cannot be set up, nor a new priesthood made, besides the one altar and the one priesthood.'[1] Taking the reading, 'super Petrum,' adopted by Hartel as correct,[2] the argument is as follows. St. Cyprian, as Bishop of Carthage, is warning his flock against Felicissimus and the five Presbyters who had joined him. He proves the schismatical character of their action by showing that they had left the Church through their rebellion against the authority of himself as Bishop, for there could be but 'one chair' in a local Church, and that he occupied, and so as canonical Bishop was the successor of Peter, in whom the 'One Episcopate,' which he as legitimate Bishop of the See held *in solidum*,[3] was founded. As there could be but one Bishop, so there could be but one Priesthood in a diocese, the Bishop occupying the 'one chair,' and the clergy in communion with him; thus there would be but 'one altar,' that is, the altar served by the one priesthood; by setting up altar against altar their schismatic position was clearly defined. Hence his flock would understand that they must hold aloof from them and adhere to him.

558. The manifest conclusion to be drawn from the evidence which has been here given is that the *Satis Cognitum* uses the expression 'the chair of Peter' in a sense opposed to, and incompatible with, that of the writer, St. Cyprian. He used it in the passage whence it is cited in the sense that all Bishops, as successors of Peter, sit in 'the chair of Peter'; amongst them of course is the Bishop of Rome, who had, in St. Cyprian's view, the privilege of sitting in the actual throne occupied by the representative Apostle himself, 'the place of Peter,' as he calls it elsewhere,[4] and thus had the unique honour of being his successor in his own particular diocese, the Roman Episcopate of Peter having become the accepted belief by St. Cyprian's day.[5] The use of the expression here by St. Cyprian is thus in complete harmony with his teaching with regard to the Episcopate throughout his writings, in which he ascribes to the Episcopate the supreme power of government in the Church.

559. (*b*) The words *Ecclesia principalis*, which follow next in the 'sentence,' are rendered in the authorised English translation 'the principal Church.' By the use of the word 'principal' the translator intends to convey that St. Cyprian meant that the Roman Church is the 'principal Church,' in the sense that it occupies a position which differs *in essence* from that of any other local Church, which is undoubtedly the signification which the *Satis Cognitum* affixes to the

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Plebem universam*, Ep. xliii. 5; Hartel, p. 594.
[2] The Benedictines, with many old MSS., read *Petram*.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 36.
[4] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv.; Hartel p. 630.
[5] On the alleged Roman Episcopate of Peter, *vide supra*, chapter xiii.

word *principalis* by the connection in which it cites the 'composite' sentence from St. Cyprian, of which it forms part.

There is, however, nothing in the word *principalis* which justifies any such interpretation of it. The title *Princeps* did not, as has been shown,[1] convey the idea that he who bore it possessed any 'jurisdiction' or 'sovereignty,' but merely that he occupied the first position amongst the citizens of the Republic. Consequently the word 'principalis' would mean at most first in order amongst equals. There could be *per se* no objection in using the word *principal* as a translation in that sense, *i.e.* as the first in order amongst all local Churches which possess equal authority *jure divino*, in that their respective Bishops held the One Episcopate in joint tenure, but, as will be seen,[2] the words which immediately follow make it probable that it should be interpreted differently. If, then, the term *principalis* does refer to the position of the Roman Church amongst other local Churches, it does not mean that St. Cyprian applied it to that Church in the sense the *Satis Cognitum* makes him do, viz. as expressing the 'sovereignty' held by it over all such other Churches because of the monarchical position conferred on Peter and his legitimate successors in the Episcopate of that Church, an idea alien from St. Cyprian's teaching throughout his works with reference to the position of the Episcopate. An example of this teaching is found, as has been seen,[3] in this very letter in which the term is found, where he says that 'the majestic and divine power of governing the Church' resides in the Episcopate; and it is confirmed by his own conduct, which is entirely incompatible with any belief on his part in Papalism.[4]

560. The term, then, might well be applied by St. Cyprian to the Church of Rome, as expressing the priority in rank amongst the local Churches possessed by that Church, both because of its foundation, according to his belief, by St. Peter, whom he erroneously[5] regarded as having actually occupied the Bishop's 'chair' of that See, so that it was in his eyes the See of the representative[6] Apostle, as well as because of the superior rank of 'the City,' which naturally brought about a 'pre-eminence' amongst all others;[7] so that as the City was the 'principal' City in the civilised world, so the Church in the City became the 'principal' Church. St. Cyprian, indeed, apparently has this sort of pre-eminence in his mind when he says in a letter to Cornelius, 'Rome, from her greatness, ought to have precedency of Carthage.'[8]

561. Whilst, however, this might be the meaning of the term, the words which immediately follow, *unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*,

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 502. Also infra 1144 (Hartel)
[2] *Vide infra*, n. 561.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 553.
[4] *Vide infra*, nn. 574 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 558.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Vide supra*, n. 519 *et seq.*
[8] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lii. 2; Hartel, p. 618.

which will be considered next, seem to point to another signification which the term will bear, viz. that it should refer to the antiquity of the foundation of the Roman Church, that 'very ancient Church,' as St. Irenæus had before called it.[1] Such a use of the term would be quite in accordance with African usage. Tertullian, for example, whom St. Cyprian called his 'Master,'[2] in arguing against the heretics and urging that the truth comes first and error afterwards, speaks of the *principalitas veritatis* and the *posteritas mendacitatis*,[3] and St. Augustine uses the term *principale* in order to convey the idea of a certain word being 'the root' whence another sprang, and so prior to it.[4] If St. Cyprian uses the term in this sense as meaning 'ancient' or 'primæval,' it would signify here that, as he regarded St. Peter as the *first* in time to receive the Apostolate,[5] so the See, the 'chair' of which he believed to have been actually personally occupied by Peter, was the 'principalis,' primæval, in that as his See it was "original" See, a meaning which, as has been already remarked, would harmonise best with the words which immediately follow, and which will now be considered.

562. (*c*) The concluding words of the composite sentence '*unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*' follow immediately the words '*principalem ecclesiam*' just discussed.

St. Cyprian, by the fact that he uses the verb in the past tense, plainly shows that he is referring not to any present relationship existing between the *unitas sacerdotalis* and the Roman Church, but to a certain event which had taken place in the past. The Roman Church is thus not asserted by St. Cyprian to be the existing source from which the *unitas sacerdotalis* derives perpetually certain at least of its powers, so that union with it is an essential condition to the reception and continued possession of those powers, and therefore to the preservation of the unity of the Church, which is the Papalist allegation. From this it follows that the interpretation of these words in the *Satis Cognitum*, that they declare the Roman Church to be 'the efficient cause of unity in the Christian commonwealth,'[6] is untenable, quite apart from the fact that it is plain both from his writings and actions that St. Cyprian knew nothing of any such idea.

Next, by the *unitas sacerdotalis*, according to St. Cyprian, is meant the whole body of the Episcopate—the *unus Episcopatus* as he elsewhere

[1] S. Irenæus, *op. cit.*, III., iii. 2, quoted *supra*, n. 496.

[2] 'He daily called for some manuscript of his in the famous phrase, "Give me the Master."'—Archbishop Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 9, giving a reference 'Da Magistrum' Hieron., *de Virr. Ill.* 53.

[3] Tertullian, *De Prescript. Hæret.*, c. xxxi.; P.L. ii. 44.

[4] S. Aug., *Sermo* lxxi., *De Verb. Evang. Matt.*, vii. 7; P.L. xxxviii. 409. Du Cange, *Glossarium*, *s.v.* 'Principalis,' interprets the word to mean 'primus, primævus, antiquior,' tom. v. p. 447. Edit. 1845. I am indebted for these two references to Father Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 51, note 2.

[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 556, 557.

[6] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

calls it. The like use of the word *unitas* is made by St. Augustine in the statement, '*Has enim claves non homo sed unitas accepit Ecclesiae*,'[1] the *unitas ecclesiæ* being the whole body of the Church.

563. The meaning, therefore, of the citation is obvious. The Roman Church is the 'ecclesia principalis,' either because it is the 'primæval Church' or because it was in St. Cyprian's mind 'the See of Peter,' and so was the See of the Apostle who was the 'princeps'[2] of the Apostles, upon whom the Apostolate was first conferred, that its unity might be manifest.[3] Hence, as the Apostolate had its commencement in St. Peter, in the sense that he first received it, so the Episcopate which succeeded to the Apostolate, the *unitas sacerdotalis*, might be said to have its source from the See which he occupied, the Roman Church thus possessing the same representative position towards the Episcopate as St. Peter held in regard to the Apostolate, the unity of the Episcopate being set forth by its origin from the '*principalis ecclesia*.' The words are thus in complete accord with St. Cyprian's view as to the representative character of St. Peter and his connection with the Roman See, and an argument calculated to assist the object St. Cyprian had in writing the letter in which they occur. For St. Cyprian is writing to St. Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, to complain of the schismatical conduct of certain Africans towards himself as canonical Bishop of Carthage, who had, he feared, been permitted by that Bishop to influence him. It was of the utmost importance, in order to preserve the unity of the Episcopate, to impress on Cornelius that the conduct complained of was injurious not simply to himself as an individual Bishop, but to the *unitas sacerdotalis*, the whole body of the Episcopate. Hence to remind him that the Church over which he presided was the *ecclesia principalis* whence, because it was the See of the representative Apostle, that One Episcopate took its origin, would be to put strongly before him the duty of doing all in his power to avoid countenancing any proceedings which would infringe on the rights of that One Episcopate, a duty incumbent on all Bishops who hold the One Episcopate *in solidum*,[4] but especially upon him who occupied the very 'chair' of the representative Apostle. St. Cyprian's view as to both the position of St. Peter and his connection with the Roman See was no doubt erroneous, the Apostolate having been conferred on all the Apostles at the same time,[5] and St. Peter never having been diocesan Bishop of Rome;[6] but it is plain from what has been said that the words cited by the *Satis Cognitum*, which require that his view should have been correct, do not bear the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* by its use of them endeavours to affix thereto, but one which is consistent with the rest of his teaching

[1] S. Aug., *Sermo* ccxcv. c. ii.; P.L. xxxviii. 1349.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 502, for the meaning of *princeps*.
[3] *Vide infra*, nn. 570-1.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 36.
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 30.
[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 473 *et seq.*

on the position of St. Peter and the Roman Church, as contained elsewhere in his writings, and as set forth by his attitude towards that Church, teaching which is incompatible with Papalism.

Section LXXV.—*The way in which 'communion with the Catholic Church' is maintained.*

564. Another passage is cited from St. Cyprian a little farther on in the *Satis Cognitum*, as showing that St. Cyprian held that 'union with the Roman See of Peter' was 'always the public criterion of a Catholic.' The words quoted are—'To be in communion with Cornelius is to be in communion with the Catholic Church'[1] (Ep. lv. n. 1), and are taken from the Epistle of St. Cyprian to Antonianus, who was then residing at Rome.

The letter was called forth by the following circumstances. Cornelius was duly consecrated by sixteen Bishops to the See of Rome, and Novatian intrigued to be 'made by deserters an adulterous and strange Bishop';[2] and as St. Cyprian says elsewhere, his party 'appointed [him] a Bishop for itself, and contrary to the mystery of divine appointment, set up an adulterous and opposed head without the Church,'[3] the canonical Bishop alone being the head of the local Church—there being only one Bishop in a Catholic Church. St. Cyprian had already advised Antonianus to communicate with Cornelius, and in reply Antonianus had informed him that he had followed his advice, and suggested that he should transmit a copy of the letter he was writing to Cornelius, 'that so, laying aside all anxiety, he might know that he [Antonianus] held communion with him, that is, with the Catholic Church.' Antonianus, however, afterwards wrote a second letter to St. Cyprian, from which it appeared that he was wavering in the matter, being influenced by a letter of Novatian.

565. The meaning of the citation given in the *Satis Cognitum* is determined by the circumstances under which they were written. The question to be settled was this. A Catholic can only communicate with the canonical Bishop of a See. At Rome there were two claimants to the See, Cornelius and Novatian; with which of the two, as the legitimate successor of Fabian, the last Bishop, was Antonianus, sojourning at the time at Rome, to communicate? St. Cyprian's answer is definite. To communicate with Novatian would be to communicate with one who was an intruder, having no canonical right to the Episcopal chair. His action had been throughout schismatical, Cornelius had been made Bishop 'by the judgment of God and His Christ.' The 'sacerdotal chair' had been therefore 'filled by the will of God and

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 32.
[2] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. n. 24; Hartel, p. 642.
[3] *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlv. n. 1; Hartel, p. 600.

ratified by the consent of all of us; whosoever would thenceforward be made Bishop must necessarily be made without; nor can he have ordination of the Church who does not maintain the unity of the Church'; yet 'whereas there is one Church from Christ throughout the whole world divided into many members, and one Episcopate diffused throughout an harmonious multitude of many Bishops, he, notwithstanding the tradition of God, notwithstanding the unity of the Catholic Church, everywhere compacted and joined together, attempts to make a human Church, and sends his new Apostles through many cities that he may establish certain recent foundations of his own institution; and whereas there have been already ordained through all provinces and through every city Bishops in age venerable, in faith sound, in trials proved, in persecutions banished, he dares to create other false Bishops over them.'[1] To communicate with such a man, who had separated himself from the bond of his Church and from the College of Priests, would be clearly to join the schismatics and become partakers of their sin.

566. On the other hand, to communicate with Cornelius would be to communicate with the canonical Bishop, and therefore with the Catholic Church, which he, as the legitimate occupant of the Episcopal chair at Rome, represented, in that he, and he alone, shared that 'One Episcopate which was diffused throughout an harmonious multitude of many Bishops.' There is absolutely nothing in this advice which would not be equally applicable in the case of any See where a schismatical Bishop had been set up in opposition to the rightful holder of the See. To communicate with such a one would be to own a head outside the Church, and so be outside the unity of the Catholic Church; to communicate with the canonical Bishop of the See would be to 'hold communion with the Catholic Church.' The *Satis Cognitum*, in citing these words of St. Cyprian for its purpose, attaches to them a sense which is not that of the writer.

567. It is further opposed to St. Cyprian's teaching elsewhere. He wrote a treatise on *The Unity of the Catholic Church*, the very subject of which, on Papalist principles, would have compelled him to lay down, in no ambiguous terms, the necessity of being in communion with the Roman Pontiff as the essential means according to the Divine Constitution of the Church, whereby there may be One Flock under one Supreme Shepherd. Yet in the whole treatise there is not a single sentence with reference to this point which, according to Papalism, is vital, the salvation of souls depending upon careful compliance with this condition to being within the One Flock. Further, there is nothing in the treatise with reference to the possession by the Bishop of Rome of full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church as the 'legitimate successor' of Peter in 'the Primacy over the universal

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv.; Hartel, p. 642.

Church,' a prerogative asserted in the *Satis Cognitum*[1] to be necessary to the due fulfilment of the office of that Primacy by which the principle of unity is guarded and preserved. It is inconceivable that St. Cyprian could have omitted all mention of this, which is thus laid down as being essential to the unity of the Church by the institution of Christ in a treatise in which he is dealing with that Unity, had the monarchical position declared by the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the 'Roman Pontiff' been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' including, therefore, that in which St. Cyprian flourished.

568. This conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that the circumstances under which the treatise was written were such as would have made it necessary for St. Cyprian, had he held the Papalist doctrine on the subject embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, to have laid special emphasis on it in his argument. These circumstances were as follows. Novatus and Felicissimus, who had both given trouble to the Church of Carthage, of which they had been clergy, had gone to Rome, perhaps to escape the condemnation which they knew awaited them at home. There they headed a party opposed to the appointment of Cornelius as Bishop of Rome, for their own ends. They found assistance in certain newly liberated confessors who were biassed against Cornelius, as he did not hold their ascetic view with regard to the lapsed, and who, urged on by Novatus, determined to elect Novatian as Bishop, although the See of Rome had already been filled by the consecration of Cornelius. Novatian, a Roman prebyster of considerable influence, had embraced rigorist opinions, which made him hold that it was impossible for the Church on earth to reconcile apostates. 'He maintained that it was one of the most solemn ministries to bring them to repentance, but to communion never. To communicate in their communion was to become excommunicate.'[2] This man 'the confessors' thought to be suitable for their purpose, and procured his consecration by three country Bishops. The First Council of Carthage had already recognised the regularity of the consecration of Cornelius, as the two African Bishops, Stephen and Pompeius, who had been present at it, had arrived, and brought with them documentary proof thereof, and gave evidence themselves on the point, so that there was no longer any need for the Council to await the return of Caldonius and Fortunatus, whom it had sent to Rome to investigate and report on the subject. After the Council had heard their two colleagues, messengers arrived from Rome to solemnly announce the consecration of Novatian, an event which had taken place after the departure of the two African Bishops from Rome. The Council, however, in view of the evidence they had had laid before them by their two colleagues, declined to hear more from the Novatian delegates, or to admit them to com-

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 26, 36.

[2] Archbishop Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

munion until the return of their two delegates from Rome, and in the result Cornelius was recognised as the legitimate occupant of the chair, and the whole province of Proconsular Africa was duly informed of the Council's resolution on the subject.

569. The treatise, then, was written at the very time when the position of Novatian was before the Church; consequently, therefore, when on Papalist principles there were two claimants to the office of Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, communion with whom was necessary in order to abide in 'the edifice,' in 'the fold,' in 'the kingdom of God.' A question of most momentous character would therefore be agitating the Church. Which of the two claimants is 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' which is the true 'Vicar of Christ,' who exercises in the Church the power which He exercised during His mortal life? Which is 'the Supreme Judge of the Faithful,' 'the Head of the whole Church,' 'possessed of real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey?' Which is 'the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' whose definitions as to faith and morals 'are irreformable of themselves and not from consent of the Church?'[1] Obviously, on Papal principles, the Church was in deadly peril, and it would have been impossible under such circumstances for St. Cyprian not to have fully and carefully set forth the position held *jure divino* by the Roman Church, and not in a treatise written at such a time. Yet, as has been said, there is not a word in the treatise on the subject.

570. A passage in this celebrated treatise around which controversy has raged must be specially considered. It is as follows—I give a translation of it as printed by Manutius in his edition of 1563, the 'interpolations' are in italics:

'This will be, most dear brethren, as long as there is no regard to the source of truth, no looking to the head, nor keeping to the doctrine of our heavenly Father. If any one consider and weigh this, he will not need length of comment or argument. It is easy to offer proofs to a faithful mind, because in that case the truth may be quickly stated. The Lord said unto Peter, "I say unto thee" (saith He) "that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

> *And to the same [Apostle] He says after His resurrection, "Feed my sheep."* He builds *His* Church upon *that* one, *and to him entrusts His sheep to be fed;*

and although after His resurrection He assigns equal power to all the Apostles, and says, "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you, receive

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484, 487.

ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted to him; and whose soever sins ye retain, they shall be retained." Yet in order to manifest unity; He

established one chair and

by His own authority so arranged the commencement of that same oneness as [a commencement] beginning from one person. Certainly, also, the other Apostles were what Peter *also* was, endowed with equal share both of office—*honoris*[1]—and power, but a commencement is made from unity:

> *and Primacy is given to Peter that one Church of Christ and one Chair may be pointed out; and all are pastors, and one flock is shown, to be fed by all the Apostles with one hearted accord,*

that the Church may be set before us as one: which one Church in the Song of Songs doth the Holy Spirit in the person of our Lord design and name, saying My dove, My spotless one is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the elect one of her that bare her. He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He who strives and rebels against the Church,

> [*he who deserts the chair of Peter on which the Church was founded*],[2]

does he think that he is in the Church? For the blessed Apostle Paul teaches this same thing, and manifests the Sacrament of unity thus speaking; "There is One Body and One Spirit, even as ye are all called in One Hope of your calling; One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God." This unity we should firmly hold and maintain, especially we Bishops who preside in the Church, in order that we may approve the Episcopate itself to be one and undivided. Let no one deceive the brotherhood by falsehood; no one corrupt the truth of one faith, by a faithless teaching. The Episcopate is one: it is a whole in which each enjoys full possession. The Church is likewise one, though she is spread abroad and multiplies with the increase of her progeny.'[3]

571. St. Cyprian in this passage lays down that our Lord gave to St. Peter, as the representative of the Apostolate, the charge to feed His flock, which is thus 'shown' to be 'one' 'to be fed by all the Apostles with one-hearted accord,' and says that He 'built His Church' upon 'him,' 'that one,' the powers of the Apostolate being symbolically bestowed upon him first as their representative at Cæsarea Philippi, the 'one Chair' being then 'established,' and thus 'primacy was given to

[1] So Bright translates *honoris*, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 43.

[2] This clause is not in Manutius, but it is given by Pamelius, Ed. 1563, Rigault, Ed. 1648, and Baluze (Maran), Ed. 1726. Benson, *op. cit.* p. 549.

[3] For the Latin text of this passage in the Edition of Paulus Manutius, A.D. 1563, see Benson, *op. cit.* 549-551. On the 'interpolations,' *vide* note 43.

Peter' as the first Apostle having priority of time,[1] so that thus he became the representative Apostle and so the representative Bishop,—for the Apostles were Bishops[2]—and his 'one Chair' the representative See of the One Episcopate which was the successor to the one Apostolate. No prerogatives or powers other than 'Apostolic' were then granted to Peter, as after His resurrection Christ 'assigned' an 'equal share both of office—*honoris*—and power' to 'all the Apostles,' which power was the supreme authority in the Church being conferred by the words '*As* My Father hath sent Me *even so* send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit they shall be remitted to him, and whose soever sins ye retain they shall be retained'[3]—words which bestowed upon them the power He had received from His Father without any qualification or limitation. The object of this previous action on His part, according to St. Cyprian's view, was 'to manifest unity' in order that 'a commencement' being 'made from unity,' 'one Church of Christ and one Chair,' *i.e.* the one Episcopate, 'may be pointed out'; the office and power thus conferred upon Peter by the words of the promise in St. Matthew xvi. 18, 19 (a promise renewed to the whole Apostolate in St. Matthew xviii. 18), being bestowed on the first Easter night upon all the Apostles, for whom Peter had acted as spokesman in his Confession, 'one speaking for all and answering in the name of the Church,'[4] and who in consequence had been addressed at that time by our Lord as being, in point of character, their representative, so that they became the 'foundation' of the Church. These two ideas, viz., that St. Peter was appointed representative Apostle, and so the representative Bishop, and his 'one Chair' the representative of the One Episcopate which succeeded to the one Apostolate, are found elsewhere in St. Cyprian's writings.[5] Since then the 'Chair of Peter' occupies this representative position, it follows that 'he who deserts' the canonical Bishop of the local Church 'deserts the Chair of Peter' in whom the one Episcopate which he, as legitimate Bishop of the See, holds *in solidum*, was founded, and so such deserter cannot be 'in the Church.'

572. The representative character here attributed to St. Peter is clearly incompatible with the Papalist doctrine that he has a special office in the Church distinct from that of the Apostolate. He, according to St. Cyprian's teaching, held an office and possessed a power which was shared by the rest of the Apostolic College, all the members of which possessed equality of office and power. They were not subject to a 'Master,' but as their successors, the Bishops, 'preside in the Church' so did they. The oneness of the office they held in

[1] *Cp.* S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Quintum*, Ep. lxxi. 3; Hartel, p. 674.
[2] Cp. *Ep. ad Rogatianum*, Ep. iii. 3; Hartel, p. 476.
[3] S. John xx. 21-22.
[4] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lix. 7; Hartel, p. 674.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 556, 557.

common was set forth by its bestowal first on a single individual that the Church might be shown to be one, Peter thus becoming the symbol of that unity, he being succeeded by his 'one Chair' as the representative See of the One Episcopate, which is a whole in which each enjoys full possession, and which therefore becomes in turn the symbol of the unity of the Church, so that by it that unity is manifested to all.

573. The importance of the evidence of this treatise of St. Cyprian in connection with Papalism cannot well be over-estimated. It is on the subject of the Unity of the Church and it is alleged by Papalism that, in order to bring about and ensure the maintenance of such unity, 'inasmuch as the Church is a divinely constituted Society, unity of government, which effects and involves *unity of communion*, is necessary *jure divino*,' and to that end St. Peter was 'appointed head of the Church,' by 'Jesus Christ,' 'and He also determined that the authority instituted in perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by his successors' 'the Pontiffs who succeed' him 'in the Roman Episcopate' 'in whom the same permanent authority of Peter himself should continue.'[1] Yet St. Cyprian in this treatise on the Unity of the Church says nothing about this alleged prerogative of Peter and his 'successors,' the Roman Bishops; the conclusion is inevitable that this great Saint and Father was entirely ignorant of the monarchical position which Papalism asserts belongs *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs and to be essential according to the Divine Constitution of the Church to the preservation of its Unity.

Section LXXVI.—*St. Cyprian and the case of Basilides and Martial.*

574. St. Cyprian's conduct, like his writings, protests against the Papalist assumptions in support of which the *Satis Cognitum*, with a wonderful audacity, calls him as a witness. His action in the case of Marcian,[2] Bishop of Arles, has already been considered. It has been shown that it bears witness to the position of the Episcopate as the supreme authority in the Church, and consequently that he knew nothing of the Roman Bishop possessing *jure divino* 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church.' In like manner his action in the case of the Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martial, affords similar testimony. These two prelates had been deposed for being defiled with idolatrous[3] certificates, and bound by

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, 25, 26, 30.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 41.

[3] *I.e.* they were 'Libellatics,' persons who had received certificates which showed that the 'certifying magistrate had satisfied himself of the sound paganism of the recipient.'—Benson, *op. cit.*, pp. 81, 82.

the guilt of dreadful crimes.[1] To the Sees thus vacated Sabinus and Felix had been consecrated. Basilides went to Rome, and there 'through fraud imposed' on Stephen, who admitted him to communion notwithstanding his deposition, and gave a declaration that he would hold them still the lawful occupants of their Sees.[2] Basilides then returned to Spain, and both he and Martial endeavoured to force themselves back into their former Sees. Some Bishops appear to have been willing that they should be reinstated, admitting them to their communion. The Churches of Leon, Astorga, and Merida thereupon sent letters to St. Cyprian, as did also Felix, Bishop of Saragossa, by the hands of Felix and Sabinus, asking him to give his opinion on the difficulties which had arisen, which were causing great confusion in the Churches of Spain.

575. These letters were read in a Synod of thirty-seven Bishops presided over by St. Cyprian, held at Carthage 'a short time after the Synod of 252,'[3] and a Synodal letter was sent in reply. In it, after laying down the necessity of taking the greatest care with reference to ordinations, the Synod declares that the Episcopate had been conferred on Sabinus in a proper manner to take the See formerly held by Basilides, and proceeds: 'Nor can it rescind an ordination rightly performed. But Basilides, after his crimes had been detailed, and his conscience laid bare by his own confession, canvassing to be unjustly restored to the Episcopate from which he had been justly deposed, went to Rome and deceived Stephen, our colleague, residing at a distance and ignorant of what had been done and of the real truth. The effect of this is not to efface but to swell the guilt of Basilides, in that to his former sin is added the guilt of deceit and circumvention. For he is not so much to be blamed who through negligence was imposed upon, as he to be execrated who through fraud imposed upon him. But if Basilides could impose on man, on God he cannot, for it is written, God is not mocked; neither can deceit avail Martial, that he, who is also involved in heinous sins, should not forfeit his Bishopric, for that the Apostle admonishes and says a Bishop must be blameless as the steward of God—wherefore since (as ye, dearest brethren, have written; as also Felix and Sabinus, our colleagues assert; and as another Felix of Cæsaraugusta, devout in faith and a defender of the truth, intimates in his letter) Basilides and Martial have been defiled with the profane certificates of idolatry . . . and since there are many other and heinous sins in which Basilides

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Clerum et plebes in Hispania consistentes; inter Epist. S. Cypriani*, Ep. lxvii. 1; Hartel, p. 735.

[2] 'It is not expressed that Martial approached Stephen, but *fallacia* (Ep. lxvii. 5) is attributed to him, and these respectable Spaniards are treated both on one platform.'—Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 312, note 1.

[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. 5. [E.T. vol. i. p. 58.]

and Martial are held implicated, in vain do such attempt to usurp the Episcopate, it being evident that men of that mind can neither preside over the Church of Christ, nor ought to offer sacrifices to God . . . wherefore though amongst our colleagues, dearest brethren, some are found, who think that the deific discipline is to be neglected, and who rashly communicate with Basilides and Martial, this ought not to disturb our faith . . . we alike commend and approve the religious anxiety of your integrity and faith: and so far as we are able, exhort you by our epistles not to mingle in unholy communion with profane and polluted priests, but with religious awe uphold the firmness of your faith steadfast and sincere.'[1]

576. The Synod, it will be observed, held that they were fully competent to assist the distressed Churches of Spain as they had requested. The Unity of the Episcopate imposed, indeed, that duty upon them, just as it gave the Bishops of Spain the right to call in that assistance by complaint to St. Cyprian, the other great Metropolitan of the West, of the way in which St. Stephen had acted in the case. The African Bishops did not say that as St. Stephen had full and supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, jurisdiction which is immediate and ordinary in every diocese, he therefore had by his action in receiving the deposed bishops into communion finally decided that they had been unjustly deposed and were in canonical occupation of their Sees, a decision which could not be reviewed by any one. On the contrary, St. Stephen's action was repudiated by them as unjust: the only excuse to be made for St. Stephen was 'negligence' on his part in being taken in by the fraud and deceit of the two Prelates. The Spanish Bishops are warned not to be troubled by the action of those with whom 'an unsteadfast faith wavers or an irreligious fear of God vacillates.'[2] St. Cyprian and the African Bishops plainly regarded Basilides and Martial as still deposed Bishops, in virtue of the sentence which had been passed on them by the Bishops of Spain, notwithstanding St. Stephen's action, and the two Bishops, who according to that action were schismatic intruders into Sees already canonically occupied by Basilides and Martial, as the legitimate Bishops thereof. Obviously 'communion with Rome' was not to St. Cyprian and his colleagues in Africa, or the Bishops in Spain, 'the public criterion of a Catholic': on the contrary, Stephen was amongst those who mingled in unlawful communion with Basilides and Martial, and his doing so, sad as it was, was not to disturb the faith of the Spanish Bishops. Their repudiation of St. Stephen's action is complete, and they exhort the Spanish Bishops to act in accordance with this repudiation, so absolutely ignorant were they that 'all the pastors and all the faithful are bound to the Roman Pontiff by the obligation of hierarchical

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. cit.*; Hartel, p. 739 *seq.*
[2] *Ep. cit.*; Hartel, p. 739 *seq.*

subordination and of true obedience.'[1] The whole episode is a very good illustration of the care which all Bishops are bound to take with regard to assisting those who are in trouble and distress through heretics, and the right that that obligation gave to any Church to appeal to any holder of the one Episcopate *in solidum* for such assistance, whilst it also witnesses clearly against the arrogant presumption of Papalism being 'the venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of St. Cyprian and his colleagues in Spain and Africa.

SECTION LXXVII.—*St. Cyprian and the controversy as to Re-baptism.*

577. St. Cyprian's action with reference to the controversy as to the re-baptism of heretics affords further evidence that he knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy as part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, 'the principal matter of Christianity,' as Bellarmine calls the Papal 'Primacy.'[2] The controversy arose as follows. A Synod of Bishops held at Carthage, under the presidency of Agrippinus, between the years 218 and 222,[3] had affirmed that the baptism of those who had been baptized by heretics should be repeated. St. Vincent of Lerins affirms that Agrippinus was the first of all mortals to take this line,[4] and whatever may have been the case in the East, he certainly was the cause of the introduction of the custom into Africa. A few years later the Council of Iconium in the East, about A.D. 230, declared every baptism performed by a heretic to be invalid, a similar decision being also given by the Bishops assembled in the Synod of Synnada about the same time.[5] There can be no doubt that the custom widely spread in the East and in Africa; the rest of the West accepted the baptism of heretics and schismatics as valid. Towards the end of the year A.D. 253, a controversy broke out on the subject between St. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, and the Bishops of Asia Minor, with the result that St. Stephen wrote that 'he would not hold communion with them . . . [because] they re-baptized the heretics';[6] the Bishops thus 'excommunicated' made no alteration in their custom.

578. The controversy came before St. Cyprian and the African Bishops in the following way. Some of these Bishops were of opinion that those who had abandoned heretical sects for the Church, if they had received baptism, need not be baptized anew. On the other hand, some eighteen Bishops of Numidia, who held the opposite view,

1 *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

2 Bellarmine, *De Summo Pontifice*, Præfatio; *Op.* tom. i. 498. Col. Agripp., 1620.

3 Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. 4. [E.T. i. 87.]

4 S. Vincent Lirinensis, *Commonitorium*, i. 6; P.L. l. 645.

5 Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. i. 90.]

6 Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. vii. cap. v.; P.G. xx. 644. The words describing his action are *ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων*, which express not an intention to break off communion at a date in the future, but an act which commenced from the present moment, the separation being accomplished then.

brought the subject before the Synod of Carthage held in A.D. 255, the fifth under St. Cyprian. Twenty-one Bishops were present, and in St. Cyprian's Seventieth Epistle we learn that, in the judgment of the Council, it 'had long since been settled by their predecessors . . . that no one can be baptized without the Church, in that there is one baptism appointed in the holy Church.'[1]

579. A larger Synod was assembled at Carthage, probably in the following year, A.D. 256, at which seventy-one Bishops were present.[2] The Council reaffirmed the decision of the previous Council, and together with the letter of that Council to the eighteen Numidian Bishops and St. Cyprian's letter to Quintus,[3] who had consulted him on the point, sent a Synodal Letter to St. Stephen containing the determination at which they had arrived. Their object in so doing was no doubt to induce, if possible, St. Stephen by the authority of this influential Synod to change the attitude which he had taken up with regard to this question in the case of the Bishops of Asia Minor. 'These things,' they say, 'by reason of our mutual respect and single-hearted affection, we have brought to thy knowledge, believing that what is alike religious and true will, according to the truth of thy religion and faith, be approved by thee also. But we know that some will not lay aside what they have once imbibed, nor easily change their resolves, but keeping the bond of peace and concord with their colleagues, retain certain practices of their own which have been once adopted among them. In this matter we neither do violence to any nor lay down a law, since each prelate hath in the government of the Church his own choice and will free, hereafter to give an account of his conduct to the Lord.'[4]

580. The Synod clearly did not regard the Bishop of Rome, to whom they thus wrote, as the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, their 'Master' whose sovereign authority they were bound to obey. They address him as equals, and as one possessed of no other jurisdiction than that which was shared by all members of the One Episcopate. St. Stephen's reply is not extant, but it is clear from the Epistle of St. Cyprian to Pompeius, Bishop of Sabrata, in the province of Tripoli, that it was couched in arrogant terms. In that letter St. Cyprian says that 'our brother Stephen' wrote 'arrogant, extraneous, and self-contradictory things,' 'without due instruction and caution.' He speaks of his 'obstinacy' and 'presumption,' his 'blindness of mind' and 'perverseness,' and speaks of him as one who is 'the friend of heretics and enemy to Christians,' thinking 'that priests of God defending the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church are to be

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Januarium*, Ep. lxx. 1; Hartel, p. 767.
[2] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. i. 100.]
[3] *Ep. ad Quintum*, Ep. lxxi.; Hartel, p. 771 *et seq.*
[4] *Ep. ad Stephanum inter Epp. S Cypriani*, Ep. lxxii. 3; Hartel, pp. 777, 778.

excommunicated.'[1] The great saint thus treated St. Stephen as an erring brother who deserved rebuke for his conduct, not as the Supreme Monarch of the Church, exercising the same 'power' over the Episcopate as Christ 'exercised during His mortal Life'[2] over the Apostolate.

581. After receiving this letter from St. Stephen, St. Cyprian convoked another Synod, and eighty-five Bishops assembled at Carthage on the 1st of September A.D. 256, under his presidency. St. Cyprian would appear not to have read St. Stephen's letter to the Council, following the precedent he had set in the Council of A.D. 251, held before the recognition of the legitimacy of Cornelius' consecration to the See of Rome, to which, in order to avoid scandal[3] and perplexity, he did not read the accusations sent by the opponents of Cornelius. It is clear, however, that he had it directly in his mind, referring to it in scathing terms in his opening speech, in which he asked the assembled prelates to deliver their opinions separately on the question, 'judging no one, nor depriving any one of the right of communion if he differ from us. For no one of us setteth himself up as a Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical terror forces his colleagues to a necessity of obeying, inasmuch as every Bishop, in the free use of his liberty and power, has the right of forming his own judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge another. But we must all wait the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone has the power both of setting us in the government of His Church, and judging our acts therein.'[4] In response, the Bishops unanimously and emphatically repeated their previous decision, St. Cyprian giving, as President, his sentence last.

582. The Synod sent certain of their number as their legates to St. Stephen to convey to him the decision they had arrived at in Synod. Stephen 'would not admit them to the common intercourse of speech,' and 'commanded the whole brotherhood that no one admit them to their house, so that when they came, not only *peace* and communion, but shelter and hospitality, were denied them.'[5] He broke the peace with Cyprian, which his predecessors ever maintained with him in mutual respect and affection, excommunicating him, as is plain not only from his action towards the legates from the African Church, denying to them the common right of all who came with letters of communion from their own Bishop, but also from St. Firmilian's indignant words: 'How great sin hast thou heaped up when thou didst cut thyself off from so many flocks! For thou didst cut thyself off; deceive not thyself; for he truly is the schismatic who has made him-

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Pompeium*, Ep. lxxiv.; Hartel, p. 799 *et seq.*
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.
[3] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlv. 2; Hartel, pp. 600, 601.
[4] Mansi, i. 95.
[5] S. Firmilian, *Ep. inter Epp. S. Cypriani*, lxxv. 26; Hartel, p. 826.

self an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church. For while thou thinkest that all may be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all.'[1]

583. This exclusion of St. Cyprian and the Africans from the communion of the Roman Church by St. Stephen was in accord with the principle on which he had acted towards the Bishops of Asia Minor whom he had already excommunicated, 'breaking peace' with them as he now did with the Africans 'in the south.'[2] Communion between the Churches remained broken off until, it would seem, the Episcopate of Xystus, who succeeded St. Stephen, probably through the mediation of St. Dionysius the Great of Alexandria, who had strongly disapproved of St. Stephen's action with reference to the Bishops of Asia Minor, of which he said, 'I cannot endure it.'[3] Such action on the part of Xystus in bringing about the restoration of peace would explain the fact that 'Pontius, Cyprian's deacon and biographer, calls' him '*bonus et pacificus sacerdos*, and the name of this Pope was written in the diptychs of Africa.'[4] Such peace, however, was not purchased by the surrender of the Africans of the position they had taken up in the face of Stephen's threats, for the divergence in practice with regard to the question of 're-baptism' continued to exist for a long time afterwards, as is plain from the Eighth Canon of the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, by which the law of the Africans was abolished, it being laid down that any one coming to the Church from heresy who had been baptized in the name of the Trinity was simply to receive imposition of hands.[5]

584. Certain conclusions must be drawn from the history of this controversy—(*a*) First, it is plain that St. Cyprian, the African Bishops, St. Firmilian, and the Eastern Bishops, knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy, for had they done so, it would have been inevitable that they should have obeyed their 'Master,' 'the Supreme Pastor,' 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful,' 'the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' St. Stephen, and at once accepted his '*ex cathedra*' pronouncement on the subject, notwithstanding it condemned their teaching and practice. (*b*) Secondly, it is plain that these Bishops of the Churches, the members of which were incomparably more numerous than those of the Churches of the West,[6] did not consider that excommunication by a Bishop of Rome cut them off from the

[1] S. Firmilian, *Ep. inter Epp. S. Cypriani*, n. 25; Hartel, p. 825.

[2] *Ibid.*, lxxv. 26; Hartel, p. 826.

[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 19; P.G. xx. 656.

[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. vi. [E.T. i. 103.]

[5] Mansi, vi. 472. 'Nevertheless, unity was not restored at the expense of the practice Pope Stephen condemned. In the fourth century S. Basil still adhered to the same practice as Firmilian, and so it was in Syria. The Africans also adhered to their own custom, and did not give it up until the Council of Arles, in 314, under the Emperor Constantine.—Duchesne, *The Early History of the Church*, E. T., p. 311.

[6] Duchesne, *Origines du culte Chrétien*, p. 21.

Unity of the Church, so that they were no longer within 'the fold'; on the contrary, St. Firmilian expresses their belief that Stephen's arrogant action simply resulted in his excommunicating himself; 'communion with Rome' was thus certainly not with them the public criterion of being a Catholic. (*c*) Thirdly, the African Bishops especially denied that any 'one' Bishop, evidently referring to St. Stephen, had the right to judge another. This they could not have done had it been the 'venerable and constant belief of' the Church in their 'age' that St. Stephen was as 'the successor of Peter in his primacy over the universal Church' 'by the institution of Christ' 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful,' 'possessed of full and supreme power of jurisdiction,' to whom all were bound to render obedience if they were to abide in the 'kingdom.' It was to be remembered that the two chief 'abettors' of the course of action adopted by those Bishops were prelates of great authority. St. Cyprian was probably at this date the only Metropolitan besides the Bishop of Rome in the West, exercising a wide jurisdiction as Primate of Carthage, and St. Firmilian, one of the most illustrious[1] Bishops of his time, who presided at the two Synods of Antioch[2] in which the heresy of Paul of Samosata was condemned, and with Dionysius was entitled 'of blessed memory'[3] by the Fourth Council of Antioch, A.D. 269, whither he was journeying when he died at Tarsus. Both, too, are enrolled in the hierarchy of the saints, notwithstanding that they had been excommunicated by the Bishop of Rome, for St. Cyprian is 'counted amongst the most illustrious martyrs even in the Roman Church; which names him in the Canon of the Mass in preference to St. Stephen; and the Greeks in their *Menologion* honour the memory of Firmilian'[4] [on October 28].

585. From the evidence which has been given, it follows that the *Satis Cognitum*, in quoting certain words from St. Cyprian's writings in support of the position therein laid down as belonging *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome, uses them in manner opposed to their true meaning, and by so doing totally misrepresents 'the testimony' of St. Cyprian on the subject. That 'testimony,' as shown by his writings and conduct, being indeed proof positive that he and the Church of his age knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy which the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees* allege to be an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, an allegation which is therefore disproved: for if it had been true, it must, as the *Satis Cognitum* asserts, have been 'the venerable and constant belief of' the 'age' of St. Cyprian.

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 5; P.G. xx. 644.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. ix. [E.T. i. 120.]
[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 30; P.G. xx. 709.
[4] Fleury, *op. cit.*, liv. vii. c. xxxii., tom. i. 288. Edit. Paris, 1856.

CHAPTER XVI

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST. JEROME

SECTION LXXVIII.—*St. Jerome and St. Damasus.*

586. The next witness appealed to in the *Satis Cognitum* is St. Jerome, from whose writings two extracts are given. The first of these is as follows:—'My words are spoken to the successor of the Fisherman, to the disciple of the Cross . . . I communicate with none save your Blessedness, that is, with the chair of Peter. For this, I know, is the rock on which the Church was built' (Ep. xv. ad Damasum, n. 2).'[1] The quotation is taken from St. Jerome's Fifteenth Epistle, which was addressed to Damasus, Bishop of Rome, under circumstances a consideration of which throws considerable light on the true meaning of the words cited. St. Jerome had been only nine years a Christian when he wrote this letter, having been baptized at Rome at the age of twenty. He arrived at Antioch at a time when the dispute amongst the Orthodox as to which of two claimants was the legitimate occupant of the Episcopal chair in that city was raging. Meletius was the one who was recognised by the Easterns, and whose claims were admitted by the greater number of those who adhered to the Catholic faith at Antioch; Paulinus, on the other hand, ruled over a small minority of the Orthodox, who had, during the Episcopate of the Arianizing Bishops thrust into the See after the banishment of St. Eustathius, held aloof from them under his guidance. Paulinus had been consecrated by Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, in direct opposition to the desire of a great Council held at Alexandria in A.D. 362, under the presidency of St. Athanasius. This Synod had, with all the influence it possessed, urged that all the followers of St. Eustathius should recognise Meletius, a saintly man, who had been a short time before appointed Bishop of Antioch by the efforts of both Catholics and Arians, and who had soon after his election unequivocally declared his adherence to the Catholic faith. St. Jerome thus, a stranger and a Western, found himself at Antioch in the midst of a great dispute.

587. To whom could he more naturally turn for guidance as 'a man of Rome' than to the Bishop of the Church where he had received Baptism? The Bishop, too, of a See which had been, with the excep-

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

tion of the time of Liberius' fall, firm on the Orthodox side against Arianism, and so specially qualified to deal with a disputed point which, as he might well be led to think by the followers of Paulinus, was at least complicated by an alleged complicity with that heresy on the part of one of the claimants; the Bishop moreover whom, according to the view then universally accepted in the West, he regarded as sitting in the chair of that Peter who had in the name of the Apostolate confessed their belief in that foundation truth which that heresy denied. He wrote, then, a letter to St. Damasus, giving expression to the perplexity in which he was, 'since,' says he, 'the East tears in pieces the Lord's coat, and foxes lay waste the vineyard of Christ, so that among broken cisterns which hold no water it is difficult to understand where the sealed fountain and enclosed garden are,' 'therefore by me is the chair of Peter to be consulted, and that faith which is praised by the Apostle's mouth,' 'thence now seeking food for my soul where of old I received the robe of Christ.' . . . 'Whilst the bad children have wasted their goods, the inheritance of the fathers is preserved uncorrupt among you alone. There the earth from its fertile bosom returns the pure seed of the Lord a hundredfold; here the grain buried in the furrows degenerates into darnel and tares. At present the Sun of righteousness rises in the West; but in the East the fallen Lucifer has placed his throne above the stars. You are the light of the world: you are the salt of the earth: you the vessels of gold and silver; but here the vessels of earth or wood await the iron rod and eternal flame. Therefore though your greatness terrifies me, yet your kindness invites me. From the priest the sacrifice claims salvation; from the shepherd the sheep claims protection. Let us speak without offence; I court not the Roman height; I speak with the successor of the Fisherman and the disciple of the Cross, I who follow none as my chief but Christ, am associated in communion with thy Blessedness, that is, with the See of Peter. On that rock the Church is built I know. Whoso shall eat the Lamb outside that house is profane. If any one shall not be in the Ark of Noah, he will perish when the flood prevails. . . . I know not Vitalis,[1] Meletius I reject. I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whoso gathereth not with thee scattereth; that is, he who is not of Christ is of Antichrist.'[2]

588. The whole tone of the letter is just what one might expect from a layman who, owing his baptism to Rome, wrote to the Bishop thereof under the circumstances detailed above. The letter is plainly that of one who, so far from weighing his words, writes in exaggerated

[1] Vitalis had been a priest in communion with Meletius, but becoming an Apollinarian left him with others. He was ultimately, in A.D. 376, consecrated by Apollinarius as 'Bishop of Antioch.'

[2] S. Hieron., *Ep. ad Damasum*, Ep. xv. 1, 2; P.L. xxii. 355.

language. The grave restraint which a theologian is careful to use is not to be expected of one of his temperament, who was young both in years and in the faith. Nor had he yet attained that knowledge which would make him an authority on theological matters, as he indeed practically admitted by the way in which he spoke at a later date of a work written by himself about this very time.[1] Yet exaggerated as is its language, the letter itself bears witness against Papalism. If St. Jerome had believed St. Damasus held the position alleged to belong to the Bishops of Rome by the institution of Christ, he would have adopted a different method. He would have appealed to him as the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, having full and supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, whose special office it was, according to the Divine Constitution of the Church, to preserve its unity, to declare to him with the final authority inherent in his office of Supreme Judge of all the faithful, which of the claimants to the Antiochene throne was its rightful occupant. This he did not do, but as one who followed 'none as his chief but Christ,' he merely asks the Catholic Bishop with whom he, as a 'man of Rome,' was 'associated in communion,' to give him that guidance which, as a member of the flock of which he was the shepherd, he had a right to expect in his perplexity, so that having been informed by him which of the rivals was the one with whom he, his Bishop, as a Catholic was in communion, he would know who was the canonical Bishop.

589. Again, the question submitted to St. Damasus involved the consideration of the orthodoxy of the respective claimants to the See. If St. Jerome had believed St. Damasus to be the 'Teacher of all Christians,' having 'the supreme power of teaching,' clearly he would have in his application to him have emphasised his prerogative on this matter, instead of using language inconsistent with it. For he applies to the 'chair of Peter,' not because its occupant is the divinely appointed Teacher of the Church, possessing by the institution of Christ 'the gift of truth and never failing faith . . . that the whole flock of Christ kept away by him from the poisonous fruit of error might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine';[2] but because '*at present* the Sun of righteousness arises in the West,' because, that is, at that time the Bishop of Rome was Orthodox, whilst in the East the Arian heresy was making terrible havoc, and was the cause of the position which St. Jerome felt to be intolerable. The 'time' limitation thus expressed by St. Jerome shows that he is referring to a temporary state of things then existing, which gave him special justification for making his application; such a limitation presupposes that a different state of things might exist which would

[1] S. Hieron., *Comment. in Abdiam Proleg.*; P.L. xxv. 1098.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486-7.

render such an application useless, as it would have been, for example, during part of the episcopate of Liberius,[1] and so incompatible with the belief that the Bishop of Rome is at *all times* the final judge in matters of faith, whose decisions *ex cathedra* are binding on the whole Church, East and West.

590. The terms 'Chair of Peter,' 'See of Peter' are quite in harmony with the whole tenor of the application, for in themselves, as has been shown,[2] they mean no more than that St. Jerome, as one who had been baptized at Rome, had accepted the tradition which by his day had become accepted there, viz., that St. Peter was the first diocesan Bishop of the Church in Rome, so that the Episcopal Chair there was actually 'the Chair of Peter,' and the See of Rome actually 'the See of Peter,' terms which might be used of any See, on the Cyprianic principle that the Episcopate was constituted by our Blessed Lord in St. Peter.[3] The circumstances under which the letter was written, and the context in which the citation occurs, prove therefore that the use which the *Satis Cognitum* makes of it is contrary to St. Jerome's intention and belief when he wrote it.

591. The other citation is as follows: 'I acknowledge every one who is united with the See of Peter' (Ep. xvi. ad Damasum, n. 2), which is adduced in support of the allegation that to St. Jerome 'union with the Roman See of Peter is always the public criterion of a Catholic.'[4] The term 'See of Peter' in itself, as has been shown,[5] has not the meaning which the advocates of Papalism attach to it, and the circumstances under which this letter was written do not in any way require that such should be its signification. Those circumstances have been detailed in the previous paragraphs, and the whole statement therefore simply records St. Jerome's position that 'a man of Rome,' sojourning in a foreign land in which there was a dispute as to who was the legitimate ruler of the diocese in which he then was, naturally would determine only to communicate with the Bishop who was in communion with the Bishop of the diocese whence he came, that diocese being the one which, in the opinion of the West at that date, was the one which had actually had St. Peter as its first diocesan Bishop, and so was 'the See of Peter.'

592. Thus appealed to by St. Jerome, St. Damasus took the step, from which hitherto he had refrained, of recognising by his letters Paulinus as the legitimate occupant of the Antiochene chair, and there can be no doubt that St. Jerome, in accordance with his letters, entered into communion with him. Therefore by him St. Meletius, if his letters are to be taken literally, was treated as 'not in the Church built on the

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 758.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 556 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 135.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 556, 557.

rock, a profane person outside the house,' and not being in the Ark, would utterly perish. A strange position to take up towards one whom Easterns, like the great St. Basil, recognised as the true Bishop of Antioch with a full knowledge of the position, and who as such presided at the Second Œcumenical Council, a Council illustrious for the number of Saints amongst its members. Evidently they did not regard St. Meletius as 'outside the Church and profane,' because the Bishop of Rome recognised him not. St. Jerome, as a Western and a member of the local Church of Rome, might excusably take the direction of its Bishop and act upon it by rejecting St. Meletius and recognising Paulinus, but the Eastern Prelates, not being under his jurisdiction, acted freely and in accordance with their own opinion as to the rights of the case, untrammelled by any idea that they were subject to the Bishop of Rome as 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' whose sovereignty they were bound to recognise by humble obedience, and in the exercise of their right rejected Paulinus and recognised St. Meletius.

593. Further, when at the Council of Constantinople St. Meletius died, still out of communion with Rome, the whole East was plunged into mourning, and he was venerated as a Saint, St. Gregory Nazianzen pronounced a eulogy upon him which expressed the opinion of the Easterns, declaring that he died full of years and merit, and was carried away by troops of angels, whilst his body was borne in triumph from Constantinople to Antioch. Ten years later, when St. Chrysostom proclaimed[1] his glorious merits before the people over whom he had ruled as Bishop, he invoked him as a Saint. The judgment of the Easterns has prevailed, and St. Meletius is by the West as well as the East venerated as a Saint. Yet if Papalism were true, the great Saint was a schismatic 'separated from the fold,' he was not a member of the one 'flock,' living for years, and in the end dying out of communion with 'the Supreme Pastor.' The history of St. Meletius' tenure of the See of Antioch affords witness which cannot be gainsaid, against the unhistorical nature of the monarchical position which Papalism alleges to belong *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome.

Section LXXIX.—*St. Jerome and the position of the Apostolate.*

594. St. Jerome's opinion with regard to the position of the Apostolate further confirms the conclusion arrived at, that the use made of his words quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* is untenable: Papalism alleges that St. Peter was the divinely appointed 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' exercising the same power over its members as Christ did during His mortal life. The truth of this allegation is the necessary foundation of the Ultramontane assertions with regard to the 'Roman

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom. in S. Meletium*; P.G. I. 520.

Pontiff.' If St. Jerome did not hold the Papalist doctrine as to St. Peter's position, clearly he did not hold that doctrine with regard to the position of the Bishops of Rome as the legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate. His writings give clear evidence that this was the case. For example, he calls St. Peter and St. Andrew '*Apostolorum Principes*,'[1] hence he did not consider St. Peter to have been 'the Prince of the Apostles' in the sense of possessing a unique sovereignty over the Apostles by the institution of Christ, for to apply the title to another Apostle, and this in conjunction with St. Peter, shows that whatever the position St. Jerome meant by the title to ascribe to St. Peter, he considered was equally the right of that other Apostle. No doubt, he used the word *Principes* in the sense of pre-eminent personages in the Church, and not as designating, as Papalists do, when they use it, a single 'Lord' possessed of that supreme and full power of jurisdiction which is of the essence of sovereignty.

595. Similar testimony to St. Jerome's belief as to the equality of all the members of the Apostolic College is to be found in his treatise against Jovinian written in his later years. Having said of St. John the Evangelist, 'if he was not a virgin let Jovinian explain why he was more beloved than the other Apostles,' he proceeds, 'but you say that the Church is founded upon Peter, though the same thing is done in another place on all the Apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the solidity of the Church is established equally upon all; nevertheless, among the twelve one is, therefore, chosen, that by the appointment of a head an occasion of dissension may be taken away—*schismatis tollatur occasio*.—But why was not John chosen, who was a virgin? Deference was paid to age, because Peter was the elder, lest one who was still a young man and almost a boy should be given precedence before men of mature age; and lest the good Master, who felt bound to remove an occasion of strife from His disciples—*Magister bonus qui occasionem jurgii debuerat auferre discipulis*—and who had said unto them, 'My peace I give unto you; peace I leave with you,' and who had also said, 'Whosoever would be great among men let him be the least of all'; and lest He should seem to give a cause of envy against the young man whom He loved—*in adolescentem quem dilexerat causam præbere videretur invidiæ*.—Peter was an Apostle, and John was an Apostle, the first married, the second a virgin. But Peter was only an Apostle—*sed Petrus Apostolus tantum*—while John was an Apostle, and an Evangelist, and a Prophet.'[2]

596. In this passage St. Jerome asserts the absolute equality of all the Apostles. St. John had a privilege which St. Peter had not, viz. he was a virgin. But he was not chosen as the head of the Apostolic

[1] S. Hieron., *Brev. in Ps. lxvii.*; P.L. xxvi. 1021.
[2] *Adv. Jovinianum*, lib. i. c. xxvi.; P.L. xxiii. 247.

College because of his youth, whilst St. Peter was *on account of his age*. It is clear that this 'position' involved no 'sovereignty' or jurisdiction of any kind, for 'the solidity of the Church is established equally upon them all.' Had St. Peter been designated as *the* sole, divinely appointed, necessary foundation rock of the Church by our Lord, so that according to the Divine Constitution of the Church he was as Supreme Pastor to be the centre of unity of the one flock, the Church could not have been said to have been 'established equally on all' the Apostles. He would have occupied a 'position unshared by any.' Again, the reason assigned by St. Jerome for the appointment is that the 'occasion of dissension might be taken away,' the word *schisma* being used by St. Jerome in the same sense as he uses it in his translation of St. John ix. 16, viz. for dissension such as that which is recorded in St. Mark ix. 34 to have taken place. The word *schisma*, as Bramhall long ago pointed out,[1] is thus 'to be understood of contention and altercation amongst the Apostles themselves.' And the ground he assigns for the choice of Peter for this purpose, instead of St. John, the virgin Apostle, is that another occasion of strife might be avoided. The essential equality of the Apostles is clearly in no way impaired by the appointment of one of their number as *primus inter pares* for the object named: his position remained the same, he was 'only an Apostle,' not 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College.' The whole passage thus forms a complete argument, all the parts of which are in strict harmony. Such a headship of order is consistent with his denial in the context that the Church was founded on Peter alone, or that he alone received the keys. On the other hand, had St. Jerome taken the Papalist line and asserted St. Peter to have been by the instruction of Christ appointed the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, possessed of real and sovereign authority, which all are bound to obey, for the purpose of maintaining unity, his argument would have been ruined, its parts being in that case self-contradictory. It is strange, therefore, that Papalists quote the words *schismatis tollatur occasio* in support of their allegation with reference to the supremacy of St. Peter, when a reference to the context would show the absurdity of so doing.

597. In St. Jerome's view, then, all the members of the Apostolic College held equal power and authority. Their jurisdiction was supreme in the Church: of them, he declares, all 'Bishops are the successors.'[2] He knew nothing of any one Bishop being the Supreme Pastor, communion with whom is necessary to the preservation of the unity of the One Flock, any more than he knew of an Apostle holding such a position. To him the Apostolate was the supreme authority in

[1] Bramhall, *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon*. *Works*, ii. 155. Anglo-Cath. Library.

[2] S. Hieron., *Ep. ad Evangelum*, Ep. xliv.; P.L. xxii. 1193.

the Church; and to that, in his opinion, succeeded the Episcopate. The conclusion, therefore, already arrived at as to the use made in the *Satis Cognitum* of quotations from St. Jerome's writings is confirmed by this fact; and to adduce St. Jerome as a witness to the monarchical position which Papalism alleges to belong *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome, is to make him testify to that which is incompatible with his true belief.

CHAPTER XVII

'THE TESTIMONY' OF ST. AUGUSTINE

SECTION LXXX.—*The 'Principatus Apostolicæ Cathedræ.'*

598. 'The testimony' of St. Augustine is next claimed by the *Satis Cognitum*, in support of the allegations. Two quotations are given from his writings. The first is that 'The Primacy of the Apostolic chair always existed in the Roman Church' (Ep. xliii. n. 7).[1] The Latin is *in romana Ecclesia Apostolicæ Cathedræ viguisse principatum.* On this citation it must be noted, (*a*) in the first place, that *Satis Cognitum* assumes that St. Augustine here uses the words *Apostolicæ Cathedræ* to signify '*the* Apostolic Chair,' as they are rendered in the authorised English translation, *i.e.* the 'sole' Apostolic chair. But this is contrary to that use of the expression 'Apostolic Sees'—*Sedes Apostolicæ*—which, as has been shown,[2] was customary with him, in accordance with which they should be translated 'an Apostolic chair.' This translation is further in harmony with her use of the words 'Apostolic Churches'—*Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ*—in the very Epistle from which the citation is made. In fact, St. Augustine follows Tertullian, the first great African Church writer, in this matter, who in his argument against the heretics said, 'Come now, thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, go through the *Apostolical Churches* in which the very *seats of the Apostles* at this very day do preside in their own places'—Percurre *ecclesias Apostolicas* apud quas ad hoc *cathedræ Apostolorum* suis locis præsident.[3]

599. Leaving for the moment the word *principatum* untranslated, St. Augustine says, therefore, that 'the principatus of *an* Apostolic chair has always flourished in the Roman Church,' a statement the truth of which at this date was not doubted, as all admitted that the Roman Church, as one of the Apostolical Churches, possessed in common with them an 'Apostolical chair,' a point of great importance in the controversy with the Donatists in which St. Augustine was then engaged, and with which the Epistle whence the citation is

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 11.
[3] Tertullian, *De Prescript. Hæreticorum* cap. xxxvi.; P.L. ii. 49.

taken, is concerned, for it enabled him to use the following argument, which conclusively proved the Donatist position to be schismatical. The Donatists, who were Westerns, were not in communion with the one Apostolical See in the West. St. Augustine lays hold of this fact, and, as he was justified by the position in the Church which he held to belong to the Apostolic Sees, proceeded to draw as an inevitable conclusion, that they were not in communion with the Catholic Church. Similarly, in another place, when proving the untenable character of the position of his Donatist adversary, he says, 'What has the chair of the Roman Church done to you, in which Peter sat and in which Anastasius sitteth now? Or the chair of the Church of Jerusalem, in which James once sat and in which John sitteth now, with which we are united in Catholic Unity and from which by impious fury you have separated yourselves.'[1] The fact that the Donatists were not in communion with the Sees of Rome and Jerusalem—two of 'the Apostolic Sees' in the prelates of which the Church was solidly rooted, separation from which, therefore, he declared, as Pelagius I. said, to be schism[2]—sufficiently showed that they were out of Catholic Unity.

600. (*b*) In the next place, what does the word *principatus* in the quotation mean? It is rendered in the English translation, 'Primacy.' Now that word is, as has been already said,[3] an ambiguous one; in fact it may signify any position from that of first in honour, to that of an 'autocrat.' There is, however, no doubt that the translator uses it here in the same sense as he does elsewhere, in his translation of the *Satis Cognitum*, viz., to express the monarchical position asserted in that document to belong *jure divino* to the Pope, and in doing so, accurately gives the sense affixed to the word, of which it professes to be the English rendering, by the use to which the quotation in which it occurs is put in the *Satis Cognitum*. From what has been said in the previous paragraph, it is clear that the rest of the quotation in which the term *principatus* occurs, determines that this meaning cannot be that of the writer, and is inconsistent with its general tenor; hence the term must have such a meaning as would be applicable to any Apostolic See.

601. Further, if the term be considered in itself, there is absolutely nothing whatever about it making it necessary that it should bear the Papalist meaning. On the contrary, as has already been seen,[4] the title *Princeps*, from which the term *principatus* is derived, was not intended by the Roman people when they applied it to the Emperor to signify that he held supreme authority in the Empire as an autocrat, succeeding to his office by right, but simply that he was the foremost

[1] S. Aug., *Contra Literas Petiliani*, lib. ii. cap. li.; P.L. xliii. 300.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 11. [3] *Vide supra*, n. 101. [4] *Vide supra*, n. 502.

citizen of the State, that being the sense in which it had been used under the Republic. Hence *principatus* clearly in itself signifies that pre-eminence which belongs to a *Princeps*, and in no way conveys the idea that he who bore that title exercised any jurisdiction as such. Hence it follows that, so far as the word itself is concerned, it might well be used to describe the position of any See, since every Bishop is a *Princeps Ecclesiæ*, as is plain from St. Hilary's use of the word.[1] Indeed, whilst the word *principatus* does not convey the idea of jurisdiction, or sovereignty, terms which have such signification are applied by early writers to Bishops; for example, the African writer of the tract, *De Aleatoribus*,[2] uses the term *Apostolatus ducatus* to denote the Episcopate, and St. Gregory Nazianzen a very strong word with reference to the position of a Bishop, declaring that he as a Bishop 'had rule, a throne and sovereignty (ἀρχήν).'[3]

602. Since, then, the word *principatus* could be fittingly used to describe the position held by any Bishop, it would also be suitable to describe the pre-eminence of those who shared that Apostolate to which the Episcopate succeeded. Consequently it is used by St. Gregory the Great, as the term which accurately sets forth the positions held by St. Paul, when he says, 'He was made head of the nations because he held the *principatus* of the whole Church'[4]; that is, St. Gregory means that St. Paul shared that pre-eminence which the Apostolate had in the Church, not that he as an individual had 'sovereignty' over the whole Church, including, of course, the Apostolic College. If the term had possessed the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum*, by its method of using the citation under notice, implies and requires that it must, St. Gregory, a Bishop of Rome, in an age when the Papal theory as to Peter and the Roman Bishop had considerably developed,[5] would in the passage referred to be asserting that St. Paul possessed 'sovereignty' over the whole Church, including his brother Apostle St. Peter, obviously an absurdity.

A word thus used to designate the position of Apostles and of Bishops who succeed them, is especially suitable to describe the position of those Sees which have the distinction of possessing 'an Apostolic chair,' that is, one which according to St. Augustine's argument had been actually occupied by an Apostle,[6] and he so uses it.

[1] S. Hilar., *De Trinitate*, lib. viii.; P.L. x. 256.

[2] This tract is placed amongst the spurious works of S. Cyprian; on it *vide* note 44, p.

[3] S. Greg. Nazianzen, *Orat.* xvii.; P.G. xxxv. 976.

[4] S. Greg. M., *in* 1 *Reg.*, lib. iv. cap. v. 28; P.L. lxxix. 303-4.

[5] *Vide*, nn. 196 *et seq.*, 1117.

[6] St. Augustine's view on this point, which was that accepted in the Church of his day, was no doubt erroneous, the Apostles being the *auctores* of the Episcopal succession in the Apostolical Churches, not the first Diocesan Bishops thereof (*vide supra* 475 *et seq.*), and so not the actual occupants of 'the chair' of the See.

SECTION LXXXI.—*St. Augustine and the Donatists.*

603. St. Augustine's works are voluminous, and in them he nowhere attributes to the occupant of the particular 'Apostolic Chair' which existed at Rome that full and supreme power of jurisdiction *jure divino* which the *Satis Cognitum* alleged to belong to him; further, it is clear from his writings that he was entirely ignorant of any such divinely conferred prerogative belonging to the Bishop of Rome.

For example, in the epistle from which the citation considered in the last section is taken, the way in which he discusses the attitude which the Donatists had taken up in their opposition to Cæcilian, formerly Bishop of Carthage, is incompatible with any belief on his part in Papalism. He says that they appealed to the Emperor to decide between them and Cæcilian, who should judge with a better judgment than that which broke the bond of peace in Africa. This, he declares, was done, Cæcilian and those who opposed him being present, and 'Melchiades, then Bishop of Rome, judging with his colleagues,' 'Bishops whom the Emperor had sent to Rome' —'*Judicante Melchiade tunc Romanæ Urbis Episcopo cum collegis suis*,' '*Episcopis quos ad urbem Romam miserat*'—at the petition of the Donatists. Nothing could be proved then against Cæcilian, who thus being confirmed in his Episcopate, Donatus, who was present against him, was condemned, 'the Donatists perishing in their obstinacy.' 'Afterwards at Arles . . . the Emperor took care that the same cause should be more diligently examined and terminated. But they appealed from the ecclesiastical proceedings, desiring that Constantine should hear the cause, which was afterwards done with the assent of both parties, and Cæcilian was pronounced innocent. If, however, the Donatists should object that Melchiades, Bishop of the Roman Church, with his colleagues the transmarine Bishops, ought not to usurp to himself that judgment which had been determined by seventy African Bishops under the presidency of the Primate Tigistanus, the answer is, "What if he did not usurp it?" For the Emperor, being requested to do so, sent Bishops as judges, who sat with him and determined what appeared just concerning the whole business. And although such a sentence was delivered last by Melchiades himself, yet . . . if they considered that the Bishops who judged at Rome were not good judges,[1] there remained still a plenary Council of the Universal Church, where also the cause could be gone into with the judges themselves, so that if they were convicted of having given a bad judgment,

[1] These judges were: Melchiades, Bishop of Rome; Merocles, Bishop of Milan; three Gallic Bishops: Reticius, Bishop of Autun; Maternus, Bishop of Cologne, and Marinus, Bishop of Arles; with fourteen other Bishops from Italy. Merocles is to be identified with Marcus, to whom in conjunction with Melchiades, according to Eusebius

their sentence could be annulled. . . . They dared to accuse Bishops, ecclesiastical judges of so great authority, that they had judged badly, by whose judgment both the innocence of Cæcilian and their own condemnation had been declared, not before their colleagues, but before the Emperor. He gave them that other trial at Arles, that is of other Bishops, not because it was necessary, but yielding to their perversity, and desiring to restrain in every way so great impudence. For neither did that Christian Emperor dare so to receive their tumultuous and fallacious questions as to judge concerning the judgment of the Bishops who sat at Rome, but, as I have said, gave other Bishops from whom, nevertheless, they again desired to appeal to the Emperor.'[1]

604. St. Augustine here states five facts: (*a*) First, that no appeal lay by right from the judgment of the African Bishops, and that the Donatists, in order to upset their canonical judgment, addressed themselves to the civil power; (*b*) Secondly, that the Tribunal composed of Bishops before which the appeal came, derived the jurisdiction it exercised in the case from the Emperor who constituted them judges in the matter; (*c*) Thirdly, that the judgment given was that of the 'Bishops who judged at Rome,' 'Bishops of so great authority';[2] (*d*) Fourthly, that Melchiades was one of these judges giving his sentence last which, as President over his colleagues, as St. Augustine elsewhere calls him, by which 'vote,'[3] following upon that of the other Bishops, 'the judgment was closed,' as St. Optatus says,[4] it being the custom for the President of such assemblies to give his *sententia* last, as is evident, for instance, from the example of St. Cyprian at the Synod of Carthage on Rebaptism[5] over which he presided. Being President of the Tribunal, the judgment might well be called the 'judgment' of Melchiades, and the assemblage of Bishops his 'Council,' as was done by St. Augustine at the conference with the Donatists in

(*Eccl. Hist.*, x. 5; P.G. xx. 889), the letter of Constantine constituting the Tribunal was addressed. Marcus was certainly a Bishop, as the three Gallic Bishops are described as 'your colleagues,' which otherwise they would not have been called, and the name Marcus does not appear in the list of Bishops referred to above, given by St. Optatus (*De Schism. Donat.*, i. 23; P.L. xi. 930-932), and he was evidently a member of the Tribunal constituted by Constantine. For Μάρκῳ in Eusebius 'unquestionably should be read Μεροκλεῖ,' and he being Bishop of Milan, and the Synod being due to the joint action of Melchiades and himself in compliance with the Emperor's orders, accounts for Bishops from north as well as central Italy being members of the Tribunal. Cp. *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, ii. 1811, 1812.

[1] S. Aug., *Ep. ad fratres Glorium, Eleusium*, etc., Ep. xliii.; P.L. xxxiii. 161 *seq.*

[2] *Cp.* also S. Aug., *Ep. ad fratrem Generosum*, Ep. liii. c. ii.; P.L. xxxiii. 198.

[3] S. Aug., Ep. cv.; P.L. xxxiii. 399, and cp. *Contra Ep. Parmaniani*, lib. i. c. iv.; P.L. xliii. 39.

[4] *Cæcilianus supra memoratorum sententiis innocens est pronunciatus, etiam Melchiadis sententia, qua judicium clausum est.* S. Optatus, *De schism. Donat.*, i. 24; P.L. xi. 933.

[5] *Vide supra*, n. 581.

A.D. 411,[1] but so far as jurisdiction is concerned, that possessed and exercised by the President was precisely the same in nature as that of the rest of the other Bishops who, with him, composed the court of inquiry, to whom accordingly, as just observed, the 'judgment' is in like manner attributed by St. Augustine, which is also clear from the language which the Emperor Constantine uses to describe the result of the proceedings of the Tribunal he had ordered to be constituted, saying that 'the affair was terminated at the City of Rome by the Bishops.'[2] So far from Melchiades having any responsibility for, or share in, the 'judgment' other than that which was possessed by each of his fellow-members of the Tribunal which gave it, Constantine, in alluding to the part he took in the settlement of the cause, simply says, 'the Bishop of the City of Rome being also present,'[3] thus plainly indicating that his position on the Tribunal was, so far as responsibility and power were concerned, exactly the same as the other constituent members of it possessed. (*e*) Fifthly, that if those who had judged at Rome, that is, Melchiades and his colleagues, were not good judges, their sentence was subject to an appeal to a Plenary Council of the Universal Church.

605. St. Augustine, it is plain, could not have made these statements had he believed that the Bishop of Rome is 'the Supreme Judge of the Faithful, to whom recourse may be had in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction,'[4] a prerogative alleged to be divinely conferred, which is essential to the position in support of which the *Satis Cognitum* adduces the citation from St. Augustine which has been considered. Had Melchiades been, as the 'legitimate successor' of 'Peter in the Roman Episcopate,'[5] 'the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' 'having full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church,' 'towards which pastors of whatever rite and dignity, and the Faithful, whether singly or collectively, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience,'[6] so far from any permission from the Emperor being required to enable the Donatists to appeal, they would have had the right to do so as to the 'Supreme Judge of all the Faithful,'[7] and he would have had the right and duty of receiving such appeal. Further, Melchiades would have had the right to decide such appeal himself in virtue of the jurisdiction inherent *jure divino* in his office, instead of requiring a commission from the Emperor, and without being joined with other Bishops as judges of equal power as himself. The judgment would have been that of Mel-

[1] S. Aug., *Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis, Collatio tertii dici*, s. 24, 31, 33, 36, 38; *Ad Donatistas post Collationem*, s. 17, 19, 36; P.L. xliii. 637, 642, 645, 646, 648, 661, 663, 687.

[2] Ep. Const. Aug., *Ad Ablavium, Vicarium Africæ*. Mansi, ii. 463.

[3] Ep. Const. Aug., *Ad Chrestum*. Mansi, ii. 466, 467.

[4] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

[5] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 30, 31.

[6] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

[7] *Ibid.*

chiades solely, deriving its authority from him alone, not that of 'all the Bishops who judged at Rome.' Lastly, it would have been final and conclusive 'for the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, may not be reviewed by any one, nor is it lawful for any to judge concerning his judgment.'[1] St. Augustine, on the contrary, declares that an appeal did lie from the judgment of Melchiades and his colleagues, so that judgment could be reviewed by a Council.

606. The Emperor acted in accordance with this, deciding 'that the whole controversy should be definitely settled by a great assembly of all the Bishops of Christendom.'[2] He summoned a Synod which met at Arles 1 August A.D. 314, a Council which St. Augustine calls 'a Plenary Council of the Universal Church,'[3] the greater part of Christendom being represented by Bishops. The President of this Council was not the Bishop of Rome, although deputies from St. Sylvester were present as his representatives, but appears to have been Marinus, Bishop of Arles,[4] one of the three Gallic Bishops who had been formerly appointed by Constantine as members of the earlier Tribunal before which the case had come at Rome. The whole matter was again investigated by the Council, and Cæcilian was acquitted. The case was thus reheard, the judgment of the Bishops at Rome, amongst whom was Melchiades, was reviewed. The Synod knew nothing, therefore, of the monarchical position alleged in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to the Bishop of Rome, a witness against Papalism, the importance of which can be understood from Constantine's statement that he had assembled at Arles 'a great number of Bishops from different and almost innumerable parts of the Empire.'[5]

Section LXXXII.—*St. Augustine 'on the Unity of the Church.'*

607. In his controversy with the Donatists St. Augustine had especially to deal with their contention that they alone formed the Church. This necessarily involved the consideration on his part of the subject of the Unity of the Church, and he wrote, in the year A.D. 402, his celebrated Treatise 'On the Unity of the Church.' In it he urges the Catholicity of the Church spread throughout the whole world against the Donatist contention that they alone formed the Church, a contention which practically confined the Church to Africa,

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. i. sect. 14. [E.T. i. 180.]
[3] S. Aug., *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, ii. cap. ix. sect. 14; P.L. xliii. 135.
[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. sect. 15. [E.T. i. 181.]
[5] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. x. c. v.; P.G. xx. 889.

where they were.[1] There is not a sentence in the whole work which has any reference to the 'Roman Pontiff' as the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock and its necessary centre of unity. Yet clearly on Papalist principles this would have been the *one* argument used. It is *the* argument of the *Satis Cognitum*, in which Pope Leo XIII., in order to induce men to submit to the Roman See, declared that only those who are in communion with that See, belong to the 'one fold,' and are 'in the Unity of the Church.' Had St. Augustine believed this to be 'a doctrine of the truth from which no one can deviate, his faith and salvation being preserved,'[2] he would have necessarily confronted the Donatists with this 'Doctrine of the Truth,' as one which they were bound to believe, and so have conclusively disproved their contention. St. Augustine did not do so, and this fact alone is sufficient to prove that he knew nothing of it.

608. Further, St. Augustine nowhere in this Treatise appeals to the authority of the 'Roman Pontiff' as the 'Supreme Judge of all the Faithful,' whose divinely conferred authority, which finally settles all such disputes as that raised by the Donatists, was universally recognised by the Church. On the contrary, it is the authority of the Catholic Church which he considers as that which decides that the Donatists were wrong. To the judgment of that Church, the whole world, he confidently appeals as conclusive against them, *securus judicat orbis terrarum*.[3] So far was he from holding that the Bishop of Rome had any such authority as Papalism alleges, that he suggests 'that the Bishops beyond the sea, where the largest part of the Catholic Church is spread, should judge concerning the dissensions'[4] which the African Bishops had not been able to arrange themselves. Amongst these transmarine Bishops the Bishop of Rome is included as sharing their authority. This is a remarkable proof that he had no idea that that Bishop possessed any authority differing in essence from that of his colleagues in the Episcopate. It cannot be denied that on Papalist principles he would necessarily, in a Treatise of this kind, have laid stress on the full and supreme power of jurisdiction belonging to the Roman Pontiff *jure divino* to determine such a controversy, and thus preserve the Unity of the Church, to which on those principles the Donatists would be compelled to submit or be 'outside the edifice.' The great doctor did not do so, and thus it is clear that the doctrine as to the Papal Monarchy embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* was not the 'venerable and constant belief' of 'the age' of St. Augustine.

[1] S. Aug., *Ad Catholicos Epistola contra Donatistas, vulgo De Unitate Ecclesiæ Liber Unus*; P.L. xliii. 396 *seq.*

[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

[3] On this statement, *vide* note 45.

[4] *l.c.*

SECTION LXXXIII.—*St. Augustine and the case of Apiarius.*

609. Not only do St. Augustine's writings protest, as has been shown, against the use which is made in the *Satis Cognitum* of the quotation which has been considered, but this action in the celebrated case of Apiarius affords like testimony.

Apiarius, a priest of the diocese of Sicca in Proconsular Asia, was for certain heinous crimes deposed and excommunicated by his Bishop Urban, a pupil of St. Augustine. Apiarius thereupon crossed the sea to Rome, where Zosimus, the then Roman Bishop, took him under his protection and admitted him to communion. Not contented with doing this, and so acting in a very different manner to the way in which the Roman Church had long previously dealt with the case of Marcion,[1] Zosimus proceeded to demand that Apiarius should be reinstated.[2] The African Bishops were greatly displeased at this, and at the sixteenth Council of Carthage, held 1 May 418, they enacted the following Canon (xvii.):

> If Presbyters, Deacons, or other inferior clerics complain in any causes which they may have of the judgment of their own Bishop, let the neighbouring Bishops hear them and settle the dispute. If they should desire to appeal from them they shall only do so to African Councils or to the Primates of their provinces. But whosoever should think fit to appeal to transmarine Councils may not be received into communion by any one in Africa.[3]

610. Zosimus sent to Africa as his legates Faustinus, Bishop of Potentina in the March of Ancona, and two priests, Philip and Asellus. They were received by Aurelius, Archbishop of Carthage, at a small Synod held probably at Cæsarea Mauretana, A.D. 418.[4] The legates at first delivered their commission verbally, but were called upon to produce their written instructions (*commonitorium*). By this they were directed to treat with the Africans as to four points: 'First, concerning the appeal of Bishops to Rome; secondly, that so many Bishops should not travel to the Court; thirdly, that the affairs of priests and deacons who were unjustly excommunicated by their own Bishops should be dealt with by neighbouring Bishops; and fourthly, that if Bishop Urban did not correct himself (viz. his sentence upon Apiarius) he should be excommunicated or summoned to Rome.'[5]

In support of the first point Zosimus quoted the fifth (*al.* the seventh)

[1] On the case of Marcion, *vide* note 46.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 120. [E.T. ii. 463.]

[3] Mansi, iii. 811. On the question whether this Canon prohibited appeals to be made by Bishops, *vide* note 47.

[4] Van Espen, *Dissertatio in Synodos Africanas*, § x. art. iii. *Op.* vol. iii. p. 273. Lovanii, 1758.

[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 120. [E.T. ii. 463.]

Canon of Sardica, and in support of the third the fourteenth (*al.* the seventeenth) Canon of the same Council, not, however, as Sardican, but as Nicene. The African Bishops were naturally not able to find these two Canons in the copy of the Acts of the Synod of Nicæa which had been brought back to Carthage by Archbishop Cæcilian. The Council, however, wrote to Zosimus that pending a further investigation of the Nicene decrees they would observe 'the two pretended Canons of Nicæa.'[1]

611. Before he could receive this letter Zosimus had probably died, and the negotiations had therefore to be carried on with his successor Boniface. A Council, the seventeenth of Carthage, at which all the provinces of Africa were represented, assembled at Carthage on the 25 May A.D. 419. Two hundred and seventeen Bishops, amongst whom was St. Augustine, were present under the presidency of Aurelius. The Fathers took the necessary steps for the investigation of the Nicene Acts resolved on at the Synod held in the previous year. On the motion of Aurelius the copy of the Nicene Acts preserved at Carthage was read. Afterwards, on the demand of Faustinus, the *Commonitorium* of Zosimus was ordered to be read, but the reading of this document was interrupted by Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste, after the first of the two pretended Canons of Nicæa had been read, on the ground that it was not to be found in the copy of the Nicene Acts kept at Carthage, and he proposed that since this was the case, as the original Acts 'were understood to be at Constantinople, Archbishop Aurelius should send deputies to the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and request from them authentic copies of these Acts.'[2]

612. Faustinus opposed this proposal, evidently considering that such a course would be tantamount to a pronouncement of the Synod against the Roman claim, and urged that the Synod should write to the Pope and request him to institute an investigation into the genuine Nicene Canons. To do this would have been to place the whole matter of deciding the genuineness of the impugned Canons in the hands of the person who had asserted them to be Nicene. The Council took no notice of the opposition raised by Faustinus, and it was resolved that a copy of the Nicene Acts which had been read, together with the rules of former African Synods (including, therefore, Canon xvii. of the sixteenth Council of Carthage[3]) should be added to the Acts of the Synod, and that Aurelius should write to the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch to obtain from them copies of the genuine Nicene Acts, so that, if the Canons Zosimus had alleged were found in these Acts, they should be observed, and, if not, the

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 120. [E.T. ii. 464.]
[2] *Ibid.* [E.T. ii. 466.]
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 609.

matter should be considered in a Synod. Meanwhile the impugned Canons would be observed; but at the same time the Synod was careful to lay down 'that what was decided at Nicæa had its approbation,' in order both to make clear the ground on which they were willing to make this concession, and to effectually preserve their liberty of action in the future.

613. It was further agreed that a Synodal letter should be written to Boniface, and accordingly one was drawn up by certain commissioners, amongst whom were St. Augustine and Alypius. It was addressed 'To their most blessed Lord and honourable brother Boniface.' After giving a summary of what had taken place, the Fathers proceeded to deal with the first and third of the instructions contained in the *Commonitorium* given by Zosimus to his legates as follows: 'We took care to intimate by our letter to Zosimus of venerable memory, that we would for a short time permit these rules to be observed without any injury to him until we had searched the statutes of the Nicene Council. And now we request your Holiness to cause these rules to be kept by us, as they were passed or appointed at Nicæa by the Fathers; and to cause the rules which they brought in their instructions to be carried out in your own Provinces, to wit': here follow the fifth (*al.* the seventh) and the fourteenth (*al.* the seventeenth) 'Sardican Canons.' They proceed: 'These we have, at all events, inserted in the Acts until the arrival of the most authentic copies of the Nicene Council: and should they be there contained (as the brethren sent to us from the Apostolical See have alleged in their instructions), and be even kept according to that rule by you in Italy, we could by no means be compelled either to endure such treatment as we are unwilling to mention, or could suffer what is unbearable. But we trust, by the mercy of our Lord God, that while your Holiness presides over the Roman Church, we shall not have to endure such arrogance as that—*non sumus jam istum typhum passuri*—and that a course of proceeding will be maintained towards us such as ought to be observed, even without our having to speak about it. A course of proceeding which, according to the wisdom and justice which the Most High has given you, you yourself see ought to be maintained, if perchance the Canons of the Nicene Council run otherwise. For though we have read very many copies, yet we never find in the Latin copies of the Nicene Council the quotations made in the above-mentioned instructions: nevertheless, as we could not find them here in any Greek copy, we the more desire they should be brought us from the Oriental Churches, where, it is said, authentic copies of the same decrees may be found. Wherefore we also beseech your Reverence to be good enough yourself to write to the Priests of those parts, that is, of the Church of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, and to others also, if your Holiness please:

that these same Canons appointed by our Fathers in the city of Nicæa may reach us, you specially by the help of the Lord conferring this benefit on all the Western Churches. For who can doubt that the copies, brought from so many different places and noble Churches of Greece, which are compared, and agree, are the most authentic copies of the Nicene Council which met in Greece. Until this be done, the quotations made to us in the above-mentioned instruction, concerning the appeals of Bishops to the Priest of the Roman Church, and concerning the terminating the causes of the clergy by the Bishops of their own Provinces, we declare that we will maintain till the copies are tested; and we trust that your Blessedness will by the will of God help us in this.' Of the rest that was done at the Synod the legates would inform him.[1]

614. The African Fathers in this letter were careful to safeguard their rights in terms which are such as clearly show they had no idea that they were writing to the 'Supreme Pastor' to whose sovereignty they were subject. They do not accept Zosimus' statement as to the two Canons, but on the supposition that they were Nicene, and so having the authority of the most venerable of all Church Synods, they state their intention to observe them until the result of the inquiry they had set on foot should determine whether they were genuine or not. They do not recognise any authority, *jure divino*, in the Roman Bishop as 'the legitimate successor of Peter,' 'in the Roman Episcopate,' binding them to adopt the procedure in the Canons, but the authority of the Canons as Nicene. To that, and to that alone, they were willing to give obedience, and the continuance of their acceptance of the two Canons was made dependent on the result of their investigation into their genuineness. Further, if Nicene, they remind the Bishop of Rome that he was bound equally by them, the Council being the Supreme Authority to which he was with them likewise subject, a reminder, too, that his action in the case of Apiarius had been *ultra vires*, as the Canons to which he appealed ordered such cases to be tried by a special tribunal, not at Rome, but in the neighbourhood of the place where the sentence appealed against had been delivered.[2] To this letter St. Augustine was a consenting party, a letter whose whole tenor is a witness against Papalism.

615. It must be noted, too, that Zosimus' own action in citing these pretended Nicene Canons is also incompatible with Papalism, for, according to the Vatican decrees, to the Roman Pontiff as the supreme judge of all the faithful, having full and supreme power of jurisdiction, *jure divino*, over the universal Church, recourse may be had in all causes appertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Hence,

[1] Mansi, iii. 830 *seq.* [2] *Vide supra*, n. 326 *et seq.*

therefore, to allege a Canon granting such a limited power to the Roman Bishop as that quoted in the *Commonitorium* as the ground of his claim would have been to practically deny that he had, as the 'legitimate successor of St. Peter,' a grant of sovereign power from the Head of the Church; a grant essential to the maintenance of the Divine Constitution of the Church.

616. This is significant in another way also. Bishops of Rome might succeed in getting large claims accepted by those Bishops who, as holding Suburbicarian or other Sees, which for various reasons were under their influence in Europe, especially after the grant of jurisdiction bestowed by Gratian and his predecessor, but in dealing with the African Episcopate with its Cyprianic traditions, any attempt to force such claims on it would have been futile. They maintained the true constitution of the Church; to them the One Episcopate, which each Bishop shared *in solidum*, was the supreme authority in the Church, and so Zosimus was bound to appeal to that authority if he was to be listened to; hence he adduced the Canons, falsely attributing them to an Œcumenical Synod. Papalism, as it afterwards was formulated, was unknown in that age, but even the far more moderate authority claimed then in the other parts of the West, where circumstances were favourable, could not be urged with any prospect of success in a controversy with the African Bishops.

617. In reply to the application of the African Bishops, Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, forwarded copies of the Nicene Acts preserved in their respective Churches, with short letters from themselves,[1] which were sent on to Pope Boniface on the 26th November A.D. 419. The African Fathers do not appear to have considered the matter in Synod until some years afterwards, when a favourable opportunity for doing so arose out of the same case of Apiarius, and meanwhile the provisional arrangement remained in force.

618. During this period occurred the case of Bishop Anthony of Fussala, a town in the diocese of Hippo, which St. Augustine had, with the consent of the Primate of Numidia, constituted a See, finding it too far off for him to bestow upon it that attention which it especially needed, owing to the Donatists being in large numbers there.[2] Anthony, who, it would seem, had been elevated to the

[1] The inevitable charge of forgery which is brought by the fautors of Papalism against inconvenient evidence destructive of Papalism is of course brought against these letters, *e.g.* by Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars iii. cap. iii. p. 286 *seq.* It need only be remarked as to this that Hefele has no doubt whatever as to their genuine character, speaking of St. Cyril's as 'his short letter,' and of that from the Bishop of Constantinople as 'a similar letter from Bishop Atticus of Constantinople.'—*Op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 22. [E.T. ii. 477.]

[2] S. Aug., *Ep. ad Celestinum*, Ep. ccix.; P.L. xxxiii. 956.

Episcopate without due care, proved himself unworthy of the post. Various charges were laid against him which were investigated by St. Augustine and a Council of Bishops, with the result that he was deprived of his See, but not deposed from the Episcopate. Anthony appealed to Boniface, the Bishop of Rome, it would appear, on the ground that 'either he ought to sit in his chair or ought not to be a Bishop.'[1] Boniface wrote for his restitution, but subject to the condition, 'If he had faithfully described the state of the case.' St. Augustine wrote strongly to Celestine, the successor of Boniface, sending to him all the acts of the proceedings, and supporting the decision of the Council by giving three cases bearing on the point raised by Anthony which had occurred in Africa in the period during which the temporary provision was in force. At the conclusion of the letter he makes an 'appeal,' that the unworthy Bishop might not be imposed by the military and civil powers on an unwilling people,[2] a significant act on his part, showing both how the powers conferred by Valentinian I. and Gratian on the Roman Bishop affected even the independent Episcopate of Africa, and his fear that Celestine would avail himself of them to override the canonical decision of that Episcopate. The result of this letter appears to have been that Celestine did not attempt to enforce the 'decision' of his predecessor. Possibly the war which broke out immediately after the death of Honorius prevented the effective exercise of the State-conferred jurisdiction, whilst in the following year the question of appeals to Rome was considered by the Africans in Synod, as they had before intimated they would do in the event of the Canons sent by Zosimus not being found in the authentic copies of the Nicene Acts which they had sent for from Constantinople and elsewhere. The result of that consideration was, as will be shown, such as would make it useless for Celestine to attempt to carry the matter through successfully from his point of view; and St. Augustine, who, on the deprivation of Anthony, had resumed the government of Fussala, continued to rule it until at least a short time before his death.[3]

619. Any right of appeal to Rome was finally repudiated by the African Bishops in the time of St. Augustine, under the following circumstances. Apiarius was once again the cause of the matter coming before them. He had been restored to the Priesthood by Bishop Urban, on condition that he retired from the Church of Sicca. This he did, going to Tabraea,[4] in Proconsular Africa. Here he behaved in such a manner that the people were obliged to accuse him of infamous crimes, and he was consequently ex-

[1] S. Aug., *Ep. ad Celestinum*, Ep. ccix.; P.L. xxxiii. 956.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ep. ad Quodvultdeus*, Ep. ccxiv.; P.L. xxiii. 1001.
[4] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xiii. 860.

communicated. As on the former occasion, he betook himself to Rome, pretending that he had appealed to Rome, an allegation which he could not prove when he wished to do so. Celestine received him with pleasure, and without hearing his accusers restored him to communion. He then sent him back to Africa, accompanied by Bishop Faustinus, who had acted in the previous case in which Apiarius was concerned on behalf of his predecessor Zosimus, with a letter stating that he had found him innocent, and requiring him to be admitted to communion. This afforded the African Bishops a natural opportunity of taking the action with reference to appeals across the seas they had said they would, at the time when the former case with reference to Apiarius was before them, in the event of the Canons, to which Zosimus had then appealed, being found not to be genuine.

620. A Synod was accordingly summoned, A.D. 424,[1] to meet at Carthage, the proceedings of which are set out in the letter addressed by the Synod to 'the most beloved Lord and honourable Brother Celestine,' which was as follows:—'We could wish that, like as your Holiness intimated to us in your letter sent by our fellow-priest Leo, your pleasure at the arrival of Apiarius, so we also could send to you these writings with pleasure, respecting his clearing of himself. Then, in truth, both our own satisfaction, and yours of late, would be more reasonable; nor would that lately expressed by you concerning the hearing of him then to come, as well as that already past, seem hasty and inconsiderate. Upon the arrival, then, of our holy brother and fellow-Bishop Faustinus, we assembled a Council, and believed that he was sent with that man in order that, as he (Apiarius) had before been restored to the Presbyterate by his assistance, so now he might with his exertions be cleared of the very great crimes charged against him by the inhabitants of Tabraea, but the due course of examination in our Council discovered in him such great and monstrous crimes as to overbear even Faustinus, who acted rather as an advocate than a judge, and to prevail against what was more the zeal of a defender than the justice of an inquirer. For first he vehemently opposed the whole assembly, inflicting on us many injuries, under pretence of asserting the privileges of the Roman Church, and demanding that Apiarius should be received into communion by us on the ground that your Holiness, believing him to have appealed, though unable to prove it, had restored him to communion, but this we by no means allowed, as you will also better see from reading the Acts. After, however, a most laborious inquiry carried on for three days, during which, in the greatest affection, we took cognisance of the various charges against him,

[1] So Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 125. [E.T. ii. 480.]

God the just judge, strong and long-suffering, cut short by a sudden stroke both the delays raised by our fellow-Bishop Faustinus and the evasions of Apiarius himself, by which he was endeavouring to conceal his foul enormities. For his strong and shameless obstinacy was overcome by which he endeavoured to cover, through an impudent denial, the mire of his lusts, for our God put pressure upon his conscience and published even to the eyes of men the secret crimes which he was already condemning in that man's heart, a very sty of wickedness, so that notwithstanding his false denial he suddenly burst forth into a confession of all the crimes with which he was charged, and at length convicted himself of his own accord of every kind of infamy beyond belief, and changed to groans even the hope which we had entertained, believing and desiring that he might be cleared from such shameful blots; except, indeed, that it was so far a relief to our sorrows that he had delivered us from the labour of a longer inquiry, and by confession had applied some sort of remedy to his own wounding, though, Sir and brother—*domine, frater*—it was unwilling and done with a struggling conscience. Premising, therefore, our due regards to you, we earnestly implore you, that for the future you do not readily admit to a hearing persons coming hence, nor choose to receive to your communion those who have been excommunicated by us, because your Reverence will readily perceive that this has been prescribed by the Nicene Decree. For though this seems to be there forbidden, in respect of the inferior clergy or the laity, how much more did it will this to be observed in the case of Bishops, lest those who had been suspended from communion in their own province might seem to be restored to communion hastily or unfitly by your Holiness. Let your Holiness reject, as is worthy of you, that unprincipled taking shelter with you of Presbyters likewise, and inferior clergy, both because by no ordinance of the Fathers hath the Church of Africa been deprived of this right, and the Nicene Decrees have most plainly committed not only the clergy of inferior rank, but the Bishops themselves, to their own Metropolitans. For they have ordained with great wisdom and justice that all matters should be terminated where they arise; and they did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting to any Province for the Priests of Christ [*i.e.* the Bishops] wisely to discern and firmly to maintain that which is right, especially since whosoever thinks himself wronged by any judgment may appeal to the Council of his Province or even to a general Council [of all Africa], unless it be imagined that God can inspire a single individual with justice and refuse it to an innumerable multitude of Priests [*i.e.* Bishops] assembled in Council. And how shall we be able to rely on a sentence passed beyond the sea, since

it will not be possible to send thither the necessary witnesses, whether from weakness of sex, or of advanced age or any other impediment. For that your Holiness should send any on your part we can find ordained by no Council of the Fathers. Because with regard to what you have sent us by our brother Bishop Faustinus, as being contained in the Nicene Council, we can find nothing of the kind in the more authentic copies of that Council, which we have received from the holy Cyril our brother Bishop of the Alexandrine Church, and from the venerable Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, and which we formerly sent by Innocent, the Presbyter, and Marcellus, the Sub-deacon, through whom we received them, to Boniface the Bishop, your predecessor of venerable memory. For the rest, whosoever desires you to delegate any of your clergy to execute your orders, do not comply, lest it seem that we are introducing the pride of secular dominion into the Church of Christ, which exhibits before those who desire to see God the light of simplicity and the splendour of humility; for now that the miserable Apiarius has been removed out of the Church of Christ for his horrible crimes, we feel confident respecting our brother Faustinus that, through the uprightness and moderation of your Holiness, our brotherly charity not being violated, Africa will by no means any longer be forced to endure him. Sir and brother, may our Lord long preserve your Holiness to pray for us.'[1]

621. The African Fathers maintain in this letter—(1) First, that the Bishop of Rome had no right to receive to communion those who had been excommunicated by the Bishops of Africa, whether Bishops, Presbyters, inferior Clergy, or laity, so that it was his duty to reject those who took shelter with him, because, according to the Constitution of the Church, the authority to rule the various Churches had been given to the Bishops thereof, so that the action of each Bishop in his own diocese in the matter of excommunication was not to be interfered with, save as prescribed by the Canon of Nicæa;[2] (2) Secondly, that the Provincial Synod was the appointed tribunal by which any appeal arising within the limits of the Province should be decided, subject to a further appeal to a Council at which a larger number of Bishops should be present, *i.e.* in Africa to a general Council of all the African Bishops; (3) Thirdly, that no appeal in any case whatsoever, including those in which Bishops should be concerned, should be allowed to be made to transmarine Bishops, including amongst them the Bishop of Rome, in accordance with the principle embodied in the Nicene Decrees that all causes should be terminated in the place where they arose; (4) Fourthly, they assert that an Œcumenical Council is the supreme authority in the Church both (*a*) by their reference to the Nicene Council having prohibited the transfer of the trial of causes

[1] Mansi, iv. 515, 516.

[2] Canon v., *vide supra*, n. 306 *et seq.*

from the places where the matter of such causes had arisen, and (*b*) by their refusal to act on the Canons which Zosimus and Celestine had sent to them as being Nicene, on the ground that they had been proved not to have the authority of that Synod, and consequently not possessing that Œcumenical authority which those Prelates had claimed for them; (5) Fifthly, they plainly tell him that the Canons which he and his predecessors had asserted to be Nicene were not authentic; (6) Sixthly, they repudiate any right on his part to send any delegates to them to execute his orders, asserting that such an action on his part is contrary to the Spirit which animates the Church of Christ, savouring as it does of that worldly pride which infects the secular power, perhaps not without allusion to the secular source of the jurisdiction which the Bishops of Rome were endeavouring to make effective in the Western Empire; (7) Seventhly, they complain of the discourteous and prejudiced way in which his legate Faustinus had acted, and with studied politeness intimate to him that his presence in Africa could be no longer tolerated.

622. Both the tone of the letter and its contents are such as are incompatible with any belief on the part of the African Episcopate in any such monarchical position as that which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts belongs to the Bishops of Rome *jure divino*. It is not simply that they do not refer to it, but their determination to resent even the comparatively slight infringement of the rights of the Episcopate which Zosimus and his successors attempted, based, be it noted again, *not* on any power conferred on the Bishops of their See 'by the institution of Christ,' but on a Canon which they falsely alleged to be Nicene, is incompatible with Papalism. They plainly did not believe that any person, clerical or lay, had a right *jure divino* to have recourse to the judgment of the Bishops of Rome in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, a judgment which none could review. Papalism could not therefore have been the 'venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of the African Episcopate at the time when St. Augustine was its most distinguished ornament.

623. Vincenzi, with his usual acuteness, perceives that it is impossible to reconcile the proceedings of the African Bishops in connection with the case of Apiarius with the Papalist doctrine which all must believe who would preserve their faith and salvation. He consequently not only denies, as already observed,[1] that the letters of St. Cyril and Atticus are genuine, and that 'Canon XVII.' as to Appeals was ever subscribed, executed, or conceived by the African Church,[2] that Canon being in his opinion the invention of some enemy of the Roman Church,[3] but also declares that nothing will persuade him that

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 617, footnote 1.

[2] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars ii. cap. xii. p. 284.

[3] *Ibid.*, cap. xi. p. 275.

Augustine, Alypius, and other Bishops assented to or subscribed the Synodal Letters to Boniface and Celestine.[1] It is sufficient to say, with reference to this charge of forgery, that Hefele admits the genuine character of all these documents, and does not think even worthy of any notice the arguments against their authenticity.[2] The fact that the learned author is compelled to fall back upon the last resource of a discredited controversalist and deny the genuine character of documents which are incompatible with the position he advocates, is the testimony of an unwilling witness which is exceedingly valuable.[3] The whole episode thus affords further corroborative evidence of the strongest character that the use made of the citation from the works of St. Augustine in the *Satis Cognitum* is to quote him in support of a position against which his conduct as well as his own words are a standing protest, all the more effective as Papalism, as embodied in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees*, was not known in his 'age,' and he had only to face far less extensive claims, avowedly based on mere ecclesiastical legislation, and not claimed to be conferred by 'the institution of Christ.'

Section LXXXIV.—*Did St. Augustine make agreement with the Roman Church the test of being a Catholic?*

624. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to allege that St. Augustine 'denies that any one who dissents from the Roman faith can be a Catholic.'[4] The *Satis Cognitum* by so doing asserts that St. Augustine testifies that the Roman Pontiffs exercise the supreme power of teaching in the Universal Church, so that by virtue of 'the gift of truth and never-failing faith conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in the Roman Chair, they perform this high office for the salvation of all, that the whole flock of Christ kept away from the poisonous fruit of error is nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine, and the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church is kept one, and resting on its foundation stands firm against the gates of hell.'[5] Agreement with the 'Roman faith' would be the necessary consequence of the supreme *Magisterium* possessed *jure divino* by the Roman Pontiff, thus defined by the Vatican Council; for 'the Roman Faith,' being that officially set forth by the Supreme Father and Teacher of all Christians, would be 'the Catholic faith,' so that any one who did not hold that 'Roman faith' would be proved by that fact at once not to be holding the Catholic faith, and therefore not to be a Catholic.

[1] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars ii. cap. xii. p. 278.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sects. 120, 122, 125. [E.T. pp. 463, 476, 480.]

[3] Father Puller has treated the subject of the authenticity of the letter to Celestine at length, and gives conclusive proof that it is genuine. 'There is,' he says, 'hardly any document of this sort which has such a varied amount of attestation' (*op. cit.*, p. 211. Third Edit.).

[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.

[5] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.

625. The citation given in the *Satis Cognitum* in proof of its assertion is as follows: 'You are not to be looked upon as holding the Catholic Faith if you do not teach that the faith of Rome is to be held.'[1] —'*Non crederis veram fidem tenere Catholicam qui fidem non doces esse servandam Romanam.*' The reference given is Sermo cxx. n. 13. This quotation is not to be found in the Sermon so numbered, or in any other of St. Augustine's in the Benedictine Edition. In a Sermon, however, which Cardinal Mai has published in his work, *Patrum nova Bibliotheca*,[2] and attributed by him to St. Augustine, the words occur.

626. Several reasons combine to suggest that the learned Cardinal is in error in considering this Sermon to be by St. Augustine; (*a*) First, this Sermon does not appear to have been attributed to St. Augustine by any other editor of his works. This itself is a weighty argument against his authorship thereof. If it be sought to destroy the force of it by alleging that no previous editor was aware of its existence, in that there is only one MS. of it, that preserved at the Vatican, to which Cardinal Mai was the first to have access, it must be replied that the mere fact that there is but one known MS. of this Sermon, no trace of it being found elsewhere, creates a presumption that, so far as its authorship is concerned, it is spurious, for, on the one hand, it is hardly probable that any genuine sermon of so great a Doctor as St. Augustine would remain unknown for so long, everything of which he is known to be the author being especially valued, whilst, on the other hand, the fact that he was the greatest of the African Fathers would be likely to result in any fifth-century writing of African origin to which no name was attached being ascribed to him in those ages in which 'critical' investigation into such matters was unknown, so that the MS. at the Vatican might easily have been dubbed St. Augustine's without any *mala fides*.

627. (*b*) Secondly, the internal evidence afforded by the Sermon itself is against the alleged Augustinian authorship, as it manifestly deals with a condition of affairs in Africa which arose after St. Augustine's death in A.D. 431, as will be seen when the meaning of the words cited is discussed. It surely must be a matter of surprise that words should be quoted in a document of such an important character as the *Satis Cognitum* as the 'evident testimony of the holy Father' St. Augustine, the authorship of which is at least open to question; especially considering that if they had borne the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* attaches to them by the connection in which it quotes them, they would naturally carry greater weight if they were his than if they merely represented the opinions of some anonymous writer of the fifth century. That it should have been necessary to make use of, for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*, this doubtful passage is plain evidence

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 31, 32. [2] Vol. i. p. 273.

that it was impossible to extract from those works of St. Augustine which are universally admitted to be genuine any words which would, in the opinion of those responsible for providing Pope Leo XIII. with the quotations he made use of in the *Satis Cognitum*, establish the truth of their assertion.

628. But do the words themselves, whoever may have been their author, bear the interpretation which is affixed to them by the *Satis Cognitum*? The Sermon is entitled *Sermo Secundus de accidentibus ad Gratiam.* It is clearly of African origin, and written after the conquest of Rome in A.D. 455 by the Vandals, who carried captive to Carthage a number of Catholics from the 'City,' whom, together with the Catholics of Africa, they endeavoured to turn away from the Faith to Arianism by grievous persecutions, so that they endured great sufferings for the Faith at the hands of Genseric and his son Hunneric. The Catholics who were thus persecuted being Latins were called 'Romani,' as it appears from the History of the Vandal persecution in Africa, by Victor, Bishop of Vite, a Catholic, who 'may have been born about the year 430,' and who 'seems to have been an eyewitness of the Vandal persecution for more than thirty years.'[1] He says, for instance, of the Vandals that 'they understood nothing else save to despitefully treat the Romans, and, so far as their will was concerned, always desired to obscure the glory and nobility of the Roman name, nor do they desire that any of the Romans should continue to live. And when they consider it wise to spare those who are in subjection to them, they merely spare them for the purpose of using them as slaves, for they have always hated the Romans.'[2]

629. Now the Latins were Catholics whilst their Barbarian conquerors were Arians; consequently as the former were called *Romani*, the same term came naturally to be applied to them, both by themselves and the heretics who were oppressing them, to signify that they were Catholics. The writer just quoted so uses the term in relating the following incident. Theodoric, son of the king, wished to behead one Armagasta who was in his service, and whom he had tortured in vain, but was dissuaded from so doing by an Arian Presbyter, named Jocundus, who said, 'You can kill him by various kinds of tortures, but if you kill him by the sword the *Romans* will begin to proclaim him to be a martyr.'[3]

630. The author of the Sermon is warning Catholics in Africa against the attempts made by their heretical oppressors to cause them to apostatise, whether by torture, banishment, or flattery, efforts which

[1] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv. 1122.

[2] Victor Vitensis, *Historia Persecutionis Africæ Provinciæ*, lib. v. c. 18; P.L. lviii. 255.

[3] *Ibid.*, lib. i. c. 14; P.L. lviii. 196-7.

had been only too successful in many cases. In doing so he reminds them that as they were called *Romani* because they were Latins, so also that appellation denoted that they held the orthodox faith of the Latins, which, on the same principle, would be called 'the Roman faith.' That faith their Barbarian persecutors denied and hated, but to them as Latin subjects of that Imperial Rome which the Vandal heretics had so evilly treated, and whence so many of them had been dragged as culprits, that faith ought to be dearer than life itself, therefore he says in a pregnant sentence, *non crederis veram fidem tenere Catholicam qui fidem non doces esse servandam Romanam.*—'Do not believe that you hold the true Catholic faith who do not teach that the Roman faith must be held.' It is useless, that is, to imagine that, if you yield to the heretics and teach what they believe, you hold the Catholic faith, it is only when you teach that the faith held by the despised and persecuted Romans must be adhered to that you can be said to do that, and thus the very name by which you are called will remind you of your duty.

631. The circumstances, therefore, under which the author of the Sermon here applies the epithet *Romana* to 'faith' show that he did not do so to convey the idea that the Roman Pontiffs possessed *jure divino* the authority to decree what 'the faith' is, so that his definitions are in themselves binding on Catholics. His argument was an *ad hominem* one, which would be at once apprehended by those to whom it was addressed, and form a powerful incentive to steadfastness to them under the conditions with which they, as *Romani*, were surrounded. If, then, it were sought to argue that the value of the quotation for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum* would be unaffected by the question of authorship, which clearly cannot be the case, since the citation in that document is adduced for the express object of supporting its allegations with regard to the monarchical position of the Roman Bishop in the Divine Constitution of the Church by 'the testimony of the holy Father' St. Augustine himself, the reply is conclusive. Consideration of the circumstances under which the Sermon, whence the quotation is taken, was written, proves that it is incapable of being used for any such purpose, as it in no way refers to any supposed unique teaching authority belonging by the institution of Christ to the Roman Bishop as the Supreme Pastor, father and teacher of all Christians.

632. But did not, it may be said, St. Augustine himself say with reference to the Pelagian heresy, *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*, and therefore plainly recognise the Roman Bishop as the supreme authority in matters of faith, so that the *Satis Cognitum* is, after all, justified in claiming him as a witness to the truth of its allegations? To this it must be replied, (*a*) first, these words are nowhere to be found in the works of St. Augustine. The passage whence they are professedly

taken runs as follows: 'Refute gainsayers and bring opponents to us, *for already on this matter two Councils have sent to the Apostolic See, whence also rescripts have come. The cause is finished, would that the error may terminate likewise.*'[1]

St. Augustine is referring to Pelagianism, at that time causing great trouble, of which he was a determined opponent. He had urged Orosius, a Spanish priest, a pupil of his, to go to Bethlehem to put St. Jerome and others on their guard against this heresy, with the result that Pelagius was obliged to appear before a Diocesan Synod held under the presidency of Bishop John of Jerusalem in A.D. 415. There was considerable discussion, in the course of which difficulties arose owing to the fact that Orosius, who took a prominent part in the proceedings, could only speak Latin, whilst John only spoke Greek, 'so that they could only understand one another through an interpreter, who translated many things wrongly. On this account, and because he observed the ill will of Bishop John, Orosius demanded that as Pelagius as well as his opponents were Latins, the decision concerning this heresy should be left to the Latins,' and this was agreed to.[2]

633. Some time afterwards a 'miserable' Synod, as St. Jerome calls[3] it, was held at Dioscopolis (Lydda), at which Pelagius, having explained certain statements and repudiated others, and anathematised all who opposed the doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church, was admitted to communion. The Bishops of the Proconsular Province, when assembled in Synod at Carthage in A.D. 416, under the presidency of Aurelius, were informed of this by letters from Heros, Metropolitan of Arles, and Lazarus, Bishop of Aix, who had presented a memorial against Pelagius to the Synod at Dioscopolis. At this Synod the decisions which had been pronounced against Cœlestius in A.D. 411 were reaffirmed and announced in a Synodal Letter to Pope Innocent I., in which they said that they had thought good to intimate to him what they had done, 'that the authority—*auctoritas*—of the Apostolic See might be added to what they in their mediocrity had ordered.'[4] In the same year a Synod of the Bishops of the Province of Numidia was held at Milevis, under the presidency of Silvanus, at which fifty-nine Bishops, amongst them St. Augustine, were present. This Council also addressed a Synodal Letter to Innocent, urging him to show his faithfulness as a shepherd, and to hinder the spread of this heresy, which they state was in many ways 'against the Sacred Scriptures, as

[1] *Jam enim de hac causa duo concilia missa sunt ad sedem apostolicam; inde etiam rescripta venerunt; causa finita est: Utinam aliquando finiatur error.*—S. Aug., *Sermo* cxxxi. 10; P.L. xxxviii. 734.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 118. [E.T. vol. ii. pp. 449 *seq.*]

[3] S. Hieron., *Ep. ad Alypium et Augustinum*, Ep. cxliii.; P.L. xxii. 1182.

[4] S. Innocentius, *Ep. Carthaginensis Concilii inter Epp. S. Innocentii*, Ep. xxvi.; P.L. xx. 565.

he was aware, and saying that they considered that the heretics would give way to the authority—*auctoritati*—of his Holiness, drawn from the authority—*auctoritate*—of the Sacred Scriptures.'[1]

634. The object of the two Synods in thus communicating with Innocent is clear. The heresy was Latin in origin, and the proceedings at Dioscopolis clearly showed that the Easterns did not understand its bearings. As Latins they would naturally desire to have on their side in the controversy with the Easterns the *auctoritas* of the Roman Bishop, the recognised medium of communication between the Eastern and Western Bishops, as their action would thus carry greater weight with those who might be encouraged by the unhappy proceedings of the Synod of Dioscopolis. They in no way submit the question as one which was undecided to Innocent for a final judgment, they have no doubt that their condemnation of Pelagianism as heresy is right, and that what they have condemned ought to be anathematised by the authority of what was to them, as Westerns, 'the Apostolic See.'[2] This being done, what they had ordered would be strengthened by being thus practically established as the decision of the whole West, and they considered that the declaration which Innocent would thus at their request put forth in accordance with the Sacred Scriptures, to which they referred him as exposing the real nature of Pelagianism, would have such an *auctoritas*, based as it would be on the authority of the Sacred Scriptures,[3] that the heretics would be compelled to recognise it as destroying the false doctrine which they taught.

635. Had they considered that Innocent had the supreme power of teaching in the Church in virtue of the Apostolic Primacy, which, according to Papalism, he, as the successor of Peter, possessed *jure divino*, their course of procedure must have been essentially different. They could not have been so presumptuous as to put forward their own decision on the question as that which must necessarily be the one which the Supreme Judge of all the faithful would give, or dared to have intimated to him that his duty would necessitate him taking the course of adding his *auctoritas* to their decision, whatever his previous attitude towards Pelagius might have been; they could not have taken upon themselves to refer him to the Sacred Scriptures as the source whence he should draw the declaration they considered he ought to make, so that the Pelagians would perforce be obliged to recognise it on that ground as authoritative, but would have approached him, their 'Master,' begging a decision which he alone could give, as wielding, by the institution of Christ, supreme power of jurisdiction over the

[1] S. Aug., *Ep. Milevitani Concilii Patrum ad Innocentium inter Epp. S. Aug.*, Ep. clxxvi. 5; P.L. xxxiii. 764.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 13.

[3] *Cf.* Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 127.

whole Church, and possessed of the supreme power of teaching therein, to which, therefore, the Pelagians would be compelled to submit at once, recognising such a decision as being of necessity final, and conclusively settling the matter once and for all.

636. Innocent in his replies to these Synodal Letters makes, it is true, great claims for his See. He treats the carefully worded application of the African Bishops as if it were a reference by them of the whole question to his 'judgment,' the very thing which, as has been seen, the Fathers did not do, and that they so acted because 'the institution of the Fathers . . . decreed by them not of human but of Divine will, that whatever was done in the provinces, however separate or remote, they should not account concluded until it had come to the knowledge of this See, that every righteous finding might be established with its whole authority, and that all other churches might take thence what they should teach . . . just as all waters move from their native fountain.'[1] His statements, for which the African Letters gave him no warrant whatever, are indeed as accurate as the ground he thus gives as that on which they based their supposed action, since no such decree of the Fathers exists.

637. Innocent must have known that his assertion was erroneous. It could not have been intended to refer to the 'Sardican Canons,' for they contain no such provision. Further, knowing, as he must have done, the independent line which the African Church had taken in St. Cyprian's day with reference to the pretensions of one of his predecessors, St. Stephen, he could not have failed to have been aware that those to whom he wrote would never have accepted his claims; why then, did he make them? Simply, it must be said, 'on a principle which has been all but invariably followed by his successors, that of making the very largest demands, far in advance of the rightful claims of his See, on the chance of their being allowed, in which case they would be all clear gain; while, even if rejected, the mere fact of having made them would serve so far as a precedent, that the demand next time would cease to arouse attention as a startling novelty, and the documents might also be utilised in places where the fact of their having been challenged and rejected could be passed over in silence, and it might be taken for granted that they enjoyed their pretended authority.'[2]

638. These replies give indeed an excellent example of the way in which Innocent pushed forward the pretensions of his See on every occasion.[3] For doing this he had special opportunities, since at the time when he became Bishop of Rome, 'the Imperial power was declining

[1] S. Innocentius, *Ep. ad Episcopos Carthaginensis Concilii*, Ep. xxix.; P.L. xx. 583.
[2] Littledale, *The Petrine Claims*, chap. vi. p. 211.
[3] For another instance, *vide* note 48.

towards extinction in the hands of the feeble Honorius.' . . . 'There was,' too, 'no Western prelate, at least in Europe, whose fame and abilities would obscure that pre-eminence which rank and position, and, in his case, commanding character, bestowed on the Bishop of Rome.' . . . Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline.'[1] Of the advantages he thus possessed he made the utmost use, and it is only owing to the fame and power of St. Leo, who soon after succeeded to the Bishopric of Rome, that the part he took in originating the Papacy has not been fully recognised.

A careful distinction must, it is evident, be drawn between what the Africans really said in their letters, and what Innocent, by his replies, makes them say. They passed by the claims he so boldly makes, without direct reply, but the determination to protect the rights of the Episcopate which is embodied in the seventeenth Canon of the Sixteenth Council of Carthage,[2] A.D. 418, passed so soon after, formed no indefinite rejection on their part of the claims so advanced.

639. It is now possible to see what St. Augustine meant in the passage under notice. His argument is that there is no need for any further authoritative condemnation of Pelagianism. That heresy had arisen in the West, consequently its true bearings were best understood there. Two Councils of Westerns had condemned it; their decisions were sent to the sole Apostolic See in the West, and from it replies have been written back which show that that See agrees with those decisions. This is quite sufficient to meet the case, for, as he makes it plain elsewhere, it is not necessary for the condemnation of a heresy that such condemnation should take place in a General Council saying, 'Was there need of a Council being called together that an open evil might be condemned? As if no heresy was ever condemned without the calling of a Council, the fact being that very few are found which entailed such a necessity in order to condemn them, and that there are many, nay, incomparably more, which deserve to be censured and condemned in the place where they sprang up, and might thence be made known to the rest of the world for avoidance. But their pride, which exalts itself against God that it would glory not in Him but in its free will, is seen to catch at this glory likewise, that a Council of the East and West should be assembled on their account.'[3]

640. Well, then, might St. Augustine say that the 'cause was finished.' Two Councils of Provinces in Africa where the heresy had been spread by Cœlestius had condemned it; that condemnation having

[1] Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, bk. ii. chap. i. vol. i. pp. 111-112. Fourth Edit.

[2] *Vide* nn. 609, ~~1245~~ *et seq.*

[3] S. Aug., *Contra Ep. Pelag.*, lib. iv. cap. xiv. 33; P.L. xli. 636.]251[

been intimated to the Bishop of Rome, where the heresy had been, it would appear, promulgated by Pelagius, without, it would seem, hindrance on the part of Innocent, as that which he ought to support, it had been assented to by him, so that the *auctoritas* of the one Apostolic See in the West had been added to that of the Councils; surely this would be sufficient to deal with this heresy of Western origin, no further action would be needed. The form of St. Augustine's statement is the more remarkable in view of the claims put forward by Innocent, *more suo*, in his dealings with other Westerns.[1] He ignores the 'Petrine' arguments of Innocent, arguments which, it is clear from the proceedings in the case of St. Chrysostom,[2] Innocent did even not venture to use with Easterns who, as he well knew, were too well informed and independent to accept them, and rests his statement that the cause is finished on the *joint* authority of the decisions of the two Councils and the replies which Innocent had sent back to those Councils. That these replies were not considered by St. Augustine to possess any authority other than 'episcopal' is further shown by the fact that some years after he said with reference to the Pelagians, 'Your cause has indeed been terminated by a competent judgment of the Bishops in common—*Vestra vero apud competens judicium communium episcoporum modo causa finita est*[3]—the judgment to which he appeals as conclusive, being not that of the 'supreme Pontiff' but that of the Episcopate as a whole.

641. In another passage the same line of argument is found. He says, 'By the vigilance of Councils of Bishops in support—*in adjutorio*—of the Saviour who guards the Church, and also by two venerable Bishops of the Apostolic See, Pope Innocent and Pope Zosimus, Cœlestius and Pelagius have been condemned by the whole Christian world unless having amended they do penance.'[4] St. Augustine here declares that the Councils of Bishops and the two Bishops of Rome represent the whole Christian world; the Councils had been held in Africa and the East, the two Roman Bishops are consequently considered by him to represent the rest of the West. On Papalist principles the Bishops of Rome would be alone competent to condemn finally the heretics. St. Augustine, on the contrary, holds that the conjoint authority of the Councils and the Roman Bishops was that which had passed the final judgment of the whole Christian world. The Bishops of Rome are not by him held to possess any unique and sovereign authority, but simply that of like character exercised by the Councils, *i.e.* 'episcopal,' and so are by him named conjointly. This is incompatible with the Papalist doctrine as to the monarchical position of the Roman Pontiffs.

[1] *Vide* note 48.
[2] *Vide infra*, n. 721 *et seq.*
[3] S. Aug., *Contra Julianum Pelagianum*, lib. iii. cap. 1, 5; P.L. xliv. 704.
[4] *Ep. ad Optatum*, Ep. cxc. 23; P.L. xxxiii. 365.

642. That this was St. Augustine's belief as to the position of the Episcopate is corroborated by the seventeenth Canon of the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, passed some seven months after St. Augustine preached the sermon from which the phrase is supposed to be taken which involves it. Enough, then, has been said to show that not merely are the words *Roma locuta est, causa finita est* not St. Augustine's, but also that, so far from representing what he did say, they convey a meaning which is explicitly contradicted by his genuine writings as well as by his own conduct. Consequently it is futile to adduce this phrase for the purpose for which the fautors of Papalism seek to use it.

Section LXXXVI.—*St. Augustine and Pope Zosimus.*

643. Additional proof that St. Augustine did not believe that the Bishop of Rome possessed the 'supreme power of teaching' which the *Satis Cognitum*, by citing him as a witness to its allegations, asserts he did, is furnished by the following facts. Zosimus, who succeeded Innocent, reversed the decision of his predecessor against Cœlestius and Pelagius.[1] So far from accepting this judgment as that of the Supreme Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, St. Augustine and the Africans assembled in Council at Carthage either in the autumn of A.D. 417 or the beginning of A.D. 418.[2] Two hundred and fourteen Bishops were present and formally adhered to their former decision. In their Synodal Letter they said, 'We decree—*constituimus*—that the sentence put forth by the venerable Bishop Innocent from the See of the Blessed Apostle Peter should stand until by an open confession they acknowledge that by the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord we are asserted not only to know but also to do what is right in every act, so that without it we can neither possess, think, say, or do anything good and holy.'[3]

644. This course, taken by the African Fathers, was a complete condemnation of Zosimus's action. They refer him to the exactly opposite decision of his predecessor, which had been in accord with that of their own Councils, decreeing that it should stand good notwithstanding his reversal of it. The expression thus used with reference to Innocent's decision is clearly incompatible with Papalism, since, on the hypothesis that the 'Roman Pontiff' possesses the position which Papalism asserts to belong to him *jure divino*, it would be monstrous for a Synod of Bishops, however influential, to 'decree' that an *ex cathedra* judgment of their sovereign 'Master,' 'the Supreme Judge,' whose decisions may be reviewed by none, should continue. Zosimus, after this action

[1] *Vide infra*, n. 771.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 118. [E.T. iii. 457.]
[3] Mansi, iv. 376.

on the part of the African Fathers, acknowledged he had been wrong in his treatment of Pelagius, and so admitted that they were right. No doubt the attitude of the Court, which took the African view of the position, influenced Zosimus in the matter. Honorius was prepared to take strong measures at the time. He issued an Imperial *Edict* from Ravenna on the 30th April A.D. 418, 'probably at the instigation of the Africans,'[1] in which he strongly denounced Pelagius and Cœlestius, and ordered drastic measures to be taken against them and their followers, and St. Augustine records that the Pelagians declared that the reversal of the first sentence was due to the fear of the Imperial power.[2]

The African Fathers held another Synod at Carthage the day after the issue of this *Edict*, 1st May A.D. 418, which was attended by Bishops 'not only from all the provinces of Africa, but even from Spain, in all no less than two hundred.'[3] This Council enacted eight Canons against Pelagianism. In them the Fathers set forth the doctrine they held to be orthodox, in terms which show that they had authority to deal with the question, making not the slightest reference to Innocent's judgment, which on Papalist principles would have been that which had finally decided the question, being made in them—terms, too, which also are a repudiation of Zosimus' action, in that they condemn what he had declared to be orthodox.[4]

645. Of these Synods St. Augustine was a distinguished member, and his own personal reference to the line taken by Zosimus is entirely in accord with the action taken by them, in which he uses language which shows he did not believe that Zosimus possessed 'a chrisma of truth and never-failing faith' conferred by heaven on Peter and his successors in the Roman chair,[5] and consequently could not err on a matter of faith or morals. 'If,' says he, 'which God forbid, such a judgment had been pronounced in the Roman Church concerning Cœlestius and Pelagius that their opinions, which Pope Innocent had condemned in them, and with them, should have been declared to have here approved and held, it would have followed from this rather that the brand of surrendering the truth was to be impressed on the Roman clergy.'[6] St. Augustine was in error as to what Zosimus had done, as will be seen,[7] but he evidently supposes that what did actually happen could take place, and further, that such committal of the Roman Bishop to heresy would only affect his own diocese and not the Catholic Church. The whole episode proves that St. Augustine did not hold

[1] Robertson, *op. cit.*, bk. iii. ch. ii., vol. ii. p. 151. Edit. 1874.
[2] S. Aug., *Contra duas Epist. Pelag.*, ii. 3; P.L. xliv. 574.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 119. [E.T. ii. 458.]
[4] *Vide infra*, n. 771.
[5] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486-7.
[6] S. Aug., *Contra duas Epist. Pelag.*, ii. 5; P.L. xliv. 574.
[7] *Vide infra*, nn. 771 *et seq.*

that the 'faith of Rome' in the sense in which that expression is used in the *Satis Cognitum*, must at all times be held by those who would be Catholics.

646. Similar testimony is afforded by the way in which St. Augustine meets the slanders which the Donatists brought against certain Bishops of Rome. Of these, Marcellinus and others, he says, putting them on a level with those Bishops of Carthage who were likewise the objects of the calumnies of the Donatists, 'Assuredly of whatever character they were . . . against whom they object what they please on behalf of their dissensions, no hurt arises to the Catholic Church spread throughout the world. If they be innocent we in no degree share their crown, if they be guilty we in no degree share their guilt. If they were good, as grain on the threshing floor of the Catholic Church, they have been winnowed; if they were bad, as straw on the threshing floor of the Catholic Church, they have been crushed.'[1]

647. St. Augustine evidently did not consider that the Bishops of Rome held the teaching office in the Church in any other sense than that which belonged to the Bishops of Carthage, for otherwise he could not have looked upon any failure on the part of the former to discharge that office as having merely the same effect on the Church as a like failure on the part of the Bishops of Carthage. If 'the sovereign Pontiff is the necessary only and exclusive foundation of Christianity,' as De Maistre says,[2] 'if a chrisma of truth and never-failing faith' was conferred by Christ on the successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate that 'they might discharge their exalted office for the salvation of all, so that the whole flock of Christ, turned from the poisonous fruit of error, might be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, that the occasion of schism being removed, the Church might be preserved in unity, and supported on its own foundation might stand firm against the gates of hell,' as the *Vatican Decrees* assert,[3] any dereliction of duty on the part of the Bishop of Rome would have really affected the welfare of the whole Church and have destroyed that unity which is necessary to its existence, and the gates of hell would have prevailed against it. St. Augustine, therefore, knew of no such unique prerogative belonging to the Bishops of Rome by the institution of Christ, and consequently was able to regard with equanimity, so far as the continued existence of the Church was concerned, the possibility of a Bishop of Rome erring *ex cathedra*.

[1] S. Aug., *De Unico Bapt. contra Petil.*, cap. xvi. 30; P.L. xliii. 611, 612.

[2] De Maistre, *Du Pape*, liv. iv. chap. v. p. 427. Troisième Edit. [E.T. p. 320, Edit. 1850.]

[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. ix. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486, 487.

Section LXXXVI.—*St. Augustine and the authority of a 'General Council.'*

648. In striking contrast to the view held by St. Augustine as to the position of the Bishops of Rome in the Church, is the authoritative place which he assigns to a General Council. The Donatists of his day alleged the high authority of St. Cyprian against him on the question of Baptism. Did St. Augustine say that St. Cyprian was wrong, and ought to have submitted to the infallible judgment of St. Stephen on the subject, which was binding on the whole Church the moment it was made? On the contrary, he says, 'You are wont to object to us Cyprian's letters, his opinion, his Council; why do ye claim the authority of Cyprian for your schism and reject his example when it makes for the peace of the Church? But who can fail to be aware that . . . all the letters of Bishops which have ever been written, or are being written since the closing of the Canon, are liable to be rejected if there be anything contained in them which strays from the truth, either by the discourse of some one who happens to be wiser than themselves, or by the weightier authority and more learned experience of other bishops, or by the authority of Councils; and, further, that the Councils themselves which are held in the several districts and provinces must yield beyond all possibility of doubt to the authority of universal Councils which are assembled for the whole Christian world. . . . Wherefore the holy Cyprian, whose dignity is only increased by his humility . . . abundantly shows that he was most willing to correct his own opinion if any one should prove to him that it is as certain that the Baptism of Christ can be given by those who have strayed from the fold as that it could not be lost when they strayed, on which subject we have already said much. Nor should we ourselves venture to assert anything of the kind, were we not supported by the unanimous authority of the whole Church, to which he himself would unquestionably have yielded, if at that time the truth of the question had been placed beyond all dispute by the investigation and decree of a General Council. For if he quotes Peter as an example for his allowing himself quietly and peacefully to be corrected by a junior colleague, how much more readily would he himself, with the Council of his province, have yielded to the authority of the whole world when the truth had been brought to light? For, indeed, so holy and peaceful a soul would have been most ready to assent to the arguments of a single person who could prove to him the truth; and perhaps he even did so, though we have no knowledge of the fact. For it was neither possible that all the proceedings which took place between the Bishops at that time should have been committed to writing, nor are we acquainted with all that was so committed, for how could a matter

which was involved in such mists of disputation ever have been brought to the full illumination and authoritative decision of a General Council had it not first been known to be discussed for some considerable time in the various districts of the world, with many discussions and comparisons of the views of the Bishops on every side? But this is one effect of the soundness of peace, that when any doubtful points are being under investigation, and when, on account of the difficulty of arriving at the truth, they produce differences of opinion in the course of brotherly disputation, till men at last arrive at the unalloyed truth; yet the bond of unity remains, lest in the part that is cut away there should be found the incurable wounds of deadly error.'[1]

649. St. Augustine here places St. Stephen on an exact equality with other Bishops, his opinion being no more authoritative than theirs, so that St. Cyprian was at liberty to reject it unless convinced by the arguments he adduced in support of it. On the other hand, he distinctly asserts that the decisions of a General Council are possessed of final authority, placing the matter decided thereby beyond all dispute. In the particular case he has before him he is able to assert the truth of the opinion rejected by St. Cyprian, solely because the decree of such a Council, having the authority of the whole world, had since the day of that great saint been obtained. To this decision, he further asserts, St. Cyprian would have unquestionably submitted himself as being that which had the authority of the whole Church. To St. Augustine, then, a General Council is the supreme authority in the Church. As he says elsewhere, 'It is safe for us not to advance with any rashness opinions with regard to those matters which, accepted in a local Council, have not been completed in any plenary Council, but to assert with the confidence of a fearless voice that which, under the government of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, has been confirmed by a Council of the universal Church.'[2]

650. The contrast between St. Augustine's statements as to the authority attaching to the decisions of a Bishop of Rome and those of a General Council is most marked. Those of the former may be ignored with safety by any one who is not convinced by the arguments which their author adduces in support thereof, in the same way as those of any other Bishop may be; those of the latter are to be accepted as binding, having the authority of the universal Church. It is not, therefore, 'the Roman faith,' in the sense in which the *Satis Cognitum* uses the term, but the faith of the universal Church authoritatively expressed, in the event of any doubt arising on any particular point thereof by a General Council, which the great Doctor requires to be held by any one who desires to be a Catholic. That the 'supreme power of teaching'

[1] S. Aug., *De Bapt. contra Donatistas*, lib. ii. cap. iii., iv., v.; P.L. xliii. 128 *seq.*
[2] *Ibid.*, lib. vii. cap. liii. 102; P.L. xliii. 242, 243.

is possessed by the Bishops of Rome *jure divino* was, it is clear from the evidence, *not* 'the venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of St. Augustine.

651. The final conclusion from an investigation into 'the testimony' of St. Augustine as to Papalism is, therefore, that he did not recognise the Bishop of Rome as holding the monarchical position in the Church, as the Supreme Pastor, Teacher, and Judge of all Christians, the Master of the Episcopal College, possessing that authority which Christ exercised during His mortal life, an authority real and sovereign which every one is bound to obey, which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to belong to him by the institution of Christ. The authority of St. Augustine is recognised as being great in the Church; that that authority is thus against Papalism must be held to be conclusive against it.[1]

[1] On two passages from St. Augustine sometimes cited by Papalists, *vide* note 49.

CHAPTER XVIII

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE EASTERNS—PART I.

SECTION LXXXVII.—'*The testimony*' *of* '*Maximus the Abbot.*'

652. The passage which is next quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* is one from St. Cyprian, which has already been discussed,[1] and the next witness appealed to, in proof of its allegation that 'obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of the true faith and of legitimate communion,'[2] is St. Maximus, whose words are cited as 'evident testimony of holy Fathers' of the East. St. Maximus was a Catholic Confessor during the Monothelite controversy of the seventh century. Two quotations are given as his, which are as follows: 'Therefore if a man does not want to be, or to be called, a heretic, let him not strive to please this or that man . . . but let him hasten before all things to be in communion with the Roman See. If he be in communion with it, he should be acknowledged by all, and everywhere, as faithful and orthodox. He speaks in vain who tries to persuade me of the orthodoxy of those who, like himself, refuse obedience to His Holiness the Pope of the most holy Church of Rome; that is, to the Apostolic See.' The reason and motive of this he explains to be that 'the Apostolic See hath received and hath government, authority, and power of binding and loosing from the Incarnate Word Himself; and, according to all holy synods, sacred canons and decrees, in all things and through all things, in respect of all the holy churches of God throughout the whole world, since the Word in Heaven, who rules the Heavenly powers, binds and loosens there' (*Defloratio ex Epistolâ ad Petrum illustrem*[3]).

653. In this authorised translation the words 'from the Incarnate Word Himself and according to all holy Synods,' do not accurately represent the Latin '*Ab ipso incarnato Dei verbo sed et omnibus sanctis synodis.*' The translation represents the source whence the powers of the Roman See are derived as our Lord alone, the Synods being referred to as merely witnessing to this, whereas the original assigns a double character to these powers, some being conferred by our Lord, others by the holy Synods, and so not by the institution of Christ, the preposition *ab* governing both the clauses of the sentence.

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 564 *et seq.* [2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 32. [3] *Ibid.*

That this is the meaning of these words is confirmed by the fact that the word '*secundum*' is used in the immediate context governing the words '*sacros canones et terminos*,'[1] the meaning being that the prerogatives referred to are set forth and acknowledged in the Canons and rules promulgated by the holy Synods just mentioned.

654. St. Maximus, by thus saying that these 'prerogatives' were according to the 'Canons and rules' of the Holy Synods, made a statement which bears on its face the mark of inaccuracy. Vincenzi, who is both an able and acute advocate of Papalism, is compelled by the facts to admit that these very authorities to which St. Maximus refers, as they have been handed down to us, are witnesses against the Papal Monarchy. He devotes the second part of his work, already quoted, to a 'recension' of the Nicene, Sardican, Constantinopolitan, and Carthaginian Synods concerning the Pontifical jurisdiction over the Catholic Church 'against the fabricators and subtractors of the Canons of the same Synods.' In this part of his work he says: 'Nevertheless, as is clear from the preceding pages, it must not be concealed that in the ancient acts of the Church until the aforesaid age' [*i.e.* until well on in the fifth century], 'there are found some four hundred documents under the designation of Canons, both those which are commonly entitled Apostolical, and those called those of Ancyra, Elvira, Neo-Cæsarea, Gangra, Laodicæa, Nicæa, Constantinople, Africa, Chalcedon, most of them written in Greek, in which the prerogatives of the Roman Episcopate are not even once set forth, or if perchance mention of the Holy See occurs, we see such prerogatives at the same time rejected.'[2]

655. His argument is that the Canons which have a direct or indirect bearing on the prerogatives of the Roman See contained in the received codices of the Canons have been falsified, such as, for example, as we have seen,[3] Canon VI. of Nicæa, and that others which he considers to have set forth those prerogatives have been abstracted by the Eusebians and other heretics, the bases on which he grounds this 'argument' being that the received Canons are inconsistent with, and opposed to, the Papalist claims which he holds to be true. He concludes this chapter as follows: 'Finally, whatever is to be thought concerning the origin and authority of the aforesaid innumerable

[1] In the 'translation' the word *secundum* is represented as governing the words *omnibus sanctis synodis*, the relation of the preposition *ab* to these words being ignored altogether.

[2] 'Nihilominus, sicuti patet ex præmissis, non est occultandum in vetustis Ecclesiæ actis usque ad ætatem prædictam reperiri quadringenta circiter documenta sub titulo Canonum, tam qui vulgo dicuntur apostolici, quam qui vocantur ancyrani, iliberitani, neocæsarienses, gangrenses, laodiceni, nicæni, constantinopolitani, africani, chalcedonenses (quam plerique idiomate græco conscripti) in quibus ne semel quidem enunciantur prærogativae Episcopatus Romani. Et si forte fit, ut aliquando mentio incidat sanctæ Sedis, hoc expletum vidimus cum dejectione ejusdem.'—Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars ii. cap. xiii. p. 292.

[3] *Vide supra*, n. 320.

Canons, no one will persuade me that the Apostles and the orthodox Fathers of Nicæa, Constantinople, Africa, and Chalcedon ever ordained Canons of this character, in which the Primacy of Peter and his successors is discredited and destroyed, and at the same time the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff over the Episcopate of the Catholic Church is repudiated.'[1]

That Vincenzi found it necessary to take this line with regard to the Canons is significant, and it is to these Canons that Maximus refers; consequently, on the authority of this ardent supporter of the Papal Monarchy, the value of the statement which Maximus makes with regard to them is *nil.*

656. The quotations under consideration are taken from a letter to his great friend Peter, a man of senatorial rank—*illustris.*[2] It is important to note that the Greek original of this letter is not extant. Now, amongst the forged passages in the *Libellus*,[3] which furnished St. Thomas Aquinas with the 'authorities' he made use of in his work '*Contra errores Grecorum*,' authorities which apparently were just what he required, but which, unfortunately for the arguments which he based upon them, were mere forgeries by an unscrupulous Latin, there is found a quotation, *Ex Epistola Romæ Scripta*, another work by Maximus, of which Reusch, in his tractate on the forged passages used by St. Thomas, says that it is 'an inaccurate and much interpolated rendering of the fragment *ex Epistola Romæ scripta*.'[4]

657. Since, then, one work by Maximus was used by the forger of the *Libellus* as one which he could suitably interpolate for the advancement of his design of furthering the Papal claims, it would not be improbable that his other works would receive similar attention on the part of those who desired to adduce him as a witness in support of the Papal Monarchy. Inasmuch, then, as the Greek original of the passage is not extant, a circumstance which would afford both facility and opportunity to an unscrupulous forger like the compiler of the *Libellus* to insert in the Latin 'translation' sentiments and opinions which were not in the original, the extracts in the *Satis Cognitum* must be regarded with suspicion. Reusch, in fact, does not hesitate to say that it is 'a distortion of the [above] incomplete fragment.'[5] As

[1] 'Demum quidquid putandum sit de origine et auctoritate præfatorum innumerorum Canonum, nullus tamen mihi unquam suadebit, apostolos, Patres nicænos, constantinopolitanos, africanos, chalcedonenses, et quidem orthodoxos, quandoque tales sancivisse Canones; in quibus Petri et successorum imminuitur et deletur primatus; ac una Pontificatus Romani expugnatur jurisdictio supra Ecclesiæ Catholicæ episcopatum.'—Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

[2] Nothing is known of this Peter beyond what Maximus himself insinuates.—P.G. xci. 510, note 2.

[3] On this *Libellus*, *vide supra*, nn. 243 *et seq.*

[4] *Die Fälschungen in dem Tractat des Thom. v. Aquin. geg. d. Griech.*: München, *Ak.-Abhdlgen*, 1889, vol. xviii. p. 732.

[5] *L.c.*

Maximus is the sole 'Eastern' Father whose 'testimony' is quoted in this connection in the *Satis Cognitum*, it is, to say the least, unfortunate that the original of the letter quoted is unknown.

658. A further question arises. Granted that the extracts are genuine, that is, that they accurately represent in a translation the Greek original, what is the value of the statements contained in them for the purpose for which they are adduced in the *Satis Cognitum*? First, it is to be noted that the double source is assigned whence 'the Apostolic See' derives its 'government, authority, and power of binding and loosing,' viz. Our Lord and 'the holy synods.' Now this is contrary to the Papalist doctrine. The office and jurisdiction of the Supreme Pastor is, according to Papalism, the direct grant of Christ Himself to Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate, and not derived from any 'Synod.' Further, it would be true of any See that it possessed from the Incarnate Word Himself 'government, authority, and power of binding and loosing.' Such prerogatives belong to the *unus Episcopatus*, and being held by each member in joint tenure, is exercised within the limits of his See by the Bishop thereof. But Maximus alleges that the Bishop of Rome exercises these prerogatives 'in all things and through all things in respect of all the holy churches'; whence is this additional right derived according to Maximus? Plainly, '*ab . . . omnibus sanctis synodis.*' The two clauses clearly intimate a double source of the prerogatives: the second clause on Papalist principles would be meaningless, whereas on the above interpretation it has a definite signification, though, as 'the holy synods' to which he refers do not exist, it follows that the prerogatives alleged to be conferred by them must be non-existent likewise.

659. In the second place, supposing the extracts be genuine, and that they do have the meaning assigned to them in the *Satis Cognitum*, which, from what has been said in the last paragraph, it is clear that they do not, a consideration of the circumstances under which the letter to Peter was written enables a true estimate of the value of Maximus as a 'witness' to Papalism to be arrived at. Those circumstances were as follows:—

Maximus, who was born about A.D. 580, became a Monk at Chrysopolis. He was an ardent defender of the Orthodox faith against the assaults of the Monothelite heresy. After going to Africa, he went to Rome, and assisted at the Council of the Lateran in A.D. 649. The special circumstances of the time were such as would predispose Maximus both to accept as true the statements which he would naturally hear at Rome with regard to the position of the Bishop of that See, and to make use of that position as a means of strengthening his efforts to further the cause of Orthodoxy, so grievously imperilled by the spread of the Monothelite heresy in the Eastern Churches, the condition of which

was such as to render the defence of the faith by the members of those Churches extremely difficult.

660. Maximus would be the more inclined to make the utmost use of the influence of the Roman Church in this way, as he himself had suffered great personal hardships at the hands of the Monothelites Sergius and Pyrrhus, who in turn had occupied the See of Constantinople. That See had, since the days of the Council of Chalcedon, great power and influence in the East. Consequently the desire to engage the authority of the Western Patriarch, who regarded the See of New Rome as a dangerous rival, in the controversy in which he was engaged with heretics who had the strenuous support of that See, would naturally lead him not to be critical with regard to any claims which might be put forward on behalf of the occupants of the Roman See, and indeed to lay stress on them as affording great weight to the testimony to orthodoxy given by them. Hence in these extracts he would be merely reflecting the opinions current at that time in Rome with regard to the Roman claims, which, since the days of Innocent and St. Leo onwards, had continued to develop and had acquired more and more recognition in the West. It is obvious that all this at once heavily discounts the value attaching to these quotations for the purpose for which they are cited. The opinions embodied in them are not the testimony of an 'Eastern' Father writing under the influence of the ancient traditions of the East as to the position occupied by the great Sees of Christendom, but that of one who was a fugitive, driven from home by bitter persecution by heretics and received with kindness by the Roman Church, and who was thus necessarily peculiarly susceptible to that subtle and powerful influence which would be exercised on one so situate by the authorities of the Church in the Imperial City, which he would be assured by them was founded by St. Peter himself, and which claimed to possess great powers in the Church, which he would desire to enlist on his side in the struggle in which he was engaged.

661. That this was the case is corroborated by the unhistorical statement as to the Holy Synods, Canons, and Decrees to which reference has been already made. It is one which no 'Eastern,' writing in accord with the traditions of the East, so strong in their witness against Roman encroachments, would have made; one which has been shown, on the authority of Vincenzi,[1] than whom from his position no more unwilling witness could be found, to be a flagrant mis-statement.

662. To sum up: it is clear from what has been said that (*a*) the absence of the original Greek of the passage, combined with the known interpolation of Maximus' writings in the Papalist interest, makes it not improbable that the Latin translation does not accurately represent what Maximus wrote; (*b*) that the passage attributes the prerogatives

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 654.

of the Pope of Rome to two sources, viz. our Lord and the holy synods, whereas the Papalist doctrine is that they were conferred by the institution of Christ; and (*c*) that the date when, and the circumstances under which, the letter 'to Peter' was written, and the plain inconsistency of statements in it with historical facts, deprive any 'extracts' from it of any value for the purpose for which they are alleged in the *Satis Cognitum*, viz. to prove that 'the East' through all ages 'acknowledged without the slightest doubt or hesitation the Bishops of Rome, and received them as the legitimate successors of Peter' 'in the Roman Episcopate,' possessing 'the supreme power in the Church *jure divino*,' and the centre of Catholic unity. Maximus is the only writer that has the slightest pretence to being an 'Eastern' who is quoted in this connection in the *Satis Cognitum*. Had it been possible to find any statement of an 'Eastern Father,' representative of the traditions of the East of the first six centuries, which could have been used for that purpose, it is quite certain that it would have been adduced, and the illustrious author of the *Satis Cognitum* would not have relied on statements made by a Latinised Eastern (if, indeed, they be his) of the seventh century as the sole testimony of 'the holy Fathers' of 'the East,' which could be adduced in support of an assertion, the truth of which it was, from the Papalist point of view, so necessary to establish.

Section LXXXVIII.—'*The testimony*' *of St. Basil.*

663. What, then, is 'the testimony of the holy Fathers' of 'the East' as to the Papalist contention? What is the witness, for example, of St. Basil, the greatest of Eastern doctors, regarded to this day by Easterns as their special teacher, and venerated throughout the whole world, with regard to the Papal Monarchy as set forth in the *Satis Cognitum*?

St. Basil was baptized and ordained reader by Dianius, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, when that Bishop was not in communion with the Roman See, and communicated with him, *i.e.* with one who was 'outside the edifice,' 'separate from the fold,' and 'exiled from the Kingdom.' St. Basil, therefore, was in like plight for many years; continuing out of communion with Rome, after the death of Dianius in A.D. 362, till A.D. 372, when he received the Synodical Epistle of the Council of Rome held in December[1] A.D. 371, at the hands of Sabinus, Deacon of the Church of Milan, and Dorotheus, Deacon of the Church of Antioch, the messenger whom he had sent to Rome, during which period, in September A.D. 370, he had been consecrated to the See of Cæsarea in succession to Eusebius.[2] It is evident that St. Basil did

[1] So Father Puller dates this Synod, *op. cit.*, p. 299. Third Edit.

[2] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. p. 287, *sub v.* 'Basilius of Cæsarea.'

not regard communion with the See of Rome as an essential condition to being in the Catholic Church.

664. St. Basil's action with reference to the case of Meletius bears like testimony to the fact that Papalism was not 'the belief' of his 'age' of the Church. The condition of affairs at Antioch in his days was a strange one. After the deposition of Eustathius, probably at the end of A.D. 330 or the beginning of A.D. 331,[1] the throne of Antioch was occupied by a succession of Arians, with whom, following the advice of Eustathius, the Catholics remained in communion with the exception of a small number who held aloof under the leadership of a Presbyter named Paulinus. These Bishops were recognised as the canonical occupants of the See, by the majority both of Westerns and Easterns, with whom they enjoyed intercommunion until the Council of Sardica. From that date, owing to the proceedings at Philippopolis of the Bishops who withdrew from Sardica, so far as the West was concerned intercommunion ceased. As Sozomen says, 'After this Synod they ceased to hold intercourse with each other in the manner usual with those who agree in their belief, nor did they communicate together, the Westerns as far as Thrace separating themselves and the Easterns as far as Illyricum.'[2] Amongst the Easterns, Catholics and Arians remained in communion with each other. There must be included among the former those who were practically orthodox, but who objected to the use of the ὁμοούσιον as being, in their opinion, capable of being understood in a Sabellianising sense, of whom St. Athanasius himself said, in A.D. 359, that those 'who accept everything that was defined at Nicæa, and doubt only the ὁμοούσιον, must not be treated as enemies, nor do we attack them as Anomæans nor as opponents of the Fathers, but we discuss the matter with them as brothers who mean what we mean and dispute about the word.'[3]

665. No doubt in this party there were embraced different shades of opinion—amongst the Orthodox must be numbered both St. Eusebius of Samosata and St. Meletius. The latter was consecrated to the See of Sebaste on the deposition of the Semi-Arian Eustathius, probably by a Synod held at Mitylene, his birthplace, in A.D. 357.[4] He met with great opposition, and after a short time resigned the See and retired to Beroea. In January A.D. 361 he was appointed Bishop of Antioch by a Synod held in that city.[5] Acacius of Cæsarea had probably the greatest influence at this Council. He, though Semi-Arian in sympathies, had broken with them, and desired to ally himself, for his own ends, with the Orthodox. He procured the exile of certain Bishops, and 'wherever he had the power

[1] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, ii. 383.
[2] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 13; P.G. lxvii. 1065.
[3] S. Athan., *De Synodis*, sect. 42; P.G. vol. xxvi. p. 768.
[4] Father Puller seems to have proved this, *op. cit.*, pp. 241 *seq.* Third Edit.
[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 84. [E.T. ii. 275.]

advised and urged that those who openly professed the ὁμοούσιον should be appointed'[1] in their place.

666. It was in accordance with his plans that he obtained the appointment of St. Meletius to Antioch. It was true that he was in communion with a number of Arians, but promiscuous communion had not yet come to an end in the East (with the exception of Egypt), where the Arians were still regarded as a party in the Church; but, as Theodoret says, 'the maintainers of Apostolic doctrine were well aware of the soundness in the faith of the great Meletius, and they had a clear knowledge of his bright innocence of life and his wealth of virtue, and they came to a common vote and took measures to have the instrument of election written out and described without delay.'[2] This confidence was justified in a very short time, as within a few weeks of his election he made bold confession of the true faith in a sermon before the heretical Emperor Constantius, and in consequence of his orthodoxy was banished to Armenia, where he remained in exile for a year and a half. Some Arian prelates deposed him, and Euzoius, who had been 'deposed from the diaconate by Alexander of Alexandria for adhering to' Arius,[3] was intruded into the See. The large majority of Catholics had received Meletius with joy, and faithfully adhered to him as their rightful Bishop. This naturally involved the discontinuance of 'promiscuous communion' between the Orthodox and Arians which had prevailed in the Church of Antioch since the Synod of Sardica, and the latter having obtained from the civil power possession of the churches, the former were compelled to worship in the fields.

667. The 'Eustathians,' however, refused to recognise Meletius, probably owing to suspicions of his orthodoxy through his having communicated with Arianisers, and to the fact that two at least of his consecrators were Arians, who, as already stated, were still regarded in 'the East' as a party within the Church. There were thus three parties at Antioch—the Meletian Catholics, the Eustathians under Paulinus, and the Arians headed by Euzoius the intruder. The state of things was truly miserable, and throughout the East Arianism seemed to be making great headway, having the support of the Imperial power. St. Athanasius made an effort to reunite the Orthodox, and under his guidance a Synod in A.D. 362 at Alexandria drew up terms for communion of a distinctly moderate character. It was decreed 'that all who, without being themselves Arians, had been drawn by force and other means to the side of the heretics, should receive pardon and retain their ecclesiastical dignity and offices.' On the other hand, the heads and actual defenders of the heresy should indeed, if repentant, be

[1] Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. i.; P.G. lxv. 528.
[2] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 27; P.G. lxxxii. 1080.
[3] Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, i. 293.

again received into the Church, but be excluded from office. But neither class should be received excepting on condition of their anathematising the Arian heresy and its chief supporters, accepting the Nicene faith, and acknowledging the Nicene Council as of 'the highest authority.'[1] A Synodal letter was written, and St. Eusebius of Vercelli and St. Asterius of Petra were commissioned to see to the carrying out of the decision of the Synod in East and West, without, be it noted, taking any notice of the Roman Bishop, to whom, indeed, there is not the slightest reference either in the documents emanating from the Council or in the letters of St. Athanasius and St. Basil relating to the Council;[2] in fact, it is probable that Liberius was at the date of the Council still out of communion with St. Athanasius.

668. The Synod was not unmindful of the special difficulty with which their envoys would meet at Antioch, and steps were ordered to be taken 'that those who desire and strive for peace should be reconciled.'[3] No doubt the object the Synod had in view was to unite all the Catholics under St. Meletius as their Bishop.[4] Before, however, the envoys of the Council could reach Antioch, Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, had consecrated Paulinus[5] Bishop for the Eustathians, contrary to a promise he had made to St. Eusebius.[6] Consequently the position was hopelessly complicated. Eusebius, therefore, declined to recognise either party, and departed; and Lucifer, disgusted at the action of the Synod of Alexandria, 'renounced all communion with Eusebius, Athanasius, and their friends, thus causing a fresh schism called the Luciferian.'[7] The efforts, however, of the Synod proved largely effectual. Arianism was practically extinguished in the West, whilst many of the Greeks were reunited under the banner of Orthodoxy.

669. St. Athanasius came to Antioch in A.D. 363, and, as we learn from St. Basil, desired to enter into communion with St. Meletius, but his design was frustrated through 'the incapacity of councillors,'[8] and he left Antioch 'grieved because he was sent away without being admitted to communion.'[9] The result of this was that St. Athanasius re-entered into communion with Paulinus and the Eustathians, though he retained to the end of his life a desire for restoration of communion with St. Meletius.[10] The decision of the Synod of Alexandria, however, was

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 85. [E.T. ii. 276-7.]
[2] *Cp.* Puller, *op. cit.*, 265 *et seq.*
[3] *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, Mansi, iii. 246.
[4] *Cp.* Montfaucon, *Monitum* in S. Chrysost. *Hom. De Anathemate.* Quoted Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 159 note 1.
[5] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 27; P.G. lxxxii. 1081.
[6] Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 30; P.L. xxi. 500.
[7] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 85. [E.T. ii. 279.]
[8] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Epiphanium Episcopum*, Ep. cclviii.; P.G. xxxii. 952.
[9] *Ep. ad Meletium*, Ep. lxxxix. sect. 2; P.G. xxxii. 472. [10] *Ibid.*

no doubt the cause of the assembling of a Council at Antioch A.D. 363, in which St. Meletius and St. Eusebius of Samosata took a leading part. At this Council the Nicene Creed was accepted, the ὁμοούσιον being explained in their Synodal letter to the Emperor Jovian in accordance with the interpretation of it given by St. Athanasius.[1] This explanation precluded all possibility of any Sabellianising meaning being put on it, which the Easterns feared might be the case, owing to the fact that Marcellus was still in communion with Egypt and the West. Any doctrinal difficulty in the way of the restoration of unity between the two orthodox parties at Antioch was thus done away, but they still remained separated under their respective Bishops, and both out of communion with Rome. Meanwhile Arianism flourished.

670. St. Basil made great efforts to put an end to the miserable condition of affairs in the East. He was anxious to this end to secure the assistance of the 'Bishops of the West.' Writing to St. Athanasius he says, 'For myself, I have long been of opinion, according to my imperfect understanding of ecclesiastical matters, that there was but one way of succouring our Churches, viz., the co-operation of the Bishops of the West. If they would show, as regards our part of Christendom, the zeal which they manifested in the case of one or two heretics amongst themselves, there would be more chance of benefit to our common interests, the civil power would be persuaded by the argument derived from their number, and the laity in each place would follow their lead without hesitation.'[2] St. Basil took steps to give effect to his opinion by sending Dorotheus, one of the Deacons of the Church of Antioch, to St. Damasus with a letter, in order to obtain the co-operation he deemed vitally necessary. He wrote to St. Athanasius, whom he calls 'the Coryphæus of all,'—κορυφὴν τῶν ὅλων—'his counsellor and leader,' asking him to give his messenger a commendatory letter, and telling him that he had written to St. Damasus, asking him 'to take cognisance of—ἐπισκέψασθαι—the affairs of the East, and to give his opinion—γνώμην—in order that, since it is difficult to get deputies sent from thence by the general decree of a Synod, he might himself act authoritatively—αὐθεντήσει—in the matter, and choose men able to bear the fatigues of the journey, and likewise by gentleness and firmness admonish the perverted.'[3]

671. In the letter to which St. Basil here refers, he wrote of the state of the East, where 'the seeds of Arianism had brought forth into full luxuriance of growth, and, like a bitter root, give forth the fruit of death,' prevailing for a long time past, 'because the orthodox Bishops in the several dioceses have been expelled by false accusations and

[1] S. Athan., *De Synodis*, sect. 41; P.G. xxvi. 764-5.
[2] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Athanasium*, Ep. lxvi.; P.G. xxxii. 424.
[3] *Ep. ad Athanasium*, Ep. lxix.; P.G. xxxii. 429, 432.

violence; whilst power is put into the hands of those who lead captive the souls of the simpler sort.' He then proceeds to say that 'the only deliverance I expect from this is that you should of your tender compassion take cognisance of our affairs by letter. Your exceeding affection in time past has soothed us with hope, and our spirits revived for a short time at a more cheerful report that you would in some way or other take cognisance of our affairs. But deceived in this hope, and enduring no longer, I betake myself to solicit you by letter to rise up in our defence, and to send persons like-minded who shall reunite the disagreed, or bring the Churches of God to friendship with each other, or at least point out to you the authors of the confusion. And thus you too may see with whom you ought to have communion. Assuredly I ask nothing new but what has been customary both to other blessed men of old beloved of God, and especially to you [the Bishops of Rome], for I know from traditional records, as I learn from questioning our Fathers, from the letters still preserved by us, that the most blessed Bishop Dionysius, conspicuous among you for his orthodoxy and other virtues, took cognisance by letter of the affairs of our Church of Cæsarea, and by letter encouraged our Fathers, and sent persons who ransomed brethren from captivity. But things now are in a more difficult and cheerless state, and so require greater attention. For it is not the destruction of earthly buildings but the ruin of Churches that we lament. Nor is it bodily slavery, but the captivity of souls, which we behold in daily operation by the champions of heresy, so that if you rise not up presently to our help, in a short time you will find none to whom to hold out the hand, for all will be reduced under the power of the heresy.'[1]

672. This letter shows the ground on which St. Basil turns to St. Damasus for assistance in the Eastern troubles. Just as St. Dionysius had succoured the Cappadocians in the days when St. Firmilian presided over his See, so now he begs the successor of St. Dionysius to help the orthodox in their dire necessity. Both the act of St. Dionysius and that which he asks of St. Damasus are of like 'character,' the same verb being used by him to describe both, being simply based on the fact that when 'one member suffers all the members suffer with it.' Like the former, the latter would be a simple act of charity worthy of a Christian Bishop, and no more than that with which it is paralleled, an act of jurisdiction, an act incumbent on St. Damasus by virtue of the fact that he shared the one Episcopate, and thus had responsibilities towards the Christians oppressed with heresy in Antioch as elsewhere. It was thus 'Episcopal' and not 'Papal' assistance that he desired. This is further confirmed by the fact, which is evident from the letter to St. Athanasius just quoted, that he would have preferred such assist-

[1] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Damasum*, Ep. lxx.; P.G. xxxii. 433, 436.

ance to have come from a Synod of Western Bishops, and that it was only because of difficulties in the way of this being rendered that he applied to St. Damasus, to whom naturally, in that event, he would look, since, as being the chief Bishop in the West, the Easterns mainly held communication with the Westerns through him, and he would thus, in the absence of the Synodical decree which St. Basil desired, be considered in the East as representing Western opinion and authority.

673. St. Basil's effort failed, for although a Synod of Italian and Gallican Bishops, which seems to have been held about the time of the arrival of Dorotheus at Rome at the end of A.D. 371,[1] sent a Synodical Letter 'to the Catholic Bishops established throughout the East,'[2] giving the decisions of the Synod on various points, and announcing the separation of those who did not accept the Nicene Creed from the communion of the West, and asking the Easterns to express their agreement with the decisions of the Synod, no Bishops were sent to the assistance of the Easterns as St. Basil desired. Hence the Eastern Bishops, amongst whom were St. Meletius, St. Eusebius of Samosata, St. Basil, and others, wrote a letter to their most religious and holy brethren, their fellow-ministers, the Bishops of Italy and Gaul, 'of like mind with them,' imploring their help in the miserable condition to which the East had been reduced. In it they said, 'Permit not half the world to be swallowed up by error. Allow not the faith to be quenched amongst those where it first shone forth. Assuredly you have no need to learn from us, but the Holy Spirit will Himself suggest to you how you may assist us, and show your sympathy with the afflicted. But all speed must be used to save the remnant, and many brethren must come, so that those who come may make up with us a numerous Council, that they may have sufficient credit to work a reformation, not only from the dignity of those who depute them, but from their number.'[3]

674. This letter is significant. The Easterns on Papalist principles would have had recourse to the 'Supreme Pastor' alone, for he only could settle the unhappy state of things brought about, as they say in their letter, 'by the war raging amongst those who are reputed to be orthodox.' His judgment as 'final' could alone, on those principles, avail to put an end to the 'schisms which those who confessed the Apostolic faith had devised for themselves,' and subject those who had thus acted to 'the authority—τῇ αὐθεντίᾳ—of the Church,'[4] since such judgment would be incapable of review.[5] The great Eastern Bishops, so far from doing this, make no distinction between the Bishop of Rome and the

1 'As Tillemont and Father Puller think . . . or at least as Maran says, not later than the opening of 372.'—Bright, *The Church of the Fathers*, i. 381, 382.

2 *Damasus etc. episcopis Catholicis per Orientem constitutis*; P.L. xiii. 347-349.

3 *Ep. ad Italos et Gallos inter Epp. S. Basil.*, Ep. xcii.; P.G. xxxii. 477.

4 *Ibid.*

5 *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii 485.

other 'Bishops of Italy.' He is simply included amongst them, and it is on the authority of a Synod representative both of East and West that they rely, such authority being the more effective the larger the number of Prelates assembled in Synod. The Easterns knew nothing, it is clear, of any 'real and sovereign authority' belonging *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome, as 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College.' The *Unus Episcopatus* was to them the supreme authority in the Church, hence their desire for a large Synod, as being more easily accepted as representing that One Episcopate.

675. This letter, and others sent at the same time, did not, as St. Basil tells us,[1] please 'the more precise persons at Rome,' and they were sent back by Evagrius, a Presbyter of Antioch. He arrived at Cæsarea in the summer of A.D. 373, and demanded from the Easterns a letter couched in exact terms dictated by the Westerns, 'and that an embassy, consisting of distinguished persons, should be promptly sent, that they of the West might have a fair pretext for visiting us.'

The failure of the letter of the Easterns to obtain what they desired was naturally disappointing, and nothing seems to have been done until the following year, A.D. 374, when letters were sent to the West by Eastern Bishops, by Dorotheus[2] and Sanctissimus, two Priests of the Church of Antioch. One of these letters 'to the Westerns,' in which complaint is made that no 'consolatory letter, no visitation of brethren, nothing else of what is due to us by the law of charity, has taken place,' and as an additional reason why the Westerns should come to the assistance of the Churches throughout the East, it is urged 'that it is natural that the word of those to whom men are accustomed has not so much effect as a strange voice to console, especially when it comes from men who, through the grace of God, are everywhere most honourably known, such as report declares you to all men to be, with whom the faith has continued unwounded, inasmuch as you have preserved the Apostolical deposit inviolable.'[3]

676. Another letter was one written by St. Basil himself, addressed 'to the most holy, religious, and most dear brethren the Bishops throughout Gaul and Italy,' in which he says: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ having deigned to name the whole Church of God His own Body, and made us severally members of each other, hath granted us all likewise to be nearly connected with all, according to the harmony of the members. Wherefore, however far apart we are in our dwellings, yet, as conjoined in the body, we are near each other. But since the head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you, surely neither will you have the heart to put us away, but will sympathise as warmly with

[1] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Eusebium Samosatens.*, Ep. cxxxviii.; P.G. xxxii. 577.

[2] Tillemont distinguishes him from Dorotheus, the Antiochene deacon. Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biography*, i. 900.

[3] *Ep. ad Occidentales inter Epp. S. Basil.*, Ep. ccxlii.; P.G. xxxii. 900, 901.

the afflictions to which we have been given up, for our sins, as we rejoice with you in the glory of the peace which the Lord has granted you. Now, on other occasions, we have called upon your love to assist and sympathise with us; but assuredly because our punishment was not filled up, you were not allowed to rise up to our help. What we most desire is, that the Emperor himself of your world should be informed through your Piety of our confession. If this be difficult, at least send some to visit and console the afflicted, that they may put before your eyes the sufferings of the East, which it is impossible for your ears to receive, because no words can be found vividly expressing to you our state.'[1]

677. This renewed attempt was practically as abortive as the former ones, for although a Roman Synod was held by St. Damasus on the arrival at Rome, A.D. 374, of Dorotheus,[2] by which a Synodical letter was addressed to the Easterns, no attempt was made to meet the wishes of the Easterns by sending some Bishops to investigate the true condition of affairs caused by Arianism and the schism amongst the orthodox at Antioch. The result was that the three parties at Antioch, including that recently formed by Vitalis, who had embraced Apollinarianism, held that they were in communion with the Roman Church,[3] in that the terms of communion, viz. the acceptance of the definition of faith put forth by the Council, were such as they could accede to. The position was thus materially aggravated by the unfortunate rejection of the Eastern plan. In the following year, at the instigation of St. Jerome,[4] St. Damasus took another step which made matters worse, by recognising Paulinus, who was treated as a schismatic[5] by St. Basil and the whole East, as the legitimate occupant of the throne of Antioch, those whom St. Jerome admitted to communion being recognised by St. Damasus as being in communion with him.

678. So far as Rome and the West were concerned, the canonical status of Paulinus was acknowledged, and it followed that St. Meletius, whom St. Basil and the whole East regarded as the true Bishop of Antioch, and those who adhered to him, were held by the Westerns to be schismatics. On Papalist principles the dispute which had caused so much misery at Antioch was terminated by a final and irrevocable act binding on the whole Church. Did St. Basil and the Easterns so regard it? Did St. Meletius relinquish the See of Antioch at once, in obedience to his 'Master,' exercising that power which he possessed over the Episcopal College which Christ exercised over the Apostolic College during His mortal life? Certainly not. St. Basil's witness is quite clear

[1] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Episcopos Italos el Gallos*, Ep. ccxliii.; P.G. xxxii. 901 *et seq.*
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 89. [E.T. ii. p. 288.]
[3] S. Hieron., *Ep. ad Damasum*, Ep. xvi.; P.L. xxii. 359.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 592.
[5] *Cp.* Tillemont, *op. cit.*, vii. 29.

on the point. In a letter to the Count Terentius he says: 'Again another report reached us that you were staying at Antioch, and joining in the administration of government with the supreme powers. Besides this, we also heard that the brethren of the party of Paulinus are setting on foot negotiations with you respecting union with us: by us I mean the party of the man of God, Meletius, the Bishop. I hear, moreover, that they are now carrying about letters from the Westerns assigning—ἐπιτρέποντα—the Church of Antioch to themselves, and passing by Meletius, that most admirable Bishop of the true Church of God, and I do not wonder at this. For they [the Westerns] are entirely ignorant of matters here; and those who seem to know about them [the Eustathians] give them an account more in the spirit of party than with strict regard to truth. Not but what they may reasonably either know not the truth, or conceal from themselves why the blessed Athanasius came to write to Paulinus. But as your Excellency has there those who can narrate to you accurately what passed between the two Bishops, in the reign of Jovianus, we beg you to be fully instructed by them. But as we accuse no one, but desire to have love towards all, and especially to them that are of the household of faith, we congratulate those who have received the letters from Rome. And if they contain any honourable and weighty testimony to them, we pray this may be true, and confirmed by the facts themselves. I cannot, however, on this account ever persuade myself either not to know Meletius or to forget the Church which is under him, or to think the questions of small importance, about which the division originally took place, and of little weight in their bearing upon sound faith. For my part, I shall never submit to withdraw my opinion because some one has received a letter from men, and makes much of himself upon it; no, not even if one should have come from heaven itself, but should not walk by the sound word of faith, can I regard such an one as sharing in the communion of saints.'[1]

679. Similarly he wrote to Meletius himself, saying: 'After I returned, having contracted great weakness from the violent rains and my dispirits, I received immediately letters from the East, stating that Paulinus' friends had had certain letters from the West, conceived as if they were the credentials of a sovereign power, and that his partisans were very proud of it, and exulted in the letters, moreover, were putting forth their faith, and on these terms were ready to join with the Church that stands by us. Besides this, I was told that they had seduced to their side that most excellent man Terentius, to whom I wrote at once, repressing that his inclination, as far as was in my power, and informing him of their deceit.'[2]

[1] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Terentium*, Ep. ccxiv.; P.G. xxxii. 783.
[2] *Ep. ad Meletium*, Ep. ccxvi.; P.G. xxxii. 792.

680. St. Basil's attitude is plain. He remained in communion with St. Meletius, whom he regarded as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, 'Bishop of the true Church of God,'[1] and out of communion with Paulinus, whom the Bishop of Rome had recognised as the true occupant of that throne, 'since,' as Dom Maran says in a life of St. Basil, 'in fact communion could not be held with him without Meletius being rejected, who was the only legitimate Bishop of Antioch.'[2] His attitude is emphasised by the way in which, when it was proposed to again reopen negotiations with the West with reference to the Eastern troubles, he writes of the proposal, 'You have already,' says he in a letter to St. Eusebius of Samosata, 'fallen in with the views of the West as the brother Dorotheus related all to you. And as he is setting out again, what sort of letters ought to be given to him? And perhaps he will accompany the good Sanctissimus, who is very zealous going about the whole East, getting subscriptions and letters from all the more distinguished. For myself, I do not see what one should send by him, or how agree with those who send; but if you should find shortly any coming to me, have the goodness to instruct me as to this. It occurs to me to use Diomedes' language, 'Would that thou hadst never sent for aid, since, saith he, the man is arrogant.' For indeed disdainful tempers, treated with attention, are wont to show more than their usual arrogance. And if the Lord should be gracious unto us, what other support do we need? But if the wrath of God remain upon us, what help shall we find in Western pride? They who neither know, nor endure to learn, the truth; but, preoccupied with false suspicions, are doing now just what they did before in the case of Marcellus, quarrelling with those who give them reports of the truth, and giving their own support to heresy. For I myself, without any concert with any, was minded to write to their Coryphæus; nothing, indeed, about ecclesiastical matters, except so much as to hint that they neither know the truth of what is going on among us nor accept the way by which they might learn it; but generally, about the duty of not attacking those who are humbled by temptations, and of not taking pride for dignity, a sin which of itself is sufficient to make enmity with God.'[3]

681. St. Basil's language throughout is consistent. There is not only not the slightest indication of any belief on his part that the Roman Bishop is 'the supreme judge of all the faithful,' 'the teacher of all Christians possessed of a charisma of truth and never failing faith,' but, on the contrary, its whole tenour witnesses against such an

[1] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Terentium*, Ep. ccxiv.; P.G. xxxii. 783.

[2] Dom Maran, *Prefatio in S. Basil. Vit.*, cap. ii. sect. 2; S. Basil, *Opp.*, tom. iii. p. x. Edit. Bened. I am indebted to Father Puller (*op. cit.*, pp. 321, 322) for this quotation from Dom Maran.

[3] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Eusebium*, Ep. ccxxix.; P.L. xxxii. 893.

idea. The last quoted letter is specially significant, for, as Bossuet notes, from it 'it was clear that the confirming of heresy was roundly, flatly, and without any excuse, without any attempt to modify, imputed by Basil to decrees of Roman Pontiffs *de fide*.'[1] A conclusive proof that St. Basil knew nothing of the position asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Bishops of Rome by Papalism.

682. The mission to the Westerns was, however, sent, bearing the letter from the Catholic Bishops of the East, amongst them St. Basil, in which one more appeal was made for assistance against those whom they held to be disturbing the peace of the Church, amongst them the Eustathians. This letter is a remarkable testimony against the existence of the Papal Monarchy in this age of the Church. For how do the Bishops proceed? They address not as suppliants at the feet of the Sovereign Master of the Episcopal College, Damasus, begging him to exercise the divinely bestowed powers of the 'Apostolic Primacy,' which was his, and so finally settle all disputes by an act which would necessarily receive the obedience of all. On the contrary, they approach 'the Westerns,' relying on Episcopal authority against those who 'work confusion among us,' saying, 'Our language is suspected by many, as if we acted for them in a mean and narrow spirit through certain private grudges. But you, inasmuch as you are far removed from them in space, have so much more the credit with the people; besides, that the grace of God co-operates with you to succour those who are quite overborne. But if, further, a great number of you with one voice pass the same decrees, it is plain that the number of those who join in the decree will cause its reception to be undisputed by all . . . we know very well that we ought to sit together in synod with your prudence and to take common counsel on these points; but since the time does not allow this, and delay is hurtful, inasmuch as their mischief has taken root, we could not do otherwise than send these brethren to inform you of any points passed over in the letter, and to move your Piety to provide the wished for assistance to the Churches of God.'[2] This appeal was likewise fruitless, for although a Synod was held at Rome under Damasus, in which 'the banished Peter of Alexandria[3] took part,' in A.D. 376,[4] at which Apollinaris and the Apollinarian Bishops Timothy and Vitalis at Alexandria and Antioch were condemned, no Bishops were sent to the succour of the Easterns, as they had asked, probably owing to the evil advice of those interested people to which St. Basil referred as the source of the bad information

[1] Bossuet, *Gallia Orthodoxa*, cap. lxv. [*Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, vol. i. p. 58. Lugani, 1766.]

[2] *Ep. ad Occidentales inter Epp. S. Basil.*, Ep. cclxiii.; P.G. xxxii. 977, 981.

[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 91. [E.T. ii. 290.]

[4] See Hefele (*op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 92. E.T. ii. 220). Father Puller gives the date as 'probably in the course of the year 376, but possibly not till 377' (*op. cit.*, 326. Third Edit.).

which the Westerns had of Eastern affairs, viz. the Eustathians. Nothing was consequently done. St. Meletius continued to be recognised by the Easterns as the true Bishop of Antioch, whilst the Arian persecution continued till the accession of Gratian, who was a Catholic, and who issued a decree enabling Orthodox Bishops who had been exiled to return to their Sees.

683. 'The testimony' of St. Basil can now be summed up. He and the Easterns had two grave difficulties to contend with. First, the powerful opposition of the Arian heresy, 'which was widely prevalent in the East.' Cardinal Newman thus describes the condition of affairs: —'The disorders of Christendom, and especially of the East, and still more of Asia Minor, were so great in Basil's days, that a spectator might have foretold the total overthrow of the Church. So violent a convulsion never has been experienced in Christendom since; it would almost seem as if the powers of evil, foreseeing what the kingdom of the saints would be when once heathen persecutions ceased, were making a final effort to destroy it. In Asia Minor the Church was almost without form and void; religious interests were reduced, as it were, to chaos.'[1] If ever there was a time when the 'Supreme Pastor of the One Flock' would have been appealed to, finally to determine the miserable controversy which raged, it was during this period; nay, rather, the august authority of the Papal Monarch would necessarily, one would have expected, been used without any such appeal being made, in that the unity of the Church was at stake, and the very object of the existence of the Papacy, with its divinely bestowed 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,'[2] is to preserve the unity of the faith and the Divine Constitution of the Church. Not only was no such use made of these divinely given prerogatives, but also St. Basil and the Easterns clearly were unconscious of their existence. They did not call to their aid the authority, supreme and final, of the Roman Pontiff, but, on the contrary, asked for the assistance of the 'Westerns' regarding the authority of a Synod as that which had the power to deal successfully with the state of affairs which had arisen. The second difficulty was the apparent indifference of the Westerns to their miserable plight. Hence they directed their efforts to arousing 'the Bishops of the West' to a sense of their responsibilities. Again and again they urged them to take action. They attribute no unique authority to 'the Westerns' as a body, still less to one whom they included amongst them; their authority was of like nature to that which they themselves possessed, but the moral value of their authority was increased by their distance from the scene of the controversies, so that they would be regarded as impartial. They thus brought this forward as a reason why

[1] Newman, *The Church of the Fathers*, ch. ii. p. 30. Edit. 1873.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.

'the Westerns' should accede to their request. The Bishop of Rome is clearly included in the general description of 'the Westerns,' 'the Bishops of the West,' 'the Bishops of Italy and Gaul,' and merely regarded as 'their leader,' a description which *ipso facto* excludes him from being regarded by St. Basil as occupying even that position with reference to the Easterns. The sweeping language, too, used by the great doctor with reference to 'Western pride,' with evident reference to Damasus, whom he describes as 'one high lifted up, sitting on I know not how lofty a seat, and so not able to catch the voice of those who tell him the truth on the ground,'[1] is such as no Bishop who regarded the Bishop of Rome as his 'Master' could have used of him.

684. So far as any individual Bishop was looked to for assistance, it was St. Athanasius and not the Roman Bishop. It was the Council which St. Athanasius held at Alexandria[2] in A.D. 362 that laid down the terms on which Arians who desired it might be readmitted to the unity of the Church. It was to the authority of St. Athanasius that St. Basil appealed when he defended his reception of those who had been secretly Arians upon the profession of orthodoxy. He did it, he says, 'not suffering myself to form a judgment entirely on my own responsibility concerning them, but following the decrees passed concerning them by our Fathers. For I received a letter from the blessed Father Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, which I have in my hands, and show to those who ask to see it, in which he plainly declared that if any was minded to come over from the Arian heresy, and confess the faith of Nicæa, such an one should be received without hesitation; and he cited to me, as joining in this decree, all the Bishops both of Macedonia and Achaia; and I conceived it necessary to follow so great a man, on account of the trustworthiness of those who passed the law.'[3]

685 How great was the authority attributed to St. Athanasius in this matter may be gathered from the fact that when his letter to 'the Lord, my son and most dear fellow-minister Rufinanus,'[4] giving an account of what had been decreed at the Council of Alexandria, and adhered to by Councils in Greece, Spain, and Gaul, had been read at the Seventh Synod, 'the most holy Patriarch Tarasius said the decision of our Father Athanasius instructs us, that the most reverend Bishops are to be received, if there be no other cause against them.'[5] It is not a little significant that in this letter there is no reference to any action of a Roman Council, though such a reference was interpolated into it and read at the Council just referred to.[6] The work was that of

[1] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Dorotheum*, Ep. ccxv.; P.G. xxxii. 792. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 667.
[3] S. Basil, *Ep. ad Neocæsarienses*, Ep. cciv.; P.G. xxxii. 744.
[4] S. Athan., *Ep. ad Rufinanum*; P.G. xxvi. 1180-81. [5] Mansi, xii. 1034.
[6] Father Puller, *op. cit.*, 269, note 1, gives proof that the words, 'these things were written in Rome and were received by the Church of the Romans' (Mansi, xii. 1030), are an interpolation. They are excluded by the Benedictines from their text.

St. Athanasius and not that of the Roman Bishop; indeed, the West took but a subordinate part in the work, which St. Jerome describes as follows: 'On the return of the confessors it was determined, in a Synod afterwards held at Alexandria, that, with the exception of the authors of the heresy, who could not be excused on the ground of having made a mistake, those who repented should be admitted to communion with the Church; not that those, who had been heretics, could be Bishops; but because it was clear that those, who were received, had not been heretics. *The West assented to this decision*; and it was by means of this most necessary decree that the world was snatched from the jaws of Satan,'[1] the Council, which passed the 'decree,' being, as Tillemont says, 'one of the most important which has ever been held.'[2] The Easterns knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy. The Episcopate was to them the supreme authority in the Church, and it was to the Episcopate of the West that they looked for assistance in bringing about that peace of which they were so greatly in need.

686. This 'testimony' afforded by the conduct of St. Basil and the Easterns under the circumstances of their time is of the utmost significance, and it is not difficult to understand why a writer like Maximus should be quoted in the *Satis Cognitum* as the 'testimony' of the East in favour of its allegation that obedience to the Roman Pontiff is proof of 'true faith and legitimate communion,' and why the 'evident testimony' of the great Eastern doctor of the fourth century, so truly representative of the East, is not so adduced.

Section LXXXIX.—'*The testimony*' *of St. Chrysostom.*

687. Like St. Basil, another great Eastern doctor, St. Chrysostom, finds no place in the *Satis Cognitum* as a witness in this connection. Why is not his 'evident testimony' adduced here? Is it because he was in the same entire ignorance of the existence of the Papal Monarchy *jure divino* in the Church as was St. Basil? The evidence will show whether he regarded 'union with the Roman See of Peter' as 'the public criterion of a Catholic,'[3] or held that the Roman Pontiffs receive the supreme power in the Church *jure divino*.

688. In the first place, this great saint and doctor of the Church lived the greater part of his ministerial life out of communion with Rome. He was baptized in A.D. 369, when he was twenty-three years old, by St. Meletius, and made by him a Reader. St. Meletius ordained him Deacon in A.D. 380, and he was raised to the Priesthood by St. Flavian, the successor of St. Meletius in the Chair of Antioch, in A.D. 386.[4] Both

[1] S. Hieron., *Dialog. adversus Luciferanos*, sect. 20; P.L. xxiii. 174, 175.
[2] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, viii. 206.
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 31.
[4] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. p. 321, *sub v.* 'Chrysostom.'

St. Meletius and St. Flavian were, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, 'outside the edifice,' 'separated from the fold,' and 'exiled from the Kingdom,' inasmuch as they were not in communion with the Roman Pontiff, who acknowledged Paulinus as the rightful occupant of the Antiochene throne. St. Chrysostom, by receiving baptism and ordination at their hands, emphatically declared that he recognised them as the Bishops who in succession exercised the jurisdiction of the See of Antioch, and thus rejected the pretensions of Paulinus as those of an intruder. St. Meletius, too, he, when preaching at his tomb, invoked as a saint, whilst of St. Flavian he asserted that not only was he the successor of Peter in virtue, but also the inheritor of his See;[1] his repudiation of Paulinus could not have been more marked.

689. Similarly, when Paulinus consecrated, contrary to the Canons,[2] Evagrius to be his successor[3] on his death in A.D. 389, St. Chrysostom actively declined to recognise him. The fact that Paulinus had to consecrate Evagrius without the co-operation of any other Bishop, shows that the whole Antiochene Patriarchate was at one with St. Chrysostom in his repudiation of the Eustathian Bishops. He emphatically warns the people of Antioch against joining the body which recognised Evagrius. They were to him schismatics. In a sermon preached at Antioch in A.D. 395,[4] he denounced the act of 'those who are deserting from' St. Flavian's flock as an 'act of adultery.'[5] Such is the way in which this great doctor characterises the conduct of those who, to use the language of our day, 'went over' to what on Papalist principles was 'the Church' at Antioch. A more severe condemnation it would be impossible to pronounce, it emphasises in a way which none can affect to misunderstand the fact that to St. Chrysostom the schismatics at Antioch were those who were in communion[6] with Rome and 'the true Church,' that which was ruled over by Flavian, who on Papalist principles was incapable of

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Hom. ii. in Inscript. Antiochium*, n. 6; P.G. lii. 86.

[2] Apostolic Canon I.; Apost. Constitution VII., 4, 27; Canon IV. of Nicæa; Canon V., Arles, A.D. 443, etc.

[3] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. v. cap. xxiii.; P.G. lxxxii. 1248.

[4] *Cp.* Oxford, *Lib. of the Fathers*; S. Chrysostom, *Hom. on Eph.* x., p. 220, note *b*.

[5] S. Chrysostom, *Hom. on Eph.* xi.; P.G. lxii. 88.

[6] It is practically certain that Evagrius was at the time of the delivery of this homily in communion with Rome. The Council of Capua in A.D. 391 had referred the case of the rival successions at Antioch to Theophilus of Alexandria and the Bishops of Egypt (S. Ambros., *Ep.*, lvi. sect. 8; P.L. xvi. 1171-2). Flavian naturally refused to submit his case to these prelates, not only because judgment had already been given in his favour by his recognition by the Bishops of the East, who were the rightful judges in the matter, but also because Theophilus and the Egyptians had formally recognised Evagrius (Theodoret, *H. E.*, v. 23; P.G. lxxxii. 1248). Flavian's refusal would result in the recognition of Evagrius as the true Bishop of Antioch by the Bishops of the West.

possessing the power of ruling, in that he was 'separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice must rest,'[1] which proves that he knew nothing of the monarchical position which is alleged in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs.

690. It was not until after his consecration in A.D. 398 to the See of Constantinople by Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, that St. Chrysostom entered into communion with Rome. Theophilus was himself in communion with Rome, and that he should have consecrated St. Chrysostom, who reverenced St. Flavian as his spiritual father, and was out of communion with Rome, to the second See in Christendom, is an eloquent testimony that the Egyptians knew nothing of communion with Rome being 'the public criterion of a Catholic.' St. Chrysostom laboured from the beginning of his Episcopate to bring about peace between the Bishops of the East and those of the West and Egypt. Between the Egyptians and himself communion existed, Theophilus having consecrated him. He brought Theophilus and Flavian to a reconciliation, and finally Theophilus, on his entreaty, joined with him in an effort to negotiate peace between Rome, the West, and the East. The negotiations were successful, and Acacius, one of the messengers who had conducted them, returned to Syria, bringing to Flavian letters of pacification from the Bishops of Egypt and the West. Thus was communion established between these churches.[2] It must not be forgotten that it was during the long period when St. Chrysostom was not in communion with 'the One Supreme Shepherd,' the Roman Pontiff, that he composed the greater part of his commentaries on the sacred Scriptures.[3] They would thus be on Papalist principles the works of a schismatic, yet the Church never so regarded these writings. Nor is there to be found in them any consciousness that the writer was in such an awful position as being 'separated from the fold.'

691. Enough has been said to show why the 'evident testimony' of St. Chrysostom finds no place in the *Satis Cognitum* in this connection. The great doctor's language and conduct alike would protest against any attempt to adduce him as a fautor of Papalism. Like St. Basil, his great friend, he knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy as an integral part of the Divine Constitution of the Church necessary to its very existence. *They* represent the true teaching of the East, not a Latinised Eastern like Maximus. The fact that the latter's 'testimony' is adduced[4] in this connection, and the 'evident testimony' of the former ignored, is eloquent of the inherent incompatibility existing

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35.
[2] Fleury, *op. cit.*, bk. xx. cap. xli. [Tom. ii. 130. Edit. 1856.]
[3] *Cp.* Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. p. 522.
[4] On the value of his 'testimony,' *vide supra* nn. 659, 662.

between Papalism and 'the venerable and constant belief' of the Church in the 'age' of these Saints.[1]

Section XC.—'*The testimony*' *of St. Cyril of Alexandria.*

692. St. Cyril of Alexandria gives evidence of like tenour to that afforded by St. Basil and St. Chrysostom by the way in which he treated the action taken by the Roman Bishop with regard to the latter. St. Chrysostom having incurred the enmity of Theophilus of Alexandria, was through his efforts deposed at a Synod held *ad Quercum*, near Chalcedon, A.D. 403, and again at a Synod, largely composed of his enemies, held in the following year. Innocent I. interested himself on behalf of St. Chrysostom,[2] but the Easterns resenting any interference by the West, Innocent and the Westerns did not hold communion with Theophilus nor with Atticus, who had been intruded into the See of Constantinople during the lifetime of St. Chrysostom, since they refused to place St. Chrysostom's name on the 'diptychs,' which was the condition on compliance with which communion would be restored. Alexander, Bishop of Antioch, was the first to do this, in A.D. 415,[3] and Atticus, yielding to the entreaty of the people and the authority of the Emperor, took the same course in A.D. 417, and thus communion was again restored between them and the West.

693. Theophilus, however, died in A.D. 412,[4] without having placed St. Chrysostom's name on the diptychs. His successor, his nephew St. Cyril, continued to take the same line in the matter, and when Atticus wrote to him both justifying his own conduct and exhorting him to follow his example, St. Cyril in his reply blamed Atticus 'for having placed the name of John in the rank of the Bishops as an attempt against the Canons.'[5] It was not until A.D. 419 that St. Cyril put St. Chrysostom's name on the diptychs of his Church, with the result that once more the whole East became in communion with the West.

694. Now, whether St. Cyril was right or wrong in the action which he took in this case in no way affects the evidence which such action affords as to the way in which he regarded the Roman See. The incident proves that he preferred to remain out of communion with the Bishop of Rome rather than do that which that Bishop had the right, as any other Bishop would have had, to require as a condition of communion with himself. The inevitable conclusion is that St. Cyril knew nothing of that 'real and sovereign authority which the

[1] On the 'appeal' of S. Chrysostom to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, *vide infra* nn. 718 *et seq.*

[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 721 *et seq.*

[3] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. v. cap. xxxv.; P.G. lxxxii. 1265.

[4] On the position of Theophilus, *vide* note 50.

[5] Fleury, *op. cit.*, bk. xxiii. cap. xxvii. [Tom. ii. 245. Paris, 1856.]

whole community is bound to obey,' belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs as the legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, otherwise he would necessarily have obeyed the sovereign command of his 'Master.' Nor would he have dared, as he valued his salvation, to be and to persist in remaining for so many years out of communion with 'the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' which none can do according to Papalism, his faith and salvation being preserved.[1]

695. 'The evident testimony' of these holy Fathers of the East, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, all great doctors, all witnesses to the true tradition of the Eastern Churches, is, it must be admitted, widely different in character to that of Maximus, who was not only, as has been seen,[2] from the circumstances under which he wrote, more of a Latin than an Eastern, but was also some two centuries or more later in date, by which time the Petrine idea had developed in Rome, where he was at the time the letter quoted was written. The 'evident testimonies' of *these* 'holy Fathers' would have been worse than useless for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*, since they expose the falsity of its contention that the Papal Monarchy was 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,'[3] hence they are naturally not adduced in this connection. The significance of this is obvious.

[1] For additional 'testimony' of St. Cyril as regards Papalism, *vide supra*, nn. 351 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 659, 662.
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

CHAPTER XIX

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE EASTERNS—PART II.

SECTION XCI.—*Alleged 'Appeals' of Easterns to Rome.*

696. But, it may be said, did not great Eastern Bishops, such as St. Athanasius and St. Chrysostom, as a matter of fact 'appeal' to Rome, and thus recognise the Bishop of that See as the supreme judge of all Christians? Did not this show that they believed in the Papal supremacy?

The argument appears plausible, but a little consideration will show that, supposing the fact be that Easterns did 'appeal' to Rome, it by no means supports the allegation sought to be proved by it. It is necessary to bear in mind, in considering this argument, that, as has been already shown,[1] there lies upon the Bishops, inasmuch as the Episcopate is one of which each Bishop enjoys full possession, care for the whole Church. As St. Cyril says, 'one is the solicitude of priests, though we be divided in position.'[2] The duty of Bishops towards the Church was thus not confined within the limits of the diocese wherewith they had been entrusted.

697. This care was exercised in various ways. For example, St. Cyprian sent to the confessors, Maximus, Nicostratus, and others who had been deceived by Novatian into supporting a schism against the legitimate Bishops of Rome, warning them of the unlawful character of their proceeding and its consequences, and exhorting them to return to the Church, their mother, and to the brotherhood.[3]

In a different way we find, for instance, St. Eusebius of Samosata exercising the same care when the Emperor Valens was making havoc of the Church. St. Eusebius had been banished to Thrace, and 'understanding that many churches were deprived of their pastors, assumed the garb of a soldier, and putting a tiara on his head went over all the countries of Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, ordaining priests and deacons, and performing other ecclesiastical offices among them. And

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 41 *et seq.*

[2] S. Cyril Alex., *Ep. ad Atticum*, Ep. lxxvii.; P.G. lxxvii. 355.

[3] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Confessores Romanos*, Ep. xlvi. 2; Hartel, 605.

when he found Bishops who agreed in doctrine with him, he set them over those Churches that wanted Pastors.'[1]

698. Since, then, Bishops had this care laid upon them, so that as Bishops they were bound to help in case of need those who were suffering from the efforts of those who were endeavouring to break the unity of the Church, or in any way disturb its peace, it naturally followed that those who considered that they were enduring wrong at the hands of their own immediate Pastors or Provincial Bishops would implore such help from other Bishops, whether the treatment complained of was just or not; and although the Canons required that all controversies should, in the regular course of procedure, be determined where they first arose,[2] yet this method of obtaining redress was largely made use of, and in many instances the aid sought was not refused by the Bishops to whom such appeals were made. It was, of course, abused in certain cases. Heretics were not slow to avail themselves of a course which presented to them the great attraction and advantage, from their point of view, of removing the consideration of their cause away from the place where the facts were more likely to be accurately known. Hence St. Cyprian complains of certain persons sent by Novatian to Africa, that they 'ran up and down from door to door through the houses of many, and from town to town through several cities, seeking to themselves companions in their obstinacy and error.'[3]

699. There were many instances in which this assistance was thus invoked. For example, it has already been seen[4] how Basilides and Martial sought the assistance of Stephen, Bishop of Rome, against the Bishops of Spain, taking advantage of his distance from the scene where the alleged injustice took place. On the other hand, in the same case the Bishops of Spain betook themselves to St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the nearest great See to Spain, who, in consequence of his being a neighbour, would be able to arrive at an accurate judgment on the whole matter, for aid against St. Stephen's proceedings, which St. Cyprian thereupon afforded to them.[5] In another case, when Privatus, an old heretic in the colony of Lambesis, who had years before been condemned for many heinous crimes by ninety Bishops, wished to plead his case before St. Cyprian and the Council on the Ides of May A.D. 252, he was not permitted to do so.[6]

700. So the 'Long Brothers' and others who had been driven from their homes by Theophilus of Alexandria[7] craved the aid of St.

[1] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. iv. cap. xii.; P.G. lxxxii. 1148.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 306, 342, 620.
[3] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xliv. 3; Hartel, 598, 599.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 574 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 575.
[6] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lix. 10; Hartel, 677.
[7] *Vide infra*, n. 718.

Chrysostom. Accordingly St. Chrysostom wrote to Theophilus asking him to receive them because they were orthodox in the faith, and, if he thought their case should be reheard, requesting him to name some one who should be authorised to begin the process against them.[1]

In like manner St. Cyril of Alexandria received an appeal from one Peter, an aged Bishop in the Patriarchate of Antioch, who considered that he had been unjustly expelled from his See on the pretext of a renunciation thereof which had been extorted from him. St. Cyril, in consequence of this appeal, wrote a letter to Domnus, the Patriarch of Antioch, asking him 'to have regard to his letter and stop the tears of the old man.'[2]

701. To the same prelate, together with Proclus of Constantinople, Athanasius of Perrha appealed also against certain proceedings of the same Patriarch of Antioch as Peter. He succeeded by misrepresentations in inducing them to intercede for him, and asking that fit persons should be sent to inquire into the accusations which Athanasius brought against certain clerics of his diocese, so that the guilty should be deposed.[3]

702. Naturally the aid of the greater Sees would be the most frequently invoked, and amongst them the Roman See would certainly be applied to more frequently than the others. The position held by that See as admittedly the first of the Patriarchal Sees, as the one seated in the Imperial City, with its special opportunities for increasing its prestige, in the West as the one 'Apostolic See' in that part of Christendom, and in the East as the See through which ordinary communications were made with the West, tended to make this inevitable, especially in cases in which the occupants of the other Patriarchal thrones were aggrieved or injured.

703. As a matter of fact, such 'appeals' were made in which the assistance of the Bishops of Rome was implored against manifold violence. Petitions were the more readily addressed to the Bishops who occupied that chair owing to the fact that, with such unhappy exceptions as Liberius[4] and Honorius,[5] the Roman Bishops steadfastly defended the orthodox faith against the attacks of heresy. The comparative peace, too, enjoyed by the West during the periods when the orthodox Easterns were harassed by the machinations of these early heretics, would further dispose them to seek aid in their difficulties from the great See of the West, through which alone they had, as a rule, communication with the Western Bishops whose aid would be of such value in the struggle in which they were engaged. When the

[1] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, viii. cap. xiii. ; P.G. lxvii. 1549.
[2] S. Cyril Alex., *Ep. ad Domnum*, Ep. lxxvii. ; P.G. lxxvii. 360.
[3] *Ibid.* [4] *Vide infra*, nn. 758 *et seq.* [5] *Vide infra*, nn. 782 *et seq.*

various cases of 'Appeals to Rome' which are adduced in support of the allegation embodied in the query at the beginning of this Section are considered, it will be found that they are cases of this character, viz. of persons who, compelled by necessity, sought in their difficulties the powerful aid of the Bishops of Rome, as others sought aid in their difficulties from other Prelates, which they had the right to invoke, inasmuch as care for the whole Church is incumbent upon every Bishop who enjoys *in solidum* the one Episcopate.

Section XCII.—*The 'Appeal' of St. Athanasius.*

704. St. Athanasius was deposed at the Synod of Tyre in A.D. 335, and forbidden to return to Alexandria. The proceedings of the Eusebians, to whose efforts this result was owing, were of such an unjust character as to call forth a protest from those Egyptian Bishops who were present, which they addressed in a letter to the Imperial Protector of the Synod, Count Dionysius.[1]

St. Athanasius endeavoured himself to interest the Emperor Constantine in his case, but in vain, the Eusebians sending the leaders of their body to Constantinople, with the result that he was exiled to Treves. He returned to Alexandria in triumph in A.D. 338, but was again driven out, being deprived again, with the consent of the Emperor Constantius II. in A.D. 340, by the Eusebians at an assembly at Antioch,[2] and Gregory, a Cappadocian, was intruded into the See.

705. St. Athanasius went to Rome, and his case was taken up by St. Julius, the then occupant of the Roman See. St. Julius had already given an invitation to a Synod to the Eusebians by the messengers whom they had sent to prejudice him against St. Athanasius in A.D. 339, and who, when embarrassed by the defenders of St. Athanasius, had demanded a Synod before which they could lay full and sufficient proof of their charges against St. Athanasius. This invitation he now repeated, sending it to Antioch by two of his priests, Elpidius and Philoxenus, fixing, it would appear, a definite limit of time before the end of A.D. 340 for the Council.

706. The Eusebians, however, instead of replying at once, detained the messengers until after the time appointed for the Synod, and then sent them back with a letter to St. Julius.

In it, according to Sozomen, they said 'that the Church of the Romans is indeed honourable among all as having been the school of the Apostles and the metropolis of piety from the beginning, not but the original teachers of the faith came to it from the East. Not,

[1] *Cp.* Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. iii. sect. 50. [E.T. ii. p. 25.]
[2] *Ibid.*, bk. iii. sect. 54. [E.T. ii. 51.]

however, for this were they content to take the second place, being, as they were, eminent for virtue and firmness of mind, inasmuch as they did not grasp at more than their due by means of the greatness and p›pulousness of their Church. And they bring accusations against Julius for having communicated with Athanasius and the rest, and complained that their Synod [of Tyre] was insulted and its decision annulled, and censured what had been done as unjust and contrary to ecclesiastical rule. Having made their censures and declared they had been greatly wronged, they offered peace and communion to Julius if he would receive the deposition of those whom they had expelled, and the establishment of those whom they had elected in their stead, but if he resisted their decree they threatened a contrary course. . . . But as to their conduct in reference to the decrees of Nicæa, they did not even make him any answer, stating that they had many reasons wherewith to defend what had been done, but it was superfluous to clear themselves on those points, as they were suspected of general injustice throughout.'[1]

707. St. Julius, notwithstanding the uncompromising tone of this letter, still hoped that some of the Antiochenes would yet perhaps come to the Council, and therefore delayed its publication. Time however went on, and when St. Athanasius had been eighteen months at Rome, and none appeared, he held the Council in November A.D 341,[2] at which some fifty Bishops were present, amongst them being Bishops from Thrace and Palestine. This Synod declared the deposition of St. Athanasius to be unjust, and received him to communion. At the request of the Council, St. Julius wrote to the Antiochenes to explain this; a letter which St. Athanasius has embodied in his *Apology against the Arians.*

708. In this remarkable letter, St. Julius, it is to be observed, does not tell the Antiochenes that as 'the Supreme Judge of the Faithful' St. Athanasius had had recourse to his judgment, and that, exercising his office, he had decided that St. Athanasius was innocent of the charges brought against him, and therefore the question was settled, since his judgment could not be reviewed by any one. On the contrary, he takes an essentially different line. He proceeds to justify the proceedings of the Synod which had acquitted St. Athanasius, dealing with the objections which the Eusebians had raised against the holding of such a Synod. 'He had desired them to attend a Synod, and he who has confidence in his own cause will not be displeased with an examination into his sentence; even the Fathers of the great Nicene Council had given them permission that the decisions of one Synod should be tried by another, besides which, their own messengers had

[1] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. cap. viii.; P.G. lxvii. 1152.
[2] *Vide* Hefele, *op. cit.* bk. iii. sect. 55. [E.T. ii. 53, note 8.]

themselves demanded a Synod when they found that they could make no stand against the messengers of Athanasius. They themselves, too, had violated the decrees of Nicæa by receiving those Arians who had been by them condemned. It was they who contemned the decrees of Synods. If they said that the authority of a Bishop did not depend upon the size of a town, then they should have been satisfied with their small Sees, and not have attempted, like Eusebius of Nicomedia, to thrust themselves into more important ones. He had not written in his own name alone, but in the name of all the Italian and neighbouring Bishops, and this was also the case with the present letter. Athanasius and Marcellus had been, with good reason, again received into the communion of the Church. The charges brought against Athanasius were in themselves contradictory; the Egyptian Bishops had given him the best possible character, and he had waited a year and six months at Rome for his accusers. Meanwhile they, the Antiochenes, had appointed a new Bishop, contrary to the Canons, to Alexandria, consecrating him, contrary to custom, at Antioch, and sending him to Alexandria with a military force. Supposing, as you assert, that some offence rested upon those persons—Athanasius and Marcellus—the case ought to have been conducted against them, not after this manner but according to the Canons of the Church. Word should have been written of it to us all, that so what was just might be determined by all. For the sufferers were Bishops, and Churches of no ordinary note, but those which the Apostles themselves had personally governed.

709. And why was nothing said to us concerning the Church of the Alexandrians in particular? Are you ignorant that the custom has been for word to be written first to us and then for a just sentence to be passed from this place? If, then, any such suspicion rested upon the Bishop there, notice thereof ought to have been sent to the Church of this place, whereas, after neglecting to inform us, and proceeding on their own authority as they pleased, now they desire to obtain our concurrence in their decisions, though we never condemned him. Not so have the constitutions of Paul, not so have the traditions of the Fathers directed; this is another form of procedure, a novel practice. I beseech you readily to bear with me, what I write is for the common good. For what we have received from the blessed Apostle Peter, that I signify to you, and I should not have written this as deeming that these things were manifest unto all men, had not these proceedings so disturbed us. Bishops are forced away from their Sees and driven into banishment, whilst others from different quarters are appointed in their place; others are treacherously assailed, so that the people have to grieve for those who are forcibly taken from them, while as to those who are sent in their room, they are

obliged to give over seeking the man whom they desire, and receive those they do not.'[1]

710. It will be observed (1) first, that St. Julius did not write as if he himself had personally, as Supreme Judge, declared St. Athanasius to be innocent, but in the name of the Synod by which the great doctor had been acquitted; (2) secondly, he complains that if St. Athanasius had been in the wrong, the matter should have been formally brought before *all*, that *all* might give a just decision. The ground he thus takes being that such cases as those which concerned so eminent a See as Alexandria ought to have been brought before a Synod which represented the Episcopate at large, and not before Synods, such as that of Tyre, which did not possess that authority of the One Episcopate, and so was unfitted to deal with a case affecting a See in which had sat the disciple of St. Peter and St. Paul, to whose directions and traditions he refers as the guide by which such matters ought to be decided; (3) thirdly, he appeals to a particular custom which he alleged existed with regard to the Church of the Alexandrians which had been violated, in that they had not informed the Church of Rome that a just sentence might be passed from there.[2]

711. The position thus taken up by St. Julius is clearly incompatible with Papalism. There is not only no exercise of the office of Supreme Judge possessed 'of real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' but the grounds of his complaint are such as are entirely inconsistent with any such office belonging to him *jure divino* as the 'successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate.' For he says (1) the sentence should have been passed by *all*, after *all* had had the case formally brought before them — it is the One Episcopate which is the Supreme judicial authority in the opinion of St. Julius, not the Roman Bishop; (2) next, that he had a special claim to be consulted which had been ignored, which claim he based on 'a custom.'

712. Now, if Papalist theory of the Divine Constitution of the Church were true, St. Julius would have been bound, in faithful discharge of the divinely bestowed office of Supreme Pastor which he held, to have demanded, in so weighty a cause, the full recognition of his rights as Supreme Judge of the Faithful, and such action on his part would, as has been said, have closed the matter. All parties must have so recognised these rights, the faith which was imperilled by the action of the Antiochenes would have been safeguarded by the Supreme Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, Rome would have spoken, and the cause would have been finished. No other course, indeed, is conceivable, if the Bishop of Rome held by the institution

[1] S. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, 20 *seq.*; P.G. xxv. 281 *seq.*

[2] On this alleged 'custom,' *vide* note 51.

of Christ that supreme position in the Church which is asserted to be his by the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum*. The importance, therefore, of the evidence against the Papal Monarchy afforded by this letter of St. Julius is very great.

713. The weight of that witness is enhanced greatly by the fact that even the position which the writer had taken up with reference to St. Athanasius had been challenged by the Antiochenes, and his letter was a reply to one which contained a denial that any special authority belonged to the Roman See, seated as it was in the chief city of the world. If Papalism had been 'the venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of St. Julius, he would have been bound at once, when thus challenged, to have vindicated for his See its divinely bestowed prerogatives, stating them in definite language which would have at once shown to Christendom the untenable position which the Antiochenes had taken up with reference to 'the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock.' He did not do so, and he deals with the denial of the Antiochenes in a manner which shows that he was ignorant of those divinely bestowed prerogatives, simply pointing out to them that their own practice in striving to obtain important Sees was inconsistent with that denial, thus implying that themselves being judges, some additional authority would accrue to the See seated in the Imperial City.[1]

714. From what has been said, it will be seen that St. Athanasius did not have 'recourse' to the judgment of the Supreme Judge of the Faithful, he did not 'appeal to Rome,' but to the West as a whole, for assistance, a conclusion which is corroborated by the statement made by St. Ambrose in a letter written by him in the name of a Council held in Italy, (probably at Milan), in A.D. 381, viz. that 'Athanasius of holy memory . . . Bishop of the Church of Alexandria . . . seem[s] to have had recourse to the judgment of the Roman Church, of Italy, and of the whole West.'[2] The application for such assistance would naturally be made through the Roman Bishop, as he was the usual channel through whom communication from Easterns passed to Westerns. For as all communications between the two Empires passed through Rome, so in ecclesiastical matters a similar custom was found convenient, and so he would be the one through whom it would be easiest to get into contact with the rest of the Bishops in the Western Empire, who, too, would be more likely to be influenced on his behalf by the Bishop of the sole Apostolic See of the West, whose chair was, too, placed in the Imperial City, and whose moral authority with them would be great.

715. But the question further arises, Did the Easterns admit that the

[1] On Sozomen's statement with reference to this letter, *vide* note 52.

[2] S. Ambros., *Ep. inter Epp. S. Ambrosii*, Ep. xiii.; P.L. xvi. 850.

Western Episcopate had even the limited right to interfere in matters which concerned the East, which St. Julius asserted on its behalf? The answer must be in the negative, for at the Synod held at Antioch, *in Encæniis*, A.D. 341, certain Canons were promulgated which cannot be reconciled with such a right, viz. the Fourteenth and Fifteenth. Canon XIV. is as follows:—

> 'If a Bishop is to be condemned for certain offences, and the Bishops of the Eparchy are divided in opinion concerning him, some holding him to be innocent and others guilty, the holy Synod decrees, for the removal of all doubt, that the Metropolitan of the neighbouring Eparchy shall summon other Bishops, who shall try the matter, clear up the doubt, and, with the Bishops of the Province, confirm the decision.'

And Canon XV.:—

> 'If a Bishop accused of certain offences has been tried by all the Bishops of the Eparchy, and all have unanimously given sentence against him, he may not be tried again by others, but the unanimous decision of the Bishops of the Eparchy must hold good.'[1]

716. These two Canons deal with every case in which a Bishop is concerned. If the court of the Eparchy is divided, a new court of other Bishops is ordered to be constituted by the Metropolitan of the neighbouring Eparchy, whose decision shall be accepted by the Bishops of the first court and shall be final, no such new hearing, however, being allowed in a case in which decision of the first court has been unanimous. The system thus laid down provides, it is plain, for the decision of all such cases in the district where they arose, and precludes their being carried out of the East to the West. In fact, the line taken by the Synod is exactly that followed by the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 382, who declined to admit the claim made by St. Ambrose in the letter written in the name of an Italian Synod, which has been already quoted,[2] to have a share in the 'examination' of cases like that of Maximus, which was decided at Constantinople[3] without any reference to the West.[4]

717. It cannot be objected against these Canons that they were passed by Arians and are therefore of no authority, for (1) first, it is probable that the Eusebians formed the smallest party amongst the Bishops present, all others being reckoned amongst the orthodox,[5] the Synod indeed being called by St. Hilary *Synodus Sanctorum*;[6] (2) secondly, 'these Canons of Antioch have always been held by the

[1] Mansi, ii. 1313. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 714. [3] *Vide supra*, n. 540.
[4] On the case of Paul of Samosata, *vide* note 53.
[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. iii. sect. 56. [E.T. ii. 58.]
[6] S. Hilar., *De Synodis seu de fide Orientalium*, cap. 32; P.L. x. 504.

Church as great authorities,' two of them, for example, being cited at the Council of Chalcedon among the 'Canons of the Holy Fathers';[1] (3) thirdly, these Canons received 'the confirmation of the Œcumenical Synod' of Chalcedon by its first Canon, 'in order to raise them,' as Hefele says, 'to the position of universally and unconditionally valid ecclesiastical rules';[2] and (4) lastly, they were declared to remain in force by the second Canon of the *Quinsext* or *Trullan* Synod of A.D. 692.[3]

On consideration, therefore, this 'appeal' of St. Athanasius proves that, so far from such 'appeal' being of any use to establish the accuracy of the allegations in the *Satis Cognitum* with regard to the Papal Monarchy, it witnesses to the fact that Papalism was not 'the venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of St. Athanasius.

SECTION XCIII.—*The 'Appeal' of St. Chrysostom.*

718. The 'appeal' alleged to have been made by St. Chrysostom to the Roman Bishop next comes under notice. The circumstances of the case are as follows:—Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, having anathematised in Synod the doctrines of Origen and his adherents, 'the Long Brothers,' four learned Egyptian monks and ecclesiastics who were especially aimed at in the latter designation, fled to Constantinople. St. Chrysostom, who was at that time Bishop of that See, received them kindly but would not admit them to communion, because they had been banished by their own Bishop. Theophilus, however, having been misinformed on the point, was greatly displeased with St. Chrysostom for what he considered to have been a violation of the laws of the Church. On the other hand, grave charges were brought against Theophilus by the Egyptian monks.

St. Chrysostom had raised up many enemies against himself by the reforms which he had accomplished since his elevation to the See, as well as by his eloquent preaching. To these malcontents Theophilus joined himself, and succeeded in obtaining the Emperor's sanction to summon St. Chrysostom before a Synod, instead of himself appearing before St. Chrysostom to justify himself against the accusations brought by the Egyptians. The Synod held in A.D. 403, on an Estate *ad Quercum* belonging to the Imperial prefect Rufinus, deposed St. Chrysostom, and the sentence was confirmed by another Synod held under court influence at Constantinople the following year. St. Chrysostom was thereupon sent, on the 9th of June A.D. 404, into exile, in which he endured great hardships.[4]

[1] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. ii. 59.] [2] *Ibid.*, bk. xi. sect. 200. [E.T. iii. 386.]
[3] Mansi, xi. 940.
[4] *Cp.* Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 116. [E.T. ii. 430 *et seq.*]

719. St. Chrysostom wrote to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia,[1] the three great prelates of the West. In this letter he says, after pointing out that because the laws of the Fathers 'laid down that causes should not be drawn beyond the countries to which they belonged, but the affairs of each province should be transacted there,' he had refused to act as a judge of Theophilus although requested to do so by the Emperor, he goes on to complain that Theophilus, on the contrary, 'eager to accomplish what was in his mind, though we declared that we were ready to answer his charge before a hundred or a thousand Bishops, and to show that we were innocent, as we are; but while we were absent, and appealed to a council, and sought for judgment, and declined not a hearing, but open enmity, he both required accusers and absolved those whom I had deprived of communion, and received complaints from those very persons who were not yet cleared themselves, and caused depositions to be made, all which things are contrary to the law and the order of the Canons. . . . Dragged through the middle of the city by the officer and hurried away by violence, I was taken and cast into a ship, and sailed by night, having appealed to a Synod for a just hearing . . . for if this custom is to grow into use, and those who will allowed to burst into the dioceses of others at a distance, and to cast men out at their pleasure, to take upon their own authority what measures they chose, be assured that all will be ruined and implacable war overrun the whole world, all men being engaged in hostilities. That so great confusion may not seize the whole world, be so good as to write that proceedings so lawless in our absence, one side only being heard, though we did not decline pleading, have no force as they have none by their own nature, and that they who have thus transgressed when convicted, be subjected to the punishment of the ecclesiastical laws. And let us who have neither been condemned nor proved guilty, nor set on our trial, enjoy continually the advantage of your letters and your affection, and that of all the rest which we used to enjoy.'[2]

720. In this letter St. Chrysostom complains to the Bishops of the three great Sees of the West of the conduct of the Patriarch of Alexandria as being contrary to the Canons, which provided that cases such as his should be decided in the provinces whence they arose, viz. Canons v. and vi. of Nicæa,[3] and Canon ii. of Constantinople.[4]

[1] Palladius, *Dial. Histor. de vita S. Joan. Chrysost.*, cap. iii., *ap. Chrysost. Opera*; P.G. xlvii. 12. Palladius adds at the close of the letter to Innocent, after the words 'to enjoy,' 'This has also been written to Venerius, Bp. of Milan, and Chromatius, Bp. of Aquileia, Farewell in the Lord.'

[2] S. Chrysostom, *Ep. ad Innocentium*; P.G. li. 531, 534.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 306 *et seq.*

[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 342, 344.

He further declares that he had appealed to a Synod against the unjust treatment he had received, and begs their assistance that those who had thus transgressed might, when convicted, be punished according to the ecclesiastical laws, and in this manner he might be restored to his See whence he had been driven out.

There is not the slightest trace of any 'appeal' to the 'Roman Pontiff' as to the Supreme Judge of the Faithful to whose jurisdiction the Synods of 'the Oak' and Constantinople were necessarily subject *iure divino*, the three Bishops are each asked to declare the proceedings against St. Chrysostom null and void *ab initio*, and to use their influence both to bring about the punishment of the transgressors according to the Canons, and also with the Court through whose action St. Chrysostom had been wrongly convicted and banished, that he might again be restored to his See.

721. Now, had St. Chrysostom held that Innocent was as 'the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate' the Supreme Judge of the Faithful, 'to whose judgment in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical discipline recourse may be had,'[1] he would not have written in such terms to three Bishops, but merely have appealed to Innocent alone as the one whose authority was universally allowed in the Church to be supreme, and consequently final. Innocent, too, on his part would, in the exercise of his office thus invoked, have after trial given the sentence which would have been conclusive, decreeing, if he thought fit, that the sentences appealed against were null and void, and punishing the authors thereof, or, on the other hand, decreeing that they should stand. So far, however, from Innocent taking this line, we find that he, in his letter to 'the Presbyters, and Deacons, and all the Clergy and people of the Church of Constantinople, who are under the Bishop John,' simply refers to the breach of the Canons 'which were set forth at Nicæa, which alone the Catholic Church ought to execute and acknowledge,' and declares that 'the reunion of a Council is necessary . . . for this alone can lay the commotions of such hurricanes.'[2] Palladius, Bishop of Hellenopolis, a disciple of St. Chrysostom, tells us that Innocent also wrote letters of communion to both St. Chrysostom and Theophilus, declaring that another unexceptionable Council of Westerns and Easterns ought to be assembled, from which first the friends and then the enemies of the parties should retire.[3]

722. Such a letter from Innocent to Theophilus is extant, in which he says :—'Brother Theophilus, we acknowledge both thee and Brother

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. ix. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

[2] S. Innocentius, P. I., *Epist.* vii.; P.L. 503, 505.

[3] Palladius, *Dial. Histor. de vita S. Joan Chrysost.*, cap. iii., *ap. Chrysost. Opera* P.G. xlvii. 12-13.

John to be in our communion, as in our first letters we made known our mind . . . except a fitting judgment follow upon such acts of mockery, it is impossible that we should without reason decline John's communion. So that if thou art confident in the judgment, meet the Council assembling according to Christ, and there set forth thy accusations according to the Canons of Nicæa, which alone the Roman Church acknowledges, and so thou wilt have undeniable security.'[1] Innocent also used his influence with Honorius, Emperor of the West, to write to Arcadius, the Emperor of the East, urging the convocation of a general Synod.[2]

723. The method of procedure thus adopted by Innocent shows that he admitted that a Council was the proper authority to put an end to the unsatisfactory state of things then existing, a testimony the more weighty, since he was about this time making great demands upon certain of the Western Churches which lay within reach of his influence as Bishop of Rome.[3] Such demands might be made with impunity in the West, owing to the unique position held by the Roman See in the Western Empire, a position which had been enormously strengthened by Gratian's grant,[4] but which it would have been useless to put forward in the East with its old traditions as to the true position of Apostolic Sees, of which, unlike the West, it possessed several, and the real nature of the position and precedence of the great Sees, and where, too, the grant of jurisdiction made to the Roman See by the Western Emperor did not, of course, have any effect. Innocent's action was indeed diplomatic, but at the same time entirely incompatible with Papalism, and is thus a witness against its historical character.

724. St. Chrysostom's 'appeal' is thus shown to be useless for the purpose for which it is sought to use it. The whole proceedings connected with it witness against the existence of the Papal Monarchy in his 'age,' and the witness is rendered the more significant by the fact that it would not have been an unnatural proceeding had St. Chrysostom, the Patriarch of second rank in the hierarchy, appealed to the first Patriarch alone for support against the treatment he was receiving at the hands of the Patriarch third in rank, he did not do so. The Roman Bishop was one of the great Bishops of the West to whom with others he wrote; it was the assistance of the Western Episcopate he desired as that which would be effectual in its influence in bringing about the convocation of a Synod to decide the case; he recognised in the Roman Bishop no 'jurisdiction' other than that

[1] S. Innocentius, P. I., *Epist. ad Theophilum Alex.*; P.L. xx. 493, 495.
[2] Palladius, *op. cit.*; P.G. xlvii. 14.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 636.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 209.

which he shared with the whole Episcopate. St. Chrysostom knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy.[1]

SECTION XCIV.—*The 'Appeal' of Flavian of Constantinople.*

725. Flavian, Archbishop of Constantinople, is alleged to have 'appealed' to Rome against the unrighteous proceedings of that Synod which has become known as the *Latrocinium*, from the description given of it by St. Leo in one of his letters, that it was 'no court of justice but a gang of robbers' (*Latrocinium*).[2] This Synod was held to consider the case of Eutyches, who had been condemned by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, presided over by Flavian. Eutyches had, when his deposition was read, appealed to the holy Synods of the most holy Bishops of Rome, and Alexandria, and Jerusalem, and Thessalonica,[3] and in order to gain over to his side the more influential Bishops, he addressed to several of them, amongst them St. Leo of Rome, a cautiously composed letter. He further accused Flavian of heresy, and having gained the favour of the Court, Theodosius at his request and that of Dioscurus of Alexandria, convoked by imperial brief a Council which assembled at Ephesus in August A.D. 449. It was presided over by Dioscurus, and was intended to be of Œcumenical rank.

726. The efforts of those who controlled the Synod were directed to obtaining the reversal of the proceedings of the Synod of Constantinople of the previous year. These efforts were successful; Eutyches was declared to be orthodox, and a sentence of deposition was pronounced by Dioscurus against Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylæum. The ground alleged for this sentence was that these proceedings at the Synod of Constantinople brought them under the condemnation pronounced by the Council of Ephesus against those who altered anything in the Nicene faith, since going beyond the Creed they wished to introduce the expression, 'two natures.' The iniquity of this was apparent. The Synod was completely under the domination of Dioscurus and Eutyches; and of the former, Eusebius of Dorylæum expressly complains that he 'at the second Synod of Ephesus, by money and by the brute force of his troops, depressed the orthodox faith and confirmed the heresy of Eutyches.'[4] Such a Synod well merited the name *Latrocinium*.

727. Flavian naturally would not submit to such flagrant injustice. What was the position? Flavian was the occupant of the Second great See, though his rightful position secured to his See by the

[1] On other statements of St. Chrysostom, *vide* nn. 189, 688 *et seq.*

[2] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Pulcheriam Augustam*, Ep. xcv. cap. ii.; P.L. liv. 943.

[3] Mansi, vi. 89.

[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. x. cap. iii. sect. 179. [E.T. iii. 253.]

Council of Constantinople had been denied him at this Synod, he being placed fifth in order of precedence, even below Juvenal of Jerusalem. Dioscurus, the Bishop of Alexandria, Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, the occupants of the other great Sees in the East, had taken part in his condemnation; there remained only the West whither he could appeal for redress. To whom would he therefore turn as Bishop of the Second See, but to the Bishop of the First See, the Patriarch of the West, who, besides his great position, was the natural medium of communication between East and West, and whose legates had been present at the Synod, and had heard him utter in the Synod his demand that 'justice should be done?' To Leo, therefore, he addressed a *Libellus appellationis*, which he handed to the legates before they left Ephesus. No trace of this letter could be found, until in A.D. 1874 a translation of the missing document was discovered by Professor D. Guerrino Amelli, of the Ambrosian Library, in a manuscript volume belonging to the Chapter of Novara, who published it in A.D. 1882.[1]

It commences as follows:—'Flavian to the most religious and holy Father and Archbishop Leo, greeting in the Lord. With good cause at the present time I purpose further reference to your holiness by way of apostolic appeal that you may visit the East and rescue in its imminent peril the godly faith of our holy fathers which they with laborious defence have handed down to us. For lo! all is confounded; the laws of the Church are broken; the faith is destroyed; godly souls are bewildered by controversy; the doctrine of the fathers is now no longer called the faith, but by the authority of Dioscurus, the bishop of the Alexandrine church, and those who hold with him, the teaching of Eutyches is now extolled and called the faith. This he has established by his own decree and by the suffrages of bishops giving a forced consent. All the circumstances it is impossible for me at this moment to report to your blessedness, but I will briefly explain what has happened.'

After describing the proceedings of Dioscurus in the Synod, the narrative proceeds to state that he—'proposed the condemnation of me and Eusebius, the bishops all weeping, and would not grant to their entreaties a postponement for a single day; and having made this motion he compelled some of the other bishops to assent to this abominable condemnation, swords being drawn upon those who wished for a postponement on the ground that he would not allow the letters of your holiness to be read, since that would sufficiently establish the faith of our fathers, but [neglecting] what might open

[1] The Rev. T. A. Lacey has reprinted the text from the manuscript, with the addition of a revised text, introduction, and translation, in Tract LXX. of the Church Historical Society, entitled *Appellatio Flaviani*. Mr. Lacey's translation is here adopted.

the way of truth even to angry and brutal minds, and requiring statements irrational and full of blindness to be received and read, he treated your delegates as if they were unworthy to utter a single word, but with a sort of rush, shamefully managed by him alone, all wrongs, so to say, were suddenly packed into one day, riot, the restoration of the condemned, the condemnation of the innocent—of me who have never in any way thought of transgressing against the authority of the fathers. And since all was going unjustly against me, as if by a settled agreement, after the iniquitous proposal which, of his own motion, he levelled at me, on my appealing to the throne of the Apostolic See of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to the holy council in general which meets under your holiness—'*universam beatam quae sub vestram sanctitatem est synodum*'—a crowd of soldiers at once surrounds me, prevents me from taking refuge at the Holy Altar, as I desired, and tried to drag me out of the Church. Then, amid the utmost tumult I barely succeeded in reaching a certain part of the Church and there hid myself with my companions, not without being watched, however, to prevent my reporting to you all the wrongs which have been done me.

'I therefore beseech your holiness not to let things rest, in regard to this mad plot which has been carried out against me, since there are no grounds produced for bringing me up to judgment; but rise up first in the cause of our right faith which has been recklessly destroyed; and further, in view of the violated laws of the Church, assume their guardianship, simply stating the facts throughout to the more honourable among the people, and instructing with suitable letters our faithful and Christian Emperor; writing, moreover, to the clergy and laity of the holy church of Constantinople and the very religious monks, also to Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, to Thalassius, of Cappadocian Cæsarea, to Stephen of Ephesus, Eusebius of Ancyra, Cyrus of Aphrodisias, and the other holy bishops who have consented to the base plot against me, and to Dioscurus who lorded it, so to say, over the sacred Synod of Ephesus, issuing a decree,—*dare etiam formam*,—also as God shall inspire your mind that an united Synod of the fathers both of West and East may be held, and the same faith preached everywhere, that the constitutions of our fathers may be upheld and all be brought to nothing and undone which has now been effected evilly and darkly by a sort of gamester's trick, so healing this terrible wound which is now creeping and spreading over almost the whole world. Those, however, who under great pressure of violence subscribed and consented to this unjust sentence are very few in number. The bishops who did not consent to this iniquity are much more numerous, as the reading of the above written report to your blessedness will explain.' The letter is, as has been said

not the original, but a translation, and also unsigned, but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity, and we thus have the document which has been unknown for so many years.

728. It has been observed that the position in the East was such that Flavian could alone look to the West for any redress, and, moreover, there was no one to whom he could, as Bishop of the Second See, address his appeal from a Synod of such importance in which all the chief Bishops of the East had taken part against him, save to the Bishop of the First See.

The letter is not free from rhetorical expressions, and the use of the phrase, 'the Apostolic See of Peter' simply testifies to the fact that at that date the See of Rome was universally believed to have been founded[1] by Saint Peter, and the title 'the Prince of the Apostles' is naturally applied to the one who was pre-eminent[2] in order amongst them.

The important question is—Did Flavian appeal to Leo as a Supreme Judge of all the Faithful, having *jure divino* supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church? The words of the 'appeal' itself would appear to refute any such supposition; he appeals to Leo and to the Holy General Synod—'*universam beatam synodum*'—which meets under him. Such a Council a Western Synod would be. Many Western Synods met under the Bishop of Rome, consisting mainly of the Bishops of the Roman Province, but attended also by other Bishops of the West, such as, for example, that to which St. Cyril referred in his letter to John of Antioch,[3] where he speaks of the holy Synod of the Romans whom it is necessary for those to follow who clung to communion with the West.[4] Such a Synod, composed of the 'pious Bishops who were found in the city of Rome,' was to St. Cyril thus a General Synod fully representing the West, and Flavian, also an Eastern, would so regard it. Further, this is borne out by the fact that he urges him to 'issue a direction,'[5] that an Œcumenical Synod should be held and the same faith preached everywhere, that the constitutions of the Fathers should be upheld. An appeal to the Supreme Judge of the Faithful would have been sufficient, since his judgment may not be reviewed by any, nor is it lawful for any to judge concerning his judgment. Further, to ask for an Œcumenical Council after appealing to the Supreme Judge would be entirely inconsistent with the Papal idea, for it is expressly stated in the *Vatican Decrees* that 'those err from the right path of truth, who affirm that it is lawful to appeal from the judgment of the Roman Pontiff to an Œcumenical Council as to an authority superior to the Roman Pontiff.'

[1] *Vide* on the foundation of the See of Rome, nn. 468 *seq.*
[2] *Vide* n. 594.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 358.
[4] Mansi, iv. 1036.
[5] dare formam—forma = τύπος.

It is obvious that to Flavian an Œcumenical Council was the supreme Tribunal of the Church which alone had jurisdiction to render him justice. He had no idea that the Roman Pontiff had the supreme power of governing the Universal Church, having immediate and ordinary jurisdiction over all and every Church. Had he so believed, his 'appeal' would have been for a judgment of the case from the Supreme Pontiff from which there could be no appeal. That is the simple point. Honorific language, after the manner of Orientals, he could and did use, but when that language is examined the distinctive recognition of the position which is claimed by Papalism for the Bishop of Rome as an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church is found to be absent, a fact the significance of which is enhanced by the very terms of eulogy employed in the letter.

729. How did St. Leo himself regard this 'appeal'? He speaks in his letters[1] only of an appeal in general, on account of which a Synod should be convened. It is to be observed that in these letters the request for the convocation of a Synod is made to the Emperor, which throws light upon the meaning of the phrase '*dare formam*' in Flavian's letter. St. Leo did not, at any rate, interpret those words in the sense of his having the power to convene a Synod of this character. The language he uses, as has been seen,[2] is incompatible with any idea that St. Leo held that as the Supreme Ruler of the Church having *jure divino* full power of ruling and governing the Church, he had power to convene an Œcumenical Synod. Further, had Flavian, the most important Eastern Bishop, intended by the use of these words to admit that any power to convene an Œcumenical Council resided in Roman Bishop, no doubt St. Leo would have laid emphasis on such admission, as it undoubtedly would have been of great assistance to him in his efforts to aggrandise his See. That he would, from his occupancy of the First See in Christendom, be admitted to have the right and duty under the circumstances to issue an authoritative decision that such a Council ought to assemble might well be urged by Flavian, inasmuch as it would be specially incumbent on him from his position to defend the truth and the constitutions of the Fathers.[3]

Further, these letters, it is to be noted, base the request to the Emperor to convoke a Council on the Nicene Canons. It has been already shown that the Canons alleged, if genuine,[4] are Sardican not Nicene. It is difficult to see which of the Canons really bear at all on the case. Probably they were adduced as laying down the principle of appeal from one Council to another. Be this as it may, it is clear that to base the request on Canons shows that no power had been

[1] S. Leo M., *Epp. ad Theodosium*, Ep. xliii., xliv.; P.L. liv. 826, 829.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 386, 387. [3] *Vide supra*, n. 43. [4] *Vide supra*, nn. 331 *et seq.*

divinely bestowed, according to the constitution of the Church, on the Roman Pontiff to take even the limited action asserted to be conferred by these Canons. Whatever right or power was given by these Canons was of the nature of a 'grant,' and not inherent in the Roman Pontiff by the Divine Constitution of the Church. The whole tone of these letters shows that St. Leo regarded Flavian's 'appeal' as one which could only be heard by an Œcumenical Council. He could not have taken this line had he held that it was an 'appeal' to him as Supreme Judge, as he would have been in that case faithless to his trust. Moreover, had he held that Flavian's 'appeal' had been to him as an individual Bishop, it is not at all probable that he would, in letters to an Eastern Emperor, have characterised the 'appeal' as one on account of which a Synod should be summoned. For such an 'appeal' made to him by a Bishop of New Rome, whose attitude since the day that his See city had become the seat of the Imperial Government had been a source of constant anxiety to the Bishop of Old Rome, would, it is certain, have been used by such an acute man of affairs as St. Leo to the very utmost in pursuance of his aim of extending the influence of his See. That he did not do so is sufficient proof that Flavian's 'appeal' was made to the Œcumenical Council, which was to be summoned in consequence of it.

730. If it be said that the Emperor Valentinian III. does say that Flavian appealed to the Bishop of Rome,[1] it is to be replied that his statement is easily accounted for, and in no way can be held to destroy the conclusion arrived at on consideration of the facts. Valentinian had, by his grant of arbitrary power to the Bishop of Rome,[2] practically made him a spiritual Emperor in the West, on grounds which had been supplied to him by St. Leo, which no doubt he fully accepted as facts. He would take it for granted that the Easterns would view St. Leo's position as he himself did. When, then, he heard that Flavian had sent a *Libellus appellationis* to St. Leo, he would, without reference to its contents, regard it as an appeal to Leo himself, as one to whom he held antiquity had granted the chiefdom of the priesthood over all, having the right to judge concerning faith and Bishops (*Sacerdotibus*).

But, further, if Flavian's appeal had been made to Leo personally it would in no way avail to prove the Papalist contention. Such an 'appeal' would simply have been of the same character as those which, as has been shown, might be and were made for aid to withstand oppression and injustice. Certainly it might be well said that in this case such an application would have been especially appropriate. For what was Flavian's position? The occupants of the Third and Fourth Sees,

[1] Valentinian Imp., *Ep. ad Theodosium Aug. inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. lv.; P.L. liv. 859.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 211 *et seq.*

Dioscurus of Alexandria and Domnus of Antioch, had by force made a Council inflict on him gross injustice, accompanied by every form of indignity. From a Council of Easterns so completely dominated by his enemies he could expect no redress. It might well be that he, the Bishop of the Second See, should look to the West for aid, and apply to the Bishop of the First See, who was removed from the malign influences which had been the cause of his ill-treatment, and upon whom rested, from the acknowledged rank of his See, pre-eminently the duty which lay on all Bishops of seeing that the Canons of the Church were obeyed, and the Divine Constitution and faith of the church preserved inviolate.[1]

Flavian's own conduct with regard to the case of Eutyches affords further confirmation of the accuracy of this interpretation of his alleged 'appeal,' as it was absolutely inconsistent with any belief on his part that the Bishop of Rome possessed *jure divino* supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church. This is shown by the fact that he held the decree of his Synod, deposing and excommunicating Eutyches, to be 'final,' the sentence being subscribed by himself and the other Bishops with the formula ὁρίσας ὑπέγραψα, that is 'judicans subscripsi,'[2] and he announced it to St. Leo as well as to other Bishops, in order that he might make the Bishops of the West acquainted with the sentence, so that they might know that he was a condemned heretic, and hold no communion with him.[3]

The deposition and excommunication of Eutyches by the Synod were treated as the acts of the supreme authority, from which no recourse could be had to the judgment of any Bishop, whether of Rome or elsewhere, a position inconsistent with the 'Papal Monarchy,' which was thus not 'the venerable and constant belief' of Flavian and his 'age.'[4]

Section XCV.—*The 'Appeal' of Theodoret.*

731. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, who, like Flavian, had been deposed by Dioscurus at the *Latrocinium*, also turned to Rome and the West for assistance. His letter to St. Leo is couched in terms of great respect, according to his Apostolic throne the Primacy in the Church,[5] but the reason he gives for this is not that the office of Supreme Pastor belongs *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop, but a very different one. In a letter to Renatus the Presbyter, who had been one of the Roman legates at the *Latrocinium*, written at the same time as the above-mentioned letter, he distinctly alleges as the chief

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 43.
[2] Mansi, vi. 746.
[3] Flavianus, *Ep. ad Leonem*, cap. iv., *inter Epp. S. Leonis*; P.L. liv. 727.
[4] As to the 'appeal' of Eusebius of Dorylæum, *vide* note 54.
[5] Theodoret, *Ep. ad Leonem*, Ep. cxiv.; P.G. lxxiii. 1313. On this letter *vide* note 55.

reason why the holy 'throne' of Rome possessed the 'hegemony' over the Churches of the world, the fact that its faith had never been sullied by any taint of heresy.[1] 'Hegemony,' too, is not 'supremacy,'[2] and *that* is what Papalism asserts to belong to the 'Roman Pontiff' by the institution of Christ. Further, the way in which, in his letter to St. Leo, he lays stress on the position of the City of Rome in the Empire is quite in accord with the principle on which the Church determined in Council the precedence of the various Sees. Theodoret's appeal for help, however, does not appear to have been to the Bishop of Rome individually, but to the Bishops of the West, for it is plain that he desired the Bishops of the West should decide his cause, since he wrote at the same time to Anatolius, the Patrician of Constantinople, begging him to intercede with the Emperor for him, that he might be permitted to go to the West to be judged by the Bishops of those parts.[3] He would naturally address a letter to the Bishop of Rome, as being the one through whom, as a general rule, Easterns made their communications with the West, and thus obtain their assistance.

732. His application was successful. A considerable Western Synod was held at once, A.D. 449, by St. Leo, by which all that had been done at the *Latrocinium* was rejected, including the sentence of deposition which had been passed on Theodoret. This action of St. Leo was designated by the Imperial Commissioners at the Council of Chalcedon as a 'restoration to his See' of Theodoret, a statement which 'may be illustrated by Socrates' assertion that Maximin of Jerusalem, then a suffragan of Cæsarea, "restored Athanasius' dignity" to him in 346, and that Cyril and John, at their reunion, "restored to each other their Sees," *i.e.* recognised each other as legitimate bishops.'[4] The Council, as has been seen,[5] did not at all accept this as deciding the status of Theodoret; the Bishops, even at the first session of the Council, objected to his being introduced into the Council, and it was not till the Eighth session of the Council that Theodoret, having pronounced an anathema on Nestorius, was reinstated, the Imperial Commissioners delivering the judgment of the Fathers, that 'in accordance with the decree of the holy Council, Theodoret shall again be put into possession of the Church of Cyrus.'[6]

733. The consideration of these cases of alleged 'appeal' shows that the term 'appeal' cannot be used of them in the sense of an 'appeal' from an inferior tribunal to the Bishops of Rome as to the supreme authority to which such inferior tribunal was subject, and which would

[1] Theodoret, *Ep. ad Renatum*, Ep. cxvi.; P.G. lxxiii. 1325.
[2] *Vide* Duchesne's use of the word, n. 1178.
[3] Theodoret, *Ep. ad Anatolium*, Ep. cxix.; P.G. lxxiii. 1330.
[4] Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, ii. 517.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 400, 401. [6] Mansi, vii. 190.

have power to enforce its decision on such inferior tribunal from which the appeal went. Still less were they 'appeals' from Councils as inferior tribunals to the 'Roman Pontiffs' as the Supreme Judges *jure divino*, whose real and sovereign authority the whole community is bound to obey. There is no suggestion of any such idea. They were, it is clear, petitions for help made by those who were suffering injustice, of like nature to those which were addressed to other Bishops to extend such aid as was in their power to render as sharing the One Episcopate, and which, apart from the consolation it would bring, might be the means of procuring their restoration to the positions whence they had been wrongfully driven. Such 'appeals,' therefore, did not infringe the ordinary procedure by which all causes were to be determined in places where they arose, since they were of the nature of extraordinary proceedings arising out of extraordinary circumstances, and when considered in themselves, so far from being of any use to quote in support of Papalism, they in no way militate against the 'evident testimonies' of 'the holy Fathers' of the 'East' against the existence in their age of the Papal Monarchy, which is thus proved to be not part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, as it is alleged to be by the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees.*

CHAPTER XX

'THE TESTIMONY' OF THE EASTERNS—PART III.

SECTION XCVI.—*The 'Pontifical legate' Philip's assertion at the Council of Ephesus.*

734. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to assert, as the conclusion to be drawn from 'the evidence' it has adduced, that its allegation as to the position of the Roman Bishops 'was acknowledged and observed as Christian faith, not by one nation only, nor in one age, but by the East and by the West, and through all ages.'[1] This statement has been proved to be erroneous by the examination of the evidence on which it is based. That evidence has been shown not to bear the significance which the *Satis Cognitum* seeks to put upon it, as being both opposed to the real opinions of the writers quoted, and in complete contradiction to their own conduct; whilst the real value to be attached to the 'evidence' of the single 'holy Father' of 'the East,' whose writings are quoted, has been ascertained to be nil.

735. The *Satis Cognitum*, however, proceeds to quote in support of its conclusion certain other statements, the first of which is contained in some words which were used by the Presbyter Philip, who was one of the legates 'who supplied the presence of Celestine' at the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus. It is given as follows: 'No one can doubt; yea, it is known to all ages, that St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and ground of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ. That is: the power of forgiving and retaining sins was given to him who, up to this present time, lives and exercises judgment in the persons of his successors' (Actio III.).[2]

736. Philip, it will be observed, applies here our Lord's words to St. Peter alone, at least implying that he alone received 'the gift of the keys,' and in the latter part of his assertion he amplifies an idea which is found in the first 'Papal Decretal,' the Epistle of Pope Siricius to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona, in A.D. 385.[3] Siricius there says: 'We bear the burden of all who are heavy laden, or rather the blessed

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 32. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Vide supra*, n. 69.

Apostle bears them in us, for he, as we trust in all things, protects and defends those who are heirs of his government.'[1] It is not improbable that Philip by these words intended to assert that the Bishop of Rome was the *sole* successor of St. Peter, as such a claim was, it is clear from the language used by various Bishops of Rome, made by them as time went on, yet it is not necessary to attach this signification to them, for, if so, it would not be possible to reconcile the statement with those in Celestine's letter to the Council, which has already been discussed,[2] in which he definitely places himself in the ranks of the Episcopate, and the African theory as to the symbolical position occupied by St. Peter as the representative of the Apostles, and by the Bishops of Rome as his successor in the chair which they believed he had actually occupied, as the representative Bishop, would give to the statement an explanation which would harmonise with Celestine's letter.

737. Be this as it may, it has already been shown that the Papalist interpretation of our Lord's words in Matthew xvi. 18 has against it the consent of the Fathers, who teach that 'the gift of the keys' was bestowed upon all the Apostles,[3] and so, if Philip did put forth this statement with the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* assumes that he did, it is evident that the Council of Ephesus can in no way be said to have endorsed it, as the *Satis Cognitum* implies by its statement that 'no voice' was 'raised in dissent' when Philip spoke: besides which, the testimony of the Council itself is, as shown above,[4] against any such claim as is involved in the idea of the Papal Monarchy, which is embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, in support of which the quotation from Philip's speech is adduced.

738. To what has been said already may be added the following considerations: St. Cyril, who presided over the Synod, certainly did not regard Peter as holding the unique position which, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, Philip asserted in these words to belong to him. This is clear from the letter which he in the name of the Synod of his Patriarchate addressed to Nestorius. For in it, as already noted,[5] he expressly declared that 'Peter at least and John were of equal rank with each other, as Apostles and holy disciples,'[6] a statement which is in strict agreement with his teaching elsewhere, as we have already seen,[7] with reference to the supreme position conferred on the Apostolate in the Church by Christ. He could not, therefore, have assented to Philip's statement if it was intended to signify what the *Satis*

[1] Siricius P., *Epist. ad Himerium Tarraconensem*, Ep. i.; P.L. xiii. 1131 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 373.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 117 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 361 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 96.
[6] S. Cyril Alex., *Ep. ad Nestorium*, iii.; P.G. lxxvii. 112.
[7] *Vide supra*, nn. 94 *et seq.*

Cognitum alleges it does. The same witness is borne by St. Cyril's own conduct,[1] which indeed is an 'evident testimony' against any belief in the Papal Monarchy on his part.

739. The proceedings of the Council itself afford similar evidence that, so far from accepting Philip's words in the sense which the *Satis Cognitum* alleges them to bear, if the Fathers paid any attention to them at all, they took the most effectual means of expressing their dissent from any such sense. Their dealings with the legates were entirely incompatible with any tacit acceptance of the words in the meaning which is assigned to them by the *Satis Cognitum*. In the first place, the President of the Synod himself, after Philip and the other legates had spoken, declared that the Council had recognised that in what they had said they had acted in the name of 'the whole Council of the Holy Bishops of the West,' as well as of 'the Apostolic See.' Their assent is thus of the more importance, as being that of the representatives of 'the Bishops of the West,' as, indeed, Philip himself had admitted, who after the sentence quoted in the *Satis Cognitum*, briefly summed up the proceedings against Nestorius, and added, 'the sentence pronounced against him remains firm according to the decree of all the Churches, for the Bishops of the Eastern and Western Churches are present either personally, or certainly by their legates at this Episcopal Council.'[2] The significance of this is obvious. Had St. Cyril believed in the monarchical position declared by Papalism to belong to the Roman Pontiff as an integral part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, he would have known that the assent of all the Western Bishops, or even of all the Bishops of the world, could not add, on Papalist principles, to the authority of the judgment of the Supreme Judge; not only so, but it was not of any value whatever when such a decision had been given, as it had been in the case of Nestorius. From this it would follow that he would not have used language which, on the hypothesis that the allegations of the *Satis Cognitum* as to Papal Supremacy are true, would have been derogatory to the position divinely conferred on the Roman Pontiffs as the legitimate successors of St. Peter in the Roman Episcopate.

740. Secondly, the Council itself in its Synodal Letter to the Emperor is careful to emphasise the representative character of the legates, by speaking of them as making known to the Synod 'the opinion of the whole Council of the West.'[3] If, then, St. Cyril and the Fathers of Ephesus did consider that Philip made any such claim on behalf of the Roman Bishop as the *Satis Cognitum* alleges, it must be admitted that they took the greatest possible care to show that in their opinions the value of the legates' presence at, and agreement with, the proceedings of the Council was, not owing to their being the legates of the Supreme

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 692. [2] Mansi, iv. 1296. [3] *Ibid.*, iv. 1461.

Judge of the Faithful, conveying the final and conclusive judgment on the case of Nestorius from him, 'the Master' of the Episcopate, 'whose real and sovereign authority' compelled instant submission to that decision, but to the fact that the Bishops of the West by them assented to the decrees of the Synod, so that its judgments were those of the whole Church, East and West, and *therefore* possessed 'of supreme authority.'

741. Whatever Philip's meaning may have been, the proceedings of the Council demonstrate the absurdity of the deduction sought to be drawn by the *Satis Cognitum* from the circumstance that the Fathers did not audibly, at the moment the legate spoke, proclaim their dissent from his statement, and, therefore, that the Fathers of the Synod, understanding that statement in the same sense as the *Satis Cognitum*, agreed therewith. Those proceedings are entirely inconsistent with assent to, or belief in, any such claims as those in support of which the *Satis Cognitum* quotes the words; 'dissent' from such claims, had they been aware of them, could hardly have been more practically or emphatically expressed.

Section XCVII.—'*The pronouncement of the Council of Chalcedon*,' and '*the voice of the Third Council of Constantinople*.'

742. 'The pronouncement of the Council of Chalcedon on the same matter,' 'Peter has spoken through Leo,' is next appealed to by the *Satis Cognitum*[1] in support of its allegation. Any one not acquainted with the facts of the case would naturally suppose, from the way in which they are here quoted, that the words cited embodied a formal pronouncement by the Council, acting synodically, as to the position of the Bishops of Rome, a 'pronouncement' which would thus have that value which attaches to the dogmatic 'pronouncements' of an Œcumenical Council. This is not the case; they merely formed an 'exclamation' of the Fathers in the Council, and, as has already been shown,[2] have no dogmatic value whatever. Further, the connection in which the 'exclamation' was made proves that it could not possibly have the meaning sought to be put upon it by the *Satis Cognitum*,[3] a meaning, too, which is incompatible with the whole history of the Synod.[4] The learned Pannilini, Bishop of Chiusi and Pienza, an independent witness, since he lived at a time when the idea of the Papal Supremacy had been greatly developed, justly observes with reference to this 'exclamation,' 'It is truly deplorable to be obliged to rebut the same errors. False assertions like these are a thousand times reduced to powder, and a thousand times reproduce themselves with a wonderful

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 33.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 458 *et seq.*
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, *l.c.*
[4] *Ibid.*

effrontery. The allegation of a mere acclamation made in this Council has already been examined by the great Bishop of Meaux, Mgr. Bossuet, and proved to demonstration by him, by means of the Acts of the Council, to be no proof whatever of the Roman pretensions, while it is shown that the letter of St. Leo to St. Flavianus, which was the subject of these acclamations, was thoroughly examined. The circumstances which accompanied this fact are no less unfavourable to the actual pretensions of the court of Rome.' After giving an account of the treatment of 'the Tome' of St. Leo by the Council,[1] the learned Bishop proceeds to say, 'It was after all this that the Fathers exclaimed, 'This is the faith of the Fathers, etc. . . . Peter has spoken by Leo. . . . Piously hath Leo taught, hath Cyril taught. May the memory of Cyril be eternal. Leo and Cyril have taught the same. Anathema to him who believes otherwise!' Notwithstanding this energetic declaration, which comprises equally the letter of the Pope and the two letters of Cyril, some Bishops of Illyria and of Palestine raised a question upon certain passages in the letter of the Pope, which they did not fully understand. They were attended to, and received the explanation they required; the passages of St. Leo being confronted with three similar passages of St. Cyril, to prove their agreement with them. Here we see a new examination, and the doctrine of St. Cyril serves as a test to prove the purity of that of the pope. Some were persuaded and acquiesced, while some remained still doubtful. The decision was therefore delayed for five days, and the Council directed opportune explanations to be given. . . . Finally, in the fourth session, the affair was terminated in a more decisive manner. . . . From this it is easy to see the true meaning of the acclamation of the Fathers of Chalcedon—'*Petrus per Leonem locutus est.*' With almost a jocose boldness the Papal advocates report these few words detached from the history and the context, and exhibit them separately to surprise the simplicity of the ignorant. The whole history of the controversy which occasioned the Council is concealed, the examination of the letter of St. Leo is suppressed, the acts of this venerable and numerous assembly are passed by, and they draw out from these few words all the consequences they need according to their own caprice. Yet the words '*Petrus per Leonem locutus est*,' merely mean, not that St. Leo's letter was the voice of St. Peter because he was a successor to the apostle, but rather, because from the examination and collation they had made, the Council recognised that it contained and taught that same faith which St. Peter had confessed. But even this proves nothing in favour of the chimerical infallibility, and of the pretended right of the pope, to form incontrovertible rules of faith, and to enjoin them as a guide for Synodical definitions, or, if it does, it proves the same in behalf of

[1] On the way in which the Council dealt with 'the Tome,' *vide supra*, nn. 451 *et seq.*

every bishop or pastor who teaches the true apostolic doctrine. Moreover, the doctrine of St. Cyril receives like acclamations from the Council, and is even employed to confront the letter of St. Leo. Would the conclusion be just, that therefore St. Cyril was infallible, and that controversies could only be decided according to the form of his definitions? Without assigning to the holy patriarch or to his see any such prerogative, the Council might well combine his name with that of St. Leo, and might say with all truth of every one who teaches the true doctrine of Jesus Christ, that Jesus Christ speaks by His mouth, and all the more truly, inasmuch as Christ Himself affirms in the Gospel '*qui vos audit me audit.*'[1]

743. The *Satis Cognitum* having misinterpreted the 'exclamation' of the Fathers of Chalcedon, proceeds to state that 'the voice of the Third Council of Constantinople responds as an echo' to it, as follows: 'The chief prince of the Apostles was fighting on our side: for we have had as our ally his follower and successor to his See; and the paper and the ink were seen, and Peter spoke through Agatho' (Actio XVIII.).[2]

The object of the citation is obviously to confirm, by the testimony of the Sixth Œcumenical Council, the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* had just previously sought to affix to the exclamation of the Fathers of Chalcedon. Whatever, however, may be the meaning of this citation, it clearly cannot alter what has been proved to be the true signification of that exclamation.

744. But do the words themselves, when examined, bear that meaning which it is necessary they should have if they could be quoted in support of the unique and sovereign position which is alleged by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to the 'Roman Pontiff'? The answer to the question must be in the negative, on the following grounds. The quotation is taken from the λόγος προσφωνητικός of the Synod, subscribed by the members thereof. This, having been read to the Emperor, was, at the request of the Synod, confirmed and subscribed by him. The whole passage from which the extract is made is as follows: 'On our side the Prince of the Apostles was fighting, for we have had his imitator and successor in his See as our helper, and elucidating the mystery of the Divine Sacrament by his letter. That ancient Roman community presented to thee a confession written by God. The letter of doctrine brought the light from Western parts, and the ink was seen, and Peter speaking through Agatho, and at the same time with the omnipotent king, thou the pious Emperor, wast decreeing as thou hadst been appointed by God.'[3]

[1] Quoted, *The Privilege of Peter*, by R. C. Jenkins, pp. 79-84.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 33.

[3] 'Summus autem nobiscum concertabat Apostolorum princeps, illius enim imitatorem et sedis successorem habuimus fautorem, et divini Sacramenti mysterium illus-

745. The concluding words obviously assign a position to the Emperor incompatible with that asserted in the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop, words just short of which significantly the citation stops. The passage, therefore, taken as a whole, bears witness against Papalism. Further, the circumstances under which the Synod made the reference to Agatho which is contained in it, show that 'the voice' of the Council certainly did not give the witness which the *Satis Cognitum* alleges by its method of citation.

746. The Monothelite heresy had by the date of this Synod infested the East, and Constantinople had for many years been under its influence, and consequently had been out of communion with the Roman See, which, with the possible exception of Vitalian,[1] had, since the fall of Honorius, maintained its orthodoxy. The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, in the year A.D. 678, being desirous to restore peace to the Church, summoned certain Eastern and Western Bishops to a conference. When, however, contrary to expectation, this Conference was attended by representatives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, it called itself, with the Emperor's consent, an 'Œcumenical Synod,' and has so been considered by the Church. The Synod opened on November 7, A.D. 680: the Emperor presided in person, when present, and in his absence two Patricians and two ex-consuls did so as his representatives.

What was the attitude adopted by this Synod towards the Roman Bishops? Heresy, affecting the very foundation doctrine of the faith, was devastating the Church; did the Fathers of the Synod when dealing with it regard the Bishops of Rome as the supreme teachers of the Church, whose 'definitions' as to the faith 'are in themselves irreformable, and not from the consent of the Church'? This, and nothing short of this, is required by the interpretation which the *Satis Cognitum* affixes to the statement made by the Council now under consideration. The answer is clear from the following facts.

747. The heresy which the Synod had before it had already been condemned by St. Martin, the martyr Bishop of Rome, in an *Encyclical Letter* from himself and the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649, over which he presided, addressed to the whole Church.[2] If Papalism had been 'the venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' of this Council, the matter was closed, Monothelitism was condemned, St. Martin's definition being 'irreformable of itself.' The Supreme Judge of the Faithful, the Supreme Teacher of the Church, had spoken; if Papalism were

trantem per literas. Confessionem tibi a Deo scriptam illa Romana antiqua civitas obtulit, et dogmatum diem a vespertinis partibus extulit charta et atramentum videbatur et per Agathonem Petrus loquebatur, et cum omnipotenti corregnatore pius imperator simul decernebas ut qui a Deo decretus es.'—Mansi, xi. 665, 666.

[1] On Vitalian's case, *vide* note 56.

[2] Mansi, x. 1170, 1183.

true, all that the Fathers of the Sixth Council could have done was to have simply recalled to the minds of the faithful that the Supreme Pastor had spoken, and therefore finally settled the question which was agitating the Church, or rather there would have been no need for the Emperor to have summoned a Conference at all, for the Church would have at once recognised the voice of the divinely appointed Supreme Teacher, and those who refused to accept the definition of St. Martin would have by that act ceased to belong to the 'one fold,' since they would no longer have been in communion with the one Supreme Pastor. The action of the Emperor, in convening the Council, therefore, is a witness against Papalism, and the way the Synod dealt with the matter proves most plainly that they did not regard St. Martin's action as final, for the Fathers caused a careful investigation to take place, after which the Council put forth a decree of faith ending with an anathema, which decree was subscribed by the Fathers.

748. In the next place it is to be observed, that the deputies who were sent by the Roman Synod, which had just been held under the presidency of Agatho, were furnished with two letters, one written by Agatho personally to the Emperor, in which he makes profuse declarations of obedience to the Emperor, the other the synodal letter of the Council. The first of these letters was 'intended to form a counterpart to the celebrated *Epistola* of Leo. I. to Flavian.'[1] Did the Fathers of the Synod receive it as a definition with regard to the faith made by the Supreme Pastor 'exercising' the supreme power of the 'teaching-office,' which was his in right of 'the Apostolic Primacy,' which he, the 'Roman Pontiff, as successor of Peter, Prince of Apostles, holds over the Universal Church'?[2] Did they regard it as coming from one whose real and sovereign authority as their 'Master' they were bound to obey? The course of procedure adopted by the Synod with reference to it proves that they did not.

749. In the Eighth Session of the Synod the Emperor asked the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, who at their own request had received copies of the said reports to read, to state whether they and their Synods agreed with the sense of the reports sent by Agatho, most holy Pope of Rome, and his Synod. George of Constantinople replied as follows: 'Having inspected, O pious Lord, the full force of the reports sent to your most pious person by Agatho, most holy Pope of Rome, and his Synod, and having examined the writings of the holy and approved Fathers which are kept in my venerable Patriarchal house, I have found all the testimonies of the holy and approved Fathers which are contained in the said reports, to be correct and in no way disagreeing with the holy and approved Fathers, and

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. cap. ii. sect. 314. [E.T. v. 142.]
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

I agree with them and so confess and believe.'[1] The Bishops, who were subject to the Patriarchs, one after the other made similar declarations.

750. The Fathers of the Council examined the letter, and when they found that its teaching was consonant with that of 'the holy and approved Fathers,' then, and not till then, they expressed their agreement with it; that is, they did not hold those decrees binding on the whole Church *ex sese*. Hence, in accordance with this, in the decree which they ultimately put forth in the Eighteenth Session of the Synod, they declared that 'the Holy and Œcumenical Council received' it and the synodal letter of the Western Bishops, 'since the two letters agree with the holy synod of Chalcedon, the Tome of the holy Leo to Flavian, and with the synodal letters of Cyril against Nestorius and the Bishops of the East.' Notice that they here put 'the Tome' of St. Leo on the same level with the two letters of St. Cyril. It is quite clear from their statement that had the result of their examination been that they had found that the letter of Agatho was not in agreement with the doctrinal statements which had the authority of Œcumenical Councils with which they compared it, they would necessarily have rejected it.[2] The whole treatment of the letter is as inconsistent with Papalism as was the treatment of 'the Tome' of St. Leo by the Fourth Synod.[3]

751. Again, this Synod decreed 'that Honorius, the late Pope of Elder Rome, should be cast out of the holy Church of God and be anathematised . . . because we have found from the letter written by him to Sergius that he followed the mind of the latter in all things and authoritatively confirmed his impious dogmas'[4]—*κατὰ πάντα τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ ἐξακολουθήσαντα καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ κυρώσαντα δόγματα*. The Fathers of the Council evidently did not hold that 'Peter spoke through Honorius' in the Papalist sense, consequently they could not have regarded Agatho, his successor, as holding a different position *jure divino* from that held by Honorius.

752. These considerations make it plain that, in the extract given in the *Satis Cognitum*, the Fathers of the Council did not regard the Bishop of Rome as the Supreme Pastor of the Church, possessing supreme power of jurisdiction in the Church *jure divino*. Had they done so, it is inconceivable that they should have acted in a manner so essentially opposed to the whole idea of the Papal Monarchy. On the evidence, it is clear that that which is asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' was certainly not 'the belief' of the Fathers of the Sixth Council. The words then cited in the *Satis Cognitum* cannot possibly bear the interpretation required

[1] Mansi, xi. 335.

[2] On the identical treatment by the Sixth Synod of P. Agatho's letter and Macarius, the Monothelite, *vide* note 57.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 452 *et seq.*

[4] Mansi, xi. 555. On the condemnation of Pope Honorius, *vide infra*, nn. 794 *et seq.*, 950.

for the object for which the citation is made. Nor, indeed, is there any need that such an interpretation should be affixed to them; they simply give expression to the satisfaction felt by the Fathers at having on the side of orthodoxy in their combat against Monothelitism the authority of the particular Bishop who in that age was universally believed to occupy the Chair in which St. Peter himself had sat, Agatho's faith, as expounded in his letter, having been found to be consonant with the faith which that Apostle had of old confessed in the name of the Apostolic College.[1]

753. The conclusion arrived at receives confirmation from the proceedings of the Easterns at the Council *in Trullo*, or, as it is sometimes called, the *Quinsext* Council, it being intended to be the complement of the Fifth and Sixth Councils, at which no Canons were made. It assembled at the same place as the latter of these two Councils, in A.D. 691 or 692,[2] and put forth 102 Canons, the object of the Fathers of the Council being to frame a Code of Canons for the Universal Church.

(*a*) In the first of these Canons the anathema pronounced by the Sixth Council on Honorius P. is renewed.

(*b*) The Second Canon confirms 85 Apostolical Canons, and 'sets the seal' of the Fathers upon the Canons of the first four Œcumenical Councils and of certain other Councils already held amongst them, those of that of Antioch in *Encaeniis*,[3] and on the Canons (*i.e.* the *Decretal Letters*) of Dionysius the Great of Alexandria, of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, of St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Cyril, and other Eastern Fathers, and on 'the Canon' put forth by Cyprian, Archbishop of the country of the Africans and Martyr, and by the Synod under him, which has been kept only in the country of the African Bishops according to the custom delivered down to them. 'And that no one be allowed to transgress or disregard the aforesaid Canons, or to receive others beside them, supposititiously set forth by certain who have attempted to make a traffic of the truth, but should any one be convicted of innovating upon or attempting to overturn any of the aforementioned Canons, he shall be subject to receive the penalty which that Canon imposes, and to be cured by it of his transgression.'

(*c*) Four of the Canons (III., VI., XII., XIII.) dealt with the subject of clerical marriage, no one being allowed to marry after receiving the Subdiaconate. All clerics who married a second time are to be canonically deposed. Priests, Deacons, and Subdeacons who had married once only, but a widow, or who marry after ordination, shall,

[1] Compare the statement of the Fourth Synod with reference to 'the Tome' of St. Leo, *vide*, nn. 453 *et seq.*, 742.

[2] Hefele gives proof that 'it was opened after September 1, 671, and before September 1, 692.'—*Op. cit.* bk. xvii. sect. 327. [E. T. v. 223.]

[3] *Vide* on these Canons, *supra*, nn. 347, 403, 511, 715.

after having done penance for a time, be restored to their office, but may obtain no higher degree. Priests and Deacons are allowed to live with their wives, but this is forbidden to Bishops. The Roman custom of compulsory celibacy is censured by name, and it is declared that 'if any one urged beyond the Apostolical Canons, should venture to debar any of sacerdotal rank, that is, Presbyters or Deacons or Subdeacons, from company and union with their lawful wives, let him be deposed, and in like manner, if any Presbyter or Deacon, under pretence of piety, expel his own wife, let him be excommunicated, and if he persist, be deposed.'

754. (*d*) Canon XXXVI. renewed the Third Canon of the First Council of Constantinople and the Thirty-eighth of Chalcedon, as follows:—

> 'Renewing the decrees of the 150 holy Fathers assembled in this heaven-protected royal city, and those of the 630 Fathers assembled at Chalcedon, we decree that the See of Constantinople shall enjoy equal privileges (τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύειν πρεσβείων) with the See of Elder Rome and be magnified as it in ecclesiastical matters, being second after it, next to which let the See of the great city of the Alexandrians rank, then that of Antioch, and then that of Jerusalem.'[1]

It is to be noted that the Synod had acted in accordance with the law here laid down, the Patriarch of Constantinople having been admitted to occupy, in the Council, the place assigned to him in the Canons here renewed, which had similarly been acknowledged to be rightfully his in the Fifth and Sixth Synods.

(*e*) Canon XXXVIII. re-enacts the Seventeenth of Chalcedon, declaring that if a city is renewed by Imperial command, its ecclesiastical position is regulated according to ancient laws by its new civil rights.

Canon LV. abolishes 'even in the country of the Romans,' the fast which is there kept contrary to ecclesiastical custom on the Saturdays in Lent, and declares that the Canon (the 66th Apostolical Canon) shall absolutely hold good there which says, 'if any clerk be found fasting on the Lord's day, or the Sabbath, save the one and single Sabbath (Holy Saturday), let him be deposed, or, if a layman, severed from communion.'[2]

[1] This Canon received the attention of Gratian, whose falsification took this form: 'Renewing the decrees of the holy Council of Constantinople, we desire that the See of Constantinople should receive like privileges to those which Elder Rome has; nevertheless she is not to be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters—*non tamen in ecclesiasticis rebus magnificetur, ut illa*—but holding the second place after her, let it rank before the See of Alexandria; then the See of Antioch, and after it the See of Jerusalem.' —*Dist.* xxii c. 6. The Roman correctors have substituted the words *nec non* for Gratian's falsification *non tamen*, which remained in his text for four hundred years.

[2] These Canons are given in Mansi, xi. 937 *et seq.*

755. The Fathers of the Council in these Canons take a line which is incompatible with any belief on their part in the Papal Monarchy.

1. The Council 'set its seal' on the 85 Apostolical Canons, whereas Pope Hormisdas had 'explicitly declared the Apostolic Canons to be apocryphal,'[1] and although they did not entirely fall into discredit in the West, owing to the authority of the first collection of Canons made by Dionysius Exiguus about the year A.D. 500, yet only the first fifty which he so included were ever recognised;[2] whilst of the 'Canon of St. Cyprian,' which they ordained should not be transgressed or disregarded by any, Fleury says, 'It is difficult to understand what it is unless it be the Preface to the Council of St. Cyprian, when he says that no one pretends to be a Bishop of Bishops or obliges his colleagues to obedience by tyrannical fear'[3]—a significant act on the part of the Council which needs no comment.

2. The Council also 'set its seal,' and, in intention, therefore gave Œcumenical authority, to the *Decretals* of Easterns, whilst ignoring completely those of the Bishop of Rome, and, moreover, threatened with punishment any one, including, therefore, the Roman Bishop, who should innovate upon any of these Canons and Decretal Letters.

3. They expressly renewed the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, thus testifying to its Œcumenical position in spite of the 'fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See,' which is in direct contradiction to the assertion of the *Satis Cognitum*, that, owing to such 'lack' it 'is admitted by all to be worthless.'[4]

4. The Fathers set their seal on that principle which especially encountered the persistent hostility of Rome, viz., that the rank of Bishops in the hierarchy followed the civil rank of their respective cities.

5. They condemned the law of the Roman Church as to clerical marriage.

6. The Fathers abrogated a custom of the Roman Church as to fasting, inflicting a punishment on those who followed it.

756. It is clear that the holy Fathers who enacted such Canons knew nothing of the Papal Monarchy; their ignorance is a further confirmation of the conclusion already arrived at, that the Fathers of the Sixth Synod were in a similar state of ignorance, for not only were the Fathers of the *Quinsext* Council professedly engaged in completing the work of the Fathers of that Council, and so would in all things be careful to follow their mind, but it is probable that some of them had actually taken part in that Synod.[5]

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, Appendix, *The so-called Apostolic Canons.* [E.T. i. 452.]
[2] *Ibid.* [3] Fleury, *op. cit.*, liv. xl. cap. xlix. tom. iii. 34. Paris, 1856.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39. [5] Mansi, xiii. 42.

Section XCVIII.—*The Formula of Hormisdas.*

757. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to cite, in proof of its allegations, the *Formula of Hormisdas*, asserting, of the quotation given, that by it 'this same is declared with great weight and solemnity.' The following is the extract:—'For the pronouncement of our Lord Jesus Christ saying: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church*, etc., cannot be passed over. What is said is proved by the result, because Catholic faith has always been preserved without stain in the Apostolic See' (Post Epistolam xxvi. ad omnes Episc.).[1]

This Formulary, known by the name of the *Libellus* or *Regula Fidei*, was composed by Hormisdas, Bishop of Rome, in A.D. 516, and the passage from which the citation is made is as follows:—'The first point of salvation is to keep the rule of right faith and to depart in no case from the constitutions of the Fathers. And for as much as the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed over, who said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," etc., these words are proved by their effects, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved without spot.'[2]

The *Satis Cognitum*, in making its quotation, does so clearly because of the statement that the Catholic religion has always been preserved in the Apostolic See 'without spot.' The value of the statement for the purpose with which it is cited depends upon its accuracy, and that is a question to be decided on the evidence. The facts detailed in the following sections will demonstrate its inaccuracy.

Section XCIX.—*Liberius and Arianism.*

758. In the fourth century occurred the sad fall of Liberius, who had displayed great zeal for the Nicene faith. The Emperor Constantius had put tremendous pressure upon him to subscribe the condemnation of St. Athanasius, which he had succeeded in compelling other Western Bishops to do, but Liberius firmly withstood the Emperor and refused to be influenced by the gifts which he proffered in the hope of inducing him to comply. The result of his noble resistance was that he was banished to Beroea in Thrace, and Felix[3] was intruded into his See, being consecrated by three Arian Bishops. Liberius was greatly

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 33.

[2] The Latin is: 'Prima salus est regulam rectæ fidei custodire et a constitutis patrum nullatenus deviare. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Jesu Christi prætermitti sententia dicentis: *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam*, etc.; hæc quæ dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus, quia in sede Apostolica citra maculam est semper Catholica servata religio' (Mansi, viii. 467). In the *Libellus* the word 'immaculata' is given instead of 'citra maculam,' and the word 'catholica' is omitted before 'servata' (*Ibid.*, 468).

[3] Felix had been a deacon of the Roman Church and a Catholic, but communicated with the Arians, so that the Catholics at Rome would have nothing to do with him. His position at Rome was simply that of an intruder into the See canonically occupied by

beloved by his flock, and his enforced separation from them was no doubt a great trial to him.

759. Whilst at Beroea he came under the influence of Fortunatian,[1] Bishop of Aquileia, who had lapsed into Arianism, and subscribed an heretical creed which was presented to him by Demophilus, one of the worst of the Arians, in A.D. 357. This, from St. Hilary's description of it,[2] was that drawn up in the second great Synod held at Sirmium in that year, in which Arianism was undisguisedly put forward, the same 'confession' as that which the aged Hosius, then nearly one hundred years old, 'worn out by exile, imprisonment, privation, and even torture,'[3] was compelled to sign. His fall was complete, for besides signing the Arian Creed, he assented to the condemnation of St. Athanasius, which apparently Hosius never did,[4] a fact of great significance, in view of the Emperor Constantius' words in his letter to Hosius: 'Be persuaded by us and subscribe against Athanasius, for whosoever subscribes against him, embraces with us the Arian cause.'[5]

760. Further, Liberius entered into communion with the Arians, both of East and West, including the worst of them, as is clear from his letter to 'his beloved brethren the Presbyters and fellow-Bishops of the East' (*i.e.* the Oriental Arians), in which he said: 'Your holy faith is known to God and to the world. I do not defend Athanasius, but because my predecessor, Julius, had received him, I also acted in the same way; but having learned, when it pleased God, that you had condemned him justly, I immediately agreed in your sentence, and sent a letter on the subject by Bishop Fortunatian of Aquileia to the Emperor Constantius. So, then, Athanasius being removed from the communion of us all, so that I am not to receive his letters, I say that I am quite at peace and concord with you all, and with all the Eastern Bishops throughout the provinces. But that you may know better that I speak in true faith the same as my common Lord and Brother, who was so good as to vouchsafe to exhibit your Catholic creed, which at Sirmium was by many of our brethren and fellow-Bishops set forth and received by all present: this I received with a willing mind and without opposition: to it I gave my assent, this I follow, this is held by me. I pray you now, so work together that I may be released from exile, and may return to the See entrusted to me by God.'[6]

Liberius. He was thus a schismatic. He is said to have condemned the Arians after hearing of the fall of Liberius, but there is no evidence of this or of his martyrdom, though he is venerated as a saint by the Roman Church. *Cp.* Field, *On the Church*, bk. v. ch. xliii.; *Op.*, iii. 460. Edit. Cambridge, 1850.

[1] S. Hieron., *De Vir. Illustr.*, cap. 97; P.L. xxiii. 697.

[2] S. Hilar., *Fragment*, vi.; P.L. x. 678, '*Perfidia Ariana.*'

[3] Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, bk. ii. ch. ii. vol. i. p. 322.

[4] Fleury, *op. cit.*, liv. xiii. ch. xlv. tom. i. 560. Edit. 1856.

[5] S. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum ad Monachos*, c. 43; P.G. xxv. 744.

[6] S. Hilar., *Ep. Liberii in S. Hilar. Frag.*, vi. 5, 6; P.L. x. 678.

761. In another letter addressed to Ursacius, Bishop of Singedunum, Valens, Bishop of Mursa, and Germinius, Bishop of Sirmium, three of the most prominent members of the second great Synod of Sirmium, similar evidence is found. In it he declares that 'he is not compelled by any constraint, God is my witness'; he says that they should be informed that 'Athanasius, who was Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, was condemned by me, and that he was separated from the communion of the Roman Church, as the whole Presbytery of the Roman Church is my witness. You are to know, dearest brethren, by these letters in truth and simplicity of mind, that I am at peace with you all, the bishops of the Catholic Church. I wish that through you, our brethren and fellow-bishops, Epictetus and Auxentius, should also know that I am at peace and communion with them. But whosoever shall dissent from our peace and concord which by the will of God is established throughout the world, let him know that he is separated from our communion.'[1]

762. St. Hilary introduces these letters in the *Fragment* with the words, 'Liberius forfeited all his former excellence by writing to the sinful heretical Arians who had passed an unjust sentence upon the holy Athanasius'; and of the Sirmium Creed which he signed, 'This is Arian perfidy, this I have noted, not the apostate,' and he more than once anathematises him, 'I say anathema to thee, Liberius, and to thy accomplices,' 'anathema to thee again, and yet a third time, prevaricator Liberius.'[2]

763. It has been objected against the conclusion here arrived at that this *Fragment* is spurious. Now, accusations of this kind, when the evidence of the documents alleged to be forged is inconvenient to the persons making the charge, must always be received with caution. It is sufficient to say that 'its genuineness is admitted by every critic of authority except Hefele.'[3] The letters, too, are asserted to be spurious. 'Hefele's arguments against them are exceedingly weak. The letters, like most other documents of the Arian controversy, contain historical difficulties which may not be easy to explain, particularly if a history like that of Dr. Hefele has been written without regard to them; but the question of style is quite out of place here. Popes, as we have seen in the history of Honorius, do not always write the letters for which they are responsible. Liberius may not have been the real author of the letter to Constantius which he admires, any more than of those letters which he considers unworthy of a Pope. The conversation of Liberius with the emperor in Theodoret's history, to which Dr. Hefele refers, is probably not more authentic than the speeches in Livy; and a discourse of Liberius, in St. Ambrose's works, has always been con-

[1] S. Hilar., *Ep. Liberii in S. Hilar. Frag.*, iv. 5, 6; P.L. x. 678.
[2] *Ibid.*; P.L. x. 677, 678, 679.
[3] Renouf, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 42, note on 'Pope Liberius.'

sidered as thrown by St. Ambrose into his own language. The great Protestant critics admit the genuineness of the epistles in question ; and amongst Catholic authorities [1] Dr. Hefele stands alone in opposition to Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Fleury, Dupin, Ceillier, Montfaucon, Constant, Möhler, and Döllinger.' [2] To these names may be added that of Cardinal Newman, who cites them [3] without any note of suspicion.

764. But it is said that Sozomen's account of the action of Liberius is inconsistent with the evidence of the *Fragments*, and shows that Liberius did not fall into Arianism. Sozomen's account is as follows:—

'Not long after the Emperor, having returned from Rome to Sirmium, and the Western Bishops having sent an embassy to him, he summons Liberius from Beroea. And the legates from the East being present, he assembled the Bishops who happened to be staying at his Court, and set to work to press Liberius to confess that the Son is not consubstantial—ὁμοούσιος—with the Father. Basil and Eustathius and Eleusius were urgent, and moved the Emperor to do this, using very great freedom of speech with him. They proceeded at that very time to gather together into one document the things which had been decreed against Paul of Samosata and against Photinus at Sirmium, and also the Creed which was set forth at the dedication of the Church at Antioch, because, as they said, certain persons, under pretext of the ὁμοούσιον, were undertaking to frame privately a heresy, and they contrive that Liberius, and also Alexander and Severianus and Crescens, who were Bishops in Africa, should consent to this formula. In like manner, consent was given to it by Ursacius, and by Germinius of Sirmium, and by Valens, Bishop of Mursa, and by as many Eastern Bishops as were present. But they also received in turn from Liberius a confession which excommunicated those who should declare that the Son is not similar to the Father in essence and in all respects. For when Eudoxius and his partisans at Antioch, who zealously favoured the heresy of Aetius, received the letter of Hosius, they began to spread abroad the rumour that Liberius also had rejected the ὁμοούσιον, and that he holds the opinion that the Son is unlike—ἀνόμοιος—the Father. But when these things had been in this way accomplished by the representatives of the West, the Emperor allowed Liberius to return to Rome. And the Bishops who were at Sirmium write to

[1] Renouf in a note here adds: 'Among these I do not reckon Stilting, the Bollandist, whose article on Liberius I consider one of the most mischievous productions ever written. It is, no doubt, extremely able, but it has no more solid value than Whately's *Historic Doubts*, and it is calculated to impose upon precisely those who have no notion of the difference between sophistical subtlety and accurate reasoning, Pyrrhonism and sound criticism. It will be time to consider its arguments when they have convinced a single impartial Protestant, like Gieseler or Neander, or a learned Jew like the editor of the *Regesta*.'

[2] Renouf, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 45.

[3] Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, p. 332. Third Edit.

Felix, who was at that time governing the Church of the Romans, and to the clergy of Rome, telling them that they should receive Liberius, and directing that both Bishops should act as administrators of the Apostolic See, and that they should exercise in common the episcopal office in a spirit of concord, and that all the distressing things, which had happened by reason of the ordination of Felix and of the exile of Liberius, should be buried in oblivion.'[1]

765. Now, in the first place, it is to be observed that 'the story is highly suspicious, for how could Valens and Ursacius be acting with high Semi-Arians?'[2] Secondly, that Sozomen does not make the slightest allusion to what had taken place at Beroea. He may not have known anything about it, in which case his information was imperfect, and consequently his account inevitably presents an erroneous impression of the action taken by Liberius; or he knew it and ignored it, with the same result, his account being at variance with the statement made by St. Athanasius, 'Liberius was banished, after two years he yielded, and from fear of death, with which they threatened him, signed.'[3] This clearly dates the fall of Liberius in A.D. 357, as Liberius was banished in A.D. 355, and also categorically states that he 'signed,' that is, that he subscribed against Athanasius, his refusal to do so being the cause of his banishment;[4] subscription against St. Athanasius being, it is clear, the act by which any one who was orthodox would be proved to have embraced Arianism, and therefore was insisted upon by the Emperor, a condition compliance with which on the part of Liberius is proved by his return to Rome.

766. Sozomen's account is also at variance with the account of Liberius' fall given by St. Jerome in his *Chronicon*, in which he says, under the date A.D. 357, 'Liberius, worn out by the tedium of exile, and subscribing heretical pravity, entered Rome as a conqueror,'[5] for St. Jerome here plainly ascribes Liberius' return to his subscription to 'heretical pravity' in the year A.D. 357, *i.e.* at Beroea, which is evident from the fact that he says, as already noted, that Fortunatian, Bishop of Aquileia, 'first advised, then seduced and compelled Liberius, Bishop of the city of Rome, to subscribe heresy';[6] for first it will be observed that Sozomen does not mention Fortunatian in his 'account,' and secondly, the first letter of Liberius in the *Fragment* does in connection with the fall at Beroea. This testimony of St. Jerome's, it

[1] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 15; P.G. lxvii. 1132.

[2] Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, i. 261, 262.

[3] S. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum ad Monachos*, c. 41; P.G. xxv. 741.

[4] *Ibid.*, c. 35; P.G. xxv. 733.

[5] S. Hieron., *Chron.*, A.D. 357; P.L. xxvii. 685, 686. These words are in the oldest and best MS. of the *Chronicon*, 'which is one of the treasures of the Bodleian.'—Bishop Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, Preface to the third edition.

[6] S. Hieron., *De Vir. Illus.*, c. 97; P.L. xxiii. 697.

will be noted, thus indirectly confirms the accuracy of the statement in the *Fragment*, which is, moreover, confirmed by the statement of the Arian historian Philostorgius, who says that Liberius and Hosius wrote openly against the term 'consubstantial.'[1] The coupling of the two names together points to the fact that they subscribed the same formula; this would be in accordance with the account of the action of Liberius given in the *Fragment*.

767. Sozomen's account, therefore, cannot be adduced in the face of these facts as evidence against the accuracy of the testimony afforded by the *Fragment* and the Epistles contained in it, that accuracy being confirmed by the fact that such testimony fits in with the other independent evidence. Further, it must be said that the suspiciousness of the whole story is not lessened by the fact that his 'accuracy' is not above suspicion. It is quite true that Duchesne describes this chapter of Sozomen's *History* as being 'based upon official documents of first-hand authority,'[2] but his method of dealing with other official documents, such as, for instance, the Letter of Pope Julius,[3] is not such as to inspire unqualified confidence.

768. The formula which Sozomen asserts was subscribed by Liberius must now be considered. It was one compiled from three sources, chief among which were the decrees against Paul of Samosata of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 268. Now there is no doubt that the Antiochene Council rejected the ὁμοούσιον,[4] because Paul of Samosata had objected to it as open to a misinterpretation. The composite formula thus contained a repudiation of the term which was recognised on all sides as the very bulwark of the orthodox doctrine, and as such was the object of the attack of all shades of Arianism. He thus was a 'renegade,'[5] as he had been at Beroea the year before. There can be no doubt that the *Formula* was heretical, as Ursacius and Valens, two throughgoing Arians, were, according to Sozomen, able to give their consent to it, and with them Liberius communicated. It will be seen that, even if it be granted for the sake of argument that the *Fragment* and the letters of Liberius be forgeries, there is ample evidence of the fall at Beroea, and even if there had been no such evidence, Sozomen's *History* affords clear demonstration that he fell at Sirmium in the following year. In either case it is easy to understand how it is that St. Hilary, in his *Liber contra Constantium*, says to Constantius with reference to his treatment of Liberius, 'O miserable man, in regard to

[1] Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 3 (epitome); P.G. lxv. 517.
[2] Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, i. 209, quoted Puller, *op. cit.*, p. 259, note 1. Third Edit.
[3] *Vide* note 52.
[4] As Hefele admits, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. 2. [E.T. i. 123.]
[5] Lib. of the Fathers, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, p. 127, note, quoted in Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, note 8, pp. 362, 363.

whom I know not whether you committed the greater act of impiety when you banished him or when you sent him back'[1] [to Rome].

It was only as a heretic that the Emperor 'sent him back,' and this was what made his act, which otherwise would have been one of reparation for the violence used towards him, blameworthy. It may be added that it was no doubt owing to the fall of Liberius that the great work of the pacification of the Eastern troubles was treated by St. Athanasius and the Council of Alexandria, in A.D. 362, without any reference at all to him.[2]

769. In fact, until the sixteenth century the fall of Liberius was accepted as an indisputable historical event; hence in the Acts of St. Eusebius of Rome, which were considered authentic, that saint is represented 'as a victim of the heretical pope whose communion he called upon every one to avoid.'[3] In Bede's Martyrology (19 Kal. Sept.), and also that of Rabanus, it is noted 'The birthday of St. Eusebius, who fulfilled his confession in the reign of Constantius, the Arian emperor, through the machinations of the Bishop Liberius similarly a heretic,' whilst in the Martyrology of Ado (14th Aug.) St. Eusebius is said to have 'bewailed that Liberius, the Pope, had expressed his agreement with Arian perfidy,' words which occur in other mediæval Martyrologies, and they were formerly in the Roman Breviary,[4] whence they were deleted in the sixteenth century, when that Breviary was 'reformed' by Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius, whose method of 'reformation' was one of mutilation and addition. Whether Liberius was really orthodox as a 'private Christian' may be an open question; it was as Bishop of Rome that he fell, for his act was an official one in his ecclesiastical capacity, hence the proofs of the fact that the Roman See was stained by heresy by his fall, form a great stumbling-block to Papalists, who consequently make every effort to, if possible, explain them away, or, if that expedient proves to be useless, then they assert that the proofs are based on spurious documents, both of which courses of procedure obviously fail.

Section C.—*Zosimus and Pelagianism.*

770. The case of Zosimus and Pelagianism has already been before us in connection with another point.[5] What is now to be considered is the question, Did Zosimus, when dealing with Pelagius and Cœlestius, take the side of the heretics, and so fail to preserve unstained the Catholic faith in the Roman Church? If he did so, it follows that

[1] S. Hilar., *Liber contra Constantium Imperatorem*, c. ii.; P.L. x. 589.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 667.
[3] Renouf, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, note on 'Pope Liberius,' p. 43.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 44.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 643 *et seq.*

he did not possess the 'charisma of truth and never-failing faith,'[1] which Papalism declares to belong to Roman Pontiffs by the institution of Christ, since he would have failed to discharge the office of 'Supreme Teacher' of the One Flock, which is asserted to be included in the 'Apostolic Primacy over the whole church,' declared under anathema to belong to the said 'Pontiffs.'[2]

771. Zosimus received Cœlestius after he had been driven out from Constantinople, and having 'caused the *Libellus* which he had given him to be read,' he 'repeatedly inquired from him whether he spoke from his heart, as well as with his lips, only the things which he had written.'[3] It is plain that Zosimus held the *Libellus* itself to be orthodox, the object of his examination of Cœlestius being to discover whether 'from his heart, as well as with his lips,' he spoke 'only those things which he had written'; *i.e.* that he might be certain that the *Libellus* really expressed his faith and was not a mere subterfuge compiled with the object of inducing Zosimus to take his side. The identity of his faith on the points as to which he was accused, with the statements in the *Libellus*, was established by his investigation, thereupon Zosimus declared him to be orthodox. It follows, therefore, that Zosimus approved the *Libellus* as orthodox, or he would not have taken it as the standard by which the orthodoxy of Cœlestius was to be judged. This fact is sufficient to dispose of the attempt made to do away with the inconvenient evidence which Zosimus' conduct affords, by alleging that the '*Libellus* is called perfectly Catholic because its submission enabled the doubtful part to be interpreted favourably,'[4] and at the same time shows how impossible it is to reconcile historical facts with Papalism.

772. The real attitude of Zosimus towards this heresy is further seen in his treatment of Pelagius himself. The heresiarch had written to Innocent P. I., of whose death he had not heard at the time, sending a confession of faith. It was similar in tenour to that of Cœlestius. Zosimus caused it to be read in his Synod, and thereupon wrote to the African Bishops as follows:—'After the great Cœlestius had been heard by us, and had plainly stated what his opinions are on the faith, and after he had confirmed by frequent professions the same things as he had put together, we sent a further letter concerning him to you. . . . Pelagius also sent letters containing a full purgation of himself . . . all alike and worded in the same sense and language as Cœlestius had previously put forth. . . . Could men of such unimpeachable faith—*fidei absolutæ*—be accused? . . . Rejoice in learning that these men, whom false judges have accused, have never been separated from our body

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486.
[2] *Ibid. Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.
[3] Zosimus P., *Ep. ad Episcopos Africanos*, Ep. ii.; P.L. xx. 649-650.
[4] *Dublin Review*, July 1897, p. 103.

and from Catholic truth . . . We have therefore sent you copies of the documents which Pelagius sent, and we do not doubt that their perusal will give you like joy in the Lord, because of his unimpeachable faith—*absoluta fide*.'[1]

773. Zosimus' language is unambiguous, and can have no other meaning than that he held that Pelagius was, like Cœlestius, a man of 'unimpeachable faith,' and therefore he did not maintain the faith unimpaired, another proof that the assertion that the Roman Bishops possess by the institution of Christ a 'charisma' which prevents them from falling into heresy and so betraying the faith, is incompatible with historical facts.[2]

774. If it be alleged that Zosimus, when dealing with these two heresiarchs, was not acting as the Supreme Pastor delivering a decision *ex cathedra*, so that if, perchance, Zosimus did make a mistake in this case, it proves nothing against the Papalist contentions, it must be replied that on Papalist principles Cœlestius and Pelagius had appealed to the 'Supreme Judge of the faithful' on a question the answer to which invoked a declaration as to the true faith on the point at issue. Now it is plain that such a declaration, pronounced by the 'Supreme Pastor,' 'the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' would be one in which the charisma 'of truth and never-failing faith' divinely bestowed on Peter and his successors 'in the Roman Episcopate' would perforce be called into exercise in order that Zosimus might 'perform his high office for the salvation of all, and the whole flock of Christ be kept away by him from the poisonous fruit of error and be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine.'[3] 'The salutary efficacy of the apostolic office' could hardly ever, on Papalist principles, have been more urgently required than in the case of Pelagianism, so destructive as it is to the truth of Christianity. Zosimus, if Papalism were true, would have been bound, therefore, on so grave an occasion, to have exercised his office as Supreme Teacher; not to have done so would have been to be untrue to the trust committed to him. The miserable error into which he fell is therefore proof positive that no such position in the Divine Constitution of the Church as that which, by the fautors of the Papacy, is declared to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishops is, as a matter of fact, held by them.

775. Two facts must be noted as confirming the conclusions here arrived at. (*a*) First, that Zosimus himself had no idea that he held, as Bishop of Rome *jure divino*, the office of infallible Teacher of the One Flock. This is clear from his Second Epistle to the African

1 Zosimus P., *Ep. ad Episcopos Africanos*, Ep. iii.; P.L. xx. 655-659.

2 On St. Augustine's statement with reference to the treatment of Cœlestius and Pelagius by Zosimus, *vide* note 58.

3 *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.

Bishops, in which he says: 'Great matters demand a great weight of examination that the balance of judgment be not less weighty than the matters dealt with. In addition, there is the authority of the Apostolic See, to which the decrees of the Fathers have, in honour of St. Peter, sanctioned a peculiar reverence.'[1]

Zosimus here describes the authority of his See as that to which the Fathers have, in honour of St. Peter, '*sanctioned* a peculiar reverence,' *i.e.* the reverence which he claims should be paid to the authority of the Roman See derives its origin from the decrees of the Fathers. Such a statement is incompatible with a belief in the Papal Monarchy, for, according to Papalism, obedience is due to the authority of the Roman See not because of any 'decrees of the Fathers,' but because such authority is, and has always been, inherent in that See by the institution of Christ as essential to the Divine Constitution of the Church. Further, if it be inquired what 'decrees of the Fathers' Zosimus refers to, it is clear they are 'the Sardican Canons,'[2] which he attributed to the Nicene Council, a fact which corroborates the interpretation of his words which is here given.

776. (*b*) Secondly, when Zosimus changed his mind he sent a letter to the chief Bishops of Christendom containing the condemnation which he then pronounced against the Pelagians. The *Epistola Tractoria* is said to 'have been made strong—confirmed (*roborata*)—by the subscriptions of the holy Fathers.'[3] Obviously on Papalist principles the subscriptions of all the Bishops of the world could add no force to a decision of the 'Supreme Judge' *jure divino*; not only so, but to assert that they did so would be contrary to the fact that, in accordance with those principles, it was of itself, immediately it was promulgated, binding on the consciences of all, pastors and people, of whatsoever rite or dignity.

777. Thirdly, of those who took the *Epistola Tractoria* into consideration, nineteen Italian Bishops refused to subscribe thereto. Chief among these was Julian, Bishop of Æsculanium, in Campania. These Bishops, it would seem, drew up a Confession of Faith which concluded thus: 'We have written and sent this to your Holiness, as it appears to us according to the Catholic rule. If you think we ought to hold otherwise, write back again. But if it is impossible to contradict us, and yet some wish to stir up scandal against us, let your Holiness understand that we appeal to a Plenary Council (*nos ad audientiam plenariæ Synodi provocasse*).'[4]

[1] Zosimus P., *Ep. ad Episcopos Africanos*, Ep. ii.; P.L. xx. 649, 650.

[2] On the 'Sardican Canons,' *vide supra* nn. 323 *et seq.*

[3] Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium*, vii.; P.L. xlviii. 93.

[4] *Libellus Fidei S. J. C. scriptus ut videtur a Juliano ad apostolicam sedem missus nomine Episcoporum, etc.*; P.L. xlv. 1735.

Julian and his fellow-bishops refused to subscribe the condemnation, on the ground that the accused were absent and had not been heard by them, because they are taught by the Holy Scriptures that human will ought not to be preferred to the precepts of God.

778. Julian, as one who held a See in one of the Suburbicarian Provinces, and so was within the limits of the Patriarchal jurisdiction belonging to the Bishop of Rome, would naturally desire to have his opinion on the orthodoxy of the confession which they annexed to their refusal to subscribe to the *Epistola Tractoria* sent by him; but the fact that he and his fellow-bishops drew up their own confession, and refused to subscribe to the document sent, is a proof that he, and those who acted with him, knew nothing of the idea that Zosimus had the right, as the Supreme Pastor and teacher *jure divino*, to judge and define *ex cathedra* the truth as to the question raised by Pelagius and his followers, a judgment which no one could review, and a definition which *ex sese* and not from consent of the Church would be irreformable.

779. Moreover, the fact that in the event of any attempt being made to make them, as a consequence of their action, appear odious to the world in spite of whatever Zosimus might say as to the orthodoxy of their confession, they declared that they appealed to a Plenary Council, proves that the whole Church of their age recognised such a council as possessing the final and supreme authority in the Church, and not the Bishop of Rome. If this had not been the case, a declaration from Zosimus *ex cathedra* that their confession was orthodox would have been all that was necessary, in that on Papalist principles it would have been at once recognised as the infallible act of the Supreme Teacher and Judge. Such a declaration Julian and his fellow-bishops did not expect to be so regarded; on the other hand, they knew that a 'Plenary Council' was universally held to be supreme, and its judgment consequently would be universally held to settle any point, hence to it they appealed.

780. The whole attitude of Julian and these bishops in the matter witnesses to the fact that the Papalist theory as to the divinely conferred prerogatives of the Roman Bishop was not 'the venerable and constant belief' of the 'age' in which they lived, and thus accounts for the fact that Zosimus' action with regard to Cœlestius and Pelagius did not create the terrible evil in the Church which it would necessarily have done if the contrary had been the case.

781. Should it be suggested that Zosimus was a 'good-natured Pope,' on whom the cunning craftiness of the heretics successfully imposed, this would obviously be no defence, in that Zosimus acted in a *judicial* manner. 'Blessed Zosimus, prelate of the Apostolic See,' as Facundus says, 'who against the judgment of Innocent his predecessor, who first

condemned the Pelagian heresy, praising as true and Catholic the faith of Pelagius himself and of his accomplice Cœlestius, whom having been convicted in the Church of Carthage, and appealing to the Apostolic See, himself examined in a judicial manner.'[1] The 'charisma' which on Papalist principles Zosimus had, as the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, would necessarily prevent any Pope, however 'good-natured,' from being led to countenance error by a decision arrived at in such a manner, and so involve the whole Church of which he was the divinely appointed 'Feeder, Ruler, and Governor.' It could not be otherwise, for in such case the prerogative which on those principles 'the only begotten Son of God vouchsafes to join with the supreme pastoral office,'[2] conferred on Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate, would be of no use whatever for the purpose for which it is asserted it was so conferred.

Section CI.—*Honorius and Monothelitism.*

782. From the two cases which have been considered, the inaccuracy of the statement in the *Satis Cognitum* is patent. But, further, the *Satis Cognitum*, in thus quoting the formula of Hormisdas, necessarily implies that it has *always* been true throughout the whole history of the Church that the Catholic religion has been preserved without spot in the Apostolic See, that being in fact the doctrine laid down in the *Vatican Decrees*. The Fathers of that Council declared in those Decrees that the Roman Bishops were 'indefatigable in taking care that the salutary doctrine of Christ should be propagated amongst all the peoples of the earth, and with equal care watched that where it had been received it should be preserved genuine and pure,' with the result that 'the Bishops of the whole world' carried those difficulties which 'arose in matters of faith' to the Apostolic See, 'that there the losses of faith might be most effectually repaired where the faith cannot fail,' and 'all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have venerated and followed, the apostolical doctrine' of the successors of Peter, 'knowing that the See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error.'[3]

783. As the history of the Church makes evident the inaccuracy of the statement cited at the time of the composition of the *Libellus*, so also it is contradicted by the facts of history after its appearance, as the way in which Pope Honorius dealt with Monothelitism shows.

Honorius succeeded Boniface v. as Bishop of Rome on 27th October A.D. 625. A few years previously the question as to the reality of the divine and human wills in Christ had arisen in connection with

[1] Facundus, *Pro Defens. trium Cap.*, lib. vii. cap. 3; P.L. lxvii. 715.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.
[3] *Ibid. Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486.

the heresy of the Monophysites. These heretics maintained that Christ was of two natures, but that after the union of these in the Incarnation it was right only to speak of one nature, hence the name Monophysite applied to them.

784. Efforts were made to bring about union between these heretics and the orthodox, in the course of which an attempt was made to find some new terminology, the acceptance of which would enable the Monophysites to return to the unity of the Church. With this object in view, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, endeavoured to obtain the approval of the Catholic Bishops for the use of a formula which, he said, had been used by the Emperor Heraclius when in Armenia in replying to the Monophysite Paul—viz. that there was '*μία ἐνέργεια* of Christ our true God, *i.e.* that there were not in Christ two kinds of activities or operations to be distinguished, one divine and one human. This was the utterance of the Shibboleth of Monothelitism, which consists in this, that the human nature of Christ united with the divine, possessed indeed all the *proprietates* of manhood, as the Council of Chalcedon teaches; but that it does not *work*, but that all the operation and activity of Christ proceeds from the Logos, and that the human nature is only its instrument herein.'[1]

785. Cyrus, Metropolitan of Phasis, who had sought from Sergius further explanations as to the *μία ἐνέργεια*, having been raised to the Patriarchal chair of Alexandria, proceeded to endeavour to unite the Monophysites to the Church on the basis of that formula. He drew up to that end nine *κεφάλεια*, in the seventh of which occurs the statement, 'and if any one does not confess that this one and the same Christ and Son worked both the divine and human by one divine-human operation, *μίᾳ θεανδρικῇ ἐνέργειᾳ*, let him be anathema.'[2] The language indeed employed throughout the document, especially the severe anathema pronounced on every form of Nestorianism, was such as would be likely to render it acceptable to the Monophysites. On their acceptance of the statement thus drawn up, that section of the heretics known as the Theodosian party was united to the Church, 'a watery union whereby the Council of Chalcedon was brought into such contempt that the Theodosians boasted that "the Synod of Chalcedon had come to us and not we to that."'[3] Sergius was duly informed by Cyrus of his success, and in his reply to his communication both commended him and repeated the principal contents of the *κεφάλεια*.

786. Meanwhile, however, Sophronius, a saintly and learned monk of Palestine, had expressed his disapproval of the doctrine of 'one energy.' He declared that the article was plainly Apollinarian, by

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. i. sect. 291. [E.T. v. 4.] [2] Mansi, xi. 565.
[3] Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, Ed. Bonn, t. i. p. 507, quoted Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. i. sect. 293. [E.T. v. 21.]

which he meant Monophysite, and thought that it was necessary to hold fast 'two energies.' The efforts of Sophronius had no effect, and accordingly, it would seem, on the proposal of Cyrus, he appealed to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius, going to Constantinople with letters from Cyrus for that purpose. No doubt he hoped to gain over Sergius, so that the obnoxious expression, μία ἐνέργεια, might be struck out of the instrument of union. Naturally, however, he did not succeed in accomplishing this, though he was successful in inducing Sergius 'no longer to allow the μία ἐνέργεια to be promulgated so as not to destroy the peace of the Church, and in this direction he gave counsel and instruction to Cyrus of Alexandria that, after the union had been established, he should no longer give permission to speak either of one or of two energies.'[1]

787. Sergius wrote to Honorius giving him a detailed account of what had taken place in regard to this matter. He pointed out that Cyrus was uncertain as to whether it were right to speak of one ἐνέργεια of Christ, and had applied to him (Sergius) for instruction. Cyrus had won over to union many by dogmatic κεφάλαια, of which the μία ἐνέργεια was one; but Sophronius, recently chosen Patriarch of Jerusalem, had opposed this condescending adaptation, which the Fathers had not only not forbidden but exercised themselves. 'This circumstance Sergius wished to lay before Honorius. In his view it would be cruel disputatiously to disturb the union, which had been scarcely established, for the sake of a question which did not endanger pure doctrine, as must be the case should the words μία ἐνέργεια be again struck out of the formula, agreeably to the demand of Sophronius. Sergius had discussed the matter at large with him, and Sophronius had not been able to prove the doctrine of a twofold ἐνέργεια, either by patristic or synodal testimonies. To Cyrus he had written advising him, in consideration of the peace which had been established, to allow no one to teach either the unity or the duality of the ἐνέργεια, but to limit them to setting forth one and the same only begotten Son, who worked everything—both that which befitted God and that which befitted man—the Incarnate God out of whose unity everything undividedly proceeded, and back into whose unity everything must be referred. The formula μία ἐνέργεια, though employed by some of the holy Fathers, wears still a strange face to some, and excites the suspicion that there may be an intention of leading them into Monophysitism; it would be better therefore avoided. The formula δύο ἐνέργειαι had never been employed by any recognised teacher of the Church, and is a stumbling-block to many; and it should be the more strictly avoided, as the assumption of two ἐνέργειαι necessarily involves the possession of two wills, and that of two opposed wills. It is, for example, as though the

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. i. sect. 295. [E.T. v. 23.]

Logos partially willed the sufferings and the humanity resisted His will, which would end in the recognition of two subjects choosing opposite courses; for there cannot be two wills, in reference to the same thing, at the same time, on one and the same subject. To assert that would be to separate the humanity of Christ from His deity, and to abolish the Incarnation. The doctrine of the God-taught Fathers tells us plainly enough that the flesh of the Lord, animated by a rational soul, never accomplished its natural motions separately and of its own impulse, or in opposition to the suggestions of the Logos hypostatically united with it, but merely when and as, and in the measure in which God the Logos willed it. As our body is governed by the soul, so was the entire human life-system of Christ, always and in all things, impelled by God. Gregory of Nyssa also allots the passive to the flesh, the active to God. Sergius, therefore, counselled him against the use of the formula of unity or duality, though the hushword μία ἐνέργεια ought not to be quite repudiated, as some demanded; and Sophronius had expressed himself satisfied therewith, had promised to keep the peace, and had only required a written declaration, which Sergius had given him. To the like intent he had recently expressed himself to the Emperor, warning him against too subtle investigations, and counselling him to be content with that which had been handed down of old—namely, with maintaining that every divine and human act proceeded, undivided and unseparated, from one and the same Incarnate Word. Leo had also evidently taught the same doctrine in the words "agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium habet."[1]

Sergius enclosed copies of his letters to the Emperor and to Cyrus, and concluded by praying Honorius to read what he had written, and to complete what he found defective, and to communicate to him his view—τὰ δοκοῦντα—by his holy letters.

788. This letter of Sergius is clearly heretical. Whilst apparently equally prohibiting the use of either formula, 'one' or 'two' 'energies,' he accords to them distinctly different treatment. He states that the use of the expression μία ἐνέργεια has resulted in much good to the Church, and that it was necessary that it should remain in the κεφάλεια, so that the union which had been brought about through its adoption might be maintained. The Emperor, too, was in favour of it, whilst it had been used by many of the Fathers. On the other hand, the formula δύο ἐνέργειαι had no patristic authority, and its use would have grave consequences, even a relapse into Nestorianism. His comparison of the relation of the way in which the human nature in Christ is related to the divine, to the relation of the body to the soul, so that it is guided by it, having no will of its own, emphasises the mean-

[1] Dorner, *On the Person of Christ*, Div. II., Second Period 1st Epoch, vol. i. pp. 174 *et seq.*, in T. and T. Clark's Foreign Theological Lib., 3rd Series, vol. x.

ing of this divergent treatment, making it plain that it had its basis in the denial that the human nature in Christ had any will, so that there could be only 'one energy' in Christ. There can be no doubt that Sergius, in thus approaching Honorius, had for his object to obtain his approval and support for the line he took, a line which clearly meant that Monothelitism was approved as orthodox. It may be added that the Monothelite character of the letter is further shown by the fact that a 'great inner relationship' exists between it and the *Ecthesis*[1] condemned by the *Lateran Synod* of A.D. 649, much of the heretical part of which is taken verbatim from it, as well as by the fact that it was condemned by the Sixth Œcumenical Council.

789. What reply did Honorius make to this 'dogmatic letter'? Not only did he not say a single word which can be construed as expressing disagreement with the doctrine taught by Sergius, but he expressly accepted it as orthodox. He approved that neither the formula μία ἐνέργεια nor the formula δύο ἐνέργειαι should be used, agreeing with Sergius' words and opinions throughout. But Honorius, moreover, made it quite clear that he accepted and approved Sergius' heretical doctrine not only thus, but by the definite statement 'we confess One Will of our Lord Jesus Christ'—*unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*[2]—a statement based upon the argument that the will is to be attributed to the person and not to the nature, whence it would follow that as the Word assumed a human nature but not a human personality, He had only one will. This, it may be added, is the exact teaching of the Monothelite Paul, one of the successors of Sergius in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, who, in his 'dogmatic letter'[3] addressed to Pope Theodore in reply to a letter from him, said, 'We . . . recognise also only one will of our Lord in order not to ascribe to the one Person a contradiction of wills or think of that Person as conflicting with himself, and so as not to be found to admit two wills.'[4]

Honorius concluded by saying, 'These things your fraternity will preach with us, as we ourselves preach them like minded with you, and we urge you to avoid the expression which has been brought in of one or two operations, and preach with us in orthodox faith and Catholic unity the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, true God working in two natures, the works of the divinity and the humanity.'[5]

790. Sophronius meanwhile had been raised to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, and had, in accordance with the custom which then prevailed

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. i. sect. 299. [E.T. v. 61.]
[2] Mansi, xi. 538 *et seq.*
[3] It is so called.—Mansi, x. 1019.
[4] Mansi, x. 1023, 1024.
[5] Mansi, xi. 543.

of a new Bishop sending to other Bishops an account of his creed on entering on his office, sent forth his *Epistola Synodica*, which Hefele describes as 'almost the most important document in the whole Monothelite controversy; a great theological treatise, which expatiated on all the chief doctrines, especially the Trinity and the Incarnation, and richly discussed the doctrine of the two energies in Christ.'[1]

This letter was sent to Honorius by the hands of envoys, amongst whom was Stephen, Bishop of Dor, in like manner as it was sent to other Bishops, with the request that he should signify by his holy letters his judgment on the question before him, and supply what is deficient in his own statement of doctrine.

791. What was the result of the reception by Honorius of this 'dogmatic letter' of Sophronius? That Patriarch had set forth in it clearly the orthodox doctrine as to the two energies, yet in the face of this, which gave him the opportunity of reconsidering the question and withdrawing the heretical teaching of his letter to Sergius, Honorius maintained in a second letter to the same Patriarch his previous position. He says, 'We have also written to Cyrus of Alexandria that the newly invented expression may be rejected, one or two energies . . . for those who use such expressions imagine that, according as Christ has one or two natures, there must be one or two operations, it is altogether frivolous to think or declare that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man, has one or two operations.' . . . 'These things we have decided—συνείδομεν—to make manifest by the present letters to your most holy fraternity for the instruction of those in perplexity. Moreover, as regards the ecclesiastical dogma and what we ought to hold and teach, on account of the simplicity of man and to avoid controversies we must, as I have already said, assert neither one nor two energies in the Mediator between God and man, but must confess that both natures are naturally united in the one Christ, that each in communion with the other worked and acted, the divine works the divine and the human performs that which is of the flesh without separation and without mixture, and without the nature of God being changed into the manhood or the human nature into the Godhead. For one and the same is lowly and exalted, equal to the Father and inferior to the Father. . . . Ridding ourselves, therefore, as we have said, of the scandal of the new invention, we must not define or preach one or two operations, but instead of one operation as they say, we must confess in truth one Christ, one Lord; operating in both natures, and instead of two operations, rejecting the expression "twofold operations," they should preach with us that the two natures, that is, the divinity and the flesh assumed in the one Person of the Only begotten Son of the Father, operate what is peculiar to them without confusion,

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. i. sect. 297. [E.T. v. 41.]

division, or change. And these things we have decided—συνείδομεν—to make manifest to your most blessed fraternity in order that by putting forward of one Confession we may show ourselves to be of the same mind as your Holiness, clearly agreeing in one spirit with a like teaching of the faith—τῇ ἴσῃ διδαχῇ τῆς πίστεως.—And we have written to our common brethren, Cyrus and Sophronius, that they may not persist in the new expression of one or two energies, but preach with us the one Christ, the Lord operating on both natures human and divine things, and as for those whom our brother and fellow-bishop Sophronius sent to us, we have provided—παρεσκενάσαμεν—that in future he should not persist in the expression two energies. They promised to us fully, on condition that Cyrus should also desist from proclaiming *μία ἐνέργεια*.'[1]

792. Unfortunately only the extracts of this letter, which are preserved in the Acts of the Sixth Council, are extant. It is impossible to say, therefore, whether Honorius again spoke of one will, but it is plain that he maintained the position taken up in the first letter to Sergius, declaring his agreement with him, and consequently his disagreement with Sophronius. He expressly prohibits the use of the expression 'two energies' so obnoxious to the Monothelites, inasmuch as if 'two energies' be admitted, it follows that 'two wills' must also be confessed, on which ground the formula was especially valuable in the eyes of the Orthodox, and clung to by them with as much tenacity as it was opposed by the heretics. The fact that he expressed himself in the manner adopted by the Monothelite heretics is clear from the letter addressed to him by Sergius and from the *Ecthesis*—ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως—which was the result of the correspondence between the two Patriarchs, being drawn up by Sergius on the lines of that correspondence, and which contained the statement, 'We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ true God,'[2] evidently taken from the letter of Honorius.

The *Typus* put forth by the Emperor Constans II. in A.D. 649, under the influence of the Monothelite Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, bears like testimony. With the Monothelites, Honorius admitted the two natures in Christ, with them he denied the 'two operations,' the very ground on which the 'most impious' *Typus* was condemned in the *Encyclical* of the Lateran Council of A.D. 649.

793. The heretical nature of the teaching of Honorius is further confirmed by the following historical facts:—

[1] Mansi, xi. 579-82. With reference to the concluding statement in this extract, it is to be noted that Bossuet observes (*Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, Pars iii. lib. xii. c. xxii. tom. ii. p. 38. Edit. Lugani, 1766): 'The legates of Sophronius did indeed promise this, but it is well known that Sophronius persevered in the right opinion, and that his legates only, having been badly instructed by Honorius, whom they had duly come to consult, promised that which was wrong and opposed to the faith.'

[2] Mansi, x. 996.

(*a*) First, that the First Synod of Lateran, held in A.D. 649, under Pope St. Martin I., declared under anathema that there were two wills in Christ, divine and human, and two operations, divine and human, in Christ our God, and condemned any one who, 'following the wicked heretics, should confess one will and operation of Christ our God.'[1] This is a clear condemnation of Honorius, though he is not mentioned by name, in that he taught that there was one will of Christ and forbade the use of the formula δύο ἐνεργείαι. The Council asserted the truth to be the exact opposite. That they knew of Honorius' teaching is quite clear, in that the 'dogmatic letter' of the Monothelite Paul was read, in which Honorius is quoted as an authority in support of that heresy, and it is not without significance that whilst the Fathers of this Synod were careful to refute the Patriarch Paul's appeal to the Fathers of the Church, by an elaborate and careful statement from their writings, they made no attempt to refute his statement with reference to Honorius: this is evidence that they were compelled to let the assertion pass as being true, and shows that their condemnation of Monothelitism and its professors must be held to include Honorius, who had been appealed to as one of such professors.

794. (*b*) Secondly, that the Sixth Œcumenical Council expressly declared that his teaching was like that of Sergius, 'quite foreign to the Apostolic dogmas, to the declarations of the holy Councils, and of all the holy Fathers of repute, and followed the false doctrines of the heretics . . . and in every thing followed the doctrine [of Sergius], and confirmed—κυρώσαντα[2]—his 'impious dogmas,'[3] and on this ground anathema was pronounced upon him.[4] Hefele admits this, saying, 'that the Sixth Œcumenical Synod actually condemned Honorius on account of heresy is clear beyond all doubt.'[5] So pernicious, indeed, did the Fathers of the Council consider his letters to be, that they were ordered to be burnt as profane and soul-destroying writings.[6]

795. (*c*) Thirdly, the Seventh Œcumenical Council approved the sentence of condemnation pronounced by the Sixth Council on Honorius, and 'anathematised the Monothelitism of Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and all who believe with them.[7]

796. And (*d*) fourthly, the Fourth Council of Constantinople, which by the Latins is considered to be the Eighth Œcumenical, though not

[1] Canons X., XI., XII. Mansi, x. 1153.

[2] 'Lexicographers tell us κυρώσαι non tam significare *comprobare* quam *cum auctoritate decernere, legitime rem transigere, ut demum ratum sit quod actum fuerit*' (see Stephani *Thesaur.*, ad voc.). Renouf, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 23.

[3] Mansi, xi. 556.

[4] On the condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth Council, *vide infra* n. 950.

[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 324. [E.T. v. 182.]

[6] *Et prævidimus profana et animæ perniciosa continuo ob perfectum exterminium igne concremari.*—Mansi, xi. 514.

[7] Mansi, xiii. 377.

so considered by the Easterns, anathematised with Sergius and others Honorius as 'followers of the evil doctrine of the impious heresiarchs Apollinaris and Eutyches.'[1] In the face of this evidence it is idle to deny that Honorius taught heresy.

797. But, further, what were the circumstances under which Honorius thus set forth heresy? (*a*) He was applied to by the Patriarch of the Second See, Sergius of Constantinople, in a 'dogmatic letter' as the Sixth Œcumenical Synod entitled it. His answer must be of an equally authoritative character; his letters are, in fact, the ὅσιαι συλλαβαί—'the holy letters'—which Sergius asked for, and by that expression Easterns always meant documents issued in virtue of the official position of those from whom they emanated, and so possessing their authority. (*b*) Moreover, Honorius not only wrote to Sergius but to Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and to Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem; it is impossible to question the official character of his letters, it is the first Patriarch declaring to the second, and the third and the fifth, what is *de fide* concerning a most important question. In fact, as Bossuet says, 'it is not less certain that these decrees of Honorius were carried to the churches and spread throughout the East,'[2] for when Macarius, the Monothelite Patriarch of Antioch, the remaining Patriarchate, presented his Confession of Faith to the Sixth Council, he said, 'We consent as well to the five Councils, as to *Honorius taught of God*, to Sergius, Paulus, and Peter,'[3] and in thus reckoning Honorius foremost amongst the Monothelites, he evidently refers to Honorius' letters; in fact, the Confession itself is almost entirely made up of the letter of Sergius and the reply of Honorius thereto.

798. On Papalist principles it is plain that Honorius, in issuing these letters and giving this instruction, would be acting as the 'teacher of all Christians,' exercising 'the supreme power of teaching,' which was his in virtue of his 'Apostolic Primacy.' His 'decision' on this matter of faith would be *ex cathedra*. So clearly has this been perceived by certain Ultramontane writers, that they have, as a last resource, alleged that these letters were either forgeries, or corrupted by the enemies of the Roman See. There is, of course, no justification for such an allegation, as Hefele admits, 'the two letters of Pope Honorius, as we now possess them, are unfalsified,'[4] and the learned writer maintains that they were put forth *auctoritate Apostolica*, 'seeing Honorius intended to give to the Church of Constantinople, and *implicite* to the whole Church, an instruction on doctrine and faith;

[1] Mansi, xvi. 181.
[2] Bossuet, *op. cit.*, part iii. lib. viii. cap. xxii. tom. ii. 38. Lugani, 1766.
[3] Mansi, xi. 349.
[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. i. sect. 298. [E.T. v. 56.]

and in his second letter he even uses the expression, '*Ceterum quantum ad Dogma ecclesiasticum pertinet . . . non unam vel duas operationes in mediatore Dei et hominum definiri debemus.*'[1] He says also that 'it is in the highest degree startling, even scarcely credible, that an Œcumenical Council should punish with anathema a *Pope* as a heretic!'[2] But 'startling' to whom? Not to the Fathers of the Sixth Synod,[3] or those of the Quinsext Synod,[4] nor to those of the Seventh Synod,[5] nor to those of the so-called 'Eighth' Synod,[6] who, in their condemnation of Honorius, placed him in the same category with, and on the same level as, the other heretics they included in their anathema, thus showing that they were entirely ignorant of the possession by Honorius of any authority differing in *nature* from that possessed by the others, nor to Pope Leo II., who anathematised all those condemned by the Sixth Synod,[7] nor to his successors in the Roman See, who, till the eleventh century, made the solemn profession of faith prescribed in the *Liber Diurnus*; but to Papalists it must indeed be 'startling' to encounter a so well attested fact which contradicts in the most explicit manner that which they assert to be a 'dogma divinely revealed.'

799. From what has been said it follows that when the 'injuries done to the faith' by the Monothelite heresy were brought before 'the Apostolic See' that 'they might be remedied,' so far from 'the See of Peter' being 'free from all error,' and his 'successor in that chair,' Honorius, being endowed with 'a charisma of truth and never-failing faith,' he 'discharging his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians,' spoke *ex cathedra*, and 'defined' as that which 'should be held by the whole Church' what was contrary to the truth, and on that ground was condemned by the Universal Church at the Sixth Œcumenical Council. A more complete historical refutation of the position asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs by the *Vatican Decrees*, a position which the *Satis Cognitum* necessarily endorses and endeavours to support by its use of the quotation from the *Formula* which is under notice, could not well be imagined.

From what has been said it is plain that historical facts, after as well as before the issuing of the statement, condemn it of inaccuracy.

[1] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. v. 61.] [2] *Ibid.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 324. [E.T. v. 181.]
[3] *Vide supra*, 794, *et infra*, n. 960 *et seq.* [4] *Vide infra*, n. 959.
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 795, *et infra*, n. 960. [6] *Vide supra*, n. 796, *et infra*, n. 961.
[7] *Vide infra*, n. 956. Leo 'must also, it seems, have been the author of the third "Profession of Faith" in the *Liber Diurnus*. "Moreover I receive, embrace, and venerate the definition made, under the guidance of God, by the holy, universal, and great Sixth Synod, which lately sat in the royal city of Constantinople, in which it is plain that the legates of the Apostolic See presided, and which was gathered by the decree of the most Christian, most pious, Prince Constantine, crowned of God, and what it received I receive, and what or whom it rejected I reject, and whom likewise it anathematised or condemned, I anathematise and condemn."'—*Lib. Diurnus*, p. 82. 'On the authorship of this "Profession of Faith" see Garnier's note, p. 74.'—Pusey, *Eirenicon*, iii. p. 197, note 8.

Section CII.—*How was the Formula of Hormisdas accepted by the Easterns?*

800. The next point to be considered is in what manner was this *Formula* accepted by the Easterns? For many years they had not been in communion with the Roman See, owing to their acceptance of the *Henoticon*, or Edict of Union, which the Emperor Zeno had promulgated in A.D. 482, probably under the advice of Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople. The *Henoticon*, though in itself not heretical, and anathematising Eutyches, yet contained no reference to the Council of Chalcedon; it seemed thus to cast a reflection on the definition of the faith put forth by that Council, especially as it received by name the first three Œcumenical Synods. The object of the Emperor in putting it forth was to unite the Monophysites and the Orthodox in his Empire, and it was accepted by Peter Mongus and Peter the 'Fuller,' the Monophysite intruders into the Patriarchal thrones of Alexandria and Antioch respectively. Although Acacius and other Patriarchs who succeeded him on the throne of Constantinople were not Monophysites, yet the fact that they upheld the *Henoticon*, which the Monophysites were able to accept, and therefore was shown by that fact not to be inconsistent with heresy, no doubt justified Hormisdas, as it would any other Bishop under like circumstances, in requiring, as a condition precedent to the restoration of intercommunion between himself and those who, having accepted the *Henoticon*, desired such restoration, their formal adherence to some statement which would guarantee to him their present orthodoxy on the point as to which the Monophysites had fallen into error. Such a document was this *Formula*, the text of which is as follows:—

'The chief means of salvation is that we should keep the rule of right faith, and in no way deviate from the decrees of the Fathers. And forasmuch as the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed over when He said, Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church. These words are proved true by their results, since in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved unspotted. Therefore, desiring not to be separate from its faith and hope, and following in all things the ordinances of the Fathers, we anathematise all heretics, especially the heretic Nestorius, formerly Bishop of the city of Constantinople, condemned in the Council of Ephesus by Celestine, Pope of the city of Rome, and by St. Cyril, Bishop of the city of Alexandria, together with them anathematising Eutyches and Dioscurus of Alexandria, condemned in the holy Council of Chalcedon, which we venerate, follow, and embrace. Uniting with the parricide Timothy, surnamed Ælurus, and his disciple

and follower Peter of Alexandria, we similarly anathematise Acacius, formerly Bishop of Constantinople, who became their accomplice and follower, and those, moreover, who persevere in their communion and fellowship; because if any one embraces the communion of these persons, he merits a like sentence of condemnation with them. Likewise we also condemn and anathematise Peter of Antioch with his followers, and the followers of all those who have been mentioned above—*et omnium suprascriptorum.*—Wherefore we receive and approve all the Epistles of blessed Leo, Pope of the city of Rome, which he wrote concerning the right faith. On which account, as we have said before, following the Apostolic See in all respects, we preach all things which have been by her decreed; and consequently I hope that I may merit to be in one communion with thee, the communion which the Apostolic See maintains, in which is the whole and perfect steadfastness—*soliditas*—of the Christian religion; promising for the future that at the celebration of the Holy Mysteries there shall be no mention made of the names of those who have been separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, who do not agree in all respects with the Apostolic See, I have subscribed this profession with my own hand, and have presented it to thee, Hormisdas, the holy and venerable Pope of Old Rome.'[1]

801. The purpose with which the *Satis Cognitum* gives the extract from the *Formula* is not with the view of showing that the Easterns complied with the conditions which the Bishop of Rome, in the exercise of the right which every Bishop had of laying down the conditions on which he would readmit those who had been, in his opinion, under suspicion of heresy, required, but with the object of proving that the Easterns accepted the *Formula* on the ground that it was put forth by Hormisdas as the supreme teacher of all Christians in virtue of the Apostolic Primacy over the whole Church which he is asserted to hold *iure divino*, as the successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate. Unfortunately, however, for the object the *Satis Cognitum* had in view in making the quotation, the Patriarch John of Constantinople was careful to prefix to his signature a preface addressed to his 'brother and fellow-minister,' so worded as to clearly show that he denied that any unique authority was possessed by the Roman Bishop as the successor of St. Peter, and at the same time to assert that his own See possessed authority of the same nature as that of the Roman See. John thus effectually prevented any claim over his See being advanced by Hormisdas or his successors on the ground that he had accepted this *Formula*. The Patriarch, after expressing his joy that Hormisdas was seeking to unite the most holy churches of God according to the ancient tradition of the Fathers, continued thus: 'Know therefore,

[1] Mansi, vii. 467.

most holy one, that according as I have written to you, agreeing in the truth with thee, I, too, loving peace, renounce all the heretics repudiated by thee: for I hold that the most holy churches of God, that is yours of Elder Rome and this of New Rome, are one; I define the See of the Apostle Peter and this of the Imperial city to be one See.' . . . I assent to all the acts of the four General Councils — Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon—touching the confirmation of the faith and the constitution of the Church, and I suffer no disturbance of their wise decisions, for I know that such as attempt to interfere with a single tittle of their decrees have fallen away from the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God.'[1]

802. John, it will be seen, identifies his own See with that of Rome, thus claiming himself to possess whatever authority 'the See of the Apostle Peter' possessed. Further, he was careful to mention his assent to the acts of the four Œcumenical Councils touching 'the constitution' of the Church as well as to those touching her faith. By so doing he asserted the validity of, amongst others, Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon. The importance of this is plain. Rome, conscious of the growing power of Constantinople as the seat of the Imperial Court, consistently opposed that Canon, declining to recognise it. Notwithstanding this, it maintained its ground in the East and has ever continued to do so. It would have been impossible for John to have taken a step more calculated to define his position with regard to the See occupied by Hormisdas than this declaration of the binding character of this Canon and of others which the Four Councils had made 'touching the constitution of the Church,' Canons which are, as has been shown,[2] inconsistent with even the comparatively moderate claims which in those days the Roman Bishops ventured to put forth in the West, greater though they were than any which Easterns were asked to accept, as was naturally the case, seeing that in the West those claims had the patronage and coercive assistance of the secular power.

803. The independence manifested in the action of the Patriarch John is the more remarkable when the strong pressure which the Eastern Emperor Justin, 'a rude unlettered Dacian peasant,' exerted in order to bring about the union. This union he was anxious to accomplish from political motives. Support from the West would be valuable, not only because his own position at Constantinople needed strengthening, but also because he wanted material assistance in an attempt to recover the Imperial rights over Italy, of which Theodoric was then master. Theodoric was obnoxious to the Orthodox as a protector of the Arians, hence Justin calculated that the support of the

[1] Joann. Const., *Libellus Fidei*; P.L. lxiii. 443-45.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 314, 343, 418.

Orthodox would be readily accorded to him if they were assured of his orthodoxy, in any effort which he might make to reassert the Imperial sway over Italy and so reunite the severed empire.

804. Such assistance would be the more easily obtained through the Roman Bishop, whose influence in the West was great. It would appear that Justin's designs had the support of that Bishop, for when Theodoric sent John I., the successor of Hormisdas, on an embassy to Constantinople, he, on his return home, was put to death on the ground that he was engaged in a conspiracy against the existing Government with a view to the restoration of the Roman Empire.[1] The influence of the Court, therefore, no doubt was brought unsparingly to bear on the Patriarch of New Rome; that he was able to clearly maintain his position as a condition to acceding to the Emperor's desire that he should subscribe the *Libellus* is significant. Further, when it is remembered that Hormisdas accepted his subscription, so safeguarded against any attempt to turn it into a recognition of any claims put forward by him, that action is still more significant, in that it shows that whilst the Roman Bishops could put forward pretensions in the West and obtain their acceptance without demur, or at least without overt opposition, such pretensions might indeed be put forward in the East, but without avail, in that the Easterns held firmly to the constitution of the Church as handed down to them from the beginning, and rejected any attempt to infringe that constitution in the interest of the Roman See.[2]

[1] Cp. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, bk. iii. chs. iii. and iv. vol. i. pp. 403-425. Fourth Edit.

[2] Father Puller in an interesting discussion of the various forms of Hormisdas's *Libellus* has shown that the Patriarch John also refused to anathematise the followers of Acacius, as was required by the wording of the *Formula* as sent by Hormisdas, no doubt with the object of procuring the formal condemnation of Euphemius and Macedonius, two of the predecessors of John in the patriarchal chair of Constantinople by him. Hormisdas had evidently expected that it would be impossible to persuade the Patriarch to anathematise Euphemius and Macedonius, for he gave instructions to his legates as follows: 'But if after consenting to the anathema on Acacius, he goes on to say that the names of the successors of Acacius ought to be recited (at the reading of the diptychs) because some of them were sent into exile for their defence of the Council of Chalcedon, you will inform him that it is not in your power to remove anything from the formula of the *Libellus*, in which not only the condemned persons are mentioned, but also in a similar manner their followers (in qua *sequaces damnatorum* pariter continentur). But if you are not able to turn them aside from this proposal, at least insist on this much, namely, that Acacius be anathematised by name in accordance with the *Libellus* which we have given to you, and that the names of his successors be removed from the diptychs, and so be passed over in silence. When this has been done, receive the Bishop of Constantinople into our communion' (*Collect. Avellan.*, Ep. clviii. sects. 6-8, p. 606). And so we find that in the letter of the Patriarch John to Hormisdas 'the critical sentence, in which as we read it in the earlier forms of the *Libellus*, the *sequaces suprascriptorum* are condemned, appears in an altered form' 'The sentence now reads as follows: "Simili modo et Petrum Antiochenum condemnantes anathematizamus cum sequacibus suis et omnibus suprascriptis."' By an ingenious change of *omnium suprascriptorum* into *omnibus suprascriptis*,

805. Hormisdas, in addition to the subscription of the *Formula* of which he was the author, required also as a condition precedent to the restoration of intercommunion that the names of the three Patriarchs of Constantinople—Acacius, Euphemius, and Macedonius—should be removed from the diptychs. No difficulty was, it would appear, raised with reference to the removal of the name of Acacius, who indeed was anathematised in the *Formula* which was subscribed by John,[1] but the cases of Euphemius and Macedonius were different. Neither could with any justice be suspected of Monophysitism; the former had indeed been deposed in A.D. 496[2] for his adherence to the Council of Chalcedon by Anastasius, who was a declared supporter of that heresy, whilst Macedonius had in Synod confirmed in writing the *Decrees* of Chalcedon, and was in his turn likewise deposed in A.D. 511 by Anastasius, on the ground that he would not pronounce an anathema on that Synod.[3] Both died in exile, and their names had recently, on the accession of Justin in A.D. 518,[4] been restored to the diptychs as orthodox by the Patriarch John, whose action had been endorsed by a Synod convened by him at Constantinople. *Their* fault, in the eyes of Hormisdas, was that they had retained the name of Acacius on the diptychs, notwithstanding that a Roman Synod under Felix II., A.D. 484, had pronounced a sentence of deposition against him,[5] a sentence to which Acacius himself replied by striking the name of Felix off the diptychs of his Church, and which was completely ignored.

806. John yielded to the demand of Hormisdas, after considerable opposition, under the pressure put upon him by the Imperial Court to do so. The Emperor was determined on the union, which he knew could not be accomplished so long as the names were retained on the diptychs. They were accordingly struck off.[6] The satisfaction, how-

while the anathema is still directed against the *sequaces* of Peter the Fuller, the *sequaces* of the other *damnati* are, so far as this sentence is concerned, exempted from censure; and, when the whole *Libellus* is read through, it becomes perfectly evident that the *sequaces* of Acacius are left by it unanathematised. It is clear that in accordance with the permission given to them by Hormisdas, the legates allowed John, the Patriarch, to sign a mitigated form of the *Libellus*; and we may be morally certain that throughout the East it was a mitigated form of this sort that was henceforth used. This conclusion is confirmed by the two later forms of the *Libellus*, belonging to the sixth century, which have come down to us. The first of these is the copy of the *Libellus* given by the Emperor Justinian to Pope Agapetus on the occasion of that pontiff's visit to Constantinople. The copy is dated March 16, 536. The other is the almost exactly similar copy given to Agapetus by Mennas, the Patriarch-elect of the imperial city. Both of these documents are preserved in the *Collectio Avellana*. In both we find in the critical sentence the words *omnibus suprascriptis*, and not the words *omnium suprascriptorum*' (Puller, *op. cit.*, 412, 417).

[1] On the case of Acacius, *vide infra*, n. 922 *et seq.*

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xii. sect. 216. [E.T. iv. 42.]

[3] *Op. cit.*, bk. xii. sect. 233. [E.T. iv. 116.]

[4] *Ibid.* [E.T. iv. 117.]

[5] Mansi, vii. 1065.

[6] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. iv. 123.]

ever, thus accorded to Hormisdas was of a very transient character, as both names were restored to the sacred tablets by Epiphanius, the successor of John in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In the East, it may be added, Euphemius 'has always been honoured as the defender of the Catholic faith and of Chalcedon,'[1] and Macedonius is venerated as a saint,[2] notwithstanding the action on the part of the Roman Bishop, and notwithstanding that both died when out of communion with that Bishop, Euphemius at Ancyra in A.D. 515, and St. Macedonius at Gangra about A.D. 517, therefore on Papalist principles 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *kingdom*.' John's action in so yielding, it may be added, emphasises his action with regard to his subscription of the *Formula*.

807. Further, the rightful position of the See of Constantinople, which John thus carefully safeguarded, was emphasised at this time by the title of Œcumenical Patriarch accorded to him by the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 518;[3] similarly the Bishops of Syria Secunda, in a Synod held under the presidency of Bishop Cyrus of Mariamna, in reply to the Synodal letter of the Council just mentioned, addressed him as their 'most holy Lord' and 'Father of Fathers and Œcumenical Patriarch.'[4]

The same title was used by the Patriarch Mennas in the letter of the Synod of Constantinople A.D. 536, summoning Anthimus to that Synod.[5]

808. Justinian, the nephew and successor of Justin, in like manner accorded to the Patriarch of Constantinople the title of 'the most holy and blessed Archbishop of this royal city and Œcumenical Patriarch.'[6] Nor is the significance of his action, as emphasising the position of the See of New Rome, discounted by the circumstance that he calls the See of Rome 'the head of all the holy Churches,'[7] for he is careful to place the See of Constantinople on the same level in this respect by calling it also 'the head of all other Churches.'[8] Besides this, he, as already noted, gave civil sanction to, amongst other Canons incompatible with Papalism, the Twenty-eighth of Chalcedon: 'We decree,' says he, 'that the holy Canons of the Church which have been issued or confirmed by the Four Councils . . . should have the force of law. For we receive the decrees of the aforesaid Four Councils as the Holy Scriptures, and observe their Canons as Laws. And we therefore decree that, according to their regulations, the most holy Pope of Elder Rome is the first of all priests; but that the most blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, has the second place after the holy

[1] Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, ii. 294.
[2] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xvi. 697.
[3] Mansi, viii. 641.
[4] Mansi, viii. 1093.
[5] Mansi, viii. 960.
[6] *Codex Justinian. Novellæ*, iii., v., vi., vii., xvi., xlii.; *Corpus Juris Civilis Romani*, vol. ii. 500-6, 519, 548.
[7] Lib. i. tit. i. c. 8; *ibid.*, ii. 30.
[8] Lib. i. tit. ii. c. 25; *ibid.*, ii. 36.

apostolic See of Elder Rome, but let it rank before all other Sees.'[1]

809. Justinian's action in thus treating the See of Constantinople, and giving the force of law to the Constitution of the Church, as set forth in the Canons of the first Four Synods, and those which received their sanction (an addition which has its importance[2]), upheld as they were by Easterns against the growing pretensions of the Roman Bishops, has much significance, especially when it is remembered that he was anxious to obtain the assistance of the Bishop of Rome in furtherance of his plans for the re-establishment of the Imperial power in Italy, and thus would not be likely to do more to magnify Constantinople, the See regarded by Rome as specially dangerous, than strict justice to its interests demanded. The position, therefore, which was admitted by the East to belong to the Patriarchs of Constantinople at the time of the subscription of 'the *Formula of Hormisdas*' further strengthens the proof which the declaration of the Patriarch John affords against the argument of the *Satis Cognitum*, furnishing evidence as it does that the position of his See, which he so carefully safeguarded, was not surrendered by those who succeeded him.

810. Lastly, whilst under Court pressure, the *Formula of Hormisdas* was subscribed by John and the other Patriarchs of Constantinople, subject to the preamble which he affixed to it; numbers of other Eastern Bishops, in spite of even 'the use of fire and sword,' could not be compelled to subscribe it, and specially to comply with the demand to remove the names of Euphemius and St. Macedonius from the diptychs. Amongst them was the Church of Jerusalem, a church designated by the Emperor as 'the Mother of the Christian name, from which no one dares to separate.'[3] Ultimately a way out of the difficulty was found, and intercommunion between the Roman See and those Bishops who declined to accede to its demands was brought about by the following expedient.

811. The Patriarch Epiphanius, successor of John, represented to Hormisdas the impossibility of compelling these Bishops to accede to his demands, and the Emperor Justin likewise informed him of the failure of both threats and persuasions to attain that object. The result was that though Hormisdas wrote urging the Emperor to use force to compel subscription, he wrote also to Epiphanius, sending him a concise statement of orthodox doctrine, which, being subscribed, Epiphanius had his authority to admit the subscribers to communion with the Roman See.[4] In this Formulary there is nothing whatever about any peculiar prerogatives of Rome, it solely has reference to the

[1] Novell., cxxxi. cap. ii.; *ibid.*, ii. 622. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 403.
[3] *Ep. Justiniani ad Hormisdam*, Ep. lxxix., *inter Epp. Hormisdæ*; P.L. lxiii. 503.
[4] Hormisdæ P. *Epp.* lxxvii., lxxx.; P.L. lxiii. 512, 521.

Incarnation. This was largely availed of, the result being that in three out of four[1] Patriarchates of Eastern Christendom, the Council of Chalcedon was universally acknowledged, and intercommunion restored between them and the West; not, however, by subscription to the *Formula of Hormisdas*, and the striking out of the names of Euphemius and Macedonius from the diptychs as demanded by Hormisdas; such subscription was refused by all but certain Bishops of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, whose signatures thereto were necessarily affixed subject to the same condition as that on which their Patriarch John subscribed the *Formula*. The vast majority of the Eastern Bishops subscribed quite a different *Formula*, and the names of Euphemius and Macedonius remained on the diptychs throughout the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem as well as in other parts of Eastern Christendom.

812. The whole history is instructive, showing, as it does, that the Bishops of the East recognised the right of the Bishop of Rome, as of any other Bishop, to require satisfactory guarantees of orthodoxy from those Bishops who, being out of communion with him, desired the restoration of intercommunion, guarantees which, if given by Easterns at the request of the Bishop of Rome, would result in such intercommunion being restored between such Bishops and the whole of Western Christendom, for, as already observed, it was through the one Patriarchal See in the West, that of Rome, that the Eastern Prelates held communion with the West. Whilst, however, doing this, and being willing to admit this right the more readily because of the advantage compliance with it would bring, they declined to admit pretensions put forward by the Bishop of Rome on behalf of his See which they regarded as contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church, as set forth in the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils, even though a few of them, like John of Constantinople, compelled by Court influence, acquiesced in the temporary removal of the names of certain Bishops, whom they ultimately venerated as saints, from the diptychs.

813. The conclusion which must be drawn from consideration of the facts, is that the use sought to be made by the *Satis Cognitum* of the subscription 'at the beginning of the sixth century' of the *Formula of Hormisdas* 'by the Emperor Justinian, by Epiphanius, John, and Menna, the Patriarchs,' viz. that the Easterns thus acknowledged the position which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts belongs to the Roman Pontiff *jure divino*, is unjustifiable as being contrary to those facts.[2]

[1] The Patriarchate of Alexandria did not do so till A.D. 538. Puller, *op. cit.* 402, n. 3.

[2] In the 'authorised' English translation, p. 33, the Pope is made to say that the persons named subscribed the *Formula* 'at the beginning of the sixth century in the great Eighth Council,' whereas the 'Eighth Council' was not held till three centuries later, in A.D. 869; the words 'in the great Eighth Council' are not to be found in the Latin original. If one may hazard a conjecture as to the origin of this queer 'blunder,' it is to be traced to a 'misreading' of the statement in a footnote to cap. iv. of the *Vatican Decrees*, that

SECTION CIII.—*The Confession of Michael Palæologus.*

814. The *Satis Cognitum* concludes this section of its argument with the following quotation from 'the formula of faith which Michael Palæologus professed at the Second Council of Lyons,' viz. 'The same holy Roman Church possesses the sovereign and plenary primacy and authority over the whole Catholic Church, which, truly and humbly, it acknowledges to have received, together with the plenitude of power from the Lord himself, in the person of St. Peter, the Prince or Head of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor. And as it is bound to defend the truth of faith beyond all others, so also if any question should arise concerning the faith it must be determined by its judgment'[1] (Actio IV.).

The reason why the *Satis Cognitum* chooses to cite this particular declaration in support of its allegation is the obvious one, viz. that it was made by an Eastern Emperor, the intention being that the conclusion should be drawn that the Easterns acknowledged by this declaration of their ruler that the Roman Pontiff has *jure divino* the supreme power of jurisdiction over the Church. A consideration of the facts concerning this declaration will show that it affords no basis for drawing any such conclusion.

certain words quoted in that *Decree* are 'Ex formula S. Hormisdae Papae, prout ab Hadriano II. Patribus Concilii œcumenici VIII., Constantinopolitani IV., proposita et ab iisdem subscripta est' (*Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485, 486). In the so-called 'Eighth Synod'—it is not Œcumenical (*vide* nn. 915, 918)—a letter addressed to the Emperors Basil and Constantine his son, by Pope Hadrian II., was read with the assent of the Synod, in which the important part of the *Formula of Hormisdas* was repeated, it was read first in Latin and then in Greek (Mansi, xvi. 21), and afterwards it was proposed for the acceptance of the Council by the legates of Pope Hadrian in the following terms: 'Is this Formulary, sent by the Church of the Romans, pleasing to all of you? Is it in accord with the faith and conformable to the Canons and truly wise? Is it by the grace of God orthodox? The whole Synod exclaimed: The *Libellus* which has been read to us has been drawn up by the Church of the Romans according to the truth and facts, and therefore is pleasing to all' (*Ibid.*). But there is a marked difference in the *Formula* as subscribed in the Latin and Greek texts of the Acts of the Council. The Greek omits the greater part of the references to the Roman See, running as follows: 'The chief means of salvation is that we should keep the rule of right faith, and in no way deviate from the decrees of God and the Fathers,' then are omitted all the remaining words down to 'following in all things the ordinances of the Fathers' (*vide* n. 800 for the omitted words); and the document proceeds at once with the anathemas and concludes, 'Concerning the most reverend Patriarch Ignatius, and those who think with him, whatever the authority of the Apostolic throne has decreed we embrace with our whole mind. This profession of faith, I, N., Bishop of the holy Church of N. have made and subscribed with my own hand, etc.' The fact that it was a Greek and not a Latin Synod makes it not improbable that the Greek text is the more trustworthy, at all events the divergence is remarkable. The Synod was greatly under Roman influence, and it was anathematised by the Greeks in the Synod of Constantinople A.D. 879 (*vide* n. 918), and was again expressly repudiated by the Easterns at the Council of Florence (*vide* nn. 266, 919).

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 33.

815. In the first place, Michael Palæologus had special reasons for making overtures for union to Gregory X. (*a*) The Latin Empire which had been established in the East had been overthrown by the conquest of Constantinople in A.D. 1261, and Charles of Anjou, who had married his daughter to the heir of Baldwin II., the last of the Latin Emperors, entertained designs for its re-establishment; (*b*) besides this, the clergy of Constantinople did not show any great love for him, owing to his treatment of John, who had been appointed Emperor by Theodore Lascaris II., who had been placed under the guardianship of Arsenius, Patriarch of Constantinople. Arsenius had excommunicated him and refused him absolution. Under the influence of the Court, the Patriarch was deposed by a Synod and exiled to the island of Proconnensis, where he died without having relented towards Palæologus.[1] Consequently there was great disaffection amongst the clergy, many of the followers of the late Patriarch holding aloof from the communion with the Emperor for fully six years.

816. Under these circumstances, Michael Palæologus thought that an alliance with the power of the Pope would afford him great support. Such alliance would be of use in his resistance to the dreaded Western crusade for the restoration of the Latin Empire, which indeed could hardly take place in opposition to the wish of the Pope. It would also strengthen him against those of the Greek clergy who opposed him to have the Bishop of Old Rome on his side. He would naturally, therefore, not be disinclined to admit for his own ends that the Pope of Rome, who lived far away, had greater powers than the Patriarch of Constantinople—the Royal City—with whom he was directly brought into contact, and by whom he was actually opposed. The circumstances, therefore, under which Michael Palæologus then was placed the Pope in the position of being able to dictate the terms on which he would assent to the desired union. Clement IV. therefore submitted to the Eastern Emperor a statement of faith, in which the doctrine then accepted in the Latin Church with regard to the prerogatives of the Roman Bishop was definitely set forth as that which it was necessary for the Greeks to adopt.[2]

817. Any acknowledgment, however, of any supremacy over the Church belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop was utterly distasteful to the Greeks. They held the Divine Constitution of the Church to be that developed on the lines embodied and set forth in the decrees of the Œcumenical Synods. Their doctrine as to the position of the Patriarchs in the Church is set forth by Bahanes, the Patrician, Imperial plenipotentiary at the so-called 'Eighth' Council in A.D. 869, who, being sent by that Synod to Theodorus, said, 'God

[1] Robertson, *op. cit.*, bk. vii. ch. ii. vol. vi. 263, 264. Edit. 1874.
[2] Raynaldus, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 1267, n. lxxii. *sq.*, tom. iii. 228 *sq.*

hath placed His Church in the five Patriarchates, and declared in His Gospels that they shall never utterly fall, because they are the heads of the Church. For that saying, 'and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' means this, when two fall they run to three, when three fall they run to two, but when four perchance have fallen, one which remains in Christ our God, the Head of all, calls back again the remaining body of the Church. But now, as the whole world is in agreement, you have no manner of excuse.'[1] Or as the Emperor Basil said to the Photian Bishops at the same Council, 'Lo, you have heard the sense of the Patriarchs both of Rome and Jerusalem and Antioch . . . you, holding irregular Councils by the power of the Emperor alone and by yourselves without the Patriarchal Sees, dared to call them holy and blush not to detract from this one which is held by all the Patriarchal Sees, by God's co-operation and grace, who hath entrusted us with the Empire. Both you and the whole world know that by the protection of our true God the five Patriarchates of the world hold the right view, and therefore whatsoever they judge, you must receive.'[2]

818. According, therefore, to the Easterns, the Œcumenical Synod was the supreme authority in the Church, in which the five Patriarchs had pre-eminence 'under the one Head, Christ Himself.'[3] Their resistance to the attempts of the Roman Bishop to obtain from them any recognition of the claims which he had succeeded in imposing on the Western Bishops was strenuous. When, finally, the legates of Leo IX. laid upon the altar of St. Sophia an excommunication of the Patriarch, Michael Cerularius of Constantinople, on the 16th July A.D. 1054, Michael promptly retaliated with a like anathema on the Roman Bishop, in which the other Oriental Patriarchs joined.

This being the traditional attitude of the Easterns towards the claims of the Roman Bishop, the Emperor found grave difficulty in obtaining even a reluctant assent of certain great Eastern ecclesiastics to his proceedings, notwithstanding the emphasis he laid on the undoubted blessings which would result if the Church could once more present a united front to her enemies, and the way in which he minimised the points as to which East and West were at variance. It is quite certain that if these ecclesiastics had not suffered themselves to be persuaded that their assent would in no way endanger that independence which they considered to belong, under the Divine Constitution of the Church, to the churches over which they ruled, they would never have given it; as a matter of fact, they were deceived by the Emperor's

[1] Mansi, xvi. 1401.

[2] Mansi, xxi. 86, 87.

[3] Cp. Petri Antioch. *Ep. ad Dominicum Archiep. Gradensen.* 'Quinque enim in universo orbe ex divinæ gratiæ dispensatione Patriarchæ sunt. Romanus, Constantinopolitanus, [Alexandrinus, in the Greek original], Antiochenus et Hierosolymitanus.'—*Ecclesiæ Græciæ Monumenta*, vol. ii. p. 114. J. B. Cotelarius, Paris, 1681.

assurance that the rights and privileges of their churches were as dear to him as to themselves. Court pressure, misrepresentations, and underhand means overcame these few ecclesiastics, but the main body of the Bishops with their flocks remained firm in their dislike of, and opposition to, the Imperial proposals.

819. Michael, however, was determined at all costs for his own ends to bring about the union. He signed the Profession of Faith which had been sent to him, and sent it, sealed with a gold seal, to the Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274, where it was exhibited and read to the assembled Fathers. There were no Greek ecclesiastics from Constantinople present at the Synod save those who formed the Emperor's embassy, hence the Profession of Faith was not adopted by the Greeks as a formula of union at the Council of Lyons, as is implied by the words '*Approbante Lugdunensi Concilio secundo, Græci professi sunt*' in the *Vatican Decrees*.[1] It was a purely Court affair, carried out by the Emperor in pursuance of his own objects: it in no sense committed the Greeks. That this is the case is corroborated by the fact that when Pope Nicholas III. sought to act as if the Emperor's assent to the '*Formula of Faith*' was equivalent to that of the Greek Church in its corporate capacity, demanding that his supremacy should be recognised by a solemn oath taken by the Patriarch and clergy, and that the Greek Church should seek absolution for the sin of the long schism, a strong party arose which numbered amongst its members even some of the Royal house and adherents of the Court, which openly declared both the Emperor and Pope to be heretics, and asserted the independence of the Greek Church.

820. Cruel measures were taken to suppress the movement, but as the people sided with it, they proved unsuccessful. Michael became alarmed, and, hesitating as to the line he should take, was excommunicated at Rome by Pope Martin IV. in A.D. 1281.[2] On his death in the following year, the real position taken by the Greeks was shown. John Bekkos, who had been intruded into the See of Constantinople in the room of the Patriarch Joseph, who had opposed the Emperor's designs, was compelled to take refuge from the people in a monastery, and with one consent the Greeks refused to allow the obnoxious yoke to be fastened on them. The churches in which the Latin rite had been performed were purified as if from some defilement. The 'Union,' which had never had any reality, was formally repudiated by Andronicus, the successor of Michael, who declared that in assenting to his father's measures he had done so under constraint, and he treated his father as a schismatic, refusing him religious rites at his burial.

821. It is plain (1) that the authority of the Easterns cannot be

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 486.
[2] Raynaldus, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 1281, n. xxv., tom. iii. 528.

claimed for the *Formula*. It was signed by the Eastern Emperor for political reasons, and its connection with the Greeks was solely erastian. (2) The Greeks resisted any attempt to force them to act in accordance with it, repudiating the claims embodied in it, even at the cost of much danger to themselves. (3) The *Formula* itself is purely 'Roman' in its origin, in no way representing the traditional attitude of the East towards Rome at the time when it was sent to the Emperor by Pope Clement IV. Drawn up by Papalists, it simply set forth the doctrine as to the position of the 'Roman Pontiff,' which was held at that time at Rome. By that date, as has been shown,[1] the influence of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* and other forgeries in the Roman interest, accepted as genuine in the West, had practically raised the Papacy to the position of a monarchy possessed of absolute powers over the Church. One work indeed of this character, the *Opusculum* of St. Thomas, *Contra errores Græcorum*, was composed at this very time with a view to meet the doubts of the Greeks, and how St. Thomas was deceived by the forged *Thesaurus* of Greek Fathers has already been shown.[2] If St. Thomas, a man of so great intellectual powers, was convinced of the truth of the Papal claims by the evidence which he received as genuine, it cannot be a matter of surprise that the whole West at this epoch acknowledged the Papal Monarchy *jure divino*. That that was the case must be admitted, but such admission is useless for 'Papalist' purposes, for not only do forgery and erastianism form the basis on which the monarchical conception of the office of the Roman Bishops rests, but the consistent witness of the Easterns against it by their careful preservation of their independence of Roman autocracy, and their vigorous resistance of the various attempts of the Roman Bishops to infringe on the rights of the various Patriarchates which they held to be part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, conclusively proves that such conception was not 'the venerable and constant belief' of any 'age' of the whole Church, and therefore formed no part of such Constitution.

Hence when the *Satis Cognitum* quotes, as it does, this *Formula* as authoritatively setting forth the doctrine as to the position of the Roman Bishops in the Church professed by the Orthodox and unchanging East, its action is so misleading as to be absolutely indefensible.

Section CIV.—*Conclusion as to 'the testimony' of 'the Easterns.'*

822. The examination to which the 'testimony' of 'the Easterns' as to Papalism has been subjected shows that, so far from that testimony confirming, or in any way giving support to the Papalist contentions embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, it bears witness to the fact that the

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 228. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 247.

Easterns were entirely ignorant of the Papal Monarchy. The 'evidence' of the solitary 'Eastern' whose writings are cited has been proved to be valueless for the purpose for which it is quoted by the *Satis Cognitum*. The writings and actions of representative Eastern Doctors and Saints have been cited in proof that Papalism was unknown to, and therefore unrecognised by, the Eastern Churches. The cases of alleged 'appeal' to Rome on the part of the Easterns have been investigated and shown not to bear the interpretation sought to be put upon them in the Papalist interest. The real worth of the 'exclamations' at two Councils and of the two *Formulæ* cited in the *Satis Cognitum* has been shown to be nil for the purpose for which they are adduced. The true 'testimony' of 'the Easterns' has been shown to be incompatible with the Papalist allegations as to the monarchical position bestowed upon Peter and his successors in the Roman Episcopate by the institution of Christ in the Divine Constitution of the Church. Thus Papalism is proved not to have been 'the venerable and constant belief of the Church' in the East in any 'age,' the 'testimony' of the Easterns affording irrefragable witness to the Catholic conception of the One Episcopate as the Supreme Authority in the Church as constituted by her Divine Founder.

CHAPTER XXI

'THE MASTER' OF 'THE EPISCOPAL COLLEGE'

SECTION CV.—*The 'power of Bishops' according to the Satis Cognitum.*

823. The *Satis Cognitum* next proceeds to deal with a subject of the utmost importance, viz., the position which belongs to the Bishops in the Church. This section of the *Satis Cognitum* commences with the statement that 'if the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He Who made Peter the foundation of the Church, also *chose twelve, whom He called apostles* (Luke vi. 13); and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the Episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked on as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule.'[1]

824. It will be convenient to enter into detail on some aspects of the subject of the position occupied in the Church by Bishops, according to Papalism later;[2] meanwhile it may be shortly considered here. What is the power which in this statement as to the authority of the Bishops is declared to be 'really their own'? The answer to this enquiry will throw a clear light on the position which, according to Papalism, Bishops actually hold in the Church. In considering this important question, in the first place it must be noted that the *Satis Cognitum* speaks of the power of Bishops in a different way to that adopted by the Council of Trent. The Fathers of that Council stated in its Twenty-third Session, cap. iv., '*De ecclesiastica hierarchia*,' that 'the Bishops succeed to the place of the Apostles,' 'and are placed, as the Apostle says (Acts xx. 28), by the Holy Ghost to "rule the Church of God."' The *Satis Cognitum* does not say that the Bishops 'rule the Church of God,' they are merely stated to be 'the ordinary pastors of the peoples over whom they rule.' The *Satis Cognitum* here follows the *Vatican Decrees*, in which it is

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 33, 34.

[2] *Vide infra*, c. xxiv.

declared that Bishops who 'succeed to the place of the Apostles, feed and rule as true pastors the flocks [respectively] assigned to them, each over each,'[1] *i.e.* the authority the Bishops possess, whatever it may be, is thus *strictly limited* to the people 'assigned to them.'

825. The next point is, by whom is the particular flock 'assigned' to each Bishop? It is evident from the context of the *Vatican Decrees* that it is an authority superior to that which the Bishops themselves possess, an authority in which they do not share, and in no way emanating from the Episcopate as a whole, a supreme and plenary authority having power over the whole church, and consequently able to authoritatively 'assign' the limits in which the Bishops may, and are to exercise their 'ordinary power,' and if thus to 'assign' clearly, also having the power to alter these limits, or altogether to withdraw the flock 'assigned' from the 'rule' of any Bishop. That this is in fact the case is confirmed by certain statements in the *Satis Cognitum* bearing on the relations existing between the Episcopate and the Roman Pontiff which will be considered later.[2]

826. An attempt, however, is sometimes made to interpret the statement that Bishops 'are not to be looked on—*putandi*—as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs because they exercise a power really their own,' as if it meant that the Bishops possessed Episcopal power in the sense of the primitive Church, for the right to the exercise of which they were in no way dependent on the will of the Roman Pontiffs. But it is to be observed that the statement in the *Satis Cognitum* is a strictly limited one. The *Satis Cognitum* does not assert that the Bishops are in *no* sense 'vicars of the Roman Pontiffs,' but merely that they are not 'to be looked' on as such when they exercise a certain particular power: that power may be great or small, may have a large or small number of matters with which it may legitimately concern itself. In fact, the nature of such power entirely depends upon the character of the power which is asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs, for in so far as they exercise any part of *that* they would of necessity do so by delegation from him, and therefore be his 'vicars.' Moreover, whatever this power which is 'really their own' may be, if it be subject to, exercised not freely, but in dependence on, and in subordination to, an authority possessed of full and supreme power over the whole Church, it is obvious that that supreme authority rules that exercise of this power, and so whether technically or not, they in reality hold the position of 'vicars,' or 'representatives,' of him who wields the 'supreme power.'

[1] *Concil. Vatican*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 829 *et seq.*

827. Again, whence is this power which is 'really their own' derived by the Bishops? Is it from the Apostolate, as receiving it direct from Christ Himself? Or was it received by them 'through Peter,' this 'Apostolic' as distinguished from 'Petrine' power being transmitted by his successors to the Episcopate, as the successors of the Apostles? If in the latter way, clearly the Bishops are in reality 'vicars' of the Roman Pontiff, receiving from him even the authority which is 'really their own,' which becomes so through his action in conferring it upon them. Again, what is the meaning of the phrase, 'ordinary power' of the Apostolate which the Bishops inherit? Was such power the supreme power in Church, or a subordinate power which they exercised under the control of Peter as 'the Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' and called 'ordinary' because it was delegated to them for use within the limited sphere with which it was concerned so long as they fulfilled the conditions under which they were to exercise it?

Are the Bishops the 'ordinary pastors' of their flocks, in the sense of being really 'ordinaries' of their diocese, or are they, like the Apostles, exercising ordinary power delegated to them by their Master,' only 'ordinaries,' in a like limited sense, the successor of 'the Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' the 'Roman Pontiff' being in fact 'the ordinary of ordinaries,' having the whole world for his diocese, in that he exercises immediate, supreme, *Episcopal* power in every diocese which ordinarily is ruled by the Bishop in subordination to him, and by his will?

828. Questions such as these necessarily arise, and adequate answers are to be found in the *Satis Cognitum* itself. From these answers will be seen the real significance of these statements with reference to the Episcopate. It is contrary to all sound arguments to take one or two phrases apart from their context, and then proceed to argue from them that they set forth the primitive idea of the Episcopate, and therefore that Pope Leo rejected the *prima facie* interpretation of the *Vatican Decrees*. The selected phrases must be interpreted in accord with the other statements with which they are bound up. The *Satis Cognitum* is not a mere bundle of statements having no bearing the one on the other, but a dogmatic treatise, every statement in which is intimately connected with the rest, and any interpretation which ignores this fact is simply misleading and erroneous.

SECTION CVI.—*The relations alleged to exist* jure divino *between the Bishops and the 'Roman Pontiffs.'*

829. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to lay down the relations which, according to Papalism, exist between the Bishops and the 'successors of Peter' 'according to the divine constitution of the Church.' The Roman Pontiff is asserted to be the centre of unity, so that if the bond between the Bishops and 'the successor of Peter' were to be broken, the result would be that 'Christians would be separated and scattered, and would in no wise form one body and one flock,'[1] it being essential to the unity of the One Flock that it should be under one supreme Pastor.

830. The *Satis Cognitum* in this allegation assumes the accuracy of the propositions it has before laboured to prove: viz. (*a*) that Christ appointed St. Peter to be the head of the Church, possessing full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church,[2] and (*b*) that the Roman Pontiffs are his successors in that supremacy *jure divino*.[3] Both these propositions have been shown on the evidence to be without foundation in fact, and in the course of the inquiry which has been pursued, it has been made clear that the Papalist allegation that communion with the Roman Pontiff is an essential condition 'to belonging to the One Flock' is historically untrue.[4] It is not necessary here to repeat the arguments and proofs which have already been given, but merely to point out that, as the propositions which are made in the *Satis Cognitum* the basis of the statement under notice have been disproved, it follows that that statement has no foundation, and thus is in itself worthless.

831. But, it may be said, does not the *Satis Cognitum* in this connection adduce evidence which proves the accuracy of the statement made; and consequently the conclusion which is drawn, and is the foundation of the argument just set forth, must be held to be disproved?

The best reply to this will be to consider the quotation which the *Satis Cognitum* makes use of in proof of its statement. It is taken from the writings of St. Jerome, and is as follows: 'The safety of the Church depends on the dignity of the Chief Priest, to whom, if an extraordinary and supreme power is not given, there are as many schisms to be expected in the Church as there are priests' (St. Hieronymus, *Dialog. contra Luciferanos*, n. 9).[5]

832. The use made by the *Satis Cognitum* of this citation requires that the *summus sacerdos*, the 'Chief Priest,' about whom St. Jerome is here writing, should be the 'Roman Pontiff,' to whom on Papalist principles 'an extraordinary and supreme power' is committed for the purpose of preserving the unity of the Church. Undoubtedly, if St.

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 34. [2] *Vide supra*, nn. 19 *et seq.* [3] *Vide supra*, nn. 464 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 528, 582, 592, 688, etc. [5] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 34.

Jerome is here referring by the words 'Chief Priest'—*summus sacerdos* —to 'the Pope,' the quotation would witness to the truth of the allegation in proof of which it is made. But does St. Jerome refer to 'the Pope'? Certainly not. In the passage from which the quotation is taken he is discussing the relation of the Bishop to the Priests of the diocese over which he rules; in doing so he says: 'And in many places we find it the practice more by way of honouring the Episcopate —*sacerdotium*—than from any compulsory law. Otherwise, if the Holy Spirit descends only at the Bishop's prayer, they are greatly to be pitied who in isolated houses, or forts, or retired places, often being baptized by the presbyters and deacons, have fallen asleep before the Bishop's visitation. The well-being of a Church depends upon the chief priest, and unless some extraordinary and supreme power be assigned to him, there are as many schisms to be expected in the Church as there are priests. Hence it follows that without the chrism and the order of the Bishop, neither priest nor deacon has the right to baptize.'[1]

833. St. Jerome's argument, it is clear, has reference to the position and authority of the Bishop, as necessary to the Church; the '*summus sacerdos*' is the Bishop of a diocese,[2] who, possessing 'an extraordinary and supreme power,'—*exsors . . . et ab omnibus eminens . . . potestas*—is consequently the centre and preserver of unity in the Church over which he rules. There is absolutely no reference whatever to 'the Pope' as 'the supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' possessing *jure divino* 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey.' So far, indeed, from the words here cited from St Jerome being a proof of the Papalist doctrine embodied in the *Satis Cognitum*, they are inconsistent with it. (*a*) According to Papalism the 'Roman Pontiff' is the divinely appointed centre of unity in the constitution of the Church, and the monarchical powers possessed by him are to assist him in the discharge of his unique office. If St. Jerome had believed this doctrine, he would plainly have referred not to the Bishop of a diocese but to the 'Roman Pontiff,' as endowed with supremacy over the Church by the institution of Christ for the express purpose of maintaining her unity. His argument would be inexplicable if Papalism had been 'the venerable and constant belief' of his 'age.'

834 (*b*) Further, according to St. Jerome's argument, the Bishop possessses 'supreme power' in his diocese, not a power which is subordinate to that of the 'supreme Pastor,' the Roman Pontiff,

[1] S. Hieron., *Dialogus contra Luciferanos*, n. 9; P.L. xxiii. 165, 166.

[2] Tertullian, *De Bapt.*, c. xvii. (P.L. ii. 1218); and St. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, cap. ii. 6 (P.L. xvi. 391); *De Sacramentis*, lib. iii. cap. i. sect. 4 (*ibid.*, p. 452); also so entitle the Bishop of a diocese.

therefore it is that he, as Bishop, is the centre of unity in his diocese, the bond of union being preserved through communion with him. This union thus maintained prevents schisms arising, and Christians being separated from each other and scattered.

835. The ground of St. Jerome's statement is no doubt to be found in the fact that the Bishop shares the One Episcopate *in solidum*, there being, in fact, but one Episcopate in the whole Church; hence the faithful, being in communion with the Bishop of the diocese in which they live, are in the unity of the Church. The argument is in full agreement with that of St. Cyprian, who says: 'They are the Church who are a people united to the Bishop, and a flock adhering to their own Shepherd. Whence you ought to know that the Bishop is in the Church and the Church is in the Bishop; and if any be not with the Bishop, that he is not in the Church, and that they in vain flatter themselves, who, not having peace with the priests of God, creep in and think that they secretly hold communion with certain persons; whereas the Church which is Catholic and one, is not separated nor divided, but is in truth connected and joined together by the cement of Bishops mutually cleaving to one another.'[1]

Likewise, also, this teaching accords with that of St. Ignatius of Antioch, who wrote to the Church of Philadelphia as follows: 'For as many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the Bishop; and as many as shall repent and enter into the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God. If any man followeth one that maketh a schism, he doth not inherit the kingdom of God. . . . Be ye therefore careful to observe one Eucharist, for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup into union in His Blood, there is one Altar and there is one Bishop.'[2]

836. It is plain that St. Jerome's statement in the citation made has nothing whatever to do with the Papal Monarchy, save in so far as it witnesses against its existence in his day. If it be attempted to defend in the face of this fact the use made of it in the *Satis Cognitum*, on the pretext that whilst St. Jerome in the passage quoted lays down the necessity of subordination of Priests to the Bishop of a diocese, the *Satis Cognitum* by such use is merely applying the principle therein set forth to the position occupied by the Pope in the Church, there is a twofold answer: (*a*) First, that the context of the *Satis Cognitum* requires that St. Jerome by *summus sacerdos* means the 'Pope,' 'the successor of Peter,' the Roman Pontiff, and that by 'the extraordinary and supreme power' given to him he meant that which the *Satis Cognitum* refers to as 'the authority of

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Florentium*, Ep. lxvi. 8. Hartel, 733.
[2] S. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Philad.*, iii. and iv.; P.G. v. 700.

Peter,' 'plenary and supreme,' which 'it is necessary should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff,' with whom 'union' is necessary if Christians are not to be 'separated and scattered, and . . . form one body and one flock.' The position assigned by the *Satis Cognitum* to the Roman Pontiff alone is exactly that which St. Jerome here declares to belong to the Bishop. (*b*) Secondly, the argument of the *Satis Cognitum* requires that 'plenary and supreme power' has been divinely bestowed on the Roman Pontiffs as the successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, for the purpose of preserving the unity of the Church. This power alone would be 'extraordinary and supreme,' as the *Satis Cognitum* indeed asserts. St. Jerome, on the contrary, declares that to the *Bishop* is given 'an extraordinary and supreme power,' by which he is able to preserve the unity of the Church. Hence it follows that to make use of the words cited from St. Jerome in support of Papalism, as is done in this document, is to affix a sense to them contradictory to the meaning of the writer.

837. St. Jerome's argument on the passage quoted is consistent with that used in his letter to a monk named Rusticus, exhorting him to obey his Abbot. 'No art,' says he, 'is learnt without a master. Even the dumb animals and the flocks of wild beasts follow their leaders. Among the bees there are chiefs, the cranes follow one another in the order of a letter. The Emperor is one; the judge of a province is one. Rome, when it was founded, could not have two brothers at once as kings, and was dedicated by unnatural murder. In Rebecca's womb Esau and Jacob carried on wars. Churches have each one bishop, each one archpriest, each one archdeacon, and every rank of the clergy has its one governor. In a ship there is one pilot, in a house one master, in an army, however great it may be, it is from one general that the signal is looked for.'[1]

838. The necessity of obedience to a head is the subject of this letter; to prove it he adduces several examples. Amongst them he sets forth the fact that in the civil sphere there is but 'one Emperor'; does he in the ecclesiastical sphere adduce as the corresponding fact that there is but 'one Sovereign Pontiff'? So far from this being the case, it is clear that the highest authority he is aware of is the Bishop of each local Church. He says that in every house there is but 'one master'; does he proceeed to say with reference to the 'edifice' of the Church there is but 'one Master' thereof, the Roman Pontiff, the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' under whose jurisdiction is that 'edifice,' the whole 'Christian Commonwealth'? Certainly not. Such a proceeding on St. Jerome's part, on the hypothesis that the Papal Monarchy is an essential part of the Divine

[1] S. Hieron., *Ep. ad Rusticum monachum*, Ep. cxxv. 15; P.L. xxii. 1080.

Constitution of the Church, and consequently accepted and believed in by St. Jerome and his 'age,' would be inexplicable.

839. To have reminded Rusticus that there was one 'Supreme Pastor,' 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' possessed 'by the institution of Christ' of 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' would have been to have adduced the strongest example he could have done in illustration of the duty he was enforcing of a member of a community obeying the superior thereof. Had the Papal Monarchy been an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, St. Jerome would not have failed to have done so; he did not, therefore Papalism was not 'the venerable and constant belief of' his 'age.' The highest ecclesiastical authority of which he is cognisant he naturally brings forward as his example; and that is the Bishop, and in doing this he is in exact accord with his statement in the passage cited in the *Satis Cognitum* that the Bishop is the 'Chief Priest'—*summus sacerdos* —to whom is given 'extraordinary and supreme power.' The citation, therefore, is worse than useless for the purpose for which it is made in the *Satis Cognitum*, witnessing as it does to the erroneous nature of the allegation in support of which it is adduced.

Section CVII.—*Were any powers conferred on Peter apart from the Apostles?*

840. The *Satis Cognitum* next alleges that 'nothing was conferred on the Apostles apart from Peter, but that several things were conferred upon Peter apart from the Apostles.'[1] This statement has an important bearing on the meaning of the previous statements as to the position of Bishops as successors of the Apostles, as will be seen from consideration thereof. To take first, following the *Satis Cognitum*, the latter of the two assertions of which the statement is composed, the following are the 'proofs' which are adduced in support of it. 'St. John Chrysostom, in explaining the words of Christ, asks, "Why, passing over others, does He speak to Peter about these things?" And he replies unhesitatingly and at once, "Because he was pre-eminent among the Apostles, the mouthpiece of the Disciples, and the head of the College"' (*Hom.* lxxxviii. *in Joan.*, n. 1).[2]

841. It has already been shown[3] that these words cannot be cited in proof that St. Peter possessed by the institution of Christ any superiority of jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostolic College. That he was 'the mouthpiece of the Disciples' is of course in reference to the glorious confession of the Divinity of Christ which he made in the name and on behalf of the Apostolate; that he had a primacy

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 34. [2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* [3] *Vide supra*, n. 173.

of honour, and thus was 'pre-eminent among the Apostles and head of the College,' is also, no doubt, true; but that St. Chrysostom's statement in no way implies that he had plenary and supreme jurisdiction as the 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' to which no 'power on earth is superior,' is clear from his writings, which, as has been shown, are plainly incompatible[1] with the statement in support of which the *Satis Cognitum* makes this citation, proving, as they do, that he did not hold 'that several things were conferred on Peter apart from the Apostles,' and consequently, it may be added, he did not hold that those things so 'conferred,' were 'conferred' on him and his 'successors' in 'the Roman Episcopate,' which is the allegation of the *Satis Cognitum*, a position the truth of which is confirmed by his own conduct.[2]

842. The things which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts were so 'conferred upon Peter apart from the Apostles'[3] are as follows:—(1) 'He alone was designated as the foundation of the Church.' This designation, it is plain from statements made elsewhere in the *Satis Cognitum*, is held by it to have been made by the words of our Lord, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.' The meaning of these words has already been shown[4] to be not that which the Papalist allegation requires should be the *one* meaning which has been assigned to them by 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' as being 'the charter text' setting forth the principal element in the constitution and formation of the Church. It is needless to add to what has been said, save that Holy Scripture distinctly declares that 'other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ,'[5] and in whatever limited and subordinate sense any one save Jesus Christ can be said to be a 'foundation,' that term is applied in Holy Writ to all the Apostolate, St. Paul declaring that the Church is 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the head corner stone.'[6] Thus according to Holy Scripture not only is the word foundation used of members of the Apostolic College, but of others the 'prophets,' *i.e.* those who first occupied the position of 'Bishops' receiving their commission from the Apostolate. At the beginning these 'prophets' were representatives of the Church at large, sharing with the Apostles 'Episcopal' powers; their ministry, also like that of the Apostles themselves, not being localised in any particular chart, though they had the right, as is clear from *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,[7] to settle in

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 56, 133 *et seq.*, 149 *et seq.*, 188 *et seq.*, etc.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 688 *et seq.*
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 34.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 48 *et seq.*
[5] 1 Cor. iii. 11.
[6] Eph. ii. 20.
[7] Didache, xiii. 1; Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 224.

any Church they visited, thus becoming 'Bishop' of that local Church, in that sense in which the word has been used in the Church from at least the days of St. Ignatius of Antioch.[1]

843. (2) 'To him He gave the power of *binding* and *loosing*.'[2] That this assertion is contrary to fact has already been proved;[3] that power in all its fulness being bestowed by our Lord on all the Apostles in the words, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'[4] A commission plainly of the most unrestricted character, and obviously including the power of transmitting the commission thus received by all to those whom they should in like manner send to be *their* successors, viz. the members of the Episcopate which thus legitimately succeeds to, and represents, the Apostolate.

844. (3) 'To him alone was given the power of *feeding*.'[5] This assertion has already been disproved, the passage on which it is based, 'Feed My lambs, Feed My sheep' (St. John xxi. 15-17), being shown, on the witness of the Fathers,[6] to have reference to St. Peter's restoration to the Apostolate, to all members of which the Apostolic commission denoted here by the command to 'feed' had been equally given, a commission which the Bishops now possess and discharge in succession to the Apostles, who, therefore, now in their place 'feed the Church of God.'

845. Though these statements in the *Satis Cognitum* are without foundation, yet they are of great value as showing the strictly limited nature of the power, according to Papalism, possessed by the Bishops as 'the successors of the Apostles.' If Peter alone was the 'foundation of the Church,' they as successors of the Apostles do not occupy the supreme position of authority in the Church; if to Peter, 'apart from the Apostles,' was given the 'power of *binding* and *loosing*,' they, as successors of the Apostles, do not possess that power; if to Peter 'alone was given the power of *feeding*,' they as successors of the Apostles have not that power. Hence it follows, that so far as they exercise any real power of government in their dioceses, in so far as they exercise the power of the Keys, in so far as in any sense they feed the flocks committed to them, they must do so as the *vicars* of him who alone is the 'legitimate successor of Peter,' on whom alone, 'apart from the Apostles,' these specific

[1] *Cp.* on '*The Prophets*,' Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 278 *seq.* Second ed.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 34.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 115 *et seq.*

[4] St. John xx. 21, 22.

[5] *Satis Cognitum*, *l.c.*

[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 131 *et seq.*

powers were conferred. It is difficult to see what that 'power really their own,' which the *Satis Cognitum* says belongs to Bishops who succeed the Apostles, is; it is described as the 'ordinary' power of the Apostles; on Papal principles it is clear that it was strictly limited in character, whatever real jurisdiction they possessed was of necessity 'delegated' to them by him who possessed 'the power of commanding, forbidding, and judging, which is properly called *jurisdiction*.'[1] From this it follows that, so far as any Bishop has any *real* jurisdiction, it can only be by *delegation* from the 'successor of Peter,' who possesses *jure divino* 'that supreme and absolutely independent power' which, 'having no other power on earth as its superior,' 'embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church,'[2] that is, that in reality they are '*vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs.'

Section CVIII.—*Did the Apostles receive their Apostolic powers through Peter?*

846. After thus laying down the supreme position occupied by Peter apart from the Apostles, the *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to speak of that of the Apostles in these terms. 'On the other hand, whatever authority and office the Apostles received, they received in conjunction with Peter.'[3] The form of this statement shows at once that even the limited 'power' which the Apostles possessed came to them in some way through a certain connection with Peter. What the nature of that connection is, the *Satis Cognitum* immediately explains by citing the following words from St. Leo the Great: 'If the divine benignity willed any thing to be in common between him and the other princes, whatever he did not deny to the others He gave only through him. So that whereas Peter alone received many things, He conferred nothing on any of the rest without Peter participating in it' (St. Leo M., *Sermo*, iv. cap. 2).[4]

847. 'In conjunction with Peter,' therefore, it is clear, means 'through Peter,' *i.e.* he is the channel through whom the Apostles received whatever authority and power they possessed. As St. Leo says elsewhere: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour of mankind, instituted the observance of the divine religion which he wished by the grace of God to shed its brightness upon all nations and all peoples in such a way that the truth which before was confined to the announcements of the Law and the Prophets might through the Apostles' trumpet-blast go out for the salvation of all men, as it is written, Their sound is gone out into every land, and their words unto the ends of the world; but this mysterious function—*hujus muneris sacra-*

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 26.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 35.

mentum — the Lord wished, indeed, to be the concern of all the Apostles, but in such a way that he placed the principal charge on the blessed Peter, chief of all the Apostles, and from him as from the head wishes His gifts to flow to all the body, so that any who dares to secede from Peter's solid rock may understand that he has no part or lot in the divine mystery.'[1]

848. Before considering these statements of St. Leo, two preliminary remarks must be made: (*a*) First, it must be remembered that they are the words of that Bishop of Rome in whose teaching may be seen the germ of Papalism. His position was, as has been seen,[2] a special one with regard to the way in which he advanced claims for his See. Consequently these statements in themselves are valueless as evidence of the position held by the primitive Church to belong to St. Peter in the Apostolic College; they simply embody the teaching which St. Leo desired should be accepted by those to whom he addressed himself, teaching which, whilst in the West it became generally accepted, owing to circumstances already noted, in the East never found acceptance, and to this day is repudiated. (*b*) Secondly, that the statements themselves are in direct contradiction with the evidence on the point, which proves, as has been shown,[3] that identical powers were conferred upon all the members of the Apostolic College, and that they all at the same time and place received those powers by means of the same commission from the Divine Head of the Church; consequently it follows that the statements are without foundation in fact, and erroneous.

849. Now as to the teaching contained in these statements of St. Leo. If it were true it would follow necessarily that the Bishops who are the 'successors of the Apostles' receive 'whatever authority and power' they possess from 'the successor of Peter' in the same manner as those to whom they succeed received 'whatever authority and power' they possessed from Peter himself, since the relation of 'the legitimate successors of Peter,' 'the Roman Pontiffs,' to the Episcopate is, according to Papalism, exactly the same as that held by Peter towards the Apostolate. If then this power, whatever it may be, which is 'really their own,' comes to them 'through' the successors of 'Peter,' they clearly occupy a position dependent on, and subordinate to, the source whence they receive it. Such power is 'really their own' in a limited sense only, viz., because it has been bestowed upon them; and further, because it is bestowed through a channel, it is plain that it can only be retained so long as union with that channel is maintained, as the *Satis Cognitum* in the next section asserts.

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Episcopos per Prov. Viennensem constitutos*, Ep. x.; P.L. liv. 629.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 202 *et seq.* [3] *Vide supra*, nn. 30, *et infra*, 900 *et seq.*

850. From a consideration, therefore, of the language used in this portion of the *Satis Cognitum*, it is evident that it seriously limits the meaning to be attached to the declaration that the Bishops 'are not to be looked on as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs, because they exercise a power really their own,' since, in the first place, that power can be but of a very limited character, essentially different in nature to that supreme power held to belong to the Episcopate on Catholic[1] as opposed to Papalist principles, so that whatever other power they exercise they do so as 'vicars' of the Roman Pontiff, who delegates to them all such power; and in the second place, that power 'really their own,' limited in nature as it is, comes to them through the 'successor of Peter,' 'the Roman Pontiff,' and the continuance of its possession consequently depends on the maintenance of the union with the channel whence it is derived. Bellarmine puts the Papalist claim, which is the teaching of the *Satis Cognitum*, well, asserting, as he does, 'that the ordinary jurisdiction of Bishops descends immediately from the Pope'; 'the government of the Church is monarchical, therefore all authority resides in one, and from him is derived unto the rest.' 'There is a great difference between the succession to Peter and that to the rest of the Apostles; for the Roman Pontiff properly succeeds Peter not as Apostle, but as ordinary Pastor of the whole Church; and therefore the Roman Pontiff has jurisdiction from Him from whom Peter had it: but Bishops do not properly succeed the Apostles, as the Apostles were not ordinary, but extraordinary, and as it were, delegated Pastors, to whom there is no succession. Bishops, however, are said to succeed the Apostles, not properly in that manner in which one Bishop succeeds another, and one king another, but in another way which is twofold: first, in respect of the holy Order of the Episcopate; secondly, from a certain resemblance and proportion; that is, as, when Christ lived on earth, the twelve Apostles were the first under Christ, then the seventy-two Disciples: so now the Bishops are the first under the Roman Pontiff, after them Priests, then Deacons, etc. But it is proved that Bishops succeed to the Apostles so, and not otherwise; for they have no part of the true Apostolic authority. Apostles could preach in the whole world, and found Churches . . . this cannot Bishops.' . . . 'Bishops succeed to the Apostles in the same manner as Priests to the seventy-two Disciples.'[2]

The position here accorded to Bishops has been shown to be entirely contrary to 'the venerable and constant belief'[3] of the primitive Church as to the nature and extent of the jurisdiction of the Bishops,

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 37.

[2] Bellarmine, *De Summo Pontifice*, lib. iv. cap. 24, 25, tom. i. pp. 881, 884. Col. Agripp., 1620.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 35, 132, 601.

and, as Van Espen says of its fautors, 'they utterly take away and destroy that parity of the Episcopal dignity which was instituted by Christ. For according to their principles and maxims there is no longer any appearance of unity in the Episcopate, and in all Bishops, who, whether the Roman, or of some other place, are in that quality equal.'[1] The conclusion which has been drawn from the portion of the *Satis Cognitum* which has been under notice is, it will be seen, corroborated by other allegations which follow.

Section CIX.—*Do Bishops separated from Peter and his Successors lose all Jurisdiction?*

851. The *Satis Cognitum* next asserts that 'Bishops are deprived of the right and power of ruling if they deliberately secede from Peter and his successors,'[2] an assertion which is grounded upon that just considered. Communion with Peter and his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, is thus declared to be essential to the possession of jurisdiction. Obviously this is a distinct limitation on that power which is 'really their own,' exercised according to the *Satis Cognitum* by Bishops, as the ordinary Pastors of the peoples over which they rule, and lays down what, by implication, is involved through the reception of that power through the successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, viz., that the maintenance by them of that power is dependent on continuance in communion with the Roman Bishop. The reason assigned as the basis of the assertion is then given, that 'by this secession they are separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice must rest. They are therefore outside the *edifice* itself; and for this very reason they are separated from the *fold*, whose leader is the Chief Pastor; they are exiled from the *Kingdom*, the keys of which were given by Christ to Peter alone.'[3]

852. The truth of the various assertions contained in this passage as to the position of Peter are, it will be seen, essential to the argument of the *Satis Cognitum*. They have already been disproved,[4] hence it follows that this reason based on them is without foundation in fact. Noting this, it is to be observed that the *Satis Cognitum* here makes the Bishop of Rome the centre of communion in such sense that union with him is an essential condition to being in the Church, 'the one flock under the one Supreme Pastor.'[5] Bishops not in such union are thus absolutely outside the Church. The conclusion drawn in the

[1] Van Espen, *Vindiciæ Resolutionis Doctorum Lovaniensium, Disquisitio secunda*, xi. 5; *Op.*, vol. v., *supplementum*, p. 54. Bruxelles, 1768.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35. [3] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 74 *et seq.*, 116 *et seq.*, 132 *et seq.*
[5] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. c. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

Satis Cognitum is necessarily that Bishops have no jurisdiction whatever unless they are 'under the one supreme Pastor.'

853. The position thus laid down is next alleged to be that which is embodied in the Divine Constitution of the Church. 'These things,' the *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to say, 'enable us to see the heavenly ideal and the divine exemplar of the constitution of the Christian commonwealth, namely: When the Divine Founder decreed that the Church should be one in faith, in government, and in communion, He chose Peter and his successors as the principle and centre, as it were, of this unity.'[1] The *Satis Cognitum* here assumes the accuracy of the interpretation placed on the passages of Holy Scripture in the earlier portion of the document there adduced in proof of its contentions, as well as of the use made of the citations it made from the Fathers for like purpose. Evidence has been given that the former do not bear the said interpretation, that the Fathers did not understand them to contain the charter of the Church's constitution by which the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church was bestowed by the Divine Founder on Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate,[2] and that the quotations from the Fathers do not bear the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* seeks to affix to them.[3] The basis, therefore, thus assumed for the statement now under notice, having no existence, the allegation built upon it has no foundation, and consequently is worthless. A consideration of the four other passages, which are here adduced from the Fathers in support of this allegation, will show that they also are as useless as those just referred to for the purpose for which they are cited.

Section CX.—*Did St. Cyprian make St. Peter and his successors the centre of unity?*

854. Two of the four passages in question are taken from St. Cyprian. The first is as follows: 'St. Cyprian says: The following is a short and easy proof of the faith. The Lord said unto Peter: *I say to thee, Thou art Peter;* on him alone He buildeth His Church; and although after His resurrection He gives a similar power to all the Apostles and says, *As the Father hath sent Me*, etc., still in order to make the necessary unity clear, by His own authority He laid down the source of that unity as beginning from one' (*De Unit. Eccl.*, n. 4).[4] The quotation is printed in the authorised English translation as if the words it contains form a connected and complete whole. This, however, is not the case, several words being omitted, as indeed is shown in the Latin original.

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 52 *et seq.*, 106 *et seq.*, 114 *et seq.*, 131 *et seq.*, 146 *et seq.*, 154 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 35 *et seq.*, 53 *et seq.*, 124 *et seq.*, 132 *et seq.*, 146 *et seq.*
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35.

855. The whole passage is as follows: 'It is easy to offer proofs to a faithful mind, because in that case the truth may be quickly stated. The Lord saith unto Peter, *I say unto thee* (*saith He*), *That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Upon one He builds His Church, and though He assigns equal power to all the Apostles and says, *As My Father sent Me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted to him; and whose soever sins ye retain, they shall be retained*; yet in order to manifest unity, He has, by His own authority, arranged the commencement of that same oneness as a [commencement] beginning from one person. Certainly the Apostles were what Peter was, endowed with—an equal share of office—*honoris*—and power; but a commencement is made from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one; which one Church in the Song of Songs doth the Holy Spirit design and name in the person of our Lord; 'My dove, My spotless one, is but one: she is the only one of her mother, elect of her that bare her.'[1]

856. The *Satis Cognitum* makes use of its citation as though St. Cyprian taught that St. Peter was the *means* of unity, possessing an authority not shared by the rest of the Apostolate. The passage as a whole makes it plain that this cannot be St. Cyprian's meaning. St. Cyprian's view of St. Peter's position was, as has been shown,[2] that he was the symbol, not the instrument, of unity, and as such the representative Apostle. Whatever power our Lord conferred on Peter, the same power was conferred on the other members of the Apostolic College, and on the Bishops who succeeded the Apostolate, the sole difference being in that such power was bestowed, according to St. Cyprian, first on St. Peter in order to manifest unity, that the Church might be exhibited to men as one.

857. The same idea of the representative character of St. Peter's position is made use of by St. Cyprian in his *Epistle to Jubianus*, where he says, 'For to Peter first, on whom He built the Church, and from whom He instituted and showed the commencement of [its] unity, the Lord gave that power, that *whatsoever he should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven.* And after His resurrection also, He speaks to the Apostles saying, *As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.* Whence we learn that they

[1] S. Cyprian, *De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate*, n. 4. Hartel, 212, 213.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 556, 571.

only, who are set over the Church, and are appointed by the law of the Gospel and the ordinance of the Lord, may lawfully baptize and give remission of sins; but, without, nothing can be bound or loosed, where there is no one who can either bind or loose. Nor do we propound this, dearest brother, without the authority of the Divine Scriptures, when we say that all things are divinely ordered by a certain law and peculiar appointment; and that no one can usurp to himself against Bishops and Priests what is not in his own right and power.'[1] In this passage St. Peter is the symbol of the One Episcopate which exists in the Church.

858. According to the teaching of St. Cyprian, and, following him, the Africans, as for example St. Augustine,[2] no unique office was bestowed on St. Peter by which he and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate were constituted the perpetual *source* of unity, and, therefore, the centre of unity as the *Satis Cognitum* implies by the use of his words, but simply the office of Apostle, which the rest of the Apostolate equally possessed, an office conferred on him, first, that unity might be manifested and commended to men. It is significant that the words, 'Certainly the Apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal share of office—*honoris*—and power' which follow the extract given, are omitted in the *Satis Cognitum*. They are words of vital importance to arriving at the true sense of the passage, emphasising, as they do, its harmony with St. Cyprian's teaching elsewhere in his writings, that the Apostles held the supreme power in the Church, power which passed to their successors, the Bishops, who consequently are set to govern the Church as those who are accountable to our Lord alone for the way in which they discharge this duty laid upon them. Each member of the Episcopate is thus, according to St. Cyprian, the centre of unity of each particular local church, communion with whom, within the limits of his diocese, is essential to and the means of being in the unity of the Church, inasmuch as the Bishops throughout the world hold in joint tenure the One Episcopate.[3]

859. The whole notion that St. Peter and his 'legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate' possessed *jure divino* a unique and sovereign position in the Church, in consequence of which it is essential for Bishops to be in communion with the Bishops of Rome in order that they may be in the unity of the Church and have power to exercise jurisdiction over their flocks, was clearly unknown to St. Cyprian and alien from his teaching. The passage quoted gives no countenance to any such idea; on the contrary, it is consistent with

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Jubianum*, Ep. lxxiii. nn. 7, 8. Hartel, 783, 784.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 117 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 46, 565.

what has been seen to be his teaching in his writings,[1] and with the evidence afforded by his conduct,[2] as to his belief as to the position occupied by St. Peter in the Apostolate. To quote the words under comment in the manner in which, and for the purpose for which, the *Satis Cognitum* cites them, is therefore to affix to them a meaning of which not only are they not susceptible, but which is, moreover, opposed to, and inconsistent with, his teaching both in word and deed.

860. The other quotation from St. Cyprian which the *Satis Cognitum* adduces in this connection is given after the first of the quotations from St. Optatus which is noticed below.[3] The object of the citation is clearly to make St. Cyprian a witness to the idea that the unique sovereign position which the *Satis Cognitum* alleges to belong to St. Peter by the institution of Christ was so conferred on his 'successors' also. 'Hence,' says the *Satis Cognitum*, 'the teaching of Cyprian that heresy and schism arise and are begotten from the fact that due obedience is refused to the supreme authority. "Heresies and schisms have no other origin than that obedience is refused to the priest of God, and that men lose sight of the fact that there is one judge in the place of Christ in this world"'[4] (*Ep.* xii. *ad Cornelium*, n. 5). The English translation is unfortunately not exact, and tends to obscure the real meaning. The passage should read thus, 'For this has been the very source whence heresies and schisms have taken their rise, that obedience is not paid to the priest of God, nor do they reflect that there is for the time one High Priest in the Church, and one judge for the time in Christ's stead.'[5]

861. The *Satis Cognitum*, it is plain, cites this passage as meaning that St. Cyprian lays down in it that 'the priest of God,' and 'the one judge' for the time in Christ's stead, is the Bishop of Rome, disobedience to whom, as the one endowed *jure divino* with 'the supreme authority,' is the cause of heresy and schism. This, however, is far from being St. Cyprian's meaning. He is speaking of *Bishops*, there being but one Bishop in each See, the word '*sacerdos*' being used by him here in the same sense as it is elsewhere in his writings. Just as St. Ignatius, in a passage already quoted, declares that as 'many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the Bishop. . . . There is one Altar as there is one Bishop,'[6] so St. Cyprian declares that there is but 'one priest' and 'one judge' at a time in each local church or diocese, and that the disregard of this truth is the mother of heresy and schism. Similarly in a letter to the

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 562, 570, etc.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 580 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide infra*, nn. 864 *et seq.*
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.
[5] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lviii. 5. Hartel, 671-2.
[6] S. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Philad.*, iii., iv.; P.G. v. 700.

Bishop Rogatianus, who had complained to him of the insubordinate behaviour of his Deacon, he says that the Deacon must 'do penance for his presumption, and own the dignity of the Priest, and with entire humility make satisfaction to the Bishop set over him. For these things—to please themselves, and with swelling pride despise their Bishop—are the beginnings of heresies, and the rise and essays of evil-minded schismatics. Thus is the Church deserted, thus a profane altar set up without, thus also rebellion against the peace of Christ and the ordinance and unity of God . . . and since you have written us word, that another has joined himself to this your Deacon . . . him also, and whoever else are of the like sort, and do any thing against God's Priest, you may either restrain or excommunicate.'[1]

862. To St. Cyprian, then, maintenance of union with the legitimate Bishop of the local Church is an essential condition to preserving the unity of the Church, since there could be but one Bishop in a See, and the setting up of a rival Bishop in a See already occupied was the essence of schism, the final act of disobedience to the supreme authority in that Church. The passage is thus in complete harmony with what has been shown to be St. Cyprian's teaching on the subject of the Episcopate.[2] That this is its meaning is further confirmed by the object with which the Epistle from which it is taken was written. St. Cyprian in it, as has been seen,[3] blames his 'dearest brother' Cornelius for being moved by the 'threats and menaces' of the faction of Felicissimus, so that he was in danger of recognising Fortunatus, who had been consecrated by five schismatical,[4] or degraded Bishops, as an intruder into the See of Carthage. St. Cyprian, in order to make Cornelius realise the schismatical position of this party, which he feared he was inclined to support under the influence of Felicissimus, by setting forth the fact that there can be but one Bishop in a See at one time who is the one judge at a time in the local Church. The whole force of his argument hangs upon the position of the Bishop as the supreme authority in each local Church, and has no reference, and could have no reference, to the Bishop of Rome as possessed of real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey.

863. If it be suggested that the *Satis Cognitum* by its use of this

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Rogatianum*, Ep. iii. 3. Hartel, 471-2.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 554, etc.

[3] *Vide supra*, n. 568.

[4] These five Bishops were the heretic Privatus, Bishop of Lambesis, who had been condemned by a Council of nearly ninety Bishops held at Lambesis as guilty of several grave offences, not improbably in A.D. 240; Bishops Jovinus and Maximus, who had been condemned with Felicissimus, to whose party they now belonged, for having sacrificed to the gods, and for having committed abominable sacrilege at the Synod of Carthage A.D. 251 (Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. 5. E.T. i. 95); one Felix, who had been consecrated Bishop by Privatus after his lapse into heresy; and the fallen Bishop Repostus of Tubernuc (Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 227, note 2), who had sacrificed during the persecution.

passage is merely applying to the whole Church the principle which St. Cyprian therein lays down with regard to a *single diocese*, so that as obedience must be rendered to the Diocesan as the supreme authority within the limits of the diocese, so a like obedience must be paid by the whole Church to the Pope as possessing *jure divino* full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, it is to be replied: (*a*) First, that the suggestion is futile and shown to be untrue by the way in which the passage is cited. '*Hence* the teaching of Cyprian—*unde est illa ipsius Cypriani sententia*'—the 'teaching' is adduced as the necessary consequence, according to St. Cyprian, of the position asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the 'Roman Pontiff,' and not as expressing a general principle employed for a purpose other than that for which St. Cyprian in the passage so quoted uses it. It is essential to the argument of the *Satis Cognitum* that the identity between its teaching and that of St. Cyprian here should be complete; (*b*) Secondly, if the suggested explanation were true, the unfairness of making use of language employed by St. Cyprian with reference to the authority and position of the Episcopate, of which he was the strenuous upholder, in proof of the monarchical position asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome, of which he knew nothing, and with which his 'teaching' is essentially inconsistent, and this, too, in an epistle to a Bishop of Rome who, according to Papalism, is the absolute monarch over the whole Church, 'the judge of all Christians,' without any clause safeguarding the unique prerogatives of the 'Sovereign Pontiff,' needs no comment.

Section CXI.—*Did St. Optatus of Milevis make Peter and his successors the centre of unity?*

864. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds next to adduce in this connection St. Optatus of Milevis as a witness, citing the following passage from his writings: 'You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal chair was first conferred on Peter. In this Peter, the head of all the Apostles (hence his name Cephas), has sat; in which chair alone unity was to be preserved for all—*servaretur ab omnibus*—lest any of the other Apostles should claim anything as exclusively his own. So much so that he who would place another chair against that one chair would be a schismatic and a sinner' (*De Schism. Donat.*, lib. 11).[1] The *Satis Cognitum*, in thus making use of these words, implies that St. Optatus is here treating of the unique relation which it alleges the Roman Pontiff occupies with regard to the Episcopate as

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35.

the centre of unity. Was this the meaning which the writer wished to convey?

865. What was the object St. Optatus had in view? He is arguing against the Donatists who had schismatically intruded Bishops of their own into Sees already canonically occupied, amongst which was that of Rome. As an African he held the view which, as has been seen, is identified with St. Cyprian, the great Father whose opinions had naturally so much weight in the African Church that he had been accepted as guide in the matter by St. Augustine and other African Fathers. According to that view, St. Peter was the representative of the whole Episcopate, all Bishops being instituted in him, so that he was the symbolical predecessor of them all, in that he first received the Episcopal commission, the One Episcopate which each Bishop holds in joint tenure. Hence the 'See of Peter' is present everywhere in the Episcopate, the whole Church being in fact but one See, 'the See of Peter,' which all Bishops hold in joint tenure. Langen has put this conception very clearly thus: 'The See of Peter,' says he, 'is the one ecclesiastical See in which all the Apostles and their successors, the Bishops, in equal measure participate, which is called after Peter because he first (to emphasise symbolically the unity of the Church) was put in possession of it';[1] thus 'the Sees of all the Churches are all equally different representatives of the one whole See.'[2]

866. As already observed, amongst the Sees into which the Donatists had intruded Bishops was that of Rome. St. Optatus therefore very naturally takes, as the example by which he proves the untenable character of the position assumed by them, the case of the intrusion into the See of that Bishop who by his day had come to be universally regarded as the successor of St. Peter in the particular See which he was considered to have personally occupied, and thus to have succeeded to the symbolical and representative character of St. Peter, according to the African view of his position, and so be the natural symbol of the present unity of the Episcopate. In the passage quoted his argument accordingly is that inasmuch as the Episcopal commission was first bestowed upon St. Peter in order that the unity of the Church might be symbolised, and so divisions amongst the Apostles and their successors prevented, therefore to set up a chair against that one chair of the One Episcopate in any part of the Church would be evil, consequently the act of the Donatists in doing so at Rome proclaimed them to be schismatics and sinners, his argument being emphasised and rendered more pointed by the fact that the Apostle who represented in his person the One Episcopate had already sat in the Episcopal chair of that city.

[1] Langen, *Geschichite der Römischen Kirche bis zum Pontificate Leo I.*, p. 858.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 859.

867. St. Optatus's argument here refers solely to the position of the Catholic Episcopate as against that of the Donatists, having no reference whatever to any unique *sovereign* position belonging to the Bishop of Rome. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the existence of any such prerogative. For according to it the See of Rome holds the same position in essence as the other Sees in Christendom, the Bishop thereof, simply because the chair was the one in which Peter as Bishop actually sat, being in it considered to so occupy the like symbolical position towards the Episcopate as that Apostle did with reference to the Apostolate. Hence as Peter possessed no authority or power which the other Apostles did not equally share, so also to the Bishop of Rome likewise there belongs *jure divino* no authority or power which is not equally possessed by each of the other members of the One Episcopate. Such was the conception which St. Optatus, as an African, following the Cyprianic view, had of the position of St. Peter and of the Bishops of Rome, as had St. Augustine who was almost his contemporary. Whilst, therefore, he could call the Episcopal chair of the legitimate succession of Bishops in Africa 'the chair of Cyprian or of Peter,'[1] the example he chose as that which would set most clearly forth the schismatical character of the action of the Donatists was their intrusion of a Bishop into the symbolical See, the See 'where Peter first received the Episcopal chair,' in which one chair unity was to be preserved, lest the other Apostles should claim chairs for each of themselves, so that he would be a schismatic and a sinner who should place another chair against that single one;[2] that is, the See of Rome thus being occupied by St. Peter, the other Apostles could not erect 'chairs' at Rome, the capital of the world, for themselves, because the Apostolate, and the Episcopate which is its continuation, is One, and thus unity was preserved; hence it follows that the Donatists, in placing a chair against that 'single one,' are manifestly shown to have done what the Apostles did not do because of the unity of the Apostolate, and therefore are clearly schismatics and sinners.

868. Further, in his argument he not only thus overthrows the claim of the Donatists that they possessed 'the chair,' that is, the real episcopate, but also deals with their allegation that the members of their episcopate alone had true mission, claiming, as they did, to possess 'the Angel.' The way in which he did this confirms the conclusion drawn from his treatment of the former claim. 'Send,' says he, 'your Angel, if you can, and let him shut out the seven Angels who are with our allies in Asia, to whose churches John the Apostle wrote, with whom you are proved to have no fellowship or communion. . . . Without the Seven Churches—whatever is beyond their pale—is alien [from the Catholic

[1] S. Optatus, *De Schismate Donatistorum*, lib. i. cap. 20; P.L. xi. 904.
[2] *Op. cit.*, lib. ii. cap. ii.; P.L. xi. 947.

Church]. Or if you have some one Angel derived from them, through that one you hold communion with the other Angels, and through the Angels with the Churches before mentioned, and through the Churches with us [*i.e.* the Catholics of Africa], whom, however, you regard as polluted and refuse to own.'[1]

869. St. Optatus here tells the Donatists to authoritatively exclude the Bishops of the Seven Churches of Asia if they could, and lays down that communion with these Churches is an essential condition to union with the Catholic Church, in that they represent the Church of the Apostolic Age; the reason why they are so representative being that they shared the One Episcopate, their Bishops being the successors of the seven Angels mentioned in the Apocalypse. He proceeds to clinch his argument by saying that if perchance they did claim to possess Bishops canonically derived from these Angels, thus being in communion with those Churches, the absurdity of the objection they raised against the Catholics of Africa is self-evident, since if they were so in communion, they were necessarily in communion with those whom they were denouncing.

870. The whole force of the argument, which St. Optatus here makes use of, depends on the Seven Churches being the necessary 'centre of unity,' the Donatists being compelled to allow such communion to be necessary, unless they could prove that they could authoritatively exclude the Bishops of those Churches from the Church, which implicitly he says they could not do. Whence it follows that they were bound to admit that they must be, and on their own principles were, in communion with the Seven Churches, and on that ground also in communion with those whom they were opposing, which conclusively proved the schismatical character of their action.

871. Again he says in the work already quoted: 'Therefore, as we have before said, whatever in this matter has been with asperity, when traced to its origin we have shown to belong to your chiefs; whence is it that you call Catholics polluted? Is it because we have followed the will and command of God by having peace and communicating with the whole world, united to the Easterns, where, according to His humanity, Christ was born, where His footsteps were impressed, where His adorable feet walked, where by the very Son of God Himself there were done so many and so great works, where so many Apostles accompanied Him, where is the sevenfold Church, from which you not only do not grieve that you have been cut off, but in everything congratulate yourselves? How do you dare to read the Epistles written to the Corinthians, who are unwilling to communicate them? How can you read those written to the Galatians and Thessalonians in whose communion you are not? Since all these things are so, under-

[1] S. Optatus, *op. cit.*, lib. ii. cap. vi.; P.L. xi. 1000.

stand that you are cut off from Holy Church, and that we are not polluted.'[1]

The argument is plain. The Donatists are not in communion with the Easterns, they are, indeed, proud of that; on the other hand, Catholics have such communion. Hence it follows that the Donatists are cut off from the Church, and the charge that they bring against Catholics is thus proved to be false. Communion with the Easterns is, therefore, essential to being in the Catholic Church.

872. It is obvious that the argument used in these passages by St. Optatus cannot be reconciled with any belief on his part that 'the Roman Pontiff' is the 'supreme Pastor of the One Flock,' communion with whom is the *sole* essential condition to being in the Catholic Church. The position assigned in it to the 'Seven Churches' and 'the Easterns' is incompatible with any such idea. Had it been 'the venerable and constant belief' of the Church in the 'age' in which St. Optatus flourished, he could not have placed the 'Seven Churches' and 'the Easterns' in the position he did, for he would have both misled the Donatists as to a doctrine of Christian truth which every one must believe as a condition to his eternal salvation, and at the same time laid himself open to the retort that he was false to his own principles as a Catholic by making another centre of unity to that which had been divinely appointed as a principal element in the Divine Constitution of the Church for that purpose, viz., the Roman Pontiff, and therefore was guilty of taking up a schismatical position himself. The argument, therefore, is a proof in itself that the meaning which the *Satis Cognitum* endeavours to affix to the citation made is incompatible with the opinions of the writer, whilst, on the other hand, it is clearly consistent with, and thus corroborates, that which has been shown above to be the real meaning of the quotation.

873. Another quotation is given from St. Optatus in this connection in the *Satis Cognitum*, the object being to show that that Father 'blamed the Donatists' because they refused due obedience to the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff. It is as follows: 'Against which gates [of hell] we read that Peter received the saving keys, that is to say, our prince, to whom it was said by Christ: *To thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the gates of hell shall not conquer them.* Whence is it therefore that you strive to obtain for yourselves the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—you who fight against the chair of Peter?' (Lib. ii. n. 4, 5).[2]

874. The extract is from the same treatise from which the former quotation was taken. It has already been noted that the object St. Optatus had in writing it was to show that the conduct of the Donatists

[1] S. Optatus, *op. cit.*, lib. vi. cap. iii.; P.L. xl. 1070. [2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.

in intruding Bishops into Sees already canonically occupied proved that they were schismatics. In the words quoted they are blamed for endeavouring to obtain for themselves that power which belonged alone to those who legitimately fill the 'chair of Peter,' holding as they do the one Episcopate, 'the one See of Peter,' in joint tenure, by doing which they fight against 'the chair of Peter.' Their intrusion of a Bishop into the See of Rome emphasised in a peculiar manner, as has been shown,[1] the schismatical character of their action. Moreover, the Donatist Episcopate in Rome was in no sense in succession to Peter as Bishop of that See, in that it had its beginning in Victor Garbiensis, whom the Donatists had sent from Africa. Whence it followed that the then existing successor to that first intruder, Maxentius by name, was plainly seen to be in schismatical opposition to the legitimate holder of that representative See, who could trace back his succession in direct line to Peter, who was the first occupant thereof.

875. To conclude, St. Optatus in the passages cited in the *Satis Cognitum* simply follows and develops the Cyprianic doctrine of the unity of the Episcopate and of St. Peter's position in the Apostolate as symbolising that unity, in that he first received the Apostolical communion. His language therefore is perfectly consistent with the position which the African Church took in the case of Apiarius, a few years after the treatise from which the quotations are made, at the Council of Carthage,[2] at which the province of Numidia, of which Milevis was the chief See, was duly represented, as well as with the Canon thereby enacted for the protection of the African Church against external interference, a Canon absolutely incompatible with the Papal Monarchy.[3] The *Satis Cognitum*, therefore, in adducing St. Optatus as a witness in support of its allegation with reference to the position of the Roman Bishop, gives to his words which it cites a signification alien from the intention of the writer.

876. The result of an examination of the four passages quoted in this connection in the *Satis Cognitum* with due regard to their respective contexts, and in the light of the circumstances under which they were written, proves them to be in accord with the witness of the other Fathers of the primitive Church with reference to the Episcopate, and therefore also with their testimony against the monarchical position which the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop, and specifically against the particular tenet which necessarily results from that position, viz., that communion with the Bishop of Rome as the divinely appointed centre of unity is an essential condition to the retention by Bishops of any jurisdiction in the dioceses to which they

[1] *Vide supra*, 867.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 609.
[3] *Ibid.*

were respectively appointed, which is the subject under consideration in these sections.

Section CXII.—'*Subjection and obedience to Peter*' *the test of being in communion with Peter.*

877. The *Satis Cognitum* next lays down that 'the Episcopal order is rightly judged to be in communion with Peter, as Christ commanded, if it be subject to and obeys Peter; otherwise it necessarily becomes a lawless and disorderly crowd.'[1]

The *Satis Cognitum* here adopts the theory advanced by St. Leo, viz., the *personal* ruling of the Church by Peter through his successors in the See of Rome, Bishops according to it being in communion with Peter if they are subject and obedient to the Roman Pontiffs. This is an important confirmation of the conclusion arrived at above[2] with reference to the adoption by the *Satis Cognitum* of St. Leo's theory, as it was ultimately developed, as to the position of Peter and his successors as the channel through whom jurisdiction is conveyed to the Apostolate and the Episcopate.

878. But further, the complete dependence of the Episcopate for their jurisdiction on the Pope is here asserted by the *Satis Cognitum*. The Bishops must be in subjection to 'and obey' the Roman Bishop. He is thus the absolute monarch, possessing 'real and sovereign authority,' which the whole hierarchy must recognise in every respect, exercising the authority which they have received in accordance with the commands of the 'one Supreme Pastor' and 'judge of all Christians.' Such is another grave limitation on 'the power which is really their own' which the *Satis Cognitum* lays down. Bishops who do not satisfy this condition have no 'power' at all. They are 'a lawless and disorderly crowd'—*multitudinem confusam perturbatam*—incapable of ruling, bereft of all jurisdiction. This, as will be seen, is a curious and significant comment on the statement made elsewhere in the *Satis Cognitum* that the Bishops are not to be looked on as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs.[3]

879. The absolutist nature of the authority which the Roman Pontiff is here asserted to possess over the Bishops is emphasised by the words which follow. 'It is not sufficient for the due preservation or the unity of the faith that the head should merely have been charged with the office of superintendent, or should have been invested solely with a power of direction.'[4] This is a clear repudiation of the idea that 'the Pope' is merely the chief Bishop of Christendom, whom it specially behoves to see that the Canons of the Church are

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 846 *et seq.*
[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 34.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

obeyed by all, thus taking the chief part *causa honoris* in seeing that due respect was paid to their authority, a duty incumbent on every Bishop in virtue of his participation in the One Episcopate, and therefore especially so on the occupant of that See which is recognised by the whole Church to be the 'First See,' so that he might be rightly said to be pre-eminently the Guardian of the Canons.

880. It is noteworthy that the idea thus emphatically repudiated was exactly the ground which St. Leo took in dealing with the Easterns, to whom he knew full well it would be useless to advance pretensions which, aided by the secular arm, and the prestige attaching to his See as the sole Apostolic See in the West, and that, too, seated in the Imperial city of Old Rome, he put forward so successfully in the West.[1] For example, St. Leo in writing to Anatolius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, with reference to his consecration said: 'For when your predecessor of blessed memory, Flavian, had been ejected on account of his defence of the Catholic faith, not without reason was it believed that your ordainers seemed to have consecrated one like themselves *contrary to the constitution of the Holy Canons.*'[2] The reference being to the fact that the Canons had been violated by the illegal deposition of Flavian at the *Latrocinium*, and Anatolius had been consecrated as his successor by Dioscurus of Alexandria, by whose machinations that deposition had been brought about. Again with the Emperor Marcian, he took the like line with reference to the consecration by Anatolius of Maximus to the See of Antioch, of which Domnus, the canonical occupant, had been also illegally deprived in the *Latrocinium.* Writing to the Emperor he said: 'Let the aforesaid Bishop obey the Fathers, consult the interests of peace, and not think his act of presumption in ordaining a Bishop for the Church of Antioch, without any precedent, against the precepts of the Canons, had been lawful.'[3] To be merely, because of the position of his See, in a pre-eminent degree the Guardian of the Canons, to merely superintend the observance of them as the supreme law of the Church to which he, in common with the rest of the Episcopate, must render obedience, is a position essentially inconsistent with Papal absolutism, and consequently is necessarily repudiated by the *Satis Cognitum.*

881. The *Satis Cognitum* also declares that the idea that the Roman Bishop has been invested with a 'power of direction' solely, is an erroneous conception of the power of the 'Supreme Pastor.' It is, indeed, clearly inadequate as a description of that power which is asserted therein to belong by the institution of Christ to the Roman Bishop, and, it may be added, would appear in itself to be useless for

[1] *Vide supra*, 206 *et seq.*

[2] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Anatolium Epis. C.P.*, Ep. cvi. c. i.; P.L. liv. 1001.

[3] *Ep. ad Marcianum Imp.*, Ep. civ. c. v.; P.L. liv. 997.

the purpose for which those who would thus describe his authority consider that he possesses it, viz. the preservation of unity. For it is obvious that a 'power of *direction*,' unaccompanied by a 'power of *jurisdiction*' to enforce such direction, would clearly be of no avail to that end, quite apart from the fact that no such 'power of direction' was admitted to belong to him in the 'first age' or by the orthodox Easterns to this day, whatever might be the 'demand' made by the Roman Bishop, other members of the Episcopate, as has already been shown,[1] felt themselves fully at liberty to disregard it and to act contrary thereto.

882. The *Satis Cognitum*, by thus effectually closing the door against an attempt to minimise the 'Papal' authority by explanations of this character, has increased the difficulties in the way of the reunion of Christendom, since such action authoritatively makes it impossible to place an interpretation on the Papal claims as *officially* set forth which might have the effect of rendering them less opposed to the facts of history. Having done this, the *Satis Cognitum* naturally proceeds to lay down as definite terms the true character of the Papal authority. 'It is absolutely necessary that he should have received real and sovereign authority, which the whole community is bound to obey.'[2]

883. This statement is plain, there is no ambiguity about it which could render it susceptible of more than one interpretation. Now this authority, it is to be observed, is by the *Satis Cognitum* asserted to have been conferred on Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate by the Son of God. It is not derived by grant from the Church, whether directly or by consent of the Fathers expressed by custom. Consequently this authority must have been in existence and duly exercised from the very beginning of the Christian religion, since it was an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, and also because the ground on which it is alleged the gift was bestowed,—viz., that by its means the unity of the faith might be preserved—had as real an existence in the first century as in the twentieth.

884. This authority, thus divinely conferred, the *Satis Cognitum* asserts to be 'real and sovereign.' A real power, that is, supreme in the Church, and subject therefore to no external interference, the whole community, including therefore the Episcopate, being bound to obey it. In thus describing the power alleged to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop, the *Satis Cognitum* gives an authoritative exposition of the *Vatican Decrees*, to which it refers as defining the nature and power of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.[3] In those *Decrees* it is declared

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 447, 577.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

under anathema that the Roman Pontiff has not 'merely an office of inspection or direction, but full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the whole world, and that he possesses not only the chief part, but the whole plenitude of this supreme power which is ordinary and immediate over all churches singly and collectively, and over all pastors and faithful singly and collectively.[1]

885. Such an authority as this is rightly described as 'sovereign.' It is that of an absolute monarch, to which the Bishops are bound to render obedience, since it belongs to the Roman Pontiff by the institution of Christ, and unless they are thus in 'subjection' and 'obedient' to it, they are incapable of exercising any power of ruling, being 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*.' To exercise authority of any kind in subjection and obedience to an absolute monarch is to do so by his permission and according to his will, in short, for all practical purposes as his deputies or 'vicars,' and this is the exact position occupied by Bishops according to the *Satis Cognitum*. Their authority is a subordinate one, dependent on the Pope, who, according to Papalism, alone possesses authority in the true sense in the Church, authority which is of so full and supreme a nature that it is difficult to imagine what authority could possibly be supposed to be possessed by the Bishops which they do not derive through him who possesses the whole plenitude of 'Episcopal' power in the Church. A further proof is thus afforded by this statement that the *Satis Cognitum* embodies the theory that *all* jurisdiction, including 'the authority which is really their own' (whatever that may be, and which is distinguished in the *Satis Cognitum* from jurisdiction 'properly so-called'), is received by the Episcopate through Peter's 'successor,' 'the Roman Pontiff.'

886. Having made this unambiguous statement as to the true nature of the Papal authority, the *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to assert, as a proof thereof, that 'the Son of God . . . promised the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to Peter *alone*,' and that the power thus promised was of an essentially different nature to that 'power of binding and loosing' which was conferred on the rest of the Apostolate, and so on the Bishops, *i.e.* that it was 'the supreme authority' which '*Biblical usage* and the unanimous teaching of the Fathers clearly show [to be] designated . . . by the word keys.'[2] It may be readily admitted that '*Biblical usage* and the unanimous teaching of the Fathers' do designate the supreme authority 'by the word keys,' but, as has already been shown,[3] the 'unanimous teaching of the Fathers' does not 'show'

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 117 *et seq.*

that such supreme power was bestowed on Peter alone. On the contrary, according to the early Fathers, the words in St. Matthew xvi. 19 contain neither a grant, nor a promise of a grant, of such sovereign power to St. Peter *alone*. Their teaching is that the promise was made to St. Peter as the representative of the Apostolate, and that the power so promised was afterwards conferred on the Apostles and their successors. As Theophylact says: 'They who have obtained the grace of the Episcopate as Peter had, have authority to remit and bind. For though the "I will give thee" was spoken to Peter alone, yet the gift has been given to all the Apostles. When? When He said, Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted; for this "I will give thee" indicates a future time—the time, that is, after the resurrection'[1]—*i.e.* the promise recorded in St. Matthew xvi. 19 was fulfilled when our Lord said to the Apostolate, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you': 'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'[2] These words, as has already been noted,[3] conveyed to them the whole plenitude of power which our Lord had received from His Father, including of necessity, therefore, the right and power to confer it on others in as ample measure as it had been bestowed on them. Hence it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the Bishops as their successors, receiving the identical power which they received, possess that supreme power in the Church which is designated, by '*Biblical usage* and the unanimous teaching of the Fathers,' 'by the word keys.'

887. The *Satis Cognitum*, in support of its assertion, then declares that 'the duty of feeding the lambs and sheep' was 'assigned by God' to Peter, and cites the following passage from St. Bruno, Bishop of Segni, as setting this forth. 'Christ constituted [Peter] not only pastor, but pastor of pastors; Peter therefore feeds the lambs and feeds the sheep, feeds the children, and feeds the mothers, governs the subjects and rules the prelates, because the lambs and the sheep form the whole of the Church' (S. Brunonis Episcopi Segniensis, *Comment. in Joan.*, part iii. cap. xi. n. 55).[4] There is no need to consider this passage from St. Bruno in itself as his authority, as a witness to the true meaning of our Lord's words cannot be held in this instance to be of any value, inasmuch as he, as a Western, simply sets out the interpretation of St. John xxi. 15 *seq.* which prevailed at Rome in the twelfth century when he wrote as being in accord with that view of the position of Peter which through the influence of *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* and other forgeries in the Papalist interest, was then accepted everywhere in the West.

[1] Theophylact, *Enarratio in Matt.* xvi. (19); P.G. cxxiii. 320.
[2] St. John, xx. 21, 22.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 30, 120.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 37.

888. The *Satis Cognitum* here assumes (1), first, that St. Peter received from our Lord, in the words recorded in St. John xxi., the Supreme Pastorate of the One Flock; and (2), secondly, that the Roman Pontiffs, as the legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, possess *jure divino* this Supreme Pastorate so bestowed, that is, that the two allegations to this effect which are contained in the earlier portion of the *Satis Cognitum* are true. These allegations have both been considered in detail. As to the first, proof has been given that, according to the teaching of the Fathers, the meaning of the passage in St. John is that our Lord by His words then made a renewal of that Apostolate which Peter had already received, and to which by his triple denial he had been false.[1] It was no bestowal of a new and unique office, but a restoration effected after his thrice repeated confession. As St. Gregory Nazianzen says: 'Jesus received him back, and by the triple question and confession' He 'healed the triple denial.'[2] The charge indeed of feeding the sheep, feeding the lambs, was no new commission, it was simply a rehabilitation of St. Peter.

889. In itself it is applicable to all who held the office of Apostle, and thus may also be regarded as being said to him in his character of representative of the Apostolate, which he is held by many to have possessed.[3] It is thus interpreted by the Venerable Bede in the passage already quoted: 'That which was said to Peter, "Feed My sheep," was in truth said to them all. For the other Apostles were the same that Peter was, but the first place was given Peter that the unity of the Church may be commended. They are all shepherds, but the flock is shown to be one, which was both then fed with unanimity by all the Apostles, and is since then fed by their successors, with a common care.'[4] The erroneous nature, indeed, of the Papalist assumption has already been shown, and there is no need to reiterate what has been said on the point.

890. The second allegation has been already considered in detail. The Roman *Episcopate* of St. Peter has been proved by the evidence to be destitute of any basis,[5] the earliest historical evidence now extant being incompatible with the idea that St. Peter occupied the position of Diocesan Bishop of Rome. It consequently follows, that inasmuch as the allegations advanced as the ground on which the *Satis Cognitum* bases its assertion, that Peter and his successors received from our Lord the Supreme Pastorate of the One Flock are erroneous, that assertion is disproved.

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 138 *et seq.*
[2] S. Greg. Nazianzen, *Oratio in Sancta Lumina*, xxxix. 18; P.G. xxxvi. 537.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 117 *et seq.*, 571.
[4] V. Beda, *Hom. in Vig. Petr. et Pauli, Hom.* xv.; P.L. xciv. 244-45.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 473 *et seq.*

891. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to declare that, because of the unique position which it has asserted to belong *jure divino* to St. Peter which has been under discussion, the 'ancients' 'frequently call him "the prince of the College of the Disciples: the prince of the holy Apostles: the leader of that Choir: the mouthpiece of all the Apostles: the head of that family: the ruler of the whole world: the first of the Apostles: the safeguard of the Church."'[1] It has been shown that the Fathers by no means confine themselves to giving high-sounding titles to St. Peter,[2] and consequently the absurdity of gravely advancing the application of such titles to him in support of the monarchical position, which it is the object of the *Satis Cognitum* to set before Christendom as belonging to the Bishop of Rome by the institution of Christ, is manifest. The absurdity is indeed the more marked, owing to the fact that most of the instances in which they are so used are to be found in the writings of Easterns whose Oriental habit of using high-flown compliments is well known, and who themselves were great lights in that portion of the Church which has consistently repudiated the Papalist claims. It is obvious that they never intended by the use of such expressions to in any way countenance a position which the Eastern Church never recognised, and against the existence of which the attitude they preserved in their day towards the Roman See is a conclusive proof. In fact, the Eastern Emperor, John Palæologus II., at the Council of Florence, when a similar attempt was made to use complimentary titles in the Papalist interest, stated plainly how absurd the idea was in the opinion of the Easterns when he opposed the proposal that the position held by the Pope in the Church should be defined in the conciliar decree as *juxta dicta Sanctorum*. He objected at once that any thing could be made of such *dicta*, saying, 'If any one of the Fathers gives to the Pope an honourable title, does that mean that he admits the special privilege of the Roman Bishop?'[3] The justice of this objection had to be admitted, and the obnoxious and misleading words were not inserted in the *Decretum Unionis*.[4]

892. It is, no doubt, true that St. Bernard made use of titles of this character, because he believed St. Peter to have occupied the position which the *Satis Cognitum* alleges to have been his *jure divino*. But that a Latin writer of his date should so do is no proof, as *Satis Cognitum* by its citation of his authority implies, that such a position was conferred on that Apostle, because in the twelfth century, in which St. Bernard flourished, the many forgeries in the Papal interest were, as has been shown,[5] universally accepted in the West

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 37.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 175, 176.
[3] Mansi, xxxi. 875, 876.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 265 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide supra*, 234, 247.

as authentic, and the Papalist claims were thus in that age universally admitted in Western Christendom. St. Bernard, in fact, in the passage quoted,[1] is simply reproducing the idea then current in the West on the subject.

893. The claim, therefore, made that communion with Peter and his successors in the Roman Episcopate is an essential condition to belonging to the Church, together with the 'proof' thereof alleged to be found in the obedience and subjection of the Episcopate to Peter and such successors, is thus shown to be devoid of any foundation in fact. The claim itself thus disproved, it must be noted, completely substantiates the fact that, according to Papalism, the Bishops are in reality 'vicars of the Roman Pontiffs.' They have no power whatever, save in union with him, and this power so possessed must be exercised in subjection and obedience to Peter and his legitimate successors, the Roman Pontiffs. The position, therefore, of the Pope is thus clearly asserted to be that of an absolute monarch, the Bishops ruling in subjection and obedience to him; their power to do so, according to the language of St. Leo, whose authority the *Satis Cognitum* recognises and endorses, coming to them 'through Peter,' *i.e.*, through the Bishops of Rome who have succeeded him in the Roman Chair. This conclusion as to the relative positions occupied by the Papacy and the Episcopate respectively, it may be added, will be found to be amply corroborated by a later passage in the *Satis Cognitum* which will now be discussed.

Section CXIII.—'*The subjection to the Roman Pontiff of the Bishops collectively as well as individually.*'

894. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to assert that the whole Episcopate collectively is subject to the Roman Bishop.[2] It assumes that each individual Bishop is bound to obey the sovereign power of the Roman Pontiff, and therefore alleges that they are bound to a like subjection to their 'Master' when assembled together. The object of this is obvious; it is to assert the supremacy of the Pope over an Œcumenical Council, so that the absolute character of his authority *jure divino* may be clearly established. In so doing, the *Satis Cognitum* simply reaffirms the statement of the *Pastor Æternus* of the *Vatican Council* that 'they err from the right path of truth who affirm that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman

[1] The passage is from *De consideratione ad Eugenium tertium*, lib. ii. cap. viii.; P.L. clxxxii. 751.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 37-38.

Pontiffs to an Œcumenical Council as to an authority superior to the Roman Pontiff.'[1]

895. The assertion is a definite one, but inasmuch as that the assertion, viz., that the Bishops individually are in subjection to the Roman Pontiff, has been proved to be erroneous, it follows that the proposition that the Bishops taken 'collectively' are in like subjection is in even more flagrant contradiction, if possible, to facts. But though this is so, since this particular allegation is no doubt intended to condemn that superiority of General Councils over the Pope contained in the decrees of the Council of Constance, and which the Gallican Church, in the famous *Cleri Gallicani de Ecclesiastica Potestate Declaratio* put forth on the 19th March 1684, proclaimed to be in full force and unshaken,[2] it will be useful to examine it, the more so as such an examination will serve to strengthen the conclusion already arrived at, viz., that the monarchical position of the Pope is no part of the Divine Constitution of the Church.

896. Before, however, proceeding to discuss this allegation under notice in the light afforded by history, one or two remarks may be made on the statements by which the *Satis Cognitum* endeavours to support it, viz :—

(1) that the Roman Pontiff as the legitimate successor of Peter is the *foundation* which supports the unity of the whole edifice ;

(2) that he is set over the whole flock ;

(3) that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven have been placed in his power ;

(4) that as the power of a Bishop in his own district extends to the whole community, so to the authority of the Roman Pontiff the whole Christian Commonwealth must in all its parts be subject and obedient ;

(5) and, fifthly, that Christ made Peter and his successors His *vicars* to exercise for ever in the Church the power which He exercised during His mortal life over the Apostolic College.[3]

897. It will be observed that the power herein asserted to belong to Roman Pontiffs is one superior to that which Bishops possess, this superior power being identical with that which Christ exercised during His mortal life over the Apostolic College ; hence the power which the Episcopate, as succeeding to the Apostolate, possesses is something different in essence to that which Christ exercised over the Apostolate, and which He delegated to Peter and his successors in the Roman

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

[2] *Cleri Gallicani de Eccl. Potestate Declaratio.* Bossuet, *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, tom. i. xxxiv. Lugani, 1766.

[3] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.

Episcopate. This is important as throwing further light on the position in the Church actually occupied by Bishops according to Papalism. The allegations from which this conclusion is drawn have already been discussed,[1] and the proof that they are erroneous need not be repeated.

898. The statement which immediately follows the fifth of these allegations must, however, be considered, as they emphasise the real nature of the power therein referred to. The statement is as follows: 'Can the Apostolic College be said to have been above its Master in authority?'[2] St. Peter is here stated to have been 'the Master' *jure divino* of the Apostolic College as Vicar of Christ, consequently the Roman Bishops, his legitimate successors in the Roman Chair, hold the same position with reference to, and possess the same power over, the Episcopal College. The momentous character of this claim is obvious. All admit that Christ had absolute authority over the Apostolic College, and that He exercised this authority during His mortal life. If the argument of the *Satis Cognitum* is true, then St. Peter exercised the same power over the Apostolic College after the Ascension as Christ did before it. It would necessarily follow that in the New Testament there will be found recorded instances of such exercise. It would be impossible that it could be otherwise, since this power, which is on Papalist principles absolutely essential to the maintenance of the unity of the Church, must have been recognised by 'the whole Christian Commonwealth' from the beginning. The *Satis Cognitum* admits this, asserting that such power 'is clearly set forth in Holy Writ.'[3] The truth of this assertion can therefore be easily ascertained by reference to the Sacred Scriptures themselves. Do we then find in the Acts and the Epistles St. Peter governing the Apostolic College with supreme power and authority? It is simply a question of evidence.

899. What was the position of the Apostles at the time of the Ascension? Forty days previously, on the first Easter Night, our Lord had bestowed upon them the great commission in the words, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.'[4] The extent of that commission has already been discussed.[5] There is no reservation whatever of any unique prerogative bestowed on Peter alone; to the Apostolate as a whole was granted the position of representing Him in the world in the fullest sense possible. The very form of such commission precludes the existence of any such reserved prerogatives. It was, in fact, as the Fathers held,[6] the fulfilment of the promise made to the Apostolate in the person of Peter, when he made on its behalf

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 53 *et seq.*, 117 *et seq.*, 132 *et seq.*
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] St. John xx. 21.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 30 *et seq.*
[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 122 *et seq.*

the memorable confession: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'[1] The form of the commission was, too, as has already been shown,[2] such that it included of necessity the power of perpetuating the position bestowed on them in all its fulness by conferring such position on others, who in time should take their place, as they had themselves taken that of Christ, and thus be His 'Vicariate.' The commission, in fact, is the source of the authority possessed and handed on by the Bishops, who are thus by the Apostolical Succession, conveyed by the laying on of hands, appointed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God until the end of time.

900. The fact that the form of the commission is exhaustive, and thus incompatible with the reservation of any prerogative conferred on Peter alone, is the more to be noted, as even to the very last there had been much strife amongst the Apostles as to which of them should be accounted the greatest,[3] a contention which, as well as the request of the mother of Zebedee's children,[4] proves that the Apostolate had no idea that St. Peter had either been constituted their 'Master,' or that a promise had been made that such a unique office should be bestowed on him in St. Matthew xvi. 18. It is inconceivable in view of what had taken place that our Lord, had He intended that St. Peter should occupy the position towards the Apostolic College which He Himself hitherto had held, should, when giving the very charter of the life of the Church, have placed all the Apostles on an exact equality, thus constituting them all as the representatives to act in His stead, assigning, as St. Cyprian says, 'equal power'[5] to them all. On the other hand, His so doing is plainly in accordance with what He had said on the subject of the contention which precluded the appointment of any *official* leader, and specifically set forth the essential equality of the holders of the Apostolic Office in the declaration that all the twelve should sit 'on thrones' in His kingdom.[6]

901. Again, it is in complete accord with the absolute character of this commission that He, at the close of the great Forty Days in the mountain in Galilee, gave to them 'immediately' a mandate which involved the possession by them of that supreme and unlimited jurisdiction which had by that commission been bestowed upon them. 'All power,' said He, 'is given unto Me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'[7] A mandate

[1] St. Matt. xvi. 16.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 30 *et seq.*
[3] St. Luke xxii. 24.
[4] St. Matt. xx. 25.
[5] S. Cyprian, *De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate*, n. 4. Hartel, 212.
[6] St. Luke xxii. 29-30.
[7] St. Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

which, be it noted, recognises them as the supreme teaching authority of the Church, a position which is necessarily included in the commission already given, for which cause He had before promised to them the gift of the Holy Ghost, who should guide them into all truth—a promise fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost—and which secured that the teaching they so delivered should be preserved from all error. The promise, too, with which the mandate concludes of the abiding presence of the great Head of the Church with the Apostolate has an obvious reference to the commission, since it is alone rendered possible of fulfilment by the perpetuation of the Apostolate in the Episcopate which that commission of necessity involves and provides for.

902. This mandate and the commission are, it will thus be seen, closely bound up together; the former witnessing to the truth that the Apostolate had been constituted by Christ, His 'Vicariate' exercising that supreme power and authority which He had 'exercised during His mortal life,' possessing, as essential to their position, the supreme teaching authority in the Church—this 'Vicariate' being divinely perpetuated in the Episcopate which, in virtue of the power it had received, it constituted to that end. There is clearly no room for any higher authority, no place for any 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College.' Such then was the position which the Apostolate held *jure divino* at the time of the Ascension, and all that is recorded in the New Testament of the history of the Church after that date is in complete harmony with this position. There is not a single act attributed to St. Peter therein which even indirectly implies that Peter exercised supreme power of jurisdiction over the Apostles as their divinely appointed 'Master,' whilst on the contrary there is ample evidence that no such position and authority was held to belong to him.

903. (1) First: the account of the choice of a disciple to take the place in the Apostolate from which Judas fell which was made during 'the days of expectation' makes it clear that the whole body of the disciples acted in unison in the matter. They chose two, one of whom was, after united prayer, appointed by lot.[1] The position occupied by St. Peter in the assembly was exactly that which might have been expected from his previous conduct. Before the Ascension he had on certain important occasions spoken as the representative Apostle, so he, on this occasion, naturally sets before the disciples the matter to be taken in hand, but from the narrative it is plain that his authority and power was no greater than that of the Apostolate, on behalf of which he speaks.[2] The position, in fact, is identical with that which a few days afterwards, when on the Day of Pentecost, the cloven tongues like as of fire had sat upon each of them, he 'standing

[1] Acts i. 15-26.

[2] On S. Chrysostom's treatment of this passage, *vide* nn. 151 *et seq.*

up with the eleven' spoke as their representative, as is evident as well from the position thus assigned to him as from the words of the multitude after the sermon spoken to 'Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?' emphasised as they are by his reply in the name of, and on behalf of, those to whom the inquiry was so addressed. 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'[1] It may be added that a like representative position is also shown to be held by St. Peter in the case of Ananias and Sapphira.[2]

904. (2) Next: when the Seven Deacons were appointed, it was 'the twelve' who called the multitude together. Such summons was the act of the Apostolic College, not of Peter as their 'Master' and 'the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock.' Whether at the assembly thus convoked St. Peter addressed the disciples we are not told, such a proceeding would, however, have been quite in accord with the other instances already referred to as examples of the ordinary proceedings at the assemblages of the Church at that time, but nothing is recorded on the point. On the other hand, the matter which is of main importance, viz., the authoritative act by which the Diaconate was instituted is carefully set forth as that of the Apostolate, as is also the case with regard to the ordination by which that determination was carried into effect.[3]

905. (3) Thirdly: when the news reached Jerusalem of the success of St. Philip's labours at Samaria, was it St. Peter who gave 'mission' as 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College' to those Apostles who were sent to administer Confirmation to those who had been baptized by St. Philip? On the contrary, 'mission' was given 'by the Apostles who were at Jerusalem.'[4] And to whom? To 'Peter and John.' The fact that the Apostles so acted proves that they had no idea that St. Peter had by the institution of Christ full and supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, exercising the authority which 'Christ the Lord exercised during His mortal life,' and therefore their 'Master,' having 'a real and sovereign authority' which 'they' were 'bound to obey.'[5] For 'subjects' even to propose to give 'mission' to, to 'send,' their 'Master,' the Sovereign Pontiff *jure divino*, would have been a rebellious proceeding utterly subversive of 'the principal element' in 'the constitution and formation of the Church,' viz., its government by the 'one Supreme Pastor.' The Apostles clearly regarded Peter simply as one of themselves, a conclusion emphasised by the fact that they coupled with him another of their number,

[1] Acts ii. 14, 35, 38.
[2] Acts v. 2, 3, 8-10.
[3] Acts vi. 2, 6.
[4] Acts viii. 14.
[5] *Satis Cognitum*, pp. 33, 36.

St. John, as his equal in the discharge of the work they committed to them conjointly. They, as the Apostolate, acted in virtue of His supreme power in the Church which had been bestowed on them, and to that authority all the members of the Apostolic College were bound to render obedience.

906. (4) So again when the Gentiles had been admitted into the Church, and the inevitable question whether or not the Gentile converts were bound to observe the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law reached an acute stage at Antioch, owing to the opposition existing between the teaching on the subject of certain who came from Judæa, and that given by St. Paul and St. Barnabas, what was the course that the Church at Antioch adopted? The Christians at Antioch 'determined that Paul aud Barnabas with certain other of them should go' to obtain an authoritative settlement of the difficulty which had arisen, to whom? Were these 'legates' commissioned to go to St. Peter as 'the Supreme Judge of the faithful' whose 'judgment could be reviewed by none,' and obtain a decision from him which would finally close the question? On the contrary, they were sent to 'the Apostles and elders about this question.'[1] There was evidently absolute ignorance on the part of all at Antioch that St. Peter possessed *jure divino* 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey.'[2] They knew nothing of that Supremacy which is the 'principal element in the constitution and formation of the Church.' It is inconceivable that neither of the two contending parties should have known of so important a position belonging by the institution of Christ to St. Peter as the 'principle of unity and the foundation of lasting stability,'[3] had Christ so bestowed it upon him. Here was an occasion on which it would have been imperative to make use of 'the Supreme Pastor' whose special prerogative it was to be the means of maintaining the unity of the Church which the events at Antioch so seriously threatened. If this Sovereign Office had then existed, if both parties had not agreed to refer the question to its holder, one would certainly have exercised its right to make such application, and the other, by its refusal to do so, would have been plainly revealed to be schismatical. It follows that the Church at Antioch knew nothing of Papalism in the days of St. Peter himself any more than it did in the days of St. Damasus.[4]

907. (5) Similar testimony against Papalism is afforded by the proceedings at the Council which was held at Jerusalem to consider the matter which had been referred by the Church at Antioch to the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem. As the question concerned the obligations which Gentiles incurred by their baptism, it was natural that the particular Apostle whose privilege it had been to be the first to admit

[1] Acts xv. 2.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 36.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 593.

under a special call from our Lord,[1] Gentiles into the Church, should speak on the question. He would be in a position to inform the Council what, if any, regulations had been laid down for his guidance, and what conditions, if any, he had, under divine direction, imposed on these Gentiles whom he had been commissioned to admit to the benefits of the Covenant of the New Law. St. Peter, therefore, in the course of the proceedings, during which there was 'much disputing,' related what had taken place with reference to the conversion of Cornelius and his friends, but in all respects his position at the Council was simply that of an ordinary member thereof. It was St. James who evidently presided at the Council, as the Bishop of 'the Mother of all the Churches'[2] within the limits of whose jurisdiction the Council was being held. Hence, as 'he was invested with the chief rule,'[3] it was St. James who, when the multitude 'held their peace' after St. Paul and St. Barnabas had declared 'what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them,' gave the authoritative decision, saying, 'My sentence is that we trouble not them which from the Gentiles are turned to God, but that we write unto them that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood,'[4] and the sentence so given was made the Act of the Council.

908. The language used by the Council in doing this is also significant. 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.' The expression is essentially different in meaning to the phrase *Sacro approbante Concilio*, by which is denoted the part taken by Bishops at a Papal Council as to any decision which may be promulgated in such Council by the Pope. That formula aptly expresses the fact that such decision is the Act of the Pope alone, as 'the Father and Teacher of all Christians,' the 'one Supreme Pastor,' 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful,' 'having full and supreme jurisdiction over the universal Church,' the Bishops present in the Council simply acting as assessors and not as equally possessing, whatever the ecclesiastical dignity of the Sees they individually occupy, the Episcopate, and equal therefore in legislative and judicial authority.

909. If Papalism were true it is obvious that an entirely different procedure would have been adopted. The 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' the one whose 'real and sovereign authority the whole community is bound to obey,' would have been applied to for a final decision on the question which threatened to rend the Church asunder. If he chose to summon the Apostolic College to take part in

[1] Acts xi. 5, and *vide* note 3.
[2] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 9; P.G. lxxii. 1217.
[3] S. Chrysostom, *in Acts App.*, *Hom.* xxviii., c. 2; *vide supra*, n. 177.
[4] Acts xv. 19, 20.

deliberating under conditions laid down by himself on the matter submitted to them by him, whatever their opinion might be, the final decision would have been promulgated by him as his own, and therefore binding on the whole Church, since no appeal would be lawful from his judgment to any other authority as superior to his.[1] The Council at Jerusalem by its procedure thus is a plain witness against that Supremacy which by Papalism is asserted to have belonged to Peter by the institution of Christ.

910. It has already been observed[2] that whilst in the earlier portion of the Acts St. Peter maintains the position which he occupied previous to the Ascension as the spokesman of the Apostolic band, yet in the latter portion of this, the earliest Church history extant, it is St. Paul who occupies the most prominent place amongst the chiefs of the Church, being equal to them in all power and authority. This is in accordance with St. Paul's own conception of his office, which is incompatible with any idea that he received his jurisdiction through St. Peter, union with whom was an essential condition to the retention of such jurisdiction, and to whom as his 'Master' he, in common with all other members of the Apostolic College, was bound to render obedience. St. Paul is careful to 'magnify his office,' which he declared he had 'not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, Who raised Him from the dead,'[3] he proclaimed that he 'was nothing behind the very chiefest Apostles';[4] his authority, if challenged by any, was, he asserted, as great as that of any Apostle; he did not seek to defend his proceedings by a reference to any external and supreme authority divinely vested in Peter, as being that whence he derived his commission as Apostle; he regarded his converts as being bound to him as children to their father, since 'in Christ Jesus he had begotten them through the Gospel,' and therefore as possessing the right by virtue of the authority which was inherent in his office as an Apostle, which no one could question, to warn them.[5]

911. True, he went up to Jerusalem to see Peter after his return to Damascus from Arabia, whither he had gone after his conversion three years before,[6] but he did so that he might become acquainted with him, 'wanting nothing of Peter,' as St. Chrysostom says, 'not even his assent, but being of equal dignity with him (for at present I will say no more) he comes to him as to one greater and older. . . . Paul was induced to visit Peter by the same feeling from which many of our brethren go to visit holy men; or rather by a humbler one, for they do so for their own benefit, but this blessed man, not for his own

[1] *Concil. Vatican*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 75 *et seq.*
[3] Gal. i. 1.
[4] 2 Cor. xii. 11, *cp. ibid.*, xi. 5.
[5] 1 Cor. iv. 14, 15.
[6] Lightfoot, *in Gal.* (i. 18), p. 83. Third Edit.

instruction or correction, but merely for the sake of beholding him and honouring him by his presence.'[1]

912. Fourteen years after his conversion[2] he went up again to Jerusalem[3] with St. Barnabas and St. Titus to the Council at Jerusalem.[4] In describing the visit he is careful to point out that whilst there were there some 'who seemed to be somewhat,' *i.e.* held in great esteem by the Church, yet such esteem was in itself a personal matter, 'whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person.'[5] He names 'those who seemed to be pillars' in the following order, 'James, Cephas, and John,' an order and description which itself is incompatible with any belief on his part that Cephas held by the institution of Christ the unique office of Supreme Pastor. All three are alike designated 'pillars,' and Cephas is mentioned second, St. James being placed first evidently as the *local* Bishop, and it may be added that the circumstances under which St. Paul is here enumerating the Apostles will clearly show that if elsewhere in his writings he names St. Peter before other Apostles, he does not by so doing imply that he possessed any jurisdiction whatever over them. These 'pillars,' he declares, had no authority over him, they did not even when assembled in conference with him 'add' anything to him. They recognised the fact that to him was committed the work of spreading the Gospel amongst the Uncircumcision, and to themselves the like work amongst the Circumcision. This commission made him 'the Apostle of the Gentiles,' a position inconsistent with any subjection to Peter, to whom the Apostleship of the Circumcision was committed. So far indeed as the account of the episode is concerned, it might be argued that as St. Paul's jurisdiction was far wider in extent than St. Peter's, the former held a higher position than the latter, at all events it is clear that, as St. Chrysostom says, St. Paul here 'declares his own rank to be equal to that of the Apostles, and by comparing himself with their leader, not with others, he shows that each hath the same dignity.'[6]

913. Further, St. Paul not only in word asserts his equality with the Apostles, including St. Peter, but by his acts bears like testimony. On the memorable occasion when St. Peter subjected himself to blame by yielding to his fears of the Judaising Christians, St. Paul withstood him to the face,[7] correcting and rebuking him for conduct which he saw was in plain contradiction to the precepts of the New Law. Now, had St. Peter been his 'Master,' to whose 'real and sovereign authority' he was subject, it would have been an act of the

[1] S. Chrysostom, *Comm. in Gal.* i. 18; P.G. lxi. 631.
[2] Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 102. Third Edit.
[3] Gal. ii. 1.
[4] Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 122 *et seq.*
[5] Gal. ii. 6.
[6] S. Chrysostom, *Comm. in Gal.* ii. 8; P.G. lxi. 638.
[7] Gal. ii. 11.

gravest presumption on his part to have judged, and that, too, openly before men, his acts, which in that case would have been invested with the authority of the one Pastor, who in the exercise of his supreme power of government had decided to take the course he objected to. Vincenzi is acute enough to see that St. Paul's action is quite irreconcilable with Papalism, and therefore argues that the Cephas who was so withstood to his face was not St. Peter, but one of the seventy-two disciples.[1] This is a significant tribute, all the more valuable because unintended, to the fact that the position which is recorded in the Sacred Scriptures to have been held by St. Peter is not, and is incompatible with, that which Papalism asserts to have been his *jure divino*. The history of the early years of the Church's life, therefore, preserved in Holy Writ, thus exhibits St. Peter as exercising the office of an Apostle, not any unique sovereign office. Hence even if it were true that he had sat in the Roman Chair, and been Diocesan Bishop of Rome, his 'legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate' would simply have succeeded to the authority of an Apostle in the same way as other Bishops succeeded to the like Apostolic authority of the first founders, directly or indirectly, of their Sees, and it follows that the allegation that the Supreme power of Peter and his successors, the Roman Bishops, over the Apostolic College, and the Episcopal College which succeeded it, as 'Masters' thereof, exercising that power over the same which Christ exercised during His mortal life, 'is clearly set forth in Holy Writ,' is determined by the evidence to be untrue.

[1] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars. iii. cap. v. pp. 338 *et seq.*

CHAPTER XXII

GENERAL COUNCILS AND 'THE MASTER' OF 'THE EPISCOPAL COLLEGE'

SECTION CXIV.—*The testimony of the first four Œcumenical Councils.*

914. The *Satis Cognitum* next asserts that the supreme power of the Roman Pontiffs over the Episcopal College 'has ever been acknowledged and attested by the Church, as is clear from the teaching of General Councils.'[1] A definite statement. It involves an appeal to history, hence its real value can only be tested by means of an examination into those historical facts which bear on it.

The evidence afforded by the first four Œcumenical Councils will, it is plain, be of the highest authority, because they bear witness to the belief of the Universal Church, early in its existence. That evidence has been made clear in the discussion of their proceedings which has been already given.[2] The conclusion to be drawn from all the circumstances connected with their proceedings and the Canons enacted by them is manifestly that the Fathers of these Councils had no knowledge that any such monarchical position belonged *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome as is asserted by the *Satis Cognitum*. So clear, indeed, is the matter that it is not surprising that the *Satis Cognitum* is compelled to make its appeal not to them, but to mediæval Councils such as the Fourth Lateran, and that of Florence, and that, as already shown,[3] the earlier ones, so far as their genuine Canons are concerned, are given up as hopeless by so learned an upholder of Papalism as Vincenzi, who declares that if the received Canons be authentic, then 'the edifice of the Church built upon Peter falls down,' since 'they are against the privileges of the Apostolic See,' 'and the endowments of Peter chosen by Jesus to rule this Church must be accounted amongst fabrications,' and he concludes that the said Canons were never sanctioned by the Councils to which they are commonly attributed.[4] This witness is

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 297 *et seq.*, 340 *et seq.*, 360 *et seq.*, 391 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, 281, 463, etc.
[4] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars. ii. pp. 297, 298.

true and cannot be shaken, and there is no necessity to recapitulate the evidence from which the conclusion must be drawn that in the 'age' of these Councils it was *not* 'the venerable and constant belief of the Church' that the Bishop of Rome is *jure divino* 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College.'[1]

SECTION CXV.—*The statement of Hadrian, P. II., with reference to the judgments of the Roman Pontiff.*

915. The *Satis Cognitum*, thus forced to ignore the evidence of these Councils, gives in this connection a quotation from Pope Hadrian II. as follows:—'We read that the Roman Pontiff has pronounced judgments on the prelates of all the Churches; we do not read that any body has pronounced sentence on him.' (Hadrian II. *in Allocutione* iii. *ad Synodum Romanam* an. 869, *cf.* Actionem viii. Conc. Constantinopolitani iv.)[2]

That citation, it will be observed, is given as the 'teaching' of a General Council, and from the way in which it is incorporated in the *Satis Cognitum* any one unacquainted with the facts might be pardoned for supposing the Roman Synod of A.D. 869 to be a General Council, whereas it had no such authority. The *Satis Cognitum* further clearly implies that the Constantinopolitan Synod referred to was a General Council, and it is so considered by Roman authorities[3] and is cited as such by the *Vatican Council*.[4] But was this Synod a General Council? Certainly not, as is proved by the following facts. The Emperor Michael III. had, at the instigation of his uncle Cæsar Bardas, deposed on a charge of treason the Patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople, and in his stead appointed Photius, the nephew of Tarasius who occupied the Patriarchal throne at the time of the Seventh Synod. Photius at this time was a layman, and was in successive days passed through all the grades of the ministry, Gregory, Bishop of Syracuse, conferring the various Orders. He was enthroned on Christmas Day, A.D. 857, after Ignatius had been drawn into something which the Court could regard as a resignation of his See.[5]

916. The struggle, however, continued between the respective partisans of the rival Patriarchs, each party excommunicating their opponent in Synods. Photius sent notice of his consecration to Nicholas I., who then occupied the Roman See. Nicholas was one who advanced great pretensions in the West, using, as has been

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 284 *et seq.*, 340, 348, 361 *et seq.*, 412. 452 *et seq.*
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.
[3] *E.g.* Hefele, *op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. x. [E.T. i. p. 35.]
[4] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. note. *Concil. Lacensis*, vii. 486, nota 4.
[5] Robertson, *op. cit.*, bk. v. ch. iii., vol. iii. p. 422. Edit. 1874.

seen,[1] for that purpose, the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*. He seized the opportunity which the ecclesiastical dissension at Constantinople afforded him to make an effort to extend his influence in the East. This he did, by assuming the attitude of a judge, and wrote in authoritative language both to the Emperor and Photius,[2] accusing the latter of breach of the Canons. He sent two Bishops to inquire on his behalf into the matter, and ordered them not to admit Photius to communion, save as a layman; a clear denial of his position of Patriarch. The answer of the Greeks was plain. The Emperor treated the two Bishops with contumely. A Synod was held in May, A.D. 861, at which Photius was acknowledged as Patriarch, and the two Bishops were induced to declare for him.[3]

917. Photius addressed a letter to Nicholas which was sent to him with the Acts of the Council. In it he denies that the Canons which Nicholas had asserted had been violated in his case were unknown at Constantinople. A significant statement. He defended himself, writing throughout as an equal to equal, and he concluded his letter with declaring that Nicholas ought not to receive, contrary to the Canons, persons who came from Constantinople without letters commendatory from himself.[4] A Roman Synod held in A.D. 863 declared Photius to be deposed, and all proceedings against Ignatius to be void, and it was required that he should be recognised as Patriarch. Nicholas wrote to the Emperor a letter[5] containing the decisions of his Synod couched in haughty terms, which provoked an indignant reply. The Roman decision was disregarded, and when Nicholas, in compliance with the request of Bogoris, King of the Bulgarians, who had been baptized by Photius, sent two Bishops and other Latin teachers to convert his people, Photius convoked a Synod and in a letter addressed to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem denounced the usages and doctrines of the Latins, and their intrusion into a portion of his jurisdiction.[6] The Synod met in A.D. 867 and pronounced sentence of condemnation on Nicholas.

918. On the accession of Basil, the Macedonian, after the death of Michael in the same year, however, Photius was deposed, and Ignatius reinstated on the Patriarchal throne. Photius was again condemned at a Synod held at Rome in A.D. 868,[7] under Hadrian II. who had succeeded Nicholas. It was at this Council that the

[1] *Vide supra*, 234 *et seq.*
[2] Nicholas, P., Ep. ii. *ad Michael Imp.*, Ep. iii. *ad Photium.* Mansi, xv. 178, 259.
[3] Mansi, xv. 168.
[4] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad an. 861, tom. xiv. 544.
[5] Nicholas, P. I., *Ep. ad Michael Imp.* Mansi, xv. 216.
[6] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad an. 863, tom. xv. p. 105.
[7] Mansi, xvi. 129.

allocution cited in the *Satis Cognitum* was delivered.[1] In the next year, A.D. 869, the Synod at Constantinople under notice was held. At this Council the sentence pronounced against Photius by 'Elder Rome' was after examination adopted.[2] Photius, however, recovered the favour of Basil and was reconciled to Ignatius, with whom he was after that time on good terms, refusing steadily to become head of a party in opposition to the aged Patriarch.[3] On the death of Ignatius, Photius again became Patriarch, and was recognised by John VIII., Pope of Rome, who hoped by so doing to regain jurisdiction over Bulgaria, Ignatius having again asserted successfully his authority over that country as the Vicarii of the Oriental Patriarchs had decided,[4] in spite of the opposition of the Roman legates, that, as its inhabitants had received Greek priests, Bulgaria belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.[5] Another Synod was held in A.D. 879 at Constantinople, at which letters were read from the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, disowning the persons who had acted as their legates at the Council of A.D. 869, and disavowing all connection with the proceedings against Photius. A large number of Bishops were present, together with three legates from the Pope. The letters from the Pope to Photius were read, but in a Greek translation, in which the extreme pretensions of John were omitted, and passages complimentary to the Patriarch were inserted.[6] The Greek Bishops acted in entire independence of Rome, supporting Photius in every way, and the Synod of A.D. 869 by which Photius had been deposed was anathematised—an anathema in which the Roman legates joined, won over by the crafty management of the Greeks.

919. The Council of A.D. 869 thus rejected has never been recognised by the Greeks as Œcumenical, and when at the Council of Florence the documents of the Seventh Synod had been read, application was made by the Cardinal Julian for the book containing the Acts of this Synod, the Bishop of Ephesus replied: 'We are not bound to number amongst the Œcumenical Councils another Council which was not approved, but rather rejected. This Council contains the Acts against Photius in the time of Popes John and Adrian. Another Council was afterwards celebrated; which restored Photius and abrogated the former.' Cardinal Julian in his reply practically admitted the justice of this refusal, saying: 'I desire to free you from this fear that ye be not afraid lest any thing be read out of the Eighth

[1] Mansi, xvi. 126.
[2] *Vide infra*, n. 929.
[3] Robertson, *op. cit.*, bk. v. ch. iii. vol. iv. p. 445. Edit. 1874.
[4] Mansi, xv. 814.
[5] Anastasius, *in vita* (c. viii.) *Hadrian II.*; P.L. cxxvii. 1391.
[6] Mansi, xvii. 411 *sqq.*

Council, yet we ask you to have the book which we want brought, for we wish to see something in the Sixth and Seventh Councils, and we say nothing of the Eighth.'[1]

It was in accordance with this objection thus practically admitted that the Council of Florence was called the Eighth Œcumenical Council both by its own Acts and by the Papal decrees.[2] The Fourth Council of Constantinople is not therefore Œcumenical, so that even if the 'Allocution' of Hadrian II. had been an Act of the Council, the statement cited in the *Satis Cognitum* would not have had Œcumenical authority as implied by the way in which the citation is therein adduced as giving 'the teaching of General Councils.'

Section CXVI.—*The 'judgments' of the Roman Pontiff not admitted to be decisive.*

920. There are many cases which prove the falsity of Hadrian's statement, which implies that whenever the judgment of the Roman Pontiff on the Prelates of all Churches had been pronounced, such judgments were admitted by the Church to finally close the case as being those of 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful,' that they were accepted as conclusive, and acted upon as such, so that any further examination of the cases so decided was not merely unnecessary, but impossible, for on Papalist principles the Episcopate cannot 'review' the judgments of their 'Master.' It has already been shown that the excommunication pronounced against the Asiatics[3] by Victor, that against St. Cyprian and others by St. Stephen,[4] the judgment of Zosimus in the case of Apiarius,[5] were ignored by those concerned; that the sentence pronounced by Celestine against Nestorius,[6] and that by St. Leo against Dioscorus,[7] so far from being treated as decisive in their respective cases were practically passed by. The Synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon investigated the cases *de novo*, the Fathers of these Councils not regarding themselves as 'mandatarii' of the respective Popes; but, on the contrary, as possessing full authority to pronounce Canonical judgments in these cases, and as free to exercise that authority notwithstanding any 'judgment' which had been 'pronounced by the Roman Pontiff.'

921. Again, as has been seen,[8] the Roman Bishop determined not to recognise Meletius as Bishop of Antioch, and therefore decided that Paulinus was the legitimate occupant of the throne of Antioch.

[1] Mansi, xxxi. 553, 554.
[2] Launoii *Epistolarum* lib. vi. Ep. xiii. op. v. 293. Col. Agripp. 1731.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 528 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 582 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 609 *et seq.*
[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 368 *et seq.*
[7] *Vide supra*, nn. 393 *et seq.*
[8] *Vide supra*, n. 592.

This decision that St. Meletius was thus an intruder was ignored in the East, by which St. Meletius and not Paulinus was regarded as the rightful Bishop of that See; and the Church by her veneration of Meletius as a Saint has practically ratified the judgment of the East and rejected that of 'the Roman Pontiff,' in consequence of which, according to Papalism, Meletius was 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*.'

St. Hilary, too, who is likewise numbered amongst the Saints, disregarded the judgment 'pronounced by' Pope Leo.[1] The same course was adopted by St. Augustine and the Africans in the case of Pelagius and Cœlestus, who were acquitted by Zosimus of Pelagianism.[2]

SECTION CXVII.—*The witness of the case of Acacius against Hadrian's allegation.*

922. Other instances of the like character can be adduced; for example, the 'judgment pronounced by the Roman Pontiff' in the case of Acacius was ignored and treated with indifference by those whom it specially concerned. Pope Felix II. had in A.D. 483 proceeded to excommunicate Acacius under the following circumstances. John Talaia, an orthodox priest, having been elected to the See of Alexandria, sent according to custom letters announcing his election to Simplicius of Rome, and Calendion of Antioch, but omitted to send a like letter to Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople; perhaps, as Hefele suggests, 'because he formerly cherished a grudge against him.'[3] Acacius, irritated by this slight, persuaded the Emperor Zeno that John was not a suitable person to occupy the important position of Patriarch of Alexandria. Evagrius tells us that John had employed money to secure his election, and this in spite of his sworn pledge to the Emperor that he would not come forward as a candidate.[4] Acacius suggested that Peter Mongus, who had, on the death of Timothy Ælurus, been elected by the Monophysites to the Patriarchal throne, and had been afterwards expelled from Alexandria by the Emperor, but who was now ready to support the *Henoticon*,[5] should be recognised as the true Patriarch. The *Henoticon* was an *Edict* which Zeno had put forth as a basis of union between Catholics and Monophysites.

923. The *Henoticon* itself was at least capable of an orthodox interpretation. The true Godhead and true Manhood of Christ were set forth in it. Both Nestorius and Eutyches were anathematised, whilst an express approval was given to the twelve anathematisms of

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 213 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 641, 645.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xii. sect. 213. [E.T. vol. iv. p. 28.]
[4] Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. iii. cap. xii., xx.; P.G. lxxvi. pars. 2, 2618, 2638.
[5] *Vide supra*, 800.

St. Cyril of which the Eutychians made use in a sense not intended by their author. The great 'Tome' of St. Leo, the text-book of the Orthodox, was passed over in silence, notwithstanding that the Council of Chalcedon had, by extending to it synodical sanction, given to it the same Œcumenical authority[1] as the Council of Ephesus had to the letters of St. Cyril.[2] The significance of this was accentuated by the fact 'that every creed other than that of Nicæa, as completed at Constantinople, and thus that of Chalcedon, was rejected, the expressions "one" or "two natures" were intentionally avoided, and a very equivocal reference was made to the Council of Chalcedon in the words: "If any one thinks or has thought otherwise, at Chalcedon or at any other Synod, let him be anathema."'[3] The fact that the *Henoticon* dissatisfied both parties shows that it was a compromise, and therefore, to that extent, inconsistent with the position taken up by the Church at Chalcedon.

924. No doubt these facts were such as to throw suspicion on the document at Rome, which must have been materially strengthened by the circumstance that Peter 'the Fuller,' the distinctly Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, had signed it. Hence, when John Talaia, who had fled to Rome, addressed a formal petition to Felix II., bringing various charges against Acacius, that Bishop would naturally be influenced against Peter Mongus, especially having in regard his previous history. Felix cited Acacius to answer the accusations—a fact which is significant of the advance of the Papal pretensions. A much milder attempt at interference in Eastern concerns by Westerns had been successfully defeated[4] in the past, and the Council of Chalcedon had set its seal upon this independence of external authority which was so jealously guarded by the Canons by which it was determined that the affairs of a Patriarchate should be settled within the limits of the patriarchal jurisdiction.[5] It is true that no express provision had been made for the trial of a case in which a Patriarch himself was concerned, but the principle on which the legislation of this Synod was based made it quite clear that either a Synod of the Patriarchate or a General Synod, which had been the tribunal which had decided the cases of the Patriarchs Nestorius and Dioscorus, was the proper court before which a Patriarch should be cited to answer charges brought against him.

925. The Papal claims had been largely developed in the West by St. Leo,[6] and his successors continued to work in the same direction. The action of John Talaia presented an opportunity of advancing those

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 452 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 368.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 208. [E.T. iii. 453.]
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 543.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 404, 409.
[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 202, 638 *et seq.*

claims in the East where they were not admitted, an opportunity which was not to be neglected. Acacius could not, it is clear, acknowledge the right of Felix to issue a citation of that character. To have done so would have been to surrender the position accorded to his See by the Council of Chalcedon by the Twenty-eighth Canon, and the whole position which the East had consistently maintained against Roman aggression. Felix thereupon held a Synod in A.D. 484 at which Acacius was condemned, and wrote a synodal letter cutting him off from 'Catholic communion.'[1] In a synodal letter from a Roman Synod held in the next year,[2] referring to the case of Acacius, a reference is made to St. Matthew xvi. 18, and the 318 Fathers of Nicæa are represented to have in obedience to our Lord's words, 'Thou art Peter,' granted to the Bishops of Rome 'the confirmation and constitution of [ecclesiastical] proceedings, both of which rights all the succession [of Roman Bishops] preserve by the grace of Christ down to our own age.'[3] The Roman Synod may be here referring to the interpolated version of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa which had already been exposed at the Council of Chalcedon, when it was adduced by the Roman legates,[4] putting *more Romano* an interpretation on it which even it in no way bears, or more probably they may, with Felix' sanction, be attempting to foist the 'Sardican' Canons[5] on the Fathers of Nicæa, as Zosimus, Celestine, and St. Leo had done, though again in that case these Canons do not in themselves bear the meaning here asserted. In either case the attempt would necessarily fail, because the Easterns had already had experience of Roman efforts in this direction.

926. Acacius and the Easterns took no notice of the 'judgment pronounced by the Roman Pontiff,' treating it, in fact, in the same manner as St. Chrysostom had the judgment pronounced against him by a tribunal which he asserted was incompetent to try the case. He formally struck the name of Felix from off the diptychs of his Church. It is important to bear in mind the real significance of this treatment of a 'judgment pronounced by the Roman Pontiff.' The point is not whether Acacius had acted rightly or wrongly in advising Zeno to promulgate the *Henoticon*, and suggesting the appointment of Peter Mongus, provided he accepted that *Edict*, in the place of John Talaia. It may indeed be conceded that however good his motive may have been, he acted wrongly in both these matters, and his conduct may well have been held to have reflected on the Council of Chalcedon, though such an intention may not have been present to his mind, but the Bishop of Rome in arrogating to himself the right to depose

[1] Felix P. I., *Ep. ad Acacium*, Ep. i.; P.L. lviii. 893.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xii. sect. 213. [E.T. iii. 33.]
[3] Mansi, vii. 1138.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 425.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 323 *et seq.*

Acacius, a Patriarch, by a final sentence, and to cut him effectually off from the communion of the Church, pronouncing an anathema on any bishop, clerk, monk, or layman who should hold communion with him, usurped an office and authority which was not his, and violated the great principle which had been embodied in the Canons, that causes should be determined where they arose.

927. Almost the whole East supported Acacius in his refusal to take any notice of the 'judgment pronounced' by Felix. The breach of communion between East and West was complete, and lasted until A.D. 519, a period of thirty-five years. There is no doubt as to the cause being Felix's usurpation of authority, which the Easterns were compelled to resist in defence of the position which the East had always taken in preservation of the Catholic constitution of the Church. This is brought out by the conduct of Euphemius, who succeeded to the throne of Constantinople after the short episcopate of Flavitas, the immediate successor of Acacius. Euphemius was a strict adherent of orthodoxy. He refused to hold communion with Athanasius, the successor of Peter Mongus, who was an avowed Monophysite, as he had previously cut off from his communion Peter Mongus himself. He assembled a Synod at Constantinople in A.D. 492,[1] by which the decrees of Chalcedon were confirmed. He replaced the name of Felix on the diptychs, and addressed to that Pope a synodical letter; but his orthodoxy was in vain, both Felix and Gelasius, his successor, requiring as a condition to the restoration of communion with them the removal of the name of Acacius from the diptychs. This was plainly impossible, for to have done so of his own free will would have been to admit the claims of the Roman Bishop to depose an Eastern Patriarch, and so to be false to his trust, bound as he was to protect the rights of episcopate according to the Catholic system of government. The East preferred to remain out of communion with, and under the anathema of, Rome sooner than compromise this position.

928. At length, through the influence of the Court, the name of Acacius was removed from the diptychs, and communion between East and West was restored in A.D. 519.[2] The whole history of the matter proves that the East did not regard 'judgments pronounced by the Roman Pontiffs' as those of 'the Supreme Judges of all the faithful,' and therefore as binding upon the whole Christian Commonwealth which is subject to their real and sovereign authority. For although Rome did, with the aid of the Emperor Justin, who was determined that communion should be restored between the Church of Constantinople and the Church of Rome, ultimately succeed in obtaining compliance with the condition which it had thought necessary to make before such resumption of communion, yet nothing is plainer than that the

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xii. sect. 214. [E.T. iv. 41.] [2] *Vide supra*, nn. 800 *et seq.*

Easterns knew nothing of Papal Supremacy being part of the divinely ordained constitution of the Church. They were obviously entirely ignorant of the idea that because they refused to recognise 'the judgment pronounced by' the Roman Pontiffs, they rebelled against one who as Supreme Pastor possessed real and sovereign authority which they were bound as Catholics to obey, and that because they so rebelled they were 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*' during the thirty-five years they were out of communion with him—a period during which, as Father Puller has shown[1] at length, many Saints flourished amongst them illustrious for their sanctity, some of whom died before the breach was healed.

SECTION CXVIII.—*The witness of the Fourth Council of Constantinople*, A.D. 869, *against Hadrian's allegation.*

929. Further, this very Council, the authority of which, as has been said, the *Satis Cognitum* implies was given to this Allocution of Hadrian P. II., supplies evidence to the same effect as that already given.

The Roman legates, the Bishops Donatus and Stephen, and the Deacon Marinus, made strenuous efforts to bring about the acknowledgment by the Council that the Papal judgment already pronounced against Photius should be regarded by the Synod to have finally determined the matter without any examination being made of the grounds thereof, and that therefore neither Photius nor his adherents should be heard at all. The Emperor's representatives would not, however, permit this course to be adopted, demanding that Photius and others should be afforded an opportunity of answering, as otherwise 'men's consciences will not be healed.' The legates ultimately gave way, and consequently Bahanes the Patrician, on behalf of the Imperial Commissioners, said: 'This is good and excellent; let them hear the judgment of the most blessed Pope Nicholas in our sight, and if they have anything to say against it, let them say it, or, being persuaded, let them acquiesce; but if they have anything, let them undertake to speak against their own condemnation; but if they will not undertake this, what seems good to the Canons shall be done.' The Bishops signified their approval of this by Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Smyrna, rising and saying: 'Approving the words of the most noble Princes, we find them just and fitting; all the Bishops and this most holy Council agree to this.'[2]

930. The Roman contention was thus rejected, the Synod not holding the 'judgment pronounced by the Roman Pontiff' to be final. As Elias, the legate of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, said: 'The Emperor

[1] Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 388 *et seq.* Third Edit. [2] Mansi, xvi. 55.

knowing that judgment had been pronounced by Elder Rome for the most holy Ignatius and against Photius . . . being just and most pious, and wishing the truth to be confirmed most perfectly and clearly, he well judged to collect hither legates from all the Patriarchates likewise. The Lord God hath given effect to his good intentions that what is better and more suited to ecclesiastical order may be; that is, by the assembling hither of the most holy legates of Elder Rome and our humility. . . . For we believe that the Holy Spirit Who has spoken by the holy Church of the Romans, has also spoken in our Churches. . . . But the most holy legates of Elder Rome and we who are legates of the other Sees annul all these things to-day, and by the grace of Jesus Christ, who hath given to us the power of the High Priesthood, justly and fittingly to bind and loose, since all was done by violence and compulsion. . . . We have therefore declared our sentence and judgment before the Emperor beloved of Christ and the Holy Council.'[1]

931. The position of the five Patriarchs is emphasised in the proceedings of the Council. It is *their* agreement which is urged as conclusive upon Photius and his adherents. The Emperor Basil, for instance, saying to them: 'Both you and the whole world beneath the sun certainly know that by the protection of our true God the five Patriarchates of the whole world hold the right view and cannot break the Faith, and therefore whatsoever they judge you must receive.'[2]

Bahanes being sent by the Council to Theodorus, used a like argument. 'God hath placed the Church in the five Patriarchates and declared in His Gospels that they shall never utterly fail, because they are the heads of the Church: For that saying, "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," meaneth this, when two fail they run to three, when three fail they run to two, but when four perchance have fallen, one, which remains in Christ our God, the Head of all, calls back again the remaining body of the Church. But now as the whole world is in agreement you have no manner of excuse.'[3]

The resistance to the agreement of the Patriarchates is the point, it will be seen, not to a 'final' decision which would not be reviewed of the Roman Pontiff. The whole conception of the authority appealed to is incompatible with Hadrian's assertion.

932. Further, the Synod in the *Encyclical Letter* describes the condemnation of Photius thus: 'Wherefore . . . as he was disobedient and resisted this holy and Universal Council, we have rejected and anathematised him and severed him from the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church by the power given unto us in the Holy Spirit by the first and great High Priest, Deliverer, and Saviour of all.'[4]

Such a description of that action witnesses to their freedom in making

[1] Mansi, xvi. 85, 86.
[2] Mansi, xvi. 86, 87.
[3] Mansi, xvi. 140.
[4] Mansi, xvi. 199.

their decision to which they ascribe the excommunication of Photius, and in itself proves that they did not regard the 'judgment pronounced by the Roman Pontiff' as finally closing the case. The procedure of the Fathers of this Council witnesses that, as Cardinal de Cusa says, 'By the decree of an Universal Council the judgment of Pope Nicholas and his Council on Photius was again examined and cleared in an Universal Council, in spite, too, of the legates of Elder Rome, from which is apparent the superiority of an Universal Council to the Pope and his Patriarchal Council.'[1] The 'judgment pronounced by the Roman Pontiff' was thus not held by the Synod to be *per se* final and conclusive, as being that of 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful.' That which the Council did so regard was manifestly its own sentence.

933. The importance of the testimony afforded by the procedure adopted by the Fathers of this Council is the more evident when the circumstances under which it was held are borne in mind. The influence of Rome in the Synod was so marked as to form the subject of complaint,[2] and, as already seen, the Greeks availed themselves of the first opportunity which presented itself to annul its proceedings, and have ever since refused to accord to it the character of a General Council. Moreover, there was every inducement on the part of Ignatius, whose claim to the Patriarchate was disputed, to do all in his power to conciliate the legates of the powerful Western Patriarch by acquiescing as far as possible in any claims which might be put forward by them: that under these circumstances the Council thus asserted its right is remarkable, as is also the way in which the two Patriarchs are styled by its Twenty-first Canon 'Supreme Pontiffs and Heads of Pastors in the Church Catholic,'[3] and treated throughout its proceedings as of co-equal authority. There is no doubt manifest a considerable development in the authority ascribed to the occupants of the five Patriarchal Sees; they are indeed regarded as holding a special position in the Church, but the authority possessed by each of them is identical in essence; in short, the highest authority recognised by the Synod is Patriarchal, not Papal. The witness of the Synod is thus manifestly opposed to the statement of the *Satis Cognitum* under consideration. Sufficient has been said to prove that the 'judgments pronounced' by 'the Roman Pontiffs' were not held by the Primitive Church to possess that unique and final character *jure divino* which the citation of Hadrian's statement by the *Satis Cognitum* implies.

[1] Card. de Cusa, *De Concordantia Catholica*, lib. ii. cap. xxii., in Schard's *De Imperiali Jurisdictione*, p. 331. Edit. 1609.

[2] Vide *Adnotatio Anastasii*; Mansi, xvi. 29.

[3] Mansi, xvi. 166.

SECTION CXIX.—*Have 'sentences' been passed on the Roman Bishop?—The case of Vigilius P.*

934. The citation from Hadrian's Allocution concludes with the statement that 'we do not read that any body has pronounced sentence' on the Roman Bishop. A statement of this universal character has this advantage: if no single case to the contrary is proved by investigation to have occurred, its truth is established, whilst, on the other hand, if any such case be found, its inaccuracy is made patent to all. What then is the witness of history as to the accuracy or otherwise of this assertion?

935. The controversy with regard to 'The Three Chapters' will be found to afford a plain disproof of Hadrian's statement. Justinian by an *Edict* in A.D. 544 had anathematised Theodore of Mopsuestia, certain writings of Theodoret, and a letter from Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to the Persian Maris. The Emperor's object in so doing was to reunite the Monophysites to the Church, in order that the Empire which he had succeeded in raising to something like its former majesty and power might again be restored to religious unity. This end he was persuaded by Theodore Ascidas, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, would be attained by anathematising, not the Council of Chalcedon—to do which, of course, would have necessarily resulted in further breaches of the Church's unity—but those theologians who were especially obnoxious to the Monophysites as their chief opponents. The three propositions laid down in the first Imperial *Edict*, which is now lost, by which Justinian carried out his plan, would be called τρία κεφαλαία; κεφαλαία—capitula—signifying generally at the time 'propositions drawn up in the form of anathematisms which threatened with excommunication every one who maintained this or that.'[1] In the controversy generally, as, for instance, in the minutes of the Fifth Œcumenical Council,[2] however, by the expression 'The Three Chapters' is meant—'(1) the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; (2) the writings of Theodoret for Nestorius, and against Cyril and the Council of Ephesus; and (3) the letter of Ibas to the Persian Maris.'[3]

936. The Imperial *Edict* was subscribed under Court pressure[4] by Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople; Ephraim, Patriarch of Antioch; Peter, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the whole East. The Latins, however, 'were not so pleased,' and the Emperor 'summoned Vigilius to Constantinople in order to get him to assent to his plans.' Vigilius, who had been formerly Roman Deacon and Secretary at Constantinople, was an ambitious man, and had obtained under discreditable circumstances, through the influence of the infamous Empress Theodora, the

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xiv. ch. i. sect. 258. [E.T. iv. 231.] [2] Mansi, ix. 35, 76.
[3] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. iv. 232.] [4] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. iv. 244-6.]

Bishopric of Rome; Theodora, who had been raised to the throne by Justinian,[1] favoured the Monophysites, and Vigilius had made a promise that he would declare against the Council of Chalcedon on condition of his being appointed.[2] Before, however, Vigilius could reach Rome, Sylverius, a sub-deacon, son of a former Pope Hormisdas born before he had taken Holy Orders, was elected.[3] In order that the compact between Vigilius and the Emperor might be carried out, Sylverius was in the following year deposed by Belisarius, the general of the army sent by Justinian to reconquer Italy from the Goths, under circumstances of peculiar insolence in which his profligate wife Antonia, 'the accomplice of the Empress in all her intrigues of every kind,' took a leading part.[4] Vigilius was then at the command of Belisarius intruded into the See, which was still canonically full after paying for the interest of Belisarius two hundred pounds of gold.[5]

937. Vigilius was summoned to Constantinople by the Emperor in order to get his assent to his plans. He had become alarmed by the commotion which had been raised by the mere supposition that by the condemnation of 'The Three Chapters' the Council of Chalcedon was repudiated. He consequently foresaw the difficult position he would be placed in owing to the obligations he had contracted by his engagement to Theodora, and a letter which he had written to the Monophysite Bishops Theodore, Anthimus, and Severus, in which he had declared his agreement[6] with them in matters of faith, and therefore obeyed the command with reluctance. He was welcomed at Constantinople by the Emperor with many honours, and emboldened by his reception he proceeded to excommunicate for four months Mennas, and all the other Bishops who had subscribed the Imperial *Edict*.[7] Mennas retaliated by having the name of Vigilius struck out of the diptychs of his Church.

938. Before long, however, 'Vigilius altered his position in the most surprising manner.'[8] He first resumed communion with Mennas on the 29th June A.D. 547, some four months after his excommunication of him. Several conferences of Bishops present at Constantinople were held soon after to examine the anathematisms of 'The Three Chapters' laid before them by the Emperor. These conferences resulted in the issue on Easter Eve, 11th April, by Vigilius of a document known as his *Judicatum*, in which he anathematised Theodore of Mopsuestia 'with all his impious writings and those who defend him. . . . The impious letter also which is said to be written to the Persian Maris by Ibas . . . and all who defend it or say that it is orthodox—*rectam*— . . . and the

[1] Milman, *op. cit.*, bk. iv. chap. iv. vol. i. p. 421. Fourth Edit.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 208. [E.T. iii. 457.]
[3] Liberatus, *op. cit.*, cap. xxii.; P.L. lxvii. 1039.
[4] Milman, *l.c.*, vol. i. p. 432. [5] Liberatus, *l.c.* [6] *Ibid.*
[7] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xiv. ch. i. sect. 259. [E.T. iv. 249.] [8] *Ibid.*

writings also of Theodoret which were written against the Orthodox faith—*rectam fidem*—and the twelve chapters of Cyril.'[1] At the same time, as may be gathered from certain words in the *Constitutum*, of which more later,[2] he appears to have insisted that due respect should be paid to the Council of Chalcedon.[3] Much dissatisfaction was caused against Vigilius by the publication of the *Judicatum*. Whatever his words as to due respect being paid to the Council of Chalcedon, it was felt both at Constantinople, Africa, and elsewhere that he 'had done something to the disparagement of'[4] that Council. The opposition was so strong that Vigilius excommunicated two Roman Deacons, Rusticus, his nephew, and Sebastian, who took a prominent part in the movement.

939. This step on his part, however, had but little effect, and whilst the opposition in Gaul and the province of Scythia was quieted by the explanations he gave, the Bishops of Dalmatia refused to receive the *Judicatum*.[5] The Illyrian Bishops in Synod in A.D. 549 declared themselves for 'The Three Chapters.' They addressed a document in defence of them to the Emperor, and deposed their Metropolitan for defending the rejection of them.[6] The African Bishops went further, and in A.D. 550 synodically withdrew Vigilius, the Roman Bishop, who had condemned 'The Three Chapters' from Catholic communion, reserving for him a place of penitence, and sent in defence of the said 'Three Chapters' letters to Justinian.[7] Owing to this opposition Vigilius, with the permission of the Emperor, withdrew the *Judicatum*. This withdrawal, however, was merely 'formal,' as he took at the same time an oath to the Emperor in writing (which was kept secret) that he was of the same mind with him, and would labour to the utmost to have 'The Three Chapters' anathematised at the Synod which was to be called,[8] according to an agreement made between them. Notwithstanding this, the Emperor, without waiting for the Synod to examine the question, again condemned 'The Three Chapters' in an *Edict* addressed to the whole of Christendom,[9] probably drawn up in A.D. 551. Vigilius protested and fled. Ultimately he issued, in January A.D. 552, from the Church of St. Euphemia in Chalcedon, where he had finally taken refuge, a *Damnatio*[10] (which he had drawn up some time before) pronouncing the deposition of Theodore Ascidas, who had suggested the issue of the *Edict*, and sentence of excommunication on all his adherents, especially Mennas.

[1] Vigilius P., *Epistolæ et Decreta. Decretum Justiniani Imperatoris*; P.L. lxix. 32. This fragment of the *Judicatum* is only preserved in this *Decretum* of Justinian.

[2] *Vide infra*, 941 *et seq.*

[3] Vigilius P., *Epistolæ et Decreta, Constitutum de Tribus Capitulis*; P.L. lxix. 112.

[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xiv. ch. i. sect. 260. [E.T. ix. 261.]

[5] Mansi, ix. 158.

[6] Victor Tunun, *Chronic.*, ad ann. 549; P.L. lxviii. 958.

[7] *Ibid.*, ad ann. 550, *l.c.*

[8] Mansi, ix. 363.

[9] Mansi, ix. 537-582.

[10] Mansi, ix. 60.

940. Attempts were made to gain over Vigilius, and he agreed to the convocation of a Synod which he wished to be held in Italy or Sicily. The Emperor, however, desired that it should be held at Constantinople, to which place it was accordingly convoked. The Synod was opened on the 5th of May A.D. 553, in accordance with the Imperial command, without the presence or assent of Vigilius, who had paid no regard to the repeated request that he should appear at it. The Council was presided over by Eutychius, who had succeeded Mennas as Patriarch of Constantinople. There were also present Apollinaris, Patriarch of Alexandria, Domninus, Patriarch of Antioch, three Bishops, legates of the Patriarch Eustochius of Jerusalem, and 145 other Metropolitans and Bishops. The number of members afterwards increased, so that 164 members signed at the close of the Synod.[1]

941. Vigilius, though repeatedly requested by the Synod, refused to take any part in it. During its earlier sessions he published a document headed '*Constitutum Vigilii Papæ de Tribus Capitulis*,' dated 14th May A.D. 553, from Constantinople. In it, whilst condemning certain *Capitula* taken from several books of Theodore of Mopsuestia, he declined to pronounce an anathema on his person or consent to this being done by others. With regard to Theodoret, he declined to do anything to his dishonour, as he had subscribed without hesitation the sentence of Chalcedon, and willingly given his assent to the letters of Pope Leo. He declared that the letter of Ibas had been accepted by the Fathers of Chalcedon as orthodox, and that nothing should be done with regard to the letter or the person of Ibas against their judgment. Finally, the *Constitutum* concludes with the words: 'We ordain and decree that it be permitted to no one who stands in ecclesiastical order or office to write or bring forward, or undertake or teach anything contradictory to the contents of this *Constitutum* in regard to "The Three Chapters," or after this definition begin a new controversy about them. And if anything has been already done or spoken in regard to "The Three Chapters," in contradiction of what we here assert and decree by any one whatsoever, this we declare void by the authority of the Apostolic See.'[2]

942. Now 'it cannot be doubted that,' as Mgr. Maret says, 'this decree was a solemn judgment of the Holy See, a judgment invested with all its authority. At the commencement of this Act, Vigilius recalls the right of his See to give his sentence first. The decree bears on matters of faith or dogmatic facts. It had for it the adhesion of a minority of Bishops. It contains the most formal orders, and it is addressed to a Council which regards itself as General. Some respectable theologians have objected however that there is wanting to this

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xiv. ch. ii. sect. 267. [E.T. iv. 289.]

[2] Vigilius P., *Epistolæ et Decreta, Constitutum de Tribus Capitulis*; P.L. lxix. 67 *et seq.*

decree one of the conditions of the solemn and irreformable judgments of the Apostolic See, since it does not pronounce the sentence of excommunication against the refractory. Without entering into the question whether excommunication is a rigorously necessary condition of the judgments of the dogmatic judgments of the Apostolic See, we would say to these theologians that if they had read the *Constitutum* carefully, they might have counted in it sixty-one anathemas. Excommunication, then, occurs in it sixty-one times. This last condition, then, of the solemn judgments of the Holy See exists in a superabundant manner. It is true, however, that the last excommunication alone is directed against the adversaries of the letter of Ibas. But does not one excommunication suffice to fulfil the required condition?'[1] The *Constitutum* was thus a solemn definition made *ex cathedra* with reference to the faith. Did the Fathers of the Council regard it as an authoritative judgment pronounced by the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' irreformable *ex sese* and binding on the whole Church? They had already carefully investigated the question before them and had, clearly with a view to the conduct of Vigilius in refusing to attend the Council, anathematised all who should separate themselves from it. At the Eighth Session of the Synod, after censuring Vigilius for not joining with them in their condemnation of heresy, they proceeded to give their final sentence as those 'to whom is committed the charge of ruling the Church of the Lord.' 'We,' decreed the Fathers, 'now condemn and anathematise, with all other heretics who have been condemned and anathematised at the first four Holy Synods and by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, also Theodore, formerly Bishop of Mopsuestia, and his impious writings, likewise also that which Theodoret wrote *impie* against the true faith and against the twelve anathematisms of Cyril, against the First Synod of Ephesus and in defence of Theodore and Nestorius. Besides which we anathematise the impious letter which Ibas is said to have written to Maris, in which it is denied that God the Word became flesh and man of the Holy God-bearer and perpetual Virgin Mary. We also anathematise "The Three Chapters" named, *i.e.* the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia with his mischievous books, and what Theodoret *impie* wrote, and the impious letter which Ibas is said to have composed, together with all who declare these Chapters to be right, and who might and should seek to protect their impiety by the names of the Holy Fathers or of the Council of Chalcedon. Finally, we find it necessary to put together the doctrine of truth and the condemnation of heretics and their impiety into some Chapters.' These Chapters or anathematisms were fourteen in number, of which the Twelfth gives a summary of the

[1] Mgr. Maret Evèque de Sura, *Du Concile Général et de la Paix Religieuse.* Tome i. 268, 269.

doctrine of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and anathematises all who defend him or his writings, or who do not anathematise him and his impious writings, and all who adhere to him or defend him, or say that he has given an orthodox interpretation, or who have written in defence of him and his impious writings, or who think or have ever taught the same; the Thirteenth contains a like anathema with reference to the writings of Theodoret; and the Fourteenth a similar one with reference to the letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian.[1]

943. In the sentence, and in the appended anathematisms there is a plain condemnation of Vigilius. He had declined to pronounce an anathema on Theodore or Theodoret, and declared that the letter of Ibas had been received by the Council of Chalcedon, and therefore was orthodox. Thus in each case he incurred the anathema pronounced by the Council. Further, in the reference in their sentence to the defenders of 'The Three Chapters,' who had sought to defend their impiety by the names of the Holy Fathers or of the Council of Chalcedon, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Fathers of the Council had in mind the *Constitutum*, in which Vigilius appeals in support of its contentions to the Council of Chalcedon. Indeed, the fact that his name was struck off the diptychs is a certain proof that they had his conduct specially in view. There could not therefore be a more explicit contradiction of the statement of Hadrian than that which is furnished by the proceedings of this Council.

944. Vigilius some months later, as a condition of his liberation from the punishment of exile which had been inflicted on him, and pressed by the censure of the Council, acknowledged that the Synod was right in two documents, the one addressed to Eutychius of Constantinople, dated 5th December A.D. 553, and the other, dated 23rd February A.D. 554, probably addressed to the Bishops of the West. In the former he says: 'The enemy who sows discord everywhere had separated him from his colleagues, the Bishops assembled in Constantinople. But Christ had removed the darkness again from his spirit, and again united the Church of the whole world. . . . There is no shame in confessing and recalling a previous error; this had been done by St. Augustine in his *Retractationes*. He, too, following this and other examples had never ceased to institute further inquiries in the matter of "The Three Chapters" in the writings of the Fathers. Thus he had found that Theodore of Mopsuestia had taught error, and therefore had been opposed in the writings of the Fathers. [Here he inserts several heretical expressions of Theodore almost verbally taken from the Twelfth Anathematism of the Synod.] The whole Church need now know that he rightly ordained the following: "We condemn and anathematise, together with all the heretics who

[1] Mansi, ix. 375, 376.

have already been condemned and anathematised at the four Holy Synods and by the Catholic Church, also Theodore, formerly Bishop of Mopsuestia, and his impious writings, also that which Theodoret impiously wrote against the right faith, against the twelve anathematisms of Cyril, against the First Synod of Ephesus, and in defence of Theodore and Nestorius. Moreover, we anathematise and condemn also the impious letter which Ibas is said to have written to Maris. [Here follow the very same words which the Synod employed in their sentence.] Finally, we subject to the same anathema all who believe that the Chapters referred to could at any time be approved or defended, or who venture to oppose the present anathema. Those, on the contrary, who have condemned or do condemn 'The Three Chapters,' we hold for brethren and fellow-priests. Whatever we ourselves or others have done in defence of 'The Three Chapters' we declare invalid. Far be it from any one to say that the beforementioned blasphemies (from the books of Theodore and Theodoret, etc.), or those who teach the like have been approved by the four Holy Synods, or by one of them. On the contrary, it is well known that no one who was in any way under suspicion was received by the Fathers named, especially by the Holy Synod of Chalcedon, unless he had first anathematised the said blasphemies or the heresy of which he was suspected."'[1]

945. A more complete *Retractatio* of his former utterances could hardly be conceived. The form, too, in which it is cast, the way in which he quotes the Council, and repeats its condemnation of the very acts of which he had been guilty in his *Constitutum*, is a further proof, if any were needed, that the Council did pronounce judgment on him, a 'Roman Pontiff,' being besides a clear acknowledgment of the justice of that judgment. His appeal to the example of St. Augustine in justification of his conduct in retracting his previous error is significant. By that appeal he deliberately places himself in the same rank as St. Augustine, that is, the rank of the Bishops, as his predecessor Celestine had done;[2] declaring, as he does, by that appeal that his *Constitutum* had no greater official authority than the opinions of a simple Bishop like St. Augustine, so that his *Retractatio* was like in character to the *Retractationes* of St. Augustine. This is obviously incompatible with any idea on the part of Vigilius that *his* definitions *ex cathedra* as to faith were of supreme authority, irreformable *ex sese* as being those of 'the Pastor and Teacher of all Christians,' 'possessed of the supreme power of teaching,' in

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xiv. ch. iii. sect. 276. [E. T. iv. 347-8.] The first of these two documents was discovered in the Royal Library at Paris by Peter de Marca, the second by Baluze in the Colbert Library; on them refer to De Marca, *De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, App. pp. 207 *et seq.*

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 374.

virtue of 'his Apostolic Primacy.' Vigilius' own conduct in this matter, therefore, as well as the proceedings of the Synod itself, witness against Papalism. Certainly this General Council held that 'the Episcopal College' is above the Roman Bishop in authority, and in fact *his* 'Master,' which is the exact opposite to the assertion of the *Satis Cognitum*.

Section CXX.—*The Bishops of the 'Italian Diocese' and the conduct of Vigilius.*

946. Certain events which followed the Fifth Synod in connection with the conduct of Vigilius show that even at that date, after a succession of Bishops of Rome from the days of St. Leo had advanced—with a pertinacity worthy of a better cause—claims for their See which, owing to a variety of circumstances,[1] had met with acceptance in the West, the 'Roman Pontiff' was not regarded by Western Bishops to occupy *jure divino* the position of 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' any more than by the Fathers of the Fifth Synod.

947. Vigilius after his *Retractatio* obtained permission from the Emperor to return to Rome, but died on his way thither at Syracuse, towards the end of A.D. 554 or the beginning of A.D. 555. His successor was Pelagius I., his Deacon, who had been with him at Constantinople and had subscribed the *Constitutum*. Pelagius acknowledged the authority of the Fifth Synod and endeavoured by various means to enforce acceptance of it. A strong spirit of opposition to the Synod, however, manifested itself and its decrees were very generally resisted in the West, where, owing to some misapprehension, the condemnation of Theodoret and Ibas was regarded as endangering the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. The Bishops of 'the Italian Diocese' headed by Paulinus of Aquileia, who was supreme Metropolitan of Venetia and Istria with part of Illyricum, Rhætia II., and Noricum, and by the Archbishop of Milan, who was the ecclesiastical head of the western part of 'the Diocese,' formally separated themselves from communion with Rome. Pelagius made great efforts to bring them back; even calling in the assistance of the 'secular arm' to that end, but in vain. And although when, owing to the Longobardi having obtained possession of all the provinces of Upper Italy, Laurence II., one of the two rival Archbishops of Milan, who, on the death of Franto, became recognised by the whole Diocese of Milan, entered into communion with Rome in A.D. 571, the Bishops of Istria with the Metropolitan of Aquileia (who owing to the incursions of the Longobardi had removed his throne in A.D.

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 211, 519 *et seq.*

568 to the little island of Grado) in spite of all the efforts made even by force, remained firm in their attitude towards that See. The Metropolitan of Aquileia assumed the title of Patriarch, and it was not till the Synod of Aquileia, about the year A.D. 700, that the last of the Istrian Bishops renewed their fellowship with Rome.

948. There can be no question that these Bishops were wrong in not accepting the Fifth Synod, and that they based their action on an erroneous construction of its acts. This, however, does not affect the real point, which is that they repudiated the action of Vigilius, Pelagius I., and their successors, and were entirely ignorant that by so doing they were rebelling against their 'Master,' whose 'jurisdiction extended over the whole Church,' to whose 'real and sovereign authority' it was their duty to be 'subject and obedient.' Still less had they any notion that by their deliberate 'secession' from the Roman Bishop they were 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*.' The conduct of these Bishops, extending as it does over one hundred and fifty years, is plain evidence that the monarchical position asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishop was not 'the venerable and constant belief' of their 'age'; so entirely irreconcilable was that conduct with any such 'belief.'

SECTION CXXI.—*Have sentences been pronounced on the Roman Bishop?—The case of Honorius.*

949. The case of Honorius P., which has already been considered with reference to the question as to whether he was a heretic,[1] affords another disproof of Hadrian's assertion, as will be seen from the following facts. The Sixth Synod, which originally was not intended to be œcumenical, met on November 7, A.D. 680, with the object of restoring peace to the Church then vexed with the Monothelite heresy. It was presided over by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus,[2] by whom it was convoked.[3] The whole question then disturbing the

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 783 *et seq.*

[2] The Emperor presided at the First Session of the Synod, having on his left, which was formerly the place of honour, the legates of Pope Agatho, and on his right the Patriarchs George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch, and he was also personally present at the last Session. At the intermediate Sessions the Imperial representatives held the practical presidency, *i.e.* keeping order, arranging the order of business and the like, whilst the actual decisions of the Synod were those of the Episcopate therein assembled, and in the list of the signatures of the Bishops those of the representatives of the First See, Agatho, occupy the first place. (Hefele, *op. cit.* bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 315. E.T. v. 151 *et seq.*). Pope Leo II. expressly says that the holy Œcumenical and Great Sixth Synod was convoked by the Emperor under God's inspiration, and 'presided over' by him in accordance with the divine plan. (Mansi, xi. 725).

[3] Mansi, xi. 208.

Church was thoroughly investigated by the Fathers, and during its proceedings various documents referring to it were read in order to enable them to arrive at a correct judgment. Amongst these documents was read, at the eleventh Session, the letter of Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople;[1] and at the twelfth Session, the letter of Sergius to Bishop Cyrus of Phasis in Colchis,[2] the letter of Sergius to Honorius,[3] and the first letter of Honorius to Sergius.[4]

950. This having been done, the Imperial Commissioners asked the Council to give its judgment at the next session on Sergius, *Honorius*, and Sophronius. Accordingly, at the thirteenth Session, at which the second letter of Honorius to Sergius appears to have been read,[5] the judgment of the Synod was given in the following terms:—

'The Holy Council said, according to the promises which were made by us to your Spendours we, taking into consideration the dogmatic Epistles which were written by Sergius, Patriarch of this God-protected and Royal City, both to Cyrus, at that time Bishop of Phasis, and to Honorius, who was Pope of the Elder Rome, and in like manner the Epistle written in reply by him—that is Honorius—to the aforesaid Sergius, and having found them to be altogether alien from the Apostolic dogmas, as from the definitions of the Holy Councils and of all the Fathers of repute, and that, on the contrary, they follow the false doctrines of heretics, we altogether reject them and abhor them as soul-destroying. And we have judged that the very names of those whose impious doctrines we execrate should be cast out of the Holy Church of God, that is of Sergius, formerly Bishop of this God-protected Royal City, who first wrote on this impious dogma, of Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, who have also discharged the Episcopate on the throne of this God-protected City, and were likeminded with those others; in addition to these also, that of Theodore, formerly Bishop of Pharan, of all which aforesaid Agatho, the most holy and thrice-blessed Pope of Elder Rome, made mention in his letter to the most pious Lord, strengthened by God, and great Emperor, and rejected them as thinking things contrary to our right faith, whom we define to be under anathema. With them also we have judged that *Honorius*, who was Pope of Elder Rome, should be together with them cast out of the Holy Church of God, and be anathematised together with them, because we have found from the letter written by him to Sergius, that in all things he followed his mind and authoritatively confirmed his impious dogmas.'[6]

[1] Mansi, xi. 461-509; *vide supra*, n. 787.
[2] Mansi, xi. 526-8.
[3] Mansi, xi. 529-30; *vide supra*, n. 789.
[4] Mansi, xi. 537-44; *vide supra*, n. 790.
[5] Mansi, xi. 579.
[6] Sanctum Concilium dixit, Secundum promissionem, quæ a nobis ad vestram gloriam

This was expressly recognised by the Imperial representatives as the 'judgment' which they had requested the Synod to give.[1]

951. Further, the Council at its sixteenth Session exclaimed: 'Anathema to the heretic Theodore! Anathema to the heretic Cyrus! Anathema to the heretic *Honorius*! Anathema to the heretic Pyrrhus!'[2]

952. At the Eighteenth and last Session of the Synod the Emperor presided in person. At his command the dogmatic decree of the Council which had been drawn up at the previous Session was read, and the Emperor then asked whether it received the assent of all the Bishops, to which they replied in the affirmative, with loud acclamations. The λόγος προσφωνήτικος of the Synod, having been drawn up and read to the Emperor, was thereupon subscribed by the members of the Synod. It contained the following statement: 'We cast out, moreover, superfluous novelties of words and their originators far from the ecclesiastical boundaries, and subject them worthily to an anathema, that is, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius and Paulus, Pyrrhus and Peter, who formerly held the Bishopric of Constantinople, Cyrus also, who administered the Bishopric of the Alexandrians, and with them *Honorius*, as he followed them in these things.'[3]

953. The Synod also in a synodal letter to Pope Agatho declared

facta est, retractantes dogmaticas Epistolas, quæ tanquam a Sergio quondam patriarcha hujus a Deo conservandæ regiæ urbis scriptæ sunt, tam ad Cyrum, qui tunc fuerat episcopus Phasidis, quam ad Honorium, quondam papam antiquæ Romæ. Similiter autem et epistolam ab illo, id est, Honorio rescriptam ad eundem Sergium, hasque invenientes omnino alienas existere ab apostolicis dogmatibus, et a definitionibus sanctorum conciliorum, et cunctorum probabilium patrum, sequi vero falsas doctrinas hæreticorum, eas omni modo abjecimus, et tanquam animæ noxias execramur. Quorum autem, id est, eorundem, impia execramur dogmatica, horum et nomina a sancta Dei ecclesia projeci ad judicavimus, id est Sergii quondam præsulis hujus a Deo conservandæ regiæ urbis, qui aggressus est de hujusmodi impio dogmate conscribere, Cyri Alexandriæ, Pyrrhi, Petri et Pauli qui et ipsi præsulatu functi sunt in sede hujus a Deo conservandæ civitatis et similia eis senserunt, ad hæc et Theodori quondam episcopi Pharan, quarum omnium suprascriptarum personarum mentionem fecit Agatho, sanctissimus ac ter beatissimus papa antiquæ Romæ, in suggestione quam fecit ad piissimum et a Deo confirmatum dominum nostrum, et magnum imperatorem, eosque abjecit, utpote contraria rectæ fidei nostræ sentientes, quos anathemati submitti definimus. Cum his vero simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia, simulque anathematizari prævidimus et Honorium, qui fuerat papa antiquæ Romæ, eo quod invenimus perscripta, quæ ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus ejus mentem secutus est et impia dogmata confirmavit' [κυρώσαντα].—Mansi, xi. 544, 556.

[1] Mansi, xi. 557-8.

[2] Theodoro hæretico anathema! Sergio hæretico anathema! Cyro hæretico anathema! Honorio hæretico anathema! Pyrrho hæretico anathema. *Cp.* Mansi, xi. 621-662.

[3] 'Superfluas autem vocum novitates, et harum adinventores procul ab ecclesiasticis septis abjicimus et anathemati merito subjecimus; id est Theodorum Pharanitanum, Sergium et Paulum, Pyrrhum simul, et Petrum qui Constantinopoleos præsulatum tenuerunt, insuper et Cyrum, qui Alexandrinorum sacerdotium gessit, et cum eis Honorium qui fuit Romæ præsul, utpote qui eos in his secutus est' [ὡς ἐκείνοις ἐν τοιτοῖς ἀκολουθήσαντα].—Mansi, xi. 663, 666.

that they had destroyed the tower of the heretics, and killed them by anathemas; the heretics named being Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, Peter, Macarius, and Stephen.[1]

954. These documents prove—(1) first, that the Synod occupied an identical position towards Honorius, Sergius, and Cyrus, all three Patriarchs being equally subject to the authority of the Synod as that which was competent to judge them and pass a final and conclusive sentence upon them; and (2), secondly, that the Synod exercised that authority and condemned Honorius as a heretic, pronouncing judgment with an anathema upon him. Thus the Sixth Synod condemned him who, according to Papalism, was the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' having 'real and sovereign authority,' which all Bishops, collectively as well as individually, are bound to obey as the Apostles obeyed Christ. This case forms therefore a complete refutation of Hadrian's statement and of the position in support of which it is cited in the *Satis Cognitum*. It is not surprising that this action on the part of an Œcumenical Council has proved a great stumbling block to Papalists; *more suo*, they have taken refuge in boldly disputing the authenticity of the Acts of the Council. It need hardly be said that there is absolutely no ground whatever for doubting their genuine character; nothing indeed was heard of any such doubt for many centuries after the Council. Baronius in his *Annales*, following Pighius and others, endeavoured to establish it with what Hefele calls 'a great expenditure of words,' but as that learned writer says, 'apart from the Synodal Acts, as we know, many other ancient documents testify of the anathema on Honorius.'[2]

955. Of such documents are the following:—

(1) First, the Emperor in his Imperial decree says: 'We anathematise and reject those also who are the heretical authors and patrons of the false and new dogmas. We name, moreover, Theodore, who was Bishop of Pharan, and Sergius who was Bishop of this our Royal city protected by God, agreeing with him in precept and equal to him in impiety, to these also *Honorius*, who was Pope of Elder Rome, who was the fautor of their heresy, going with them and confirming it in all things.'[3]

956. (2) Secondly, Pope Leo II., the successor of Agatho, whose confirmation in writing of its decrees the Synod had asked, in his

[1] Mansi, xi. 683-8.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 324. [E.T. v. 191, 192.]

[3] 'Anathematizamus atque refutamus et eos qui supervacuorum et novorum dogmatum hæretici auctoris atque fautores sunt. Dicimus autem Theodorum qui fuit Pharanitanus Episcopus et Sergium, qui fuit hujus a Deo conservandæ nostræ regiæ urbis antistes, huic consentaneum et moribus atque impietate parilem, ad hos et Honorium qui fuit antiquæ Romæ papa, horum hæreseos in omnibus fautorem, concursorem atque confirmatorem.' Mansi, xi. 709, 712.

letter to the Emperor for that purpose expressly says: 'We equally anathematise the inventors of the new error, that is, Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, plotters against rather than Prelates of the Church of Constantinople, and also *Honorius*, who did not illumine this Apostolical Church with the doctrine of Apostolical tradition, but by profane treachery endeavoured to subvert its spotless faith, and all who died in their error.'[1] Honorius is here anathematised as the Council had anathematised him in common with the others named.

957. (3) Thirdly, the same Pope in his letter to the Spanish Bishops, requesting their confirmation of the Acts of the Council at which they had not been represented, declares that 'of those who had been traitors against the purity of the Apostolical traditions those who are gone have been punished with eternal condemnation; that is, Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, Cyrus, Bishop of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus, Bishops of Constantinople, with *Honorius*, who did not extinguish the flame of heretical dogma, but fanned it by his negligence.'[2]

958. (4) Fourthly, Leo in his letter to the Spanish King Ervig expressly speaks of the anathematising of Honorius, saying: 'All the authors of the heretical assertion condemned by the sentence of the venerable Council have been cast out of the unity of the Catholic Church, that is, Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, Cyrus, Bishop of Alexandria, Sergius, Paulus, Pyrrhus and Peter, formerly Bishops of Constantinople, and *together with them — una cum eis* — Honorius, Bishop of Rome, who consented that the spotless rule of Apostolical tradition which he had received from his predecessors should be polluted, likewise also Macarius of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen and Polychronius too . . . and all these—*omnes hi*—together with Arius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus, Theodosius, Themistius, preaching one will and one operation in the Godhead and Manhood of our Lord Jesus Christ, endeavoured shamelessly to defend heretical doctrine. . . . All of whom—*quos omnes*—with their errors the divine judgment has cast forth from His Holy Church.'[3] There can be no question that both the Emperor and Pope Leo held that the

[1] 'Pariter anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, id est Theodorum Pharanitanum episcopum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ subversores magis quam præsules; necnon et Honorium qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est et omnes qui suo errore defuncti sunt.' Mansi, xi. 731-732. The Greek has μιανθῆναι παρεχώρησε (*ibid.* 733), that is 'permitted its spotless faith to be subverted,' words which clearly mean the same thing, involving, as they do, such a culpable surrender of the faith that the faith of his See could no longer be said to be spotless, any more than it could if Leo directly said that Honorius had polluted it with heresy.

[2] Mansi, xi. 1052.

[3] Mansi, xi. 1057, 1058.

Sixth Council judged and condemned Honorius.[1] That his name was found amongst those anathematised by the Council in the Roman copy of its Acts of the Sixth Œcumenical Council is also quite clear from Anastasii *Vita Leonis Papæ* in which he says: 'Hic suscepit sanctam sextam synodum—in qua et condemnati sunt Cyrus, Sergius, *Honorius*, et Pyrrhus, Paulus et Petrus, nec non et Macarius cum discipulo Stepheno. Sed et Polychronius novus Simon, qui unam voluntatem et operationem in domino Jesu Christo dixerunt, vel praedicaverunt.'[2]

959. (5) The Fathers of the *Quinsext* Synod corroborate the evidence given. They declared 'that the Sixth Synod condemned all who taught only one will, viz., Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, *Honorius* of Rome, etc.'[3] As this Council was held in A.D. 692, only eleven years after the Sixth Synod, it is practically a contemporary witness, especially as some of the two hundred and eleven Bishops present at it had taken part in the Sixth Synod, amongst them Basil, Bishop of Gortyna in Crete.[4]

960. (6) So again the Seventh Œcumenical Council, the Second of Nicæa, which met 24th September 787, also condemned Honorius as a Monothelite.[5] Reference was made during the proceedings of the Council to his rejection by the Sixth Synod,[6] the Fathers of the Council evidently having no more doubt as to the fact that that Synod had passed judgment on Honorius than those of the *Quinsext* Council had. Moreover, at the third Session of the Council the letters which Tarasius had sent announcing his elevation to the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople to his brother Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were read. In these he pronounced an anathema on Honorius, and no objection whatever was raised by the Roman legates who were present, which assuredly they

[1] The inevitable charge of falsification has been brought against the letters of the Emperor and Leo and the Acts of the Sixth Synod as to which Garnier says: 'No learned man now listens to Baronius, who objects to the letters of the Emperor and of the supreme Pontiff as supposititious.' (*App. ad notas .c.* 2 *Lib. Diurnus*, p. 248.) The Versailles editors of Bossuet quote Massarelli: 'How futile that accusation is as to the Acts of the Sixth Synod having been adulterated by the Greeks Massarelli himself shall be witness. "Such a conjecture," he says, "has now become so improbable, that although at other times I might with many learned and sensible writers have suspected it, yet now, having at leisure diligently examined all the original documents, I should be ashamed not absolutely to reject such a judgment. Nay, I see that the condemnation of the Epistle of Honorius is so connected with the condemnation of the Epistle of Sergius and of the Type of Constans, that, not only could the Sixth Synod not abstain from it, but the delegates of the Pope, and the supreme Pontiff Agatho himself, and his successor Leo, ought, in consistency, to agree with it."' (*De Rom. Pont. Auctor.*, t. ii. p. 223.) Quoted by Pusey, *Eirenicon*, part iii. p. 197.

[2] Mansi, xi. 1047.

[3] Mansi, xi. 937.

[4] Mansi, xi. 990. *Cf.* List of Subscriptions at the Sixth Synod, *ibid.*, 642.

[5] Mansi, xiii. 377.

[6] Mansi, xii. 1124, 1141; xiii. 404, 412.

would have done had not his condemnation by the Sixth Council been a fact.[1]

961. The so-called 'Eighth' Œcumenical Council,[2] the Fourth of Constantinople, A.D. 869, at which Hadrian's Allocution, quoted in the *Satis Cognitum*, was read, gives like testimony. The Fathers declare: 'Receiving the Holy and Universal Sixth Synod which wisely affirmed two operations and two wills in the two natures of the One Christ, we also anathematise Theodore, who was Bishop of Pharan; and Sergius and Pyrrhus, and Paul, and Peter, impious Prelates of the Church of Constantinople, and with them *Honorius* of Rome, together with Cyrus of Alexandria, and also Macarius of Antioch . . . who following the teaching of the impious hierarchs Apollinaris and Eutyches preached that the flesh of God was animated by a reasonable and intellectual soul without operation and without will, the powers being mutilated, and, in fact, without reasoning faculty.'[3]

962. The condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth Council is found therefore by this evidence to be an historical fact. It was indeed admitted to be so in the earlier Roman official documents. For instance, in 'the *Liber Diurnus*,' *i.e.* the formulary of the Roman Chancery from the fifth to the eleventh century, there is found the solemn profession of faith which the Roman Bishops had to make on the day of their election. In it it is said: 'With these five universally venerated Councils we recognise the Sixth Holy Universal Council . . . which bound by eternal anathema the authors of the new heretical dogma, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, Bishops of Constantinople, together with *Honorius*, who fomented their perverse assertions.'[4] Extraordinary efforts to suppress and place on the Index[5] in the eighteenth century this book, containing as it does such incontestable proof that the Episcopate held itself to be, and acted as, the supreme authority in the Church, passing judgment on the 'Roman Pontiff,' who, according to Papalism, is the 'Master' of that College; proof the importance of which can only be accurately understood when it is remembered that it has the authority of the Bishops of Rome themselves for centuries again and again expressed.

963. The motive for this attempted suppression is recorded by De

[1] On the treatment of P. Hadrian's letter to the Council by the Seventh Council, *vide* note 59.

[2] On the question of the Œcumenicity of this Council, *vide supra*, nn. 915, 919.

[3] Mansi, xvi. 180-1.

[4] . . . qui . . . Sergium . . . una cum Honorio . . . nexu perpetui anathematis devinxerunt: *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum* in *Recueil des Formules usitées par la Chancellerie Pontificale du v. au xi. Siècle publié d'après le manuscript des Archives du Vatican avec les notes et dissertations du P. Garnier et le commentaire inédict de Baluze par Eugène de Rozière inspecteur général des Archives*, p. 200. Paris, 1869.

[5] De Rozière, *op. cit.*, Introduction, lxi., lxiii.

Rozière in his Introduction to the *Liber Diurnus*. Cardinal Bona said plainly: 'As Pope Honorius is condemned in the profession of faith of the newly-elected Pontiffs . . . it is better not to publish this work.'[1] Whilst Father Sirmond wrote: 'I am astonished to see the Romans themselves in the profession of faith of the newly-elected Pope stamp with reprobation, with the authors of the heretical dogma, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Constantinople, the memory of Honorius. . . . It is this reason alone which has chiefly deterred me from editing the formulary, in spite of the promise which I made to Cardinal Sainte-Suzanne.'[2] Confessions of this character are conclusive as to the incompatibility of the Ultramontane assertion of a monarchical position belonging *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiffs with historical facts; such facts Papalism would therefore suppress at all hazards if possible.

964. Similar testimony is afforded by the way in which the memory of Honorius has been treated in the Roman Breviary. Until the sixteenth century his condemnation by the Sixth Synod was to be found duly recorded in the third Lesson for the Feast of St. Leo, June 28, as follows: 'In which Synod were condemned, Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, also Macarius with his disciple Stephen and Polychronius and Simon, who asserted and proclaimed one will and operation in our Lord Jesus Christ.'[3] There can be no doubt that this was the original form in which this particular statement was worded from the date of the introduction of the Office of St. Leo into the Breviary. That was not long after the date of the Sixth Council, which is described in it as having been 'lately'—*nuper*—'celebrated in the Royal city.' When the Breviary was 'reformed' this inconvenient statement was 'reformed' by being mutilated, the name of Honorius being omitted. The statement was made to run: 'In this Synod were condemned Cyrus, Sergius, and Pyrrhus, proclaiming one will and operation only in Christ.' If it be argued that the 'reformed' statement is merely an abbreviation of the older one,[4] the answer clearly is that the names of the three of the condemned heretics are given, but they are not the first three which occur in the older list, but the first, the second, and *the fourth*, the third is omitted, and *that* is the name of Honorius. Now had abbreviation been the object of the alteration the fourth name would not have been given in preference to the third — the mention of Pyrrhus next to Sergius thus implies that no other name came between them in the

[1] De Rozière, *op. cit.*, Introduction, cxiii. [2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*, cxix.

[3] A very few Breviaries do not mention the Sixth Council at all, such as that published at Viterbo in 1515, but *all* which do so record the condemnation of Honorius with the rest by it.

[4] F. Garnier says, 'Nunc aliter ista *breviusque* [the italics not in the original] leguntur.' *Dissertatio*, ii. De Rozière, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

list of those condemned by the Council—the reason of the falsification is obvious. It is interesting to note in connection with this that in the *Le Somme des Conciles par M. Guizot*, published as recently as 1868, in the list of names of those condemned for heresy in the thirteenth Session of the Sixth Council a like omission is made.[1]

965. Bossuet says with reference to this treatment of the *Liber Diurnus* and the *Roman Breviary*. 'The condemnation of Honorius . . . exists in the *Liber Diurnus* seen and known by learned men for a long time past. P. Garnier, a learned man of the utmost integrity of the Society of Jesus, Professor of Theology, has published it from the best manuscripts. It was also accustomed to be read in the life of St. Leo in the ancient Roman Breviaries down to our own time. But that *Diurnus* they suppress as far as lies in their power, and in the Roman Breviary they have erased these things. But are they therefore hidden? On all sides the truth breaks forth, and these things by so much the more appear as they are the more eagerly erased. . . . A cause is clearly lamentable which needs to be defended by such figments.'[2]

966. Proof like this of the essential incompatibility between the whole thesis maintained by the *Satis Cognitum* and the true position occupied by the Bishop of Rome in the first age of the Church cannot be gainsaid. Had the Papalist allegations with regard to the Roman Pontiffs been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' of the Church, there would obviously have been no necessity either to attempt the suppression of the *Liber Diurnus* or to falsify the Roman Breviary, because there would have been no facts to be recorded in them incompatible with that belief. There would not have been any condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth Council to be mentioned in either work, as 'the Episcopal College' would not have had the presumption to act in violation of the Divine Constitution of the Church by pronouncing judgment on its 'Master.'[3]

967. Lastly, the citation itself made by the *Satis Cognitum* from Hadrian's letter is in fact found to be useless for the purpose for which it is adduced by the context. The letter proceeds thus: 'For although Honorius was anathematised by the Orientals after his death, yet it is to be observed that he had been accused of heresy, on account of which alone it is lawful for inferiors to resist the ways of their superiors and freely to reject their bad judgment. Although even in this case it would not have been lawful for any of the Patriarchs or any other Prelate to pass any sentence whatever without the authority of

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. i. p. 315.

[2] Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars. iii. lib. vii., cxxvi. cap. ii. pp. 45, 46. Lugani, 1766.

[3] On the attempt made by Baronius to destroy the evidence of the Sixth Council as to the condemnation of Honorius, *vide* note 60.

the previous assent of the Pontiff of that same First See.'[1] Hadrian here admits Honorius was condemned by the Sixth Council, a fact which he was shrewd enough to see entirely destroys the value of the allegation which immediately precedes. Consequently he endeavours to weaken its force.

968. (1) In the first place, he carefully avoids the œcumenicity of the Sixth Council by speaking of the condemnation of Honorius as the work of 'the Orientals.' He ignores the fact that the legates of Pope Agatho were present at the Synod and assented to the condemnation. He ignores also the fact that Pope Leo II. and other Westerns afterwards, by accepting the Acts of the Sixth Synod, concurred in that condemnation. (2) He endeavours to confine the action of inferiors against superiors, meaning by this the resistance by Bishops of the Roman Pontiff, to cases of heresy. This of course is a mere arbitrary limitation of his own, inconsistent with the attitude assumed by the early Synods of the Church towards the Bishop of Rome—an attitude which was clearly one which recognised that that Bishop was by custom of the Fathers the first in rank, but nevertheless possessed of no other inherent jurisdiction than that which all Bishops shared; whatever further jurisdiction he was recognised as possessing being, like that of other Patriarchs, of ecclesiastical, not divine right. This being the case, he, like all other Bishops, was subject to the 'Episcopal College,' and it was in accordance with this general principle that any condemnation for heresy of a Bishop of Rome took place. (3) Thirdly, Hadrian assumes that the Bishops who condemned Honorius were his 'inferiors' in power. That individual Bishops are 'inferior' in rank to the Bishop of Elder Rome was no doubt the view of the Fathers of the Sixth Council, but their whole conduct of the case shows that they did not hold themselves to be under him, as one superior in *power*, possessing, according to Papalism, by the institution of Christ, 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church . . . [and] the whole plenitude of this supreme power,' 'a real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey.' (4) Fourthly, Hadrian endeavours to save the situation by asserting that neither Patriarchs nor Bishops could ever, in the case of Honorius—one of heresy—have acted without the authority of the *previous* assent of the Roman Bishop being obtained.[2] Unfortunately for Hadrian, such 'authority' was not given by any Roman Bishop. This is proved by the fact that Pope Agatho in his letter to the Council, whilst naming the innovators, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, repeated more than once the assurance that *all* his predecessors had stood fast in the right doctrine. 'Agatho,' says Hefele,

[1] Mansi, xvi. 126.

[2] *Nisi ejusdem primæ sedis Pontificis consensus præcessisset auctoritas.*

'was then far removed from accusing his predecessor Honorius of heresy, and the supposition that he had beforehand consented to his condemnation entirely contradicts this letter.'[1]

Further, it is not possible to plead that the authority of the previous Council, of the Lateran, held by Pope St. Martin v. in A.D. 649, had been given to the condemnation of Honorius, and that therefore the previous consent of the Roman Bishop had been so given, for whilst by the Eighteenth Canon of that Council all were required to anathematise Theodore, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paulus, the name of Honorius was not mentioned.[2] In fact, St. Martin and his Synod were as careful as Agatho to avoid any appearance of doing so. Hadrian therefore is contradicted by the facts, consequently his assertion is proved to be valueless. 'The anathema on Honorius was the exclusive act of the Council.'[3] Possibly this fact, which makes the letter itself disprove the allegation quoted from it in that it admits the condemnation of Honorius, gives the reason why the citation in the *Satis Cognitum* stops short where it does. To have given the words which follow would have been to give proof that the citation was useless for the purpose for which it was made.

969. The conclusion, therefore, derived from an examination of the citation made in the *Satis Cognitum* from Hadrian's letter is that, even supposing that a Pope could be accepted as a witness in a case affecting the position of his See, it is useless as proving that the supreme power of the 'Master' over 'the Episcopal College' is clearly set forth in the teaching of General Councils. Not only did this letter not possess the authority of a General Council, but the allegations it contains are disproved by facts, and are mere assumptions so patently contrary to those facts, that the endeavours of its author to minimise the force of an admission he was compelled to make, which on the face of it shows that his statement was without foundation, only serve to bring into greater prominence the contradiction of history of which he was guilty.

SECTION CXXII.—*The statement of Pope Nicholas I. as to the authority of 'the Apostolic See.'*

970. The *Satis Cognitum* adduces as setting forth the reason for the assertion made in the citation from Hadrian's letter, the inaccuracy of which has just been shown, a quotation from a letter of Pope Nicholas I. to the Emperor Michael. The words cited are: 'There is no authority greater than that of the Apostolic See (Nicholaus in Epist. lxxxvi. ad

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 314. [E.T. v. pp. 145-6.]
[2] Mansi, x. 1159.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 320. [E.T. v. 167.]

Michael Imp.)' The passage in which these words occur is given in a footnote. 'It is evident that the judgment of the Apostolic See, than which there is no authority greater, may be rejected by no one, nor is it lawful for any one to pass judgment on its judgment.'[1] A like reference to the passage is given in the third chapter of the *Pastor Æternus* of the *Vatican Council*.[2]

971. It has already been shown[3] that there is ample evidence that the judgments of the 'Roman Pontiffs' were not regarded in the Primitive Church as those of the supreme authority which could not be 'reviewed,'[4] and that the Œcumenical Councils acted as the authority which finally decided all matters which came before them, whether or not they had been adjudicated upon by the Roman Bishop. If indeed the position of the Roman See had been that which Nicholas asserted it to be, there would have been no need whatever for the convocation of an Œcumenical Council. 'The judgment of the Apostolic See'[5] would have been that which in all cases would have been held to finally close any matter, as being that of the supreme authority. That such Councils were held is itself, quite apart from the evidence their proceedings furnish, a sufficient refutation of the allegation made by Nicholas.[6]

972. But, further, the statement emanates from a specially tainted source. Nicholas, the predecessor of Hadrian, was the first Pope to

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39, and note †, *ibid.*

[2] Vide *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 362 *et seq.*, 400 *et seq.*

[4] Bishop Ketteler of Mayence in a pamphlet entitled *Quæstio*, distributed to the members of the *Vatican Council*, puts this plainly when he says: 'From the Acts of the Fifth, Fourth, and Third Councils it is clear that causes already decided by the Roman Pontiff were accustomed, according to the apostolic and universal tradition of the universal Church, to be subjected to a new and true examination, and to a new and real judgment in Œcumenical Synods, that either the matter might be defined by an irreversible judgment, according to the sentence of the Roman Pontiff, if the same sentence of the Roman Pontiff was found to be conformable to apostolical and universal doctrine, as was done at Ephesus and Chalcedon, and as we shall see in the Sixth and Seventh Synods in which the matter was defined according to the sentence which Cælestine, Leo, Martin, Agatho, and Hadrian had pronounced; or also the matter was settled by a final judgment contrary to the sentence of the Roman Pontiffs if the sentence of the Roman Pontiff should happen to be found not to agree with the apostolical and universal doctrine, as was done in the Fifth and Sixth Synods, in which the matter was defined contrary to the *Constitutum*, which Vigilius had put forth, and contrary to the letters which Honorius had directed to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and to Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem. And we have now heard how, according to the utterance—*confessionem*—of the Fifth Œcumenical Synod, General Councils were accustomed to approve of the writings and sentences even of the Roman Pontiffs, not simply on examination, but only on that pact and condition if they were found to be in agreement in all things and through all things with apostolical and Catholic doctrine.' (*Quæstio*, reprinted in Friedrich *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*, vol. i. 59, 60).

[5] On the term Apostolic See, *vide supra*, nn. 11 *et seq.*

[6] *Cp. supra*, nn. 290 *et seq.*

make use of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* which he alleged to have been preserved in the Roman Archives,[1] and which he found of great value in extending his pretensions in the West. This assertion made by Nicholas simply represents that view of the Papacy which at his date had become the accepted doctrine at Rome—a Papalist statement by a Pope of the century of the False Decretals and other forgeries in the Papal interest. The proposition *Prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam*, which evidently is the basis of this passage in the letter of Nicholas, occurs in a forged account of a pretended Council of *Sinuessa* A.D. 303, 'an account so filled with improbabilities and false dates that in modern times Roman Catholics and Protestants have unanimously rejected the authenticity of it.'[2] Yet though it is a forgery it was introduced into the Roman Breviary in the sixteenth century in one of the lections for the feast of St. Marcellinus, April 26, and this not in full at once, but gradually during a period extending from 1526 to 1588 or 1602, when it appears in its complete form, at a date therefore when the fact that it is a forgery was known.[3] The value of the assertion by Nicholas is thus on a par with that of the citation from Hadrian's letter in explanation of which it is given, and forms a fitting conclusion to the 'proof' given in the *Satis Cognitum* of its assertion that the supreme power of the Roman Pontiffs over the Episcopal College has ever been acknowledged and attested by the Church, as is clear from the teaching of the General Councils.

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 234 *et seq.*

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. iii. sect. 10. [E.T. i. 123.] Hefele considers it to have been an amplification of a falsehood spread by the Donatists about the year 400, with reference to Marcellinus whom they accused of having delivered up the Holy Scriptures and sacrificed to idols during the persecution by Diocletian, a falsehood which Augustine and Theodoret had already refuted.

[3] Gratry, *Fourth Letter to Mgr. Deschamps*, English Trans., pp. 26-27.

CHAPTER XXIII

'THE EPISCOPAL COLLEGE' SUPERIOR TO THE BISHOP OF ROME

SECTION CXXIII.—*The testimony of the Reforming Synods in the West in the Fifteenth Century*

973. The reason why the *Satis Cognitum* does not adduce the testimony of the Œcumenical Councils themselves in proof of its allegation that the Roman Pontiff possesses *jure divino* the same supreme power over 'the Episcopal College' as St. Peter exercised over the 'Apostolic College,' as the Vicar of Christ exercising 'for ever in the Church the power which He exercised during His mortal life,'[1] has been made clear in the previous pages.[2] To have done so, indeed, would have been to show that such testimony witnessed to the fact that the exact opposite to the Papalist contention was the truth. The whole attitude of the Easterns has been seen to be a standing protest against and refutation of Papalism; in the West, the predominance of the Bishop of Rome for various causes[3] enabled the Bishops of that See to successfully advance pretentions which, even in a modified form, the Orientals refused to acknowledge. Yet, even in the West, it is important to remember that in the fifteenth century a strong effort was made to reassert the superiority of the Church over the Pope, which found its expression in the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle.

974. The significance of this fact is the more clearly understood when it is remembered that by that time the power of the Papacy had developed well nigh to its highest extent. Claims increasingly extensive in character on behalf of the Roman See had been pushed forward with the utmost perseverance. The *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* and other forgeries in the interests of Papalism had been accepted in the West as genuine for centuries. These forgeries had been 'popularised' by Gratian's *Decretum*, a work which has been a powerful agent[4] in the persistent efforts made by the Roman Bishops to aggrandise their See. It was officially used in the Western Church as

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.
[2] *Vide*, nn. 290 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 211, 519 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 240 *et seq.*

an authoritative work, being taught at Bologna, the great School of Canon Law. Its statements were accepted without question, so that even theologians used it as a source whence they borrowed their quotations from the Fathers. These quotations were in the main drawn from the Papalist forgeries,[1] so that it can be easily understood how far-reaching was the influence of this *Decretum*. St. Thomas himself made use of it, as well as the passages attributed to the Greek Fathers which had been forged by some Dominican monk and presented to Urban IV., in his treatise devoted to establishing the Papalist view of the position of the Bishop of Rome against the Easterns.

975. The claims of the Papacy were thus greatly assisted in the West, resting, as they did, very largely upon these forgeries, which in an uncritical age were accepted *bona fide* by many of those who made use of them in their work of making the Pope a spiritual autocrat who should rule mankind for their spiritual welfare. Prominent amongst the most successful fautors of Papalism was Hildebrand, who, as Gregory VII., occupied the See of Rome from A.D. 1073 to A.D. 1085. He laboured to build upon the ideas with reference to the Papacy which he found rooted in the West an organised system of even wider powers than those embodied in those forgeries. In this he was to a great extent successful. Under Innocent III. the claim of the Pope to be ruler of the whole world as Vicar of God was openly advanced. The Bishops became bound to the Pope by an oath of fealty, thus of necessity being placed in a position of complete subordination to him who received that oath. Innocent, indeed, laid down definitely that 'the Apostolic See has so dispensed between our brethren and fellow Bishops the weight of the Pastoral Office, so taken them into a share of the care committed to him as to withdraw from him nothing of the plenitude of power by which he should be the less able to inquire concerning each ecclesiastical cause and to judge whom he wills.'[2]

976. The supremacy of the Roman Bishop in the West was, then, by the fourteenth century so firmly established that it would almost have seemed incredible that it should ever be challenged. Circumstances, however, arose which compelled the Westerns to face the grave question, which of two claimants thereto was the rightful possessor of the vast privileges which were then admitted by them to belong to the Roman Bishop. As a consequence of this, there was brought about that movement which culminated in these Councils. The fact that so momentous a question arose at all is significant. Had our Lord appointed one particular Bishop to be, as 'the legitimate successor of Peter,' *jure divino* His Vicegerent, the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' the Supreme

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 240, 243.

[2] Innocent, P. III., *Registrorum* lib. i. Ep. cccl.; P.L. ccxiv. 324, and *vide infra*, n. 1085.

Pastor of the One Flock, the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, possessed of that power of government of the Church 'which belongs to the constitution and formation of the Church as its principal element—that is, as the principle of unity and the foundation of lasting stability,'[1] it is inconceivable that there could be at any period of the Church's life any doubt as to who was 'the legitimate successor of Peter.' According to Papalism, the consequences of not being in communion with the 'One Supreme Pastor' are most momentous, being nothing short of being 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*.' If then this were true, it would surely have been in accordance with the Divine Constitution of the Church, that the prerogatives bestowed by the institution of Christ on the Roman Pontiffs would have been accompanied by some never-failing gift to the Church which would effectually prevent even the possibility of any doubt arising at any time in the minds of the faithful as to who was the Supreme Pastor, communion with whom is a necessary condition to membership of the One Flock. It would, therefore, follow that the historical fact of the 'Great Schism' in the fourteenth century is itself a sufficient proof that no such position formed an integral part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, and thus refutes the allegation of the *Satis Cognitum* that such position is essential *jure divino* to the unity and stability of the Church.

977. The Schism commenced in the Pontificate of Urban VI., the successor of Gregory XI., in A.D. 1378. Urban, a man of ascetic life, had raised up many enemies in the College of Cardinals by the way in which he had censured abuses which existed, such as the shameless simony which prevailed in the Curia Romana, which he laboured to put an end to by the threat of excommunication, whereat 'the Cardinals were much disturbed and offended since it seemed to them that they could not well avoid the said excommunication.'[2] They retired to Anagni. There they declared that they had elected Urban under fear of death, and that, therefore, his election was invalid. Retiring to Fondi, they elected, on the 20th September A.D. 1378, the Bishop of Cambray, who assumed the name of Clement VII. Clement betook himself to Avignon, whither Clement V. had removed the Papal Court in A.D. 1309, and placed himself under the protection of France. Western Christendom was divided as to which of the two claimants was the legitimate Pope, some nations recognising Urban, others Clement. Amongst the former were Germany, Sweden, Poland and England; amongst the latter, France, Scotland, Savoy and parts of Spain. So marked was the division that when the University of Paris had declared itself on the side of Clement, the *Natio Anglicana* was privileged by

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 30.

[2] Thomas de Acerno, *De Creatione Urbani*, Muratori SS. iii. 2, 725.

the grace of the king to remain under the obedience of Urban, as England herself was.[1]

978. The rival Popes excommunicated each other, and their respective partisans resorted to secular as well as spiritual weapons. The Church groaned under the oppression of having two Popes. The exactions of one had formed the ground of bitter complaints, and what had been felt to be already an insupportable burden was now increased by the heavy expenses caused by two Papal Courts, whilst the scandal to religion presented by the spectacle of two rival Popes was necessarily very great. The Schism continued for some time, each side electing successors to their own nominees; but in A.D. 1394 efforts were made to put an end to it by the University of Paris, which obtained the sanction of the French Court to take steps in the matter since there was no possibility of an agreement being arrived at by the two Popes themselves. Attempts were made to bring about the voluntary resignation of the Papacy by those who were elected by the rival parties, but in vain. Whatever engagements[2] were made before election were invariably broken, and when after protracted negotiations a meeting had been arranged between Gregory XII., the 'Roman Pope,' and Benedict XIII., the 'Avignonese Pope,' it did not take place, owing to the refusal of the former to proceed to the appointed rendezvous.

979. The vacillations and hesitations which were exhibited by the rival Popes caused the greatest disgust. At length, through the influence of France, whose king had proclaimed the neutrality of his country between the rivals, four of Benedict XIII.'s Cardinals were sent to Livorno to confer with four of the Cardinals of Gregory XII., who ultimately issued to all Bishops an invitation to a Council to be held at Pisa in A.D. 1409. Both Popes were summoned to appear and to renounce their pretensions, as they had promised to do when elected, and they were further warned that in the event of their refusal the Council would take its own course.

[1] Bulæus, *Hist. Univ. Paris*, v. 65, quoted by Gieseler, *op. cit.*, iv. 97.

[2] Such agreements were made several times: *e.g.*, the Cardinals who were present at Avignon, September A.D. 1384, before the election of Peter de Luna (who assumed the name of Benedict XIII.), with the exception of those who took no part in the election, 'signed a solemn form of oath binding themselves to do all in their power to end the Schism, and binding him who should be elected to resign the Papacy if a majority of the Cardinals called upon him to do so in the interests of the Church' (Creighton, *A History of the Papacy*, i. 147). Again the Cardinals at Rome in A.D. 1404, before they proceeded to the election of Cosimo dei Migliorati, who took the name of Innocent VII., 'signed a solemn undertaking that each of them would use all diligence to bring about the unity of the Church, and he who might be chosen Pope would resign his office at any time, if need be, to promote that object' (*Ibid.*, 185).

SECTION CXXIV.—*The witness of the Council of Pisa* A.D. 1409.

980. The Council opened at Pisa on the 25th March A.D. 1409. There were present twenty-four Cardinals of both obediences, ten Archbishops, besides proctors for thirteen more, eighty Bishops in person and one hundred and two by proctors, a multitude of Abbots, Priors, Generals of religious Orders, representatives of Cathedral and Collegiate Chapters, with many doctors of theology and law. Guy Malésce, Cardinal of Poitiers, the only Cardinal who had been created before the Schism, presided. Amongst the theologians, John Gerson, the celebrated Chancellor of the University of Paris, and Peter D'Ailly, Bishop of Cambray, held the leading positions in the party which desired reformation. The latter had some years before advocated the convocation of a General Council in an address to the Duke of Anjou, and in the beginning of A.D. 1409 at a Provincial Synod at Aix propounded certain conclusions, amongst which was the following :—

'The Head of the Church is Christ and in unity with Him and not necessarily with the Pope does the unity of the Church consist. From Christ, its Head, the Church has authority to come together, for Christ said, Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst. He said not in the name of Peter, or in the name of the Pope, but in My Name. Moreover, the law of nature prompts every living body to gather together its members, and resist its own division or destruction. The Primitive Church, as may be seen in the Acts of the Apostles, used this power of assembling Councils, and in the Council of Jerusalem it was not Peter but James who presided. This power is inherent in the Church, and in case of necessity it must be used; though by the growth of the Church, for the sake of order, Councils were not called as a custom without the Pope's authority. Before a Council under existing difficulties so-called the rival Popes were bound to appear, or to send their proctors, and to abdicate, if such abdication was necessary to promote the unity of the Church, and if they refused to do so the Council could take action against them and proceed to a new election, which, however, would not be expedient unless the whole of Christendom was likely to agree to it.'[1]

981. Gerson materially strengthened the position thus laid down by D'Ailly by his work *Tractatus de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, written in the January preceding the Council. In it he declared that 'The unity of the Church always remains in Christ her Spouse, for the Head of the Church is Christ. And if he should not have a Vicar, either because he was dead bodily, or in power—*civiliter*—or because it could not be reasonably expected that the obedience of Christians

[1] Creighton, *A History of the Papacy*, vol. i. pp. 240-1, giving a reference to Martene, *Amp. Coll.* vii. 909.

should ever be given to him and his successors, then the Church by both divine and natural law is able to procure for herself a Vicar, and certainly to assemble herself together to a General Council representing her, and thus, not only by the authority of the Lord Cardinals, but even by the assistance and help of any Prince or other Christian. For the mystical Body of Christ perfectly established by Christ has no less right and power to bring about her unity than any other body, civil, mystical or naturally real: for it is not of an immediate and immutable law that the Church cannot assemble itself and unite without the Pope, or any particular state or College.' 'It is lawful in certain cases to withdraw obedience from a rightly elected Pope, to remain neutral, to imprison him bodily, to interdict him from all public administration, to resist him by appeal or some other remedy, and this is true obedience rather than opposition and resistance: it is lawful to celebrate a General Council against his will, to compel him to abdicate, and to depose him from all honour and position, and even to deprive him of life.'[1] Naturally such opinions as these obtained prominence in the minds of many through the Schism, when men were then being impelled to consider what could be done to remedy a state of things abhorrent to all Christian people, and they had the greatest weight in the Council.

982. The Council several times summoned the two Popes under the names of Angelo Corario [Gregory XII.] and Peter de Luna [Benedict XIII.] to appear. These summons were disregarded. The Council, therefore, in its twelfth Session, held on the 25th May, declared them to be contumacious, and the Articles which had been exhibited against them in the previous Sessions were pronounced to be notoriously true. The Council had already in the eighth Session decreed that the Synod was a 'General Council representing the whole Catholic Church, rightly, justly, and reasonably established and assembled, and to this General Council, as to the sole superior and judge on earth, pertains the investigation, examination, and decision of this cause, and of all the charges against Benedict and Gregory, the aforesaid, contending concerning the Papacy and the final determination of all and every matter pertaining to the said cause, in whatever way depending on, or arising from, and incidental to, the premises.'[2]

983. Having thus prepared the way, the Council held its fifteenth Session on the 5th of June, when the definitive sentence of the Council was read by the Archbishop of Paris, decreeing the deposition of the two Popes as follows: 'The Name of Christ having been invoked,

[1] J. Gerson, *Tractatus de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, Considerationes, ii. x.; *Opp.*, vol. ii. p. 118. Ed. Dupin, Antwerp, 1706.

[2] Mansi, xxvii. 366.

the Holy and Universal Synod representing the Universal Church, to which the cognisance and decision of this cause is admitted to pertain, pronounces, decrees, defines, and declares—that Angelo Corario and Peter de Luna contending concerning the Papacy, and each of them, were and are notorious schismatics, and besides breeders, defenders, fautors, approvers and pertinacious supporters of the ancient schism, notorious heretics and wanderers from the faith, and stained with the notorious and horrible offences of perjury and breach of vow, notoriously, evidently, and manifestly scandalising the Holy Universal Church of God with incorrigibility, contumacy, and pertinacity; and for these and other causes have rendered themselves unworthy of every honour and dignity, even the Papal; and that they and each of them should *ipso facto* be deposed and deprived, on account of the aforesaid iniquities, crimes and excesses, by God and the sacred Canons, that they should not reign, command, or rule, and even be cut off from the Church; therefore by this definitive sentence in these writings [the Council] deprives, casts out, and cuts off the same Peter and Angelo, inhibiting them lest any one of them should dare to carry himself as if he were Pope.'[1]

984. The Council, having thus deposed the rival Popes, permitted as a compromise the Cardinals to proceed to elect a new Pope; they having promised in the sixteenth Session of the Council, 'that if any one of them was chosen Pope he would continue the present Council, nor dissolve it, nor permit it to be dissolved, until, by himself, with the advice of the same Council, a due, reasonable and sufficient reformation of the Universal Church and of its condition, both in its head and members had been accomplished.'[2] Their choice fell upon Peter Philarghi, Cardinal of Milan, who assumed the name of Alexander v. The Council thus acted as the supreme authority of the Church. There can be no doubt that one or other of the rival Popes was the legitimate one as the successor of Urban vi. or Clement, one of whom had been the rightful occupant of the See of Rome, both of them were held to be subject to its jurisdiction. 'The Episcopal College' thus pronounced judgment on its 'Master,' and so 'was above its Master in authority.' The whole procedure adopted by the Fathers of Pisa is thus in explicit contradiction to the position asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Bishops.

985. It is no answer to this to say that the Council of Pisa was not Œcumenical. That it was not so in the real sense of the term may be at once granted; but Papalists are debarred from using this argument, inasmuch as it was from their point of view as Œcumenical as other purely Western Synods, which are so considered by the

[1] Mansi, xxvii. 402, 404. [2] *Ibid.*

Latin Church, such as the Fourth Synod of the Lateran, A.D. 1123, and that of Vienne in A.D. 1311. It represented the Roman obedience and *that* according to Papalism constitutes the whole Church. It is true that it was not convoked by a Pope, but that cannot be considered to be a necessary condition to the œcumenicity of a Synod, as none of the eight First Councils were so summoned, and so far as Papal confirmation is concerned, that, if not formally given by Alexander V., is clearly implied in his decree dissolving the Council, and also by the convocation of the Council of Constance which was its continuation,[1] it being impossible to admit the authority of the latter without acknowledging that of the former. So inconvenient has the testimony afforded by this Council against Papalism been found that Ultramontanes like Raynaldus[2] and P. Ballerini[3] feel compelled to allege that the election of Alexander V. was *ultra vires*, and that Gregory XII. was and continued to be legitimate Pope until his voluntary resignation at Constance in A.D. 1415. Of this method of meeting the difficulty by which Papalists are confronted Hefele says of its advocates that they 'have too little regard for the Council.'[4] Nevertheless, it must be admitted that they are at least logical, for if a Council can legally depose a Pope and cause another to be elected who is held to be legitimate, it certainly follows that such a Council is truly Œcumenical, and the supreme power in the Church which all must obey—a position incompatible with Papalism, of which they were the ardent fautors.

SECTION CXXV.—*The witness of the Council of Constance* A.D. 1414.

986. The Council of Pisa failed to bring peace to the distracted Church, neither Benedict nor Gregory recognising his deposition. The result was that there were now three Popes, each claiming to be legitimate, and each having his adherents. It is true that the larger part of Western Christendom acknowledged Alexander V., but Gregory XII. still retained the allegiance of Naples and certain of the smaller Italian States, and Benedict XIII. that of Spain and Scotland. The death of Alexander V., on 2nd May A.D. 1410, did not reduce the number of claimants on the obedience of Christians, for the eighteen Cardinals who were at Bologna when he died elected Balthasar Cossa, the Cardinal of Bologna, a man of infamous character, as

[1] *Cp.* Bossuet, *op. cit.*, pars ii. lib. v. cap. xii., vol. i. p. 409. Edit. Lugani, 1766.

[2] Raynald, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 1409, n. 79, 81, tom. xxvii. pp. 291, 292, 293.

[3] Peter Ballerini, *De Potestate ecclesiastica summorum Pontificum et Concil. Gen.*, c. vi. § vi. pp. 97-100. Veronæ, 1768.

[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. 10. [E.T. i. 58. Second Edit.]

his successor. Cossa assumed the name of John XXIII. After some delay, and after an abortive Council at Rome in A.D. 1411, he, practically under compulsion from Sigismund, King of the Romans, convoked a Council to meet at Constance on 9th November A.D. 1414; Sigismund having previously issued a like summons, the latter also sending summonses to attend the Council to Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII.

987. The widespread desire for the reformation of abuses, which the Council of Pisa had failed to accomplish, had grown and developed. Special efforts were made to the attainment of that end. Men saw that nothing could be done without a Council to put an end to the corruption which defiled the Church 'in its head and members,' of which complaint was made on every side. A powerful work in support of such a reformation appeared soon after the Council of Pisa entitled *Opus de modis uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam in Concilio Universali.* In it the writer maintained 'that Christ is the sole Head of the Universal Church, that a General Council, even one which is not presided over by the Pope, is superior to the Pope in authority, dignity, and office. To such a Council the Pope himself is held to be obedient in all things: such a Council is able to limit the power of the Pope, because to such a Council, since it represents the Universal Church, have been granted the keys of binding and loosing. Such a Council is able to abolish Papal laws; from such a Council no one is able to appeal. Such a Council is able to choose, deprive, and depose a Pope. Such a Council is able to lay down new laws, and to abolish those existing, even ancient ones. The Constitutions, Statutes, and Regulations of such a Council are immutable, and cannot be dispensed by any person inferior to the Council. Nor is the Pope able, nor was he ever able, to dispense, contrary to the Holy Canons in General Council, unless the Council for some good reason specially commit this to him. Nor can the Pope change the Acts of Councils, nor even interpret them, or grant dispensations in opposition to them, since they are like the Gospels of Christ which allow of no dispensation, and over which the Pope has no jurisdiction. That the General Council representing the Universal Church could limit and terminate the coercive and usurped Papal powers, and should lead back and reform the Universal Church according to ancient law.'[1] Principles such as these found their expression at the Council of Constance which opened on 5th November A.D. 1414.

[1] *De Modis uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam in Concilio Universali*, cap. ii. *et seq.* Gerson, *Opp.* Edit. Dupin, ii. 895. This work is attributed to Gerson, but is ascribed more probably to a German writer, Dietrich of Niem, who was well acquainted with the ways of the Roman Curia, as he joined the Curia at Avignon at the age of twenty, and was constantly employed in weighty matters by Popes. (Creighton, *op. cit.*, i. 307, 365-6; ii. 362. Edit. 1897.)

988. The Synod was largely attended. The Titular Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem, twenty-nine Cardinals, thirty-eight Bishops were present, together with a great number of theologians, the total number of clergy being reckoned at eighteen hundred, not all of whom, however, had arrived at the commencement of the Council. Amongst the Prelates were Peter D'Ailly and Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, whilst amongst the theologians was Gerson. The Council, regarding itself as the continuation of that of Pisa, rejected a proposal made by the Italian party that it should confirm the proceedings of that Synod, and it was ultimately decided, through the influence of the French Prelates who desired that the restoration of unity to the Church should be taken in hand at once, that owing to the Council of Pisa not having been universally recognised the better course would be to proceed mildly against Benedict and Gregory, making resignation as easy as possible for them. P. D'Ailly gave the reason that induced him to so argue as follows: 'Although the Pisan Council is probably believed to have represented the Universal Church, to have acted on behalf of her who is ruled by the Holy Spirit and cannot err, nevertheless it cannot be concluded on account of this that it is firmly to be believed by each one of the faithful, that that Council is not able to err, since many former Councils which have been accounted General we read to have erred. For, according to some great doctors, a General Council can err not only in deed, but in law, and what is more, in faith. Because only the Universal Church has this privilege according to that saying of Christ to Peter, not with regard to himself or his personal faith, but with regard to the faith of the Universal Church, "Peter, that thy faith fail not."'[1]

989. The common abdication of all three Popes was resolved upon by the Council according to a proposal of the Council of the Cardinal of St. Mark.[2] John XXIII., who was recognised as the legitimate Pope by the Council, took an oath[3] under pressure in the second General Session in a form drawn up by the University of Paris that he would resign as soon as Peter de Luna and Angelo Corario, intitled in their respective obediences Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., should lawfully cede by themselves or their proctors the Papacy to which they pretended. This promise John embodied in a Bull dated 7th March A.D. 1415. He, however, seeing that the Council was determined to carry matters through, fled to Schaffhausen; but his flight in no way influenced the Council, save in affording it the earliest opportunity of asserting its rightful position.

990. Gerson, two days after the Pope's departure, preached before

[1] Mansi, xxvii. 547.
[2] Von der Hardt, *Magnum Œcumenicum Concil. Constantiense*, ii. 230.
[3] *Ibid.*, 240.

the Council a sermon in which he declared that the Church is united to its one Head, Christ, and that a General Council representing the Church is the authority directed by the Holy Spirit, ordained by Christ, to which all, even the Pope, are bound to render obedience;[1] whilst the Council itself, in its third General Session, held on the 26th March, decreed amongst other matters that 'the Holy General Council of Constance gathered together in the Holy Spirit was rightly convoked, initiated, and celebrated at Constance, and remained in its integrity and authority, and was not dissolved by the withdrawal of the Pope, and that it could not be transferred to any other place except for a reasonable cause with it own deliberately signified consent.'[2]

991. At its fifth Session, held on 6th April, the following decree was repeated by order of the Council, the Cardinal of Florence, Zabarella, having published it with certain omissions at the fourth Session. It ran finally as follows: 'In the Name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen. The Holy Synod of Constance forming a General Council for the extirpation of the present Schism, and for the union and reformation of the Church of God in its head and members legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit to the praise of Almighty God, for the obtaining more easily, more securely, more fruitfully, and more freely the union and reformation of the Church of God, ordains, defines, determines, decrees, and declares as follows: In the first place, it declares itself legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit forming a General Council and representing the Catholic Church Militant, has power immediately from Christ, which any one of whatever rank or dignity, even the Papal, is bound to obey in these things which pertain to the faith and the extirpation of the aforesaid Schism and general reformation of the Church of God in its head and members. Item, it declares that every one of whatsoever condition, rank, or dignity, even the Papal, who contumaciously refuses to obey the command, statutes and ordinances or precepts of this Holy Synod and any other General Synod legitimately assembled, with reference to the premises or to those things which pertain to them, made or to be made is, unless he shall come to his right mind, subjected to condign punishment and rightly punished even, if necessary, by having recourse to the law. Item, the Holy Synod defines and ordains that the Lord John XXIII. shall not change or remove the Roman Curia and public Offices, or his or their Officials, from the city of Constance to another place, or directly or indirectly compel the persons of the aforesaid officials to follow him without the consultation and consent of this Holy Synod itself. Item, it ordains and defines that all and every translations of Prelates, deprivations of the same or of others holding Benefices, officials, administrators, reservations of any commendams or donations,

[1] Gerson, *Opp.* ii. 205. Edit. Dupin. [2] Von der Hardt, *op. cit.*, iv. 79.

monitions, ecclesiastical censures, processes, sentences, and whatsoever acts, done or to be done, performed or made by the aforesaid Lord John Pope or his officials or commissaries to the hurt of this Council or its adherents from the time of the beginning of the aforesaid Council—made or to be made—are by the authority of this Holy Synod, null, void, worthless, and in vain. Item, it declares that the same John XXIII. Pope, and all Prelates and others summoned to the Council, and others present at the said Council, have been and are completely free, as it is clear to the aforesaid Holy Council, nor has the contrary been brought to the knowledge of the aforesaid persons summoned or of the aforesaid Council. And this the said Council testifies before God and men.'[1]

992. The meaning of the decree is sufficiently plain. Andrew of Escobar, Bishop of Megara, a celebrated theologian present at the Council, after saying that it was promulgated and defined in the fifth General Session of the Council by the consent, vote, and command of all the Fathers present, and that it ought to be preached and perpetually written and promulgated, so that all Christians might be brought to believe it firmly and without doubt as they believe any article of faith, states its meaning as follows. He declares that in accordance with it, 'It ought absolutely and without doubt to be held and believed that the power of the Church is in all things greater than the power of the Pope, in authority, in jurisdiction and in execution.' He further says, that in the two decrees of the Council of Constance 'is comprehended whatever is to be corrected, reformed or amended in the Clergy or Christian people, and in the Roman Pontiff. For three gradations are made in it, in which the Pope is subjected to the Council and inferior to it; first, that he is subject in matters of faith and reformation; secondly, he is subject in all things relating to faith and reformation; thirdly, he is subject in all things relating to things relating to faith and reformation. And the gradation is of such great extent that it is scarcely possible to conceive anything that is not comprehended in it.'[2]

993. Cardinal de Cusa, a few years after the Council, wrote in the same sense. 'From this,' he says, 'it is manifest that a General Council is absolutely superior to the Pope, nor is there any longer need to bring forth examples of this, since we have various decrees of the Holy Council of Basle and even of Constance that the Pope may be said to be subject to Councils. And although the Council of Constance speaks only in three cases, it is clear that all Canons made or to be made can be reduced to them.'[3]

[1] Mansi, xxvii. 590, 591.

[2] Von der Hardt, *op. cit.*, vi. 153, 300, 316.

[3] Card. de Cusa, *De Concordantia Catholica*, ii., cxviii. 5; in Schard's *De Imperiali Jurisdictione*, p. 328.

994. The Council of Constance, therefore, plainly declares that it and any other General Council possesses supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church. Special mention is made of the subjection of the Pope to such Councils for the obvious reason that at the age of the holding of the Synod the claims of the Papacy to supremacy had become accepted in the West, and consequently there was grave need to reassert the superiority of the jurisdiction of General Councils which had by those claims been denied. There is no ambiguity about this conciliar decree in itself, and that its meaning is that which the theologians quoted declare is shown that on the doctrine thus embodied in it the Council based the action which it took with regard to John XXIII. and the two pretended Popes.

995. A citation was issued on the 2nd of May[1] summoning John to appear before the Council to answer the charges which had been brought against him, charges which included heresy, simony, schism, and horrible scandals affecting his moral character. John did not obey the citation. He was consequently condemned by the Council for contumacy in its tenth General Session and suspended. Further, after further proceedings during which seventy Articles (many of which, however, were not read in public because of their scandalous nature), had been proved by witnesses,[2] the Synod, on the 29th May A.D. 1415, in its twelfth General Session, pronounced sentence of deposition upon him. In it the Council declared that our 'Lord John, the Pope, was a notorious simoniac, a notorious wrecker of the goods and rights not only of the Roman Church but of other Churches, had been a notorious waster and evil administrator and dispenser of the spiritualities and temporalities of the Church, and by his detestable and dishonourable life and morals notoriously scandalising the Church and the Christian people, and after right and charitable monitions made again and again had persevered pertinaciously in the aforesaid evils, and thus shown himself to be notoriously incorrigible, and that he ought to be removed, deprived and deposed from the Papacy as one unworthy, useless and harmful: And him the aforesaid Holy Synod removes, deprives and deposes, by declaring all and every Christian of whatever rank, dignity, and condition, absolved from obedience, fidelity and their oath to him. And that he should be condemned, and the same sentence condemns him to remain and abide in some fitting and honourable place in the custody of the most serene Prince the Lord Sigismund, King of the Romans and of Hungary, in the name of the aforesaid General Council as long as it shall seem to the said Holy General Council to be for the good of the unity of the Church. But the other punishments which for the aforesaid crimes and excesses ought to be inflicted according to Canonical rules the said Council by its own will reserves to be declared and inflicted

[1] Von der Hardt, *op. cit.*, vi. 183.

[2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*, pp. 237, 247, 253.

according to what the vigour of justice or reason of piety shall persuade.'[1]

996. Gregory XII. voluntarily resigned in the fourteenth General Session,[2] and received from the Council the appointment of Cardinal-Legate of the March of Ancona.[3] Benedict XIII., however, refused all attempts to induce him to take a like step, and therefore the Synod, in its twenty-eighth General Session, 26th July 1417, pronounced sentence of deposition against him as a perjurer who scandalised the Universal Church, the fautor and creator of the schism, a heretic, incorrigible, notorious, and manifest.[4] The Council further declared that no new election should be made to the Papacy in case of vacancy without the express consent of the Council, and at the same time excluded the contending claimants from being so elected.

997. The Fathers of the Council of Constance, it is clear, did not consider the position of the 'Episcopal College' to be that laid down in the *Satis Cognitum*, viz., that of subjection to the Roman Bishop as its Master, possessing real and sovereign authority, to which they were bound to render true obedience. On the contrary, the Bishops in General Council assembled claimed to possess immediately from Christ the supreme power in the Church. They further exercised that power in decreeing the deposition of John XXIII., who was held to be the legitimate Pope. Not only is there not a word in the sentence of deposition which can in any way be construed as implying that John was not the legitimate Pope, but he was recognised as such by the Council, and was, because of causes alleged and proved to the satisfaction of the Synod, by it deposed from the Papacy. Further, as such legitimate Pope, he submitted himself to the sentence pronounced by the Synod, and so admitted that he was subject to the supreme authority of the body which so pronounced it.

998. The evidence against Papalism afforded by the statements and Acts of the Council of Constance has, as can readily be understood, proved very awkward to its advocates, and various attempts are made to destroy, or at least to minimise, its damaging effects—(1) In the first place, the œcumenicity of the Synod is denied because 'it necessarily lost its œcumenical character as long as it was separated from the Head of the Church';[5] some admitting with Hefele[6] that the Sessions after the election of Martin V. and with his approbation (*i.e.* Sessions Forty-two to Forty-five) must be held to be those of an Œcumenical Council, and that the same character attaches to certain decrees of the earlier Sessions which were approved by Martin V.

999. From a Catholic point of view the same objection must be

[1] Mansi, xxvii. 716.
[2] Von der Hardt, *op. cit.*, iv. 346.
[3] Von der Hardt, *op. cit.*, iv. 474.
[4] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* 1373.
[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. 10. [E.T. i. 58. Second Edit.]
[6] *l.c.*

taken to this Council as to that of Pisa, namely, that it was a purely Western Synod—the Easterns not being summoned to it, or represented at it, nor ever having confirmed it by their subsequent acceptance of its decrees. From a Roman point of view, however, it is difficult to understand how its œcumenicity can be denied. For (*a*) in the first place, how did Martin v., who is regarded as a legitimate Pope, obtain his right and title to the Papacy? Simply in consequence of and by the authority of the Council. The Council of Constance deposed the Pope whom at all events those who recognise the title of Martin v. regarded as the legitimate occupant of the Papal Throne. It was in virtue of such deposition that the election proceeded which resulted in the elevation of Martin to the Papacy. That deposition would necessarily have been null and void as *ultra vires* if the Council was not Œcumenical, therefore, the Roman See would not have been vacant, and consequently the 'election' would have been likewise null and void. The result being that Martin v., who was at once held by all (save the few in the little town of Peniscola in Valencia who adhered to Benedict XIII.) to be the true Pope, had no right to that position, but was merely an intruder.

(*b*) Secondly, the election was conducted in accordance with certain regulations laid down by the Council as the supreme authority, and with its consent and assistance, hence it follows that the election itself would be vitiated, not only because of the invalidity of the deposition of John XXIII., but also because Martin was elected indirectly, if not directly, in accordance with the will of a body which in interfering with the election of a Pope assumed to itself functions to which it had no right.

(*c*) Thirdly, 'It is certain that Martin v., when still only Cardinal Otto Colonna, and after having in common with his colleagues withdrawn his allegiance from Gregory XII., signed the decree summoning the Cardinals to a General Council. It is also certain that he took part in all that was done at [the Council of] Pisa, and that he had recognised Alexander v. and John XXIII. as genuine Popes. Otto Colonna was a member of the Council which from its opening spoke and acted with the supreme authority of a General Council. It is nevertheless true that Otto Colonna accompanied John XXIII. in his flight, and that he was actually one of the last Cardinals to remain faithful to him. But when the cause of this unfortunate Pope became hopeless, Otto Colonna abandoned him, and definitely threw in his lot with the Council.' 'This return to the Council was a real adhesion to all that had been done during his absence. The Cardinal subscribed, in particular, to the deposition and condemnation of John XXIII. accomplished in the twelfth Session, and when he accepted his election, effected in the forty-first, he

renewed by that fact alone the adhesion which he had given to the Acts and authority of the Council.'[1]

(*d*) Fourthly, Martin himself repeatedly designated the Council as œcumenical in the most formal manner, especially in the Bull *Inter Cunctas*. In this Bull he ordains 'the execution of that which had been decided by the Council against Wycliff and John Huss, and for the reason that those decisions are those of a General Council. It is sufficient to read the Bull to prove this: "The General Council of Constance has ejected from the Church John Wicliff, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague as heretics." It was in the eighth and fifteenth Sessions, before the consummation of the reunion (of the separated obediences), that the Council of Constance condemned Wicliff and John Huss. It is then certain that Martin held the Council of Constance to be truly œcumenical from its opening and before the reunion of the separated obediences. In the remainder of the Bull he shows his belief still more explicitly. After having decreed the penalties incurred by the heretics, he adds divers interrogations which he ordains should be put to those whose faith is suspect; and amongst these interrogations we find this: "Do you believe that every General Council, and especially that of Constance, represents the Universal Church? Do you believe that the faithful are obliged to approve and believe that which the Council of Constance, representing the Universal Church, has approved and approves touching the faith and the salvation of souls, and that which it has condemned and condemns is contrary to the faith and good morals? Do you believe that the condemnations of Wicliff and John Huss were pronounced canonically and justly by the Holy Council?"[2] What more formal or decisive proof of the authority of the Council of Constance could be found than is contained in the foregoing words? Do we find the Pope distinguishing between two epochs in this Council—an earlier one during which it is not to be a General Council, and a later one when it would have become so, either through the union of the divided obediences or as the result of his own presence? Do we find him speaking of this Council as possessing in its first Sessions an authority only doubtful and

[1] Mgr. Maret, Évêque de Sura, *Du Concile Général et La Paix Religieuse*, tom. i. pp. 397, 398.

[2] 'Item, utrum credat, teneat et asserat, quod quodlibet concilium generale, et etiam Constantiense universalem Ecclesiam repræsentat. Item, utrum credat quod illud quod sacrum concilium Constantiense universalem Ecclesiam repræsentans, approbavit et approbat in favorem fidei et ad salutem animarum, quod hoc est ab universis Christi fidelibus approbandum et tenendum: et quod condemnavit et condemnat, esse fidei et bonis moribus contrarium, hoc ab iisdem esse tenendum pro condemnato, credendum et asserendum. Item, utrum credat quod condemnationes J. Wiclef, J. Huss et Hieronymi de Praga, factæ de personis eorum, libris et documentis per sacrum generale concilium Constantiense fuerint rite et juste factæ, et quolibet catholico pro talibus tenendæ et firmiter asserendæ.'—Mansi, xxvii. 1210.

debatable? The answer is no, since even when he is dealing with these first sessions, during which it had uttered the condemnations which he renews, he places the authority of the Council of Constance on a level with that of all the other General Councils. One must remark that the adhesion demanded by the Pope to the Council of Constance does not refer solely to the condemnations pronounced against Wicliff and John Huss, but in general to all that had been done in favour of the faith, morals, and the salvation of souls.'[1]

1000. But it is objected that, granted that the Council of Constance is Œcumenical, only these decrees which were confirmed by Martin v. have œcumenical authority, amongst which was not that of the fifth General Session, in which the Synod decreed the supreme position of General Councils (not merely of the existing Council) in the Church, so that all were bound to obey their authority. This objection assumes that the Papal confirmation is requisite in order that the decrees of a General Council may possess œcumenical authority; that assumption cannot be admitted as being contrary to the fact,[2] the objection therefore is *per se* of no weight. As a matter of fact, however, did Martin v. give his assent to the decrees of the fifth General Session? At the close of the Synod Martin v. declared that 'all that had been determined, concluded, and decreed *in materiis fidei* by the General Council *conciliariter* he was willing to hold and inviolably to observe, and never in any way to contravene. And these things thus *conciliariter* done he approves and satisfies, and not otherwise in any manner.'[3]

1001. The words are explicit. It is simply necessary to inquire what is the meaning of the word *conciliariter*. Now this meaning is very easily arrived at. The declaration in which the word occurs 'was made on the occasion of a request put forward by the King of Poland's ambassadors, the aim of which was to bring about the condemnation, by the whole Council and in a General Session, of a book written by the Dominican Falkberg against the King of Poland. This book had been already condemned by the commissioners of the Council and by private congregations. The Pope, not to prolong the Council now drawing to a close, refused to have this condemnation pronounced in General Session, and it was then that he made the declaration we have quoted above. But in truth what conclusion adverse to the general and indivisible authority of the Council of Constance can be drawn from these words? What theologian has ever contended that all that was said and done at Constance, before the commissioners or in private congregations, had the authority and power of a conciliary decision? Is it not evident that this high and

[1] Maret, *op. cit.*, i. 398-400.
[2] *Vide infra*, nn. 1016 *et seq.*
[3] Mansi, xxvii. 120.

sacred character can be attached only to what was made public in the general and solemn assemblies of the Council? In other words, to that which was done *conciliariter*? It may, perhaps, be objected that this expression *conciliariter* excludes the Sessions that were held before the reunion of the divided obediences. But we have just proved that Martin v., both by his Bull *Inter Cunctas* and by all his actions, always accepted the œcumenical character of all the solemn Sessions of the Council.'[1]

1002. If it be sought to destroy the conclusion here reached as to the meaning of the word *conciliariter*, urging that Martin's confirmation was limited to what the Council had decreed *in materiis fidei*, and that therefore the decrees of the fifth Session are excluded, the reply is twofold. (1) First, that the declaration does not necessarily exclude any other decrees by its wording, hence it must be held not to do so, as otherwise if it did, it would exclude the decrees of the twelfth and thirty-seventh Sessions by which John XXIII. and Benedict XIII. were deposed—a deposition upon which rested Martin v.'s own title, for John XXIII. was recognised as the 'legitimate Pope,' and if he was not legitimately deposed Martin was an intruder. So too the election which resulted in the election of Martin was held in obedience to the mandate of the Council, and in accord with the procedure laid down by it, hence he must also have approved the decrees of the Council to that end, as otherwise such election would have taken place in virtue of action by the Council of which he did not approve, and that 'Papal' confirmation which on Papalist principles was needed to give it validity would have been lacking. The absurd result being that as Martin would, by not confirming the decrees of deposition, have destroyed his own title to the Papacy, he would have by his own act shown that his pretended election to the Papacy—thus not vacant—was not validly performed.

1003. (2) Secondly, as a matter of fact 'these decrees concern those matters which by their nature belong to matters of faith, since their aim is to explain the divine right and the nature of the power granted directly by Jesus Christ, not only to the successors of St. Peter, but also to Bishops assembled in a General Council. They were made with conciliar power, being drawn up in two public and General Sessions. If Martin v. had wished to make an exception of them he ought to have made this exception known to the Church and to the world. The fact that he did not do so proves that he had neither the will nor the power to do it.' '. . . We have proved that the decree of the fifth session related to matters of faith, and nothing is more evident since this decree declares to what extent authority was granted by Jesus Christ to General Councils and to the Popes. Nevertheless,

[1] Maret, *op. cit.*, pp. 401-2.

from the fact that the Council, at the end of the fifth Session, sanctioned an ordinance *on matters of faith*, writers have tried to infer that it had established an essential distinction between its decree on ecclesiastical authority and matters of faith, and that in consequence, according to the Council itself, the first decree was not a matter of faith. To dissipate this misunderstanding it is only necessary to quote the exact passage which gives rise to the difficulty. The proctor first read the decree on the authority of the Council, and then others which were only the continuation of the first, "after which the Reverend Father Seigneur Andre, Bishop-elect of Posen, read the regulations which followed which are on matters of faith and concern the case of John Huss." From the fact that the question of John Huss essentially concerned the faith does it follow that the decree on ecclesiastical authority is in no way related to it? No, evidently not, and the record of the Council may place the trial of John Huss, Jerome of Prague and Wycliffe among matters of faith without our being justified in inferring therefrom that the Fathers regarded the power of decreeing on ecclesiastical matters as being entirely foreign to them. The question, then, must be decided by the nature of things, and this, once granted, loses all its doubtfulness as we have seen.'[1]

1004. It is evident, indeed, that the position of the Pope is, according to Papalism, 'a doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of salvation.'[2] The decree, therefore, of the Council did deal with what Papalism holds to be a most important matter of faith essential to the unity of the Church. That the Council's decree is in exact opposition to the doctrine enshrined in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* in no way affects the question; Martin's words are explicit. The decrees of the Council *in materiis fidei* are by him confirmed, the decree of the fifth Session was one which dealt with what on Papalist principles is a matter of faith, therefore, on those principles he must be held to have confirmed the same. The fautors of Papalism are therefore debarred from raising this objection.

1005. Further, it is plain that when Eugenius IV. in his Bull *Dudum Sacrum* of 15th December A.D. 1433, by which he recognised the Council of Basle[3] as a General Council, legitimately continued from the commencement and then existing, he recognised the previous state of that Council as lawful, and consequently the validity of its Acts done up to that time. Amongst such Acts was the recognition of the decree of the fifth Session of Constance. It is true that in his letter to his Legate on the 22nd July A.D. 1436, and in his Bull *Moyses* of 4th September A.D. 1439, Eugenius uses language which was intended to modify or do

[1] Maret, *op. cit.*, i. 408, 409.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 434.
[3] *Vide infra*, n. 1011 *et seq.*

away with the assent he thus gave, yet that the decree of the fifth Session had received the Papal assent seems clear from his letter to Frederick III., King of the Romans, in A.D. 1447, a little before his death, in which he approved all the decrees of Constance without any reservation and, therefore, those of the fifth Session, saying, 'The General Council of Constance, moreover, the *decretum Frequens* and its other decrees—*alia ejus decreta*—as the other Councils representing the Church Militant, their power and authority and eminence, as did also my other predecessors from whose footsteps we intend never to deviate, we embrace and venerate.'[1]

1006. This evidence is further confirmed by the fact that Pius II., who had been an adherent of the Council of Basle even when it was, from a Papalist point of view, no longer a General Council, and had in fact created an antipope when he wrote his *Retractationes* at Rome in A.D. 1463, took pains, whilst emphasising the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, that no countenance should be given by his action to the idea that he condemned those things which had been defined at the Council of Constance concerning the authority of an Œcumenical Council representing the Universal Church, saying, 'With these also we embrace the authority of the General Council as it has been in our age declared and defined at Constance whilst the Universal Synod was held there. For we venerate the Council of Constance and all the Councils which preceded it approved by the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors,'[2] and that these decrees were held by other writers of this age to be valid has been shown above.[3] So far therefore as 'Papal confirmation' is concerned, it cannot be doubted that it was duly given to the decrees of the fifth Session, though the obvious inconvenience to Papalism of such fact has caused it to be denied by its advocates—a denial of which the facts of the case are a sufficient refutation.

Section CXXVI.—*The witness of the Council of Basle* A.D. 1431.

1007. The Council of Constance had in its thirty-ninth General Session held on 9th October A.D. 1417 decreed that General Councils should be held at frequent intervals, the next one to meet five years after its own dissolution. The ground alleged for this decree by the Council was that such Councils were for the good of the Church, extirpating heresies, errors, and schisms, whereas the neglect of Councils had the opposite effect of disseminating and fanning them. Consequently Martin V. in A.D. 1423 convoked a Council to meet at

[1] Raynald, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 1447, n. 5, tom. xxviii. 489.
[2] *Ibid.*, ad ann. 1463, n. cxxvi., tom. xxix. 388.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 993.

Pavia, which subsequently on the outbreak of the plague transferred itself to Siena. Few Bishops, however, attended, and all attempts to carry out reforms as laid down at Constance were easily frustrated by the Papal party, and the Council was dissolved in the following year. A short time before its dissolution the Council agreed that the next Council, which according to the decree of Constance was to be held in seven years, should meet at Basle.

1008. In pursuance of this determination Martin v., although 'he hated the very name of a Council,'[1] a short time before his death ordered Cardinal Juliano Cæsarini, his Legate in Bohemia, to summon a Council at Basle,[2] and commissioned him to preside at the opening thereof. The Council met on 23rd July A.D. 1431, being attended by but few Bishops at its commencement. Its first General Session did not take place till the 14th December following. The chief object the Council had before it was to bring back the Bohemians who had embraced the Hussite heresy into the unity of the Church, an object Cæsarini had much at heart. Negotiations were accordingly entered into with the Bohemians, a step which, coupled with the discussion which took place with regard to the organisation of the Council, betrayed an independence of spirit on the part of the Synod which alarmed Eugenius IV., who had succeeded to Martin v. Eugenius accordingly sent by the Bishop Pasenzo to Basle a Bull which he had secretly prepared dissolving the Council. The Council, however, objected so strongly to being dissolved in the then condition of Christendom that the Pope's messenger thought it wise to temporise, and declared that if he had any Papal Bulls he would not publish them, and ultimately thought it better to depart, leaving his Bulls with John of Prato, who attempted to publish them on 13th January, but was interrupted, and his Bulls and himself were taken into custody by the Council's orders.'[3]

1009. Notwithstanding the hostile action of the Pope the Council continued to sit, and when Cæsarini could not reconcile it with his allegiance to the Pope to act any longer as President, the Council emphasised its determination to proceed with its work by electing Philebert, Bishop of Coutance, as its President in his place, and by ordering a seal for its official use bearing the legend—*Sigillum Generalis Concilii Basiliensis universalem ecclesiam representantis.* A strong party in favour of reform was present at the Council, amongst them Cardinal de Cusa, dean of St. Florinus at Coblentz, in which capacity he attended the Synod. He was the author of a work entitled *De Concordantia Catholica*, in which he had laid down that a universal Council of the Catholic Church had power in all things over the

[1] Creighton, *op. cit.*, ii. 193. Edit. 1897.
[2] Mansi, xxix. 11.
[3] Creighton, *op. cit.*, ii. 203-4. Edit. 1897.

Roman Pontiff himself.[1] Consequently the spirit of reform which had been carefully kept in check by Martin v. now showed itself in a marked degree.

In the second General Session the Council renewed the decree of the fifth Session of the Council of Constance.[2] Further, it decreed that it being legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit it could not be dissolved or transferred by any authority, even the Papal, without its consent, and that any proceeding of the Pope against those who took part in, or who were coming to take part in the Council, was null and void.[3] All this showed that the Council was determined not to be thwarted in its efforts to carry out its desire to extirpate heresy and to bring about a general reform of the Church in its head and members by Papal obstruction, and that it regarded Eugenius' attempt to dissolve it as *ultra vires* and so null and void.

1010. The Council did not delay acting on its claim to supremacy. In its third General Session it demanded the revocation of the Bull of dissolution, and summoned Eugenius to appear at Basle either personally or by his representative within three months, and in its fourth General Session it decreed that in the event of a vacancy occurring in the Papacy the election of the Pope should take place at Basle. The struggle between the Council and Eugenius was maintained for some time, but at length Eugenius, deserted by many of the Cardinals and influenced by the powerful support extended to the Council by the Emperor Sigismund, was forced to yield. At first he attempted by the Bull *Dudum*,[4] issued on 1st August A.D. 1483, to avoid any recognition of what had been done by the existing Council. The language used was such as was unsatisfactory to the Council owing to the absence of any words formally stating that the Pope admitted that its proceedings had been valid from the first. Sigismund in vain endeavoured to move the Council from its uncompromising attitude, the President especially objecting that Eugenius by his Bull refused to admit the superiority of the Council over the Pope. In the result the Council in its fourteenth General Session drew up several *formulæ* which embodied these demands in this matter[5] for the Papal choice, whilst a further term of ninety days was granted to Eugenius within which he should make the revocation of those things derogatory of the Council which was demanded of him.

1011. Eugenius gave way and issued a new edition of the Bull *Dudum*, dated 15th December A.D. 1433, which satisfied the require-

[1] De Cusa, *De Concordantia Catholica*, lib. ii. c. 34; in Schard's *De Imperiali Jurisdictione*, p. 352.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 991 *et seq.*

[3] Mansi, xxix. 21.

[4] Mansi, xxix. 74.

[5] Mansi, xxix. 72, 74.

ments of the Council. The language used was unambiguous. 'We decree and declare,' said Eugenius, 'that the aforesaid Council of Basle, from the time of its aforesaid commencement, has been and is legitimately continued, and has proceeded and ought to be continued and proceed for the aforesaid purposes and all things pertaining to them as if no dissolution had taken place, declaring indeed the aforesaid dissolution void and vain, and that we accept freely and simply and in the fullest sense and with all devotion and favour the Holy Council of Basle itself. Besides which we annihilate, revoke, make void and annul our two letters, and whatsoever others, and whatever by us or in our name has been done, attempted or asserted to the prejudice or in derogation of the aforesaid Council of Basle or against its authority. Item, we revoke whatsoever processes have been made against the things done by this Holy Council of Basle and those adhering to the same. Moreover, we freely and in the fullest manner desist from bringing henceforth any charges of novelty, any grievances or prejudices against this Holy Council or its Acts or those adhering to the said Council.'[1]

1012. This was held by the Council to be a satisfactory compliance with its demands. Before, however, the Legates of Eugenius were permitted to take the chief places in the Council, they were compelled to swear that they would 'faithfully labour on behalf of the rank and honour of the Council of Basle and defend and maintain its decrees, and especially the decrees of the Council of Constance, the tenor of which follows, and is this: In the first place, that the General Synod of Constance and every other Synod legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit has its authority immediately from Christ,[2] etc.'

The proceedings of the Council were in accord with these definite claims. Its efforts after reform were consequently distasteful to the Papalists, not merely in themselves, but because they were based on, and involved the truth of, the principle which the Council had taken such care to emphasise and to place in the forefront of all that it did, viz., that the General Council representing the Universal Church was supreme over the whole Church, including the Pope.

1013. The value of the testimony afforded by the Council is clearly great. Such value does not of course depend upon whether the Council was œcumenical or not. On Catholic principle, as has been already pointed out, it cannot be held to possess œcumenical rank, but that Papalists can deny œcumenical authority to the most important of its Acts, viz., that of its earlier Sessions, which have been given above, must be held to be in conflict with the position they assign to the Pope with regard to Œcumenical Councils.

Eugenius IV. clearly by the Bull *Dudum Sacrum* recognised the Council as legitimate and canonical up to the fourteenth Session,

[1] Mansi, xxix. 78, 79.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 991, etc.

when the reconciliation took place between himself and the Council. The decrees of the fifth Session of Constance had been previously to this expressly confirmed by the Council, consequently it follows that Eugenius solemnly approved those decrees. This is confirmed by the following significant fact. The original Bull *Dudum Sacrum* which the Council refused to accept as being in accordance with their requirements contained a clause which required that those things which had been done by the said Council 'against the person, authority, and liberty of Eugenius and of the Apostolic See, and our venerable brethren the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, and of all others whomsoever adhering to us in the said Council' should be done away with. This clause might have been interpreted as referring to the decrees of Constance, which the Council had reiterated and stamped with its approval. It was omitted from the Bull as revised and received by the Council.

We find then that 'during the reign of an undisputed Pope, and in a time of ecclesiastical unity, the Council of Basle lays before us a new promulgation of the law of Constance. It was there renewed four times in the most positive and solemn manner. Not only was it renewed, but it was put into practice and that with the assent of the opinion most generally prevailing in the Church. . . . Warned by the misfortunes which menaced him, Pope Eugenius listened to his better judgment, though somewhat tardily, and withdrew his resistance and opposition to the Council. And by proclaiming the *œcumenicity*, the *sanctity* of the Council of Basle, by according it his *adhesion of devotion and favour*, he gave fresh approbation to the decrees of Constance, which had been renewed at Basle, and to the constitutional law on which the Council based its proceedings. Could this law, relating as it does to matters of faith, and most closely concerning the general welfare of the Church, receive a more solemn sanction?'[1] Mgr. Maret in no way puts the position which Eugenius IV. finally took with regard to the Council too strongly when he says, 'Pope Eugenius showed himself as strikingly and palpably inconsistent as Pope Vigilius [did at the Fifth Synod], and over a question which had as direct and immediate a connection with the faith as had that of the Three Chapters. Truly nothing concerns the faith more than to know whether a Council is genuinely General, that is to say, legitimate, holy, infallible. Now there is no blame and contempt that Eugenius does not pour on the first sixteen Sessions of the Council of Basle in the Bulls *Inscrutabilis* and *In arcano*; there can be no more scathing reprobation than that which he pronounces. Nevertheless, a short time after all this is completely changed. The Bull *Dudum Sacrum* nullifies the former ones, and proclaims before the Church and the world the legitimacy, the

[1] Maret, *op. cit.*, tom. i. 466-7.

sanctity, and consequently the infallibility of this accursed and reprobate Council! And the Bull *Dudum Sacrum* remains an eternal and immutable judgment of the Apostolic See. That is a fact which no scholastic subtlety will ever be able to disguise. In fact, would not all that might be urged against the proceedings of the Fathers of Basle during the first sixteen Sessions come back upon the Pontiff who gave to these same Sessions his solemn approbation? And the faults, if there were any, must they not be obliterated in the eyes of the theologians of the extreme school by this solemn judgment of the Apostolic See? At least it is evident that in these sixteen Sessions there can have been nothing contrary to the faith, Christian morality, or the true interests of the Church. It is true that, with the object of weakening the powerful argument derived from the Bull *Dudum Sacrum*, it has been asserted that Pope Eugenius was not a free agent when he revoked the Bulls of dissolution and gave the one confirming the Council. Doubtless Eugenius by his weakness and subterfuges had, it must be owned, drawn upon himself the indignation of Europe; he was menaced by the enemies that he had created for himself. But no one will ever succeed in proving that any violence, even moral, was exerted against the Pope. Again, it is objected that Eugenius when he recognised the legitimacy and sanctity of the Council of Basle did not thereby approve all its decrees. But this is to forget that he declared that he "*adhered to the Council unrestrictedly, entirely, and with complete devotion and favour.*" How can these words imply a restrictive approbation? and if there were any restrictions in the mind of Eugenius, would he not have been deceiving the world and the Church? Those who hold the "restrictive" view support it by saying that in a private letter to the Emperor Sigismund, Pope Eugenius said he had abated his rights for the sake of peace. Firstly, we will reply with Bossuet, "*Hujus modi epistolis negamus jura contineri.*" Secondly, we would say that if the Pope spoke of the essential rights of his supreme See, he had not the power to abandon them. Such an abandonment would have been to betray the Church. The first sixteen Sessions of the Council of Basle seem to us then to be safe from all attack, and unite in themselves all the characteristics of œcumenicity. In fact, none of the essential conditions of General Councils are wanting to them: neither lawful convocation, nor the presidency of Papal Legates, nor an adequate representation of the Universal Church, which by its unconcealed adhesion supported the Fathers of Basle, nor, lastly, the Pope's confirmation.'[1]

[1] Maret, *op. cit.*, pp. 458-61. The learned writer, it will be observed, in the last paragraph assumes that convocation by the Pope, the presidency of the Papal Legates, and confirmation by the Pope are essential to the œcumenicity of a Council. That this is not the case has been shown *supra*, nn. 283 *et seq.*, 297, *et infra* 1017 *et seq.*

1014. Ultramontanes, however, in spite of the overwhelming evidence on Papalist principles to the contrary, persist in denying œcumenicity to this Council,[1] in terms which themselves bear witness as to the weight which it is felt by them the testimony of this Council affords against Papalism. The question of the œcumenicity of the Council, however, does not affect the value of the witness of this Council for the purpose for which it has been here adduced. That purpose is simply to prove that a great Western Council, during those six years of its existence which are acknowledged by all (viz., those which preceded its forcible translation to Ferrara by the Bull of Eugenius IV., dated 18th of September A.D. 1437,[2] when he was under impeachment by the Council), so far from regarding 'the Roman Pontiff' as 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' exercising over it that authority which Christ exercised during His mortal life over the Apostolate, acted as the supreme authority in the Church. This testimony is, indeed, the more important insomuch as, although not that of an Œcumenical Council, it records the deliberate judgment of Western Christendom even at a late date when Papalism had for some centuries exercised in the West almost undisputed sway as to

[1] The witness afforded by the Council of Basle against Papalism is a source of considerable embarrassment to Hefele owing to the Bull *Dudum Sacrum* of Eugenius IV. The learned writer is too straightforward to be able to take the 'pure Ultramontane' line of simply denying that the Council was œcumenical, but at the same time he is gravely hampered by the necessity involved by his position of reconciling the facts of the case with the assertions of the *Vatican Decrees*. Consequently he is driven to attempt to attain the same end as that of those just alluded to by another method. As a Papalist he is bound to hold that confirmation by the Pope is the necessary mark of the œcumenical authority of the decrees of a Synod. Now Eugenius by this Bull did so approve the decrees of the Council of Basle which have reference to the relative positions of a General Council and the Pope, which therefore, on Papalist principles, have œcumenical authority. Hefele's way of meeting this difficulty is by saying that the Pope 'only recognised generally the *existence* of the Council of Basle, and made use of expressions which *implicite* might appear to include an approval of that thesis,' viz., 'the superiority of an Œcumenical Council over the Pope' (Hefele, *op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. 7. Second German Edit. [E.T. vol. v. p. 410]). Hefele's language is significant. He admits that the Bull *implicitly* recognised the doctrine of the decrees of the Council of Constance, which had been previously confirmed and reiterated by the Council of Basle, and that the Bull was so understood by that Synod is also clear. Does the writer mean that Eugenius used intentionally language which would deceive the Fathers of the Council on this crucial point, so that they would believe that they had his solemn adhesion to the position which they had taken up with such emphasis, whilst all the time he did not and had no intention of doing so, merely awaiting a convenient opportunity of openly declaring his real attitude after he had attained the immediate object he had in view? If this be the case, the learned writer makes an imputation on the good faith of Pope Eugenius which one is glad is made by a Roman Catholic writer, and not by one who is not of the Roman obedience. That an historian of such an established position as Hefele is should be compelled to take the line he does in order to prevent the action of Eugenius being adduced in proof of the untenable character of the Papalist allegation as to this Council is significant; that the attempt itself is futile is plain from the evidence set out in the text as to the real nature of that action.

[2] Mansi, xxix. 147.

the relative positions occupied by an Œcumenical Council and the 'Roman Pontiff' respectively.

Section CXXVII.—*Conclusion from the evidence afforded by the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle.*

1015. The testimony afforded by the proceedings and decrees of these three Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle which has been set out in the preceding sections is in explicit opposition to the allegations in the *Satis Cognitum* that the whole Episcopal College collectively is bound to render obedience to the real and sovereign authority possessed *jure divino* by the Roman Pontiffs. This evidence is especially valuable, as has already been noted, because of the late date when the Councils were held. The action of the Fathers of these Councils was, in fact, the outcome of the intolerable burden which the Papalist claims had fastened upon Western Christendom, a burden which made men realise that the then existing state of the Church was not in accordance with its Divine Constitution. The 'forgeries' and the *dicta* which had been based on them, regarded as they yet were as genuine testimonies of the past ages of the Church's history, hampered the Fathers in their efforts. They did not know what the critical investigation of a later date has proved, that these writings which seemed to them to necessarily possess the highest possible authority were the corrupt inventions of later ages which the Papacy had boldly adopted in its own interests. Thus they were prevented from proceeding, as they might have otherwise done, to effectually prevent the abuses which had resulted from the development of Papalism. Yet it is of the utmost significance that under these circumstances, even with their necessarily imperfect knowledge, and in face of the opinion with regard to the Papacy which had become firmly established in the West, they made so strenuous an attempt to return to a more Catholic state of affairs by proclaiming by decree the supremacy of the Church herself in General Council assembled over all its members, whatever might be their dignity and rank. The effort failed, largely owing to the want of accurate knowledge as to the *real* position held by the Roman Bishop in the hierarchy, hence the Fathers did not take a sufficiently drastic line. The great principle, however, upon which that effort was based can never die; it will, it cannot be doubted, hereafter reassert itself once more, and in the light which the researches into the past history of the Church, the unmasking of the 'forgeries' of which the fautors of Papalism have made such fatal use, and the more critical methods possible in this age of examining testimony, has thrown on the untenable and the uncatholic character of the usurpations of the Roman

Bishops, result in reinstatement of the One Episcopate in that supreme position which the Lord willed it should possess in the constitution of that society which He called into existence and of which He is the One and only Head.

Section CXXVIII.—*Is 'Papal Confirmation' of the Decrees of an Œcumenical Council necessary?*

1016. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to support its allegation that the Roman Pontiff has *jure divino* power over the Episcopal College as its 'Master' by asserting that it is essential to the validity of the decrees of Councils that they should receive the confirmation of the Roman Pontiffs, in the following terms: 'It has ever been unquestionably the office of the Roman Pontiffs to ratify or to reject the decrees of Councils.'[1] This statement is couched in most unambiguous terms. It plainly means that in order that the decrees of an Œcumenical Council may be binding on the Church, such decrees must be confirmed by 'the Pope,' otherwise no Acts of a Council, however great, can possess œcumenical authority.

1017. It is evident that this claim involves that the 'ratification' by the Roman Pontiff is an act done by him in virtue of a power that he alone possesses, so that without such action on his part any act of the One Episcopate would be null and void. Such ratification is the act of the 'Master' *jure divino* of 'the Episcopal College' holding the same position towards it as Christ did towards 'the Apostolic College.' It is an exercise by 'the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate' of that power which that Apostle had *jure divino* over 'the Apostolic College,' a power identical with that which 'Christ exercised' over that College 'during His mortal life,' in a word, the supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, 'a real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey.'

1018. In considering this assertion it is necessary to bear in mind that this power, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, must be exercised in the case of every Œcumenical Council, for without such Papal confirmation no Synod could claim œcumenicity; it is the essential mark of and condition precedent to a Council being held to be œcumenical. This is, of course, the logical consequence of the assumption that the Papal Monarchy is the essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, having been instituted by Christ for the purpose of ensuring its unity and stability. It must be at once said that the *Satis Cognitum*, so far from making any attempt to dispute this, expressly accepts the position, declaring that 'in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 30.

Roman Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age.'[1] It appeals, as has been seen, both to 'Holy Writ' and to 'the teaching of the General Councils' in confirmation of that position. There is no attempt to adduce any theory of 'development' by which to endeavour to explain away any evidence which might be found to be incompatible with such position. On the contrary, Papalism is boldly asserted to have been in existence *jure divino* from the very beginning of the Christian religion, and therefore it is declared to have '*ever* been the office of the Roman Pontiff to ratify or to reject the decrees of Councils.'

1019. It is the logical conclusion from the assumptions made, but it has just this great obstacle in the way of securing assent to it—it is a conclusion which must be in accordance with the facts of history. If it be true, these facts will necessarily be found in entire harmony with it. It could not be otherwise. There will be found to be no Council recognised by the Church as œcumenical the decrees of which have not received the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff exercising his authority as the Supreme Pastor, 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College.' A 'ratification' as to which no doubt could arise as to the way in which, and the actual time when, it was given, because on such ratification depends the œcumenical character of the Council and the whole binding powers of its decrees. It would be impossible for any doubt to exist as to whether in the case of the Œcumenical Councils 'the Roman Pontiff' had discharged his office in this respect, for a failure to do so in any one case would be equivalent to the failure of the divinely appointed organ endowed with the supreme power over the Church, and the consequent result that the divine plan for the safeguarding the existence of the One Church would be proved to be inadequate for the purpose, and the gates of hell would have prevailed against her.

There appears to be no escape from this conclusion. If then there be any single case of a Council held by the Church to be œcumenical where this 'Papal' confirmation is wanting, it will follow, as a necessary conclusion, that such confirmation is not necessary or essential to the œcumenicity of a Council. The issue is clear; what do the facts of history say with regard to it?

Section CXXIX.—*Did the First Council of Nicæa*, A.D. 325, *receive Papal Confirmation?*

1020. First, it is to be noted that there is absolutely no proof whatever that any confirmation by the Bishop of Rome was sought for, or obtained by, the Council of Nicæa. The importance of this fact is

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

more clearly realised when the unique position of the Nicene Council is borne in mind. It was the first of the Œcumenical Councils, a Synod whose authority has always been regarded as of the greatest weight. As Tillemont says: 'If one wished to collect all the existing proofs of the great veneration in which the Council of Nicæa was held, the enumeration would never end. In all ages, with the exception of a few heretics, the sacred Assembly at Nicæa has never been spoken of but with the greatest respect.'[1] Yet with regard to this Synod no evidence whatever of any exercise by 'the Roman Pontiff' of that power which he alone possesses, according to Papalism, of validating the Acts of the Council, and so giving to it œcumenical authority can be produced. If such Papal 'ratification' had been necessary to that end, which must have been the case if the position alleged to belong to the Roman Pontiffs *jure divino* by Papalism had been 'the venerable and constant belief' of the Nicene 'age,' such ratification would inevitably have had a prominent place accorded to it amongst the records of the Church, as exhibiting the way in which the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock discharged his office with regard to the first of those Synods which in the history of the Church should obtain, by the exercise of the like power on the part of his succesSSors, œcumenical rank. The conclusion to be drawn is that the case of the Nicene Council proves that 'Papal' confirmation is not necessary to the validity of the decrees of a Council or to such Council being enrolled amongst those of œcumenical rank.

1021. The advocates of Papalism are acute enough to see the absolute incompatibility of this conclusion with their position. Hence they endeavour to hinder such conclusions being drawn by asserting that Pope Sylvester did 'confirm' the Council of Nicæa, and appealing to a certain letter of Hosius, Macarius of Jerusalem, and the two Roman priests Victor and Vincentius, in which they request Sylvester to convoke a Roman Synod in order to confirm the decisions of the Nicene Synod,[2] the answer of Sylvester to that letter, his decree of confirmation,[3] and other documents to the like effect. The spurious character of these documents is, however, certain. The falsity of the letter is plain on the very face of it, *e.g.* the Bishop of Jerusalem is placed next to Hosius the President, and so made to take precedence over the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, who are not even named in the letter; the date given is viii Cal. Julias, from which it would appear that, according to the document, the 'Council asked the Holy See for its approval of its work a few days after its commencement.'[4] The spuriousness of St. Sylvester's 'confirmation' is likewise 'entirely beyond doubt,' *e.g.* an entirely false date is given, *Constantino VII. et*

[1] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, vi. 293.
[2] Mansi, ii. 720.
[3] Mansi, ii. 719.
[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. ch. ii. sect. 44. [E.T. i. 443.]

Constantio Cæsare IV. consulibus. 'When Constantine became consul for the seventh time (A.D. 326) his son, Constantine, was invested with that dignity for the first time and not for the fourth. Such a chronological error would certainly not have been committed in a writing so important in the Roman archives.'[1]

1022. Hefele also gives proof of the spurious character of all the other documents referred to. That these documents should have been forged and then appealed to as authoritative is significant, proving as it does that no genuine evidence of that formal exercise by the Roman Pontiff of the supreme power which is alleged by the *Satis Cognitum* to belong to him *jure divino* in connection with the Nicene Synod could be obtained. The conclusion, therefore, sought to be overthrown is thus only the more firmly established, and this famous Council, acknowledged throughout Christendom as œcumenical,[2] must be held never to have been 'ratified' by Pope St. Sylvester, and so the allegation of the *Satis Cognitum* which is under notice is at once disproved.

Section CXXX.—*Did the First Council of Constantinople*, A.D. 381, *receive Papal Confirmation?*

1023. The Second Œcumenical Council furnishes similar testimony. Convoked and held without any assent of the Roman Bishop being asked, that Prelate was not himself present or represented. No Western Bishop, indeed, was at the Council, for though Ascholius of Thessalonica attended, his See was considered by Theodosius, who convoked the Synod, to be an Oriental[3] and not a Western one. Its

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ch. ii. sect. 44. [E.T. i. 443.]

[2] It is sometimes asserted that Socrates, the historian, makes a statement which proves that the Pope 'confirmed' the decrees of Nicæa. It is said that he states with reference to Julius, Bishop of Rome, only eleven years after the Nicene Synod, and therefore necessarily fully cognisant of its proceedings, 'that there is a Canon which enjoins that no Bishops make Canons without the knowledge of the Bishop of Rome.' [παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης.] (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 17; P.G. lxvii. 220.) It is sufficient to reply that Socrates can only be referring to the letter of Julius to the Bishops of the East, which has already been considered and shown to be incompatible with Papalism (*vide supra*, nn. 705 *et seq.*). Whatever Socrates may have imagined the letter meant, it contains nothing which can by any means be twisted into a foundation for such a statement, on the contrary it is itself a witness against any such idea. Further, no Canon giving to, or recognising as belonging to, the Bishop of Rome any such prerogative is producible. Socrates' statement is thus on these two grounds of no value for the purpose for which it is adduced, and the conclusion arrived at on the evidence in the text is in no way affected by it. A somewhat similar statement is made by Sozomen, viz., 'that it is an ecclesiastical law to declare null and void what is contrary to the judgment of the Bishop of the Romans' (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 10; P.G. lxvii. 1057). As has been seen there is no such statement in the letter of Pope Julius referred to, and therefore the remarks made above with reference to Socrates' statement apply equally to the still more 'inaccurate' statement made by Sozomen.

[3] *Vide infra*, n. 1209.

first President was St. Meletius of Antioch, a Bishop out of communion with Rome.[1] There is no evidence, or any record, of a confirmation of this Council's Acts by the then Bishop of Rome, nor, in fact, was any such confirmation asked for. The Council considered itself to be fully competent to deal as the final authority with the matters which came before it. This is plain from the manner in which the Easterns treated the complaints of the Western Bishops with reference to some of their proceedings, especially their appointment of Nectarius to Constantinople and of Flavian to Antioch.

1024. St. Ambrose and certain Italian Bishops addressed a letter to Theodosius, to which the Fathers of the Council, in a Synod held in A.D. 382 at Constantinople, replied in a Synodal letter as follows: 'As to the management of particular matters in the Churches both an ancient fundamental principle, as ye know, hath prevailed, and the rule of the Holy Fathers at Nicæa that in each Province those [Bishops] of the Province, and if they be willing their neighbours also, should make the elections according as they judged meet. In accordance with which ye know that both the rest of the Churches are administered by us, and the Priests of the most distinguished Churches have been appointed. Whence in the, so to say, newly-founded Church of Constantinople, which by the mercy of God we have snatched as it were out of the jaws of the lion, from subjection to the blasphemy of the heretics, we have elected Bishop the most reverend and pious Nectarius in an Œcumenical Council, with common agreement in the sight both of the most religious Emperor Theodosius, and with the consent of all the clergy and the whole city. And those [Bishops] both of the Province and Diocese of the East being canonically assembled, the whole accordant Church as with one voice honouring the man have elected the most reverend and religious Bishop Flavian to the most ancient and truly Apostolical Church of Antioch in Syria, where first the venerable name of Christian became known; which legitimate election the whole Synod hath received. But of the Church of Jerusalem, the mother of all Churches, we declare that the most reverend and religious Cyril is Bishop, both as being since canonically elected by those of his Province, and as having struggled much against the Arians in different places, whom as being lawfully and canonically established by us we invite your Piety also, spiritual love obliging you, and the fear of the Lord which represses all human affection and accounts the edification of the Church more precious than sympathy with, or in favour of individuals. For thus, by agreement in the word of faith and by the establishment of Christian love in us, we shall cease to say what the Apostle has condemned, 'I am of Paul and I

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 339, 592.

of Apollos, and I of Cephas,' for all being shown to be Christ's, who in us is not divided, by the help of God we shall keep the body of the Church unrent and shall stand with confidence before the tribunal of the Lord.'[1] The Eastern Bishops, it will be observed, call the Council of A.D. 381 Œcumenical, they hold its Acts to be conclusive, and recognise no right on the part of anybody to interfere with anything which had been settled in the Council by common agreement.

1025. No record of any formal act of 'Papal' confirmation by the Bishop of Rome is to be found; had there been one, it must on Papal principles have been well-known, as the œcumenicity of the Council depended upon it, and it would, no doubt, have been carefully preserved in the archives at Constantinople. It may be said that Photius, some centuries later, says with reference to this Council that 'not long after it was known that Damasus, Bishop of Rome, did also confirm the same decrees, declaring himself to be of the same opinion with the Fathers above named.'[2] But, in the first place, it is clear both from the fact that Photius was an Eastern, and from the whole passage, that he is not speaking of *Papal* confirmation, but of that ordinary Episcopal act[3] by which any Bishop absent from a Synod 'confirmed' its Acts by assenting thereto, a power which undoubtedly St. Damasus and all Bishops of Rome have enjoyed equally with the other members of the Episcopate, which obviously differs in essence from that unique power which is alleged to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff as 'the legitimate successor of Peter.' It follows, therefore, that the statement cited, whatever the authority for it may have been, is of no value for the purpose of proving *Papal* confirmation of the Council by Damasus. As a matter of fact, the Latins only gradually recognised the Second Council as œcumenical, though the Easterns, as is clear from the proceedings of the Fourth Council, always honoured it as such. The conclusion, therefore, is that the First Council of Constantinople —no more than did that of Nicæa—does not derive its œcumenical character from any formal ratification of its Acts by the Roman Pontiff in virtue of his supremacy over the whole Church.

Section CXXXI.—*Did the Council of Ephesus*, A.D. 431, *receive Papal Confirmation?*

1026. The Third Council, like its predecessors, received no Papal confirmation. The representatives of Celestine signed the Acts, but

[1] Mansi, iii. 585, 587.

[2] Photius, *De Synodis*, Justellus, *Bibliotheca Juris canonici veteris*, vol. ii. p. 1134. (1661).

[3] *Vide infra*, nn. 1029, 1040.

the signatures were of no greater importance *per se* than those of other Bishops. They did not by such signatures exercise in virtue of delegation to them that unique power of ratification on which the whole validity of the proceedings of the Council depended, they simply subscribed the Acts and so gave their assent to them, no doubt, as Celestine's representatives, but an assent of the like nature as that of any other Prelate who 'confirmed' the Acts by his subscription thereto. No record of any 'Papal' confirmation by Celestine in virtue of that alleged prerogative, which, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, he must have possessed is forthcoming, yet the Acts of the Third Council and its œcumenical character have nevertheless been universally acknowledged.

Section CXXXII.—*Did the Council of Chalcedon*, A.D. 451, *receive Papal Confirmation?*

1027. The Fathers of the Fourth Council in a letter which has already been considered in another connection[1] communicated to Pope Leo the whole purport of what they had done for his 'confirmation and assent'—*βεβαίωσίν τε και συγκατάθεσιν*—but notwithstanding the Oriental phraseology of politeness and compliment which they used in their communication it is quite plain that they did not hold that the validity of their acts depended on the exercise by St. Leo of any unique prerogative of 'Papal' confirmation. In their statement of these proceedings they declare that the sentence which they had pronounced on Dioscurus was their own: he had refused to obey the three legal citations made to him, 'Wherefore that sentence which by his misdeeds he gave against himself, we with all possible moderation ratified, stripping the wolf of the shepherd's coat to which he was long ago convicted of only pretending.' They assert that 'they had received authority to pluck up and to plant,' and 'sighed over a single excision, whilst they carefully strengthened a harvest of blessings.' The sentence is by the Fathers obviously held to be final, as being that of those who had the right to deliver a final judgment from which there could be no appeal.

1028. The Fathers then proceed to make known to Leo that they had 'decreed certain other points which they declare to be the act of 'the Œcumenical Council,' and entreat him 'to honour their decree by his vote'—*παρακαλοῦμεν τοίνυν τίμησον καὶ ταῖς σαῖς ψηφοῖς τὴν κρίσιν.* Such language shows that in the minds of those who used it there was no doubt that the decree to which they referred possessed full validity, 'guided,' as they assert they were, 'by the Divine Will' to make it. They apply for St. Leo's confirma-

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 431 *et seq.*

tion of, and assent to, the decree thus made, especially because 'the most holy Bishops Pascharinus and Lucentius, and the most religious presbyter Boniface who is with them, the legates of His Holiness had attempted vehemently to resist what had been so decreed, doubtless, with the wish that he should have the initiation, and with this good forethought that the successful issue not only of the faith but of good order should be set to his account.'[1]

1029. Confirmation and assent of this nature was sought of any Bishop who was absent from the deliberations of the Synod; in St. Leo's case it was the more to be desired because his representatives had, as the Fathers, with Eastern courtliness, chose to consider, refused their assent on his behalf that he might give it personally. Such confirmation and assent would be of same nature as that which his representatives could have themselves given at the Synod, as the legates of Celestine at the Third Synod had given on his behalf, viz., that which is implied by the subscription of the members of the Synod, and thus no more than it, a 'Papal' confirmation.

1030. The Fathers knew that the Canon to which they were asking St. Leo to give assent would be obnoxious to him, hence the diplomatic language used by them in approaching on the unwelcome subject; but there is an entire absence of any recognition on their part of any power essentially different in nature to that which they themselves possessed as being inherent in St. Leo *jure divino* as their 'Master' to whom they were bound to render obedience. Further, when St. Leo refused his assent, not because the Canon infringed the 'Papal' prerogatives, but because he held it to be contrary to the Nicene Canons,[2] the Easterns in no way regarded his action as affecting the validity of the act done by 'the Œcumenical Council' under divine guidance, and the Canon has always been held to be binding by the Easterns.[3] The Fathers of the Fourth Council knew nothing of the necessity of 'Papal' confirmation.

Section CXXXIII.—*Did the Second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, receive Papal Confirmation?*

1031. At the Fifth Œcumenical Council Pope Vigilius was not present,[4] and its decisions were arrived at without any idea on the part of the Fathers of the Synod that they would require his 'ratification' as the Supreme Pastor. So far indeed from any such notion being held by them, in their decrees with reference to the controversy with regard to 'The Three Chapters' they took a line in direct opposi-

[1] Mansi, vi. 147.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 438.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 447 *et infra*, 1054.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 940.

tion to that adopted by Vigilius in his *Constitutum*.[1] The terms of the judgment pronounced by them preclude any supposition being entertained that the Synod considered it to be subject to Papal confirmation. They held it to be final and conclusive, and those who did not accept it became subject to anathema.

1032. If it be attempted to argue that Vigilius did 'ratify' the decrees of the Council by his second *Constitutum*, dated 22nd February A.D. 554, the reply is simple. The *Constitutum* itself testifies that it can in no way represent a 'Papal' confirmation. Its language has already been discussed in another connection and shown to be incompatible with Papalism.[2] Fleury gives an account of its real meaning most favourable to Vigilius when he says: 'At last Pope Vigilius resigned himself to the advice of the Council, and six months afterwards wrote a letter to the Patriarch Eutychius, wherein he confesses that he had been wanting in charity in dividing from his brethren. He adds that one ought not to be ashamed to submit when one recognises the truth, and brings forward the example of St. Augustine. He says that after having examined "The Three Chapters," he finds them worthy of condemnation. We recognise for our brethren and colleagues all those who have condemned them, and annul by this writing all that has been done by us or others for the defence of "The Three Chapters."'[3]

1033. In fact it is plain that the Council acted as the Supreme authority in the Church, and notwithstanding his opposition Vigilius was compelled to recognise this by his admission that that which the Synod had laid down as to be accepted and as anathema was right, though it was the exact opposite of that which he himself had set forth in his *Constitutum*. His 'confirmation' was then simply the assent which any other Bishop who had not been present at the Synod could have given, with the addition that it was couched in language which his previous conduct required, and expressed his withdrawal from the position he had taken up.

SECTION CXXXIV.—*Did the Third Council of Constantinople*, A.D. 680, *receive Papal Confirmation?*

1034. The Sixth Council in its first Session called itself Œcumenical,[4] and its Acts clearly show that the Fathers of the Synod held themselves to constitute the Supreme authority in the Church, as they passed judgment on heretics, including a Pope, in such manner as to effectually bar any idea that that judgment was not final, and could not be conclusive without receiving the 'ratification' of the Pope as the

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 942.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 941 *et seq.*
[3] Fleury, *op. cit.*, liv. xxxiii. ch. 52, tom. ii. 663-4. Edit. 1856.
[4] Mansi, xi. 656.

Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, and Supreme Judge of all the faithful. Their sentence casting out with anathema from the Church the heretics was not dependent upon 'Papal' confirmation. No doubt the Synod communicated their decrees to the Pope and desired his 'confirmation' thereof, but their action in so doing, no more than in other like cases, does not imply what is meant by 'Papal' confirmation, for they declare in their letter written before the 'confirmation' had been received that 'they had ordained, by the help of the life-giving Spirit, a definition free from all error, certain and infallible.'[1] The Fathers of the Council merely request from Agatho that assent which was customarily given by absent Bishops to testify that they adhered to the decrees passed. It must be repeated that the essential difference between 'Papal' confirmation and the 'confirmation' which all Bishops have a right to give must be carefully borne in mind in considering all these cases, and care taken lest evidence of the latter should be treated as if it were evidence of the former.

1035. Before Agatho's legates left Constantinople at the end of the Council he had died on 10th January A.D. 682, and his successor Leo II., in a letter addressed to the Emperor, expressed the agreement of his See with what had been defined by the Council, confirming it 'by the authority of Blessed Peter,' declaring that as he received the five previous Universal Councils, so with like veneration he received the Sixth Council.'[2]

The 'Petrine' tone of the letter was in accord with the prevailing traditions of his See; but that his confirmation thus expressed gave authority to the decrees of the Council which they did not before possess, so that *henceforth*, and not till then, they were binding on the Church, was certainly not the opinion, as has been seen, of the Fathers of the Synod. Further, Leo himself did not so regard his action. For when he laboured diligently to bring about the recognition of the Sixth Council throughout the entire West, it is to the 'sentence of the Venerable Council,' as 'the divinely inspired censure which cast the heretics forth from Holy Church,'[3] that he refers, and to which he asks those to whom he wrote to assent. This it would have been obviously needless for him to do, had he as the Supreme Pastor given authority to the Council's Acts; they would then have been his, and therefore on that ground, and not as the Synod's decrees, been binding on the whole of Christendom. Moreover, the Spanish Bishops to whom Leo thus communicated the Acts of the Council in like manner did not so regard them, as is clear from the way in which they proceeded to act in compliance with the request made to them.[4]

[1] Mansi, xi. 683-8.
[2] Mansi, xi. 726-36.
[3] Mansi, xi. 1050 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide infra*, n. 1041.

SECTION CXXXV.—*Did the Second Council of Nicæa*, A.D. 787, *receive Papal Confirmation?*

1036. The Seventh Œcumenical Synod does not appear to have asked Hadrian I., the then Bishop of Rome, to confirm its Acts, but no doubt he, in common with other Bishops who were not able to attend the Synod, received, and assented to, the decrees of the Council of which he was a prominent defender against the *Libri Carolini*. At the conclusion of the Synod Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who had taken the chief part in the management of the Synod, acting practically as President thereof,[1] wrote to 'his most holy and blessed brother and co-minister the Lord Hadrian, Pope of Elder Rome,' describing the proceedings of the Synod. In this letter, the part which Hadrian had taken in rooting out the tares is acknowledged, and the fact that his letter and those which had been received from the Eastern dioceses had been read is stated,[2] but this is all. The decrees of the Synod are in no way submitted to him for Papal confirmation or rejection by him in virtue of his prerogative as the Supreme Pastor.

1037. The Synodal 'decree of the Faith' clearly shows that the Fathers of the Council were entirely ignorant of any necessity of applying to Hadrian for his 'ratification' in order that it might be binding on the Church. In it the Synod calls itself Holy and Œcumenical, and of it the members of the Council, in reply to the proposal made by the two rulers, Constantine and Irene, 'that the Holy and Œcumenical Council should declare whether this ὅρος had been accepted with universal consent,' said: 'Thus we believe, thus think we all, we have all agreed and subscribed, this is the faith of the Apostles, the faith of the Fathers, the faith of the Orthodox. Anathema to those who do not adhere to this faith.'[3]

1038. To the same effect testifies the way in which they 'confirmed' the letters of Hadrian,[4] placing them on the same level with the declaration of Tarasius and the letters from the Oriental Patriarchs—all being jointly received by the Council, and the question before the Synod deemed by them to be settled by the agreement of the Five

[1] The Empress Irene and her son were present at the eighth and last Session of the Synod as Honorary Presidents. The legates of the Bishop of Rome, the Archpresbyter Peter and the Abbot Peter, naturally, as representing the First See, appear at all the sessions of the Council to come first in the Acts, and in that position sign the decrees of Synod, but, as Hefele admits, 'Tarasius had the real management of the business at this Synod' (*op. cit.*, Introduction, sect. 2. E.T. i. 30), and, 'from the transactions themselves, we learn that Tarasius essentially conducted the business, as also the Sicilian bishops nominated him at the first Session (*ibid.*, bk. xviii. sect. 347. [E.T. v. 360, 361]).

[2] Mansi, xiii. 459.

[3] Mansi, xiii. 414, 416.

[4] Their approval of that to the Emperor was given to it as it was read to the Synod, *vide* note 59 On the Seventh Synod and Pope Hadrian's Letter to the Emperor.

Patriarchal Sees, which the letters and declaration made manifest in the third Session of the Council. The words used by the Synod set this forth clearly: 'All the Holy Council,' said the Fathers, 'which is assembled by the grace of Christ, our true God, and the pious command of our most serene and orthodox Emperors, receives and agrees to the report made to our orthodox Emperors by Hadrian, Pope of Elder Rome, and the paper now read, the orthodox declaration of the most holy and blessed Œcumenical Patriarch Tarasius, and the letters sent from the East to his Blessedness by the High Priests.'[1] Any idea that the Supreme power and jurisdiction over the whole Church belonged to Hadrian *jure divino* as the Roman Pontiff it is plain was unknown to the members of the Synod, and consequently they did not know that it was necessary to seek from their 'Master' his 'ratification' of their Acts without which they would be of no force.

Section CXXXVI.—*The evidence of the 'subscriptions' of the Bishops to the Acts of Councils.*

1039. Further proof that the Œcumenical Synods did not hold that their Acts required validation by the exercise of his supreme authority by the Roman Pontiff is afforded by the terms in which the action of Bishops with regard to these Acts is described, such terms precluding any such idea. For example, the 'subscriptions' of the Bishops themselves. The representatives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem at the Fourth Synod of Constantinople (which though not an Œcumenical Council was regarded by some as such),[2] used the terms *definiens subscripsi*,[3] which necessarily describe an act final and conclusive,[4] so also is the action of the Bishops collectively in Synod described.

The Fathers of the Second Council, for instance, say in their letter to the Emperor Theodosius, 'We have confirmed the faith—*fidem confirmavimus*—of the Fathers who assembled at Nicæa.' The action of these same Fathers is described in similar language by the Imperial Representatives at the Council of Chalcedon: 'The Synod of the one hundred and fifty assembled under Theodosius the Great confirmed the same faith'—*ipsam fidem confirmavit*.[5]

St. Leo says of the definition of the faith of the Synod of Chalcedon in his letter to the Emperor Leo, that 'which in our days at Chalcedon was confirmed—*firmatum est*—concerning the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, this also at Nicæa the mystical number of

[1] Mansi, xiii. 569.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 915.

[3] Mansi, xvi. 190. 'Ignatius misericordia Dei episcopus Constantinopoleos novæ Romæ sanctam hanc et universalem synodum suscipiens et omnibus quæ ab ea judicata, et scripta sunt concordans, et definiens subscripsi manu propria.'

[4] *Vide supra*, n. 292.

[5] Mansi, vii. 9, 10.

the Fathers defined'—*definivit*;[1] and in the *Edict* of the Emperor Marcian after the Council of Chalcedon it is said, 'The most religious Bishops came from different provinces according to our precepts and taught by clear definition—*definitione docuerunt*—what ought to be observed in religion. . . . Injury is done to the judgment of the most religious Synod if any one endeavours to reopen and publicly to dispute about things once judged and rightly decided, since these things which have now been determined—*statuta sunt*—concerning the Christian faith are acknowledged to have been defined—*definita esse*—according to the Apostolic exposition and the statutes—*statuta*—of the three hundred and eighteen Holy Fathers and of the one hundred and fifty. . . . All therefore ought to guard what have been determined by the Sacred Synod of Chalcedon, raising no doubts after it.'[2] . . . These instances are sufficient to show that the assertion of the *Satis Cognitum* with reference to the 'ratification' or rejection of the decrees of Councils by the Roman Pontiff is contradicted by the way in which the Acts of the Episcopate assembled in an Œcumenical Council were regarded as final.

Section CXXXVII.—*The meaning of the Confirmation by Bishops of the Decrees of a Council.*

1040. In the arguments in the foregoing sections a distinction has been pointed as existing between 'Papal' confirmation of the Acts of Councils as asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to be necessary, and the 'confirmation' which Bishops gave to those Acts. It has been maintained that on the evidence 'Papal' confirmation was unknown to the Church of the Councils as being required to give force to the decrees of Councils and œcumenicity to Synods, and that the Bishops of Rome can only be said to have been admitted by the Church to have 'confirmed' the decrees of Councils in the same sense as other Bishops did, and not as 'the Supreme Pastor' of the 'One Flock,' the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College.'

1041. This Episcopal 'confirmation' was simply the recognition by Bishops who were not present at any particular Synod of the decrees made by such Synod; they are thus said to 'confirm' them in the same way as those who are present at a Council are said to 'confirm' the Canons when they decree them by their votes. The Bishops thus 'ratified' the decrees by their adherence to them, and they were thus strengthened by their authority, seeing that by their action they become of force in another diocese, or if the 'confirmation' was given by a Provincial Synod, in another Province, as the case might

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Leonem Augustum*, Ep. clxii.; P.L. liv. 1144.
[2] Mansi, vii. 475-8.

be. For the purpose of obtaining this 'confirmation' the decrees of Councils were sent to absent Bishops, who on receiving them considered them, exercising the power of ratifying them by their assent or rejecting them by formally withholding it. An example of the procedure in such cases is to be found in the case of the Sixth Œcumenical Council. Pope Leo. II., the successor of Agatho, sent the *gesta synodalia* of the Council to the Spanish Bishops, not one of whom had been present at the Synod. No invitation to the Council would appear to have been sent to them, and they did not know it had been held. Leo requested their recognition of these *gesta*. Leo died, and his successor Benedict II. wrote another letter[1] to the same effect. It not being possible to convoke another Spanish National Synod, as King Ervig wished, Provincial Synods were ordered to be held, of which that of Toledo was commanded to take the lead. To that Synod every Metropolitan was ordered to send a Vicar, with the object that the other Provinces might accept its decrees. This Synod, known as the Fourteenth Synod of Toledo, assembled in November A.D. 684. At it the *gesta* sent were compared with the decrees of the earlier Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and found to be in complete agreement with them.

1042. Bossuet gives the following account of the decree made at this Council: 'They pass a decree in these terms: "We have received the Acts of the Council, and with the Acts the invitatory letter of the Pontiff of old Rome: by which letter the Bishops of Spain were asked that the aforesaid Synodal decrees might have force, supported by the authority of our power." Here in plain words the authority of the Spanish Bishops is required. "We then determined for the satisfaction of the Roman Pontiff to confirm the said Acts." And a little after "that both Acts may pass through a Synodical examination and be ratified by a distinct authority of Councils" (*i.e.* of Spain), and this they wish done after, as they say, "they have again been passed in review by Synodical examination or approved by the common judgment of all the Councils." Lastly, "comparing the aforesaid Acts with the ancient Councils we have approved them . . . and therefore the Acts of the aforesaid Council are to be venerated by us, and shall be received and enforced in so far as they do not depart from the beforementioned Councils" (Nicæa and the others). Here is deliberation, here is an exact examination according to a certain rule, viz., the faith of the Fathers and ancient Councils, and after that examination and not otherwise the Acts are confirmed.'[2]

1043. The Council, it is clear, did not conceive that the decrees of

[1] Hefele thinks that it may be possible that the letter to King Ervig generally attributed to Leo may belong to Benedict (*op. cit.*, bk. xvii. 325. [E.T. v. 215]).

[2] Bossuet, *op. cit.*, pars. iii. lib. vii., c. xxix. vol. ii. p. 52. Lugani, 1765.

the Sixth Council were binding on them because they had been 'confirmed' by Leo. That Bishop had given his assent to them, but to them such 'ratification' was no higher nature *per se* than that given by any other Bishop. They held themselves perfectly free to 'ratify' or reject the decrees, and it was not until the matter had been thoroughly examined that they 'confirmed' them. The method of examination adopted by them likewise testifies to their entire freedom of action in the matter, for they compared the decrees with the first Four Councils; they did not take the Fifth into consideration, since the Spanish Bishops, largely influenced by their connection with Africa, did not receive that Synod, consequently they placed this Synod next to Chalcedon. The weight of this testimony to the real nature of the 'confirmation' of a Synod by the Roman Bishop is the more striking as the Spanish Bishops were Westerns, and likely to be influenced by the one 'Apostolic See' which existed in the West, through which, as already observed, all communications between East and West usually passed.[1]

1044. Again, when Hadrian I. in A.D. 790 sent a copy of the Acts of the Seventh Synod to Charlemagne he caused an elaborate answer —the *Libri Carolini*—to be drawn up directed against the practices which that Council had sanctioned. Hadrian's reply to this manifesto did not satisfy Charlemagne who, having succeeded in disseminating his opinions by means of Alcuin in England, procured the attendance of some English Bishops at the great Synod which he convoked on the subject. The Council met at Frankfort A.D. 794. The assembled Fathers 'rejected with contempt and unanimously condemned the adoration and service' which the new Synod of the Greeks had declared should be paid to images.[2] It is to be observed that the point is not whether the Fathers took a right or a wrong view of what the Seventh Synod had done, but that German, French, and English Bishops, like their brethren of Spain, did not consider that the assent which Hadrian had given to the Acts of that Synod clothed them with such authority that they were compelled to accept them at once as

[1] The same ignorance of the existence of Papalism on the part of the Spanish Bishops is shown by the way in which they treated the request of Benedict II. that certain alterations should be made in some passages of the *Liber responsionis fidei nostri*, which they had sent to Rome in order to testify their agreement with the Fathers of the Sixth Council. Not only did they not respond to his request, made, be it noted, by one who, according to Papalism, was their 'Master,' 'whose real and sovereign authority they were bound to obey,' but besides defending their doctrine they concluded thus: that 'if any (*i.e.* including the occupant of the Roman See) should in any respect disagree with their doctrine and the dogmas of the Fathers from which it was taken they would no longer contend with them, but, walking in the footsteps of their fathers, their answer will by the divine judgment be to the lovers of truth of the highest weight, even if it should be considered unlearned by ignorant rivals.'—Mansi, xii. 17.

[2] Mansi, xiii. 909.

decrees which had been 'ratified' by the Supreme Pastor. They held themselves free to consider whether or not they should 'confirm' these decrees themselves, Hadrian's assent thereto being thus considered by them to be of like nature as that which they as Bishops could give if they so thought fit, and not, as the *Satis Cognitum* declares, of an essentially different and unique nature as that of the 'Master' of the 'Episcopal College' by which these decrees had received validity—a ratification which could not be impeached since it was that 'of the Vicar of Christ.' The result of the Frankfort Synod was that since the Bishops did not 'confirm' the decrees of the Seventh Synod, these decrees had no authority in their respective dioceses, and this continued to be the case until the Bishops of these dioceses gave their assent to and so 'confirmed' the said decrees.

1045. The proceedings of these Councils furnish evidence as to the meaning of the 'confirmation' of the decrees of a Council by Bishops to whom they have been sent on account of their absence from the Synod. Such ratification was an Episcopal act which the Bishops were free to give or withhold in the exercise of their power as members of the One Episcopate. The 'ratification' by the Roman Bishop was of like nature with that given by any other Bishop, and consequently no more gave 'validity' to the Acts of a Synod than did that of his brother Bishops. The 'confirmation' of the Acts of great Synods by all Bishops not present therein was no doubt much desired, as such ratification extended the area within which the authority of the Synods was recognised, and the fact that all the Œcumenical Synods were held in the East—but very few Westerns being present at them—would no doubt make the members of some of them particularly anxious that the 'confirmation' of the Bishop of Rome should be obtained. Since as it was through the Roman Bishop the East held intercourse with the Western Church as a rule, such 'confirmation' would lead to the probability, though not, as has been seen, to the certainty of their Acts being 'confirmed' by the Western Episcopate;[1] but in itself such 'confirmation' was the same in nature and essence as that given by his fellow-members of the One Episcopate.

SECTION CXXXVIII.—*The Papalist argument sought to be based on the rejection by the Roman Pontiffs of the decrees of certain Councils examined.*

1046. The allegation of the *Satis Cognitum* is thus shown by the evidence to be untrue. But, it may be said, does not the *Satis Cognitum* support its assertion with proof declaring that 'Leo the Great rescinded the acts of the conciliabulum of Ephesus, Damasus

[1] On the manner in which a Synod attains Œcumenical Authority, *vide* note 61.

rejected those of Rimini, and Hadrian I. those of Constantinople? The twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, by the very fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See, is admitted by all to be worthless.'[1] In considering these four statements the precise position in support of which they are adduced must be carefully borne in mind. That position is that by the rejection by the Roman Pontiffs of the decrees of Councils, such decrees have no validity whatever, it being according to Papalism 'the Office' of the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College' to decide finally whether or not such decrees would have validity and thus be binding on the Church. From this it follows that such decrees as were rejected by the Supreme Pastor, because of such rejection, and on no other ground, would of necessity be regarded by the Church as null and void.

SECTION CXXXIX.—*Why the Church rejected the Council of Ephesus* A.D. 449.

1047. To take the first of the four statements of the *Satis Cognitum*. The Council of Ephesus A.D. 449 was not rejected by the Church simply because of any action taken by St. Leo. On the contrary, its proceedings were vitiated from the commencement. The intimidation exercised by Dioscurus who presided, the unfairness of the procedure adopted, the way in which the Bishops were compelled to affix their names to a blank paper at the close of the Synod so that they might not have any opportunity of further considering the judgment which had been pronounced on Flavian as Patriarch of Constantinople and Eusebius, the horrible treatment of Flavian under which he succumbed, all combined to ensure its non-recognition by the Church. Whilst St. Leo and a Roman Synod, as we learn from a letter of the Deacon Hilarus to Pulcheria,[2] repudiated all that had been done at Ephesus against the Canons, other Bishops did the same. In fact Christendom was divided. The West, with the Bishops of Syria, Pontus, and Asia, held with Flavian; Egypt, Thrace, and Palestine, with Dioscurus of Alexandria and the Emperor Theodosius II., supported the Council; and the final rejection of the Council was accomplished by the Council of Chalcedon, as is plain upon the authority of St. Leo himself. For in a letter to Juvenal of Jerusalem he said, 'Christ destroyed by the holy authority of the Council of Chalcedon that detestable judgment of the Synod of Ephesus.'[3] A similar statement is also found in his letter to the Emperor Leo,

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[2] Hilarus Diaconus, *Ep. ad Pulcheriam Augustam, inter Epp. S. Leonis*, Ep. xlvi.; P.L. liv. 837-40.

[3] S. Leo, *Ep. ad Juvenalem Epis. Hierosolym.* Ep. xxxix.; P.L. liv. 1103.

viz., that 'the holy Synod of Chalcedon did away with the crime' of Dioscurus at the Ephesine Synod.[1] The statement in the *Satis Cognitum* is thus inaccurate.

Section CXL.—*Why the Church rejected the Council of Ariminum* A.D. 359.

1048. As to the second statement, the Council at Ariminum (now Rimini) was convoked at the same time as that of Seleucia by the Emperor Constantine. The former was to be attended by Westerns, the latter by Easterns; this arrangement having been brought about by the strict Arians, who were afraid that if a 'great Synod took place the Semi-Arians and Orthodox would probably make common cause in censuring the Anomæan doctrine.'[2] They further managed that an ambiguous formulary should be drawn up by Bishop Marcus of Arethusa before their departure from Sirmium, for the Synod which, whilst it did not do any harm to the Anomæans, would satisfy the Emperor and the Semi-Arians. This formula—the fourth and last Sirmian formula, not the third[3]—was read at the Council of Rimini by Valens of Mursa and others, who declared that it had already been confirmed by the Emperor and was now to be accepted universally without discussion as to the sense which individuals might attach to the words. They further endeavoured to deceive the Westerns, whom they regarded as simple, by arguing that the terms ὁμοούσιος, and ὁμοιούσιος which had caused so much dissension were not contained in Holy Scripture, and therefore the use of both ought to be discontinued. The Orthodox, however, were not deceived, and the Synod unanimously approved the decision of the Council of Nicæa and pronounced an anathema on each separate point of Arianism and deposed Valens and others as heretics.

1049. The result of this was that the Orthodox and Arian parties commenced to hold separate meetings at Rimini. Both parties sent deputies to the Emperor. The Arians arriving first, they succeeded in obtaining the assistance of the Arianising Constantius. The Orthodox were consequently blamed for their conduct, and their deputies ordered to remain at Adrianople, whence they were sent to Nicæa. These deputies by means of fraud and deception of all kinds, accompanied by violence and oppression, were induced by the Arians to sacrifice the decisions of their own Synod and to accept a new formula—similar to the Fourth Sirmian, drawn up by Valens, Ursacius and the other Arian deputies—a formula which, owing to

[1] S. Leo, *Ep. ad Leonem Aug.*, Ep. lvi. cap. i.; P.L. liv. 1128.
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 82. [E.T. ii. 248.]
[3] *Ibid.* [E.T. ii. 249.]

the fact that the deputies were at Nicæa when they thus accepted it, might be called Nicene, and thus the Arians be aided in deceiving the less instructed by its title. They returned to Rimini, and though at first the Orthodox refused to have anything to do with them owing to their conduct, ultimately yielding to pressure they all accepted a formulary which was unorthodox. Many indeed of the Bishops were deceived, not rightly understanding the matter, and considered that they had won the victory. The formulary thus adopted was afterwards accepted by the deputies which had been sent to the Court at Constantinople from the Synod of Seleucia, so that the representatives of both East and West gave their assent to this formula, and thus, as St. Jerome says, 'The whole world groaned and marvelled to find itself Arian.'[1]

1050. But this was merely an external union. St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Gregory of Nyssa made great efforts on behalf of Orthodoxy, and gradually various Synods declared themselves in favour of the Nicene Confession. St. Damasus, the successor of Liberius, was orthodox, and held various Synods for the establishment of the faith. From one of these held at Rome, probably in A.D. 369, a Synodal letter was sent to the Bishops of the East in which it was said: 'No disadvantage ought to arise from the number of those who were present at Ariminum, since it is plain that neither the Roman Bishop, whose opinion ought before all to be sought, nor Vincent (of Capua) who had served the priesthood so many years blamelessly, nor others, gave any assent to the decrees of this kind, besides especially, as we have said, the very ones who appeared to have succumbed to the attack have protested that it grieves them.'[2] The ground taken in this letter is that the Orthodox had rejected the decrees of the Synod of Rimini, and that many who had assented to them had recanted; therefore, notwithstanding the number of Bishops present at its proceedings, it had no weight. The Synodal letter thus gives the real reason why the Synod of Rimini has never been received as œcumenical. The Bishops who were not present at it, and forming a great portion of the One Episcopate, did not 'confirm' its decisions but rejected them, consequently the *Satis Cognitum* is inaccurate in alleging that the cause of their rejection was the rejection thereof by St. Damasus in virtue of the office Papalists allege him to have held as the 'Supreme Pastor,' 'Vicar of Christ,' and 'Master' of the 'Episcopal College.'

[1] S. Hieron, *Dial. contra Luciferanos*, n. 19; P.L. xxiii. 172.
[2] Mansi, iii. 459.

SECTION CXLI.—*Why the Church rejected the Council of Constantinople* A.D. 754.

1051. The third statement has reference to the Council of Constantinople held in A.D. 754. This Council was summoned by the Emperor Constantine Copronymus with the object of obtaining a prohibition of the veneration of images. There were three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops present, over whom presided Theodosius, Archbishop of Ephesus, Anastasius the Patriarch of Constantinople having died the previous year, and the Patriarchates of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem not being represented.[1] The three Patriarchs Cosmas of Alexandria, Theodore of Antioch, and Theodore of Jerusalem, together with the Bishops under their jurisdiction anathematised Iconoclasm.[2] The general rejection of this Council was adduced by the Fathers of the Seventh Council in their sixth Session, in which it was said of it, 'How was it great and œcumenical when the Prelates of other Churches neither received nor agreed with, but anathematised, it? It had not the co-operation of the then Pope of the Romans or the Priests [*i.e.* Bishops] about him, neither by his representatives nor by his *Encyclical Letters* as in the law of Councils. Nor had it the agreement of the Patriarchs of the East, of Alexandria, Antioch, and the Holy City, or of the ministrants and High Priests with them.'[3]

1052. The fact that 'the Pope of the Romans,' and 'the Priests' [Bishops] about him did not co-operate in the Council is especially remarked on, for such co-operation was held to be of great importance, for it was the means by which the assent of the Westerns was signified, such co-operation being usually given, as in the case of the Council of Ephesus,[4] by means of legates sent to the Synod, or by *Encyclical Letters*, or both. It is clear that the Fathers of the Seventh Council knew nothing of any unique power inherent in the Roman Pontiff *jure divino* to decide finally whether the decrees of any Council were to be received or rejected, for they place the co-operation of the 'Bishops about him' on the same level with his, and name the fact that the Eastern Patriarchs and the Bishops of their Patriarchates had refused to ratify these decrees. They adduce the fact that a large proportion of the One Episcopate had not confirmed the decrees of this Council, and that and not the rejection of it by 'the Roman Pontiff,' as the Supreme Pastor, is the reason why they declare that it

[1] Theophanes, *Chronographia*, vol. i. p. 659. Edit. Bonn. Quoted Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xviii. ch. i. sect. 336. [E.T. vol. v. p. 308.]

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xviii. ch. i. sect. 340. [E.T. vol. v. p. 328.]

[3] Mansi, xiii. 208.

[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 378, 739, 740.

is not œcumenical. The statement of the *Satis Cognitum* as to this Synod is therefore inaccurate.

1053. It may be added that it is somewhat unfortunate that the *Satis Cognitum* should have made the allegation it does with reference to Hadrian's non-reception of this Council of Constantinople, for, as has been shown,[1] the fact that he 'confirmed' the decrees of the Seventh Council did not influence the Frankish Bishops to accept that Council, so that Hadrian's 'ratification' in the one case, and his 'rejection' in another case, afford a singular disproof of the allegation of the *Satis Cognitum* as to the effects necessarily resulting from the action of 'the Supreme Pastor.'

Section CXLII.—*The position of Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon.*

1054. The assertion made by the *Satis Cognitum* that 'the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, by the very fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See, is admitted by all to be worthless,'[2] has been already shown to be contrary to fact.[3] The result of the investigation into its accuracy shows that the statement of the *Satis Cognitum* that 'it has ever been unquestionably the office of the Roman Pontiffs to ratify or to reject the decrees of Council,' is disproved by facts,—'Papal' confirmation of the decrees of a Council being unknown in the age of the Œcumenical Synods, and thus certainly not a necessary condition to such Synods being held by the Church to be of œcumenical authority.

Section CXLIII.—*Pope Gelasius on the Authority of the First See.*

1055. The *Satis Cognitum*, however, refers, in proof of its discredited allegation, to the statement of 'Gelasius on the decrees of Councils.' 'That which the First See has not approved cannot stand; but that which it has thought well to decree has been received by the whole Church' (Epist. xxvi. ad Episcopos Dardaniæ, n. 5).

An assertion of this character made by an interested party can be clearly of no weight as against the evidence which has been adduced in disproof of the position in support of which the citation is made. This must be especially true in the case of one who during his short 'Pontificate' was active in developing the claims of his See. For example, when in consequence of the action of Felix P. II. in pronouncing sentence of degradation and excommunication against Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople,[4] there was a complete breach of communion between East and West which lasted thirty-five years, it was alleged

[1] *Vide supra*, 1044.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 446 *et seq.*
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 925.

on behalf of Acacius that he had not recognised Peter Mongus as Patriarch of Alexandria in the place of John Telaia, who, in spite of his oath that he would not be a candidate for the See, had been elected to the vacant throne[1] without having first absolved him, Gelasius, who had succeeded Felix, replied: 'Since without me you have not the right of absolving or receiving properly a person in such a position, it is plain that he was not acquitted lawfully or regularly. . . . For so long as my sentence against him remains, you having no right without me to undo my sentence, by what power is he either asserted to have been judged, or by what authority received?'[2] The claim here made shows how great an advance Papalism had made since the days of St. Julius and St. Ambrose, when even the far more moderate claims made on behalf, not of the Bishop of Rome alone, but on behalf of the Bishops of the West, were repudiated by the Easterns.[3] In other ways the development of the Papal claims is manifest from the writings of Gelasius. He asserts that the Lord Christ delegated the 'chief government—*gubernatio principalis*—of the whole Church'[4] to St. Peter and therefore to the occupant of 'the Apostolic See' as his successor, a claim of supremacy over the whole Church emphasised by assertion of the right in virtue of the *principatus* which blessed Peter received by the voice of them to confirm Synods.[5] He asserts, too, 'that the See of blessed Peter the Apostle has the right of reversing the sentences of any Bishops whatsoever and the right of judging every Church, nor is it lawful for any one to judge concerning his judgments since indeed the Canons allowed appeals to be made to it from any part of the world, but no one was permitted to appeal from it.' That 'the Apostolic See has the power by the custom of our ancestors, even without a Synod, both of absolving those whom a Synod had unjustly condemned and without a Synod condemning those whom it thought fit.'[6] Such far-reaching claims on behalf of a divinely conferred 'primacy,' unsupported by an atom of proof, are so unhistorical that the testimony of the Pope who made them must be accounted as utterly worthless for the purpose for which it is adduced by the *Satis Cognitum*. The accuracy of the statement cited by the *Satis Cognitum* is on a par with that of these assertions, as it is also with that of other statements of the same writer. For instance, in a letter to Faustus, the legate of King Theodoric, he says: 'They,' the Eastern Bishops, 'set against us the Canons, not knowing what they say; against which they betray their opposition by this very

[1] Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 20; P.G. lxxxvi. 2637.
[2] Gelasius, *Ep. ad. Episcopos Orientales*, Ep. xv.; P.L. lix. 91.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 704 *et seq.*, 540 *et seq.*
[4] Gelasius, *Ep. ad Æonium Arelatensem Episcopum*, Ep. xii.; P.L. lix. 60.
[5] *Ep. ad Episcopos Dardaniæ*, Ep. xiii.; P.L. lix. 63.
[6] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*; P.L. lix. 66, 67.

thing, that they shrink from obeying the First See when it advises them soundly and rightly. It is the Canons themselves which have ordered that appeals from the whole Church should be deferred to the examination of this See. But they have decreed that no appeal anywhere should be in any case made from it, and by this it should judge of the whole Church, while it should come itself before no man's judgment, nor have they ordered that judgment should ever be passed on its judgment, but appointed that its sentence should not be annulled, but rather its sentence observed.'[1]

1056. The argument here of Gelasius requires that he should be referring to Canons acknowledged by the whole Church to possess œcumenical authority; it is hardly necessary to observe that no such 'Canons' are producible. Evidence sufficient has been given in proof of this one. On the other hand, there are Canons which do possess such authority, viz., Canons IX. and XVII. of the Council of Chalcedon, by which the Patriarch of Constantinople was made the judge of Final Appeal in cases which arose in the East, a fact which Gelasius characteristically ignores, even sneering at Constantinople in another place as being a mere suffraganate of Heraclea.[2]

1057. It is probable that Gelasius is here referring to the 'Sardican Canons,' attributing them, as had done his predecessors Zosimus[3] and Celestine,[4] to the Council of Nicæa, and so possessed of œcumenical authority. This misuse of these 'Canons' had, it is true, been shown up many years before by the African Bishops, but this did not prevent this 'Roman' usage of these 'Canons' being continued—Innocent I.[5] and St. Leo the Great citing as Nicene a few years after,[6] a practice which was followed by Felix II. the immediate predecessor of Gelasius.[7] Gelasius would thus simply furnish another instance of the untrustworthy character of the witness of Popes to the position of their See.

1058. Yet the statement, inaccurate as it is itself, is incompatible with the 'Papalism' it is cited to support. For Gelasius it ascribes the right of receiving appeals and the final character of the judgments pronounced in such appeals by the Roman Bishops to the Canons. But on Papalist principles the right itself, and the conclusive nature of the judgments pronounced in accordance with that right, form part of the divinely conferred prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs as the legitimate successors of Peter, possessing by the institution of Christ full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church.

1059. Gelasius, indeed, seems, in his anxiety to push the claims of

[1] Gelasius, *Ep. ad Faustum*, Ep. iv.; P.L. lix. 28.
[2] *Ep. ad Episcopos Dardaniæ*, Ep. xiii.; P.L. lix. 66.
[3] *Vide* nn. 610, 775.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 620.
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 334.
[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 329, 402.
[7] *Vide infra*, n. 925.

his See, doomed to show the untenable character of those claims by his inaccuracy. Not only did he in this case appeal either to 'Canons' which had no existence, or to Canons which neither had the authority[1] (as he must have known) which he asserts they had, nor conferred any such unlimited power as he alleged on the Bishops of Rome, but his inaccuracy is shown in other statements also. For instance, when setting forth in lofty terms what he asserted to be the prerogatives of his See, he says: 'For with what reason or consistence are other Sees to meet with deference, if the ancient and time-honoured reverence is not paid to the First See of the most blessed Peter, by which the dignity of all priests has ever been strengthened and confirmed, and for which, by the all-prevailing and peculiar judgment of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers, its most ancient honour was maintained.'[2] In these words Gelasius refers to Canon VI. of Nicæa in language which shows that he was making use of the 'version' which St. Leo's legates had brought forward at Chalcedon,[3] and which had at once been conclusively shown not to be the genuine text. Besides which he assumes *more Romano* that the glosses put upon this corrupted text give its real meaning, whereas, as a matter of fact, the 'corruptor' did not do his work thoroughly enough to afford a basis for these glosses, inasmuch as in the state in which he left the Canon the wording of it is such as to leave the Roman See still on the same level as the other great Sees mentioned in it,[4] which is in direct conflict with the teaching of Papalism on the subject.

1060. So again, when in a decree in a Roman Council, A.D. 494, Gelasius, adopting a previous decree of Pope Damasus in the Council of Rome, A.D. 378,[5] on the subject, laid down that 'the second See was consecrated at Alexandria in the name of blessed Peter by Mark, his disciple and evangelist. And he himself being sent by Peter the Apostle into Egypt, preached the word of truth, and consummated a glorious martyrdom. The third See of the most blessed Peter is had in honour at Antioch, because he dwelt there before he came to Rome, and there first arose the name of Christians for the new people.'[6] Gelasius overreached himself, the form of the assertion itself betraying its inaccuracy, for it is plain that foundation by St. Peter personally was a greater honour than foundation by his disciple, so that Antioch,

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 325 *et seq.*

[2] Gelasius, *Ep. sive Tractatus*, Ep. xiv.; P.L. lix. 30.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 425, 426.

[4] *Vide supra*, n. 318.

[5] There is no doubt that certain parts of this decree *de recipiendis et non recipiendis libris*, the first third of the decree, is of the time of S. Damasus. Mr. C. H. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. p. 559, gives as authorities for this A. Thiel, Professor Friedrich Maassen, and Professor Theodor Zahn. Hefele (*op. cit.*, bk. xii. sect. 217 [E.T. iv. 43]) is of the same opinion.

[6] Gelasius (*Concilium Romanum*, A.D. 494), *Decretum de Apocryphis Scripturis*, lix. 159.

according to the Gelasian principle, ought to have occupied the second place in the hierarchy of the Church, whilst it is worth noting that Eusebius, who gives the ancient tradition that St. Mark was the founder of the Alexandrian Church, says nothing whatever about his being sent by St. Peter to do so in his name.[1] In fact, the precedence actually accorded to the great Sees shows that the principle adopted by the Church in settling the question of the precedence to be accorded to the See of New Rome was the same as that embodied in the 'ancient custom' of the Fathers by which that precedence had been decided.

1061. There can be no doubt that the principles by which Gelasius guided himself in his active efforts to advance the pretensions of the See were by this date largely admitted in the West. Hence at a Roman Council held in the year A.D. 495 the Bishops present at it, some forty-five in number, probably drawn from the adjacent parts of Italy, in the acclamations with which they greeted a speech made by Gelasius to the Council, called him several times 'Vicar of Christ,' and many times exclaimed: 'May he hold the years of the See of Peter during the years of Peter!'[2] In the East, however, these pretensions were differently received. There the Catholic conception of the Constitution of the Church was steadily upheld. The claims made by Felix, the predecessor of Gelasius, in the case of Acacius, were strenuously resisted,[3] resistance which was maintained when those claims were upheld by Gelasius and his successors. In fact, the Easterns regarded the Westerns as *having separated themselves from the East.*[4] The Bishops of Rome had made an unjust aggression on their rights, the result of which had been that communion ceased between East and West—therefore the fault lay with them and not with the Easterns.

1062. What has been said is sufficient to show that the statement of Gelasius cited in the *Satis Cognitum* is valueless for the purpose for which it is quoted, not only because of its inaccuracy, not only because it was made by a Roman Bishop, and so not a competent witness, but also because that Roman Bishop is clearly one who developed and pushed forward those 'Petrine Claims' which St. Leo the Great had formulated and advanced to a considerable extent, and for which, moreover, he had succeeded in obtaining the recognition of the civil power in the West.

SECTION CXLIV.—*Value of the Papalist assertion as to the relation of the Roman Pontiffs to Councils.*

1063. The *Satis Cognitum* draws its conclusion from the 'arguments' which have been considered as follows: 'Rightly, therefore, has Leo X.

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. xvi.; P.G. xx. 174.
[2] Mansi, viii. 184.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 915 *et seq.*
[4] Vide *Cyril. Scythopolis Vita*, lib. i. cap. i., quoted Puller, *op. cit.*, 286.

laid down in the Fifth Council of Lateran "that the Roman Pontiff alone, as having authority over all Councils, has full jurisdiction and power to summon, transfer, to dissolve Councils, as is clear not only from the testimony of Holy Writ, from the teaching of the Fathers and of the Roman Pontiffs, and from the decrees of the sacred canons, but from the teaching of the very Councils themselves."'[1]

The 'conclusion' necessarily can have no greater value than that warranted by the premises. But these premises have been discussed and found to be worthless, hence the 'conclusion' is in the same plight. Leo X.'s assertion in the Bull *Pastor Æternus* here quoted is in fact in flagrant contradiction to historical facts.[2] Indeed the introduction, into an *Encyclical* dealing with the Papal position, of a quotation from a Bull of a 'Roman Pontiff' of the sixteenth century, as expressing accurately the position of the Bishop of Rome, is a quaint device, in that to do so is to allege as authoritative on a question which bears on the truth of the Papalist claims made by Roman Pontiffs one of these claims, and this, too, as formulated at so late a date as that of Leo X., when those claims had become so largely developed—a proceeding which obviously offends against the well-known principle, *Nemo esse queat Judex in causâ propriâ*.[3]

SECTION CXLV.—*Value of the Papalist appeal to Holy Writ as showing the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff over the Episcopal College.*

1064. The *Satis Cognitum* finally appeals to Holy Writ as setting forth the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff in the Episcopal College in the following terms: 'Indeed, Holy Writ attests that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter alone, and that the promise of binding and loosing was granted to the Apostles and to Peter; but there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power *without* Peter, and *against* Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ.'[4]

The allegation that St. Peter alone received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven has already been disproved,[5] and it has been shown that to the Apostolate as a whole was granted that supreme power which is signified by 'the keys,' the power of 'binding and loosing,' and thus of acting as the representatives of Jesus Christ. All the Apostles received the same power, therefore, of course, 'including Peter.' The *Satis Cognitum*, however, by saying not 'without Peter,' it is plain, insinuates that Peter occupied an unique position, and that the Apostles only

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 286 *et seq.*
[3] Benedict XIV., *De Synodi Diœces.*, I. vii., c. xiv. Migne, *Theologiæ Cursus completus*, vol. xxv. p. 1067.
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.
[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 117 *et seq.*

received whatever power they possessed 'in conjunction with Peter,' 'through' him their 'Master,' and that, consequently, the power so conferred was exercised in subordination to Peter as supreme. The 'mediate' position thus assigned to Peter has been shown to be contrary to truth; the power conferred on 'the Apostolate,' including Peter as a member thereof, was so conferred 'immediately.'

1065. The Acts of the Apostolic College testify that they knew not that Peter was its divinely appointed 'Master.' As a member of the Apostolate—the first member if you will, but still a member, not the 'Master,'—according to Holy Writ he shared with his fellow-members the supreme power, but to the authority of the whole College he, as well as every other member thereof, was bound to defer, that being the authority which exercised supreme power as representing Christ. Whether it exercised that power 'against Peter' would, of course, in his case, as in the case of any member of the Apostolate, depend upon whether such exercise was needed or not. The fact that St. Paul, a member of the Apostolic College, withstood him to the face at Antioch, and that at the Council of Jerusalem St. Peter had a voice in deciding the question before the Council, but not the supreme power to finally decide it, clearly shows that such power could, if it had been necessary, have been exercised 'against Peter,' 'the Apostle of the Circumcision,' as it could have been similarly exercised against St. Paul, 'the Apostle of the Uncircumcision.'

1066. There is not, as has already been shown,[1] a shred of proof to be obtained from Holy Writ in support of the Papalist view of the position of St. Peter. On the contrary, it represents Peter as a member of the Apostolic College, clearly admitting its authority 'to send him' to Samaria and also to authoritatively recognise his mission to the Jews in the same way as St. Paul's to the Gentiles, whereas according to Papalism 'mission' should have been conferred by Peter on those 'sent' to Samaria, and St. Paul's field of labour assigned to him by 'the Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' to be accepted by him in due obedience to that 'Master' who possessed *jure divino* full and supreme power of jurisdiction over him and the whole Church, and consequently the right to commit to him his work and to receive from him that true obedience which is due to the sovereign authority of the Supreme Pastor. The appeal to Holy Writ is thus singularly infelicitous; witnessing as it does against the position asserted by Papalism to belong by the institution of Christ to Peter, it is thus also equally against the claims made by Papalism for the 'Roman Pontiffs' even if they were, as it has been proved they are not,[2] the 'legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate.'

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 903 *et seq.* [2] *Vide supra*, nn. 464 *et seq.*

SECTION CXLVI.—*Papalism asserted to be the belief of the Church in every age.*

1067. The monarchical position of the Roman Pontiffs over the Church, of which this supremacy of the Roman Bishop over Councils which has been disproved is an essential prerogative, next forms, in the *Satis Cognitum*, the subject of a declaration of the utmost importance: 'Wherefore, in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, no newly-conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age (sess. iv. cap. 3).'[1] This decree thus authoritatively expounded in the *Satis Cognitum* is asserted to have been the 'venerable and constant belief of every age.' This is a momentous statement.

1068. In the *Vatican Decrees* it is asserted that the Roman Pontiff has 'by the disposition of the Lord'[2] that supreme jurisdiction which is therein stated to be his. The words 'by the disposition of the Lord' might have been possibly held to have been susceptible of the interpretation that 'the disposition of the Lord' was gradually unfolded by the action of the Holy Spirit indwelling in the Church, developing from a germ to its present perfect conditions. Of course this would have needed the existence of such germ; that it did not exist is plain from Holy Writ, and the history of the first age of the Church; but apart from this the theory of a development from a germ is definitely excluded by the statement of the *Satis Cognitum*. The Roman Pontiffs according to it exercised supreme jurisdiction *jure divino* in the Church 'in every age,' *i.e.* from the very beginning of the Christian religion, and the whole of the powers which are necessarily included in such supremacy were according to it believed by the Church to belong by the institution of Christ to Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate, and to have been recognised from the very first and in every succeeding age to have been rightly exercised by them.

1069. If this be so, it follows that the history of the Church will be in perfect accord with the position laid down in the *Satis Cognitum*. Papalism will be proved by evidence unimpeachable—the facts of history—to have been in possession in every age. So momentous a power, necessary to the very continued existence of the Church, will be found in active use in all parts of the One Church, subject as the whole thereof is to the 'Master.' A definite issue is thus plainly raised. However regrettable it must be that the *Satis Cognitum*, in making this declaration, effectually shuts the door to any 'explanation' which might be made

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

in order to affix to the text of the *Vatican Decrees* such a signification which would bring them into harmony, if that were possible, with historical facts, it is at least satisfactory to know, and without possibility of mistake, that the Roman doctrine as to the monarchical position of the Roman Bishops over the Church is alleged by Papalism to have been accepted by the Church in *all ages* as *de fide*. The truth or falsity of the Papal claims can thus be ascertained without difficulty. It would not be sufficient to point to the possession by the Roman Bishops of a greater influence than that possessed by other Bishops, or to some undue power which the circumstances of their day enabled them to claim successfully, but it is necessary, in order to prove that Papalism is true, to adduce proof that the 'full plenitude of the supreme power of jurisdiction' was recognised by the Church in every age to belong, 'by the institution of Christ,' to the 'Roman Pontiffs'; nothing less than this would be sufficient to satisfy the statements of the *Satis Cognitum*; this is what those who submit to Rome must *ex animo* accept.

1070. No ingenious theory of development is then permissible. According to Papalism the Papal Monarchy is the principle of unity and the foundation of lasting stability to the Church. It is thus essential to its very existence, being the principal element in its constitution; it must *always* therefore have been in existence and so recognised. The *Satis Cognitum* rightly affirms this, and therefore labours to support its assertion by appealing to the past. The investigation into the statements which the *Satis Cognitum* makes in this endeavour has shown that they do not bear out those assertions, that is, that the so-called historical evidence adduced shows that the appeal made to the past on behalf of Papalism by its fautors is useless, much of that evidence being, indeed, by its date or by its being that of parties interested in advancing the claims of the Roman See, inadmissible, whilst the testimonies of the Fathers adduced have been found not to bear the meaning sought to be fixed thereto in the *Satis Cognitum*. On the other hand, in the course of the inquiry abundant evidence has been produced from the history of the Primitive Church, the Acts of the Councils, and the writings of the Fathers which proves the unhistorical character of the allegations made in the *Satis Cognitum*. From this it follows that the statement, bold and definite as it is, of the *Satis Cognitum* that the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff as embodied in it and the *Vatican Decrees* has been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' is contrary to fact, and therefore itself must be rejected as false; the *Satis Cognitum* itself being judge, since such 'venerable and constant belief in every age' would be according to its argument a necessary result of its truth.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE PAPALIST CONCEPTION OF THE POSITION OF THE BISHOPS

SECTION CXLVII.—*The power of the Bishops 'limited' and 'dependent.'*

1071. Consideration of the statements of the *Satis Cognitum* with reference to the 'power really their own' said therein to belong to the Bishops has shown that it is wholly subordinate to the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff, who alone possesses *jure divino* jurisdiction and is the unique source of whatever jurisdiction is exercised by the Bishops; it is thus a derived power in the same manner as that of the Apostles was, being conferred on them in conjunction with Peter in such a way as, in the words of St. Leo, it is 'from him as from the head' the Lord 'wishes His gifts to flow.'[1] Further, this power thus mediately received necessarily can only be retained so long as those upon whom it was so conferred remain in communion with 'Peter and his successors,' since by secession from them they would be 'separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice must rest.'[2] It is in accord with this that the position occupied by the Roman Pontiff towards the Episcopal College is declared to be that of 'Master,' having real and sovereign authority 'which is properly called jurisdiction,' a jurisdiction which extends to the entire Christian Commonwealth, the whole of which, 'even taken collectively,' is 'subject and obedient to' 'his authority.'[3] The Pope is thus 'Master' of the Episcopal jurisdiction, both of the Bishops individually and of the Episcopate collectively in Councils. In fact, so absolute is his power over the Episcopate that he can do anything, if not licitly at least validly, except decree its abolition. The Episcopal 'right and power of ruling' is clearly therefore very limited in nature. Mediately received through the 'Supreme Pontiff,' as from an ever-flowing stream, it can only be retained so long as union with that Pontiff, the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, is maintained. It can only be exercised in subjection to the full and supreme jurisdiction of the 'Master,' who exercises for ever in the Church, as the Vicar of Christ, that power which He exercised during His mortal life over the Apostolate. Hence

[1] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Episcopos per Prov. Viennensem constitutos*, Ep. x.; P.L. liv. 629.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35. [3] *Ibid.* p. 38.

it is something different in essence from that power which, according to the belief of the Primitive Church, each Bishop possessed by virtue of his holding the One Episcopate in joint tenure, the One Episcopate being as the successor of the One Apostolate the divinely appointed body to which the whole care of the government of the Church was confided. Jurisdiction, *i.e.* the government of the Christian people in the *forum externum* which comprehends all the exterior exercises of a pastoral authority, teaching, the legislative and judicial power, was thus held to be conferred on the Bishops in virtue of their consecration. As Van Espen says: 'We must observe, that the Lord Christ, in instituting His Apostles, did not separate from each other Episcopal Order and Episcopal Jurisdiction, but willed that the exercise of that spiritual Jurisdiction and power should dwell even primarily in them. "Receive," He says, "the Holy Ghost: as My Father sent Me, even so send I you." "Go ye, and teach all nations": "whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them." Which rule the Church subsequently observed in ordaining Bishops, successors of the Apostles: whence even to this day, in the consecration of a Bishop, the book of the holy Gospel is delivered to him by the ordainer with this salutary and necessary warning: "Receive the Gospel, and go, preach to the people committed to thee." And the consecrating Pontiff himself thus prays to God in the Preface, as it runs in the Roman Pontifical, and also in the Roman Ordinal: "Give to him, O Lord, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that he may use, not boast of, the power which Thou givest to edification and not to destruction. Whatsoever he shall bind on earth, etc. Grant to him, O Lord, the Episcopal chair, for the ruling of Thy Church and the people committed to him. Be Thou to him authority, and power, and strength." Would it not in truth be mocking God, if such charges were given at consecration in the solemn rite of ordaining, and asked of God in prayers poured forth and directed with a loud voice to heaven; and in the meantime neither the Pontiff ordaining, nor the Bishop to be ordained, should intend to become, or to do, what is ordered, or to obtain of God what they pray for? Observe likewise that it hence not obscurely inferred that Bishops receive their Jurisdiction from God Himself, but not from the Roman Pontiff. Moreover, for ten or eleven centuries, the Episcopal Order or Character, and the Episcopal Jurisdiction, or spiritual power and authority to rule the Church of God, were considered so united, and, so to speak, indivisible, that by the sacred Canons those ordinations were termed null and void, in which, though the Episcopal Character was impressed, yet, on account of their faultiness, Episcopal Jurisdiction or authority was withdrawn by the Church from those faultily ordained. So that these Bishops, though truly ordained, were degraded to the ranks of the laity, and were not considered Bishops even so far as the name.

Thus the Fathers of the Nicene Council decreed in their sixth Canon. If any one, they say, be made a Bishop contrary to the vote of the Metropolitan, the great Council hath decreed that he should not be a Bishop. Where those holy Fathers wish these two things to be synonymous, not to have Episcopal rule or Jurisdiction, and not to be a Bishop. Therefore the holy Fathers thought that Episcopal Order should not be conferred without Jurisdiction, being things which the Lord Christ seemed to have closely joined together. Moreover, the name itself of Bishop has more of a sound of Jurisdiction than of Order, for it signifies the inspecting, watching over, caring for, a thing: and thus the holy Fathers call him one set over, presiding. . . .' And a few pages further on, after considering the passages 'I will give thee the keys'[1] and 'Feed My sheep,' he continues: 'The sum of what has been adduced in this section is, that the Lord in promising the keys to Peter, and charging him to feed His sheep, did not appoint the supreme Pontiff the source of all Jurisdiction, whence it is derived to inferior ministers, but the Church herself, His Spouse, of whom Peter was the figure: that all Bishops in the person of the Apostles received from Christ an equal power of feeding the flock, under the authority, however, of the Church our mother, who, divinely instructed by her Bridegroom, prescribes to every one the manner and order of executing his ministry: that therefore, saving the pre-eminence of the First See, all the Prelates of the Church are equally the Vicars of Christ, taking care of the whole flock each according to their own measure, all succeeding to the Apostles, all being leaders and rams of the flock, prime members of the Shepherd, High-Priests, Fellow-Priests, Fellow-Ministers, and Brethren.'[2] Jurisdiction then, according to the Divine Constitution of the Church, is thus conferred upon Bishops duly consecrated by the Church to any See. They 'receive by succession the very authority of the Apostles, so that whatever the Apostles had of episcopal power, that is, of power concerned with the government of the Church, has been transferred by them into the Bishops, as their successors in the Church's administration and government,'[3] a very different conception, it must be acknowledged, of the power of Bishops to the 'limited' and 'dependent' power ascribed to them by the *Satis Cognitum*.

1073. The conclusions which have been drawn as the result of the consideration of this part of the *Satis Cognitum* are amply confirmed by its concluding portion. It is plain that the author of the *Satis Cognitum* felt that an objection might be raised to what had been laid down in it with reference to the position according to Papalism of Bishops in the

[1] Van Espen, *Vindiciæ Resolutionis Doctorum Lovaniensium*, Disquisitio Secunda, § iii. 7, 8, 9; *Op. Supplementum*, vol. v. p. 527. Bruxelles.

[2] *Op. cit.*, § vii. 14, *ibid.*, p. 538; *vide* also *supra*, n. 37.

[3] *Jus Eccl. Univers.*, pars 1, tit. xvi. 7; *Op.* i. p. 125. Lovanii, 1753.

Church, that it must beget confusion in the administration if Christians are bound to obey a twofold authority. How does the *Satis Cognitum* proceed to meet it? Does it do so by alleging that the authority of the Roman Pontiff and that of the Bishops have to do with essentially different spheres, so that it would be impossible for the two to clash, each being supreme in its own sphere? Clearly this course would have been inconsistent with what had been already laid down, as it would necessitate that the power of the Bishops should not be a power mediately derived 'through' a 'Master' and thus under his control as the source whence it is derived, and would also belong to them whether or not they remained in communion with that 'Master,' the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock. The *Satis Cognitum* meets the objection in the only way, therefore, open to it consistently with the principles which it has laid down.

Section CXLVIII.—*The authority of the Roman Pontiff 'supreme, universal,' and 'independent.'*

1074. It gives two replies to the objection named. 'We are prohibited, in the first place, by divine wisdom from entertaining any such thought, since this form of government was constituted by the counsel of God Himself. In the second place, we must note that the due order of things and their mutual relations are disturbed if there be a twofold magistracy of the same rank set over a people, neither of which is amenable to the other.'[1]

1075. The first of these replies assumes the truth of the allegation it has made, that Jesus Christ has appointed the Roman Pontiff as the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate to exercise full and supreme jurisdiction over the Universal Church; that allegation has been considered in detail and disproved. The Divine Wisdom has not placed us in the position of being obliged to reconcile what are irreconcilable positions, viz., that which according to Papalism belongs to the Roman Pontiff, and that which belongs *jure divino* to the Episcopate. The Divine Constitution of the Church precludes any possibility of any clashing between demands made on Christians by two authorities, inasmuch as there is only one authority which according to that Constitution has a right to their obedience, viz., the authority of the Episcopate, to which He committed the whole care of the government of the Church when He conferred on the Apostolate the right and power to represent Him without making any reservation in the grant of any authority and power.

1076. The second of these replies it is sought to establish by arguments which are of the utmost importance. It is declared that 'the

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 40.

authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, universal, independent; that of the Bishops limited and dependent.'[1] A few lines before the *Satis Cognitum* had expressly referred to as authoritative the *Decree* of the *Vatican Council* as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. In that *Decree*, as in the *Satis Cognitum*, the absolute character of that authority as being that of the Sovereign-Monarch of the whole Church is unmistakably set forth. He is declared to possess 'by the disposition of the Lord' 'the whole plenitude' of 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church,' and not 'merely the greater part' thereof, 'which is truly episcopal,' 'ordinary and immediate,' 'over all and each church and over all and each pastor and faithful,' 'to which all of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world.'[2]

1077. It has already been seen that the words stating that the Bishops 'exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule,' are by the context so explained and modified that such power is found to be both limited in extent and strictly subordinate to that of the Roman Pontiff.[3] The *Satis Cognitum* by its reference to the *Vatican Decrees* emphasises this in such a manner as to render it impossible that any other interpretation should be affixed to the description of the Episcopal power given by it. The power of the Roman Pontiff is asserted to be 'supreme, universal, independent,' and to be 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' and '*truly Episcopal*'—*vere episcopalis*. The supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, the whole plenitude—*tota plenitudo*—of which is declared to belong to the Roman Pontiff, is described as 'truly Episcopal'; this 'episcopal' jurisdiction is thus universal, that is, he who possesses it has the whole world for his diocese. It is most significant that these words *vere episcopalis* were inserted in the decree as passed by the Council, notwithstanding the objections which some of the Fathers of the Council had raised to words of similar import—*quæ proprie est episcopalis jurisdictionis potestas*—which appeared in the draft of the *Constitutio* as submitted to them,[4] and to the words themselves when they were inserted in the

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

[2] *Concil. Vatican.* sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484, 485.

[3] *Vide supra*, n. 1071.

[4] *E.g.*, '15. Vox Episcopalis, utpote inaudita, pravisque et periculosis interpretationibus favens, omnio eradatur.' '17. Petitur, ut in § 2 capitis III. expungantur verba "quæ proprie est episcopalis jurisdictionis," quia in præjudicium episcopalis potestatis exponi possunt, quasi non esset propria vel divini juris, sed tantum vicaria.' (*Emenda-*

draft as finally proposed in the General Congregation on the 13th July 1870, prior to being passed in the fourth Public Session on 16th July.[1] The objections raised make it quite clear what the reason was why these words were deliberately made part of the decree. The jurisdiction here asserted to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff is thus not defined as simply a Primatial Jurisdiction, but is declared to be 'Episcopal,' a declaration which is emphasised by the words 'immediate' and 'ordinary' used to describe it. There is nothing between it and the faithful. The Pope exercises it by right everywhere, and over all as the 'ordinary' of whatever place he may be so exercising it. Now it is plainly impossible that there should be two pastors in the same Church exercising 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' and 'truly *Episcopal*' 'power,' since in that case there might possibly arise a doubt as to which was to be obeyed—the very objection which the *Satis Cognitum* is here answering; it therefore follows that the power of the Bishop must be something less than this 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' 'and truly *Episcopal*' 'power.'

1078. That this is so, is clear from the fact that this latter power exercised by the Roman Pontiff is described as 'supreme' and 'independent.' This 'truly Episcopal power' being 'supreme,' if the Bishops are said to have 'the right and power of ruling,' 'as ordinary pastors,' 'the peoples over whom they rule,' such power can only be said to be a 'ruling' authority in that restricted sense in which an authority 'amenable' to a 'supreme' authority can be said to rule over those committed to it by the said 'supreme' authority which exercises immediate, ordinary, and truly episcopal jurisdiction over those so committed. Nor can it be objected to this that this power, whatever it may be, is described as the Bishops' 'own,' because 'the truly Episcopal' power of the Roman Pontiffs is further described as 'independent,' whilst that of the Bishops is described in the same connection as 'dependent.'

1079. Now the use of these terms in the respective cases is significant, and bears out what has been shown to be the real position of the Bishops according to the *Satis Cognitum*. By applying the term 'independent' to the 'supreme,' 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' and 'truly Episcopal' jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, the *Satis Cognitum* empha-

tiones a nonnullis Patribus in congregationibus generalibus factæ super capite III. *Constitutionis Dogmaticæ Primæ. Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 337, 338.)

[1] '31*a*. In Capite tertio ea expungantur, quæ conciliationi et desiderabili unanimitati Rmorum Patrum obstarent . . . vox *Episcopalis*,' etc. '31*b*. Ad Cap. III. Deleantur . . . verba "quæ vere Episcopalis est."' '31*d*. In Cap. III. . . . omittatur vox "Episcopalis," et si placet addatur "Apostolica."' '31*f*. . . . loco "Quæ vere episcopalis est," dicatur "Quæ vere primatialis est." (*Exceptiones in Constitutionem Dogmaticam Primam De Ecclesia Christi a nonnullis Patribus in Congregatione generali factæ. Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 438.)

sises the teaching that it is inherent in the Roman Pontiff 'by the disposition of Christ,' and not derived through any mediate channel, still less from any earthly source; it is a divinely conferred power on Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate. On the other hand, by describing the authority of the Bishops as 'dependent' as well as 'limited,' the *Satis Cognitum* emphasises the fact that it is a power subordinate to the 'truly Episcopal' 'power,' 'dependent' upon it, *i.e.* derived from it, as the Papal power is 'independent,' because conferred by our Lord Himself. This 'dependent' power is therefore said to be the Bishops' 'own,' not because inherent in an office as conferred by Christ, and thus 'independent,' but because they are the holders of an office to which such power is attached through derivation from the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' because, and so long as, that office is held in union with, and subjection to, the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock.

1080. It is plain then that the power of the Bishops is a subordinate power strictly 'limited' in character, necessarily derived directly or indirectly from the Supreme Pastor who possesses *jure divino* the whole plenitude of supreme jurisdiction, immediate, ordinary, and truly episcopal over the whole Church, by whom also the respective spheres wherein the Bishops are to exercise that 'dependent' authority in subjection to him are assigned. That this is the true meaning of the statements of the *Satis Cognitum* on this subject is confirmed by the citation made by it from St. Thomas in support of its allegations :—

'It is not congruous that two superiors with equal authority should be placed over the same flock; but that two, one of whom is higher than the other, should be placed over the same people is not incongruous. Thus the parish priest, the bishop, and the Pope are placed immediately over the same people' (St. Thomas *in* IV. *Sent.* dist. xvii. a. 4, ad. q. 4 ad. 3).[1]

Section CXLIX.—*The teaching of St. Thomas as to the relative positions of the Bishops and the Pope.*

1081. The example adduced by St. Thomas and adopted by the *Satis Cognitum* is full of significance. All admit that the authority of the Parish Priest is derived from the Bishop. It is a power which he exercises as Parish Priest, which is 'really his own,' but it is a delegated power which became 'his own' when he received the cure of souls in the parish from the Bishop at his institution thereto. It is a 'limited' and 'dependent' power derived from the superior, the Bishop, and exercised in subjection to and in union with Bishop from whom it is so derived. The position which the Bishop occupies towards the

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 40.

Pope is, according to St. Thomas here, like to that which the Parish Priest occupies towards the Bishop. The Bishop having been 'provided for' or 'confirmed' as Bishop and Pastor of a Church by the Pope, exercises within the limits thus assigned to him—his diocese—a power which is 'really his own,' and which became so when he was so 'provided' or 'confirmed.' St. Thomas, by thus enumerating the Parish Priest, the Bishop and the Pope in the way he does, sets forth the manner in which the Pope is 'higher' than the Bishop, viz., in the same sense as the latter is 'higher' than the Parish Priest, therefore it is that there can be no clashing of authority inasmuch as the Bishop's power is 'limited' and 'dependent' on that of the Supreme Pastor through whom it is derived, who having the whole plenitude of truly Episcopal jurisdiction is the sovereign authority which the whole community in every diocese is bound to obey; the dependent character of the Bishop's authority, exercised in subjection to the Roman Pontiff, preventing any difficulty as to obedience arising in the same way, as the 'dependent' authority of the Parish Priest prevents any such difficulty arising with regard to the obedience owed to the Bishop from whom that dependent authority is derived and in subjection to it is 'exercised in the' Parish.

1082. That this is St. Thomas' meaning in the passage cited is proved by the statements he makes elsewhere. He says, for instance: 'Superior and inferior power can exist in a twofold manner. Either, in the first place, that the inferior power may be derived altogether from the superior, and then the whole strength of the inferior is based upon the strength of the superior, and thus simply and in all things obedience must be rendered rather to the superior than to the inferior, and in this manner the power of God is situated with regard to any created power; so likewise the power of the Emperor is situated to that of the Proconsul; so also the power of the Pope is situated with regard to all spiritual jurisdiction in the Church, because by the Pope himself the different dignities in the Church are settled and ordained; whence his power is a certain foundation of the Church, as is evident from Matthew xvi. And therefore we are the rather held to obey the Pope rather than the Bishop or Archbishop, or a Monk the Abbot without any distinction; or, secondly, a superior and inferior power can be so situated towards each other that both may arise from a certain single supreme authority, and in this way the powers of a Bishop and Archbishop, derived from the power of the Pope, are situated towards each other.'[1]

[1] 'Potestas superior et inferior dupliciter possent se habere. Aut ita quod inferior potestas ex toto oriatur a superiore; et tunc tota virtus inferioris fundatur supra virtutem superioris, et tunc simpliciter et in omnibus est magis obediendum potestati superiori, quam inferiori; et sic se habet potestas Dei ad omnem potestatem creatam; sic etiam se

So again St. Thomas says: 'The Pope has the plenitude of pontifical power as the king in the kingdom, but the Bishops are taken into a share of his charge as judges are set over the different States.'[1]

1083. St. Thomas, it will be observed, argues that obedience is to be rendered to the superior power rather than the inferior, because the latter is derived from the former. He adduces as an instance, that obedience is to be rendered rather to the Pope than to the Bishop or Archbishop, whose authority, he declares, is derived from the Pope. This is the principle embodied in the citation in the *Satis Cognitum*. The Parish Priest derives his authority from the Bishop, who derives his from the Pope. All three are set over the same people; but the power of the Bishop and of the Parish Priest are obviously inferior to that of the Pope, being derived from his power. Therefore the power of the Pope is alone the true 'independent' power, and so there is no incongruity in the position any more than there is in the position of Emperor and Proconsul, who both exercise power over the same people.

1084. St. Thomas further compares the place occupied by the Pope with regard to the Church to that of a king in his kingdom, and that of the Bishop to that of judges appointed by the king. From this it follows that the power of the Bishop, like that of the judges to whom they are compared, is a derived and dependent one; his being derived from the Pope and dependent on him, as theirs is derived from the king and dependent on him. The whole teaching of the *Satis Cognitum* is in exact accord with what has been shown to be the meaning of the citation it makes from St. Thomas. The position it declares to belong to the Roman Pontiff *jure divino* is that of a monarch possessing real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey, with no power on earth superior thereto, and the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' as Christ was of the Apostolic College. The *Satis Cognitum* refers to the *Decree* of the *Vatican Council* as to the nature of the 'Primacy' of the Roman Pontiff as authoritative, and containing the true belief of the Church in every age on that subject, thus endorsing and accepting as its own the statements therein contained.

habet potestas Imperatoris ad potestatem proconsulis; sic etiam se habet potestas Papæ ad omnem spiritualem potestatem in Ecclesia: quia ab ipso Papae gradus dignitatum diversi in Ecclesia et disponuntur et ordinantur, unde ejus potestas est quoddam ecclesiæ fundamentum ut patet Matt. xvi. Et ideo in omnibus magis tenemur obedire Papæ quam Episcopis vel Archiepiscopis, vel monarchus Abbati sine ulla distinctione. Potest iterum potestas superior et inferior ita se habere quod ambo oriantur ex una quadam superiori potestate: et hoc modo se habent potestates Episcopi et Archiepiscopi descendentes a Papæ potestate.'—*S. Thomas Aquin. in IV. Sent.*, lib. ii. dist. 44 q. 2 *in fine*.

[1] 'Papa habet plenitudinem pontificalis potestatis quasi Rex in Regno, sed Episcopi assumuntur in partem solicitudinis quasi judices singulis civitatibus præpositi.'—*S. Thomas Aquin. in IV. Sent.*, lib. ii. dist. 20, art. 4, sectio 3.

That *Decree* is in strict conformity with the monarchical position of the Pope. He, it is asserted, has full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, in its full plenitude, not merely the greater part thereof.[1] According to the *Satis Cognitum*, from the Monarch of the Church the Bishops derive their power, just as the Parish Priest derives his from the Bishop. The answer of the *Satis Cognitum* is thus complete, but its unanswerable character entirely arises from the fact that the power of the Bishop is, according to it, a derived authority 'dependent' upon and accountable to the power whence it is so derived, which alone is 'independent,' as that of the King, and, consequently, that to which as 'supreme' all must pay obedience in preference to the derived and subject authority of the Bishop or Archbishop.

Section CL.—*The teaching of Innocent P. III. as to the relative positions of the Pope and the Bishops.*

1085. The teaching of St. Thomas thus adopted by the *Satis Cognitum* is in complete accord with that of Innocent III., who says: 'The Apostolic See has so dispensed between our brethren and fellow-bishops the weight of the Pastoral Office, so taken them into a share of the charge entrusted to him as to withdraw from himself nothing of the plenitude of power by which he should be the less able to inquire concerning each ecclesiastical cause and to judge when he so wills';[1] and again 'The plenitude of the Apostolical power diffused far and wide, although it exists potentially everywhere, nevertheless, because he is not able personally to exercise those things which pertain to so great an office as is fitting in each case, has called both you and other ministers of the Church into a share of the charge, so that the weight of so great an office may be the more easily borne by means of the acts of those who are assistants.'[3]

1086. Innocent thus lucidly sets forth the monarchical character of the position occupied according to Papalism by the Roman Pontiff. The Bishops are assumed by the Pope into a share of the care which is his *jure divino*, deriving their power from him; so essentially

[1] Vide *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

[2] 'Sic Apostolica Sedes inter fratres et Coepiscopos nostros pastorales dispensavit oneris gravitatem, sic eos in creditæ sibi solicitudinis partem assumpsit, ut nihil sibi subtraheret de plenitudine potestatis, quo minus de singulis causis ecclesiasticis inquirere possit et cum voluerit judicare.'—Innocent P. III., *Registrorum* lib. i., eccl.; P.L. ccxiv. 324.

[3] 'Potestatis Apostolicæ plenitudo longe lateque diffusa, licet ubique præsens potentialiter habeatur, tamen quia ea, quæ ad tantum officium pertinent, per se, prout singulis expediret, non valet præsentialiter exercere, tam vos quam alios ministros Ecclesiarum in partem solicitudinis advocavit, ut sic tanti onus officii per subsidiarias actiones commodius supportetur.' — Innocent P. III., *Registrorum* lib. i. ccccxcv.; P.L. ccxiv. 458, 459.

'dependent' is their power on that of the Pope that he retains the whole plenitude of power himself, as the *Vatican Decrees* declare, the 'whole plenitude of the supreme power of jurisdiction' still belongs to him—a power which, be it remembered, is described as 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' 'and truly Episcopal.' The example, too, which Innocent used, as showing his meaning is also adopted by those decrees wherein it is declared that the Roman Pontiff is 'the supreme judge of all the faithful,' and that 'in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical discipline recourse may be had to his judgment.' Therefore it is that the *Satis Cognitum* declares that the Roman Pontiffs possess that power in the Church which Christ exercised during His mortal life, it alone 'is plenary and supreme,' 'real and sovereign,' and since from it the Bishops derive their authority, they are subject to the Roman Pontiff as their 'Master.' The doctrine of the *Satis Cognitum* is clearly thus identical with that of Innocent III., as it is with that of St. Thomas. There is no possibility of interpreting it in any sense other than that.

Section CLI.—*The Bishops according to Papalism 'Vicars' of the Roman Pontiff.*

1087. The position of the Episcopal College, according to Papalism, having been thus clearly established, it is possible now to understand rightly the statement of the *Satis Cognitum* that Bishops 'are not to be looked on—*putandi*—as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs.' As its basis for this assertion the *Satis Cognitum* assigns the statement that 'they exercise a power which is really their own,' that power being 'the ordinary power' which the Apostles possessed. But this power, according to Papalism, has been shown to be a delegated power, being conferred on them through Peter their 'Master.'[1] The power of Peter was thus alone 'real and sovereign' and 'independent,' whilst that of the Apostles was 'limited' and 'dependent'—its retention by them being subject to the condition that they remained in union with, and in subjection to, Peter. Hence it could only be said to be their 'own' in the sense that they possessed it because they held an office which enabled them to receive that power and exercise it on the said conditions. The power of the Bishops has been shown to be,[2] according to Papalism, in like manner 'dependent' on that of the Pope, the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, in that it is received through him, and can only be exercised in the sphere assigned to them by their 'Master,' and subject also to the condition of their maintaining their union with the Pope, without which they could not in the first instance have received it, otherwise they are *ipso facto* deprived thereof.

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 847 *et seq.*

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 1071 *et seq.*

1088. The sense, then, in which Bishops 'are not to be looked on —*putandi*—as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs' is strictly limited to the fact that they hold an office which empowers them to receive and to exercise a certain power which, therefore, is 'really their own' as the holders of such office, and thus they are called the 'ordinary pastors of the peoples over whom they rule' by virtue of this power. It is obvious that the position occupied by Bishops, according to Papalism, is essentially different from that which the Bishops held in the Primitive Church. The authority of the Bishop in his diocese was supreme, inasmuch as he held 'the One Episcopate' in joint tenure with his fellow-Bishops; his authority thus being within the limits of his jurisdiction that of the One Episcopate. There was no authority superior to this, for the authority which the Episcopal College collected together in Synod was the same in essence, being that of the One Episcopate which the individual Bishops held in joint tenure, so that when a single Bishop or many Bishops submitted to the decrees of any Council, in so doing they were only recognising the authority which they themselves held, exercised by many instead of by one, and consequently by a more complete representation of that One Episcopate which they all held in joint tenure, and therefore having a claim on their obedience as members of the Episcopal College.

1089. The Bishop 'ruled' his flock in virtue of holding an office inherent in which *jure divino* was an authority which was 'supreme,' save so far as the act of the One Episcopate exercising collectively the same authority could limit it. It was not a subordinate authority to be held by him only so long as he was in union with his 'Master,' and dependent upon the 'supreme,' 'plenary,' and 'independent' authority of that 'Master' through whom he received it. The wide divergence between the position of a Bishop according to the Divine Constitution of the Church and that which Papalism asserts to be his is sufficiently plain. It can only be in a very unreal sense that the Bishops on the Papal theory can be said not to be 'vicars of the Roman Pontiffs.' Their actual position is, it is plain from what has been said, that of such Vicars, and this is borne out by the practical working of the Papalist system.

1090. According to this system, the Pope alone possesses original authority to constitute Bishops everywhere throughout the whole Church, hence he is their principal in whom dwells the property of the jurisdiction bestowed on them[1] when in the words of Innocent III. he takes them into a share of his pastoral care. Without his appointment they cannot obtain, in the first place, a diocese wherein to exercise the powers of their *Order*, and it is from him that they

[1] Van Espen, *Vindiciæ Resolutionis Doctorum Lovaniensium, Disquisitio secunda*, § xi. 10. *Op. Supplementum*, vol. v. p. 553. Bruxelles, 1768.

derive the authority to exercise within the limits assigned to them by him a certain power of *jurisdiction* which he at the same time confers on them, and without which they may not legitimately exercise the power of order or perform any purely Episcopal act. So strictly is this the case that even when they have thus received the care of a diocese from the supreme Pontiff, they are obliged to obtain from him 'faculties' from time to time which are necessary to enable them to perform many of their Episcopal duties within the limits of the diocese so assigned;[1] such a position is plainly that of a 'Vicar,' not of an 'Ordinary.'

1091. Secondly, inasmuch as the Roman Pontiff always retains, notwithstanding he may take the Bishops into a share of his pastoral charge, the full plenitude of jurisdiction, which is 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' 'and truly Episcopal,' without any diminution, he thus remains of necessity 'the Ordinary'; and since there can be but one 'Ordinary' in any diocese exercising spiritual jurisdiction, it follows that the Bishops who by his appointment exercise a certain jurisdiction therein can only do so as his Vicars.[2]

1092. Thirdly, the power of the Bishop, being 'limited and dependent,' is necessarily inferior to that superior power whence it is derived as from a perpetual fountain, which is 'supreme,' 'plenary,' and 'independent.' To this supreme power obedience in all things must be rendered by the people over 'which they rule' in preference to their own; in fact there could not be a collision of authority, because should the Bishops take a line opposed to that of the Pope they would inevitably lose their 'dependent' power, being put out of communion with him. Inferiority such as this necessarily implies that the position occupied by the Bishop is that of Vicar[3] of the one possessed of the superior power, *i.e.* the Roman Pontiff.

1093. Fourthly, the Roman Pontiff possessing 'immediate,' 'ordinary,' and 'truly Episcopal' jurisdiction in every diocese necessarily can exercise the power of the keys in such diocese whether the Bishop is willing or not, such Bishop being bound to give way to him as a Vicar is to his principal; therefore such Bishop not being able to hinder this, which is the privilege of the Ordinary, can only be the Vicar of the 'Ordinary,' who is the Roman Pontiff.

1094. Fifthly, the Roman Pontiff can delegate to whomsoever he will this 'truly Episcopal,' 'immediate,' and 'ordinary power of jurisdiction' which he possesses to be exercised by such delegate in any diocese or dioceses which he may think fit, and it is not in the power of the canonical Bishop thereof to prevent or hinder the delegate so commissioned in the exercise of the jurisdiction conferred upon him.

[1] On Quinquennial Faculties to Roman Catholic Bishops, *vide* Note 62.
[2] *Cp.* Van Espen, *l.c.* [3] *Ibid.*

An interesting instance of the Roman Pontiff thus delegating his jurisdiction is to be found in the case of the Apostolic delegate to the United States commissioned by Pope Leo XIII. as recently as 1895. In his letter to the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States appointing Mgr. Satolli to this office, he said: '. . . The Roman Pontiffs have been accustomed, because they hold the divinely bestowed Primacy in the administration of the Christian Church, to send abroad their legates to Christian nations and peoples. And this they do not by an adventitious but by an inherent right, because the Roman Pontiff upon whom Christ conferred ordinary and immediate power of jurisdiction, as well over all and singular Churches as over all and singular Pastors and Faithful (Concil. Vat., sess. iv. c. 3), since he is not able to visit personally nor to exercise the cure of pastoral solicitude towards the flock committed to him, is obliged sometimes, in discharge of the duty imposed upon him, to dispatch his legates to divers parts of the world according as necessities arise, who supplying his place may correct errors, make the rough places plain, and administer to the people confided to their care increased means of salvation.'[1]

1095. The Pope here 'confides' to the pastoral care of his legate the people of the Roman Catholic dioceses of the United States which he is unable to visit himself, and he does this in virtue of his immediate and ordinary jurisdiction over all and singular Churches. The authority of the legate so commissioned is that of the Roman Pontiff in whose stead he acts, and is thus 'truly Episcopal.' The Bishops of the respective dioceses included in the commission are entirely superseded by him, *they* had exercised the Episcopal jurisdiction which he is commissioned to exercise, it is thus withdrawn from them by the superior anthority who had bestowed it upon them. They had no power to prevent this being done. 'The peoples over whom they rule' are confided to care of the Papal legate that *he* may administer to them increased means of salvation in the place of and on behalf of the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock who is unable to do so in person.

[1] '. . . romani Pontifices, ob hanc causam quod rei christianæ administrandæ divinitus tenent principatum, suos peregre legatos ad gentes populosque Christianos mittere vel ab ultima antiquitate consueverunt. Id autem non extrinsecus quæsito, sed nativo jure suo, quia romanus Pontifex, cui contulit Christus potestatem ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas Ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos Pastores et fideles (*Conc. Vat.*, sess. iv. c. 3), cum personaliter singulas regiones circuire non posset, nec circa gregem sibi creditam curam pastoralis solicitudinis exercere, necessitatem habet interdum *ex debito impositæ servitutis*, suos ad diversas mundi partes, prout necessitates emerserunt, destinare legatos, qui *vices ejus supplendo*, errata corrigant, aspera in plana convertant et commissis sibi populis salutis incrementa ministrent (cap. in Extravag. Comm. *De Consuet.* ii.),' "Epistola *Longinqua*." *Epistola ad Episcopos fœderatarum Americæ septentrionalis civitatum*, De Rebus Catholicis. Datum Romæ die vi. Januarii, 1895. *Leonis Papæ* XIII. *Allocutiones, Epistolæ*, etc., vol. vi. p. 18. Bruges, 1900.

It is difficult to conceive of a more complete proof than this that the actual position occupied by Bishops, according to Papalism, is that of 'vicars of Roman Pontiffs.'

1096. Sixthly, as the Roman Pontiff is the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' whatever power the Bishops may exercise they can only do so in subjection to the Master as his servants, which is exactly the case of Vicars.

1097. Lastly, a Vicar is liable to deposition at the will of his principal;[1] this is an essential difference between one who is a Vicar and one who is an Ordinary. Now, according to Papalism, the Pope has the power of removing at his will Bishops from their Sees, of suppressing Sees, and constituting such others as he thinks fit. This plainly shows that Bishops derive from him as his inferiors whatever power they may possess, since he who confers is alone able to take away that which he bestows. Vicars alone can be subjected to such treatment. The suppression of a See, its amalgamation with others or division thereof against the will of its legitimate occupant, also points in the same direction. It is the act of the Ordinary doing with that in which he has immediate, ordinary, and truly Episcopal jurisdiction what he considers best, the Bishop having no right to interfere or hinder his action in any way. Only a Vicar could be in such a state of helplessness and subjection. The facts here set out, it is evident, prove that, according to Papalism, Bishops, however they may be designated, are in reality not Ordinaries, but merely Vicars of the Roman Pontiffs, for a Vicar alone could be so treated, and as 'Ordinary' alone could the Roman Pontiff so act.

1098. This vicarial position of the Bishop, according to Papalism, is perhaps most clearly observable in the last of the ways enumerated above, as may be seen from a striking instance in which the Roman Pontiff exercised that particular power. In 1790 the National Convention in France determined that the Episcopal Sees in that country should coincide in number and extent with the newly constituted departments. In consequence of this decision the civil power proceeded to make the rearrangement of provinces, dioceses, and parishes which was necessary to carry it into effect. The result, so far as the dioceses were concerned, was that some fifty bishoprics were entirely suppressed, whilst the remaining eighty-three were re-erected under different titles, the ancient ones being abolished. This was entirely the act of the civil power; the great body of the French Bishops protested against the gross violation of the rights of the Spiritualty which that act undoubtedly was. One hundred and twenty-five Prelates declined to take the oath ordered by Articles XXI. and XXXVIII. of the *Constitution civile du Clergé* in the following year, notwithstanding that they were ordered to do so within eight days.

[1] *Cp.* Van Espen, *l.c.*

1099. Other persons were forthwith appointed to fill such of the newly created Sees as were not filled by the few Bishops who took the oath, being consecrated by Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, Gobel, Bishop of Lydda, who had been chosen Bishop of the Metropolitan Department of the Seine, and Miroudet, Bishop of Babylon. All the new Bishops were appointed by the end of May 1791, and duly recognised by the civil authorities. Their ecclesiastical status was, of course, utterly irregular, the 'dioceses' which they pretended to occupy were already comprised within the limits of the ancient dioceses which were canonically full, they were thus simple intruders. Pope Pius VI. condemned by the Brief *Caritas*,[1] dated 13th April 1791, these new Bishops who were known as Constitutional Bishops, suspending those Prelates who had taken part in their consecration, as well as themselves, from all exercise of the Episcopal Office.

1100. In 1801 the French Government, at the head of which was Napoleon as First Consul, concluded a *Concordat* with Pope Pius VII. by which the position of the Church in France was regulated. As part of the arrangement thus ratified by both parties it became necessary that all those Bishops who had *canonical* possession of the ancient Sees and who survived should be removed. In order that this might be brought about the Pope by a Brief, *Tam multa ac tam præclara*,[2] dated 15th August 1801, called upon them to resign their Episcopal Sees into his hands. By the Bull *Cui Christi Domini vices*,[3] dated 2nd November 1801, the Pope 'suppressed, annulled, and for ever extinguished' the one hundred and fifty-nine Sees then canonically existing in France, and founded in their place ten Metropolitan and fifty Suffragan Sees, within the limits of which the territory comprised in the ancient Sees was now contained. In the Bull the Pope said: 'With the advice of many of our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we expressly deprive of force any agreement whatsoever of the legitimate Archbishops, Bishops and Chapters of the respective Churches, and all other Ordinaries whatsoever, and we interdict them for ever from all exercise whatsoever of any whatsoever ecclesiastical jurisdiction, declaring to be of no force whatsoever whatever any of them may attempt, to the effect that these Churches and their respective dioceses, whether whole or in part, shall be considered, and shall be, absolutely free, according to the new limits assigned to them, in order

[1] Pius VI., *Epistola ad singulos Galliarum Archiepiscopos. Collectio Brevium* Pii Papæ VI., ed. *Augustæ Vindelicorum*, pp. 110-42. Edit. 1796.

[2] Pius VII., *Litteræ Apostolicæ quibus ab Episcopis Gallicanis resignationem Sedium Episcopalium intra decem dies . . . in membris Suis fieri postulat. Collectio Bullarum, Brevium, Allocutionum* SS.D.N. Pii VII., p. 80. London, Cox and Baylis, 1821.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

that we may appoint concerning them in the manner we shall hereafter indicate.'

1101. Some thirty-seven of the surviving canonical Bishops declined to submit to this arbitrary action on the part of the Pope, and addressed repeated protests to him, but in vain. Notwithstanding their refusal, the Sees in which their dioceses were comprised in the new arrangement were filled, as well as those in which were contained the dioceses of those who did submit. Amongst those appointed to the newly erected Sees were twelve of the Constitutional Bishops, who, whilst ready to abandon the *Constitution civile du Clergé*, declined to obey the Papal Legate *a latere*, Cardinal Caprera, and retract the oath which they had taken thereto.[1] Now the action of the Roman Pontiff was performed by him in virtue of the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, which is ordinary, immediate, and truly Episcopal, which he possessed in its totality. He withdrew from the Canonical Bishops of existing Sees their power of jurisdiction, which he could not have done had not his power of jurisdiction been the 'superior' and the source of theirs, which was thus dependent and inferior, as is laid down by St. Thomas.[2] He rearranged their dioceses over which they ruled, thus acting as immediate Ordinary, and placed the Christians in the territory comprised in those new dioceses under other Bishops whom he appointed.

1102. Such an exercise of Papal authority by the Pope proves that the actual position of the Bishops, according to Papalism, is that of representatives of the Pope. Designated 'Ordinaries' they may be, but it is in some non-natural sense of the word, for in reality the Roman Pontiff, having 'plenary,' 'supreme,' 'ordinary,' 'immediate' and 'truly Episcopal jurisdiction' in every diocese, is 'Ordinary' of each. The description given by Dietrich of Niem of the position of Bishops under the Papal system is exact when he says that the Popes have used coercive power 'against God and justice by depriving them of the power and authority granted by God and the Church to them who in the Primitive Church were equal in power with the Pope. . . . At length by the increasing avarice of the Clergy and the simony, covetousness, and ambition of the Pope, the power and authority of the Bishops and inferior Prelates appear to be at once exhausted and utterly destroyed, so that now in the Church they appear to be painted images—*simulacra depicta*—and as it were nought.'[3]

1103. Such being the actual position of the Bishops, according to Papalism, the words with which the *Satis Cognitum* closes this portion

[1] *Cp.* Jervis, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution*, p. 382.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 1081 *et seq.*

[3] Gerson, *De Modis uniendi, etc.* De Reformatione Morum. Opera, edit. Dupin, ii. p. 174. Dietrich of Niem is probably the author of this work. *Vide supra*, n. 987, *footnote* 1.

which it has devoted to setting forth with much definiteness that position, are to say the least misleading. It asserts that 'the Roman Pontiffs, mindful of their duty, wish above all things that the divine constitution of the Church should be preserved. Therefore, as they defend with all necessary care and vigilance their own authority, so they have always laboured and will continue to labour, that the authority of the bishops may be upheld. Yea, they look upon whatever honour or obedience is given to the bishops as paid to themselves.'[1] The facts of history show that the Roman Bishops gradually advanced their claim by constant encroachments on the rights of Bishops, and at length deprived them of the ancient status which by divine right belongs to the Episcopate in the Church, and a state of things had been reached which enabled Benedict XIV. to say that the Pope 'is the proper priest in the whole Church . . . able to withdraw any Church from the jurisdiction of any Bishop,'[2] which, as has been seen,[3] was done by Pius VII. The paragraph in itself appears to be in obvious contradiction to these facts, but the last sentence of it may throw a light on its real meaning, viz., that the Bishops being the *Vicars* of the Popes, therefore, whatever honour or obedience is given to the Bishops they regard as paid to themselves; the Bishop's authority thus upheld being the delegated authority which they have bestowed on them. This meaning of the paragraph is consistent with the rest of the *Satis Cognitum* and the use made of the citation from St. Gregory the Great which follows; but it is not that which the words *prima facie* bear. If it is not the meaning the paragraph is irreconcilable with the rest of the document in which it appears, and is calculated to leave a false impression as to the actual facts upon the reader. In either case it is misleading.

SECTION CLIV.—*The actual position of the 'Roman Pontiff' according to Papalism that of Universal Bishop.*

1104. The *Satis Cognitum* proceeds to quote in corroboration of its assertion the following words of St. Gregory the Great. 'My honour is the honour of the Universal Church. My honour is the strength and stability of my brethren. Then I am honoured when due honour is given to every one' (St. Gregorius M., *Epistolarum* lib. viii. Ep. XXX. ad Eulogium).[4] This citation is made from a letter addressed to the Patriarch of Alexandria announcing to him the conversion of the English. The context of the quotation is as follows: 'Your blessedness has also taken pains to tell me that you no longer write to certain persons those proud names which have sprung from the root of vanity,

[1] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 40.
[2] Benedict XIV., *De Synodo diocesan.* 10, 14, *et* 5, 7.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 1100 *et seq.*
[4] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 40.

and you address me saying "as you have commanded," which word "command" I beg you to remove from my case, because I know who I am and who you are. For in rank you are my brother, in character my father. I did not therefore command, but took pains to point out what I thought advantageous. I do not, however, find that your Blessedness was willing altogether to observe the very thing I pressed upon you. For I said that you should not write any such thing either to me or any one else, and lo! in the heading of your letter directed to me, the very person who forbad it, you set that haughty appellation calling me Universal Pope. Which I beg your Holiness, who art most agreeable to me, to do so no more, because whatever is given to another more than reason requires is so much taken away from yourself. It is not in appellations, but in character that I wish to advance. Nor do I consider that an honour by which I acknowledge that my brethren lose their own. *For my honour is the honour of the Universal Church. My honour is the unimpaired vigour of my brethren. Then am I truly honoured when due honour is not denied to each one in his own degree.* For if your Holiness calls me Universal Pope, you deny that you yourself are what you admit me to be—Universal. But this God forbid! Away with words which inflate vanity and wound charity. Indeed during—*per*—the Holy Synod of Chalcedon and by the Fathers subsequently your Holiness knows that this was offered to my predecessors.[1] Yet none of them chose ever to use the term, that, while they entertained affection for the honour of all Priests, in the hands of Almighty God they might guard their own.'[2]

[1] The statement made by St. Gregory does not actually assert that the title 'Universal Bishop' was offered to St. Leo by the Council of Chalcedon, though it would appear to be implied by it. As a matter of fact, no such offer was made by the Synod. It is true that in the Latin Acts of the Council which St. Leo sent to the Gallic Bishops, in the sentence passed in the third Session on Dioscurus, St. Leo is styled *caput universalis Ecclesiæ*, but a reference to the *original* Act shows that the words actually used were, *the most holy and most blessed Leo, Archbishop of the great and Elder Rome* (Mansi, vi. 1048). Again, in all the best codices of St. Leo's Epistles the beginning of the 165th Epistle runs thus: *Leo Episcopus Leoni Augusto*; some forger thought fit to amend it as follows: *Leo Romæ et universalis Catholicæque ecclesiæ Episcopus Leoni semper Augusto salutem.* 'There is no trace,' says Hefele, 'in the Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon, or in the Letters of Leo, that they offered him in any of their transactions the title in question, or that he desired it' (Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 202. [E.T. iii. 420]). In the superscription of the memorial presented to that Council against Dioscurus by the Alexandrians, the deacons Theodore and Ischysius, the presbyter Athanasius, and Sophronius, a layman, Leo is styled repeatedly 'Œcumenical Archbishop and Patriarch of Great Rome.' The reason why the accusers of Dioscurus did this was that they might 'oppose' it to a similar title which had been given to Dioscurus in the pseudo-council of Ephesus, the Acts of which had been already recited at Chalcedon at the first Session, wherein one of the Bishops in his vote for Eutyches had used the words 'Our most Holy Father and Universal Archbishop Dioscurus of the great city of Alexandria.'

[2] S. Greg. M., *Epist. ad Eulogium, Episc. Alexandrinum*, Ep. lib. vii., Epp. xxx.; P.L. lxxvii. 952.

1105. St. Gregory's argument is plain. He objects to the title being given to himself on the ground that if it was so given those who applied it to him would by so doing deny that other Bishops were what he was, and consequently that he was their superior and not their 'brother,' as he declares himself to be of the Patriarch to whom he was writing. The use therefore of this title would take away from Bishops what was their own, making them inferior to him, and thus taking away the honour due to them. Such a course of procedure, he declares, instead of honouring him would of necessity be to his dishonour also in that he can only be truly honoured when all his brother Bishops receive the honour due to them. It was not without reason that the fautors of the extreme claims of the Papacy who had the control of the proceedings of the *Vatican Council* refused to insert in the *Decree* of the Council the words which immediately precede the citation given from St. Gregory: 'Nor do I consider that an honour by which I acknowledge that my brethren lose their own,'[1] notwithstanding it was proposed to do so, for they give the key to St. Gregory's real meaning. The *Satis Cognitum*, following the example of the *Vatican Decrees*, likewise gives the citation without these important words, doubtless for the same reason, viz., that to have done so would have shown that the meaning of the quotation from St. Gregory was not that which is affixed to them by the context in which it is placed in the two documents.

1106. The manner in which the quotation is cited by the *Satis Cognitum* thus gives, as has been already noted, a misleading idea as to its meaning. It is quoted in support of two assertions—(*a*) one that the Popes have always laboured to maintain their own authority. The citation is used to support the allegation that this was for the benefit of the Bishops. 'My honour is the honour of the Universal Church. My honour is the strength and stability of my brethren.' (*b*) The other that the Popes have always laboured, and will continue to labour, that the authority of the Bishops may be upheld, regarding whatever honour or obedience which may be paid to the Bishops as given to themselves. 'Then am I honoured when due honour is given to every one.' The first part of the quotation being thus misused in the same way as it is in the *Constitutio Prima Dogmatica de Ecclesia Christi* of the Vatican Council to which the *Satis Cognitum* had just previously referred, viz., that the power of the Bishops is strengthened and confirmed by the honour belonging to the Pope, which communicates itself to the Bishops who are under

[1] *Emendationes a nonnullis Patribus in Congregationibus generalibus factæ super Capite* III. *Constitutionis Dogmaticæ primæ De Ecclesia Christi.* '45. Petitur ut in § 3. verbis S. Gregorii Magni; "Meus honor . . ." anteponantur illa præcedentia: "Non honorem meum esse deputo, in quo fratres meos honorem suum perdere cognosco," ut facilius sensus intelligatur' (*Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 343).

his supreme jurisdiction, and are bound to him by the duty of hierarchical subordination and of true obedience, and the latter part is adduced in the sense of proving that the Popes regarded the Bishops as their representatives, looking upon whatever honour and obedience which may be given to them as given to themselves—a method of using the quotation which shows that the position maintained by the *Satis Cognitum* with regard to the status of Bishops is exactly that which it has on investigation been shown to be above, viz., that they in reality are 'Vicars' of the Roman Pontiffs, servants of the 'Masters' of 'the Episcopal College.' Both of the ideas in support of which the citation is made from St. Gregory are in essential contradiction to the true sense of the words as revealed by their context, a contradiction which is further emphasised by the claims which St. Gregory denounced as being necessarily embodied in the title 'Universal Bishop.'

1107. For what was the sense in which St. Gregory took the title he so indignantly reprobated? It has been already noted[1] that the title Œcumenical Patriarch was applied to the Bishop of Constantinople in the early part of the sixth century, and in A.D. 588, at a Synod of Constantinople held to investigate certain charges which had been brought against Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who presided at the Synod in virtue of the position assigned to his See by the Second and Fourth Synods, and who for his ascetic life was called 'the Faster,' assumed it.[2] As used by the Orientals there can be no doubt that the meaning of the title was innocent enough, as appears from the statement of Anastasius, Bibliothecarius, in the Preface to the Latin translation of Acts of the Seventh Synod, where he says: 'During my stay at Constantinople I frequently blamed the Greeks on account of this title, and accused them of pride or arrogance. But they asserted that they did not call the Patriarch [of Constantinople] Œcumenical, which many translate 'Universal,' because he held the Bishopric of the whole world—*quod universalis orbis teneat praesulatum*,—but because he presided over a certain part of the world which was inhabited by Christians. For what the Greeks call œcumen is signified by the Latins, not only the world, deriving the term 'universalis' from the comprehensive character of this world—*a cujus universitate universalis appellatur*—but also habitation or inhabited place.'[3] That this was the meaning of the title as used by the Greeks is evident from the fact that at the Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 543, at which certain opinions of Origen were anathematised, both the Bishop of Rome and the Bishop of Constantinople were styled Archbishop and Œcumenical Patriarch, which obviously could not have been done had the Greeks used the

[1] *Vide supra*, 807, 808.

[2] Mansi, ix. 971.

[3] Mansi, xii. 983.

title in the sense of Patriarch over the whole world, as it would be impossible for *two* Prelates to occupy such a position at the same time.

1108. By the close of the sixth century, however, the Bishops of New Rome had become the serious rivals of the Bishops of Elder Rome, so that the latter viewed the position of the former with considerable distrust and misgiving. The influence of the Bishops of Elder Rome had been impaired by the vacillating conduct of Vigilius with reference to 'The Three Chapters,' whilst that of their rivals had materially increased by the fact that a Patriarch of Constantinople had presided at the trial of the Bishop of the Third See. Hence Pelagius II. was led to attack the use of this title by John 'the Faster' by the fear that not only would the Patriarch of Constantinople obtain power over the other three Eastern Patriarchates, but also that he might even attempt, with the aid of the Imperial power, to extend his authority over the whole Church. St. Gregory, the successor of Pelagius, took up the same position with much warmth, writing a series of letters on the subject which make sufficiently clear the meaning which he held that title to bear on account of which he objected to its use.

1109. In a letter to the Emperor Maurice he says: 'But since it is not my cause but God's, and since not I only, but the whole Church, is thrown into confusion; since sacred laws, venerable Synods, since the very commands even of our Lord Jesus Christ are disturbed by this haughty and pompous language, let the most pious Emperor lance the wound. . . . For to all who know the Gospel it is manifest that the charge of the whole Church was entrusted by the voice of the Lord to the holy Apostle Peter, chief of all the Apostles. For to him it is said, 'Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep.' To him it is said, 'Behold Satan hath desired to sift you as wheat, and I have prayed for you, O Peter, that thy faith fail not.' To him it is said, 'Thou art Peter, etc., and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Behold he hath received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of binding and loosing is given unto him; the care of the whole Church is committed to him and the pre-eminence, and yet he is not called the Universal Apostle, and that most holy man, my fellow-priest, John, endeavours to be called Universal Bishop. I am compelled to exclaim and to say, "O tempora! O mores!" Behold everything in Europe is delivered into the power of the barbarians: cities are destroyed; camps overthrown; provinces depopulated; the cultivator does not dwell in the land; the worshippers of idols rage and daily domineer, slaughtering the faithful; and yet priests who ought

to be weeping in dust and ashes seek for themselves names of vanity, and boast in new and profane words. Do I in this matter, most pious Lord, defend my own cause? Is it a private inquiry I pursue? The cause of Almighty God, the cause of the Universal Church. Who is he who in violation of the statutes in the Gospel, in violation of the decrees of Councils presumes to usurp a new name to himself? Would that he who desires to be called Universal might exist alone without diminution to others. And certainly we know that many Bishops of the Church of Constantinople have fallen into the abyss of heresy, and not only have been heretics but heresiarchs. . . . If, therefore, any one claim to himself that name in that Church, as in the judgment of all good men he has done, the whole Church (which God forbid) falls from its place, when he who is called Universal falls. But far from Christian hearts be that blasphemous name in which the honour of all priests is taken away, whilst it is madly arrogated by one to himself. Certainly, to do honour to the blessed Peter, the chief of the Apostles, this was offered to the Roman Pontiff during—*per*—the venerable Synod of Chalcedon.[1] But no one of them ever consented to use this singular appellation, that all priests might not be deprived of their due honour by something peculiar being given to one. How is it then that we seek not the glory of the name though offered to us, yet another presumes to claim it though not offered? He therefore is the more to be restrained by the precepts of the Emperor who despises to render obedience to the canonical precepts. He ought to be coerced who injures the Universal Church.'[2]

1110. In another letter to the same Emperor, who had it appears taken the part of the Patriarch of Constantinople and ridiculed his vehement opposition to this title, Gregory wrote: 'Concerning which matter my Lord's affection has enjoined me in his commands, saying that scandal ought not to grow between us for the term of a frivolous name. But I beg your Imperial Piety to consider that some frivolities are very harmless, some highly injurious. When Antichrist at His coming calls Himself God, will it not be very frivolous, but yet cause great destruction? If we look at the amount of what is said, it is but two syllables [*Deum*], but if at the weight of iniquity it is universal destruction. But I confidently affirm that whoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest in his pride goes before Antichrist, because through pride he prefers himself to the rest, and he is led into error by no dissimilar pride, but because, like that perverse one, he wishes to appear God over all men; so whoever he is who desires to be called sole Priest, he lifts himself up above all other

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 1104, *footnote* 1.

[2] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Mauritium Augustum*, Epp. lib. v., Ep. xx.; P.L. lxxviii. 744 *et seq.*

Priests. But since the Truth says: "Every one who exalteth himself shall be abased," I know the more any pride inflates itself the sooner it bursts.'[1]

IIII. To John 'the Faster' himself St. Gregory wrote: 'Consider, I pray you, that by this rash presumption the peace of the whole Church is disturbed, and the grace poured out on all in common is contradicted. And in this, indeed, you will be able to increase just so much as you purpose in your own mind, and become so much the greater, as you restrain yourself from usurping a proud and foolish name. And you profit in the degree that you do not study to arrogate to yourself by derogating from your brethren. Therefore, most dear brother, with all your heart love humility, by which the harmony of all the brethren and the unity of the holy Universal Church may be preserved. Surely the Apostle Paul, hearing some say, "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas," exclaimed in exceeding horror at this rending of the Lord's Body, by which His members attached themselves, as it were, to other heads, saying, "Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" If he thus rejected the members of the Lord's Body being subjected to certain heads, as it were, besides Christ, and that even to the Apostles themselves, as leaders of parts, what will you say to Christ Who is, as you know, the Head of the Universal Church, in the examination of the last judgment—you, who endeavour to subject to yourself, under the name of Universal, all His members? Who, I say, in this perverse name, is set forth for imitation, but he who despised the legions of angels joined a companion to himself, and endeavoured to rise to a height unapproached by all; that he might seem to be subject to none, and be alone superior to all. Who also said, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, on the sides of the North. I will ascend above the height of the clouds; I will be like the Most High." For what are all your brethren, the Bishops of the Universal Church, but the stars of heaven? Whose life and language together shine amidst the sins and errors of men as among the shades of night. And while you seek to set yourself over them by a proud term, and to tread under foot their names in comparison with your own, what else do you say, but "I will ascend into the heaven. I will exalt my throne above the stars of God"? Are not all the Bishops clouds, who rain down the words of their preaching, and shine with the light of good works? And while your Brotherhood despises them, and endeavours to put them under you, what else do you say but this, which is said by the old enemy: "I will ascend above the height of the clouds"? And when

[1] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Mauritium Augustum*, Epp. lib. vii., Ep. xiii.; P.L. lxxvii. 890, 891.

I see all these things with sorrow, and fear the secret judgments of God, my tears increase, my heart contains not my groans, that that most holy man, the Lord John, of such abstinence and humility, seduced by the persuasion of those about him, hath proceeded to such pride, that in longing after a perverse name, he endeavours to be like him, who desiring in his pride to be as God lost even the grace of that likeness to God which had been given him, and so forfeited true blessedness, because he sought false glory. Certainly Peter, the first of the Apostles, was a member of the holy and Universal Church; Paul, Andrew, John, what else are they but the heads of particular communities? and yet all are members under one Head. And to comprehend all in one brief expression, the Saints before the Law, the Saints under the Law, the Saints under grace, all these making up the Body of the Lord, are disposed among members of the Church, and no one ever wished to be called Universal. Let then your Holiness acknowledge how great is your pride who seek to be called by that name, by which no one has presumed to be called who was really holy. Had not, as your Brotherhood knows, during—*per*—the venerable Council of Chalcedon, the Prelates of the Apostolical See, whose servant by God's disposition I am, the honour offered them of being called Universal? But yet no one ever chose to be called by such a name; no one claimed to himself this rash appellation; lest should he claim to himself the glory of singularity in the rank of the High Priesthood he might seem to have denied it to all his brethren. . . . We know that our Creator descended from the height of His exaltation to bestow glory on the human race; and we, that are created out of the lowest things, glory in the lessening of our brethren. . . . What therefore, dearest brother, will you say in that horrible examination of the judgment to come; you who covet to be called in the world not merely Father, but common Father? Beware then of the bad suggestion of the wicked; avoid every instigation to offence. "Offences indeed must come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh." For by this abominable expression of pride the Church is cut in two; the hearts of all the brethren are provoked to offence. . . . Again it is written, "Giving honour one to another," and you endeavour to take that honour from all which you illicitly desire to usurp for yourself singly.'[1]

1112. In like terms Gregory wrote to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch: 'As your venerable Holiness is aware, the title Universal was offered during—*per*—the holy Synod of Chalcedon to the Pontiff of the Apostolic See, a post which by God's providence I fill. But no one of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a

[1] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Joan. Constant. Episcopum*, Epp. lib. v., Ep. xviii.; P.L. lxxvii. 740.

term, because plainly, if a single Patriarch is called universal, the name Patriarch is taken from the rest. But far be this from the mind of a Christian that any one should wish to claim to himself that by which the honour of his brethren may seem to be in any way diminished. Since, therefore, we are unwilling to receive this honour when offered to us, consider how shameful it is that any one has wished violently to usurp it to himself. Wherefore let your Holiness in your letters never call any one universal, lest in offering undue honour to another you should deprive yourself of that which is your due. . . . Let us, therefore, render thanks to Him, who, dissolving enmities, has caused in His flesh that in the whole world there should be one flock and one fold under Himself the one Shepherd. . . . For because He is near of whom it is written, "He is King over the children of pride," what I cannot utter without grief, our Brother and fellow-Bishop John, despising the Apostolic precepts, the rules of the Fathers, endeavours by this appellation to go before him in pride. . . . So that he endeavours to claim the whole to himself, and aims by the pride of this pompous language to subjugate to himself all the members of Christ, which are joined together to the one sole Head, that is, Christ. . . . By the favour of the Lord we must strive with all our strength and take care lest by one poisonous sentence the living members of Christ's Body be destroyed. For if this be allowed to be said freely, the honour of all Patriarchs is denied. And when perchance he who is termed Universal perishes in error, presently no Bishop is found to have remained in the state of truth. Wherefore it is your duty, firmly and without prejudice, to preserve the Churches as you have received them, and let this attempt of diabolical usurpation find nothing of its own in you. Stand firm, stand fearless; presume not either to give or receive letters with this false title of Universal; keep from the pollution of this pride all the Bishops subject to your care, that the whole Church may recognise you for Patriarch not only by good works, but by your genuine authority. But if perchance adversity follow, persisting with one mind, we are bound to show, even by dying, that we love not any special gain of our own to the general loss.'[1]

1113. In spite of St. Gregory's request that he should not apply the title complained of to *any one*, Eulogius would appear to have used it of Gregory himself in his reply, for St. Gregory wrote to him the letter from which the citation given in the *Satis Cognitum* is taken, which has been given above, in which, as has been seen, he again made use of similar language.

The strong remonstrances which St. Gregory addressed to John

[1] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Eulogium et Anastasium Episc.*, Epp. lib. v., Ep. xliii.; P.L. lxxvii. 777 *et seq.*

'the Faster' do not appear to have had any effect, as Cyriacus his successor evidently made use of the title which the former had so strongly denounced in the Synodal letter in which he announced to the Patriarchs his elevation to the throne of Constantinople—a copy of which was therefore received in due course by St. Gregory.

1114. St. Gregory in a letter written after the receipt of this letter to Anastasius the Patriarch of Antioch, accordingly reiterated his condemnation of the use of this title in language similar to that already quoted. He said: 'I thought it not worth while on account of a profane appellation to delay receiving the Synodal letter of our Brother and fellow-Priest Cyriacus, that I might not disturb the unity of the Holy Church: nevertheless, I have made a point of admonishing him respecting that same superstitious and haughty appellation, saying that he should not have peace with me unless he corrected the pride of the aforesaid expression, which the Apostate first invented. But you should not call this cause of no importance; because if we bear this patiently we corrupt the faith of the whole Church. For you know how many, not only heretics, but even heresiarchs, have come forth from the Church of Constantinople. And, not to speak of the injury done to your honour, if one be called universal, the whole Church tumbles to pieces if that one, being universal, falls. But far be such folly, far be such trifling, from my ears. But I trust in the Almighty Lord; that what He hath promised He will quickly perform; every one that exalteth himself shall be abased.'[1]

1115. To the Bishops of Illyricum, St. Gregory wrote in similar terms: 'Because as the end of the world is approaching, the enemy of the human race hath appeared in anticipation, to have for his precursors, through the means of pride, these very Priests who ought by a good and humble life to resist him; I, therefore, exhort and advise that no one of you ever give countenance to this name, ever agree to it, ever write it, ever receive a writing wherein it is contained, or add his subscription; but as behoves the ministers of Almighty God, keep himself clean from such-like poisonous infection, and give no place within him to the crafty lie-in-wait; since this is done to the injury and disruption of the whole Church, and as we have said in contempt of you all. For if, as he thinks, one is universal, it remains that you are not Bishops.'[2]

1116. Consideration of these letters will show the sense in which St. Gregory denounced the term Universal Bishop. He declared it to be (i) the invention of the Apostate, a blasphemous name; (ii) that

[1] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Anastasium Episc. Antioch.* Epp. lib. vii., Ep. xxvii.; P.L. lxxvii. 883.

[2] *Ad Episc. Thessaloniensi Illyricæ*, Epp. lib. ix., Ep. lxviii.; P.L. lxxviii. 1104.

those who used it are the precursors of the devil, falling into the same sin by which he fell from heaven, arrogating to themselves, as he desired to do, a position of supremacy over the brethren to which they had no right; (iii) that the assumption of that title was so great a derogation from the rights of other Bishops, upon whom the grace [of the Episcopate] had been poured out in common, that they were no longer Bishops, clearly because he who assumed it declared himself by so doing to possess full and supreme power of jurisdiction which is 'truly Episcopal,' 'ordinary,' and 'immediate' over the whole Church. The reality of the Episcopal office is thus destroyed, those who bear the title 'Bishop' becoming representatives of the 'Universal Bishop'; (iv) that he who assumed this title claimed to be 'common Father'—not merely a Father—that is the supreme Pastor of the One Flock; (v) that if a Patriarch be called Universal, the reality of the Patriarchal office is taken from the rest who bear the title; for if one has universal Patriarchal jurisdiction, the others can only exercise an inferior jurisdiction to his, consequently those who had hitherto been Patriarchs in very deed would be so no longer. St. Gregory, be it observed, recognised no higher office in the Church than that of Patriarch, amongst the holders of which he implies he is numbered himself, consequently, according to him, a Universal Patriarch would have been the 'Supreme Pastor,' 'the Supreme Judge,' the 'Master,' having 'real and sovereign authority'; by denouncing the assumption of this title by one of the Patriarchs he denies that, according to the constitution of the Church, any such monarchical office exists; (vi) that the title implies that all the members of Christ are in subjection to him who bears it, *i.e.*, that to him all are bound to render true obedience as possessing the 'fulness of' 'supreme power,' which 'is ordinary and immediate over each and all the Churches, and over each and all the Pastors and faithful'; (vii) that the assumption of this title derogates from the honour of Christ the sole Head of the Church, being contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church, according to which all the Apostles, including Peter, the first of them, were members under One Head, being but leaders of parts. The sole Headship of Christ is thus, according to St. Gregory, incompatible with any earthly head, a position which he denies was held by any of the Apostles; (viii) lastly, that if there had been in the Church any one Bishop who had a right to the position denoted by the title Universal, it would follow that as part of his Supremacy he would be the Supreme Teacher of all Christians, with the result that if he fell into heresy the Church would necessarily be destroyed. Such is the meaning which St. Gregory considered to belong to the title Universal Bishop, and the ground, therefore, on which he reprobated its use. Is it not clear that such meaning describes exactly the monarchical position of the Roman

Pontiff which Papalism declares to be *de fide* as being an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church? The identity between that which St. Gregory denounces and that which is asserted by the *Satis Cognitum* to have been the 'venerable and constant belief of every age,' and the *Vatican Decrees*, a 'doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation,' is complete.

1117. The great value of this testimony is seen when the actual position taken by St. Gregory with regard to the prerogatives of the Roman See is remembered. St. Gregory had a firm belief in the heirship by the Roman Bishop of the privilege of Peter which had been formulated by St. Leo.[1] The claims he made had been vigorously put forward by Felix and Gelasius; the Episcopates of Vigilius and Pelagius I. had not advanced the position owing to the vacillations of the former and the influence which the Byzantine Emperors had been able to exert over both. Gregory, however, was enabled not only to uphold the claims asserted by St. Leo and his successors in the fifth century, but also to develop from the Papalist point of view the power, dignity, and prestige of the Roman Chair to a far higher extent than had been hitherto possible. The circumstances of his day undoubtedly assisted him much in this matter. The influence of the Eastern Emperor in Rome and Italy had been greatly diminished through the invasion of the Lombards, and was something very different to that exerted by Justinian, who had made his power heavily felt. Hence the Roman clergy were able to elect Gregory's immediate predecessor, Pelagius II.,[2] without reference to the Emperor of the East, thus taking up an essentially independent position towards the civil power which had not been possible for many years. This independence had an effect on the relations of the Roman Bishops and him of New Rome. The determination of the latter Bishop to maintain the privileges accorded to that See by the Œcumenical Councils, supported as they had been by the patronage of the Emperor, had been a constant source of disquietude to the former, whose attitude became one of increasing watchfulness and suspicion. This, however, had no effect in causing the Patriarch of Constantinople to recognise the attempt made by the Bishop of Rome to interfere with those privileges.

1118. On the death of Pelagius II. a great opportunity awaited a great man. The decay of the authority of the Eastern Emperor and the ruthless ferocity of the Arian Lombards exposed both Christianity and Civilization to great danger. The very existence of the Churches scattered in various parts of Europe, enfeebled by the half-reclaimed barbarism around them, and separated from each other, was threatened.

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 193.

[2] Milman, *op. cit.*, bk. iii. ch. ix., vol. i. p. 445. Edit. 1872.

There was need of the setting up of some one rallying point where they could find protection. So, too, if the remnant of the ancient civilization was to be preserved, its forces required to be reorganised that they might successfully withstand the savage powers arrayed in hostility against it. This could only be done by some one possessed of powers which would enable him to seize the opportunity, and make himself recognised as the man of the hour. It was at this critical time that Gregory was elected in succession to Pelagius II. He was a Roman of the Romans, fully imbued with that sense that Rome had the right to rule the world which manifested itself in all her sons. To the great traditions which were the glory of Rome the Bishop of Rome seemed to men to be the legitimate heir now that the Imperial power had abandoned the City. He lived in the City, he was the personification of law and order, the one person capable of making a definite and successful stand against the aggressions of barbarism. Of such prestige and circumstances Gregory was eminently qualified to make the utmost use in his efforts to advance the rights which as the heir of St. Peter he believed to be the legitimate possession of the Roman See. To these advantages must be added the fact that he was one of the greatest theologians who has ever occupied the Roman Chair, the one Pope indeed who is ranked amongst the Four Latin Doctors. This was an important assistance to him, for since the days of St. Leo no one had been Bishop of Rome who could be called a theologian. Again, he was a statesman well versed in the management of affairs, and thus well equipped for the making the most of the advantages which he undoubtedly possessed in the interest of the aggrandisement of his See.

1119. In the West, Gregory was able to make the power of the Roman See acknowledged to a greater extent than any of his predecessors. The various Churches, isolated from each other in their defenceless position, naturally sought the support and protection which one in the position of Gregory was able to give. He, seated in the Imperial City, and of commanding influence amongst men, was obviously *the* one around whom they could in those distracted times rally, and they were not likely to inquire too curiously whether the claims advanced by him were based on fact or fiction. Especially would this be the case with the new nations which by his missionary zeal were brought to embrace Christianity, such as, for example, the English to whom he sent St. Augustine, so that Bede says of him, 'by his own zeal he converted one, that is the nation of the Angles, from the power of Satan to the faith of Christ, and him we may and should rightly call our Apostle,'[1] that is, the Apostle of the English, as distinguished from the Britons who had been driven by their Saxon conquerors into the fastnesses of Wales and Cornwall.

[1] Ven. Beda, *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. ii. cap. i.; P.L. xcv. 75.

1120. Such newly formed Churches would naturally be led, especially as they consisted of people of no great intellectual attainments, and certainly incompetent of criticising any claims made by those who had subjugated them to Christ, to have a special and, perhaps, exaggerated veneration for the far-off See, associated in their minds with the great Apostle St. Peter, whence they received their faith. In fact, the expressions used by St. Columbanus with reference to Gregory's successor, that he was 'Head of all the Churches of Europe,'[1] practically describes St. Gregory's actual position, though even here his attempts to exercise the power which he conceived to be his sometime were unsuccessful. For example, the Istrian Bishops remain firm in their adherence to that defence of 'The Three Chapters' which they considered loyalty to the Councils of Chalcedon required of them, notwithstanding St. Gregory's efforts. They persuaded the Emperor Maurice to write to Gregory on their behalf, which he did, saying: 'We command your Holiness to give no further trouble to these Bishops,'[2] a prohibition which Gregory obeyed.

1121. The position attained by the Popes by their constant exertions was not yet that of divinely constituted monarch over the *whole* Church which Papalism asserts. St. Columbanus, as has just been observed, could speak accurately of the Bishop of Rome as 'the Head of the Churches of Europe,' but he could also tell Gregory, when asking his opinion on the subject of the observance of Easter, that the Irish Churches would treat as a heretic any one who rejected the 'Quartodeciman' opinion which he held,[3] and which, of course, was *not* the Roman view; whilst the Bishops of Ireland did not hesitate to regard the invasion of Italy by the Lombards, and the evils which that country was enduring at their hands, as divine judgments on the Popes for having consented to the condemnation of 'The Three Chapters,' and thus rebelled against the decrees of Chalcedon, so little did they know of any divinely conferred prerogatives of the Papacy.[4]

1122. But although St. Gregory was able to advance the interests and pretensions of the Roman See in the West, he did not meet with equal success in the East, where he had not the advantages and prestige which the Roman See had attained in the West. It is true that he said to a Western Bishop 'with regard to the Church of Constantinople who doubts not that it is subject to the Apostolic See,'[5] but even here subject 'may mean inferior, for the whole course of Gregory's dealings with Constantinople is against the idea that he

[1] S. Columbanus, Ep. v., *Ad Bonifacium*, P. iv.; P.L. lxxx. 274.
[2] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 590, cap. xliii. tom. x. 504. Lucæ, 1741.
[3] S. Columbanus, Ep. i., *Ad Greg. Papam*; P.L. lxxx. 262.
[4] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 592, cap. vi. tom. x. 528-9.
[5] S. Greg. M., *Epist. ad Joannem Syracusanum Episc.*, Epp. lib. vi., Ep. xii.; P.L. xxvii. 950.

regarded the Patriarch as subject to him.'[1] And again to the same Bishop: 'As for his [*i.e.* the Bishop of Byzacene in North Africa] saying he is subject to the Apostolic See. I know not what Bishop is not subject to it if there is any fault found in the Bishops, but where no fault requires it all are equal, in accordance with the rule of humility.'[2] He asserted, too, that 'the Apostolic See is the Head of all the Churches.'[3] Such claims, however, were not admitted by the Easterns, not even when limited to the specific case 'if any fault is found in a Bishop.' This is significantly shown by the fact that though the Emperor Phocas, who succeeded to the Imperial throne after the murder of Maurice, took the part of St. Gregory against Cyriacus, the successor of John 'the Faster,' an adherent of the Emperor Maurice, in the controversy with reference to the title 'Universal Bishop,' and forbade its use, yet this was but a momentary triumph, for Heraclius, who succeeded Phocas, gave it in his laws to the Patriarch of Constantinople, by whom it has been borne up to the present day.

1123. Even in the West St. Gregory's power was not the same in extent in all districts. Fleury points this out as well as the clear distinction, noted in the preceding paragraph, which existed between the position he was admitted to hold in the West and that which was recognised in the East, when he says: 'St. Gregory enters into this detail [the consecration of Bishops] only for the Churches which specially depended upon the Holy See, and for that reason were called suburbicarian, that is, those of the southern parts of Italy where he was sole Archbishop, those of Sicily and the other islands though they had Metropolitans. But it will not be found that he exercised the same immediate power in the Provinces depending on Milan and Aquileia, nor in Spain and the Gauls. It is true that in the Gauls he had his Vicar, who was Bishop of Arles, as was likewise the Bishop of Thessalonica for Western Illyricum. The Pope further took care of the Churches of Africa that Councils should be held there, and the Canons maintained; but we do not find that he exercised particular jurisdiction over any that belonged to the Eastern Empire, that is to say, upon the four Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. He was in communion and interchange of letters with all the Patriarchs without entering into the particular management of the

[1] Robertson, *op. cit.*, bk. iv. ch. i. vol. ii. p. 376 note.

[2] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Joannem Syracusanum Episc.*, Epp. lib. ix., Ep. lix.; P.L. lxxvii. 996.

[3] *Ep. ad Joannem Defensorem*, Epp. lib. xiii., Ep. xlv.; P.L. lxxvii. 1298. The word 'Head' is ambiguous in meaning, signifying, as it does, any kind of eminency. It does not the least imply of necessity the possession of any jurisdiction. It is so used, for instance, in Canon xxxv. of the so-called 'Apostolic Canons,' 'The Bishops of each nation ought to know who amongst them is to hold the first place, whom they may consider as Head' *τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον, καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι ὡς κεφαλήν*. This ambiguity has been greatly taken advantage of by the fautors of Papalism.

Churches depending on them, except it arose in some extraordinary case. The multitude of St. Gregory's letters gives us opportunity to remark all these distinctions, in order not to extend indifferently rights which he only exercised over certain Churches.'[1]

1124. The distinctions thus noted by Fleury are of great importance. They show that the claims made by St. Gregory fell far short of the prerogatives which he held to be denoted by and embodied in the title 'Universal Bishop' or 'Universal Patriarch.' Further, however, great as these claims were with regard to the West, they were different to those which he advanced in the East. To Easterns he exhibited himself as the Bishop of the First See, and therefore especially bound to exercise that duty of vindicating the Canons incumbent indeed on all Bishops, but to the faithful discharge of which his position called him, especially when any of the Patriarchs failed to observe them. An example of this is seen in the case so often referred to by Roman controversialists as proving that St. Gregory exercised 'Papal' jurisdiction over Constantinople, and was admitted by the Patriarchs thereof to possess such jurisdiction, viz., the case of the Priest John of Chalcedon. John having been condemned by the commissaries of the Patriarch John of Constantinople, appealed to Rome: St. Gregory held a Council, and he was acquitted. St. Gregory says of this case that it was 'referred according to the Canons to the Apostolic See.'[2] He thus based his appellate jurisdiction on the 'Canons.' He did not claim to be the supreme judge of the faithful *jure divino* as the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate. The distinction is vital. The former would be an ecclesiastical grant, the latter is claimed to be, by the institution of Christ, an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church. By the Canons to which he refers as the basis of his authority in such matters, St. Gregory meant probably the 'Sardican Canons,' for no other Canons gave the Roman Bishop any privilege which can be said to even resemble what St. Gregory claimed. As has been shown,[3] no right of appeal was granted by these Canons even if they be genuine,[4] the privilege was much more limited in scope than that. This was the utmost extent to which St. Gregory attempted to push his prerogative in the East, and it is noticeable that, like Felix[5] and Gelasius,[6] he did not specify 'the Canons'; did he not like them desire that it should be inferred that they were Nicene? His impotence in this matter in the East was practically shown, as already noted, by the fact that he was unable to put an end to what he held to be a breach of the supreme law of the

[1] Fleury, *op. cit.*, liv. xxxv. c. 19, tom. ii. 759. Edit. 1856.

[2] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Marinianum Episcopum*, Epp. lib. vi., Ep. xxiv.; P.L. lxxvii. 814.

[3] *Vide supra*, n. 326.

[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 331 *et seq.*

[5] *Vide supra*, n. 925.

[6] *Vide supra*, n. 1057.

Church, viz., the assumption by the Patriarch of Constantinople of the title which he so vehemently denounced, a title which had been repeatedly used in the documents with reference to the case of John of Chalcedon, and thus excited his ire. Here was 'a fault found in a Bishop,' a grievous one according to his letters; certainly he who bore it by his conduct showed that he was not subject even in such an event to the Roman Bishop.

1125. Yet it must not be forgotten that even the idea of the Papacy upon which St. Gregory consistently acted was not itself primitive. It formed no part of the institution of Christ. It plainly innovated on the rights of the Episcopate as understood by St. Cyprian in the third, and St. Augustine in the fifth century, as is clear by the evidence which has been given from their own conduct and statements. It is, in fact, a growth out of St. Leo's position, which itself was new, though it probably had some basis in the less strictly formulated novelties of Innocent I. Consequently it, no more than Papalism when fully developed, is found to be anything else than an excrescence on the Divine Constitution of the Church, and therefore as such in no way the prerogative of the occupants of the Roman See *jure divino*. It is important to bear in mind these two points, viz., first, that St. Gregory's claims were themselves innovations and consequently to be rejected, and, secondly, these claims so innovated were different in essence from those which are embodied in Papalism.[1] If then it were sought to have any argument in favour of the recognition of the monarchical position of the Bishop of Rome as laid down in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* by those Churches, such as the English, which owe their foundation to St. Gregory, on the claims he advanced, and which were so largely admitted in the West, it would be sufficient to reply, first, that these claims themselves were such as were contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church, and therefore not to be admitted, and, secondly, that even if it were granted that St. Gregory's assumptions for the Roman Bishop were part of that Divine Constitution, which they were clearly not, yet inasmuch as they differ in essence from the Papalist doctrine of the Papal Monarchy, it is obviously absurd to adduce such assumptions as the ground of submission to Papalism.

1126. The incompatibility between the two positions, of which proof has already been given,[2] is further shown by a letter addressed by St. Gregory to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria. The Monothelite heresy was devastating the Church of Alexandria, and Eulogius was especially desirous of obtaining Western support in his efforts to withstand its ravages. Naturally, after the manner of Orientals having an object to gain, he couched his letter in obsequious terms.

[1] On the use made by St. Gregory of the *Pallium*, *vide* note 63.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 1119 *et seq.*

1127. In reply St. Gregory wrote as follows: 'Your Holiness, who is most agreeable to me, has much to say to me in your letter concerning the Chair of St. Peter, chief of the Apostles, declaring that he continues in it himself in the person of his successors. Indeed, I confess myself for my part to be unworthy, not merely in the rank of those who rule, but in the number of those who stand. But I have willingly received all that was said, because he who spoke to me concerning Peter's Chair was the person who occupied it. And though I in no way take pleasure in honours peculiar to myself, yet I am greatly delighted that your Holinesses gave to yourselves what you bestow on me. For who is ignorant that the Holy Church is established on the firmness of the chief of the Apostles, who in his name expressed the firmness of his mind, being called Peter from the Rock, who was told by the voice of the Truth, "To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." To whom again it was said, "And then when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." And again, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep." And thus, though the Apostles be many, yet the See of the chief of the Apostles, which belongs to one, though it is in three places, alone prevailed in authority, by virtue of his chiefship. For he it is who exalted the See in which he also condescended to take his rest, and finish the present life. It is he who adorned the See, to which he sent the Evangelist, his disciple. It is he who established the See in which he sat for eleven years, though he was to leave it. Inasmuch then as the See over which by divine authority three Bishops now preside is one man's and one, whatever good I hear of you I lay to my own account. If you believe any good of me, lay this to the account of your own desert, because we are one in Him who saith, "That they may all be one; as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us."'[1]

1128. St. Gregory, indeed, believed himself to be the successor of Peter whom, in accord with the tradition long before accepted at Rome, he held to have been first Diocesan Bishop of Rome, yet the language he uses in this letter is plainly incompatible with the idea that he held the Papalist doctrine of the prerogatives belonging *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome as the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate. Had he done so he could not have placed the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch in the same category as himself, declaring their Sees with his own to be but one See, the See of Peter. The sovereign position of the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College' would have necessarily prevented him from so writing, and thus denying the unique supremacy which was his by the institution of Christ.

[1] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Eulogium Episc. Alex.*, Epp. lib. vii., Ep. xl.; P.L. lxxvii. 898, 899.

1129. St. Gregory's position differs therefore clearly in kind from that assigned to the Roman Pontiff by Papalism, and it is not a little significant as showing how plain is the distinction between them, that the very title which St. Gregory denounced in such unsparing terms is attributed to the Popes in the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*.[1] It, in fact, as already stated, accurately denotes the position claimed for them by Papalism. There are those indeed who bear the name of Bishop, but their position depends both for its origin and continuance on the will of the Supreme Pastor, and therefore they describe themselves as having their Sees 'by the grace of the Apostolic See,' they are in fact the Vicars of the 'Universal' Bishop, who is the 'Ordinary' of every diocese.

1130. It is futile to endeavour to destroy the force of the argument derived from St. Gregory's statements by alleging that he meant that the title Universal Bishop would signify that there was but one Bishop in the world, in the sense that there would be but one Bishop in the world who could confer Orders, etc., or one Priest in the sense that he alone could offer the Divine Mysteries, etc. Such a notion is so absurd that it causes its own refutation in its face, for obviously it would be physically impossible for one man to perform all these functions throughout the whole world, apart from the fact that it is incompatible with the language which the great Doctor uses in denouncing it.

1131. From what has been said it follows that the *Satis Cognitum*, in the citation which it makes from St. Gregory's writings in this connection, applies his words in a sense which their context shows to be incompatible with his meaning, and flagrantly contradicts the arguments he makes use of throughout the controversy with reference to the title Universal Bishop, about which the letter from which the quotation is taken is concerned. To which it may be added that the assumption of the *position* which St. Gregory held to be involved in that title by his successors has proved how great was his foresight as to what would be the consequence of such assumption, viz., 'the injury and disruption of the whole Church.'[2]

Section CLIII.—*The actual position of Bishops in the Church according to Papalism.*

1132. An investigation into the position which, according to Papalism, is occupied by the Episcopate in the Church has shown, first, that

[1] Sexti i., Ep. ii.; Victoris, Ep. i.; Pontiani, Ep. ii.; Stephani, Ep. ii.; Hinschius, *op. cit.*, 108, 127, 148, 182.

[2] S. Greg. M., *Ad Episc. Thessaloniensi Illyricæ*, Epp. lib. ix., Ep. lxviii.; P.L. lxxvii. 1104.

though they are said 'to succeed to the Apostles, to inherit their ordinary power, to exercise a power which is really their own, and to be most truly called the ordinary Pastors of the peoples over which they rule,' yet their power is not *properly* called jurisdiction, as that belongs to the Roman Pontiff alone; secondly, that as the Apostles' power was conferred through Peter, 'in conjunction with him,' the Bishops succeeding to the Apostles derive their power in like manner 'through' the Roman Pontiffs, the legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, and retain it only so long as they are in subjection to and in union with the Roman Pontiff, the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, in that if they secede from him they become 'outside the *edifice*,' 'separated from the *fold*,' and 'exiled from the *Kingdom*'; thirdly, that this power is essentially 'limited and dependent,' inferior to the superior power whence it is derived, which is 'supreme,' 'universal,' and 'independent,' the 'real and sovereign authority of the Roman Pontiff'; fourthly, that the Bishops occupy the position of servants, the Roman Pontiff being the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' who exercises the authority which Christ exercised during His mortal life over the Apostolate, which authority He bestowed on Peter as His Vicar, of whom the Roman Pontiffs are *jure divino* the successors; fifthly, they 'rule' the people of their dioceses in subjection to their 'Master,' who has *in* these said dioceses full and supreme power of jurisdiction, which is 'ordinary,' 'immediate,' and 'truly Episcopal'; they are thus actually his delegates, not really 'Ordinaries'; their principal, moreover, whilst assuming them into a share of his pastoral care, still retains it in its plenitude, so that he can and does exercise that Episcopal power in the said dioceses without reference to them; sixthly, as the Roman Pontiff possesses *jure divino* this 'supreme,' 'ordinary,' 'immediate,' and 'truly Episcopal' jurisdiction over the whole Church, the Bishops may be removed by him, and the territories in which they exercised the power which he conferred on them may be rearranged and placed under other Bishops without reference to them; lastly, that as the individual Bishop is thus in subjection to the Roman Pontiff, so also is the whole 'Episcopal College,' the Roman Pontiff being its 'Master,' so that the Pope is supreme even over an Œcumenical Council in which the One Episcopate is assembled.

1133. The conclusion necessarily follows that, according to Papalism, the Roman Pontiff is in reality the one Universal Bishop, and that those who bear the name of Bishop are in actual fact his 'Vicars' and not 'Ordinaries' of the dioceses over which by his authority they have been placed. The *Satis Cognitum* is a consistent whole, as indeed was to be expected, and the statement that the Bishops 'are not to be looked upon—*putandi*—as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiff' is one which must be taken in the sense in which it is made; that sense, it is

evident, from the whole argument of the *Satis Cognitum*, must be such as is compatible with the position of the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' the Supreme Pastor exercising, as the legitimate successor of Peter, that power which Christ exercised during His mortal life over the Apostles; hence the statement can only be true in the limited sense which has been explained above,[1] and which is essentially different to that which it has been sought to affix to it in disregard of the context and of the argument of the whole document. Such, then, is the Papalist conception of the position of the Bishops.

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 878, 1088.

CHAPTER XXV

CONCLUSION

Section CLIV.—*The Papalist claims recapitulated.*

1134. The investigation into the nature of the Papalist claims which has been undertaken in the foregoing pages has made quite clear what those claims are. The *Satis Cognitum*, which is the latest authoritative explanation of those claims, speaks in no ambiguous terms. In language which permits of no misunderstanding the doctrine of the Papal Monarchy is laid down and declared to be the institution of Christ. The prerogatives of the Roman Bishop are asserted in no uncertain manner, and his position declared to be that of a sovereign whom the whole community is bound to obey. The victory of 'the Italian School and Bellarmine' has been complete. According to that School, to use the words of Mgr. Maret, 'the Pope possesses a monarchy pure, indivisible, absolute, unlimited. He possesses a pure monarchy, since he sees nothing in the Church by his side or above him; an indivisible monarchy, since he knows no *necessary* sharing of his sovereignty; an absolute monarchy, since he alone makes the law, and imposes an absolute obedience to the law which he makes; an unlimited monarchy, since he is responsible to God alone for the use of his authority.'[1] That is the position which the Pope holds, *jure divino*, according to the Decrees of the *Vatican Council*. This position is not one of mere ecclesiastical appointment but of divine institution, an essential part of the Divine Constitution of the Church. The interpretation given by the *Satis Cognitum* effectually prohibits any minimising interpretation of the *Vatican Decrees*, setting its seal on what must be admitted to be *prima facie* the true meaning of these Decrees.

1135. The word Primacy applied to the position of the Roman Bishop is clearly shown to be used in the sense of Supremacy, a Supremacy absolute and complete both as regards jurisdiction and teaching—the Roman Pontiff being, as the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, the Supreme Judge of the Faithful and Supreme Teacher of all Christians. The absolute character of this Supremacy is evidenced

[1] Mgr. Maret, Évêque de Sura, *Du Concile Générale et de la Paix Religieuse*, i. 130.

by the fact that all the Bishops, not only as individuals, but collectively, are subject to his real and sovereign authority, whilst the definitions of the Supreme Pastor *ex cathedra*—as to faith and morals—are irreformable *ex sese*, and not from the consent of the Church. His monarchical position is further emphasised by the allegation that he is the 'Master' 'of the Episcopal College,' wielding over the Episcopate the same authority which Christ during His mortal life exercised over the Apostolate.

1136. The power of the Bishops is declared to be 'limited' and 'dependent.' That of the Supreme Pastor is, on the contrary, asserted to be 'independent' and 'universal.' Derived from the Pope, their jurisdiction and power of government depends for its continuance on their maintaining communion with him who still retains the full plenitude of jurisdiction. He is, in fact, the true 'Ordinary' of every diocese, having 'immediate' jurisdiction over it, which is 'ordinary' and 'truly Episcopal.' As 'the only true legislator' he 'remains ever superior to the disciplinary laws which he makes; he may without being bound by any legal prescription, but consulting his conscience only—which sometimes comes to acting according to his sole pleasure—give or refuse canonical institution, extend or limit Episcopal authority, modify the extent of dioceses, create new bishoprics, transfer, judge, suspend, depose Bishops, *even causelessly*. In a word, he can do everything to the Episcopate, if not *rightly* yet *validly*, except decree its complete abolition.'[1] As the Episcopal College collectively is, equally with the Bishops individually who compose it, subject to his real and sovereign authority, Œcumenical Councils are inferior to the Pope, from whose ratification of their proceedings, indeed, they attain Œcumenical rank.

1137. This monarchical position is declared to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff as the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate, to whom and to his successors the Lord is alleged to have committed the office of Supreme Pastor. This office is asserted to be the principal element in the Divine Constitution and formation of the Church necessary for the maintenance of its unity, communion with the Supreme Pastor being an essential condition to being in the One Flock. Hence the position of the Roman Pontiff in Church is not of ecclesiastical appointment, nor has it arisen through a mere human process of development from a position recognised by ancient ecclesiastical custom, but has necessarily been in existence by the institution of Christ from the beginning of the Christian religion, from the first moment of the foundation of the Church, and therefore the *Satis Cognitum* declares it to have been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,'[2] and, as the *Vatican*

[1] Maret, *op. cit.*, ii. 10.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 39.

Council asserts, a 'doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation.'[1]

Section CLV.—*Result of the investigation as to the validity of the Papal Claims.*

1138. What has been the result of judging these vast claims made for the Papacy by the evidence afforded by the Holy Scriptures, the Œcumenical Councils, the Fathers, and the history of the Church? Have they been shown to be justified by the evidence or not? The answer to this question of grave import must be in the negative.

The 'Charter Texts' adduced in proof of the Papalist doctrine have each of them been considered in detail, and have been shown not to bear the meaning sought to be affixed to them by the fautors of the Papacy; the Fathers and ancient writers witnessing against such interpretation, which, according to Papalism, must have been *the one* interpretation which the Church in every age has taught and believed. It has been proved, on the contrary, that according to the testimony of the Fathers the Apostles in the Divine Constitution of the Church were all equal in power and authority, possessed of Œcumenical jurisdiction, St. Peter being held by some Fathers, especially amongst the Africans, to have occupied the position of representative of the Apostolic College, but as in no way receiving from Christ any power or authority which was not equally received immediately from Christ by all the other Apostles.

1139. The various quotations from the Fathers adduced by the *Satis Cognitum* in proof of its allegations have been considered at length, and have been shown, either by means of the context, or by other passages from the same authors, or by the acts of their writers, not to be susceptible of the meaning which that document by its use of them seeks to affix thereto. On the other hand, evidence has been given from the Fathers and historical facts adduced which prove that any such monarchical position belonging *jure divino* to Peter and his 'legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate' as alleged by Papalism was unknown to the Primitive Church, and therefore could not have been conferred by Christ on them as the principal element in the Divine Constitution of the Church. Other writers cited have been shown to be on various grounds valueless as witnesses for the purpose of the *Satis Cognitum*.

1140. The question of the Roman Episcopate of St. Peter has been considered—an 'Episcopate' which is so essential to the Papalist doctrine—and it has been proved that St. Peter never held the position of 'Diocesan Bishop' of Rome, so that it is an impossibility

[1] *Concil. Vatican.* sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 484.

for the occupants of that See to be his 'legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate.' The origin and growth of the opinion that St. Peter did sit in the Roman Chair has been traced and shown to be contrary to the evidence of the witnesses who lived nearest to St. Peter's own day, and who had therefore the best means of knowing the facts.

1141. The value of the citations from Councils adduced in the *Satis Cognitum* has been shown to be 'nil' for the purposes for which appeal is made to them, whilst the evidence of the Œcumenical Councils against Papalism has been set out in detail.

The real position of Bishops in the Church has been discussed at length. It has been found on 'examining the Episcopate,' to use the words of Mgr. Pannilini, the Bishop of Chiusi and Pienza, 'that in its origin and first institution it is a unity in which every bishop possesses a part *in solidarity*, Jesus Christ gave to the whole Apostolic College, and therein to all the Episcopal body, the power of the keys, and confided to them the sacred deposit of faith and doctrine. The division and distribution of dioceses has not altered in any degree this original unity of the episcopate. For whence comes it that every bishop, though he has a particular flock to feed, still retains the obligation constantly to watch over the whole flock of Jesus Christ, according to the necessities that arise from time to time, to extend his care to the wants and interests of the Universal Church, to inform himself in regard to its general state, and to take part in its government, in that proportion and degree, and according to that form, which the plan of the ecclesiastical hierarchy established by Christ, and prescribed by the Canons of the Church, requires? Thus, in fact, wrote St. Cyprian to Pope Stephen: "Although we are many pastors, we feed but one flock, and we ought to gather together and cherish all the sheep which Christ, by His blood and by His passion has sought."'[1] The One Episcopate is thus the perpetuation of the Apostolate as the Supreme authority founded by Jesus Christ in His Church, such authority finding its fullest expression in an Œcumenical Council, the position which is occupied by the Bishops, according to Papalism, being thus shown to be contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church.

1142. The origin and gradual growth of the Papal Monarchy has been discussed, and evidence has been given of the part Erastianism and forgery had in bringing it into existence, and in developing it. It has been shown that the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* had great influence in this development, for, as Van Espen says, 'It is undoubted that the Roman Curia supported this collection of false decretals with

[1] Pannilini, *Atti dell'Assemblea* (Firenze, 1787), iv. 745, quoted Jenkins, *The Privilege of Peter*, pp. 29, 30.

the utmost zeal, and laboured in order that these decretal letters might everywhere be received as authentic, and as emanating from those early and most holy Pontiffs, and that the authority claimed in them for the Roman Pontiffs might be recognised by all,'[1] and as these Forged Decretals were incorporated by Gratian in his *Decretum*, with other forgeries in the Papalist interest, 'by this forgery and reception of the Decretals the discipline of the Fathers was broken down, and . . . moreover, the Roman Pontiffs inserted into their own Decretals, and willed to be taken for law, the new principles asserted in these Decretals as if they had been transmitted to us by Apostolical tradition.'[2] In short, Papalism has been shown not to possess the three marks of the Vincentian Canon of the truth, 'Universality, Antiquity, and Consent.' Papalism is *not* a development from a divinely implanted germ in the Constitution of the Church, following the natural laws of growth yet remaining 'the same, uncorrupted and entire, full and perfect, with no loss of what is proper to it, no variety of definition,'[3] but has been proved to be an accretion on the Divine Constitution of the Church, the beginnings of which can be traced, and which bears upon it the impress, not of Divine Wisdom, but of human craft. Such, it is submitted, is the result of the investigation undertaken in this work.

Section CLVI.—*Papalism of necessity must be rejected by Catholics.*

1143. It is evident that several important consequences inevitably follow from that which has been found to be the true value of the doctrine of Papalism with regard to the position of the Roman Bishop. Inasmuch as the Papal Monarchy is no part of the Divine Constitution of the Church, but a human institution deforming the creation of the Divine Founder of the Church, not only is any portion of the Church free to reject it, but it is bound in loyalty to the Divine Head of the Church to do so. Whatever advantages might theoretically be considered as probable to result from the institution by the Church of a certain See as a centre of unity, so that, for example, the Roman See might have been so recognised, and thus occupied a great and influential position with many prerogatives conferred on it *jure ecclesiastico*, the Church has not been guided by the Holy Spirit Who dwells in her so to act; such action on her part, if she had taken it, would not in any way justify the acceptance of such a pre-eminent position and accompanying prerogatives as alleged to be conferred *jure divino*. The two positions are essentially different—no one who has read the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum* can fail to apprehend this; the language of both documents, especially

[1] Van Espen, *Comment. in jus novum Canonicum*, pars secunda, diss. prima, *De Collectione Isidori*, op. tom. iii. 453. Lovanii, 1753. [2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*

[3] St. Vincent Lirin., *Commonitorium Primum adv. Hæreses*, c. ii.; P.L. i. 668.

when taken together, is clear and definite on the point, for if there had been any possibility of explaining the former in such a way as to make the 'Papal' prerogatives and position of Bishop of Rome consonant with such a position as that mentioned hypothetically above, such possibility is completely removed by the latter. It is, it must be carefully borne in mind, the claim that Papalism makes for the Roman Bishop to be the Supreme Monarch over the whole Church as an essential element in the *Divine* Constitution of the Church, such position being conferred on Peter and his successors in the Roman Episcopate by her Divine Founder Christ Himself, which has to be accepted *ex animo* as a 'doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation' by all who are of the Roman obedience, this, and nothing short of this, is the condition therefore which must be complied with by all who 'submit to Rome.'

1144. Hence it follows that if any portion of the Church has, at any period of its history, submitted to the Supremacy of the Pope, recognising and admitting all that is involved in the Papal position, paying the lowliest submission to the monarchical authority of the Roman Pontiff, such portion of the Church has obviously the full right to reject Papalism as being contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church without in any way forfeiting the position it holds as an integral part of the Catholic Church. Consequently, if it be granted, for instance, that the *Ecclesia Anglicana* was in absolute subjection to the Roman Pontiff prior to the breach with Rome in the sixteenth century, nevertheless, when that Church, by the Acts of the Convocations of the two Provinces of Canterbury and York of which it is comprised, rejected the Papal Supremacy,[1] it did not by the action thus taken cease to be what it had ever been, since the first moment of its foundation, viz., an integral part of the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.[2] As regards the claims of the Roman Bishop, the English Church has taken deliberately the position which the great Eastern Churches have ever occupied. It is often forgotten, or intentionally put out of sight, that the Eastern Churches—the Churches of the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem—have always repudiated the Papal claims, and adhered to the Divine Constitution of the Church. The abortive 'Union,' the work of the Council of Florence, was, as has been seen, repudiated by them as soon as they emancipated themselves from the overwhelming pressure put on them by the civil power, by whose exertions for political reasons it had been brought about,[3] though even the *Decretum Unionis* itself bears witness to the difficulty experienced by the fautors of the Papacy in inducing those Eastern Bishops who

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 782, 745.

[2] On the foundation of the Church of the English, *vide* note 60.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 254 *et seq.*

were present at the Council to assent to it.[1] The four Patriarchs occupy the same positions as were assigned to them by the Œcumenical Councils, they recognise the Bishop of Rome as the First of the Patriarchs, Bishop of the See to which 'the Fathers naturally assigned privileges,' that is, they recognise a Primacy as attached *jure ecclesiastico* to the Roman Bishop in the sense it was attributed to him by the Œcumenical Councils, not in the Papalist sense of 'Universal Bishop,' the Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, whose real and sovereign authority, conferred by Christ Himself, the whole community is bound to obey. The Easterns witness to the Divine Constitution of the Church, and have never admitted the Papal claims. This is of the greatest importance; it shows that those claims are without foundation, and accretions on, and alien from, the Constitution of the Church as it was framed by her Divine Founder, and therefore not to be accepted as a 'doctrine from which no one may deviate without loss of salvation,' and consequently completely justifying the action of the English Church in repudiating those claims. It must be added that the English Church has never declined to recognise the 'Primacy' of the Roman Bishop in the same sense of the word as the Eastern Churches do, the sense of the Œcumenical Councils, which she accepts. To use the words of the great Archbishop of Armagh, Bramhall, writing of a Papalist controversialist: 'If he had not been a mere novice and altogether ignorant of the tenets of our English Church, he might have known that we have no controversy with St. Peter, nor with any other, about the privileges of St. Peter. Let him be "first, chief, or prince of the Apostles," in that sense, wherein the ancient Fathers styled him so. Let him be the first "ministerial mover." And why should not the Church have recourse to a Prime Apostle or Apostolical Church in doubtful cases? The learned Bishop of Winchester [Andrewes], of whom it is no shame for him to learn, might have taught him thus much, not only in his own name, but in the name of the king and Church of England: "Neither is it questioned among us whether St. Peter had a primacy, but what that primacy was, and whether it were such a one as the Pope doth now challenge to himself, and you challenge to the Pope; but the king [James I.] doth not deny Peter to have been prime and prince of the Apostles."'[2]

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 260 *et seq.*

[2] Bramhall, *Schism Guarded*, sect. i. ch. i. *op.* Lib. of Anglo-Catholic Theology, vol. ii. p. 371. The reference to Bishop Andrewes is, *Ad Card. Bellarmini Apologiam Responsio*, p. 17, *op.* Lib. of Anglo-Catholic Theology. What the meaning of princeps was originally has been shown above [n. 502]. That this was the meaning of the word as used by the Fathers is clear from St. Hilary's use of the word [*vide supra*, n. 601]. It is not to the point to object that in the time of the Emperors the word acquired the meaning of 'sovereign,' the question being in what sense the word was used by the Fathers, and that, the evidence shows, was the original meaning of the word, and not that which it is alleged it afterwards came to bear.

It is Papalism which she in common with the Eastern Churches has repudiated, and it is Papalism which is the great hindrance to the reunion of all Christian people. In the words of Elias Meniates, Bishop of Zerniza, towards the end of the seventeenth century, 'I hold the dispute about the supreme power of the Pope to be the principal cause of our divisions. This is the wall of division between the two Churches. The chief controversy I hold to be about the sovereignty of the Pope. For this is at this time the great wall of separation which divides the two Churches. If all Christians were agreed on this chief point, viz., how the Church was to be governed, whether by aristocratical rule, as we think, or monarchical, as the Latins think, there would be little trouble in agreeing about the rest.'[1] The Bishop wrote with reference to the Eastern Churches, but his words are equally applicable to the case of the English Church. The supposed necessity of maintaining the authority of the Supreme Pastor and Teacher of the One Flock, *jure divino*, renders it practically impossible to discuss other questions on their merits, with a view to finding such explanations as would remove the differences which seem to hinder reunion.

1145. The venerable Pope Leo XIII. at the close of the *Satis Cognitum*, in language which all must recognise as breathing the true spirit of Christian charity, made an appeal to those whom he designated as not being of the fold. 'Let all those,' he said, 'who detest the widespread irreligion of our times, and acknowledge and confess Jesus Christ to be the Son of God and the Saviour of the human race, but who have wandered away far from the Spouse, listen to Our voice. Let them not refuse to obey Our paternal charity. Those who acknowledge Christ must acknowledge Him wholly and entirely. "The Head and the body are Christ wholly and entirely." The Head is the only begotten Son of God, the body is His Church; the bridegroom and the bride, two in one flesh. All who dissent from the Scriptures concerning Christ, although they may be found in all places in which the Church is found, are not in the Church; and again, all those who agree with the Scriptures concerning the Head, and do not communicate in the unity of the Church, are not in the Church' (S. Augustinus, *Contra Donatistas Epistola*, sive *De Unit. Eccl.*, cap. iv. n. 7).[2]

An appeal couched in such terms cannot fail to prove to all to whom it is addressed that he who made it was full of love for souls, and desirous for the advancement of true religion. Whilst, however, a tribute must thus be paid to the motives which inspired the illustrious Prelate when he made this appeal, nevertheless the response to it must be such as in accord with the Truth which must stand first, far beyond

[1] Quoted by Pusey, *Eirenicon*, pt. i. p. 63, giving as reference 'Lapis Offensionis, l. 2, c. i. init.,' quoted by M. Trévern, *Discuss. Amicale*, t. i. p. 231.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 41.

any other consideration. One great advantage, it must be admitted, the *Satis Cognitum* possesses, viz., that in it the Papal position is set forth in unambiguous language; there consequently can be no manner of doubt as to the grounds on which Pope Leo based his appeal. As has been seen, the prerogatives alleged to belong *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome are clearly set out in it in detail, and it is asserted that Holy Scripture, the Fathers, and the Councils attest the truth of the allegations made in the *Encyclical* as to the real and sovereign position which the Bishop of Rome is asserted to possess by the institution of Christ over the Church. It is to these claims, vast and great as they are, which are conveniently summed up as constituting Papalism that Pope Leo demanded an unconditional submission from those to whom he addressed his appeal. Amongst those whom he had especially in his mind, as we know from himself,[1] were the English people; the only answer that English Churchmen can make to the appeal thus made to them must be in the negative. They are prohibited from returning any other response by the fact that those claims to which submission is demanded are proved to be without foundation, and to be an accretion on the Divine Constitution of the Church; to submit to them would be false to the Truth, and English Churchmen in declining to make such unconditional submission to the Papal demands, in declining to recognise the Papal Monarchy as *jure divino*, are simply acting as they are bound to do in accordance with Catholic principle.

1146. Pope Leo XIII. made a citation from St. Augustine's treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* at the close of his appeal.[2] That great theologian, however, as we have seen,[3] knew nothing of Papalism. In the very treatise quoted by Pope Leo it would have been of the utmost advantage to him in his controversy with the Donatists to have adduced the monarchical position belonging, according to Papalism, *jure divino* to the Bishop of Rome over the Church, and the fact that they were out of communion with him whose real and sovereign authority they were bound to obey, as an argument which would be conclusive against their pretentions; he did not do so because the Divine Constitution of the Church of which he was so distinguished a Doctor had no such 'element' principal, or otherwise, in it. English Churchmen, therefore, will be in accord with St. Augustine's teaching in rejecting the claims thus put before them, and they, abiding in the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, so far from being 'outside the *fold*,' 'agreeing with the Scriptures concerning the Head,' do 'communicate in the Unity of the Church,' and are thus 'Catholics' 'holding God as their Father and the Church as their

[1] Leonis XIII., P., *Litteræ Apostolicæ de Ordinationibus Anglicanis*, 50 n. Leonis, P. XIII., *Allocutiones*, etc., vol. vi. p. 198. Bruges, 1900.

[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 42.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 605, 614 *et seq.*, 621 *et seq.*, 641.

Mother.'[1] Sorely indeed must they lament that the moral unity of the Church is broken, and thus her power to discharge the great Commission wherewith she has been entrusted is weakened, yet firmly 'walking in the old paths,'[2] 'holding fast that which is good,'[3] refusing to be false to the Truth by submitting to that which is contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church, they must in prayerful patience await the time when the great Head of the Church shall see fit to remove by the gracious influence of the Divine Spirit of love all the hindrances which now stand in the way of that reunion of all Christian people which must be so dear to His Sacred Heart.

[1] S. August., *Sermo* ii. n. 14; P.L. xxxviii. 27.
[2] Jeremiah vi. 16.
[3] 1 Thess v. 21.

NOTES

Note 1, n. 40.

On St. Cyprian and the authority of Councils.

1147. St. Cyprian's language with reference to the authority of an individual Bishop, which has been quoted above,[1] is in no way inconsistent with what has been said with reference to the position of the One Episcopate as the perpetuation of the One Apostolate; on the contrary, it supports it. St. Cyprian in the passages quoted is dealing with a specific case, viz., that of the attempt of a single Bishop, St. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, to coerce his co-Bishops, and he denies that any individual Bishop has the right to judge another. 'No one of us,' he said, at the Third Council of Carthage, in the context of the second quotation, 'setteth himself as a Bishop of Bishops or by tyrannical terror forceth his colleagues to the necessity of obeying.'[2] He

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 40.

[2] *Sententiæ Epis. . . . de hereticis Baptizandis*, Hartel, 430. St. Cyprian's action in the case of Marcian of Arles does not in any way contradict his statement here made. Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, had, as noted above, n. 41, together with his fellow-Bishops settled in the Province (Narbonensis), written more than once to St. Cyprian and to St. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, denouncing Marcian as a Bishop who had 'joined himself to Novatian, and departed from the unity of the Catholic Church and from the concord of our body and priesthood' (S. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxviii. n. 1, Hartel, 744). He had consequently by his own action already cast himself out of the Church, and condemned himself by joining a schismatical and heretical body. St. Stephen, it would appear, had not moved in the matter, and as he was the nearest of the two great Bishops of the West to Arles, to whom the Gallic Church had applied for aid, and, moreover, had a close connection with that Church, several of the Sees of which had been quite recently founded by the Roman Church, St. Cyprian wrote to him. He does not appeal to him to take action merely on his own behalf as an individual Bishop, but on the ground that it is the duty of all Bishops to come to the aid of their fellow-Bishops who were suffering as were the Bishops of Gaul, 'It is ours to advise and come in aid,' because Marcian 'seemeth as yet not to be excommunicated—*abstentus*—by *us*.' 'For therefore, dearest brother, is the body of Bishops so large, united together by the glue of mutual concord and the bond of unity, that if any of our College should attempt to introduce heresy, and to rend and lay waste the flock of Christ, the rest may come in and aid, and as good and merciful shepherds gather the Lord's Sheep into the fold. . . . Since Marcian . . . joining himself to Novatian, has become an enemy to mercy and pity, let him not pronounce but receive sentence, nor act as though judge of the College of Bishops, for that himself has by all the Bishops been judged' (*ibid., l.c.*). St. Cyprian here clearly lays down in what capacity St. Stephen was called upon to take action, it was as a member of the College of Bishops whom Marcian had 'insulted' by refusing to follow the practice sanctioned by the One Episcopate regarding the reconciliation of the *lapsi*, and joining Novatian 'who has been long ago excommunicated and adjudged an enemy to the Church' (*ibid., l.c.*). 'Wherefore it behoves you to write a very full letter—*plenissimas litteras*—to our fellow-Bishops established in Gaul that they no longer suffer the

thus asserts that no *one* Bishop possesses a power superior to that of any other of the Bishops, differing from it, so that he occupies the position of 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' having *jure divino* 'real and sovereign authority which' that 'College' 'is bound to obey.' All Bishops according to St. Cyprian hold in joint tenure the One Episcopate, their individual authority is thus exactly the same in essence. But this so far from being inconsistent with, on the contrary involves, the recognition of the fact that such authority, the authority of the One Episcopate, has a more perfect representation in Councils of Bishops. For it is obvious that though the authority of such Synods is the same in essence, being that of an assemblage consisting of those who hold the One Episcopate in joint tenure, as that of an individual Bishop, yet the Acts of a Council, being the joint Acts of many of those who thus hold the One Episcopate, necessarily are superior in weight to that same kind of authority when exercised by the same Bishops who comprise the Council as *individuals*.

1148. This we find St. Cyprian clearly held, as the following facts prove: (*a*) St. Cyprian during the first eighteen months of his Episcopate had to deal with the case of Germinius Victor of Furni, near Carthage, who had nominated by his will Germinius Faustinus, a Presbyter, as the tutor or curator of his property. In his first *Epistle* he writes to the presbyters, deacons, and laity of Furni strictly forbidding that any oblation should be made for Germinius Victor on his falling asleep, or any prayer offered for him in the Church, on the express ground that 'it was long ago decreed in a Council[1] of Bishops that no one should by his will appoint one of the clergy and ministers of God to be executor or guardian,' and that should any do this 'the Bishops, our predecessors . . . enacted . . . that no offering should be made for him nor sacrifice celebrated for his repose.'[2]

froward and proud Marcian, an enemy both to the mercy of God and the salvation of the brethren, to insult over our College. . . . Let letters be addressed from thee to the Province, and to the people dwelling at Arles, whereby, Marcian having been excommunicated,—*abstento Marciano*—another may be substituted in his room, and the flock of Christ, which to this day is overlooked, scattered by him and wounded, be again collected together' (*ibid.*, nn. 2, 3; Hartel, pp. 145-6.) St. Stephen's act was thus in St. Cyprian's intention to be a reminder to the Gallic Bishops by one of two great Bishops of the West to whom they had applied for aid (which they in virtue of their holding in joint tenure the One Episcopate were bound to render) against Marcian, who was retaining possession of his See in defiance of the whole Episcopate, of the sentence which he had incurred by becoming a follower of Novatian, viz., a share in his excommunication and of their consequent duty to proceed to the removal of Marcian from the position he was unlawfully occupying, since by no member of the One Episcopate could he be received to communion, and so no longer could they (*i.e.* the Gallic Bishops) suffer him to insult the College of Bishops by allowing him to retain his See. This was the object of the 'very full letter' to the Bishops; the other letter was to be addressed to the 'Plebs who stand faithful at Arles' in order that, Marcian having been formally removed from the See, it might be filled up by the nomination of a successor with the '*Suffragium*' of the laity, according to the rule of the Church in the Cyprianic age, and the effect of the letters would be the cessation of the scandal. St. Cyprian's action is thus seen to be entirely consistent with the statement in the text.

[1] Perhaps that held under Agrippinus, between 218-22. Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. 4. [E.T. i. 87, 92.]

[2] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Presbyteros et Diaconos et Plebem Furnis. consistentes.* Ep. i. 2; Hartel, 466. This letter was written after this decision had been renewed by the Council of Carthage, A.D. 249.

(*b*) Again, when in retirement during the persecution, St. Cyprian gave certain directions with regard to the treatment of the lapsed, but expressly deferred the final settlement of the question until the time when, on the abatement of the persecution, it would be possible for the Bishops to come together and decide it by a common decision of a Council.[1] This course was actually pursued. On the suspension of the *Edict* of Persecution on the departure of Decius from Rome, A.D. 251, a Council of Bishops met at Carthage in the April of that year, and the manner in which the lapsed should be dealt with was considered.

1149. By the decision which the Synod arrived at the treatment which St. Cyprian had ordered until a Synod could meet was materially modified. The Council, consisting of a large number of Bishops 'whom their own faith and the protection of the Lord had preserved uninjured and safe,' 'the divine Scriptures being admitted on both sides,' determined that the penance should be long, but the reconciliation should not be postponed till the approach of death.[2] This decision was further modified by a later Council, held A.D. 252, on the approach of another persecution in which the Bishops 'determined that peace should be granted to those who had not departed from the Church of the Lord, but from the first day of their fall have not ceased to do penance and to lament, and to entreat the Lord that they ought to be armed and accoutred for the impending battle.'[3]

1150. The decisions arrived at by the Councils differed in two important particulars from the avowedly temporary course pursued by St. Cyprian—(1), firstly, in not postponing the reconciliation till the approach of death, and (2), secondly, in ignoring the recommendations of the Confessors which Cyprian had required. The remarkable character of the latter difference is seen when it is remembered that the 'Confessors' had been exerting an influence so powerful as to threaten the destruction of the discipline of the Church. That St. Cyprian held these decisions as of greater authority than his own as an individual Bishop, in that they were those of Synods consisting of many Bishops, is clear, for he expressly says: 'Lest the number of Bishops in Africa should seem to be insufficient we wrote to Rome also on the subject to our colleague Cornelius, who himself likewise in a Council held with very many of our co-prelates [at Rome A.D. 251] agreed in the same opinion with us with like solemnity and wholesome moderation.' 'To this agreement of our College' St. Cyprian submitted, and declared that he would 'not recede from those things which have once in our Council by common consent been determined.'[4]

1151. (*c*) A certain deacon named Felicissimus being associated with Novatus in his opposition to St. Cyprian during his retirement was excommunicated by him.[5] St. Cyprian, however, at the same time reserved the consideration of certain grave charges brought against him until he should meet together with more of his colleagues.[6] Accordingly, at the Council held in A.D. 251 already mentioned, 'After hearing the parties sentence

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. 4; Hartel, 626.
[2] *Ibid.*, n. 6; Hartel, 627.
[3] *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. lvii. 1; Hartel, 651.
[4] *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. 6, 7; Hartel, 627-8.
[5] *Ep. ad Caldonium et Herculanum*, Ep. xli.; Hartel, 588.
[6] *Ibid.*

was passed on Felicissimus, a sentence which though it is probable that St. Cyprian was not present at the deliberations of the Council as he was plaintiff in the case,[1] yet he recognised as decisive, referring as he did Cornelius to the 'Letter' of his 'colleagues' 'subscribed by their own hands' containing it.

1152. (*d*) So also when St. Cyprian wrote to Cornelius with reference to Fortunatus, whom the party of Felicissimus had caused to be consecrated as 'Anti-pope' of Carthage in opposition to himself, and who had gone to Rome in order to obtain support in that quarter for his opposition, he appealed to the authority of the Council [the First of Carthage, A.D. 251] which had dealt with the case. He said that 'it had been decreed by our *whole body*, and is alike equitable and just that every cause should be heard where the offence had been committed, and a portion of the flock had been assigned to the several shepherds, which each is to rule and govern, having hereafter to give an account of his ministry to the Lord, it therefore behoves those over whom we are set not to run about from place to place, nor, by their crafty and deceitful boldness, break the harmonious concord of Bishops, but there to plead their cause where they will have both accusers and witnesses of their crime; unless perhaps some few despicable and abandoned men count as inferior the authority of the Bishops appointed in Africa who have already given judgment concerning them, and have lately by the weight of their judgment condemned those persons' consciences, entangled in the bonds of many sins. Already has their cause been heard, already has sentence been given concerning them; nor does it accord with the authority of Prelates to incur blame for the levity of a changeable and inconstant mind, since the Lord teaches us and says, Let your communication be Yea, yea, Nay, nay. If the number of those who judged this cause last year be computed with the presbyters and deacons, more were then present at the hearing and the judgment than these same persons amount to who appear to be joined with Fortunatus.'[2] In these words St. Cyprian is clearly adducing the authority of the Synod, that of the Bishops in Africa, as that which is sufficient and conclusive against any attempt by any single Bishop to reopen cases decided by such authority, and therefore it is superior to that of such individual Bishop.

1153. (*e*) The *Epistle* just quoted furnishes another instance of the recognition by St. Cyprian of the authority of Synods. He says in it that Privatus, an old heretic in the Province of Lambesis, who had been 'condemned many years since for many and grievous crimes by the sentence of ninety Bishops' was on that ground not permitted to plead as he desired his case afresh before the Council held at Carthage [A.D. 251].[3]

1154. (*f*) So in the controversy on heretical Baptism similar testimony is found. (1) St Cyprian in his *Epistle to Quintus* in proof of his contention with reference to it adduces the fact that 'Agrippinus, a man of excellent memory, with the rest, Bishops with him, who at that time governed the Church of the Lord in the Province of Africa and Numidia, did, by common counsel duly weighed, establish and confirm'[4] the rebaptism of

[1] *Vide* Archbishop Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 132.
[2] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium*, lix. nn. 14, 15; Hartel, 683-4.
[3] *Ibid.*, n. 10; Hartel, 677.
[4] *Ep. ad Quintum*, Ep. lxxi. 4; Hartel, 774.

heretics, and (2) in the first Council [A.D. 255] on the question under St. Cyprian's presidency, he says in the Synodal Letter to the Bishops of Numidia: 'We deliver not our sentence as though new, but in kindred harmony we unite with you in that long since settled by our predecessors, and observed by us.'[1] These words show that St. Cyprian regarded the authority of the Council just referred to as being sufficient to close the question, and that the Bishops in Council, though many, simply adhered in their decision to that which had been determined, whence it is clear that if the authority of a Council of Bishops was under St. Cyprian's guidance regarded thus by another Synod, it necessarily follows that it would be held by him to be superior to the authority of an individual Prelate.

1155. (*g*) Again, the case of the Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martial,[2] was brought before, and decided by, the Fourth Council of Carthage, and the Synodal Letter announcing the fact is the composition of St. Cyprian, closing with his own nominal salutation.[3]

1156. (*h*) Further, the case of the title of Cornelius to the Episcopal Chair at Rome was brought by him before the 'First Council of Carthage' [A.D. 251]. The resolution of that Council ordaining that communications with Cornelius as Bishop should be suspended, and the letters on Church business addressed to the presbyters until the Synod had been satisfied as to the regularity of the consecration of Cornelius by the report of the two Bishops, Caldonius and Fortunatus, whom they had sent to investigate the matter on the spot,[4] was considered by him as authoritative. This is plain from the fact that when, in company with Liberalis, one of the seven Bishops of the Province, he visited Adrumetum, he found the clergy in official communication with Cornelius, he, in the absence of their own Bishop Polycarp, at that time at the Synod, which was still sitting, enforced the decision of the Council.[5]

1157. The evidence that has been given that St. Cyprian held the authority of a Synod to be superior to that of an individual Prelate is in complete harmony with his own declaration as to the means by which difficult questions were regulated in his own day. His words are: 'In order to the settling of certain matters, and regulating them by the aid of our common Council, we deemed it necessary to assemble and hold a Council whereat many prelates were gathered together, in which Council many things were propounded and transacted.'[6]

In fact, had St. Cyprian not so recognised the superior authority of Councils he would have been out of harmony with the practice of the Church in his age, for by the third century Councils were practically universally held to be the organ of the Church for the purpose of authoritatively settling questions that might arise. Hence St. Firmillian, in view of this fact, declared in an *Epistle* to St. Cyprian that 'it is of necessity

[1] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Januarium*, etc., Epp. lxx.; Hartel, 767.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 574 *et seq.*

[3] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Clerum et Plebes in Hispania consistentes*, Ep. lxvii. 9; Hartel, 743.

[4] *Ep. ad Cornelium*, Ep. xlviii.; Hartel, 606 *seq.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ep. ad Stephanum*, Ep. lxxii. 1; Hartel, 775.

arranged among us, that we, elders and prelates, meet every year to set in order the things entrusted to our charge; that if there be any matters of graver moment they may be settled by common consent.'[1]

So settled and acknowledged was the practice of the Church in this respect that half a century later Constantine convoked a Council at Arles [A.D. 314] to deal with the question of the Donatists, assigning as his reason for so doing exactly that which St. Firmillian lays down in the letter just cited, viz., the greater authority of a Council in which matters are settled by common advice. For in his letter summoning the Bishops to the Synod, after stating that the question had been already by command examined by certain Bishops from Gaul and elsewhere, he says that nevertheless 'as it happens some, forgetful of their own salvation and the reverence due to our most holy religion, even now do not cease to protract their own enmity, being unwilling to conform to the decision already promulgated . . . it appeared to him necessary to provide that the dissensions which ought to have ceased after the decision had been given by their own voluntary agreement, should now at length be brought to an end if possible by the agreement of many,' for which purpose he commanded many Bishops to meet together.[2]

1158. This testimony on the part of Constantine to the firmly established and recognised position of Councils in the policy of the Church is confirmed by that of Eusebius himself, who, in commenting on the prohibition by Licinius, the opponent of Constantine, of Bishops assembling in Synod, says that they were by such prohibition compelled either to violate his commands or to nullify the constitution of the Church 'for not otherwise than by Synods could great questions be settled.'[3]

1159. To conclude, the evidence is incontestable that so far from the words of St. Cyprian with reference to the authority inherent in an individual Bishop being inconsistent with a belief in the superior authority of Councils of Bishops, they, in fact, involve such belief. For from the principle which he lays down as to the One Episcopate being held *in joint tenure* by individual Bishops, which is the ground on which St. Cyprian's statement as to the authority of the individual Bishop rests, it necessarily follows that, as in a Synod there is a better representation of the One Episcopate, the authority of that One Episcopate is the more fully expressed, and therefore its decisions the more authoritatively set forth. To this may it be added that the very idea of a Bishop uncontrolled by the Church in her corporate capacity, which it is sought to deduce from the passage cited from St. Cyprian in spite of the evidence which has been given, is in flat contradiction to his own express statement limiting their liberty of action, saying, as he does: 'So long as the bond of concord remains and the inseparable sacrament of the Catholic Church endureth, each Bishop orders and directs his own proceedings, having hereafter to give an account of his intentions to the Lord.'[4] Any action on the part of a Bishop which was contrary to the preservation of 'the bond of concord' in the Church would bring a

[1] S. Firmillian, *Ep. ad Cyprianum contra Epp. S. Cypriani*, lxxv. 4; Hartel, 812.
[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. x. c. 5; P.G. xx. 889.
[3] *Vita Const.*, bk. i. c. 51; P.G. xx. 966.
[4] S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. 21; Hartel, 639.

Bishop under the active exercise of the authority of the One Episcopate assembled in Synod, and this would cover all cases of heresy, schism, discipline, or undue use of the power of his office.

Note 2, n. 69.

On 'Decretals.'

1160. From time to time questions of doctrine and discipline arose in the Church as to which Bishops were naturally desirous to have the opinion of the Bishops who held the more distinguished positions in the Church. To such questions replies were made by letters entitled *Epistolæ Canonicæ*, of which, for example, may be noted those of St. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, both about A.D. 260; of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 306; and later those of St. Athanasius, Timothy, and Theophilus, also Bishops of that See, and of St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea. Many of these Decretal Letters of Eastern Bishops were of so high authority in the Church that the Council *in Trullo*, A.D. 692, by its second Canon set its seal upon them, placing them on a level with the Canons which it received and ratified.[1]

1161. Naturally in the West the Roman See was chiefly applied to. Its position in Western Christendom was unique owing to its Apostolic foundation and its pre-eminence as seated in the Imperial City. At the same time it is plain that, notwithstanding its most distinguished position, such reference was by no means exclusively made to its Bishops on such matters. For example, the Third Council of Carthage in A.D. 397 decided to consult, with reference to a question as to infant Baptism, 'their brothers and fellow-Bishops, Siricius, Bishop of Rome, and Simplicianus, Bishop of Milan.'[2] Another African Council—the Fifth of Carthage, A.D. 401—ordered a similar reference to be made on a like subject to Anastasius, Bishop of Rome, and Venerius, Bishop of Milan,[3] that is, to the Bishops who had jurisdiction over the civil divisions of the '*Diœcesis Romæ*' and '*Diœcesis Italiæ*,' which were included with the '*Diœcesis Africæ*' in the '*Præfectura Italiæ*' and thus would be the chief Bishops with whom the African Bishops would have naturally been brought most into contact. The 'Papal Decretals' had their origin in this custom. They were precisely the same in nature as those of other distinguished Bishops, and had a similar kind of authority in the Church.

Note 3, n. 75.

On St. Peter and the Conversion of Cornelius.

1162. It has been alleged that the Ethiopian Eunuch was the first 'Gentile' admitted into the Church.[4] But—(1) First, it would appear that he was a 'proselyte,' as it is expressly stated that he had been up to Jerusalem 'for to worship.'[5] (2) Secondly, the way in which St. Peter is caused by God to go to Cornelius proves that up to that time there had been no admission of any Gentile *as such* into the Church, otherwise it would have

[1] Mansi, xi. 940, 941. [2] *Ibid.*, iii. 891. [3] *Ibid.*, iv. 482-3.
[4] Everest, *The Gift of the Keys*, p. 19. [5] Acts viii. 27.

been impossible for St. Peter to have regarded Gentiles as 'common or unclean,'[1] and so incapable of admission into the Covenant of the New Law. (3) Thirdly, the fact that Cornelius and his household were the first Gentiles to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost which was given to Christians is plain from the astonishment of Peter's companions; (4) Fourthly, the gift of the Holy Ghost in this particular way was clearly intended to make it plain to Peter and those of 'the Circumcision which believed' that the Gentiles were to be admitted to the Church, for otherwise there would have been no point in St. Peter's words, 'Can any man *forbid* water that these should be baptised?'[2] from which it is evident that up to that time they were in ignorance that they could be so admitted, which could not have been possible had the question been settled already by the baptism of a Gentile at the express command of the Spirit.

1163. (5) Fifthly, the complaint made by those who were of 'the Circumcision' against Peter when he returned to Jerusalem in itself implies that no Gentile had hitherto been numbered among the brethren, for otherwise there would have been no ground of complaint against him. This is further corroborated by the fact that when they had heard his account of the whole matter they were satisfied, 'and glorified God saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life,'[3] words which clearly show that this was the first occasion on which any Gentile had been brought into covenant with God under the Dispensation of the New Law, and consequently that which had taken place was a manifest proof to them that it was not, like that of the Old Law, to be limited to the Israelites.

1164. (6) Lastly, we have St. Peter's own statement at the Council of Jerusalem: 'Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the words of the Gospel, and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.'[4] This statement from the connection in which it is made is a plain declaration that Cornelius, his kinsmen, and his friends, were the first Gentiles to be admitted into the Church, inasmuch as St. Peter alleges his position as having been the divinely chosen instrument of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church as the ground which would specially commend to them the advice which he was about to give.

Note 4, n. 122.

On a statement by St. Optatus on 'the Gift of the Keys.'

1165. The curious idea which prevailed in Africa owing to the influence of St. Cyprian that, by the words under notice in the text, 'the Keys' were actually conferred on St. Peter as a type of unity, instead of being merely a promise which should be fulfilled in the future, as the language used by our Lord clearly indicates, finds expression also in the works of St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, an African Father of slightly earlier date than St. Augustine. St. Optatus says: 'For the good of unity . . . he did alone receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to be imparted to the rest.'[5]

[1] Acts ix. 28. [2] *Ibid.* v. 47. [3] *Ibid.* xi. 18. [4] *Ibid.* xv. 7-9.
[5] S. Optatus, *De Schisma Donatist.*, lib. vii. 3; P.L. xi. 1087.

That is, as Bossuet says,[1] that Peter first received the Keys 'which were afterwards to be imparted to the Apostles (Matthew xviii. and John xx.), but to be imparted not by Peter but by Christ, as is clear.'

Note 5, n. 129.

On Tertullian's interpretation of 'the Gift of the Keys.'

1166. Tertullian is the only writer who lays down that the Gift of the Keys, *i.e.* the power of binding and loosing, was a grant personal to St. Peter. The passage is in his treatise *De Pudicitia*.[2] This treatise, however, was written in the latest period of his life, when he had become a Montanist and separated from the Church; his object in thus limiting the grant to St. Peter personally was to deny that the power of binding and loosing had been transmitted down in the Church. His argument being that it was exhausted by St. Peter himself when he unlocked the doors of the Kingdom of Heaven by his action in admitting new converts into the Church, conveniently ignoring the reiteration of the promise to all the Apostles in St. Matthew xviii. 18, and the fulfilment thereof in the commission given to the Apostles jointly in St. John xx. 21, 22.

Note 6, n. 156.

Some of the Forged Decretals cited by Melchior Cano.

1167. Anacletus, Ep. i., *De Oppressione Christianorum*, cap. xvii., *vide* Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidoriana*, p. 74, Ep. iii., *De Patriarchis*, cap. xxx., *ibid.*, p. 83; Evaristus, *Ep. de ordine Diaconorum*, *ibid.*, p. 87; Alexander, *Ep. ad universos Orthodoxos*, cap. iv., *ibid.*, p. 95, Sixtus i., *Ep. ad omnes Episcopos*, cap. v., *ibid.*, p. 508; Eleutherus, *Ep. ad Episcopos Gallicanos*, cap. ii., *ibid.*, p. 125; Zephyrinus, *Ep. ad Episcopos Siculianos*, cap. vi., *ibid.*, p. 2; Marcellus, *Ep. ad Episc. Antiocenos*, cap. i.-ii., *ibid.*, pp. 223, 224, etc.

Note 7, n. 157.

On the letter of Pelagius P. II. to the Bishops of Istria.

1168. It is sometimes alleged that an earlier instance of this use of the text is to be found in a letter of Pelagius P. II. to the Bishops of Istria in A.D. 585. An examination, however, of the letter shows that the use therein made of the text is, in fact, incompatible with the Papalist interpretation. 'Consider,' says Pelagius, 'beloved, that the truth is not able to lie, nor the faith of Peter able to be shaken or to be changed; for when the devil desired to sift all the disciples, for Peter alone the Lord testified that He prayed and willed that by him the others should be confirmed. . . . But because the enemy of the human race does not rest from sowing tares over the good seed in the Church of the Lord, and therefore lest by chance any one should presume with malignant desire to imagine and demonstrate

[1] Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars. iii. lib. viii. cap. xii., tom. ii. p. 90. Lugani, 1766.

[2] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, c. xxi.; P.L. ii. 1025.

under the instigation of the devil what is untrue concerning the integrity of our faith, and thus perchance your minds would appear to be disturbed, we have judged it necessary by our present letter . . . to send you our apology concerning the integrity of our faith, so that no suspicion may remain in your minds concerning us, that I may not be found guilty on the day of judgment through my silence. For we hold that aforesaid faith, and defend with all purity of conscience, even to the shedding of our blood, which delivered by the Apostles and inviolably guarded by their successors, the reverend Synod of Nicæa of those hundred and eighteen Fathers received and left in the creed,' etc.[1]

1169. Pelagius, whilst referring to the promise to Peter and asserting that he held the faith of Peter, yet finds it necessary to explain his adherence thereto to the Bishops of Istria. Hence it is plain that those Bishops did not apply the promise to the Bishops of Rome, for in that case they would not have dared, in common with other Westerns, to separate themselves from the Roman Bishops in consequence of the conduct of Vigilius ; in agreeing to the condemnation of 'The Three Chapters,'[2] which they regarded as reprehensible, and thus placing Pelagius as his successor under the necessity of sending to them an 'apology' for his faith. The fact that he was so compelled shows that the use which he made of the text was different in essence to that made by Agatho. That Pope adduced it to prove that the Roman Pontiff could *never* depart from the faith, whereas Pelagius not only applies it to St. Peter alone, but does *not* appeal to it as affording at once a conclusive proof of the falsity of the accusation which the Istrian Bishops had brought against the Roman Bishops, including himself, with regard to their faith, based upon the action they had taken with reference to 'The Three Chapters.' It is obvious that he would have done this had he held that the text contained the promise of indefectibility of faith to the Bishops of Rome as the successors of St. Peter, of whom he believed himself to be one ; indeed, to have taken any other line would, on Papalist principles, have been both to ignore 'the venerable and constant belief' of 'the age' in which he lived on the subject, and to have been untrue to his office as 'Father and Teacher of all Christians,' by not performing his 'pastoral duty' of 'preserving genuine and pure' 'the salutary doctrine of Christ'[3] on this most vital subject. Further, not only were the Istrian Bishops entirely ignorant of this alleged 'venerable and constant belief' of their 'age' on the position of the Roman Bishop, but they disputed the accuracy of even Pelagius' interpretation of the text, and adduced proof from the writings of the Fathers that his teaching was heterodox.

Note 8, nn. 177, 179.

On the 'old text' of St. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts.

1170. There are some MSS. in the National Library at Paris assigned by the Parisian editor to the twelfth, fourteenth, and thirteenth centuries respectively designated A, B, C (Nos. 725, 6, 7), which, with a copy in the

[1] Pelagius, P. II., *Ep. ad Episcopos Istriæ*, Ep. iii. ; P.L. lxxii. 707, 708.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 947.
[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.

Library at New College, contain the 'old text.' Two other MSS. in the Paris Library, D, F (728 and 73 *suppl.*), exhibit a text compiled from the old and the new. The Benedictine edition follows the 'editio princeps' of the Greek text; that of Commelin, which, as a general rule, adheres closely to a MS. which furnished the Latin version of Erasmus, which is inferior in contents, authenticity, and antiquity to the 'old text.' The scribe of this MS. was one 'who, offended by the manifest abruptness and ruggedness of the earlier text, set himself to smooth out the difficulties and to make it read more easily.' He alters, transposes, omits 'what he did not understand'; amplifies, dilutes, and interpolates, 'in short, he thought more of sound than of sense, and if he could make a passage run more smoothly to the ear has given himself little concern whether St. Chrysostom was likely to have so thought or so expressed himself.'[1]

Note 9, n. 182.

On the genuineness of St. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts.

1171. The genuine character of the Homily cited is assumed in the text, but it must be noted that 'Chrysostom's authorship of the Homilies on the Acts has been disputed on the ground of their great inferiority both in style and treatment to his unquestioned writings.'[2]

Note 10, n. 213.

On Valentinian's statement as to the 'Primacy of the Apostolic See.'

1172. Valentinian in his *Edict* states that 'The Primacy of the Apostolic See had been confirmed . . . by the authority of a sacred Synod, lest presumption should endeavour to attempt anything illicit contrary to the authority of that See.' No Synod had ever made any such decree. Even the 'Sardican Canons' which St. Leo refers to as Nicene, notwithstanding that this impudent claim had been shown up to his predecessors in the case of Apiarius,[3] contain no such provision. As St. Leo was without doubt responsible for the historical statements made by Valentinian in the *Edict*, it seems impossible to acquit him of a serious misrepresentation of facts.

Note 11, n. 216.

On the Vicariate of Arles.

1173. The Gallic Episcopate does not appear to have acknowledged any See as of Primatial rank until the Synod of Turin, held 22nd September A.D. 401. This Council by its second Canon decreed that the dispute between the Bishops of Arles and Vienne as to the honour of the Primacy should be settled in favour of whichever Bishop could prove that his city was the

[1] *Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the Acts*, part ii., Preface, vii.-ix. Oxford *Library of the Fathers.*

[2] Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 344, note †. Second edition.

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 610 *et seq.*

Metropolis.[1] This decision was in accord with the principle by which 'the Fathers' had been guided in determining the precedence of the chief Sees, and which has always continued amongst the Easterns as that by which such questions are to be determined. Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, who, in accordance with the decision of the Synod had to yield place to him of Vienne, appealed to Rome for assistance, alleging that his See had been founded by Trophimus, who had been sent by St. Peter, and that therefore it should possess the Primacy.

1174. Zosimus, who appears to have been deceived as to the character of Patroclus, declared that Arles had the right to the Primacy, because that was the *vetus privilegium* of that See. He laid down that no one should be received at Rome without the letters of the Metropolitan of Arles, and that he had always had the right of ordaining—Vienne, Narbonensis Prima and Secunda being under it—because to it Trophimus had been sent by the Roman Bishop.[2] Zosimus was not slow to take advantage of the opportunity afforded to him by the action of Patroclus of extending the influence of his See. He appointed Patroclus his Vicar in Gaul, with delegated powers over Vienne and Narbonne of the same character as those which St. Damasus had delegated to Ascholius in Eastern Illyricum when he wished to prevent the separation of the Sees in that district from the Western Church owing to its inclusion in the Eastern Empire.

1175. The Metropolitans of Vienne and Narbonensis Prima declined to accept this arrangement, as did also Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, who claimed to ordain in Narbonensis Secunda. Zosimus wrote again declaring that the Church of Arles had been founded by Trophimus, and had possessed the Primacy ever since, and that the ordinances of the Fathers must be preserved inviolate.[3] Proculus of Marseilles, however, continued to ordain in spite of this injunction, and when the Metropolitan of Arles began to attempt to exercise jurisdiction over the seven Provinces which were under the Pretorian Prefect of Gaul, of which Arles was the chief city, the others who exercised Metropolitical jurisdiction in their Provinces resisted. It is remarkable that they were assisted in their opposition by the Roman Bishops, *e.g.*, Patroclus on the strength of Zosimus' statement filled up some two years later the Bishopric of Lodève, in the Province of Narbonensis Prima. Hilary, the Metropolitan, complained to Boniface, the successor of Zosimus. Boniface condemned the action of Patroclus on the ground that it was a breach of the sixth Canon of Nicæa, which preserved the rights of Metropolitans in every Province.[4]

1176. Celestine, who succeeded Boniface, took the same line. St. Leo denied plainly that Patroclus' predecessors had exercised any such authority as Zosimus stated, thus implicitly denying the alleged foundation of the See by Trophimus on which Zosimus had based his statement.[5] St. Leo's proposal to make Leontius Primate mentioned in the text was probably suggested by the African custom by which the Bishop who had been longest consecrated was head of the Province and his See called *Prima sedes*, an

[1] *Cp.* Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. viii. sect. 113. [E.T. ii. 427.]
[2] Zosimus, P., *Ep. ad Episc. Galliæ*; P.L. xx. 612.
[3] *Ep. ad Hilarium Narbonensem Episc.*; P.L. xx. 666.
[4] Bonifacius, P., *Ep. ad Hilar. Narbonensem Episc.*, Ep. xii.; P.L. xx. 772-3.
[5] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Episc. Prov. Viennensis*, Ep. x.; P.L. liv. 630.

exception being made in the case of Carthage, the Primate of which was 'in some sort the Patriarch of the whole Latin Church of Africa.'[1] St. Leo's arrangements, however, do not appear to have stood, a later Pope, Anastasius II., making some new regulations. This, Symmachus, his successor, set aside, ordering that St. Leo's regulation should be observed.

1177. A considerable advance had by this Pope's time [A.D. 498-514] been made in the development of the Papal claims put forward by St. Leo, and it is curious to note that Symmachus adduces the unchangeable character which must belong to Papal decisions as the ground of his action, saying, 'What respect will be thought due to the Vicegerents of the holy Apostle Peter, if what they ordain while they are in the See be undone as soon as they have quitted it.'[2] A strange statement to make on an occasion which so plainly proved the instability of the decisions of 'the Supreme Judge of the Faithful.'

1178. The dispute as to the Primacy of Gaul was a means adroitly made use of by the Bishops of Rome to extend the influence of their See in Gaul at a time when it was especially important to them to do so. The Church of Milan at this time exercised great influence in the West, in fact, rivalling that of Rome to such an extent that Duchesne says 'that the Western Episcopate recognised a twofold hegemony—that of the Pope and the Bishop of Milan.'[3] He admits further that the Bishop of Rome had not been able

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. sect. 14. [E.T. i. 174]. *Cp.* also bk. viii. sect. 109. [E.T. ii. 396.]

[2] Mansi, viii. 208.

[3] Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 32. [E.T. *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution*, p. 32, S.P.C.K.]. Duchesne notes, for example, that the Priscilianists of Spain about the year A.D. 380 brought their cause both before St. Damasus and St. Ambrose, and again the Council of Toledo, A.D. 400, 'made a formal appeal both to the new Pope Anastasius, and to Simplicianus, the successor of St. Ambrose' (*ibid.*, [E.T. p. 33]). Several disputes were submitted (amongst them the difficulty as to communion with Felix of Treves) to Simplicianus, Bishop of Milan, by the Churches of Gaul. A Council was held at Turin, A.D. 401, of the Bishops of the Province of Milan, and by its sixth Canon it was decreed that, 'If anyone should wish to separate themselves from the communion of Felix they shall be received into the fellowship of our peace in accordance with the former letters of blessed Ambrose of blessed memory, and of the Bishop of the Roman Church' (Mansi, iii. 560). 'Before the Bishop of Milan, the most important Bishops of Gaul felt themselves in the presence of a superior authority and believed themselves bound to accept his decisions' (Duchesne, *l.c.* [E.T. p. 34]). The Church of Africa, as already noted (*vide supra*, n. 116), also appealed to the Bishop of Milan on two occasions conjointly with the Bishop of Rome. 'There are thus evidences of an universal tendency, about the close of the fourth century, to regard the Bishop of Milan as an authority of the first order, and to associate him with the Pope in the exercise of the functions of supreme ecclesiastical magistrate, that is as judge in important causes, and as interpreter of the laws of general discipline.' Duchesne attributes the possession of this position by the See of Milan to the fact that Milan was the official residence of the Emperor, the capital of the Western Empire. It was without a rival in the West, 'and its ecclesiastical position was becoming established on the same lines as Constantinople. Milan was . . . even before the middle of the fourth century, the great centre of ecclesiastical relations in the West, and that solely on account of its being the capital of the Empire' (*ibid.*, [E.T. pp. 35, 36]). In fact, the position which the See of Milan then held was attained by it in the same way as the other great Sees of the Church—those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—attained their pre-eminence in the Church, viz., through the position occupied by those See Cities in the Roman Empire.

'to exercise more than a feeble and intermittent influence'[1] over the Bishops of Gaul. The appointment by the Roman Bishop of the Bishop of Arles as his 'Vicar' was a definite attempt to extend his Patriarchal jurisdiction over Gaul, and thus withstand at the same time effectually the influence of Milan, just as St. Damasus in the case of the appointment of his Vicar in Illyricum already alluded to hoped to resist more effectually the rising power and influence of Constantinople.[2] The attempt was not entirely successful. From the time of St. Cæsarius until the end of the sixth century the Roman Bishops took care to decree letters of the Vicariate to which they joined the honours of the Pallium, but all this was purely decorative. It did not even bring about for the Bishopric of Arles a precedence in the Councils of the Frank Empire, and the Vicariate was never an effective institution.[3]

Note 12, n. 231.

On the Donation of Constantine.

1179. The *Donation of Constantine* was a forgery of about the middle of the eighth century, and has a place in *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* under the title *Edictum Domini Constantini Imp.* The document is based upon a fifth century legend of his cure from leprosy and his baptism by St. Sylvester. In it Constantine is represented as saying that he decreed that the Roman Church of Peter should be honoured as his Imperial power, and that the most holy seat of Peter should be gloriously exalted more than his Empire and earthly throne; therefore, he granted the Imperial Palace, and Rome, and all Italy, and the province of the Western regions to the aforesaid most blessed Pontiff Sylvester, Universal Pope; and transferred his Empire to the East, since when the principality of the Priests and the head of the Christian religion has been constituted by the heavenly Emperor it is not just that the earthly Emperor should have power. This forgery was intended for use with Pepin, and was probably composed before A.D. 754. From its style it is evident that it had its origin from a Roman source, and Gratian inserted it in his *Decretum*.[4] The object of the forgery was to show that the Pope, as the successor of Peter, was superior to Constantine, the rightful heir of the Cæsar, and so supreme in the State as well as in the Church. This document was the precursor of other forged grants by means of which the Popes were enabled to extend their territory and augment their power.

Note 13, n. 242.

The spurious character of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals admitted by Roman Catholics.

1180. The real character of these decretals was fully demonstrated by the *Magdeburg Centuriators*.[5] The Jesuit, F. Turrianus, endeavoured to confute the *Centuriators* in his work *Adv. Magdeburg. Centuriatores pro canonibus Apostolorum et epistolis Decretalibus Pontificum Apostolorum*, libri quinque

[1] Duchesne, *l.c.*, p. 38. [E.T. p. 39.]
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 407.
[3] Duchesne, *l.c.*, p. 39. [E.T. p. 39.]
[4] *Dist.* xcvi. c. 14; P.L. clxxxviii. 460-5.
[5] *Cent.* ii. c. 7; *Cent.* iii. c. 7.

(1572). To this work David Blondel wrote an answer entitled *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus Vapulantes*, 4 (1628), which settled the question beyond all cavil. Both Bellarmine[1] and Baronius[2] abandoned these *Decretals*. The opinion of the best modern Roman authorities on the subject is well expressed in the following extract from the Benedictine notes to the *Bibliotheca Canonica* of Ferraris under the title 'Canones':

'The collection contains besides the fifty Canons of the Apostles from the collection of Hadrian, epistles from Roman Pontiffs, from Clement to Sylvester, lastly, letters from Sylvester himself to Gregory the Great, with other epistles and records, of which one part taken from other collections is true and genuine, except all the epistles of Pontiffs older than Siricius with the exception of the letters of St. Damasus to Paulinus: the other part with the Acts of the Roman Council under Julius, and Councils I., V., and VI. under Symmachus, was fabricated and forged.'[3]

1181. In these forgeries the following 'prerogatives' of the Roman Church are represented as existing in the first four centuries on the authority of the alleged writers, chiefly the first Bishops of Rome:

(*a*) The supremacy of the Roman Church is laid down as of divine authority, *e.g.*, in the Third Epistle of Anacletus [*circa* A.D. 81], who is asserted to have been ordained by St. Peter, 'Prince of the Apostles,' and which is addressed to 'all Bishops,' it is stated 'this Sacrosanct and Apostolic Roman Church did not obtain its Primacy from the Apostles, but from the Lord Himself, our Saviour, as He Himself said to blessed Peter: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," etc. . . . For this Apostolic See has been made the hinge and head by the Lord Himself, and no other; and as a door is guided by the hinge, so all Churches are by the institution of the Lord ruled by the authority of this holy See.'[4]

In the Second Epistle of Sixtus [A.D. 119-128], 'Bishop of the Universal Apostolic Church to all Bishops' it is stated, 'We, brethren, desire to destroy no one, but he destroys himself who of his will violates the decrees of the Apostles and of this holy See.'[5]

It is alleged in the First Epistle of Pius P. I. [A.D. 142-154], directed 'to all Churches' that our Lord 'commanded that this holy Apostolic See should be the head of all the Churches, Himself saying to Peter, Prince of the Apostles, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," etc.[6]

In the Second Epistle of Soter [A.D. 165-173], it is stated that 'we are instructed by the divine precepts and Apostolic monitions that we should watch with unwearied affection over the state of all the Churches, and if anything is found worthy of reprehension we should recall it with swift care from the unskilfulness of ignorance or the usurpation of presumption.'[7]

In the First Epistle of Calixtus [A.D. 217-222], it is stated that 'it is doubted

[1] Bellarmine, *De Summo Pontifice*, lib. ii. c. 14. Col. Agripp., 1620.

[2] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 365, c. viii., tom. xv. 18. Lucæ, 1744.

[3] *Bibliotheca Canonica, Juridica, Moralis, Theologica*, sub v. *Canonica*, tom. ii. p. 57. Edit. 1848.

[4] *Ep. Anacleti Tertia*, c. xxx., xxxiv.; Hinschius, *op. cit.*, pp. 83, 84.

[5] *Ep. Sixti Secunda*, c. vi., *ibid.*, p. 109.

[6] *Ep. Pii I., Prima*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 117.

[7] *Ep. Sotheri Secunda*, c. iii., *ibid.*, p. 124.

by none, that the Apostolic Church is the Mother of all Churches, from whose rules it is fitting that you should deviate in no respect. And as a son sets about to do the will of his father so do you fulfil the will of your Mother, which is the Church, whose head as has been before said is the Roman Church.'[1]

In his First Epistle, Fabian [A.D. 236-250] is made to say 'to his beloved fellow-ministers of the Catholic Church everywhere,' that 'we are warned by the divine precepts and Apostolic institutes that we should watch over the state of all Churches with unwearied affection, whence it follows that you ought to know what is the usage of the Roman Church in sacred rites, that, following her example, you may be found true sons of her who is called your Mother.'[2]

In the Second Epistle of Dionysius [A.D. 259-268] it is stated that 'long ago and from the beginning we received so great a trust from blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, that we should have authority by the help of the Lord to assist the Universal Church and to correct and amend whatever is amiss by Apostolical authority.'[3]

In the First Epistle of Marcellus [A.D. 307-309] addressed to all Bishops throughout the Province of Antioch, the following statement is made: 'We beseech you, therefore, brethren, that you teach and think nothing else than what you have received from blessed Peter and from the other Apostles. By him you were first instructed, therefore it does not behove you to leave your own father and to follow others; for he is the head of the whole Church, to whom the Lord said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," and the rest. For his See was first with you which was afterwards by the command of the Lord translated to Rome, over which, the divine grace assisting us, we preside at this day. Nor does it behove you to deviate from this rule to which all the greater ecclesiastical matters are by the disposition of divine grace commanded to be referred, that by it they should be regularly decided from whom they took their beginning. If your Antioch, which formerly was the first, yielded to the Roman See, much more there is no See which is not subject to its jurisdiction, to which, according to the decrees of the Apostles and their successors, all Bishops who so desire or have necessity, ought to resort and appeal, that thence they may receive protection and deliverance whence they received instruction and consecration.'[4]

The *Donation of Constantine* after declaring 'that those who hold the *principatus* of the Prince of the Apostles himself,' have authority superior to the Imperial power and dignity, proceeds to state: 'We have decreed that the holy Roman Church is to be venerated, and the most holy See of blessed Peter is to be gloriously exalted above our Imperial and earthly throne, and we decree that it should have the *principatus* over the four principal Sees, viz., Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, and also over all the Churches in the whole world. And the Pontiff, who for the time being presides over the most holy Roman Church, is higher

[1] *Ep. Calixti Prima*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 136.
[2] *Ep. Fabiani Prima*, c. i., *ibid.*, pp. 156, 157.
[3] *Ep. Dionysii Secunda*, *ibid.*, p. 195.
[4] *Ep. Marcelli Prima*, c. i., *ibid.*, pp. 223, 224.

than, and chief of, all the Bishops of the whole world, and by his judgment whatsoever pertains to the worship of God and to the procuring of stability of the Christian faith should be decided.'[1]

In the 'Epistle or Preface of the Nicene Council' it is asserted that 'it is sufficiently well known by all Catholics, that the holy Roman Church is exalted by no Synodical decrees, but obtained the Primacy by the evangelical voice of our Lord and Saviour, when He said to blessed Peter the Apostle: "Thou art Peter," and the rest.'[2]

In the account of the spurious Synod said to have been held by St. Sylvester at Rome at the same time as the Council of Nicæa, it is stated that 'this most holy Pope (Sylvester) recalled by his Apostolic authority many who had been excommunicated by other Bishops and ejected from communion by tyrants, and restored them to the Churches to which they had formerly been instituted.'[3]

In the Epistle of Julius [A.D. 337-352] to the Eastern Bishops it is alleged that the Roman Church 'is greater than, and preferred above, all Churches, which not only by the decrees of Canons and of the holy Fathers, but by the voice of the Lord the Saviour Himself, has obtained an unique sovereignty: "Thou," says He, "art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church," and the rest. Moreover, it has been decreed by the holy Apostles and their successors in the aforesaid ancient statutes, which the holy and universal and Apostolic Church holds, that Councils ought not to be held nor Bishops to be condemned without the assent of the Roman Pontiff, since they willed that the holy Roman Church should be the Primate of all the Churches; and as blessed Peter the Apostle was first of all the Apostles, so also this Church, consecrated in his name, should by the institution of the Lord be the first and head of the rest, and to it, as to the Mother and head, all the greater causes of the Church, and the trials of Bishops should be referred, and receive sentence according to its determination, nor ought anything to be decreed concerning these without the Roman Pontiff. . . . Into which fault you will by no means be able to fall, if, whence you received the honour of consecration, thence you take the rule of your observance, and the See of the blessed Apostle Peter, which is the Mother of your sacerdotal dignity, be the mistress of your ecclesiastical procedure.'[4]

In a 'Synodical Letter' St. Athanasius and all the Egyptian Bishops are represented as appealing to Liberius for assistance against Arianism on the ground of the orthodox teaching of himself and the Apostolic Church 'to which all people have recourse as from darkness to light';[5] and in the reply of Liberius [A.D. 352-366] to his 'son' Athanasius, he says that 'formerly and from the beginning we have received so great faith from blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, that we should have authority to defend the true faith on behalf of the Church Universal,' and that therefore 'we are prepared to labour for you as a father for his children.'[6]

In the Epistle of Athanasius and all the Bishops of Egypt to Pope Felix II.

[1] *Exemplar Domni Constantini Imperatoris*, c. v., *ibid.*, p. 252.
[2] *Epistola vel Præfatio Niceni Concilii*, *ibid.*, p. 255.
[3] *Ep. Synodalibus gestis Silvestri*, *ibid.*, p. 451.
[4] *Decreta Julii Papæ*, c. v., vi., viii., *ibid.*, pp. 459, 460.
[5] *Ep. Synodica Athanasii ad Liberium*, c. i., *ibid.*, p. 474.
[6] *Ep. Liberii Papæ ad Athanasium*, c. i., *ibid.*, p. 476.

it is said: 'We appeal to your holy Apostleship that you should deign to take care of us, as you are accustomed according to your most prudent wisdom which is manifest clearer than the light to all . . . therefore, most blessed Father, because our predecessors and ourselves have always received assistance from your holy Apostolic See, and we recognise that you have the care of us, we beseech the aforesaid Apostolic and supreme See, according to the decree of the Canons, that we may receive help from that See whence our predecessors and ourselves have always received their ordination and teaching. To her as to a Mother we have recourse that we may be nourished by her breasts, since a mother is not able to forget her child, so you cannot forget us committed to you since our enemies persecute us' . . . 'unless we consent to their errors which we should never presume to against your advice, the Canons ordaining that we ought to decree nothing without the Roman Pontiff concerning the greater causes, therefore . . . we implore help, because God has not despised the prayers offered with tears, but on account of this He placed you and your predecessors, the Apostolic Bishops, in the supreme position and commanded them to have the care of all the Churches, that you to whom all judgment of Bishops is committed should succour us and not neglect to free us from our enemies.' . . . 'Our Lord Jesus Christ constituted your Apostolic See, for it is the very sacred head by which all are guided, sustained, relieved, and as Christians in Christ so also in the rock, that is, Christ, the Churches are renewed by the mouth of Peter. For "Thou art Peter," as the divine word truly testifies, and upon thy foundation the pillars of the Church, that is, the Bishops who ought to uphold the Church, and are bound to carry it upon their shoulders, are there established, and to thee He committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and publicly enacted that thou shouldst bind and loose with thy power those things which are on earth and which are in heaven.'[1]

Felix (A.D. 356-365) in his answer is represented as fully taking the position ascribed to him in the 'Letter,' replying in authoritative terms that 'by the help of God and the holy Apostle Peter, through whom began the Apostolate and the Episcopate,' he will set out 'certain Capitula formulated by the holy Fathers both in the Nicene Synod and in this See strengthened by which our brethren and fellow-bishops will be able to overcome by the help of the Lord the snares of the enemies . . . and treat of those things which we find in your letters, and we add some other things necessary for the present time as you requested.'[2]

1182. (*b*) The inerrancy of the Roman See is alleged as follows: In the Epistle of Lucius [A.D. 253-254], it is stated that 'this holy and Apostolic Mother of all the Churches, which by the grace of the omnipotent God is proved never to have erred from the path of Apostolic tradition nor succumbed to be depraved by heretical novelties, but as it received in the beginning the rule of the Christian faith from its authors, the Princes of the Apostles of Christ, remains hitherto undefiled according to the divine promise of our Lord the Saviour Himself, who said to the Prince of His Apostles in His Gospel: "Peter," says He, "behold Satan has sought to have

[1] *Ep. Athanasii ad Felicem Papam*, c. i., iv., *ibid.*, pp. 479, 480.
[2] *Ep. Sanctissimi Archiepiscopi Felicis*, c. xii., *ibid.*, p. 485.

you that he may sift you as he who sifts wheat, but I have prayed for you that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren."'[1]

In the Third Epistle of Felix I. [A.D. 269-274] the statement in the Epistle of Lucius just quoted is repeated.[2]

In the Third Epistle of Eusebius [A.D. 310] the statement is made: 'Nor is the word of our Lord Jesus Christ to be passed by saying, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," and those things which were said are proved by the results, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved without stain.'[3]

In an Epistle of Athanasius and all the Egyptian Bishops they are represented as addressing Mark [A.D. 326] as 'Pope of the Universal Church,' and asking that they 'might receive from the authority of the Church of your holy See, which is the Mother and head of all the Churches,' those things which were necessary for the correction of the orthodox faithful, since they 'were his and were obedient to him and willed always to be so with all those committed to their charge.'[4]

In his reply Pope Mark is made to assert that 'the holy Roman Church always remains unstained, and with the help of the Lord, and the assistance of blessed Peter always will so remain.' And that 'this holy and Apostolic Church, the Mother of all the Churches of Christ, which by the grace of the omnipotent God is proved never to have erred from the path of Apostolic tradition nor to have succumbed to be depraved by heretical novelties, but as it received the form of the Christian faith from its authors, the Princes of the Apostles of Christ, remains until the end untarnished according to the divine promise of the Lord, the Saviour Himself, who said to the Prince of His disciples in his Gospel: "Peter," says He, "behold Satan has desired to sift you as he who sifts wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." . . . Which, it is known to all, the Apostolic Pontiffs, the predecessors of my unworthiness, have always faithfully done.'[5]

1183. (*c*) The *causæ majores* and the trials of Bishops are to be carried to the Apostolic See: In the First Epistle of Anacletus [*circa* A.D. 81], it is laid down that 'if difficult cases or greater matters arise they are to be referred to the greater See, and if they are not able to be there easily decided or justly terminated where the Synod of the Chief Priests is gathered together, which is accustomed, and ought to be, held twice in each year, let the business be justly and in a way pleasing to God be judged before the Patriarch or ecclesiastical Primate and before the civil Patrician in common. But if more difficult questions should arise, or there should be judgments of Bishops or of greater individuals or greater suits, let them be carried to the Apostolic See, on which Christ built the Universal Church. Himself saying to Peter, the blessed Prince of the Apostles:

[1] *Ep. Lucii*, c. viii., *ibid.*, pp. 179, 180.

[2] *Ep. Felicis Tertia*, c. xviii., *ibid.*, pp. 205, 206.

[3] *Ep. Eusebii Tertia*, c. xix., *ibid.*, p. 240.

[4] *Ep. Athanasii Alexandrinorum episcopi et omnium Ægyptiorum Pontificum Marco Papæ directa*, *ibid.*, pp. 451, 452.

[5] *Ep. Marci Papæ ad Athanasium*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 454.

"Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church," and the rest.'[1]

In the Third Epistle of the same it is laid down that 'if more difficult suits should arise between you, refer them as to the supreme tribunal of this holy See as to the head, that they may be terminated by the Apostolical decision, because it was so willed by the Lord, and is declared by the aforesaid testimonies to have been so determined by Him.'[2]

In the Second Epistle of Sixtus I. [A.D. 119-128] it is said that 'if anyone of you be overcome by any adversity let him freely appeal to this holy and Apostolic See, and have recourse to it as to the head lest the innocent should be condemned or his Church suffer harm.'[3]

In the First Epistle of Hyginus [A.D. 138-142] 'all Metropolitans are forbidden to hear cases without the presence of all the other comprovincial Bishops, saving the privilege of the Roman Church in all things,' thus asserting the right of the Roman Church to judge cases without assessors.[4]

In the Epistle of Eleutherus [A.D. 173-188] it is enacted that 'concerning ecclesiastical suits about which we have been consulted, since it is difficult that all suits should be carried to the Apostolic See, only cases relating to Bishops should be referred hither, that they may be terminated by the authority of this Apostolic See, as has been already decreed by the Apostles and their successors with the consent of many Bishops.'[5]

The Epistle of Victor [A.D. 188-193] enacts 'that any Bishop who is accused or judged by his comprovincial Bishops in any cause may freely appeal to, and have recourse to the Pontiff of the Apostolic See, who shall arrange that the case shall be tried either by himself or by his Vicars; and whilst the case is before the Pontiff no other Bishop shall be placed or ordained in his place, since although it is lawful for the comprovincial Bishops to examine into the cause of an accused Bishop, nevertheless it is not permitted to them to decide without consultation of the Roman Pontiff, since to blessed Peter it was said by the Lord, and not by any other than himself: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."'[6]

The First Epistle of Zephyrinus [A.D. 198-217] has a similar decree.[7]

In the Third Epistle of Fabian [A.D. 236-250] it is enacted that 'if an accused Bishop shall have appealed to the Apostolic See it is to be decreed as the Pontiff of the said See shall determine.'[8]

And in the First Epistle of Sixtus II. [257-258] it is laid down that 'every Bishop who is accused in certain more grave causes, as often as is necessary, may freely appeal to the Apostolic See, and fly to it as to a Mother, that by it, as has always been the case, he may be assisted, defended, and freed. To whose disposal the ancient authority of the Apostles and their successors has reserved the greater causes and the cases of Bishops, since Bishops are

[1] *Ep. Anacleti Prima*, c. xvii., *ibid.*, p. 74.
[2] *Ep. Anacleti Tertia*, c. xxxiv., *ibid.*, p. 84.
[3] *Ep. Sixti I. Secunda*, c. v., *ibid.*, p. 108.
[4] *Ep. Hygini Prima*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 114.
[5] *Ep. Eleutheri*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 125.
[6] *Ep. Victoris Prima*, c. v., *ibid.*, p. 128.
[7] *Ep. Zepherini Prima*, c. vi., *ibid.*, p. 132.
[8] *Ep. Fabiani Tertia*, c. xxix., *ibid.*, p. 168.

to be blamed who act towards their brethren otherwise than the Pope of the Apostolic See is pleased to be done,' and the decree proceeds as in the First Epistle of Victor given above, 'any Bishop who is accused,' etc. [1]

In the Third Epistle of Felix I. [A.D. 269-274] it is stated that 'all doubtful and greater matters are accustomed to receive their settlement from this holy See from the time of the Apostles who instructed it by their writings, and therefore you did rightly that you wished that you and others should be strengthened and instructed by the advice of this holy See.' [2]

The Epistle of Melchiades [A.D. 311-314] asserts that 'the Lord reserved to His own judgment Bishops whom He chose to be the eyes and pillars of the Church, to whom also He gave the power of binding and loosing. And this privilege He committed exclusively to blessed Peter, the Key-bearer, in His stead. And this prerogative has rightly come by succession to his See, to be inherited and possessed for all future time, since there was some distinction of power amongst the Apostles, though their election was alike, yet it was granted to blessed Peter that he should take precedence of the others, and wisely decide disputes and questionings which occasioned quarrels amongst them. And we believe that this was ordained by the ordinance of God, lest all should in the future claim to manage all things for themselves, but that the greater causes, such as those of Bishops and other weighty matters of concern, should be taken to the one See of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, that they might receive the final decision from that place whence they had received the beginning of their appointment, so that they might never be at variance with their head.' [3]

In the Epistle of Julius [A.D. 337-352] to the Bishops of the East who had condemned St. Athanasius, there are set out certain decrees in the form of 'Capitula of the Council of Nicæa' in which the three enactments contained in (1) the First Epistle of Sixtus II.; (2) the Epistle of Victor, and (3) the Epistle of Hyginus, set out above, are repeated as being the Acts of the Nicene Synod, and it further stated that Bishops 'may not be condemned except by this holy See.' [4]

In the Epistle of Athanasius to Felix P. II. it is alleged that 'the Nicene Synod unanimously decreed that Bishops ought not to be condemned without the assent of the Roman Pontiff,' and 'likewise it was unanimously defined by the aforesaid Fathers that if any Bishop should suspect the impartiality of his Metropolitan or comprovincial Bishops as his judges, let him appeal to your holy Roman See, to which by a special privilege above all others the power of binding and loosing was granted.' [5]

And in his reply to this letter Felix [A.D. 356-365] sets out certain Capitula of the 'Nicene Synod' and the Roman See, amongst which are the following: 'Although the Metropolitan together with the comprovincial Bishops of his Province, discuss with love and unanimity the cases of Bishops may nevertheless, as in the aforesaid Council in your presence it was enacted that it should not be lawful to decide such cases without the authority of the Roman

[1] *Ep. Sixti II. Prima*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 190.
[2] *Ep. Felicis I. Secunda*, c. xvii., *ibid.*, p. 204.
[3] *Ep. Melchiadis Prima*, c. ii., iii., *ibid.*, p. 243.
[4] *Ep. Julii Papæ Tertia*, c. xii., xvi., *ibid.*, pp. 467, 469, 472.
[5] *Ep. Athanasii et omnium Egyptiorum Episcoporum Felici Papæ directa*, c. i., iv., *ibid.*, pp. 479, 480.

Pontiff, and if any presumed to act differently they who do this should receive the punishment of their presumption, and those who had been excommunicated or condemned by them, by the authority of this holy See, and by the power of our blessed Teacher, the Key-bearer, Peter, are absolved and restored. For the Lord Himself said: "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." As often as Bishops consider themselves to be aggrieved by their comprovincial Bishops or by their Metropolitan, or doubt their impartiality, let them at once appeal to the Roman See, to which they are to be allowed to go freely without any detention or seizure of goods, and whilst they shall have appealed to the aforesaid Roman Mother Church, or demanded that they should be heard by it, no one shall presume either to excommunicate them or take away their Sees, or to spoil them of their goods or to use any force with them, before the case of them both is concluded by the authority of the Roman Pontiff. And if it is otherwise presumed by any, it will be as nothing, and be nugatory.'[1]

1184. (*d*) It is laid down that Synods may not be convoked without the authority of the Roman See. In the Second Epistle of Marcellus it is enacted that 'you are not able to hold a Synod, although you may gather together certain Bishops, without the authority of this holy See.'[2]

In an Epistle to the Bishops of the East, Pope Julius is made to say that 'it has been decreed by the Apostles and their successors in the aforesaid ancient statutes which up to this time the holy and universal Apostolic Church holds that Councils ought not to be celebrated without the leave of the Roman Pontiffs nor Bishops to be condemned, since they willed that the holy Roman Church should be the Primate of all Churches.'[3]

And in another Epistle to the Bishops of the East Julius lays down as a Capitulum of the Nicene Council that 'a Provincial Synod may be annulled by the Vicars of the Bishop of the City of Rome, if he so decree.'[4]

In an Epistle from Athanasius to Pope Felix II. it is said that 'we know that in the great Nicene Council of three hundred and eighteen Bishops it was unanimously decided that Councils ought not to be held without the assent of the Roman Pontiff.'[5]

1185. (*e*) The creation of Patriarchates is ascribed to the Roman Bishop. In the First Epistle of Clement [A.D. 91-99], Clement is represented as directing St. James to appoint, 'in those cities in which formerly the Pagans had their Archflamens and chief magistrates, Primates or Patriarchs who should discuss cases affecting the other Bishops, and business of greater magnitude, as often as may be necessary, and decide them according to the will of the Lord, as the Apostles decreed, lest anyone should incur injustice.'[6]

It is laid down in the Second Epistle of Anacletus that 'the Provinces long before the advent of Christ were divided separately, and afterwards by the Apostles and our blessed predecessor Clement, that division was renewed, and in the capital cities of the Provinces, where formerly the

[1] *Ep. Felicis II.*, c. xix., xx., *ibid.*, p. 488.
[2] *Ep. Marcelli Secunda*, c. x., *ibid.*, p. 228.
[3] *Ep. Julii Orientalibus Episcopis*, c. vi., *ibid.*, p. 459.
[4] *Ep. Julii Secunda*, c. xii., *ibid.*, p. 470.
[5] *Ep. Athanasii Felici Papæ directa*, c. ii., *ibid.*, p. 479.
[6] *Ep. Clementis Primi*, c. xxviii., *ibid.*, p. 39.

chief magistrates and the chief judiciary power were seated, to whom those who lived in other cities, when in the case of necessity they were unable to apply, or were prevented from applying, to the Court of the Emperor or King, were accustomed to apply in case of oppression or injustice, and to make their appeals, as often as there was need, as is laid down in their law, in these cities the divine and ecclesiastical laws order Patriarchs or Primates (who hold the same office although the names are different) to be appointed, to whom Bishops, if necessity arose, could apply and enter an appeal.'[1]

In the Third Epistle of Anacletus it is said, 'that the Episcopate is one, although some are Primates, whose Sees are in the chief cities, and who also in certain places are called Patriarchs by some. But those who are placed by us in the chief cities, according to the ordinance of the blessed Lord Peter or our predecessor Clement, cannot all be Primates or Patriarchs, but let the Bishops of those cities, which in old time held the chief places enjoy the rank of Patriarchs or Primates, but let the other chief cities use the titles of Archbishop or Metropolitan, and not Patriarch or Primate.'[2]

1186. Of the rest of the contents of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, Milman gives the following account: 'The False Decretals do not merely assert the supremacy of the Popes—the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome—they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to lowest degree, their sanctity and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments—on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the Cross, the discovery of the reliques of the Apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The whole is composed with an air of profound piety and reverence, a specious purity and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandisement of the See of Rome and the aggrandisement of the whole clergy in surbordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events, and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history.'[3]

Note 14, n. 243.

Forgeries in the interests of Papalism.

1187. From the end of the fifth century fabrications in the interests of Rome became common. Spurious Acts of Roman Martyrs, the account of the Baptism of Constantine by Sylvester, the *Gesta Liberii*, the *Liber*

[1] *Ep. Anacleti Secunda*, c. xxvi., *ibid.*, p. 79.

[2] *Ep. Anacleti Tertia*, c. xxix., *ibid.*, p. 82.

[3] Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, bk. v. ch. iv. vol. iii. p. 192. Fourth edit.

Pontificalis, the first edition of which appeared about A.D. 530, etc. Such fictions had a far-reaching effect in the West as they became known, exhibiting as they did the Pope as legislator for the whole Church, teacher of doctrine and Supreme judge, the Pseudo-Isidore incorporated these earlier forgeries in his fabrications, and the agreement of his work with these supposed genuine records of the annals of the Popes was a powerful aid to giving it the hold it had for so long on Western Christendom. The *Donation of Constantine*, another forged document, has already been noted,[1] and it was followed by others, either wholly forged or interpolated with a view to the aggrandisement of the Papacy.

Note 15, n. 249.

On the influence exercised by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

1188. It is of great importance when investigating the history of the early years of the Reformation in England to bear in mind that the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* were regarded as genuine until their spurious character was made known by the labours of the Magdeburg Centuriators.[2] This was not until A.D. 1559. The spuriousness of the other fabrications was not known any earlier. Consequently, men like Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More had no suspicion that the 'testimonies' contained in these forgeries to Papalism were other than they claimed to be, viz., the witness of Antiquity and the Fathers. Like St. Thomas, they accepted as genuine these documents, and thus were not in a position to form an accurate judgment as to the validity of the Papal claims, having to base their opinions on erroneous data. Hence it cannot be a matter for surprise that they with others of similar opinions did not find it possible to reject those claims.

Note 16, n. 253.

On the subjects discussed at the Council of Florence.

1189. The four main subjects which the Fathers of Florence discussed were—(*a*) the Procession of the Holy Ghost; (*b*) the use of Azymes in the Eucharist; (*c*) Purgatory; and (*d*) Papal Supremacy. The discussion on the first point (*a*) was commenced at the request of the Greeks by the reading of the former Œcumenical Councils, the position taken up by the Easterns being that any addition to the Creed was prohibited after the Council of Ephesus. The Latins endeavoured to weaken the force of this argument by alleging that the prohibition was directed against unorthodox Creeds. The Greeks ultimately yielded, and a definition was agreed upon in which the Latins disavowed the erroneous sense which the Greeks affixed to the use of the Filioque, viz., that they meant by it that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son as if from two principles, and then both East and West were declared to hold the same Truth; (*b*) the question as to the bread to be used in the Eucharist was settled by the admission that the Eucharist was valid whether leavened or unleavened

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 1179.

[2] *Vide* n. 1180.

bread was used; (*c*) there were considerable disputes as to Purgatory, the Greeks regarding the Roman doctrine as contrary to the general teaching of the Church. An agreement was, however, arrived at, nothing being decided as to the *nature* of Purgatory against the opinion of either East or West; (*d*) the discussion as to the fourth question is set out in the text. For the *Definitio*, *vide* Mansi, xxxi. 1031, 1032.

Note 17, n. 253.

Isidore and Bessarion after the Council of Florence.

1190. Isidore and Bessarion were both promoted to the Cardinalate as a reward for their services. The former returned to Russia in the hope of maintaining the Union, but he was apprehended by Basil, the Prince, as a traitor to orthodoxy, and after being imprisoned in a monastery was glad to fly to Rome. Bessarion, on the other hand, with more prudence, remained in the West. He devoted his brilliant talents to the service of the Papacy, and at more than one election appeared likely to be chosen Pope.[1]

Note 18, n. 259.

On the Gallicans and the Florentine Council.

1191. The Council of Florence was not regarded as Œcumenical by the Gallicans, on the ground that the Council of Basle denied that the Pope had the right to remove an Œcumenical Council. They therefore objected to the authority of this Council at Trent. Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, expressed this objection strongly in a letter addressed to his agent Beeton which was read to Pius IV.: 'There now remains the last of the titles adduced from the Florentine Synod, Ruler of the Universal Church, which they wish to grant to our most blessed Father. I am not able to deny that I am a Gallican and an alumnus of the University of Paris, in which the Pontiff is held to be subordinate to a Council, and those who teach otherwise are marked as heretics. Amongst the Gallicans the Council of Constance in all its parts is held to be General, that of Basle is admitted as authoritative, consequently the Florentine is repudiated as neither legitimate or General.'[2]

Note 19, n. 292.

On the phrase 'Sacro approbante Concilio' used at the Vatican Council.

1192. A similar phrase *Sacro approbante Concilio* was used by Pius IX. of the decrees which he promulgated in the *Vatican Council*. It is not without significance, as showing how completely the Papalists have triumphed in the Roman Church, that at the last great Latin Council previous to the *Vatican Council*, that of *Trent*, the ancient custom was

[1] Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, bk. ix. c. ii. and iii. vol. viii. pp. 119, 130. Edit. 1875.

[2] Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.*, sec. xv. ch. xvi., *Diss. x. De Synodo Florent.*, *l.c.*, p. 489.

at least observed in form, the decrees running 'the Œcumenical Tridentine Synod lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost . . . ordains and decrees.'[1] At *Trent* there was a last effort made by the Bishops to retain something of their ancient authority. In the centuries that intervened between it and the *Vatican Council*, Ultramontanism had obtained complete control over the Latin Church, and Gallicanism, that final attempt to withstand its progress, well-nigh stamped out. The *Vatican Decrees* were a witness to the triumph of its remorseless foe, and in those *Decrees* stands again the phrase so significant of that triumph 'sacro *approbante* Concilio . . . *definimus*.'[2]

Note 20, n. 302.

On the meaning of the word προέδροις in Eusebius, 'Vita Constant.' iii. c. 13.

1193. The statement made by Eusebius that the Emperor, after his opening discourse at the Synod made over the right of speech τοῖς τῆς συνόδου προέδροις,[3] is in no way inconsistent with the position taken in the text as to the position of Hosius in the Council, for προέδροις no doubt here means the Bishops. There were many 'clerks powerful in dispute'[4] present, besides laymen who by permission were allowed to speak. The title πρόεδρος would thus mark off the position of the Bishops in the Synod as those who alone had the decisive voice. It may be added that Eusebius used it elsewhere[5] as meaning Bishops, as it is also in Canon XXXVII. of the Council *in Trullo*.[6]

Note 21, n. 304.

On the phrase 'by the grace of God and of the Apostolic See.'

1194. 'The form *Dei et Apostolicæ sedis gratiâ Episcopus* is first found in the year 1093 . . . in the will of Amatus, Bishop of Nusco, in Ughelli, Italia sacra vii. 535. It begins to be more common in the thirteenth century. Thomassin, P. I., lib. i. cap. 60, sects. 9 and 19, is very inaccurate on this point. Compare especially Zaccaria de rebus ad hist. atque antiquitates Ecclesiæ pertinentibus dissert. lat. ii. 232.'[7]

Note 22, n. 312.

On the title 'Pope.'

1195. In early times the title 'Pope' was given to Bishops without restriction, and in no way considered to belong exclusively to the Bishop of Rome. Even in the West, in which the Roman Bishop obtained so prominent a position simple Bishops were called Popes certainly as late as the latter half

[1] *Canones et Decreta, Concilii Tridentini*, pp. 10, 11, etc. Lipsiæ, 1876.
[2] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 487.
[3] Eusebius, *Vita Constant*, I., iii., c. 13; P.G. xx. 1069.
[4] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. c. xvii.; P.G. lxvii. 911.
[5] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, x. c. 2; P.G. xx. 845. [6] Mansi, xi. 960.
[7] Gieseler, *A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, Third Period, iii. ch. i. sect. 62, note 6. [E.T. iii. 170, 171. T. and T. Clark. Edit. 1853.]

of the sixth century. For example, Fortunatus of Poitiers addresses an Epistle to Felix, Bishop of Nantes, *Domino Sancto et Apostolica sede dignissimo domno et Patri Felici Papæ*,[1] and from an account given by Gregory of Tours of a certain dispute with reference to the appointment to the See of Xaintes it would appear that both Bordeaux and Tours were called 'Sedes Apostolica' and their Bishops 'Papæ' in the same century.[2] Clovis in A.D. 508 addressed the Gallic Bishops as 'Papæ.'[3] A few years earlier Sidonius Apollinaris styles French Bishops 'Dominus Papa.'[4] St. Augustine was frequently entitled 'Papa' by his correspondents.[5] St. Jerome was one of those who so addressed him, and he similarly styles Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, and others.[6]

1196. To the Bishops of Alexandria this title seems to have appertained before it was used of other Prelates. Not only do St. Athanasius[7] and Arius both call Alexander, who held that See, Pope, but earlier still Dionysius the Great speaks of his predecessor Heraclas as 'the blessed Pope Heraclas.'[8] In the East it would appear to have been indeed considered to be the special title of the occupant of the See of St. Mark, and is still retained by them to this day,[9] their present style being 'Pope and Patriarch of the great city of Alexandria and Œcumenical Judge.'[10]

1197. Amongst the Western Bishops of early date to whom the title was given was St. Cyprian, who is called by the Presbyters of Rome in the addresses of their Epistles 'Cyprian Pope,'[11] and in the letters themselves 'blessed Pope,'[12] and 'most blessed and glorious Pope.'[13] The Confessors also likewise so styled him in writing to him.[14] This evidence is remarkable, and its date being so near the death of Heraclas, who was, as just said, so styled, it would appear to show that the title, which was not then applied to the Bishops of Rome (the earliest instance in which it is so used is that of St. Marcellinus, quite at the end of the same century, A.D. 296-304), was the customary title of the Bishops of Alexandria and Carthage. Archbishop Benson even thinks that there is an instance of a Bishop of the latter See being so styled earlier than the case of Heraclas, Bishop of the former See. He considers that Tertullian in his *De Pudicitia*, c. 13, is calling the Bishop of Carthage 'Benedictus Papa,'[15] 'which is the very word used of Cyprian in Ep. viii. 1.' The Archbishop considers that Tertullian addressed

[1] P.L. lxxxviii. 119.
[2] S. Greg., *Episc. Turonensis*, *Historia Francorum*, lib. iv. xxvi.; P.L. lxxi. 290.
[3] Mansi, viii. 346.
[4] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epp.* i., ii., iii., v., vi., vii., etc.; P.L. lviii. 551 *et seq.*
[5] S. August., *Epp.* lxviii., lxxxi., cxix., ccxvi.; P.L. lxxxiii. 237, 275, 449, 975.
[6] S. Hieron., *Epp.* lxxxi., lxxxv., lxxxviii.; P.L. xxii. 735, 754, 758.
[7] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 8; P.G. lxxxii. 1041.
[8] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. 7; P.G. xx. 643.
[9] Neale, *History of the Eastern Church*, General Introduction, vol. i. p. 113.
[10] *Orthod. Confess. Eccl. Orient.*, p. 10. Lond., 1895.
[11] S. Cyprian, *Epp.* xxx., xxxi.; Hartel, 549, 557.
[12] *Ep.* viii., *ibid.*, 485.
[13] *Ep. ad Cyprianum Papam, Presbyterorum . . . Romæ consistentium*, Ep. xxx. 8, *ibid.*, 556.
[14] *Ep. Universorum Confessorum Cypriano Papati inter Epp. S. Cypriani*, Ep. xxiii., *ibid.*, 536.
[15] *Vide infra*, n. 1234.

his *De Pudicitia* to a Carthaginian Bishop, and that it was 'the much condemned assumption of the authority of *Episcopus Episcoporum* by a predecessor which makes Cyprian in Council so anxious to disclaim the appearance of it.'[1] The title would thus appear to be African in origin, at least so far as the West is concerned.

1198. Gregory VII. was the first to formally prohibit the use of this title in addressing any other dignitary of the Church, in the Council of Rome, A.D. 1073, 'that the name of Pope might be alone in the whole Christian world.'[2] His doing this, and the consequent restriction of the use of the title to the Roman Bishops is an instance of the way in which those Bishops have arrogated to themselves titles which once were the right of any member of the Episcopate.

Note 23, n. 314.

On the title 'Patriarch.'

1199. The title Patriarch was not in use at the time of the Nicene Council. Nor was it when first used applied only as in later times to the Bishops of the five great Sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem as their official title. It was given to other Bishops, as for example, by St. Gregory Nazianzen,[3] who uses it as being especially applicable to senior Bishops. It was also applied by the Imperial Commissioners at Chalcedon to the superior Metropolitans of great districts, *i.e.* civil *Dioeceses*,[4] as it is also by Justinian.[5] Also to Metropolitans who had other Metropolitans under them, *e.g.* to the Bishop of Theopolis in the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 536,[6] and to the Bishop of Bourges in A.D. 864.[7]

1200. It would appear to have become the official title of the occupants of the five great Sees about the ninth century; it is not applied to them in the Canons of the Councils of the first eight centuries. It was, however, after that date also used of the holders of other great Sees. As, for example, William of Malmesbury calls the Archbishop of Canterbury 'Primate and Patriarch of all England.'[8] Other Patriarchates have been created in the Latin Church, such as that of the Indies by Pope Paul III., whence Lisbon claims to be a Patriarchal See, but in the case of such 'Patriarchates,' so far as the title implies any jurisdiction at all, it would appear to be equivalent at most to that of Primate.

Note 24, n. 321.

On the extent of the 'Roman Patriarchate.'

1201. There has been much dispute as to what was the extent of the Roman Patriarchate, to use a word which came into use later, recognised by

[1] Archbishop Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
[2] Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, sub. v. 'Papa,' vol. ii. 1664.
[3] S. Greg. Nazianzen. *Orat.* (*Supremum Vale*), xliii. 23; P.G. xxxii. 486.
[4] Mansi, vi. 958.
[5] Novel. cxxiii. cap. xxii. *Corpus Juris Civilis Romani*, vol. ii. p. 615. Lipsiæ, 1720.
[6] Mansi, ix. 191, 206.
[7] Nicholas P., *Ep. ad Rudolph. Bituric.* Ep. lxvi.; P.L. cxix. 334.
[8] William of Malmesbury, Proleg., lib. i. *De Gestis Pont. Anglorum*, 195.

the Nicene Council. A consideration, however, of the evidence enables a definite conclusion to be arrived at. Rufinus in his very free rendering of the Sixth Canon of Nice[1] describes the limits of the jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop, as consisting of the 'suburbicarian Churches,' *i.e.* the Churches within the boundaries of the civil *Dioecesis Romæ* in the *Præfectura Italiæ* which was under the civil jurisdiction of the Vicarius Urbis. This *Dioecesis Romæ* comprised ten provinces, viz., Campania, Tuscia with Umbria, Picenum, Valeria, Samnium, Apulia with Calabria, Lucania and Bruttii, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

1202. It seems clear that this is the meaning of Rufinus' expression, and that he did not mean by it the little territory of the *Præfectus Urbi* who exercised authority over the city of Rome, and over a suburban circle as far as the hundredth milestone. For the exercise of jurisdiction over so small a portion of the Church would not have formed a precedent for confirming to the Alexandrian Bishop of the jurisdiction which, according to ancient custom, he exercised over a number of Provinces possessing their own Metropolitans.

1203. Baronius would have it that the 'suburbicarian Churches' were those which were *under*[2] the city of Rome, *i.e.* 'subject to it,' viz., all the Churches of the world, an 'interpretation' which need not be discussed. Hefele, however, considers Rufinus' expression to be inaccurate on the ground that the *Prisca* version 'translates the passage of our Canon in question as follows: "Antiqui moris est, ut urbis Romæ episcopus habeat principatum ut suburbicaria loca et omnem provinciam suam solicitudine gubernet"—(*a*) understanding by *suburbicaria loca* the little territory of the *præfectus urbi*, but (*b*) not restricting the authority of the Pope as Patriarch within the limits of this little territory, and therefore it adds *et omnem provinciam suam.*'[3] The untrustworthy character of this *Prisca* version of this Canon has already been noticed,[4] and to quote it against the testimony of Rufinus significantly shows that there is practically *no* evidence that he is wrong. Rufinus is in fact an excellent witness. He was an Italian, a Presbyter of Aquileia, having ample opportunties of knowing exactly the limits of the Roman Patriarchate. He wrote his History before the *Prisca* version appeared. His statement may, therefore, be accepted as correctly giving the extent of the jurisdiction of the Roman Patriarch at the time of the Nicene Council.

1204. It is confirmed by the following facts: (1) First, that the Bishop of Milan exercised in the *Dioecesis Italiæ*, which consisted of the other seven provinces of Italy, a jurisdiction similar to that possessed by Patriarchs, and was moreover consecrated not by the Bishop of Rome but by the Bishop of Aquileia, as that Bishop was consecrated by him of Milan.[5] The See of Milan continued to maintain its independence till a late date, in fact it was not till 1059 that Archbishop Guido made submission to the Roman Legates, notwithstanding the opposition of the people who declared 'that the Church of Ambrose ought not to be subject to Roman laws, and that the Roman

[1] Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 6; P. L. xi. 473.
[2] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 325, c. xxxvii., tom. iv. 135.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. ii. ch. ii. sect. 42. [E.T. i. 399.]
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 316.
[5] Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, bk. ix. ch. i. sect. 11.

Pontiff possessed no right of judging or setting in order in that See. It was indeed unworthy that that Church which under our progenitors had always been free should now be subjected to another, which God forbid.'[1] (2) Secondly, that in the *Dioecesis Africæ*, as Hefele admits,[2] the 'Metropolitan (or according to African usage the Primate) of Carthage was in some sort the Patriarch of the whole Latin Church of Africa.' He was not ordained by the Roman Bishop, and the African Church asserted its independence of any external authority on more than one occasion.[3] (3) Thirdly, that when the Emperor Valentinian I. banished, in A.D. 378, the Antipope Ursinus he permitted him to go where he pleased, except to Rome and the suburbicarian provinces. Therefore, as Tillemont says, 'It appears clearly enough from what Valentinian wrote to Maximus, Vicarius of Rome, that the suburbicarian provinces are the same which were under the jurisdiction of the Vicarius of Rome. At least it is plain that we cannot understand all the West by the term without a strange absurdity, for the favour which Valentinian granted to Ursinus would have been to banish him from all his Empire.'[4]

1205. The arguments by which Hefele[5] seeks to prove that the whole West was embraced in the Patriarchate of Rome appear to be nugatory: (*a*) The statements of Zonaras and Balsamon simply represent the opinion of the twelfth century as to the meaning of the Canon, which is valueless owing to its date. (*b*) The non-mention by the ancients of the existence of a second Patriarchate in the West, whilst there is such mention of the Patriarchates into which the East was divided, proves nothing. It is a pure assumption that all Churches must be included within the limits of one or other of the Patriarchates, as is shown by the existence of autocephalous Metropolitans even in the East, and the Second Canon of Constantinople, which seems to recognise the fact that the Churches planted outside the limits of the Roman Empire amongst the barbaric nations would not necessarily be within any Patriarchate, as not being included within the boundaries of any of the *Dioeceses* into which the Empire had been divided. Further, the circumstances of the West were different to those of the East. The conversion of the barbarians and the organisation of the Churches was gradual, and in some parts, at a later date than the age of the first Councils, and bearing in mind the fact that when the limits of a Patriarchate had to be altered this was done by an Œcumenical Council, it is to be observed that by no Council were the original limits of the jurisdiction of the Roman Patriarch ever enlarged, consequently the Churches outside such limits were never placed under such jurisdiction.

1206. (*c*) The fact that St. Augustine called Innocent I. 'President of the Church of the West,'[6] merely shows that he regarded him as the first of the Western Bishops, which undoubtedly he was. President and Patriarch are by no means synonymous. (*d*) St. Jerome's mention of St. Damasus, Bishop of Rome, as being the medium through whom the charge of heresy brought against the Presbyter Mark had been carried to the West, as it had been in

[1] Mansi, xix. 887 *et seq.*
[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. iii. sect. 14. [E.T. i. 174.]
[3] *Vide*, nn. 584, 609, etc.
[4] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, viii. 398.
[5] Hefele, *l.c.* [E.T. i. 399, 400.]
[6] S. August., *Contra Julianum*, lib. i. c. 6; P.L. xliv. 659.

like manner taken to Egypt through the Bishop of Alexandria, only shows that the Bishop of Rome was the person through whom ordinarily the communications from the East to the Westerns were made, which would naturally be the case owing to the city of Rome being the capital, *the* Western city therefore with which the Easterns would have most ready communications. (*e*) In the phrase used in the letter of the Synod of Arles held in A.D. 314 to Pope St. Sylvester, *Qui majores dioeceses tenes*, the word *dioeceses* 'is best explained according to the context by understanding' it 'as meaning provinces,' and not in the technical sense of aggregates of provinces, as the word was used in the divisions of the Empire made by Constantine.[1] (*f*) Lastly, the mention by Justinian in his 119th Novel of five Patriarchates when speaking of the ecclesiastical divisions of the world is many years after the Council of Nicæa, and of no value for the purpose for which it is adduced, because the 'world' need only be the Roman Empire, the limits of which had been much contracted by Justinian's day, and did not include the whole West, quite apart from the first considerations noted above in (*b*). The conclusion is that these arguments are of no weight against the evidence adduced in this note in proof of the limited extent of the Roman Patriarchate.

Note 25, n. 335.

On the Council in Trullo and 'the Sardican Canons.'

1207. If it is alleged in disproof of the statement that the East never received these Canons, that the Council *in Trullo* in its Second Canon enumerates the Canons of Sardica amongst those on which it set its seal, the reply is easy. The Synod at the same time places in the same category the Canons of the Council of Antioch in Syria,[2] A.D. 341, of which Canons III., IV., V., and VI. deal with the question of ecclesiastical sentences in a way which precludes any recognition of any such prerogatives as even those limited in character assigned to the Bishop of Rome in these Canons. Similarly, the Canons of Chalcedon are recognised by this Synod, of which Canons IX. and XVII. are in like case with those of the Synod of Antioch. The Fathers, therefore, of the *Trullan Council*, it is clear, in confirming the 'Sardican Canons' merely sanctioned the reception of them in the West, where alone they received any recognition at all.

Note 26, n. 335.

On the interpolation in the Synodal Letter of the Council of Sardica.

1208. A passage from the Synodal Letter from the Sardican Fathers to Pope Julius is sometimes quoted in support of the Papal claims. The words so used are as follows: 'It was best and fittest that the priests (*i.e.* the Bishops) from all the Provinces should make their reports to the head, that is, to the chair of Peter the Apostle' (*Hoc enim optimum et valde congruentissimum esse videbitur, si ad caput*, i.e., *ad Petri Apostoli sedem de singulis*

[1] Bright, *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*, with Notes, pp. 24, 101. Second edit. [2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvii. sect. 317. [E.T. v. 224.]

quibusque provinciis domini referant sacerdotes). These words, however, are clearly an interpolation. The Latinity of the sentence is barbarous, besides which there is an entire want of connection between it and that which precedes and that which follows, which seems a convincing proof of forgery.[1]

Note 27, n. 338.

On the position of the Bishops of Thessalonica.

1209. Ascholius of Thessalonica attended the Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 381, but clearly as an Eastern, not a Western. His position was as follows: 'The West' to the time of Gratian was held to include the whole of Illyricum. That Emperor, however, as noted above,[2] included Eastern Illyricum in the Eastern Empire, which he conferred on Theodosius. Up to that time the whole of Illyricum had been under Western influence, and, in fact, though not within the original limits of their Patriarchate, had come to be regarded by the Bishops of Rome as under their Patriarchal jurisdiction. That jurisdiction had, prior to the meeting of the Council, received a grant of power from the State by an Imperial *Constitution* promulgated by Valentinian I. between A.D. 367 and 372, the provisions of which may be gathered from the letter of the Council of Rome held in A.D. 378.[3] Illyricum would thus, previously to the division of the Empire alluded to above, be under such grant of power. Now the Easterns were strong supporters of the principle that ecclesiastical divisions should be in accord with the civil. The fear would naturally arise on the part of the Bishop of Rome that Constantinople, already the ambitious rival of Rome, would seek to absorb into that Patriarchal jurisdiction which it coveted the province now belonging to the Eastern Empire.

1210. In order if possible to prevent any such result as this, either St. Damasus, the then Pope, or his successor, Siricius,[4] appointed the Bishop of Thessalonica, the capital of Eastern Illyricum, his 'Vicar,' that is, his deputy, to exercise the *Patriarchal* jurisdiction of the Pope by a special commission.[5] How dangerous from the Roman point of view the position was is evident from the presence of Ascholius at this Synod, he being there as an Eastern, his See being within the limits of the Eastern Empire. The decree of the constitution of the Vicariate was but very partially, if at all, successful in the attainment of its object. Duchesne considers that this institution obtained a certain vigour for a certain time,[6] but it would seem from a law of Theodosius II., of 14th July A.D. 421, that the whole of Illyricum was under the jurisdiction of the See of Constantinople, 'which enjoys the prerogatives of Old Rome.'[7] Duchesne admits that the Acacian troubles dealt the Vicariate 'a fatal blow,'[8] as the Bishops of Thessalonica observed

[1] *Cp.* Bower, *History of the Popes*, i. 192.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 1174.
[3] On this date *cp.* n. 207, *footnote* 2.
[4] Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 115.
[5] *Cp.* Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, p. 263.
[6] Duchesne, *Origines du culte Chrétien*, p. 41. [E.T. p. 42.]
[7] *Cod. Theod.*, xvi. 2, 45. *Codices Theodosiani*, lib. lxvi. p. 494. Paris, 1607.
[8] Duchesne, *l.c.* [E.T. p. 42.]

the same attitude with regard to the Acacian question as the whole of the Byzantine Episcopate. This shows that the Papal expedient practically failed in the face of the strong influence exerted by the Eastern power, and, in fact, whatever may have been the Roman theory on the subject, the Provinces of Eastern Illyricum did pass under the authority of the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

1211. Duchesne thinks that the Bishops of Rome succeeded from the time of Justinian in regaining their Patriarchal jurisdiction over the whole of Illyricum, but the evidence on which he bases his conclusion is contested. What, however, does appear not to be doubtful is 'that in the time of St. Gregory the whole of Illyricum was comprised in the Patriarchal province of the Pope, and that he exercised without any difficulty the ordinary powers of a Patriarch over the Metropolitans of their jurisdiction. Thessalonica, however, does not appear to have had re-delegated to it the powers it formerly had had conferred on it of exercising the Patriarchal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome at the restoration of inter-communion in 519; and though the Metropolitan of Justiniana Prima did receive from Vigilius, at the request of Justinian, a certain new primacy analogous to that of the Bishops of Arles, and to that which had operated in the previous century in the hands of the Bishops of Thessalonica, yet it is clear from the correspondence of St. Gregory that practically the Popes exercised themselves directly the powers of Patriarch, the two Metropolitans of Justiniana Prima and Thessalonica merely possessing some honourable distinction.[1] In the eighth century the Emperor Leo the Isaurian withdrew Illyricum from the jurisdiction of the Bishops of Rome, and subjected it and other provinces which had likewise been under that jurisdiction to the Patriarch of Constantinople.[2]

1212. It is of grave importance to bear in mind the idea which lay at the foundation of the institution by the Roman Bishop of his first 'Vicar,' so that expressions which are found used with regard to the appointment of such Vicars may be referred, as they ought to be, to the delegation of a *Patriarchal* and not a *Papal* authority. Between the two it is obvious there is a vast distinction—the former being the same in nature as that exercised by the other Patriarchs; the latter being essentially different to the former in nature and unique in character, being claimed to be that of the Vicegerent of Christ, who exercises as the Supreme Pastor the sovereign authority which He exercised during His mortal life.

Note 28, n. 340.

Why St. Meletius presided over the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381.

1213. Timotheus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, was not present at the opening of the Council of Constantinople,[3] it was therefore in accordance with the position which had been recognised by the Sixth Canon of Nicæa as belonging to the See of Antioch that Meletius occupied the position of

[1] Duchesne, *Églises Séparées*, p. 274.
[2] Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. 24, 25.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. vii. sect. 93. [E.T. ii. 344.]

President. On the death of Meletius, however, his successors in the chair were Gregory and Nectarius. Both of these Prelates were Bishops of Constantinople. They accordingly held the post of President in accordance with the principle which the Synod itself embodied in its Third Canon, in which it ranked the Bishop of New Rome immediately after the Bishop of Old Rome.

Note 29, n. 341.

On the distinction between invalid and irregular Ordinations.

1214. At the time of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, the distinction between invalid—ἄκυρος—and irregular—*illicite*—ordination or consecration had not been accurately defined. Ordinations and consecrations which in later days would only have been regarded as uncanonical were regarded as invalid. 'Morinus expresses the matter admirably, saying, "moraliter magis et civiliter de istis philosophati sunt." They thought of ordination, that is, in connection with all its moral and social associations as part of the whole life of the Church; thus very naturally "they did not regard the validity of the ordination, as lying merely in the character of the act, but they took into account also the authority of the Church and questions of moral expediency."[1] The word "valid" meant to them what, according to more elaborated definitions, is expressed by *both valid and canonical.* How could they believe an act done in violation of the will of God to carry with it His ratification and be valid? So they reasoned, and so reasoning they pronounced invalid —ἄκυρος, unratified—an ordination of which, in later days, it would only have been said, *fieri non debet: factum valet.*'[2] The validity of baptism by heretics was first admitted by the Eighth Canon of the Council of Arles,[3] and the principle adopted by that Council, that the reality of the Sacraments was not affected by the heresy or the schismatical position of those who conferred them, was extended by St. Jerome and St. Augustine to ordinations. Arian ordinations were thus recognised on the person so ordained giving satisfactory proof of his orthodoxy. So also were Donatist ordinations, on the condition that the clergy who had been so ordained accepted the terms of Communion laid down by the Church. This principle that heresy and schism do not affect the reality of the Sacraments, though destroying their spiritual value, gradually worked out to its results in the West. For instance, in the fifth century, after St. Augustine, we find that St. Leo in a letter to Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne, having said of certain Bishops unduly elected, that 'having received their dignity amiss'—*male accepto honore*—they were 'not to be reckoned among Bishops,' proceeds to lay down that the ordination by these 'pseudo-bishops' was 'vana,' yet should be deemed 'rata,' if it could be shown to have the consent of the lawful diocesan,[4] the word 'rata' evidently meaning 'regular,' and the word 'vana' referring to the lack of true 'mission,' by which authority was given to execute the office so conferred

[1] Bishop Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 191, giving references to Morinus *De Sac. Ord.*, p. iii. ex. v. cc. 9, 8, ii.; *cf.* Bingham, *Ant.*, xvii. 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 191, 192. Second edit.

[3] Mansi, ii. 472.

[4] S. Leo, M., *Ep. ad Rusticum*, Ep. clxvii.; P.L. liv. 1203.

in the Church. Still, the process of making a clear distinction between 'invalid' and 'irregular' ordinations was but slowly, and amidst many difficulties, developed in the West, in fact, as Morinus very truly says, 'What is it to track the controversy [on the validity of heretical or schismatical or simoniacal ordinations] but to exhibit bishops against bishops, councils against councils, pontiffs against pontiffs, waging a Cadmeian war?'[1] While the practice of the Eastern Church has been, and is, to ratify, if the Church sees fit, ordinations which in the West would be considered valid but 'illicit,' each case depending on the judgment of the Church thereon expressed.[2]

Note 30, n. 359.

On the forged passages attributed to St. Cyril of Alexandria, etc.

1215. Jean de Launoy in his Letter to Antonine Faure (*Op.*, tom. v. bk. i. p. 1 *et seq.*) says: 'I deferred until the third year about certain testimonies attributed to Cyril of Alexandria which St. Thomas received in authority. . . . These testimonies are thus read in St. Thomas, and first, indeed, in *fourth Sent.* dist. xxiv. quaes. iii. art. ii.: "Besides," he, St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, says, "that we may remain members of our head, the Apostolic See of the Roman Pontiffs, it is our duty to seek what we ought to believe and hold, venerating him and asking him for all things, since it is his duty alone to blame, to correct, to determine, to dispose, to loosen, and bind, in place of Him Who created him, and gave His own fulness to no other than to him alone, to whom by the divine law all bow the head, even the leaders of the world, as if they obey the Lord Jesus Christ Himself."'

'At the end of the third chapter of the book against the assailants of religion: Christ has conferred this privilege on the Roman Church that all should obey him as Christ, whence, says Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, in book II. of the *Thesaurus*: "Let us remain members of our head the Apostolic See of the Roman Pontiffs, from whom it is our duty to seek what we ought to believe and hold, venerating him, asking him for everything; since it is his duty alone to blame, correct, determine, dispose, loosen, and bind in place of Him Who created him, and has given His own fulness to no one besides, but to him alone, to whom all bow the head by the divine law, and the leaders of the world obey as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself."'

Again, in chapter iv., 'whence also 1 Peter ii., it is said of Christ, "You have been turned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." But this is especially true of the Roman Pontiff, to whom, Cyril says, all men bow the head by the divine law, and obey him as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.'

'In the work *Contra Errores Graecorum*: It is held also by the authority of the aforesaid Doctors, that the Roman Pontiff has the fulness of power in the Church. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, in the *Thesaurus* says: "As Christ issuing from Israel received from the Father the leadership and sceptre of the Church of the Gentiles, the leadership and power over all men and all things that exist that all things may bow to Him, the fullest

[1] Morinus, *De Sac. Ordin.*, p. iii. ex. v. 81, quoted, Gore, *l.c.* [2] *Cp.* Gore, *l.c.*

power; so also he committed it to Peter and his successors most fully." And again, "To no one else but Peter has Christ given His own fulness, to him alone"; and below "The feet are Christ's humanity, doubtless Himself a Man, to Whom all eternity has given the fullest power; Whom One of the Three assumed in unity of person, conveyed to the Father above all principality and power that all the angels of God may worship Him, all which He granted by His oath and power to Peter and His Church." In the same place: "It is also shown that it pertains to the said Pontiff to determine what things are of the faith. For Cyril says in the *Thesaurus* that we remain members in our head the Apostolic See of Roman Pontiff, from whom it is our duty to seek what we ought to believe and hold." And certain things having been interposed, "It is evident that he is the Prelate of the Patriarchs because of this. Cyril says that doubtless it is the duty of the Apostolic See of the Roman Pontiff himself alone to blame, correct, determine, loosen, dispose and bind in place of him who created him." In the same place, "It is also shown that the necessity of salvation is subjected to the Roman Pontiff. For Cyril says in the *Thesaurus*: "Therefore, brethren, if we imitate Christ, that we may hear His voice, being His sheep, remaining in the Church of Peter, and may not be inflated with the wind of pride; lest perchance the wily serpent may cast us out on account of our contention, as Eve formerly from Paradise." . . . Will any one dare to attribute to Chrysostom what St. Thomas attributes to him in his little work *Contra Errores Graecorum*? The words are "Chrysostom says, speaking in regard to the decrees of the Bulgarians on the Person of Christ: 'Thrice I ask thee lovest thou Me, lovest thou, likest thou, because thrice trembling and timid thou hast denied Me. But now when led back, let thy brethren believe that thou hast lost favour and the authority of the keys; because thou lovest Me in their presence, I confirm that now to thee, which is Mine fully.' I do not urge this that I may not seem to charge Thomas with so great a crime. When the Bulgarians received the Christian Faith, the 850th year was revolving (it was A.D. 850), which was the 438th after the death of Chrysostom. . . . But in reference to the reported testimonies, these are no more in Cyril, nor can they be than they are, or can be in Virgil or Hesiod. And . . . indeed that testimony which is quoted in St. Thomas thrice or four times, the second book of the *Thesaurus* has it not, as it is said to have, in the little book against the assailants of religion . . . nor can they exist afterwards, because the arguments of the book and Cyril's mode of treating it more in his own way forbid it. . . . Then the whole book of the *Thesaurus*, which, it is agreed, consisted of thirty-five logoi, can show no place in which what Thomas attributes to Cyril has place. . . . Moreover, what was done at the Synod of Florence most strongly confirms the substitution of testimonies. . . . Why, pray, did the Romans not bring before the notice of the Greeks the reported testimonies, which shut the Greeks out from every approach to delay and tergiversation? . . . Why did they not bring Cyril, a Bishop of highest authority amongst them, who yields more to Peter and in Peter to Peter's successors, more than the Romans sought? . . . Now, it might be useful to inquire at what time the reported testimonies were ascribed to Cyril. I am easily persuaded that they were ascribed after the time of Nicholas I. and Leo IX. Nicholas

and Leo did not cast these testimonies before the Greeks with whom they had a fierce strife, and such was their disposition they would have cast them. . . . . The substitutor was not a Greek but a Latin, and betrayed himself by the recent idioms of his language. . . . The design was that they should form a plan to remove the schism through the authority of famous Greeks. But the Christian religion does not recognise tricks and deceits of this sort. . . . I find that St. Thomas first of all used these testimonies. Soon what he ascribes to Cyril alone, Urban IV. assigns as the opinion of several Greek authors, in the Epistle which he writes to Palæolagus the Emperor in the year 1263.'

In his Second Epistle to the same, Launoy says that St. Thomas 'still assigns in his *Catena* to Cyril of Alexandria the following words on' Chapter xvi. of St. Matthew to Cyril in his *Thesaurus*: "According to this promise of the Lord to the Apostolic Church Peter remains immaculate from every seduction and heretical circumsention over all Presidents and Bishops, and over all Primates of the Churches and peoples among its own Pontiffs, in the fullest faith and with the authority of Peter, and when other Churches have been shamed by the error of certain men, it reigns alone, established, unshakably, imposing silence and closing the mouths of all heretics; and we by necessity, undeceived by the pride of salvation, nor drunken with the wine of pride, profess and teach the type of truth, and of the holy Apostolic tradition together with itself."'

Launoy says that 'he who substituted this passage in St. Cyril in order that he might substitute it more easily and might abuse the credibility of St. Thomas, and through St. Thomas that of others, copied the reported passages from the *Thesaurus*. The substituter thought that the *Thesaurus* was that estate from which most excellent and most precious things could be transcribed with impunity. . . . He did not fit falsehoods to . . . Commentaries on Holy Scriptures. This kind of fate was reserved for the *Thesaurus*, that false testimonies should be inserted in them. . . . They were inserted indistinctly and promiscuously, in order that the fraud may be more difficult to recognise.'

Launoy gives elaborate proofs that these testimonies are frauds, which indeed is admitted by all.

Note 31, n. 366.

On the statement with reference to St. Cyril in the Synodal Letter of the Council of Ephesus to the Emperor.

1216. If it be argued that in their Synodal Letter to the Emperor the Fathers of the Council speak of St. Cyril as having been appointed to act in Celestine's stead, the answer is simple. The context shows that the Fathers are referring to the authorisation given by Celestine in his letters with reference to the excommunication of Nestorius, consequently the phrase appealed to has nothing whatever to do with the presidency of the Council, which at the time those letters were written had not been thought of.[1]

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 365.

Note 32, n. 385.

St. Basil on Western pride.

1217. St. Basil, writing with reference to a proposed visit of his brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa, to Rome, said: 'For my own part I do not see who are to accompany him, and I know that he is entirely without experience in ecclesiastical matters; and while he would be sure to meet with respect and be valued by a considerate person, I know not what advantage could arise to the whole Church from the intercourse of such a person, who has no mean adulation in his nature, with one high and lifted up sitting on I know not how lofty a seat, and not able to catch the voice of those who tell him the truth on the ground.'[1] In another Epistle he speaks of 'Western pride,'[2] whilst in a letter to St. Meletius, whom he regarded as the canonical Bishop of Antioch, with reference to the attempts which the adherents of Paulinus made to seduce to their sides those who recognised the legitimate claims of St. Meletius, he says: 'After I returned . . . I received immediately letters from the East stating that Paulinus' friends had had certain letters from the West conceived as if they were the credentials of a sovereign power—ἀρχῆς—and that his partisans were proud of it, and exulted in these letters, moreover, were putting forth their faith, and on these terms were ready to join with the Church that stands by us.'[3]

1218. The letters from the West referred to in the Epistle just cited were those of which he had written in a letter to Terentius that the 'party of Paulinus were carrying about letters from the Western Bishops committing the Bishopric of Antioch to them, and passing by Meletius, that most admirable Bishop of the true Church of God. And I do not wonder at this, for they (*i.e.* the Westerns) are entirely ignorant of matters here, and those who seem to know about them (*i.e.* the party of Paulinus) give them an account more in the spirit of party than with strict regard to truth.'[4]

St. Basil was the leading Oriental Prelate of his day, and his strong language with reference to St. Damasus, the then Bishop of Rome, to Western pride and Western assumption of power, which he held to be based on Western ignorance of the East, no doubt adequately represented the opinions of the East on the subject, so that the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus might all take occasion to emphasise those opinions when the opportunity presented itself by language such as they used in this 'Canon.'

Note 33, n. 390.

On the convocation of the Latrocinium.

1219. A similar recognition by St. Leo that the right to convoke an Œcumenical Council rested with the Emperor is seen in the way in which St. Leo acted when the Emperor Theodosius II. summoned such a Council to meet at Ephesus—that known afterwards as the *Latrocinium*—by a brief of

[1] S. Basil., *Ep. ad Dorotheum*, Ep. ccxv.; P.G. xxxii. 792.
[2] *Ep. ad Eusebium*, Ep. ccxxxix.; P.G. xxxii. 893.
[3] *Ep. ad Meletium*, Ep. ccxvi.; P.G. xxxii. 792.
[4] *Ep. ad Terentium*, Ep. ccxiv.; P.G. xxxii. 785.

convocation dated at Constantinople, 30th March A.D. 449.[1] St. Leo on the 30th June following wrote to Flavian of Constantinople that the Emperor willed that a Synod should be assembled, although it was clearly apparent that the matter concerning which there was a controversy in no way required to be treated by a Synod,[2] and also to the Emperor himself on the same date, in which he said, when excusing his non-attendance at 'the Episcopal Council' which he had summoned, that 'the cause of the faith is so clear that it might reasonably have been abstained from holding a Synod.'[3]

Note 33 B, n. 388.

On the 'Legates' of the Middle Ages.

1220. Fleury describes the position and powers of mediæval 'Legates' as follows: 'The spiritual power of the Pope having extended itself to such a degree by the conclusions drawn from the false Decretals, he was obliged to commit his powers to others; for it was impossible that he should go everywhere, or cause everybody to come to him. Hence came the Legations so frequent from the eleventh century. Now the Legations were of two sorts, Bishops or Abbots of the country, or Cardinals sent from Rome. Legates taken on the spot were further different: the one established by a particular commission of the Pope, the other by the prerogative of their See, and these called themselves *Legati nati*, as the Archbishops of Mayence and Canterbury. The Legates who came from Rome called themselves Legates *a latere*, to mark that the Pope had sent them from his person, and this expression was drawn from the Council of Sardica. The *Legati nati* did not willingly endure the Pope's naming others to the prejudice of their privileges, but the Pope had more confidence in these he had chosen than in Prelates with whom he was little acquainted, or who suited him not. . . . The Bishops hardly endured seeing themselves presided over by foreign Bishops, still less by a Cardinal, Priest, or Deacon, under pretext of his being Legate, for until then all Bishops took rank before Cardinals which were not so. But what rendered the Legates *a latere* more odious was their pride, luxury, and avarice. . . . The most ordinary result of a Legation was a Council, which the Legate convoked at the place and time that he judged suitable. He presided there, and decided the affairs which came up, and published certain rules of discipline, with the approbation of the Bishops, who for the most part did nothing else but applaud, for it does not appear that there was much deliberation. Thus were insensibly abolished the Provincial Councils which each Metropolitan was bound to hold every year according to the Canons; the dignity of the Archbishops, overshadowed by that of the Legate, degenerated into titles and ceremonies, such as having a pall and causing a cross to be borne before them, but they had no longer authority over their suffragans, and Councils of Legates only were now seen. . . . Here is one of the greatest changes which the discipline of the Church has suffered, the cessation of Provincial Councils, and the diminution of the

[1] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. x. ch. iii. sect. 175. [E.T. iii. 222.]
[2] S. Leo M., *Epist. ad Flavianum*, Ep. xxxvi.; P.L. liv. 810.
[3] *Ep. ad Theodosium Augustum*, Ep. xxxvii.; P.L. liv. 811.

authority of the Metropolitans. . . . Let us conclude upon this point as upon the rest, the ancient discipline has not been changed to establish a better. Thus we do not see that, during the frequent Legations, religion has been more flourishing.

'The Bishops and Metropolitans were so ignorant of their rights that they sought with eagerness for the powers of Legates, not considering the advantage of a proper and independent, though less, authority over one more extended, but borrowed and precarious. It seemed they could do nothing any longer by themselves unless the authority of the Pope supported them, and the Pope willingly granted these favours, which they could have done without, and which always extended his power. . . . Right is assumed by favours asked without necessity, and claims are so made to render them necessary.'[1]

Note 34, n. 427.

On the title δευτέρα σύνοδος *as applied to the Ephesine Synod at the Latrocinium.*

1221. One of the arguments by which the Ballerini seek to support their contention is that the Synod of Constantinople would hardly have been designated as δευτέρα σύνοδος, as it is called in the contested passages,[2] apparently because at the *Latrocinium* the Ephesine Synod had been so described, that of Constantinople being thus passed over. But the whole circumstances of the *Latrocinium*, where everything was done to degrade Constantinople by Dioscurus, render it impossible to attach any weight to a statement of this kind, and the fact that Anatolius at the opening of the Synod of Chalcedon occupied the second place—that assigned to his See by the Council of Constantinople—is an additional proof that the Fathers of Chalcedon would certainly not regard such a statement as that under notice made at the *Latrocinium* as of any value, and would give to the Council of Constantinople the recognition due to it of its place as δευτέρα σύνοδος.

Note 35, n. 442.

Innocent P. III. on the dignity of the See of Constantinople.

1222. In strange contrast to the position taken by St. Leo in these letters was the assertion made by Pope Innocent III. when he bestowed precedence on the Church of Constantinople next to that of Rome. Innocent appointed in 1205, on the foundation of the Latin Empire in the East, a Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, and he then declared: 'Although the Church of Constantinople is the last in time, nevertheless it is pre-eminent in dignity amongst the [Patriarchal Churches]; that as Constantinople is called the New Rome, so the Church of Constantinople is second after the Roman, being preferred by favour of her Mother above her other sisters in privilege of dignity, that according to the Gospel the first may be last and the last

[1] Fleury, *Discours de l'Histoire de l'Eglise du onzième au treizième siècle*, *op. cit.*, tom. v p. x. Edit. 1856.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xi. sect. 201. [E.T. iii. 425; *ibid.*, note 4.]

first.'[1] That is, Innocent declares that what St. Leo had asserted to be null and void on the ground that it was a violation of the Nicene Canon, had been bestowed upon Constantinople by the favour of 'her Mother,' *i.e.* Rome.

Note 36, n. 450.

On the position held by the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople in the thirteenth century.

1223. The consciousness of the ancient dignity belonging to the true See of Constantinople seems to have been felt and acted upon by the occupants of the 'Latin See' set up in the thirteenth century, intruded into the real See. Innocent III. when he created the 'See' bestowed the highest privileges and powers on Thomas Morosini, whom he appointed Patriarch. In doing so, however, he was studiously careful to lay down that such privileges and powers emanated from the Papal authority;[2] nevertheless, three years afterwards, that Pope complained of his disobedience to and disregard of the Roman Legates,[3] whilst Honorius III. reproached Everardus, the second of these Patriarchs, for sending out Legates *a latere*,[4] endued with the same plenitude of power as that with which the Legates of the Apostolic See were sent forth, who presumed to hear appeals throughout the Patriarchate, to excommunicate and absolve the subjects of other Prelates without consulting them. The same Pope upbraided the third Latin Patriarch Matthæus, for daring to absolve those who had been excommunicated by the Legate of the Apostolic See, and for forbidding appeals, legitimately made, to be taken to that See.[5]

Note 37, n. 468.

On the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians.

1224. The letter which St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, wrote to the Corinthians is sometimes adduced in support of the position asserted by Papalism to belong *jure divino* to the Roman Pontiff. If the Epistle, however, be examined, it will be seen that not only can such use not be justified, but it is also incompatible with statements contained in it. The circumstances under which it was written are briefly these. The Church at Corinth was at the time the scene of great disorder. Led by one or two ambitious young men the Corinthian Christians had rebelled against their legitimate hierarchy, and had deposed some of their Presbyters. There does not appear to have been at this time a Bishop of that Church. Whether there was a vacancy, or whether no local Bishop was yet settled there is not known; more probably the latter was the case, at any rate there was no one at Corinth then occupying such position.

[1] Innocent, P. III., *Regist.*, lib. viii. cliii.; P.L. cxv. 728.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 1222.

[3] Innocent, P. III., *Regist.*, lib. xi., lxxvi., *Ad Patriarcham Constantinopolitanum*; P.L. ccxv. 1387 *et seq.*

[4] Raynaldus, *op. cit.*, ad ann. 1218, nn. 26, 28, vol. i. p. 438.

[5] *Ibid.*, ad ann. 1222, nn. 22, 23, vol. i. p. 504.

1225. Tidings of this dissension naturally soon reached Rome, whither, as it was the Imperial City, members of the Corinthian Church would, no doubt, frequently be called on business. Thereupon the Roman Church addressed a letter couched in urgent and authoritative language. They exhort those who were thus injuring the Church to submit 'not to them, but to the will of God.' 'But if certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger, but we shall be guiltless of this sin, and we will ask with constancy of prayer and supplication that the Creator of the Universe may guard intact unto the end the number that shall have been numbered of His elect throughout the whole world, through His beloved Son Jesus Christ, through whom He called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the full knowledge of the glory of His Name.'[1]

1226. The tone of the remonstrance is strong, but very little consideration of this letter is required to see that whatever the ground on which such remonstrance is made, it is certainly *not* that which alone would make it of any value for the purpose for which it is sought to use it. For what according to Papalism is the unique position which is occupied *jure divino* by the Bishop of Rome? It is that of 'Supreme Pastor' of 'the One Flock,' 'the Supreme Judge of the faithful,' possessed of 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' authority which is his because he is the legitimate successor in the Roman Episcopate of Peter, whom Christ made His Vicegerent, conferring on him that authority which He Himself exercised on the Apostolic College during His mortal life. This, and nothing less, according to Papalism, was the position of the Roman Bishop when this letter was written, since it is expressly declared that such position has been 'the venerable and constant belief of every age,' as indeed, if it be true, it must have been.

1227. Now, in the whole of this letter, written on an occasion which, threatening as it did the unity of the Church, demanded on 'Papal' principles an authoritative utterance on the part of the legitimate successor of Peter, 'the Supreme Pastor,' there is not only no mention of the 'Roman Pontiff,' but even the name of the writer is not given. True, it has always been believed to have been St. Clement, but the sole ground for this is Christian tradition. Whatever of 'authority' there may be in the language employed in the letter so far as it is concerned, such authority is centred in the Church which writes, and not in the 'legitimate successor of St. Peter.' It would be useless to argue that the *Church* of Rome spoke authoritatively because Peter had been its Bishop, for it is of the essence of the Papal authority, that it is inherent in 'the Supreme Pastor,' whom Christ has appointed—the Visible Head as an essential, indeed the principal, element in the Divine Constitution of the Church. It is thus the authority of the Vicegerent of Christ, the grant of whose appointment necessitates that it should be wielded by one who is His Vicar. It is admitted that St. Clement was Bishop of Rome at the date of the letter, it is admitted that he wrote the letter. On Papalist principles the letter would, therefore, be that of one possessed *jure divino* of full and supreme power of jurisdiction

[1] S. Clemens Rom., *Ep. ad Cor.*, cap. lvi., lix.; P.G. i. 521-6.

over the whole Church, yet, not only does he not write as the 'Vicar of Christ,' authoritatively exercising his office as Supreme Pastor of the One Flock having 'ordinary,' 'immediate,' and 'truly Episcopal' jurisdiction at Corinth, but there is a complete self-effacement of the writer. It is an Epistle from the Church at Rome, not one of 'the Sovereign Pontiff.'

1228. Moreover, the reference which is made to St. Peter in the letter is inconsistent with the idea that there had been conferred on him and 'his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate,' 'by the institution of Christ,' any of the unique and tremendous prerogatives asserted by Papalism. 'To pass,' says St. Clement, 'from the example of ancient days, let us come to those champions who lived very near to our time. Let us set before us the noble examples which belong to our generation. By reason of jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted, and contended even unto death. Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles. There was Peter, who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one or two but many labours, and then having borne his testimony went to his appointed place of glory. By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the price of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having reached the farthest bounds of the West.'[1]

1229. The two Apostles are here placed on exactly the same level by St. Clement. They are 'the champions' which belong to the time nearest to that of the writer and the Corinthians, they 'are the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church,' 'the good Apostles' who are to be set before their eyes. Neither is placed before the other. St. Clement and his generation had known them both, and he had no knowledge of any position occupied by Peter with regard to the Church of Rome not equally shared by Paul. They were doubtless, as St. Irenaeus relates,[2] joint founders of that Church; neither of them Diocesan Bishop thereof, neither of them 'the Sovereign Pontiff,' for both held the same position in the Church as 'the greatest pillars,' *i.e.* chief amongst the Apostles, but neither possessed any other office. Hence, St. Clement did not hold himself to be 'the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate,' and so 'Vicar of Christ.' Consequently, in the letter there is no attempt on his part to exercise Papal authority, which, if the Papal theory were true, he must have done in faithful discharge of the unique office which he held *jure divino*. Further, there is no claim for any 'superiority' in power for the Church at Rome itself as a 'Church.' There is not the slightest hint of anything of the sort, the 'authority' is moral and not a 'power of jurisdiction'—two essentially different things. Whence is this moral authority derived? No doubt the Church at Rome, since it existed in the Imperial City, would, as has been noted, obtain early information of the unhappy state of things existing at Corinth; what more natural than that a Church which rejoiced in the honour of having been founded by 'the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church,' the 'two most glorious Apostles

[1] S. Clemens Rom., *Ep. ad Cor.*, cap. v.; P.G. i. 217.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 471 *et seq.*

Peter and Paul' who had been martyred there within the memory of man, and which possessed, therefore, the Apostolic tradition as to Church Order, should in the Name of God write a letter of urgent remonstrance?

1230. Again, the 'moral authority' which such a Church so founded would possess would materially be strengthened by the fact that the Church so exercising it was an important Church, because of its position in the very centre of the known world, whose influence would, too, be rendered more widespread and weighty by the munificence which its wealth enabled it to manifest towards other portions of the Church. Probably, indeed, the Church at Corinth had had experience of this liberality, for when Dionysius of Corinth, some eighty years later, wrote to thank the then Bishop of Rome for the supplies which he had furnished to the members of the Church over which he ruled, he said: 'For this practice has prevailed with you from the very beginning, to do good to all the brethren in every way, and to send many contributions to many Churches in every city. Thus refreshing the needy in their want, and furnishing to the brethren condemned to the mines what was necessary, by these contributions which ye have been accustomed to send from the beginning, you preserve, as Romans, the practice of your ancestors the Romans.'[1] Such liberality would, it cannot be doubted, add to the moral authority of the Church of Rome, and cause its remonstrances to be readily accepted, remonstrances which it was quite consistent with the polity of the Church for any portion thereof to make to another. For all the local Churches belonging to the same Body, possessing the One Episcopate, any injury done to one part was felt by the rest; and, all the parts taking an interest in the welfare of each other, any local Church could take such steps as it might think advisable to bring about a more satisfactory condition of things.

1231. The 'tone' of the letter is quite consistent with this position, whereas the total absence of any mention of the Episcopate of Peter at Rome by one who possessed personal knowledge of the connection which had existed between him and the Church at Rome, although on Papalist principles it would have been, especially if he mentioned St. Peter, the one thing he would necessarily have emphasised as being *the* ground on which he interfered as his successor in the Supreme Pastorate in the affairs of the Church at Corinth, coupled with the way in which he does mention him, is fatal to Papalism being 'the venerable and constant belief of' St. Clement's 'age'—hence the letter is a witness against Papalism, in support of which it is sought to make use of it.

Note 38, n. 469.

On St. Ignatius' statement as to the position of the Church of Rome.

1232. St. Ignatius in the letter in the text says that the Roman Church 'presides in the place of the region of the Romans . . . and has a presidency of love.'[2] He is here alluding to two facts: First, that the Church of Rome, as the Church seated in the 'City,' naturally had precedence amongst all the other Churches 'in the place of the region of the Romans,'

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. iv. c. 23; P.G. xx. 587.
[2] S. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Rom.*, n. iv.; P.G. v. 68.

just as Tertullian says of the Apostolical Churches that in them 'the very seats of the Apostles at this very day do preside in their own places—*suis locis*.'[1] The *locus* in which the Apostolical Church of Rome would preside would, of course, be 'the place of the region of the Romans,' a definite district of which Rome was the centre, obviously distinct from other districts which could likewise be described as 'regions.' Secondly, by 'a presidency of love' St. Ignatius means that pre-eminence in charity which was the special glory of the Roman Church in the first age, as, for instance, Dionysius of Corinth recounts its munificence in the days of Soter and earlier,[2] and St. Dionysius of Alexandria, that in the days of St. Stephen to the Churches of Syria and Arabia,[3] and St. Basil mentions that in the days of St. Dionysius, in redeeming captives,[4] in the province of Cappadocia.[5]

Note 39, n. 508.

On Funk's allegation as to the reason why every Church must 'resort to' the Roman Church (Irenaeus III., iii. 2).

1233. Funk adopts 'resort to' as the meaning of 'convenire ad' in the Irenaean passage. He examines at length the question, and shows that the Roman translation leads to a great absurdity. The translation of 'convenire ad' in this passage by 'agree with' involves that 'every other Church,' he says, 'must agree with the Roman Church, because in her—*in qua*—the Apostolical tradition of the faithful of all places is preserved. Is such a proposition to be imputed to an author like Irenaeus? For this thought more simply expressed is as follows: the other Churches must agree with the Roman Church in which they (the other Churches) have the Apostolic tradition preserved. Agreement is thus demanded, and yet those who are to agree are designated as the original authors of the factor which alone justifies that demand, namely, the preservation of the truth. Is a greater absurdity conceivable? And yet it is palpably attached to the traditional explanation, and one therefore understands why it should repeatedly have given offence,' and he remarks that 'in order to remove the ground of offence, expedients have been adopted which are even more questionable than the whole explanation itself.'[6] . . . 'Under these circumstances there remains no other course than to abandon the traditional translation of "convenire," which is the sole cause

[1] Tertullian, *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cap. xxxv.; P.L. ii. 49.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. 23 (cited *supra*, n. 1230); P.G. xx. 587.

[3] *Ibid.*, vii. 5; P.G. xx. 643.

[4] S. Basil, *Sine inscriptione De Synodo*, Ep. lxx.; P.G. xxxii. 486.

[5] An inscription which was composed for his tomb by Abercius, Bishop of Hierapolis, *c.* A.D. 160, in Phrygia, and which dates at the latest from the first years of the third century, is sometimes cited in support of Papalism, and may be noted here. It runs as follows: 'I am the disciple of a holy shepherd who feeds his sheep upon the hills and plains, and who has great eyes which see all. . . . He it is who sent me to Rome to see the sovereign queen, clad in a golden robe, and with golden shoes. There I saw a people who had a gleaming seal, etc.' (quoted, Batiffol, *l'Église Naissante*). [E.T. *Primitive Catholicism*, p. 176.] It is obvious that for Abercius Rome is the queen city, whose sovereignty is betokened by her golden robe and golden shoes. *In* that city he sees Christians. There is no reference whatever to the *Church* of Rome.

[6] Funk in *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. pp. 740, 741.

of the above cited absurdity.'[1] Whilst, however, Funk adopts the words 'resort to' as the translation of 'convenire ad' he asserts that St. Irenaeus in ascribing a *potior principalitas* to the Roman Church does so 'with particular reference to her foundation by Peter,'[2] whereas, as has been already noted,[3] that Father expressly says that she was founded 'by two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul,' and attempts to bring this 'interpretation' into harmony with the rest of the passage by saying that when St. Irenaeus says that every Church must 'resort to' the Roman Church on account of its *potior principalitas* he 'simply means that in all important disputes and doubtful cases the decision of the Roman Church as the chief Church is to be taken, and that this did actually take place the history of the Church shows *ad libitum*.' Immediately after this passage the learned writer alludes to the Roman journey of St. Polycarp, and 'do we not also find at Rome such foreign Christians as Hegesippus, Tertullian, Origen, and Irenaeus himself?'[4] He evidently means that the individuals named 'took the decision' of the Roman Church in all important disputes, that is to say, recognised the Church as having *jure divino* the right to give an authoritative 'decision' binding on the Church on any questions on which they, as 'ambassadors to the chief Church,' submitted to it. Unfortunately, however, for the learned writer's argument the instances which he adduces in support of his statement are such as either refute it or have no bearing on it.

E.g., St. Polycarp certainly did not ask for or 'take the decision' of Anicetus on the Paschal question,[5] a question which obviously caused great inconvenience to both the Churches of Rome and of Smyrna, owing to the natural concourse[6] of persons from the latter to the former. The account which Eusebius gives of the matter is utterly incompatible with the idea that St. Polycarp recognised any supremacy of Rome which made it necessary for him to submit the question in dispute to Anicetus as 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful' to 'take his decision' as the final one closing the matter, or that Anicetus himself claimed to hold such position.[7]

So again, with reference to St. Irenaeus. It is to be presumed that Funk is referring to the journey that saint took to Rome after the martyrdom of St. Pothinus at Lyons, and the consequently widowed state of that Church. No conclusion whatever favourable to Funk's position can be drawn from that episode, because there can be no doubt that Gaul was evangelised from Rome;[8] hence nothing could be more natural than that when the only Bishop in that country had been martyred, the Church that owed its origin to Rome should send thither for that assistance which it could give especially, it may be, by the consecration of St. Irenaeus to succeed the Martyr. So far from St. Irenaeus regarding himself as bound 'to take the decision' of the Roman Church as authoritative and conclusive on all questions, his conduct in the controversy with St. Victor[9] is clear proof that such an idea was unknown to him.

That the other members of other Churches named found their way to

[1] Funk in *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 743. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 734.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 505.
[4] *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxxxix. p. 745. [5] *Vide supra*, n. 526.
[6] *Vide supra*, n. 510. [7] *Vide supra*, nn. 526 *et seq.*
[8] *Vide* Duchesne, *Fastes Episcopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, vol. i. p. 51. Paris, 1907.
[9] *Vide supra*, n. 534.

Rome is, no doubt, the case, but there is no evidence whatever that they submitted any questions, as 'ambassadors' for the local Churches to which they belonged, to the Roman Church in order 'to take its decision' as a final and conclusive settlement thereof. This, and nothing short of this, is required in order that Funk may derive support from the presence at Rome of those persons to which he alludes for his argument. The fact that Funk is unable to adduce a single case during the age of St. Irenaeus wherein the Bishop of Rome was recognised as occupying *jure divino* the position of 'Supreme Judge of all the faithful,' whose 'decision was taken' as finally settling any question, such question being submitted to him for such 'decision' by an 'ambassador' from another Church, is significant of the futility of his attempt to show that the concourse of the faithful from all quarters to Rome, of which St. Irenaeus speaks, was the inevitable consequence of the 'Supremacy' which he alleges to have been the result of 'its foundation by Peter,' that itself being, as has been seen, a statement which St. Irenaeus does not make.

Note 40, n. 524.

On Tertullian's expression 'Pontifex Maximus.'

1234. Tertullian in his work *De Pudicitia*, c. i.,[1] makes use of the terms *Pontifex Maximus* and *Episcopus Episcoporum*. It is alleged sometimes that his so doing proves that he believed that the Bishop of Rome held the position which is declared by Papalism to belong to him by the institution of Christ as the legitimate successor of St. Peter in the Roman Episcopate. These expressions, however, occur in a treatise written after Tertullian had become a Montanist, hence their value as a witness to any matter connected with the position of any member of the Episcopate of the Church is practically *nil*, in that the Montanists regarded the Bishops as the officials of those whom they despised as carnal and 'psychic.' In the next place, the words are obviously used ironically for the purpose of discrediting the Episcopal author of an *Edict* with reference to remitting to penitence even the sins of adultery and fornication which had raised the wrath of Tertullian as a rigorist. They are, in fact, a protest against what he considered to be an assumption by a Bishop of a prerogative which alone could be possessed by Jesus Christ Himself, the true *Pontifex Maximus* and sole *Episcopus Episcoporum*. They are not applied to the individual in question as titles rightly belonging to him, for then Tertullian's opposition would have been nullified, as the Prelate's action would then have been justified.

Thirdly, there is no reason for saying that, even in the ironical and protesting sense, Tertullian applied these terms in question to the then Bishop of Rome. It is a pure assumption to do so, and seems to be in opposition to the real circumstances of the time. The *De Pudicitia* might well have been addressed to any Bishop with whom Tertullian might be brought into contact in Africa who had taken the same line as Zephyrinus or Callistus of Rome. The *Edict* might well owe its origin to the Diocesan Bishop, in Tertullian's case the Bishop of Carthage, whose action would

[1] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, c. i.; P.L. ii. 980, 981.

necessarily affect him personally if, as is most probable, he took the less austere line which raised Tertullian's anger and scorn. The Bishop of Carthage, too, would, as his own Bishop, be more naturally described by him as *Bonus Pastor* and *Benedictus Papa* than a foreign Prelate who had no jurisdiction in Africa, and this indeed is rendered, as Archbishop Benson has pointed out,[1] the more probable inasmuch as the title 'Papa' seems to have been specially used of the Bishop of Carthage long before it was used of the Bishop of Rome,[2] the very words *Benedictus Papa* being used of St. Cyprian by the Roman Presbyters in their letter to him. The phrase used in the *De Pudicitia*, 'Thou imaginest that to thee also, that is to every Church akin to Peter —*ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam*—this power has been committed,'[3] calls to mind the African belief that every legitimate Bishop sits in the 'chair of Peter' in virtue of his holding in joint tenure the One Episcopate. The use of the title *Pontifex Maximus* was not improbably suggested to Tertullian by the heathen custom of applying it to the Roman Emperor. It continued to be borne by the Emperors after the conversion of Constantine. Gratian in A.D. 382, when a deputation of the heathen priesthood displayed before him the robe of the *Pontifex Maximus*, with the object of appealing to his feelings when he had commanded the altar of Victoria to be removed from the Senate-house, and, besides taking away all privileges from Pagan worship, had confiscated the estates of the temples, 'rejected it as unbefitting a Christian,'[4] and probably declined to bear the title after refusing to wear the robe,[5] though it appears not to have been finally dropped 'by the Christian Emperors till after the death of Justin I. in 527, since he is named "Pont. Max." in an inscription found at Capo d'Istria or Justinopolis.' 'The Popes themselves did not adopt the style of *Pontifex Maximus* till the Episcopate of Paul II. (1464-1471).'[6] In the first age the Bishop of Rome was simply designated 'the Roman Bishop,' 'the Bishop of the Romans,' or 'the Bishop of Rome,' as is plain from the writings of Tertullian,[7] St. Dionysius of Corinth,[8] and St. Athanasius,[9] from the Canons of the First[10] and Second Synods.[11] Mr. E. Bishop in an interesting note to an article in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1911, says: 'What we are concerned with is primarily mere matter of ecclesiastical etiquette. First of all, it will be well to run the eye over the beginning and the ending of the Papal letters of A.D. 400-440 in Constant or the delightfully handy little Schoenemann; nothing can be more simple than the official form designating (whether on his own part or on the part of others) "the Bishop of Rome." Exactly the same impression is derived from those imperial documents derived from the *Avellana*, so conveniently brought together by that veteran worker Wilhelm Meyer (now of Göttingen) in his capital appendices to the Göttingen Index Scholarum of 1898 and 1899; although here a favourite

[1] Archbishop Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 31. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 1107.
[3] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, c. xxi.; P.L. ii. 1025.
[4] Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, bk. ii. ch. v. vol. i. p. 398.
[5] Gieseler, *op. cit.*, ii., i. sect. 78. [E.T. vol. i. p. 316.]
[6] Littledale, *The Petrine Claims*, pp. 129, 130, note 2.
[7] Tertullian, *De Præscrip. Heret.*, c. xxxii.; *adv. Præas.*, c. i.; P.L. ii. 45, 155.
[8] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv. c. xxiii.; P.G. xx. 388.
[9] S. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, ii.; P.G. xxv. 252.
[10] Mansi, ii. 669. [11] *Ibid.*, iii. 560.

designation is "pope of the city," quite simple. So much for the ecclesiastical and upper circles. The first intimation (known to me) of the complimentary change interesting us is in a document addressed to the Emperors by the inferior clergy—the (? parish) priests—of Rome in favour of Boniface as their Bishop in succession to the deceased Zosimus (A.D. 418): "Post abscessum sancti Zosimi (they say), papæ ecclesiæ catholicæ urbis Romæ" (W. Meyer's second programme, 1898-1899, p. 18, in Constant, he says, p. 1007; Schoenemann, p. 712). The next instance of this "style" that I have come across is the signature of an underling again, one Siricius, a notary, in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (431), who, instead of using the form common in the Acts for Roman clerics, viz., τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας, subscribes himself as τῆς ἁγίας καθολικης ἐκκλησίας πόλεως Ῥωμαίων (Harduin, *Concil.*, i., col. 1466, 1468). At the Council of Chalcedon (451) this form is used by the representatives of the Pope themselves (*ibid.*, col. 1799; *cf.* ii. 465, 467). The first case in which I find the style formally adopted (unless I have overlooked in too summary a glance at Leo's letters which have not been gone through by me formally for the present purpose) and specially used by the Pope for his signature to and approval of a solemn and official act—a *Constitutum*—is in the Roman Council under Hilary in 465: "Hilarus episcopus ecclesiæ catholicæ urbis Romæ" (Harduin, ii. 799). By the time of Vigilius (middle of the sixth century), the word 'sanctæ' is added to the formula (Harduin, iii. col. 46; *cf.* col. 8); *cf.* Pelagius II., *ibid.*, col. 414). Gregory the Great in 594 (see de Rozière's edition of the *Liber Diurnus*, p. 15) fixed the form of subscription at "Episcopus sanctæ ecclesiæ catholicæ atque apostolicæ urbis Romæ"; see this form in the Acts of the Roman Synod under Martin of 649 *passim*. Of course, to understand the case "historically," and estimate what was really *en jeu*, it is necessary to follow up the contemporaneous stylistic development (to, say, 520) of the Archbishop of Constantinople into the Œcumenical Patriarch, and along with these two main currents which issue in serious events there are side inquiries that must not be neglected, rivulets as it were that lose themselves and disappear in the sands of the desert: the use, for instance, by commonplace and inferior Bishops of the form "Bishop of the Catholic Church," or "holy Church," or "the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God" in such and such a place (for instance at Ephesus). Though even here we must distinguish between such sort of subscription as is found (say) in the Acts of the Conference with the Donatists in 411 and the use in the East. But all these subordinate inquiries in their results only confirm and emphasise the singularity and uniqueness of the Roman Bishop's domestic official form of c. 466-540, which finds its echo in the terms of our Litany: "the Bishops of *this* Catholic Church."[1] The reference in the concluding words of Mr. Bishop's note is to the sixteenth suffrage of a Litany attributed by Alcuin to a Roman origin of the time of Gelasius I. (492-496), 'Pro refrigerio fidelium animarum, præcipue sanctorum Domini sacerdotum qui præfuerunt *catholicæ huic ecclesiæ*, Dominum spirituum et universæ carnis Judicem deprecamur,' where it will be observed that the local Church of Rome is designated 'this Catholic Church' (*cp.* the 'sanctæ ecclesiæ catholicæ atque apostolicæ *urbis Romæ*' of St. Gregory, see above), and

[1] E. Bishop in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xii. pp. 408, 409, note.

implying that there are other local Churches which could be described in the same way.

The title *Summus Pontifex*, it may be noted, was applied to Bishops, *e.g.*, to St. Hilary of Arles by Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons,[1] to some Gallic Bishops by Sidonius Apollinaris,[2] to Bishops in general by the Council of Agde, A.D. 506, in Canon XXXV.[3]; in A.D. 1000 the Archbishop of Arles is styled *Pontifex Summus*, and in the eleventh century Archbishop Lanfranc is designated by his biographer, Milo Crispino, as 'primas et *pontifex summus*.'[4]

Note 41, n. 537.

At what date did Milan become a Metropolitical See?

1235. The growth of the Metropolitical Sees in the West was much slower than in the East. It would seem indeed probable that the only Western Sees until the date of the Council of Sardica recognised as exercising Metropolitical jurisdiction were Rome and Carthage. It is clear, however, that Milan soon after that Synod had the position of Metropolitical See, as there were Synods held there in A.D. 345[5] and A.D. 347,[6] at which no doubt the Bishop of the See would preside. It must be remembered that the Emperor Constantine had divided the Empire into *Diocceses*, and the Bishops of these divisions naturally became more closely united with each other. The Bishop of the See seated in the capital of the *Dioecesis* would naturally also become their head, as they would meet from time to time for business in his See. One of these *Dioeceses* was that of Italy, the capital of which was Milan, and it would not be improbable that the recognition by the neighbouring Bishops of his position would gradually become fixed by custom. It is certain that St. Ambrose occupied plainly the position of Metropolitan, but the date when this custom became recognised was earlier than this, probably, as has been said above, soon after Sardica, immediately after which, as has been seen, a Council was held at Milan.

Father Puller thinks that the date was probably in the period from 356 onwards,[7] in the Episcopate of Auxentius, an Arian like Constantius, who naturally would wish to aggrandise the Sees of his friends. Father Puller thinks that Milan was then separated from the Roman Province owing to Felix, the Antipope, and afterwards Liberius, being in great subservience to the heretical Emperor. But there is no need, even if the formation of the Province of Milan was as late as A.D. 356, to suppose that it formed originally part of the Province of Rome. The idea assumes that every See always formed part of a Province subject to a Metropolitan. On the contrary, it seems evident from Canon IV. of Nicæa and Canon IX. of Antioch in *Encæniis* that the growth of Provinces was slow. It was certainly

[1] Eucherius, *Lugdunensis Episcopi Instructionum ad Salonium Libri Duo, Præfatio ad Salonium*; P.L. i. 773.

[2] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep. ad Petreium suum, Epp.* lib. iv., Ep. xi.; *Ep. ad Agræcium*, lib. vii., Ep. v.; P.L. lviii. 517, 568.

[3] Mansi, viii. 330, 331.

[4] Milo Crispino, *Vita B. Lanfranci*, c. viii.; P.L. cl. 45.

[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. v. sect. 71. [E.T. ii. 189.]

[6] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* [E.T. ii. 191.]

[7] Puller, *op. cit.*, 434, 484.

much slower in the West than in the East, and there is no need to suppose that Milan was originally part of the Province of Rome if there was no Province of Milan till A.D. 356, any more than it was necessary for the Sees in Gaul or Spain to have been under Metropolitans, which they were not at first. Further, as has been seen, Rufinus' interpretation of Canon VI. of Nicæa is against any such subjection of Milan to Rome, an interpretation which is corroborated by a certain Latin version in use at Carthage in the fifth century, and which has been attributed to Cæcilian, Bishop of that See, who was present at Nicæa. On the whole, it is probable that Milan became a 'Metropolitical See' very shortly after the constitution by Constantine of the civil *Dioecesis Italiæ*. Father Puller appears to think[1] that the phrase in the Synodical Letter of the Council of Sardica requesting Julius to inform their brethren, 'qui in Sicilia, qui in Sardinia, et in Italia sunt,'[2] indicates that 'Milan and Northern Italy remained still within the sphere of the Pope's Metropolitical jurisdiction' at the time of the Council. But first, as has been said, there was no necessity for Milan to have been under any Metropolitan at all, and supposing *Italia* does mean Northern Italy there would be nothing unnatural in the Council asking the chief Bishop of the West to communicate with the Metropolitan of Milan, or with all the Bishops of Italy who were not yet under any Metropolitan. Secondly, the phrase refers to 'Sardinia and Sicily,' both suburbicarian Churches, and it seems more natural to take *Italia* as meaning the provinces in the mainland of the same ecclesiastical division as Sardinia and Sicily, viz., the suburbicarian Churches of the *Dioecesis Romæ*. Thirdly, the fact of a Synod of Milan being held so soon after the Synod of Sardica, just noted, points to the existence of the Metropolitical position of Milan before that time. Father Puller's objection does not, therefore, seem strong enough to outweigh the probabilities on the other side, viz., that Milan was never under the Metropolitical jurisdiction of Rome, and it is likely that it attained Metropolitical rank at the time suggested.

Note 42, n. 543.

What St. Ambrose meant by agreement with the Catholic Bishops, that is, with the Roman Church.

1236. The same circumstances which show what is the real meaning of the citation made by the *Vatican Council* which has been considered in the text also enable the true sense of a statement made by St. Ambrose to his brother Satyrus to be ascertained. Satyrus had gone to Sardinia and St. Ambrose advised him, in order to find out whether the Bishop was orthodox or not, to inquire of him 'whether he agreed with the Catholic Bishops, that is, with the Roman Church.'[3] Sardinia, like the rest of 'the Roman world,' was at this time exposed to the ravages of Arianism. It was situate within the Roman Patriarchate,[4] consequently the shortest and easiest method by which any orthodox Western going thither could ascertain whether he was to communicate with a particular Bishop who

[1] *L.c.* [2] Mansi, iii. 41.

[3] S. Ambrosius, *De Excessu Fratris Sui Satyri*, lib. i. 47; P.L. xvi. 1706.

[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 1201 *et seq.*

claimed jurisdiction on the part of the island where he might be, would be to inquire whether he agreed with the Catholic Bishops, that is, the Roman Church, since the Catholic Bishops in the West were in communion with that Church 'in the Roman world,' which, moreover, the Churches in Sardinia, as part of the Roman Patriarchate, were necessarily bound to recognise as the head of the Patriarchate, to use a term which came into use later, so that any Bishop of Sardinia who did not agree with it would be manifestly unorthodox and to be avoided.

1237. Two other passages from St. Ambrose which are quoted by Roman controversialists may be conveniently noticed here: (*a*) *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.* The immediate context of these words is as follows: 'This is that Peter to whom Christ said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church." Wherefore, where Peter is, there is the Church; where the Church is there is no death, but life eternal. And therefore He adds, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." That blessed Peter, against whom the gates of hell prevailed not, did not close the gates of heaven against himself; but, on the contrary, the entrances of hell, and made manifest the entrances of heaven. Being therefore placed on earth, he opened heaven and closed hell.'[1] It is obvious that the whole passage is highly 'mystical.' There is nothing at all in it about any Supremacy of Peter, or of the Bishop of Rome in support of which the words are quoted. St. Ambrose has in his mind the Apostle as having been in his confession of faith the foundation of the Church, just as in a remarkable passage in his tract on the Incarnation he says of St. Peter: 'When he heard the words, "But whom say ye that I am?" he forthwith, not unmindful of his place, took on himself a primacy—*primatum egit*—a primacy of confession, not of office—*non honoris*—of faith, not of order. That is to say, Now let no one surpass me; now it is my part. . . . This then is Peter who answered for the other Apostles, yea, before the others, and therefore is called a foundation, because he not only knew how to preserve that which belonged to himself, but that which is common to others. Christ expressed His assent to him, the Father made revelation to him. For whoso speaketh truly of generation from the Father got it from the Father, and not from the flesh. Faith is therefore the foundation of the Church; for it was not said of Peter's flesh, but of his faith, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it; but his confession conquered hell, and this confession hath shut out more than one heresy, for whereas the Church like a goodly vessel is oft beaten on by many waves, the foundation of the Church must hold good against all heresies,'[2] and lays down in another passage that 'the Lord gave to His Apostles what was before part of His own judicial authority. . . . Hear Him saying: "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that thou mayest both loose and bind." This Novatian has not heard, but the Church of God has. Peter then (received this) in his fall, we in remission; he in impenitence, we in grace. What is said to Peter is said to the Apostles. We are not usurping a power but obeying a command.'[3]

1238. The other passage is that where St. Ambrose says that certain

[1] S. Ambrosius, *In Psalmum xl.*, s. 30; P.L. xiv. 1082.

[2] *De Incarnationis Dominicæ sacramento*, s. 32-4; P.L. xvi. 826, 827.

[3] *In Psalmum xxxviii. enarratio*; P.L. xiv. 1037.

persons 'have not Peter's heritage because they have not Peter's seat, which they rend asunder by an impious division.'[1] This is quoted as if St. Ambrose here lays down the necessity of being in communion with the 'See of Peter,' whereas he is simply referring to the schismatical Novatian Episcopate which had intruded into the See of Rome, of which St. Peter was in his age believed to have been the first occupant,[2] and alluding to the memorable confession made by that Apostle at Cæsarea Philippi declares such persons have no part in the Church which was founded upon the faith which he then confessed.

Note 43, n. 570.

On the 'interpolations' in the treatise 'De Unitate Ecclesiæ Catholicæ' of St. Cyprian.

1239. The following is a list of the chief MSS. of St. Cyprian's works :

(1) Codex Seguierianus, now Parisiensis, n. 10592, which Hartel considers to possess the highest authority of all the existing MSS.[3] It is of the sixth century, and is known as S.

(2) The Codex Veronensis, which 'is amongst the most ancient codices of Cyprian,' of the sixth or seventh century, and known as V.[4]

(3) The Codex Beneventanus, called also Neapolitanus, 'was one of the best MSS.'[5]

(4) The Codex Wirceburgensis of the eighth-ninth century, known as W.[6]

(5) The Codex Sangallensis of the ninth century, known as G.[7]

In none of these MSS. does any trace of the interpolations appear.

1240. (6) The Codex Pithœanus, 'qui . . . in Trecense migravit,' hence called Trecensis, of the eighth-ninth century, known as Q.[8]

(7) The Codex Monacensis of the ninth century, known as M.[9]

(8) The Codex Reginensis of the tenth century, known as T.[10]

(9) The Codex Vossianus, lat 7, of the tenth century, in the library of the University of Leyden, known as h.[11]

(10) At Pembroke College, Cambridge, a copy of h of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, known as Pem.[12]

(11) The Bologna MS., also a copy of h of the fourteenth century.[13]

(12) A MS. in the Bodleian of the fifteenth century, known as 'Bod 3.'[14]

(13) A MS. in the Bodleian of the end of the eleventh century, known as 'Bod 4.'[15]

(14) The MS. Cambronensis not now extant, called by Hartel, 'interpolatissimis interpolatior et alienis additamentis effertissimus,' which was used by Pamelius in his edition of St. Cyprian's works.[16]

(15) The Codex Parisienses, 15282, of the eleventh-twelfth century, known as H.[17]

[1] S. Ambrosius, *De Penitentia*, i. 7; P.L. xvi. 476.
[2] On St. Peter's alleged Roman Episcopate, *vide supra*, chap. xiii.
[3] Hartel, *op. cit.*, Prefatio, p. v.
[4] Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 204.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 205.
[6] Hartel, *l.c.*, p. xix.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. xxii.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. xxiii.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.*, p. xl.
[12] Dom Chapman, *Revue Bénédictine*, Juillet, 1902, p. 247.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 247, 248.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 248.
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] Hartel, p. lxxxiii.
[17] *Ibid.*, lvi., lvii.

1241. Dom Chapman in an interesting article, 'Les interpolations dans le traité de S. Cyprien sur l'Unité de l'Église' in the *Revue Bénédictine*[1] has endeavoured to prove that the author of the 'interpolations' was none other than St. Cyprian himself. His argument is certainly very ably built up, and, as we should expect of so distinguished a student of St. Cyprian, displays evidence of much careful and patient study of the subject. It is, so far as I am aware, also entirely original.

(*a*) Dom Chapman first discusses the evidence afforded by the MSS., dividing those which contain the 'interpolations' into three families—(*a*) h Pem H; (*b*) T t Bod 4; and (*c*) M Q Bod 3. He compares the order in which these three families give the treatises and epistles of St. Cyprian with that given by Pontius the Deacon and biographer of the saint in his *Vita Cæcilii Cypriani*, which he considers to have been the 'original order'[2] [in which those documents] appeared in the first collection which was made thereof, and makes a series of ingenious conjectures (in an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*[3] to which he refers) as to the grounds on which additional letters were added in the MSS. other than h Pem, in which are given the letters as they occur in the 'list' of Pontius without interpolation, followed by other letters. He draws the conclusion that the first two families (*a*) and (*b*) are to be referred back to one archetype, which he calls (T H h), and which he conjectures to be of the date of the third century, and of which he says, 'It is not so certain that the interpolation is found in the archetype of the third century, but it is at least extremely probable.'[4] As to the third family (*c*) Dom Chapman concludes that, 'It is difficult not to suppose that M Q and T H h descend from a common archetype of the third quarter of the third century.'[5] 'The examination of the MSS. tends to place the origin of the interpolation very near to the times of St. Cyprian himself. There is no certainty gained, but there is a very large amount of probability.'[6] Dom Chapman's theory is most ingenious, and is worked out in great detail,[7] but it depends largely upon

[1] *Revue Bénédictine*, Juillet, pp. 246-54; Octobre 1902, pp. 357-73, and Jan. 1903, pp. 26-51.

[2] *Revue Bénédictine*, Octobre 1903, p. 358.

[3] 'The Order of the Treatises and Letters in the MSS. of St. Cyprian,' *J. T.S.*, vol. iv. p. 110.

[4] *Revue Bénédictine*, Octobre 1902, p. 359.

[5] *L.c.*, p. 360.

[6] *L.c.*, p. 360.

[7] Dom Chapman makes a great point of the fact that in all the MSS. which have the interpolations the 'hic's and 'illic's in chapter xix. of the *De Unitate* which make the *Lapsi* 'here' and the schismatics 'there' are interchanged (*Revue Bénédictine*, Jan. 1903; *J. T.S.*, July 1904, p. 636). He considers this to be 'a contemporary change, and a change made by the composer of the alternative version of chapter iv., since it is witnessed to by the same codices' (*Revue Bénédictine*, Octobre 1910). But is it not at least as probable that it was not? It is quite possible that St. Cyprian interchanged the 'hic's and 'illic's, having in view the fact that the copy of the treatise was to be read by people who lived at Rome, and it is not unlikely that the scribe in whose hands the collection sent from Africa was placed used the MS. of the *De Unitate* sent by St. Cyprian himself as his 'copy' for that treatise as being the one those at Rome would wish to preserve; this would account for the 'interchange' being written in the body of the MS. itself and not in the margin. The scribe who first wrote the 'interpolations' in the margin of the MS. was evidently a very careless person, and if he did not observe or at least take any notice of the sign which directed him to substitute the 'revised version'

a series of conjectures, suppositions, and assumptions, and it seems to be incompatible with the fact that the 'amalgamation' in its commencement and complete form is found in the family T H h (of which the only MSS. are of late date), and that is certainly later than the 'original' form of the 'interpolations,' and the result of at least two recensions. So conjectural is Dom Chapman's method of dealing with this portion of the subject that he himself acknowledges that he does not expect many people to follow his conclusion as regards the evidence of the MSS. as to the early date of the interpolations.[1]

1242. (*b*) Dom Chapman next[2] gives certain 'apparent citations' of the 'interpolations' before the date of Pelagius P. II. who is the first to cite part of them *verbatim*, and as from the *De Unitate* of St. Cyprian. The quotations given are from St. Gelasius, *Epistole* XIV. *sive Tractatus*,[3] St. Jerome *Adv. Jovinianum*, lib. i. c. xxvi.;[4] and St. Optatus of Milevis, *De Schismate Donatistarum*, lib. ii. c. ii.[5] The resemblances are at best purely superficial, and the most that can be said with regard to them is that there is perhaps a bare possibility that the respective writers had knowledge of the 'interpolations.' With reference to the citation from St. Optatus Dom Chapman admits that the same doctrine could be gathered from other parts of the writings of St. Cyprian, and he also says that 'he does not see any reason to suppose St. Augustine knew of the interpolations,'[6] which it would hardly be possible should have been the case if St. Optatus knew of them, as St. Augustine was almost a contemporary of that saint, and was likewise engaged in controversy with the Donatists, and therefore would doubtless make himself acquainted with the arguments and authorities which had been used by St. Optatus.

(*c*) The third portion of Dom Chapman's argument is an elaborate proof that in St. Cyprian's works themselves 'we find the most frequent resemblances to the interpolations.'[7] It is one of the results of Dom Chapman's

for the 'original' of chapter iv., notwithstanding the length of the matter to be so substituted, it is not unlikely that he would have neglected to take any notice at all of such comparatively insignificant alterations as those involved in the interchange, especially as they would occur in a part of the MS. some way further on.

[1] *Revue Bénédictine*, Octobre 1910. I am indebted to the kindness of Dom Chapman for an English translation of his article on 'Professor Hugo Koch on St. Cyprian' in this number of the *Revue*.

[2] *Revue Bénédictine*, Octobre 1902, pp. 360-3.

[3] P.L. lix. 88. [4] P.L. xxiii. 247. [5] P.L. xi. 947.

[6] *Revue Bénédictine*, Octobre 1902, p. 363.

[7] Of the examples given by Dom Chapman is one showing the use of the word *primatus* with reference to St. Peter's position by St. Cyprian. It is as follows: '*Ep.* 71, 3, p. 773: nam nec PETRUS, quem PRIMUM Dominus elegit et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi insolenter aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se PRIMATUM tenere. et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi potius oportet, nec despexit Paulum.' [The capitals are Dom Chapman's.]

St. Cyprian's meaning is clear; *Primatus* obviously refers back to *primum*, and is plainly an allusion to his idea that the Apostolate was first bestowed upon Peter on the occasion of his memorable confession at Cæsarea Philippi, 'whom first the Lord chose, and upon whom He built His Church' (S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Quintum*, Ep. lxxi. 3; Hartel, 773). St. Peter would thus hold a position of seniority amongst the Apostles, being, in fact, *Primus inter pares*, with all moral influence which naturally belongs to

thorough study of the subject that he has made it quite clear that all the words found in the 'original' interpolations are to be found in the genuine works of St. Cyprian. Dom Chapman draws from these resemblances the conclusion that 'the interpolator was none other than St. Cyprian

such a position. This position—*primatus*—St. Peter did not insolently and arrogantly claim for himself by insisting that he, as holding the first place—*primatum*—was entitled to the obedience in preference to others, or of those who, like St. Paul, were new converts, and of posterity, nor did he look down upon St. Paul. Dom Chapman comments upon this passage as follows: 'St. Cyprian testifies also that Novatian having caused himself to be consecrated Antipope, arrogated to himself this same primacy.—*Ep.* 69, 8, p. 737. ". . . nunc hi scindentes et contra pacem atque unitatem Christi rebelles *cathedram sibi* constituere et PRIMATUM adsumere et baptizandi atque offerendi licentiam vindicare conantur."' [The italics and capitals are Dom Chapman's.] 'And by this usurped power he willed to exercise an œcumenical jurisdiction.—*Ep.* 55, 24 p. 642. "Et cum sit a Christo una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus, ille post Dei traditionem, post connexam et ubique conjunctam catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem, humanam conetur ecclesiam facere, et *per plurimas civitates novos apostolos suos mittat*, ut quædam recentia institutionis suæ fundamenta constituat, cumque jam pridem per omnes provincias et per urbes singulas ordinati sint episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persecutione proscripti, *ille super eos creare alios pseudoepiscopi audeat*; quasi possit aut *totum orbem* novi conatus obstinatione peragere, aut ecclesiastici corporis compaginem discordiæ suæ seminatione rescindere. . . ."' [The italics are Dom Chapman's.] The Epistle cited was addressed to Magnus, and treats of the validity of the baptisms of the Novatians. As a vital part of his argument he has to deal with the question as to who was the legitimate Bishop of Rome, Cornelius or Novatian? In the course of his argument he remarks, '. . . whoso says that anyone can be baptised and sanctified by Novatian must first show and prove that Novatian is in the Church or presides over the Church. For the Church is one, and, being one, cannot be both within and without. For if it is with Novatian, it is not with Cornelius. But if it was with Cornelius, who, by a legitimate ordination succeeded Bishop Fabianus, and whom, beside the honour of his priesthood, the Lord glorified also by martyrdom, Novatian is not in the Church; nor can he be accounted a Bishop, who, despising the Evangelic and Apostolic tradition, succeeding to nobody, has sprung from himself. For he can by no means have or hold to a Church, who has not been ordained in the Church . . . these . . . rending the Church and rebels against the peace and unity of Christ, attempt to set up a chair for themselves, and to assume the *primacy* and to claim the privilege of baptising and offering.' St. Cyprian here lays down that there can only be one Bishop to preside over each of the local Churches into which the One Church throughout the world is divided, and that Novatian and his followers therefore rent the Church and were rebels against its unity by setting up an 'Episcopal chair' and 'assuming the primacy,' *i.e.* the Episcopate, for so the word must be translated here as the argument is entirely concerned with the legitimacy of the Episcopate of Novatian, upon which depended his right to baptise and to offer the Eucharist, both of which privileges belonged as of right to a Bishop alone, Presbyters and Deacons being unable to baptise without the permission of the Bishop, whilst Presbyters were forbidden to celebrate without like sanction (Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, i. 230). His argument is entirely consistent with his teaching elsewhere on the subject of Novatian's position (*vide*, n. 564), and has not the slightest reference to any 'primacy' held by the Bishop of Rome as such. The second passage is quoted in proof of the position that Novatian claimed as 'Bishop of Rome' to hold 'the Primacy' in the Papalist sense of the word, as showing that in consequence of his usurped position 'he willed to exercise an œcumenical jurisdiction.' It is from the Epistle to Antonianus, and has already been considered (*vide supra*, n. 565). The meaning of the passage is clearly this: Novatian is contrasted with Christ, the Founder of the Catholic Church, a Divine Society, as the founder of 'a human Church'—*humanam ecclesiam*—who in the same manner as Christ sent His Apostles, 'sends his new apostles

himself.'[1] But surely this deduction which is not justified by the premises, the various writings which have been attributed to St. Cyprian, some of which are so 'Cyprianic' that learned scholars have argued that they were genuine, sufficiently disprove it. In fact, the occurrence of these resemblances in the 'interpolations' is just what is to be expected if they were the work of some other person desirous of passing his production off as St. Cyprian's. The case is by no means unknown in which words and expressions have been taken from a writer's own works, and by combination a passage has been produced which has been attributed to him. Such a course of procedure is, in fact, what a skilful 'interpolator' would adopt, and the objection that an 'interpolator would, in this instance, have had to make use of passages from different parts of an MS. or even of more than one MS. with simplicity and success without introducing an un-Cyprianic word' is not of any weight, as it would only testify to his thorough acquaintance with the works of his author, as was doubtless the case with some of those who compiled those works whose truly Cyprianic language has deceived the very elect.

1243. (*d*) This copy of the *De Unitate* was, according to Dom Chapman, the one sent by St. Cyprian to the Roman Confessors who were supporting Novatian under cover to Cornelius by Mettius, the Subdeacon, with Epistles xlv., xlvi., and xlvii. Of it no copy is extant, it has entirely perished, for the MS. from which Dom Chapman considers that all the MSS. which have the 'interpolations' in any form are derived was an 'example of the first collection sent from Africa. The critic who made the comparison marked on the margin of the new book the reading of the roll formerly sent by St. Cyprian, with a sign before the words *super unum ædificat*, to show where it should be substituted. The scribe who copied the book corrected chapter XIX. according to the marginal notes,[2] but in chapter IV. he inserted the

through very many cities,' and 'dares to create . . . false Bishops over the Bishops already in canonical possession of their Sees.' As if he could traverse the whole world with obstinate perseverance in his novel attempt, or disjoin the compact structure of the ecclesiastical body, by the dissemination of his own discord'; that is, he laboured hard to establish his 'human Church' in the place of the Catholic Church throughout the world, 'not knowing that schismatics are always impetuous at the beginning, but are incapable of growth; nor can they augment what they have unlawfully begun, but together with their ungodly rivalry, soon fail.' Then St. Cyprian adds, 'But he could not hold the Episcopate, even if he had been made a Bishop first, since he has fallen away from the body of his fellow-bishops and from the unity of the Church. . . . He . . . who keeps neither the unity of the Spirit, nor the bond of peace, and separates himself from the band of the Church and from the College of Priests, can retain neither the power nor the honour of a Bishop, in that he would not uphold either the unity or the peace of the Episcopate' (S. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Antonianum*, Ep. lv. 24; Hartel, 642, 653). There is not the slightest reference to any usurpation of any supposed 'primacy' possessing 'œcumenical jurisdiction' belonging *jure divino* to the 'legitimate successors of Peter in the Roman Episcopate,' for Christ, not Peter, is the Founder of the Divine Society—the Church—Christ, not Peter, sent the Apostles. So far as St. Cyprian is concerned with the ecclesiastical status of Novatian, it is with the question whether he was a Bishop, a member of the One Episcopate, or not, and with nothing else, that he deals, as is most clearly manifest from the words just quoted, which follow almost immediately after the words cited by Dom Chapman as well as by those which immediately precede them.

[1] *Revue Bénédictine*, Jan. 1903, p. 47.

[2] *Vide* on these 'corrections' *supra*, n. 1241, footnote 7.

alternative reading instead of substituting it.' This conjecture that the copy of the *De Unitate* completely disappeared, and that our only knowledge of the 'revised' version of chapter IV. it contains is derived from a single codex in which that version was inserted, can hardly be said to be very probable, for it is scarcely possible that St. Cyprian himself, no literary novice, should not have kept a copy of this *later* corrected version of his treatise, corrected, too, it is alleged, with a view to meeting the Novatian position with which he had to deal at Carthage, and therefore of practical use to him, as being the more matured expression of his mind, quite apart from the following consideration. The copy of the *De Unitate* sent by St. Cyprian would be especially valued at Rome, both by the Confessors as containing a concise justification of their recognition of Cornelius as Bishop of Rome, and as a weapon sent by an influential Prelate who, as would be well known, had been in doubt as to regularity of the consecration of Cornelius against Novatianism which was rapidly spreading 'throughout the Empire, and in the provinces where Latin literature was read as well as those of Greek speech.' This authoritative antidote would surely be disseminated by all the means the world-wide connections of the Roman Church put at Cornelius' disposal. And we should expect, if the earlier version remained in existence, to find that it had escaped oblivion as narrowly as the African type of the Old Latin Bible has done. Just as the Italian, perhaps the specifically Roman, type of the Old Latin is richly represented in comparison with the few and fragmentary witnesses to the African text, so must the orthodox reading in *De Unitate* have descended to us, if at all, in one or two MSS., and have laboured under the inevitable suspicion of spuriousness. Yet Dom Chapman holds that the revised text which St. Cyprian sent to Rome was neglected by its recipients, and lingered in obscurity until after the author's death. The first collection of his writings was promptly made, and in one of the copies which reached Rome some unknown hand made a marginal insertion, over against the place where the first version was written, of St. Cyprian's revision. From this one copy by substitution or conflation the later text has reached us through a few channels, while the main stream of tradition has carried down in triumph the uncorrected draft. Setting aside the question whether St. Cyprian, an expert literary man, and accustomed to circulate his own writings, would have allowed one of them to go forth in a double shape, is it probable that the history of the passage should have shaped itself as it has done if Dom Chapman's conjecture is right?'[1] It is not surely an answer to this argument to say, 'How can Mr. Watson know that corrected copies were not disseminated everywhere by Cornelius?' It is certain, let me remind him, that all our very numerous MSS. simply go back to the first collection of St. Cyprian's writings, which was known to Pontius, and which must have been made in Africa just after (or even just before) St. Cyprian's death. The treatises contained in this collection must have had a large circulation before they were thus collected. But we know nothing about this. The circulation of a 'Roman edition' of the *De Unitate*, such as Mr. Watson supposes, might have been the largest in the world, and yet have left no trace.[2]

[1] Dr. Watson, 'The Interpolations in St. Cyprian's De Unitate Ecclesiæ,' *J. T. S.*, April 1904, pp. 435, 436.

[2] Dom Chapman, 'The Interpolations in St. Cyprian's De Unitate Ecclesiæ,' *J. T. S.* July 1904, pp. 635, 636.

For this objection ignores (1) the peculiar circumstances with which the 'revised' version is alleged to deal, viz., the Novatian schism which lasted a considerable time, in dealing with which that version widely circulated would have a permanent value, and (2) the fact that, so far as we know, the circulation of St. Cyprian's treatises, with the exception of the *De Lapsis*, which was unrevised, and not of the same importance or of the same extended practical use as the *De Unitate*, was chiefly in Africa, where the Carthaginian collection was formed, which naturally became the text most generally used there from which all the future MSS. would be copied, so that the 'independent' copies, so to call them, of which there is no evidence that they differed in any way from the MSS. inserted in the 'collection' would inevitably disappear. It may be added that the grievous persecution of the African Church and its destruction by the Mohammedans, with the consequent disappearance of Christian literature, would render the supply of Carthaginian MSS. very slender, so that the rest of the West would be obliged to fall back upon copies of MSS. existing in Rome, which makes it still more strange that there should have existed only this one codex, besides which it is also strange that not a hint of the 'interpolations' should have been preserved in the original 'collection' of St. Cyprian's works made, as it was, by Pontius his Deacon, and who thus being brought into the closest connection with the great Bishop could hardly have been ignorant of any 'revision' made by him, if indeed he did not act as his scribe.

(*e*) Dom Chapman alleges that the treatise was originally composed with reference to the position created by the conduct of Felicissimus and his party, and that the 'revised' version was composed with reference to the case of Novatian.[1] But is there any sufficient reason in this supposition for such 'revision'? The particular point which St. Cyprian had in his mind if the treatise was concerned with the party of Felicissimus was their opposition to the lawful Bishop of the Diocese, the argument of the 'original' form of the treatise is that the sin of schism manifests itself in such opposition, and is a vindication of the authority and position of the Bishop. St. Cyprian had to deal with precisely the same question at Rome. There were two claimants to the See, Cornelius and Novatian; in the opinion of St. Cyprian Cornelius was the rightful Bishop, any opposition, therefore, to him was schismatical. Opposition to the lawfully elected and consecrated Bishop of Rome was of exactly the same character as opposition to the lawfully elected and consecrated Bishop of Carthage; the treatise would, therefore, apply with equal force to the two cases, and no necessity for any 'revision' of the copy sent to Rome, and it is noticeable that Batiffol considers that the 'revised' version was the 'original,' and applied to the case of Novatian, and that St. Cyprian afterwards issued the treatise in the form which we call the 'original' in order to give it a more general application.[2] Dom Chapman's theory is very attractive, and is lucidly worked out. But I venture to think that it is only a conjecture, the probability of which depends on the weight to be assigned to objections which are raised against it; in particular, I think that Dr. Watson's

[1] *Revue Bénédictine*, Jan. 1903, pp. 26 *et seq.*

[2] Batiffol, *l'Église naissante*, p. 447. Third edition. [E.T., *Primitive Catholicism*, p. 375.]

objection has not been met, and that so long as that is the case there appears to me a great difficulty in the way of accepting it as proved, quite apart from what can be said on behalf of what I may call the non-Cyprianic theory, which will now be considered.

1244. It will be convenient to print on the one side of the page the genuine text as given by Hartel under the letter 'A,'[1] and on the other the 'interpolated' text as also given by that editor of St. Cyprian's works under the letter 'B';[2] any additional sentence which occurs in each being enclosed in brackets, any other dissimilarity being printed in italics.

A.	B.
Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es, *etc.*, S. Matt. xvi. 18.	Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es, etc., S. Matt. xvi. 18 [et idem post resurrectionem suam dicit: pasce oves meas.]
super unum ædificat ecclesiam,	super unum ædificat ecclesiam [et illi pascendas oves mandat suas,]
Et quamvis apostolis omnibus [post resurrectionem suam] parem potestatem tribuat [et dicat S. Joan. xx. 21, etc.]	Et quamvis apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem,
tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis *ejusdem* originem *ab uno incipientem* sua auctoritate disposuit.	*unam tamen cathedram constituit* et unitatis originem *atque rationem* sua auctoritate disposuit.
hoc erant utique et ceteri [apostoli] quod fuit Petrus [pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis],	hoc erant utique et ceteri quod Petrus,
sed *exordium ab unitate proficiscitur*, *ut* ecclesia [Christi] una monstretur,	sed *primatus Petro datur ut* una ecclesia [et cathedra una] monstretur.
	[Et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur.]
[quam unam ecclesiam etiam in cantico canticorum Spiritus sanctus ex persona Domini designat et dicit, vi. 8.]	
Hanc *ecclesiae* unitatem qui non tenet tenere se fidem credit?	Hanc *et Pauli* unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit?
Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit in ecclesia se esse confidit?	*Qui cathedram Petri super quam fundata ecclesia est deserit*, in ecclesia se esse confidit?
	[Super unum aedificat, etc.]
[Quando et *beatus apostolus Paulus* hoc idem doceat et sacramentum *unitatis* ostendat dicens: Eph. iv. etc.]	

1245. (*a*) It is plain that the interpolations in themselves being 'Cyprianic,' must bear the meaning which the similar expressions do when used elsewhere by St. Cyprian. This is true of the interpolations in their most developed form as they appear in the printed editions of Manutius, etc., as has been shown above.[3] But, on the other hand, it is not unknown for skilful forgers

[1] Hartel, p. 212.
[2] *Ibid.*, xliii.-xliv.
[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 570, 571.

to take words and phrases from a writer and use them in a sense opposed to that which they hold as used by the author from whose works they are taken. In this connection the appeal which Papalists have continually made to these 'interpolations' in support of their doctrine as to the position of the Pope is of great significance. The history of their insertion into the edition of Manutius and into the Benedictine edition of 1724[1] is very instructive on this point, and they are frequently cited by moderns in this sense, *e.g.* by P. Pius IX. in his *Epistola Encyclica*, 'Singulari quidem,' of the 17th March 1856,[2] Mgr. Freppel, Bishop of Angers, late Professor at the Sorbonne,[3] and they are printed in the edition of the *De Unitate* of Professor Hurter, S.J.[4] If then they are forged it would not be improbable that the motive of the interpolator would be the desire to enlist the great name of St. Cyprian amongst those of the fautors of the Papacy, as it was impossible to do so by means of quotations from his genuine works, so much so that the *De Unitate* was cited in opposition of their contentions, it being on the very subject on which it would be impossible for any one who believed the Papalist doctrine with regard to the Papacy to avoid treating of the subject of the position of St. Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate as the divinely appointed centre of unity, on which there is not a word in the treatise. An expert in his work would be careful to suggest rather than to assert too broadly the attitude he desired to convey to his readers as being that of St. Cyprian towards the position held *jure divino* by the Roman Bishop, to which end he would naturally be restrained in his statements, making use of words and phrases employed by St. Cyprian, adapting them to his purpose by ignoring their original context aided by judicious omissions from the genuine text of the passage which he considered to be the most suitable scene of his operations, a course of procedure which, to say the least, is not contradicted by the form of the 'interpolations' itself.

(*b*) It is noteworthy that the interpolations are not found in the oldest MSS. which preserve the most genuine readings,[5] and that none of the MSS. in which they occur are earlier than the eighth-ninth century. Nor are they found in any of the printed editions of St. Cyprian's works before that of Paulus Manutius, printed in 1563, which represent to us many MSS. which have long since disappeared, and Baluze says that the German MSS. of the time of Venericus, Bishop of Vercelli (A.D. 1078-1082), seem not to have these words.[6]

(*c*) It is not without bearing on the subject that all the MSS. which have the interpolations are probably of Roman origin.[7]

(*d*) The use of the words *Post resurrectionem dicit* by St. Cyprian is frequent, but always with reference to the bestowal of the supreme power upon all the Apostles, never when Peter is spoken of alone, as is the case in

[1] Benson, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-15.

[2] Cited in the *Annotationes in primum schema constit. de ecclesia Christi*, No. 12, proposed for the examination of the Fathers of the Vatican Council.—*Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 593.

[3] *S. Cyprien.* Par M. l'Abbé Freppel, Prof. à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris (Cours fait à la Sorbonne), pp. 277-91, quoted, Benson, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-3.

[4] Hurter, *S. S. Patrum. opusc.*, i. p. 72.

[5] *Vide supra*, n. 1239.

[6] Benson, *op. cit.*, pp. 205, 206.

[7] Dom Chapman, *Revue Bénédictine*, Jan. 1903, p. 50.

the interpolations. Is not this just one of the touches by which a forger unconsciously reveals himself?

(*e*) *Unam tamen cathedram constituit . . . una ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur . . . qui cathedram Petri super quam*[1] *fundata ecclesia est deserit, in ecclesia se esse confidit?* are all Cyprianic expressions if the words 'chair,' 'Peter's chair,' are to be interpreted in the sense in which St. Cyprian always uses them, but not so if they are intended to designate the 'chair' of 'the legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate' as the Supreme Pastor, of which supremacy St. Cyprian knew nothing.

(*f*) *sed primatus Petri datur.* Primatus is an ambiguous term, used in the St. Cyprian sense it is true,[2] but not so if it is employed in the Papalist sense as expressing the absolutist position of the 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College' *jure divino.*

(*g*) *Hanc et Pauli unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit.* The wording of this sentence is somewhat strange, and has found, as is often the case with forgeries, 'emendators.' *Hanc et Pauli* is found in M Q Bod 3, whilst Bod 4, the MS. in which appears the first attempt at 'amalgamation,' gives *hanc et ecclesiæ*, which was the first attempt at correction; then came the second correction (in the Epistle of Pelagius II.) into *ecclesiæ* without the *et*, and then the change into *Petri*,[3] with the object of giving a still more 'Petrine' turn to the 'interpolations.' The origin of this sentence is plain. The 'interpolator's' object was to substitute his composition for the genuine text. Now in that text there are the words *Quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens*, Eph. iv. 4 *et seq.*[4] He omitted this in his 'version,' but wishing to retain a reference to St. Paul in imitation of the writer whose work he was 'correcting' he inserted the words *hanc et Pauli unitatem* instead of the genuine *hanc ecclesiæ unitatem.* A writer like St. Cyprian would hardly have written *et Pauli*, a slip like this seems to betray a strange hand.

(*h*) It is remarkable, too, that in the 'interpolations' more prominence is laid upon Peter's position than in the genuine text, and this, coupled with the omission of both the text, *As My Father hath sent Me even so send I you*, etc., and of the explicit declaration that the Apostles were endowed with an equal share of office—*honoris*[5]—and power may point to a wish to insinuate that Peter held an office endowed with power differing in essence from that of the other Apostles, and so to be inconsistent with the position which St. Cyprian goes on to assert belongs to the Episcopate, which requires that the supreme power in the Church should have belonged to the Apostolate to which the One Episcopate succeeded, and the members of which in consequence 'preside in the Church.'

(*i*) The clumsy way in which the 'interpolations' make their appearance in the oldest MSS. which give them, the genuine passage being repeated after it by the scribe who inserted the 'interpolations' intended to be substituted for it, seems to point to an unauthorised dealing with the MS., a course of procedure which caused ultimately the production of the 'amalgamated' text.

1246. If the 'interpolations' be a forgery, what was its date? It has

[1] *Quem.* Bod. 4. [2] *Vide supra*, n. 1242, footnote 7. [3] In b Pem.
[4] Hartel, p. 213.
[5] So Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, translates the word, p. 43.

been suggested that Pelagius P. II. was the person responsible for it, as there is a quotation definitely cited as from *De Unitate* of St. Cyprian, in a letter of his to the Bishops of Istria, which is evidently taken from the interpolated passage. The citation is as follows :—

'Aye and blessed Cyprian, too, that noble Martyr, in the book which he called after the name of Unity, among other things says thus: "The beginning sets out from unity: and Primacy is given to Peter that one Church of Christ and one chair may be pointed out: and all are pastors but one flock is shown, to be fed by the Apostles with one-hearted accord!" And a few words later, "He that holds not this unity of the Church does he believe that he holds the faith? He who deserts and rebels (*sic*) the chair of Peter, on which the Church was founded, does he trust that he is in the Church?"'[1] The interpolation cited by Pelagius would appear to have consisted of the two clauses as inserted in the letter, as in the second of these, which was intended to be substituted for the *Qui Ecclesiæ renititur et resistit* of the genuine text, the *resistit* of that text is retained, the writer 'thinking this connection of *resistit* with the accusative over the body of *deserit* might pass.'[2]

This would form the first draft of the interpolation which underwent, as is usually the case with corrupted texts, improvement and remodelling, such remodelling in this case taking the form of a connected passage to be substituted for the whole authentic one instead of the mere insertion of two paragraphs into such authentic text, in the course of which the words *et resistit* were omitted as being inconsistent with decent scholarship. The words *post pauca* evidently refer to the passage in the Canticles which was left out in the remodelled passage, a fact which points in the same direction. These considerations appear to point to some connection of Pelagius with the work of interpolation. There is no inherent impossibility in this being the case caused by the circumstance that he was a Pope, as the citation occurs in a letter in which Pelagius appeals to the 'terrible testimonies'—*terribilia Patrum testimonia*[3]—of the Fathers, amongst which he gives a 'quotation' from St. Augustine which is not to be found in the works of that Father; it is not unlikely, therefore, that a Pope who could make use of such a 'citation' from one Father would not hesitate to give another 'citation' of like character, ostensibly from another Father, if such a 'citation' would serve his purpose. There is, however, the difficulty, if this be the case, of the occurrence of the word *ecclesiæ* in the second clause of the 'quotation' instead of *Pauli*, which certainly would be the original reading of the 'interpolation.'[4] As, however, there is only one MS. of the Epistle extant, and that of the tenth century, *ecclesiæ* may represent a 'correction' of the original

[1] 'Sed et beatus Cyprianus egregius martyr in libro quam de unitate nomine titulavit inter alias sic dicit: "Exordium ab unitate proficiscitur; et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur: et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis unanimi consensione pascatur: Et post pauca." Hanc ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui cathedram Petri super quam ecclesia fundata est, deserit et resistit, in ecclesia se esse confidit?"—Pelagius, P. II., *Ep. ii. ad Episc. Istriæ*, Ep. iv.; P.L. lxxxii. 713.

[2] Benson, *op. cit.*, 221.

[3] Pelagius, P. II., *Ep. ii. ad Episcopos Istriæ*, Ep. iv.; P.L. lxxii. 714.

[4] *Vide supra*, n. 1245.

to bring it into conformity with the 'revised' version of the 'interpolations.' If then it is necessary to put the 'interpolations' at an earlier date, I venture to conjecture that it would not unlikely be that of the Donatist schism. The Donatists made use of St. Cyprian in their arguments, consequently an appeal to his authority with regard to the unity of the Church which they broke would be an obvious line for Catholics to take in the controversy. The Donatists intruded a Bishop into the See of Rome which was at that time universally believed to have been occupied by St. Peter himself. Is it improbable that the Roman Christians in their controversy with the intruding Donatists would cite St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, especially as they would have in mind his action in sending a copy of that work at the time when a similar intrusion had been made by the Novatians and that some ardent advocate wrote on the margin of his copy of the *De Unitate* of the MS. which St. Cyprian sent to Rome a 'revised' version of the words of St. Cyprian in chapter IV. in which the position of St. Peter would naturally be, owing to the Roman See being Peter's 'own' See, emphasised? This might have been as early as A.D. 330, when probably the first Donatist intruder into the See of Rome—Victor Garbiensis—established himself at Rome, a date which seems to suit the 'Cyprianic' tone of the 'interpolations' better than a later one when the Papalist position had much developed.

What is the conclusion which is to be drawn from the evidence on both sides of the question which has been set out? I must confess that Dom Chapman's theory that St. Cyprian was the author of both versions has a great attraction for me, and I consider that he has made a very strong case for it. But, on the other hand, Dr. Watson's objection, of which I venture to think that Dom Chapman has not quite realised the weighty character, presents a grave difficulty in the way of its acceptance, as is also the case with the 'internal' evidence afforded by the 'interpolations' itself. On the whole, though with great diffidence, I am inclined to the opinion that the 'interpolations' are not genuine, *i.e.*, not the work of St. Cyprian himself, and in that case that possibly they were framed with a view to the Donatist intrusion at Rome.

Note 44, n. 601.

On the tract 'De Aleatoribus.'

1247. The whole tenor of the tract makes it plain that it was written by a Bishop. The writer says, 'Since upon us the Father by love of God has conferred the Apostolic leadership—*Apostolatus ducatum*—and has distinguished the Vicarial seat of the Lord with heavenly dignity, and we have in our predecessor the origin of that genuine Apostolate on which Christ founded the Church, the power of binding and loosing having at the same time been received, we admonish with salutary doctrine. . . . For when He says, if the salt hath lost its savour it is useless, save to be cast out of doors and to be trodden under foot by men, we fear and tremble lest secure in the Church, because to us the sacerdotal dignity—*sacerdotalis dignitas*—has been committed, we should be found negligent with certain idle brethren, or by giving some false statement should lose that which

of the goodness of God we have received with honour, the Lord being indignant and rejecting us, for, say the divine Scriptures, Woe to the Pastors, for if the Pastors themselves be found negligent, what shall they answer to the Lord for the flock? . . . For as He appointed us, that is, the Bishops—*nos, id est, episcopos*—to be Pastors of spiritual sheep, that is of faithful men, who have been placed under our care lest any blemish of disease be found in them, so much the more should they be daily inspected, that, heavenly moisture having been applied, their places may grow beautiful; becoming of the nature of a saving garment. In the Gospel the Lord said unto Peter, Feed my sheep, and since we have received into the guest chamber of our heart the 'Episcopal'—*episcopium*—that is, Holy Spirit, by the imposition of hands the Apostle warns us that we should not offer any heart to our co-dweller, saying: Grieve not the Holy Spirit which is in you, and extinguish not the light which has shone in you. Moreover, how great and worthy martyrdoms, even with tribulation of body, await the Bishop—*episcopo*—discharging his Office well and healthfully admonishing. How great torments also accumulate on the negligent Bishop who sets forth no warning from the sacred Temple as the Apostle Paul urges, and sets the Bishops—*episcopos*—and guardians of the Evangelical doctrine in their true position, saying, As long as he is a child, etc. . . . If, therefore, it is required of stewards that a man should be found faithful and just, what if the steward neglect the sheep and ignore the offenders, do not they burden themselves with the weight of the transgressions of the offenders? . . . And that blessed Apostle, the Vicar of Christ—*procurator et vicarius Christi*—discharging his ecclesiastical administration, asserts and says, Ye are the temple of God,' etc.[1]

1248. The writer obviously identifies himself with the Bishops—*episcopos*, —those who have received the *sacerdotal dignity*, by which writers of this age mean the Episcopal dignity. The office of those with whom he thus identifies himself he describes as the genuine Apostolate on which the Church is founded, referring to the African idea[2] that the Episcopate which succeeds to the Apostolate was instituted in Peter, so that Peter in whom the office was originated was the predecessor of himself and of all his fellow-bishops. It is to the Bishops as such that he ascribes the *Apostolatus ducatus*. The whole argument of the tract proves this to be the meaning of the writer whoever he may have been. The author is a Bishop urging his fellow-bishops to be true Pastors and discharge the duty incumbent upon them who have received the *Apostolatus ducatus*, lest they should receive the punishment which will be awarded the unfaithful Pastors. Harnack would assign the tract to Victor, Bishop of Rome.[3] If he were the author, the tract would form an important proof that the Bishops of Rome of his 'age' knew nothing of the monarchical position which the *Satis Cognitum* declares belongs *jure divino* to the 'Roman Pontiff,' as its arguments throughout clearly presuppose that the writer occupies the same position as other Bishops, whereas, according to Papalism, the Roman Pontiff is the Teacher of all Christians, possessing in right of the Apostolic Primacy the supreme power of teaching. In fact,

[1] *De Aleatoribus*; Hartel, Appendix, pp. 93-102.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 135, 556, 865.
[3] Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuch.*, v. i.

it is this plain assertion of the real position of the Episcopate in the Church (with which the ascription therein to St. Paul of the title of Vicar of Christ is in accord) that probably led to St. Cyprian being considered the writer of the tract, for that saint is especially identified in the history of the Church with that position. It is, however, more probable, on linguistic grounds, that it was written by an African Bishop later than St. Cyprian's day.[1]

Note 45, n. 608.

On St. Augustine's statement 'Securus judicat Orbis terrarum.'

1249. What is the judgment which, according to St. Augustine, has this decisive power? It is the judgment of the whole Church. It is not the judgment of the Roman Communion alone, but of the East as well as the West. It is identical with the 'ubique' of St. Vincent of Lerins' famous Canon to which St. Augustine appeals. Hence St. Augustine's statement is one which, as it was conclusive against Donatism, is equally conclusive against Papalism. It is useless to point to an isolated expression in this writer or that Father which at first sight seems to have a tendency towards a recognition of the Papalist claims, or to the writings of some occupant of the Roman Chair, in which statements may be found capable of being 'developed' into the doctrine enshrined in the *Vatican Decrees* and the *Satis Cognitum*. Such claims must be tested by the judgment of the *Orbis terrarum*. *That* has been consistently, from the first attempts of Roman Bishops to aggrandise their Sees, against all such efforts. Whatever acceptance their claims obtained in the West owing to the prestige which attached to the occupant of the Roman See from various causes which have been noted above,[2] such claims were either not put forward in the East, or when the Roman Bishops ventured under favourable circumstances to advance their pretensions, they were rejected by the Eastern Churches, which rejection has continued to the present day.

The importance of this is obvious, for neither the *Vatican Council* nor the *Satis Cognitum* put forward the Papal Monarchy in the Church as a development from a germ, but as being 'the venerable and constant belief of every age.' The position consequently is a simple one if St. Augustine's test of the truth be adopted. Either the *Orbis terrarum* has always testified that Papalism was 'the institution of Christ,' or it has not. It is plain on the evidence that it has not so testified. Hence it follows that if *securus judicat Orbis terrarum*, there is no such judgment on behalf of Papalism ; on the contrary, that judgment in the first age is clearly against it.

Note 46, n. 609.

On the case of Marcion.

1250. Epiphanius relates that Marcion, a Presbyter in the Church of Cinope, was excommunicated by the Bishop of that Church, who was his own father. He applied to be admitted to communion with the Church of

[1] *Vide* Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, Addendum to p. 389. Second edit.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 519 *et seq.*

Rome. At that time that Church was widowed of its Bishop, but the presbyters who—*sede vacante*—exercised the jurisdiction of the See declined to grant his request, giving as the reason for their refusal that they were not able to do so without the permission of his honoured father, *i.e.* his Bishop, for there is one faith, one consent of all, nor could they oppose his father, their colleague and fellow-priest.[1]

Note 47, n. 609.

On the meaning of Canon XVII. of the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, A.D. 418.

1251. This Canon does not specifically name cases in which Bishops were parties, as the Council only had before it a cause in which a Priest was concerned, but the concluding clause of the Canon is so worded as to embrace any case in which a Bishop made an appeal of this nature. This is confirmed by the fact that Dionysius Exiguus, who compiled a collection of African Canons to which he gave the name of *Statuta Concilii Africani*, but which Justellus calls *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*,[2] included therein this Canon with the following variation in the wording of one of its clauses: 'They shall not appeal to transmarine judgments, but to the Primates of their own Provinces, or to a Universal Council, as has often been determined about Bishops, but whosoever,' etc. Further, the prohibition was evidently considered by Zosimus to bear this meaning, as is plain from the first of the points as to which he gave instructions to the Legates sent by him to Carthage with regard to the case of Apiarius.[3] Further, that this was the sense intended is confirmed by the letter of the African Council to Pope Celestine quoted above,[4] in which the Fathers of the Synod said, referring to the decrees of the Nicene Council on the subject, 'Although this seems then to be forbidden in respect of the inferior clergy and laity, how much more did the Council will this to be observed in the case of Bishops?'

1252. Vincenzi with his usual acumen perceives that the Canon had reference to every kind of cause indiscriminately, whether between Presbyters and Bishops, or between Bishops and Bishops of all grades. He therefore concludes on the ground of the inconsistency of this Canon with the Papalist claims of which he is so strenuous an upholder that 'the African Catholic Church never subscribed, or enacted, or even conceived' this decree.[5] This is a significant testimony to the value of the witness of this act of the African Fathers against Papalism. Gratian had already noted this incompatibility, but he adopted a different method to that which Vincenzi uses, more effective, indeed, as it avoided the imputation of forgery, but which, in these days, when the various sources of information as to the genuine text of the Canons are so well known, can hardly be said to be open to any one in Vincenzi's position, as the use of it would expose such person to the charge of making use of a known forgery for controversial ends. Gratian's

[1] S. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hæres.*, lib. i., *Hæres.*, xlii.; P.G. xli. 697.
[2] Voel et Justel, *Biblioth. Juris Canonici veteris*, vol. i. p. 321.
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 610. [4] *Vide supra*, n. 620 *et seq.*
[5] Vincenzi, *op. cit.*, pars. ii. cap. xiii. p. 284.

procedure was to add a clause to the Canon as follows: 'Unless perchance they shall have appealed to the Roman See. Moreover, he who shall have appealed must not be remitted to him from whom he has appealed.'[1] This clause obviously destroys the intention of the framers of the Canon, and changes what was meant to be a defence against Roman aggression into an instrument whereby such aggression is expressly recognised and its action provided for. A very adroit way of dealing with the difficulty, but hardly honest.

Note, 48 n. 638.

P. Innocent's method of advancing his pretensions in the West.

1253. Innocent, for example, in his Epistle to Ducentius of Gubbio, says: 'Who knows not that it has been delivered by Peter, the chief of the Apostles, to the Roman Church, and is kept until now, and ought to be retained by all, nor anything to be brought in or superinduced thereon which hath no authority, or seemeth to derive its precedents elsewhere? Especially since it is manifest that, over all Italy, the Gauls, Spain, Africa, and Sicily, and the subsequent islands, no one formed Churches except those whom the venerable Apostle St. Peter or his successors made Priests. Or let them find documents that any other Apostle be found to have been or to have taught in these Provinces. If not, they ought to follow that which the Roman Church keeps, from which they undoubtedly had their origin; but while they eagerly follow foreign statements they neglect the fountain-head of their institution.'[2] Innocent in his anxiety to magnify St. Peter has forgotten St. Paul the joint founder of his See, and ignores his labours, although he admits in his argument that his own authority in this particular matter under notice rests on the supposed foundation of the Western Churches by St. Peter and his successors, and that foundation by another Apostle might be adduced as a legitimate reason for not recognising it. It is evident that Papalism, though existing in germ in Innocent's demands made elsewhere, not being yet fully established, was only made use of so far as it had been and could be developed as the circumstances of the case allowed.

Note 49, n. 651.

On two passages from St. Augustine sometimes cited in support of Papalism.

1254. So weighty is the authority of St. Augustine considered to be that it is not surprising that the fautors of Papalism make strenuous efforts to minimise his 'antipapal' teaching, and endeavour to affix a Papalist meaning to statements made by him. The futility of these efforts has been shown in the text, the general testimony of his writings and conduct is too powerful to be affected by them; but as two other passages from his works are sometimes adduced in the interests of Papalism, in spite of such general testimony, it may be well, too, briefly to consider them.

[1] Cans. 2, qu. 6, c. 35; P.L. clxxxvii. 633.

[2] Innocent, P. I., *Ep. ad Ducentium Episc.* (19 Mar. 416), Ep. xxv.; P.L. xx. 552.

1255. (*a*) The first is as follows: 'In these words of the Apostolic See, so ancient and firmly established, so certain and clear is the Catholic faith that it would be a sin for a Catholic to doubt it.'[1]

The meaning of the passage is simply that certain words of a certain Bishop of Rome set forth the Catholic faith, which is so firmly rooted in the past, definitely and clearly, that it would be wrong for any one to doubt it. The reason being clearly *not* because the Bishop of Rome pronounced a definition *ex cathedra*, but because his words did rightly express the clear and definite faith of the Church in the past.

1256. (*b*) A certain Sixtus, a Roman Presbyter, had been active in the support of the cause of the Pelagians at Rome. When, however, Zosimus withdrew his support from them and accepted the African position, he was amongst the first to pronounce an *anathema* on the heretics. Moreover, as his authority had been made much of by the Pelagians, he took care to write to all those whom he knew to have heard of his former attitude, announcing his change; amongst them was St. Augustine, to whom he wrote by the priest Firmus. St. Augustine in the course of his reply said, 'But now when you write more fully what you think concerning that dogma, as thy letter, the very faith itself of the Roman Church, speaks with us, to which especially the Apostle Paul spoke many things, in various ways concerning the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, not only has all that cloud of darkness departed from our hearts,' etc.[2] The meaning of these words is clearly that Sixtus had by his letter found that he no longer held the erroneous opinions which he had advocated, and was now in thorough accord with the faith professed by the Church of Rome, in which he held office as a Presbyter, which faith was orthodox, being that taught by St. Paul.

Note 50, n. 693.

On the position of Theophilus of Alexandria.

1257. The language used with reference to Theophilus of Alexandria after his death shows how great was the esteem in which he was held. 'He was cited in the Council of Ephesus with the title of Most Holy Bishop. The Eastern Bishops of the same Council declare that they desire to tread in the steps and ever follow the doctrine of Athanasius, of John, of Theophilus and other illustrious masters of the Church, and writing to St. Cyril they cite the blessed Theophilus as our common Father. Alypius, a priest of Constantinople, praises St. Cyril for having imitated and equalled his uncle the blessed Theophilus. Paul, Bishop of Emesa, having set forth before this people of Alexandria the faith of the Incarnation, "Here," says he, "is what the blessed Athanasius, and the great Theophilus, the pillars of the Church, taught us." The people in answer called him son of Theophilus and Athanasius. Theodoret, though very zealous for the memory of St. Chrysostom, does not fail to write to Siricius to employ for defence of the faith against heretics the writings of blessed Theophilus and Cyril; and, in fact, he cites Theophilus in his third dialogue, though

[1] S. Aug., *Ep. ad. Optatum*, Ep. cxc. 22; P.L. xxiii. 865-6.
[2] *Ep. ad Sixtum*, Ep. cxciv. 1; P.L. xxxiii. 874-5.

he does not call him saint or blessed as he does the rest. St. Proterius of Alexandria calls him his most happy Father and Bishop, and cannot endure that it should be said of a man so watchful, so blessed of God, so full of the knowledge of the Scriptures, that he failed through want of care and diligence to mark Easter on its true day. He is quoted in the Fifth Council with the title of saint and of blessed memory. The Council of Myra in Lycia in A.D. 458 extols the labours of Theophilus and St. Cyril of holy memory, and calls them princes of the orthodox and genuine faith. Vincent of Lerins, amongst the Latins, calls him St. Theophilus, a Prelate illustrious by his faith, his life and knowledge. St. Leo himself, bound as he was to support the conduct of the Roman Church in respect to him, fails not to put him with St. Athanasius and St. Cyril among the excellent pastors that the Church of Alexandria had had, and to call him a Bishop of holy memory. He also quotes his writings amongst those of the saints without giving him, however, the title of saint as others. Pope Gelasius also approves the writings of the blessed Theophilus.'[1]

Now all these statements, be it remembered, are made about a man who died out of communion with Rome, and plainly prove that the want of such communion was not considered by those who made them to involve 'exclusion from the *edifice*,' 'separation from the *fold*,' and 'exile from the *Kingdom*' of God.[2]

Note 51, n. 710.

On the case of Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome.

1258. To what does St. Julius refer in his letter to the Antiochenes when he alleges that a custom which prevailed with regard to the Church of Alexandria had been violated by them, inasmuch as they had not informed the Roman Church of the case of St. Athanasius, that a juster sentence might proceed from there? Two possible answers to this question present themselves. First, that he was making use in the interest of his See of the association which traditionally was held to have existed between St. Peter and St. Mark, the founder of the Alexandrian Church, basing upon it an assumption that a special connection existed between the two Churches of Rome and Alexandria which of necessity involved the application to the Bishop of the former See, which claimed in his days to be 'the' See of Peter in any case referring to the successor of St. Mark, the disciple of that Apostle. To make a claim of this character would be quite in accord with that policy of aggrandising the Roman See, though making use of the tradition (which by the fourth century had come to be accepted as a fact) of the foundation of that See by St. Peter, which was so successfully preserved by its successive occupants.

1259. The other possible answer is that St. Julius was referring to some event in the past history of Alexandria which the Roman authorities thought they could produce as a sort of precedent, through the aid of which they could advance claims which otherwise would have been immediately rejected as being inconsistent with the relations actually existing between the two Sees.

[1] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, ii. 495. [2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 35.

The latter answer seems to be the more probable. The idea that any such connection existing between the See of Rome and Alexandria as would warrant St. Julius making the statement under notice would not have been accepted without question in his age. If, however, the second answer be the correct one, a claim so based obviously would have been essentially different to that which one who was *jure divino* Supreme Pastor of the One Flock, and the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, 'whose sentence none may review,' would necessarily have advanced under the circumstances of the case. It would thus itself be a witness to the fact that Papalism was not 'the venerable and constant belief of' the 'age' of St. Julius.

1260. If then the second answer be adopted as the more probable, the question arises to what particular episode in the past history of the two Sees did St. Julius allude as affording justification for his statement? A century earlier St. Dionysius of Alexandria was engaged in combating Sabellianism, which had infected many in Egypt, and in his anxiety to distinguish with extreme accuracy the Persons of the Godhead he appeared in his letter to Armonius and Euphranor, 'to lean to the other extreme, that is to say, not merely to distinguish the Divine Persons by attributing to each His own Property, but also to divide Each from the Others in substance, and thus to deny that the Son was of one substance with the Father.'[1] He was so misunderstood by some of the orthodox in Pentapolis. They accordingly, without writing to their own Church, or even considering that he might be able, if they made inquiry, to show that his language was used in an orthodox sense, 'betook themselves to Rome and spake against him to his namesake Dionysius, Bishop of Rome.'[2] St. Athanasius declares that 'their charge had given great pain to the Roman Council [A.D. 260], and the Bishop of Rome expressed their united sentiments addressed to his namesake.[3] St. Dionysius wrote to explain that this [accusation] was a slander upon him,[4] the work being entitled *Of Refutation and Apology* [Ἐλέγχου καὶ Ἀπολογίας].[5]

1261. The whole proceeding was entirely in accord with the principle already noted,[6] as being necessarily involved in the fact that the Episcopate is one, and is held by each Bishop in joint tenure—*in solidum*,—viz., that each Bishop has an interest in and a responsibility for maintaining orthodoxy in all parts of the Church. Nothing could thus be more fit than when doubts as to the orthodoxy of the Bishop of the See in the second city of the Empire, which doubtless already by 'ancient custom' held the rank of the Second See, ratified by the Sixth Canon of Nicæa, should be brought under the notice of the Bishop of the See in the first city of the Empire, which, too, no doubt, in like manner had by the same 'ancient custom' become recognised as the First See, and that thereupon the latter and the Council of the Bishops in which he exercised by 'ancient custom' jurisdiction, should write to the former with reference to the point. Quite naturally, too, St. Dionysius would write in reply a refutation of the slander.

[1] Bull, *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, bk. ii. ch. xi. § 3. Ox. Tr. vol. i. p. 305.
[2] S. Athan., *De Sent. Dionysii*, § 3; P.G. xxv. 500.
[3] *Concil. Arim. et Seleuc.*, § 43; P.G. xxvi. 769.
[4] *De Decretis Nicænæ Synodi*, § 26; P.G. xxv. 461.
[5] *De Sent. Dionysii*, § 14; P.G. xxv. 500
[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 36, 41.

1262. There is no trace in the letter of St. Dionysius of Rome of any claim on his part to act as 'judge of all Christians to whom recourse may be had in all cases pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction,'[1] or as 'the Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' occupying towards St. Dionysius of Alexandria the position which Christ did towards the Apostolic College 'during His mortal life.'[2] It is, so far as can be gathered from the letter preserved by St. Athanasius, simply a protest against the errors of Tritheism and Sabellianism, closing with a clear statement of the Catholic doctrine as afterwards embodied in the Nicene Creed.[3]

Nor again, did those who thus reported to the prejudice of their Bishop what they held to be error do so in any other form than by way of complaint. There was no attempt on their part to delate St. Dionysius as an offender before the Tribunal of 'the Supreme Judge of all the faithful.' It is also clear that had *judicial* proceedings been taken against St. Dionysius the course which the accusers would have adopted would have been to formulate an accusation against him before a Synod of local Bishops, as was afterwards done in the case of Paul of Samosata.[4] Finally, that this was the true character of the whole business is shown by the whole tenor of the reply made by St. Dionysius of Alexandria to the Synodical Letter of his namesake.[5] St. Dionysius complains in it that those who had maligned him did not adduce his statements entire, but mutilated them, and replies to each several objection alleged against his teaching, proving himself to be Catholic in all. There is not a single word which recognises any supreme power of jurisdiction as being possessed *jure divino* by St. Dionysius as Bishop of Rome, to whom he is writing. On the contrary, the tone and manner of the Epistle is exactly such as any Bishop might adopt in communicating with another Bishop for the purpose of assuring him that the reports which had reached him impugning the orthodoxy of the writer were false. Probably, then, St. Julius was referring to this episode in the past, but it is obvious that even the use which he made of it was one entirely unjustifiable, the statement which he bases upon it being inconsistent with the facts of the case.

Note 52, nn. 713, 767.

On Sozomen's statement with reference to St. Julius and St. Athanasius.

1263. The facts with reference to the 'appeal' of St. Athanasius enable the real value of an assertion made by Sozomen, which is sometimes adduced in support of Papalism, to be accurately gauged.

The statement in question is as follows: 'The Bishop of the Romans having inquired into the accusation against each [*i.e.* St. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Artepus of Gaza]; when he found them all agreeing with the doctrine of the Nicene Synod, admitted them to Com-

[1] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 415.
[2] *Satis Cognitum*, p. 38.
[3] S. Athan., *Concil. Arim. et Seleuc.*, § 44; P.G. xxvi. 766-71.
[4] *Vide infra*, nn. 1264 *et seq.*
[5] S. Athan., *De Sent. Dionysii*, § 14; P.G. xxv. 500.

munion as agreeing with him, and inasmuch as the care of all belonged to him on account of the rank of his See, he restored each to his Church, and he wrote to the Bishops throughout the East [*i.e.* Antioch] censuring them for not having rightly decided the causes of these persons, and for throwing the Churches into confusion by not abiding in the decrees of Nicæa.'[1] It is clear from the circumstance set out in the text, that Sozomen is inaccurate in affixing this interpretation on the letter of St. Julius. Further, so far from the act which he calls 'restoration to their Sees' in the case of the Prelates named being one peculiar to the Roman Bishop, because of the rank of his See, it was simply one of like nature to that which Maximus of Jerusalem did when he restored 'communion and rank' to St. Athanasius,[2] and to the acts of St. Cyril and of John of Antioch who, after having 'deposed' each other in local Synod, 'restored their thrones to one another.'[3] It may, moreover, be added that as a matter of fact St. Athanasius did not recover his See in consequence of any action on the part of Julius, but because Constantine, in view of the threat which Constans made of war, thought it wise to recall the Prelates who were in exile.[4]

Note 53, n. 716.

The case of Paul of Samosata.

1264. Easterns, some seventy years before the case of St. Athanasius, had in the celebrated case of Paul of Samosata shown their complete independence of the West. Paul, who was Bishop of Antioch, taught heresy both concerning the Deity and the Incarnation. Two Councils were held at Antioch to deal with the case. The first in A.D. 264 or A.D. 266, and the second soon after, at both of which the assembled Bishops allowed themselves to be deceived by Paul—the first time by his denial that he had ever professed the errors of which he was accused, the second time by his promise to renounce and retract his errors. A third Synod was consequently held at the close of the year A.D. 269,[5] at which seventy or eighty Bishops were present, presided over by Helenus, Bishop of Tarsus. This Synod deposed and excommunicated Paul, and in his place appointed Domnus, son of Demetrius, the predecessor of Paul in the See of Antioch. The Synod sent a Synodal Letter to 'Dionysius, Bishop of the Romans. and to Maximus, Bishop of Alexandria, and sent it abroad to all the Provinces.'[6] In this *Encyclical* they give a full account concerning the errors and manners of Paul, and the deliberations of the Synod respecting him, and conclude: 'We have therefore been compelled to cut this man off that set himself against God, and would not yield, and to appoint in his place another Bishop for the Catholic Church, by the providence of God, as we are persuaded, namely Domnus, son of the blessed Demetrius, who formerly with distinction presided before this man over the same diocese, and is

[1] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. cap. viii.; P.G. lxvii. 1052.
[2] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 24; P.G. lxvii. 261.
[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 6, 7; P.G. lxvii. 192. [4] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, vi. 345.
[5] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. i. ch. ii. sect. 9. [E.T. i. 121.]
[6] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. cxxx.; P.G. xx. 710.

adorned with all the qualifications that befit a Bishop, and we have made this known to you in order that you may write to him, and receive letters of Communion from him. But let this man write to Artemas (into whose heresy he had fallen), and those of the mind of Artemas communicate with him.'[1]

It is obvious that it held itself to be, and acted as a competent authority in the matter. The Fathers simply notified to the Bishop of the Romans, to another great Bishop, him of Alexandria, and to all other Bishops what they had done ; there is throughout their proceedings no recognition of *any* special obligation to the Roman Bishop, all being treated in their *Encyclical* on an absolute equality, precedence alone being given to the Bishop of the Romans and to the Bishop of Alexandria, as occupying even then by 'ancient custom' the two chief Sees of Christendom. It is not, too, without its bearing on the position of the Bishop of Rome in the first age of the Church, that the Bishops in their *Encyclical* state that in view of Paul's heresy they had acted as follows : 'We have addressed epistles, and at the same time have exhorted many of the Bishops at a distance to come to our relief from this destructive doctrine : among these, to Dionysius of Alexandria and Firmillianus of Cappadocia, those holy men, of whom the one wrote to Antioch, not even deigning to honour the leader in this delusion with an address, but to the whole Church, of which epistle we have also added a copy. But Firmillianus, who came twice to Antioch, despised his new-fangled doctrines,' and was coming again to Antioch . . . but whilst we were thus collecting and requesting him to come, and awaiting his arrival, he departed this life.'[2] The writers of the letter, it will be noted, did not even apply to the Roman Bishop to come with the other Bishops to their relief, doubtless because the trouble had arisen in the East, and therefore should be dealt with by Easterns, still less did they apply to him as the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, 'to whose judgment in all causes pertaining to ecclesiastical discipline recourse may be had,'[3] whose sentence alone would be conclusive, since it may not be 'reviewed.' They clearly were entirely ignorant of the position alleged to be conferred on Peter and his legitimate successors in the Roman Episcopate by the institution of Christ in the Divine Constitution of the Church. Papalism was thus not 'the venerable and constant belief of' the 'age' of these Fathers.

1265. De Marca in connection with the case of St. Athanasius comments on the bearing of the case of Paul of Samosata on it. He says : 'We must remark that the Orientals considered it thoroughly illegal that Western Bishops, even in a plenary Council, should attempt to reconsider judgments passed in Oriental Synods, because it was plain that by such proceeding the authority of the Synods would be infringed. And thus it is scarcely credible that they were minded to admit the authority of the single Roman Pontiff to be greater than their own, especially as they had lately made a schism against him, and excommunicated him, as being the head of those who had ruined the laws of the Church, "as the head and chief of the bad, inasmuch as he first opened the door of communication to criminal and condemned

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vii. cxxx. ; P.G. xx. 710.
[2] *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
[3] *Concil. Vatican.*, sess. iv. cap. iii. *Collectio Lacensis*, vii. 485.

persons, and made a way for others to break the divine laws." For the Orientals in these times (A.D. 341) contended for this as a certain and undoubted rule of ecclesiastical discipline, that matters judged in the East could not be reconsidered in the West, nor *vice versa*. For thus the Council of Antioch affirmed in its letter to Pope Julius, in which the Bishops quote the case of the condemnation of Paul of Samosata decreed by the Oriental Bishops, which the West received, and confirmed by its assent, without fresh examination : as likewise the East received and confirmed by its approbation the condemnation of Novatus passed by a Western Synod.'[1] The Easterns by thus citing the precedent of the case of Paul of Samosata proved that a Synod of Western Bishops, including amongst them the Bishop of Rome, had no right to revise a sentence of an Eastern Council ; they had it is clear, as has been just pointed out, no idea that there lay an appeal to that Bishop as the Supreme Judge of all the faithful, in that in all cases of ecclesiastical discipline recourse could be had to his judgment, which none could review.

It is worthy of notice also, relying on the favour of his protectress and sovereign, Zenobia, Paul kept possession of the Episcopal Palace, and the clergy and people were obliged to suffer this wrong until the defeat of Zenobia by the Emperor Aurelian, which deprived Paul of the support on which he relied, and on appeal being made to the Emperor for redress 'who gave a most just decision, ordering the house to be given to those to whom the Christian Bishops in Italy and in the City of the Romans should send letters of recognition'[2]—οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος ἐπιστέλλοιεν,—and Paul was obliged to leave the Palace 'with extreme disgrace,' being driven out 'by the temporal power itself,'[3] as Eusebius relates. No doubt the Emperor made choice of 'the Bishops in Italy and in the City of the Romans' to whom the matter should be referred, as being likely to be more impartial judges owing to the fact that they lived at a distance from the scene of the dispute ; and it must be noted in view of the use sometimes made of this incident by Papalists that the matter was a purely 'temporal' one, having to do with property, and that the Bishops acted in virtue of a commission from the civil Ruler, and that in the commission so given 'the Bishops in Italy' and the Bishop 'in the City of the Romans' are named as commissioners on an exact equality as far as their powers are concerned, precedence being given to 'the Bishops in Italy,' and not to the Bishop 'in the City of the Romans.'

Note 54, n. 730.

The 'Appeal' of Eusebius of Dorylaeum.

1266. In the same manuscript volume which contains the *Libellus appellationis* of Flavian Dom Amelli discovered another important document hitherto unknown, entitled *Libellus Appellationis ad Leonem Papam Eusebi*

[1] De Marca, *De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, vii. c. 14, tom. iii. 304. Bambergæ, 1788.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, vii. c. xxx. ; P.G. xx. 720. [3] *I.c.*

Dorylaeorum, which he printed with that of Flavian. He commences as follows :—

'To the holy and right blessed father and archbishop Leo, Eusebius the humble who was [Bishop of Dorylaeum].

'From of old, even from the beginning, the apostolic throne has ever been wont to defend those who suffer wrong, to aid those that are fallen into unavoidable strife, and to raise up the prostrate, according to the measure of your power. Being thus compassionate, you occupy a position supreme among men : the cause whereof is that you hold fast a right understanding, keep unshaken faith in regard to our Lord Jesus Christ, and show unfeigned love for the whole brotherhood, and for all who are called in the Name of Christ. Wherefore I, entangled in toils from which there is no escape, afflicted and in the last extremity of trouble, fly to the only refuge left me under God, eagerly seeking deliverance from the evils into which I am fallen.'[1]

Eusebius then proceeds to give an account of the proceedings as to Eutyches and the subsequent Synod at Ephesus. He describes the lawlessness of Dioscurus and the injustice he received at his hands, being condemned by him in spite of his adherence to the faith, and proceeds :—

'Since then I have suffered cruel wrongs in violation of the divine canons at the hand of Dioscurus and the other religious Bishops, who under terror and compulsion have bowed to his pleasure and consented to my condemnation, as the most religious legates and representatives of your holiness are aware, to whom I have also presented a libel of appeal demanding audience of your See, I beseech your blessedness, touching your knees if not with my hand, yet I render the duty of my tongue ; declare void and of none effect, my iniquitous condemnation by the most religious Bishop Dioscurus, and the judgment of those who unwillingly consented to his pleasure ; restore me the episcopal dignity and your communion, addressing a letter to my humbleness for reinstating me in dignity and communion. Which thing granted, I will render thanks to our sovereign Lord and Saviour Christ on your behalf, most reverend father.'

As has been seen in considering the 'Appeal' of Flavian,[2] in the state of the East the only possible means of obtaining redress was to apply to the West. To the West he turned, free as it was from the strife which agitated the East, as St. Basil and Easterns had done in the Antiochene troubles.[3]

Naturally, he appealed to St. Leo, and it is remarkable that he laid stress in doing so on the compassionate conduct of the former Bishops of Rome towards those in trouble, and that the supreme station among men which he says Leo occupied was based upon the fact that he held fast a right understanding, kept unshaken the faith in regard to Our Lord Jesus Christ, and showed unfeigned love to the whole brotherhood, and for all that are called in the name of Christ. There is not a word about St. Leo being the Supreme Judge of all the faithful *jure divino*, to whom recourse could be had by all on that ground. A significant fact, for a simple statement of the Papal position would not only have been all that was needed, but would necessarily have been expected in a document evidently drawn carefully by

[1] The Rev. T. A. Lacey has reprinted this *Libellus* with an English translation in his *Appellatio Flaviani*. The extracts given above from the *Libellus* are from his translation, pp. 27, 31.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 717 *et seq.*

[3] *Vide supra*, nn. 670 *et seq.*

one who had been a pleader[1] before he was a Bishop, in marked difference to the 'Appeal' of Flavian, written as that was evidently in haste and under great excitement. The Oriental diplomat shows himself in the fulsome language of the conclusion, but that language in no way discounts the significance of the ground taken by Eusebius for approaching St. Leo. The restoration to the Episcopal dignity and to the communion of St. Leo were requests that could be legitimately addressed to any Bishop, and, of course, were well within the power of St. Leo to grant so far as he himself was concerned, as it would be in the case of any other Bishop,[2] and such restoration would, as involving recognition by the whole West, be a practical demonstration to the East of the opinion held by Westerns of the proceedings of the *Latrocinium*. It is clear that St. Leo did restore him to his communion and recognise his Episcopal dignity, since he speaks of him as his 'Co-Episcopum,' and declares that he was partaker of his communion in a letter to Pulcheria.[3]

This was the compliance of St. Leo with his request, but such action on St. Leo's part did not carry with it the possession of his See; that he did not obtain, it would seem, until the Council of Chalcedon, wherein his condemnation was recognised as unjust, and he appeared as the accuser of Dioscurus.

That Eusebius did not recognise the Papal Monarchy is, it may be added, shown by the fact that he took part in the enactment of the famous Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, which is inconsistent with Papalism,[4] and, embodying the tradition of the East, formed an impassable barrier to advancing the pretensions of the Roman See. It is to be observed that, when it was objected to by the Roman legates, Eusebius in defence of it asserted that 'when he had been at Rome he had read to the Pope the (Third) Canon of Constantinople, and he had accepted it,'[5] a remarkable statement which gives further confirmation that he held fast the 'Eastern' view of that great See.

This 'Appeal,' therefore, is of the same character as those which have been considered in the text, and consequently cannot be alleged in proof of Papalism.

Note 55, n. 731.

Theodoret's letter to St. Leo the Great.

1267. Theodoret's circumstances were such as to induce him to make the most of the position he held to be occupied by the Bishop of Rome, and therefore we should expect to find in it, if he believed that Pope Leo possessed, as the 'legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate,' 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' that he would have of necessity laid great stress upon that prerogative. On the contrary, we not only find no allusion to it, but the writer uses language

[1] Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biography*, ii. 356.
[2] *Vide supra*, n. 1263.
[3] S. Leo M., *Ep. ad Pulcheriam Augustam*, Ep. lxxix.; P. L. liv. 912.
[4] *Vide supra*, n. 418.
[5] Mansi, vii. 449.

which should show that he was entirely ignorant that any such prerogative was inherent *jure divino* in the Roman See. He says :—

'If Paul, the preacher of the truth, the trumpet of the Holy Ghost, betook himself to the great Peter, in order to obtain from him an answer for those at Antioch who were in doubt about the observance of the Law, much more do we, in our humility and littleness, betake ourselves to your Apostolic chair, that we may receive from you a remedy for the wounds of the Churches. For on every account does the first place become you—*διὰ πάντα γὰρ ὑμῖν τὸ πρωτεύειν ἁρμόττει.* For your chair is adorned with many advantages. Magnitude, or beauty, or a vast population, is the glory of other cities, and some which fail in these are made illustrious by spiritual gifts. But the Giver of Good has given to your city an abundance of good things ; for it is itself the greatest and most famous, is at the head of the dwellers upon earth, and overflows with the multitude of its inhabitants. It has, besides, given birth to an imperial power now dominant, and has given its own name to those under its rule. But faith adorns it in an especial manner ; the holy Apostle is a trustworthy witness, crying, "Your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world" (Rom. i. 8). But if it were loaded with such admirable fruits immediately after it had received the seed of the saving announcement, what words are adequate to the description of that piety which has its home in it now? It has also the tombs of Peter and Paul, the common Fathers and Teachers of the Truth. . . . They have rendered your chair most illustrious ; this is the apex of your good things—*οὗτοι τὸν ὑμέτερον περιφανέστατον ἀπέφηναν θρόνον, οὗτος τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν ὑμετέρων ὁ κολοφών.* But their God hath now again made their chair glorious by placing your holiness in it, from whom emanate rays of sound doctrine.'[1] It is remarkable that in this letter, written by an Oriental, and therefore one who would go to the greatest length he felt possible in the use of expressions of respect and compliment, not to say flattery, in a letter to one from whom he was asking aid, there is not only, as has been said, no reference to the position of Supreme Pastor and Supreme Judge of all the faithful, which, according to Papalism, was held by St. Leo, but the writer lays stress on entirely different matters as rendering his chair most distinguished. First, his See was seated in the city which was the greatest, most famous, and most populous in the world, the seat of the Imperial Power which there took its rise, and which had given its name to all the subjects of the Empire ; secondly, the purity of its faith as in the days of St. Paul ; and, even more so, thirdly, it possessed the tombs of St. Peter and Paul, which was the crown of its advantages and who are put on a level as 'common Fathers and Teachers of the truth,' and apparently as joint occupants of the Chair of Rome ; whilst elsewhere he expressly says 'that the great city of Antioch possesses the throne of mighty Peter,'[2] thus manifestly being unconscious of any unique prerogative having been conferred by the institution of Christ on the Bishop of Rome as the 'legitimate successor of Peter in the Roman Episcopate.'

[1] Theodoret, *Ep. ad Leonem*, Ep. cxi. ; P.G. lxxxiii. 1313.
[2] *Ep. ad Flavianum Epis. C.P.*, Ep. lxxxvi. ; P.G. lxxxiii. 1279.

Note 56, n. 746.

On Pope Vitalian and the Typus.

1268. The orthodoxy of Vitalian, who succeeded Eugenius I. in the See of Rome in A.D. 657, in the reign of Constans II., is somewhat doubtful. The formulary known as the *Typus* had been drawn up by Paul, the successor of Pyrrhus (who had been banished but not canonically deposed) in the See of Constantinople, and was put forth as an original decree of the faith by Constans in A.D. 648.[1] This formulary was condemned as heretical by the Lateran Council of A.D. 649 by its Eighteenth Canon. Vitalian, however, in spite of this condemnation, in a Synodal Letter to Constantinople expressly guarded himself against rejecting the *Typus*, and as a result of this action on his part his name was placed in the diptychs of Constantinople,[2] on which no name of any Bishop of Rome had been inscribed since that of Honorius. This would not have been done by the Patriarch if he had not held that Vitalian's action meant agreement with the *Typus*. So far, then, Vitalian may be said to have been unfaithful. Whether after the accession of Constantine Pogonatus, who had no intention of sustaining the *Typus* by force, Vitalian withdrew from this unsatisfactory position, and made a stand for orthodoxy is uncertain. Hefele considers that he did so on the ground that the Monothelites of Constantinople after his death took the trouble to remove his name again from the diptychs.[3] It is not, however, at all certain that this action of the Monothelites was as a result of Vitalian's own action. On the contrary, it is probable that his name was struck out in consequence of the delay which took place between the sending of the Imperial letter to the Pope Donus, inviting him to send deputies to the conference which the Emperor desired should be held, and the arrival of his answer, a delay which might have been interpreted as meaning that Rome wanted no arrangement, and would send no deputies as requested.[4]

Note 57, n. 750.

On the identical treatment of Pope Agatho's letter and Macarius by the Sixth Synod.

1269. Macarius, the Patriarch of Antioch, was a Monothelite, and in the first Session of the Sixth Synod he declared, in answer to the Emperor, that 'He had not invented these new expressions' (of the one energy and one will in the Incarnate Lord Jesus Christ), 'but had only taught what we have received by tradition from the holy Œcumenical Synods, the holy Fathers, from Sergius and his successors, and from Pope Honorius and from Cyrus of Alexandria, in regard to the will and energy, and we are ready to prove this.'[5] Then followed an exhaustive inquiry, in the course

[1] Mansi, x. 1030.
[2] *Ibid.*, xi. 199, 346.
[3] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 312. [E. T. v. 137.]
[4] *Ibid.*, sect. 312, *ad finem*, 317. [E.T. v. 140, 157.]
[5] Mansi, ii. 214.

of which, at the fifth Session, Macarius handed in two volumes of Patristic testimonies for the Monothelite doctrine,[1] and, at the sixth Session, a further volume of like evidence, which were read to the Synod.[2] There was afterwards read at the seventh Session a collection of genuine testimonies of the Fathers on the doctrine in question, taken from copies of the Fathers in the Patriarchal House at Constantinople by the Roman legates, and of passages of heretics who, agreeing with Macarius, taught one will and operation.[3] At the eighth Session, at the request of the Emperor, as President, George, the Patriarch of Constantinople, declared that he had compared the Patristic passages adduced therein with copies in his own Patriarchal House, and found that they fully agreed.[4] The Emperor, at the request of the Synod, called on Macarius to give a more definite explanation of his faith. Macarius put forth a confession of faith which was read to the Synod, entitled in the Acts of the Synod, 'Ecthesis or Confession of Faith of the Heresiarch Macarius.'[5] Macarius, in answer to the repeated interrogations of the Emperor, rejected most decidedly the doctrine of two natural wills and energies, and the Emperor ordered the collection of the Patristic passages presented by him to be read. The reading was continued in the ninth Session. Macarius was proved to have falsified his Patristic authorities and to have adhered to the statements of heretics, and finally the Synod gave sentence, and he was condemned and deposed 'from all priestly dignity and function.' The Synod exclaiming: 'He has manifestly declared himself a heretic; anathema to the new Dioscurus; he deserves to be deprived of the Episcopate—that he should be deprived of his Pall.'[6]

The conclusion to be drawn from these proceedings, and those in the case of Agatho's letter, is that the Synod adopted the same method of treatment in both cases. In the words of Mgr. Maret: 'It is as clear as the day that the acceptance of the letter of Pope St. Agatho by the Sixth Council was the fruit of a free judicial examination. This liberty of examination shows itself there yet more signally than at Ephesus and Chalcedon. It is not a minority, it is a great majority, almost the totality of the Bishops, who, before adhering to the doctrine of Agatho, demands to examine, not only the citation, but the *sense* and *whole contents* of the Apostolic letter. Could the intention of not accepting a decision without cognisance of the case be possibly expressed more precisely than did the Patriarch George? The Episcopal examination lasted three weeks, and the difference of the results of this examination is a new proof of its freedom. The result of the examination of George and his Bishops was the acceptance of the letter of Agatho. The result of the examination of Macarius was its rejection. It will never be shown that the examinations of both Patriarchs were not of the same nature, equally free. They differed only in their consequences. Although belonging to the Monothelite party before the Council, George, inspired by the love of truth alone, recognised his error. Macarius, the most obstinate of men, persisted in his.'[7]

[1] Mansi, ii. 322. [2] *Ibid.*, 326. [3] *Ibid.*, 327.
[4] *Ibid.*, 335. [5] *Ibid.*, 349-60. [6] *Ibid.*, xi. 387.
[7] Mgr. Maret, Évêque de Sura, *Du Concile Général et de la Paix Religieuse*, tom. i. 285, 286.

Note 58, n. 772.

On St. Augustine's statement with reference to the acquittal by Zosimus of Cœlestius and Pelagius.

1270. In support of the assertion that Zosimus did *not* acquit Cœlestius and Pelagius, it is sometimes alleged that St. Augustine, in a passage already quoted [1] from his treatise *Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*,[2] declares that Zosimus did not pronounce these heresiarchs innocent on the ground that their opinions were orthodox. To this it must be replied that St. Augustine's statement in question cannot be reconciled with the facts set out in the text, the evidence of which is conclusive. The ground, too, on which he bases his statement is utterly without foundation when examined by means of the information afforded by the account which Zosimus himself gives of his action in his *Epistle* (iii.) quoted in the text. It must be remembered that St. Augustine was writing after Zosimus had retracted his former judgment, no doubt, in consequence of the line taken by the African Bishops, and so his actual attitude at the time when St. Augustine was writing would be especially present to his mind, the more so as on the particular occasion of his letter he would have every reason to minimise the effect of the support which Zosimus had given to Pelagianism. However, after every allowance has been made for St. Augustine's position it is impossible to pass a more lenient judgment on his statement therein than that of Tillemont, who says: 'The charity of St. Augustine, who was not writing a history in which he would have been obliged to represent things just as they were, covers this fault with a modest silence.'[3]

Note 59, nn. 960, 1038.

On the Seventh Synod and Pope Hadrian's letter to the Emperor.

1271. The Seventh Synod affords additional testimony to the fact that the Easterns did not admit the pretensions of the Roman Bishops which found such ready acceptance in the West. In the second Session, a letter from Hadrian P. I., dated October 27, A.D. 785, to the Emperor Constantine VI. and the Empress Irene was read, but, as Hefele says, 'not in its entirety'[4] —a somewhat mild way of referring to the very remarkable alterations and omissions made in it as read to the Council. In the letter as sent, Hadrian, after expressing his joy at the return of the two rulers to orthodoxy, and at their determination to restore the veneration of images, proceeds, 'If you persevere in that orthodox faith in which you have begun, and the sacred and venerable images be by your means erected again in those parts, as by the Lord, the Emperor Constantine of pious memory, and the blessed Helena, who promulgated the orthodox faith, and exalted the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, your spiritual mother, and

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 645.
[2] S. Aug., *Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*, ii. 5.; P.L. xliv. 574.
[3] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, xiii. 726.
[4] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xviii. ch. ii. sect. 349. [E.T. v. 364.]

with the other orthodox Emperors venerated it as the head of all Churches, so will your clemency, that is protected of God, receive the name of another Constantine, and another Helena, through whom at the beginning the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church derived strength, and like whom your own imperial fame is spread abroad by triumphs, so as to be brilliant and fixed in the whole world. But the more, if following the traditions of the orthodox faith, you embrace the judgment of the Church of blessed Peter, chief of the Apostles, and, as of old, your predecessors the holy Emperors acted, so you too, venerating it with honour, love with all your heart his Vicar, and if your sacred Majesty follow by preference their orthodox faith, according to our holy Roman Church. May the chief of the Apostles himself, to whom the power was given by our Lord God to bind and remit sins in heaven and earth, be often your protector, and trample all barbarous nations under your feet, and everywhere make you conquerors. For let sacred authority lay open the marks of his dignity, and how great veneration ought to be shown to his, the highest See, by all the faithful in the world. For the Lord set him who bears the keys —*clavigerum*—of the kingdom of heaven as chief over all, and by Him is he honoured with this privilege, by which the keys of the kingdom of heaven are entrusted to him. He, therefore, that was preferred with so exalted an honour was thought worthy to confess that faith on which the Church of Christ is founded. A blessed reward followed that blessed confession, by the preaching of which the holy universal Church was illumined, and from it the other Churches of God have derived the proofs of faith. For the blessed Peter himself, the prince of the Apostles, who first sat in the Apostolic See, left the chiefship of his Apostolate and pastoral care to his successors, who are to sit in his most holy See for ever. And that power of authority, which he received from the Lord God our Saviour, he, too, bestowed and delivered by divine command to the Pontiffs his successors.[1] . . .' Now this letter when it was read in the Council was read in Greek, and the translation so read differs very remarkably from the Latin; it was as follows: 'If the ancient orthodoxy be perfected and restored by your means in these regions, and the venerable icons be placed in their state, you will be partakers with the Lord Constantine, Emperor of old, by God's will, and the Empress Helena, who was made conspicuous and confirmed the orthodox faith, and exalted still more your holy spiritual mother. the Catholic and Roman Church, and with the orthodox Emperors who ruled after them, and so your most pious and heaven-protected name likewise will be set forth as that of another Constantine and another Helena; being renowned and praised throughout the world, by which the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is restored, and especially if you follow the tradition of the Church of the holy Peter and Paul the chief Apostles, and embrace their Vicar, as the Emperors who reigned before you of old both honoured their Vicar, and loved him with all their heart; and if your sacred Majesty honour the Roman most holy Church of the chief Apostles, to whom (the Apostles) was given by God the Word Himself to loose and bind sins in heaven and earth. For they will extend their shield over your power, and all

[1] Mansi, xii. 1056, 1057.

barbarous nations shall be put under your feet: and wherever you go they will make you conquerors. For the holy and chief Apostles themselves, who set up the Catholic and orthodox faith, have laid it down as a written law that all, who after them are to be successors of their Sees, should hold their faith, and remain in it to the end.'[1]

It will be noticed that the omissions are very significant, there is nothing about 'embracing the *judgment* of the Church of blessed *Peter, chief of the Apostles*,' the Roman Church is called 'the Church of the holy Peter and Paul the chief Apostles' and the Bishop of Rome 'their Vicar,' thus implicitly denying that the Roman See was the 'See of Peter' in the Roman sense, and the Roman Bishop 'the successor of Peter' in the same sense, and the ancient tradition of the joint foundation of the Roman Church by the two Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul is implied, and the passage in St. Matthew is applied to the Apostles instead of to Peter alone as the Key-bearer, a vital alteration which struck at the very root of the Papal pretensions, and asserted the supremacy of the Apostolic College in the Church, and thus of the Episcopate, as its successor. But this is not all. Hadrian, in the latter part of his letter, had expressed his wonder that in the Emperor's letter to him, Tarasius was named *Universal Patriarch*, and that he had from a layman and booted soldier—*apocaligus*—been suddenly made Patriarch in contradiction to the sacred Canons, and he would not have been able to assent to his consecration had Tarasius not been a faithful helper in the restoration of the sacred images. All this, amounting to nearly a quarter of the letter, was omitted from the letter as read to the Council. The portion of the letter referring to the title Universal Patriarch was as follows: 'We greatly wondered that in your Imperial commands, directed for the Patriarch of the Royal City, Tarasius, we find him there called Universal, but we know not whether this was written through ignorance, or schism, or the heresy of the wicked—*per imperitiam, aut schisma vel haeresim iniquorum*. But henceforth we advise your most merciful and Imperial Majesty that he be by no means called Universal in your writings, because it appears contrary to the institutions of the holy Canons, and the decrees of the traditions of the holy Fathers. For he could never have ranked second, save for the authority of our holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, as is plain to all. Because if he be named Universal, above the holy Roman Church which has a prior rank, which is the head of all the Churches of God, it is certain that he shows himself as a rebel against the holy Councils, and a heretic. Because, if he is Universal, he is recognised to have the Primacy even over the Church of our See, which appears ridiculous to all faithful Christians: because in the whole world the chief rank and power was given to the blessed Apostle Peter by the Redeemer of the world Himself: and through the same Apostle, whose place we unworthily hold, the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church holds the first rank, and authority of power, now and for ever; so that if any one, which we believe not, has called him, or assents to his being called, Universal, let him know that he is estranged from the orthodox faith, and a rebel against our holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.'[2]

[1] Mansi, xii. 1055, 1058.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1056, 1073.

Pope Hadrian's assertion that the position of the Bishop of C.P. was assigned to him by the 'authority of the Church of Rome is in strange contradiction of historical facts, the position held by that Bishop being granted to him by the Council of Constantinople,[1] and renewed by the Council of Chalcedon[2] and the *Quinsext* Council,[3] and must have seemed an extraordinary assertion to the Orientals; likewise, too, the statement that 'the chief rank and power' was given to the Roman Church 'by the Redeemer of the world Himself' must have appeared very strange to them, knowing as they did that the position occupied by the Roman See in the Church rested upon the custom of the Fathers who 'naturally assigned'[4] it to the Roman Bishop and not on the 'institution of Christ,' remembering, as they doubtless would, too, the denunciations of St. Leo of the action of the Fourth Synod in enacting the Twenty-eighth Canon. Their experience of the ways of the Roman Bishops in advancing claims for their See would enable them to see the reason why Hadrian made these statements, and the expedient which, with Oriental dexterity, they adopted of having the letter read to them in a 'translation' in which they were omitted afforded them a way of politely ignoring them and so avoided the raising of difficulties which would hinder the reconciliation of East and West. It is, too, not without significance that after the letter thus altered and abbreviated had been read to the Synod, the Deacon and Notary Cosmas announced that another letter had been sent from 'the most holy Pope of Elder Rome to Tarasius, our most holy and Œcumenical Patriarch, and your holy assembly bids it shall be done with it also. The holy Council said, Let it be read.'[5] The Official of the Synod, it will be noted, thus gave the very title to the Patriarch to which Hadrian objected, without any expression of dissent on the part of the Synod, and, therefore, with its tacit approval, in view of the fact that the Fathers knew of the condemnation of its use contained in Hadrian's letter.

1272. It may be added that the Synod, in accordance with the custom of Œcumenical Councils, gave its formal approval to the letters of Hadrian as they were read to them, at the request of the Roman legates: 'Let the most holy Patriarch, Tarasius, Bishop of Constantinople, say, whether he agrees with the letters of the most holy Pope of Elder Rome or not?' Tarasius replied, 'The most holy Apostle Paul, who was illuminated by the light of Christ, and begat us by the Gospel when writing to the Romans, bearing testimony to the steadfastness and sincerity of their faith, which they had in Christ the true God, says as follows: Thy faith is published throughout the whole world; this testimony it is necessary to follow, and he acts inconsiderately who endeavours to resist it. Whence Hadrian, Bishop of Elder Rome, since he is partaker with those who deserved to be honoured with the aforesaid testimony has written expressly and in accordance with the truth to our pious Emperors, and to our humility, affirming well and truly that he holds the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church. For we too have searched, examining the Scriptures, and taught by the doctrine of the

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 346 *et seq.*
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 410 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 754.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 312 *et seq.*, 347 *et seq.*, 411 *et seq.*
[5] Mansi, xii. 1078.

Fathers,[1] and proving by deductions what we have confessed, we confess, and will confess: we agree and confirm, and will always remain true to the doctrine of the letters which have been read.' Tarasius thus carefully confines his assent to the subject of the letters thus read, viz., the veneration of images, and makes that assent conditional on his having found, after examination thereof, that it was in accord with the Scriptures and the tradition of the Fathers, to this declaration of the Patriarch the whole Synod joined itself, saying that 'it so believes, so thinks, so dogmatises,' thus approving the letters on the same ground as Tarasius. Then the legates asked the Synod, 'Let the holy Synod tell us whether it admits the letters of the most holy Pope of Elder Rome, or not?' The answers, 'We follow, receive, and admit,' and thereupon there followed '263 votes, partly representative and partly personal, of the Bishops and representatives of Bishops (with the exception of the legates themselves and Tarasius, who had declared himself already)'[2] for the form of which that of Basil of Ancyra may be taken as an example: 'According to the contents of the letters of the most holy Adrian, Pope of Elder Rome, and the sense of our most holy Father and Œcumenical Patriarch, I think, and hold, and will teach.' In the third Session of the Synod the *Synodica* addressed by Tarasius to the Patriarchs of the East was read, and at the request of Constantine, Bishop of Constantia, the replies sent by them were read 'in order that we may know if the Pope of Elder Rome, and the most holy Œcumenical Patriarch Tarasius, who presides over this royal city, are of the same mind, and hold the same doctrine, with the Bishops of the East,' thus putting the letters of the Patriarchs on the same level, and incidentally witnessing to the fact that the Synod knew no higher rank in the Church than that of Patriarch. The Council, after the Bishops had severally expressed their consent to the letters, declared that 'All the holy Council which is assembled by the grace of Christ our true God, and the pious command of our most serene and orthodox Emperors, receives and agrees to the report made to our orthodox Emperors by Hadrian, Pope of Elder Rome, and the paper now read, the orthodox declaration of the most holy and blessed Œcumenical Patriarch Tarasius, and the letters sent from the East to his Blessedness by the High Priests.'[3] The treatment here set out of the Pope's letter is in strict accordance with the course pursued by other Œcumenical Synods with regard to the letters of other Roman Bishops,[4] it was treated in a manner incompatible with a belief that it had the authority of the 'Supreme Shepherd' whose sovereign authority the whole community is bound to obey, and thus witnesses to the fact that Papalism was *not* 'the venerable and constant belief of 'the' age' of the Seventh Synod.

[1] Bossuet (*Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars iii. lib. vii. c. xxx. tom. ii. p. 53. Edit. Lugani, 1766) notes that after the words *Scripturas rimati* are to be supplied from the Greek the words *et Patriis doctrinis docti*, which are also in the common and ancient version.

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xviii. ch. ii. sect. 349. [E.T. v. 365.]

[3] Mansi, xii. 1154.

[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 451 *et seq.*, 749.

Note 60, n. 966.

On Baronius and the condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth Council.

1273. The expedient by which Baronius endeavours to destroy the evidence afforded by the Acts of the Sixth Synod as to the condemnation of Honorius by it.[1] It provides eloquent testimony to the incompatibility of the facts with Papalism. Baronius assumes that Theodore, who had been deposed from the throne of Constantinople had been condemned by the Sixth Synod, and on his restoration to his chair he erased his own name from the Acts of the Council, and substituted that of Honorius for it, and further, in order to give a foundation for the anathema on Honorius he inserted the fiction that in the twelfth Session of the Synod the letters of Honorius were read, the condemnation following in the next Session, rewriting the Acts of these two Sessions, and inserting his own fictions therein. Baronius was further compelled to deny the genuineness of all the letters of Pope Leo II. on the subject; the Imperial Edict of Confirmation he does not mention, probably he did not know of it. He accounts for the fact that the *Quinsext* and the Seventh Œcumenical Councils, and the so-called 'Eighth' Œcumenical Council speak of the anathema of Honorius by the Sixth Council by saying that Theodore practised his deception so early that even 'the first copies of Synodal Acts' which were sent from Constantinople were falsified, particularly the copy which the Papal legates took back to Rome. Thus the later Synods and Popes had merely the falsified Acts before them, and, not suspecting the deception, they drew from them the information respecting the anathema on Honorius.[2]

1274. Hefele gives the names of a series of learned men who have exposed 'the groundlessness' of the contention of Baronius—'Combesis, Pagi, Garnier, Natalis Alexander, Mamachi, the Ballerini, Joseph Simon Assemani, Palma, Chmel.' He himself adds further evidence on the point.[3] The absurdity of Baronius' contention from a Papalist point of view is obvious, for how could it be possible if Papalism had been the 'venerable and constant belief of' the 'age' of the Sixth Council and afterwards for Popes and Synods to have been deceived by the fictitious Acts of the Council, for the fact that they recorded the condemnation of the 'Supreme Pastor,' the 'Supreme Teacher of all Christians,' for heresy would have at once revealed their forged character. Baronius, like many other ingenious persons, overreached himself.

That Baronius should have been forced to adopt this method of destroying the effect of what he clearly recognises as being utterly incompatible with the Papalism which he so strenuously advocated is highly significant, as are also the similar methods which others have used for the like purpose, such as the allegation that the letters of Honorius were forged, or that heretical passages had been inserted in them by Greeks who desired to bring discredit on the Roman Church.

[1] Baronius, *op. cit.*, ad an. 680, n. xxxiv. tom. xii. 10, ad an. 681, nn. xiv.-xxxiv.; *ibid.*, 27-34, ad an. 683, nn. ii.-xxii.; *ibid.*, 56 *et seq.*

[2] Hefele, *op. cit.*, bk. xvi. ch. ii. sect. 33. [E.T. v. 191 *et seq.*]

[3] *L.c.*

Note 61, n. 1045.

On the way in which a Council attains Œcumenical authority.

1275. Consideration of the important question, What is an Œcumenical Council? shows that but one answer can be given, that there is but one criterion of an Œcumenical Council. That criterion is confirmation by the members of the One Episcopate, either formally or tacitly expressed, of the proceedings of a Council, such confirmation being the means whereby the assent of the whole Church is given to such proceedings; so, and so only, can a Council attain Œcumenical authority and rank.

It is, of course, true that if the One Episcopate was duly assembled in Synod, such Council would necessarily be at once Œcumenical by the very fact that the One Episcopate, the supreme authority which Christ has ordained in His Church, constituted the said Synod. But whilst this is so, the difficulties in the way of gathering together the whole Episcopate have always been so great that although there have been several Councils which are recognised as Œcumenical, yet there has never been a Synod with a complete representation of the One Episcopate, in the sense that every member thereof was present therein, either personally or by duly appointed proxy, thus being the *Ecclesia congregata.*

1276. How then did the Œcumenical Councils attain the rank and authority which they are now acknowledged to possess? How did they become representative of the supreme, ruling, and teaching authority of the Church, the One Episcopate, which has succeeded *jure divino* to the One Apostolate?[1]

Field, formerly Dean of Gloucester [A.D. 1610 to A.D. 1616], gives the following as the *criteria* of a General Council. He says with regard to the number of Bishops required to make a General Council, that 'Divines require three conditions, whereof the first is that the summons be general, and such as may be known to all the principal parts and provinces of the Christian world. The second, that no Bishop, whencesoever he come, be excluded, if he be known to be a Bishop and not excommunicate. The third, that the principal Patriarchs, with the concurrence of the particular Synods under them, be present, either in person or by their substitute and vicar, or at least by their provincial letter.[2] Field also lays down that with regard to the order which must be kept in General Synods, 'First, the Book of God must be laid in the midst of them that are present; secondly, the meeting must be openly, and not in secret; thirdly, it must be free, and every man must be permitted boldly to speak what he thinketh.'[3]

1277. These *criteria*, however, are clearly insufficient. Those regarding order are certainly important, and necessary conditions to a Council being acknowledged to be Œcumenical. All the Councils so acknowledged satisfy these conditions, and it was the fact that the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 449, did not satisfy them which rendered it at once plain to the whole Church that, although the summons thereto was general, and the number of Bishops

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 34 *et seq.*

[2] Field, *On the Church*, bk. v. ch. xlix. vol. iv. p. 12. Cambridge, 1852.

[3] *Ibid.*, *l.c.* p. 15.

attending it was large, it was not Œcumenical, though it was so intended to be.[1] Premising then with regard to the first of the three *criteria* as to the number of the Bishops required to make a General Council. There is no evidence whatever that the summons to the Second General Council was a general one. On the contrary, Theodoret expressly tells us that the Emperor Theodosius confined his summons to the Bishops belonging to the Eastern Empire[2] with which he had been entrusted by the Emperor Gratian. Hence no summons was sent to St. Damasus, Bishop of Rome, or to any Bishops of the West, for Ascholius of Thessalonica, who was present, was without doubt reckoned as an Oriental Prelate.[3] So also with regard to the Sixth Synod. There is no doubt that it was not convoked as an Œcumenical Council, the Emperor, Constantine Pogonatus, expressly saying in his letter to Pope Donus, dated August 12, A.D, 678, that no time could be found for the holding of an Œcumenical Council, and he requested that deputies should be sent to a conference with certain deputies of the East.[4] Nevertheless, the Synod which did actually assemble as the result of the *Edict* of the Emperor, at its first Session, and with his consent, called itself Œcumenical, and has been recognised as such by the Church.

1278. As to the third of these *criteria*, at the Second Council the Roman Patriarch was not present. Field tries to meet this by asserting that he was present by 'his provincial letter.' Apart, however, from there being no evidence whatever that any such letter was addressed to or received by the Council, the whole history of the Council shows that not only were the Westerns not summoned at all, but they were even unacquainted with its proceedings till the Synod was ended. So also at the Fifth Synod Vigilius was not only not present, but declined to be so.[5]

It may be added that in no way could any of the Œcumenical Councils be said to 'represent the One Episcopate,' to be the *Ecclesia congregata*, in that they were all mainly, and in the case of the second, entirely, composed of Easterns, the Westerns present being but few, generally only the representatives of the Bishops of Rome.

Field's *criteria* are thus clearly of no use for the purpose for which he gives them.

1279. To turn now to the *criteria* set forth by Papalists. Are they of any greater value than Field's? These *criteria* are three in number. In the first place, Papalists lay it down as essential to the Œcumenicity of a Council that it should be convoked by the Pope. This is practically claimed, as already noted,[6] by the Bull *Pastor Æternus* of Leo X., cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, as the right of the Roman Pontiff. Its unhistorical character has been so amply proved in the text that nothing more need be said.[7] The second Papalist condition is that for any Council to be Œcumenical it is necessary that it should have been presided over by the Pope—either

[1] For a similar reason, amongst others, the claims to Œcumenicity put forth on behalf of the Vatican Council, A.D. 1870, must be rejected, the treatment of 'the minority' at that Council being such as to violate these conditions, vide *Letters from Rome on the Council*, by Quirinus, *passim*. Authorised translation. London, 1870.

[2] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. v. ch. vi.; P.G. lxxxii. 1208.

[3] On the position of Ascholius, *vide supra*. nn. 1023, 1209.

[4] Mansi, xi. 198-9.

[5] *Vide supra*, n. 940.

[6] *Vide supra*, nn. 286 *et seq.*

[7] *Vide l.c.*

personally or by his legates. Such a claim is, in fact, the necessary outcome of the Papal Monarchy. If the Roman Pontiff possess *jure divino* the supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, a 'real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey,' it is obvious that a Council at which he was not present, personally or by his legates, and therefore *ex necessitate* President, would have no claim to recognition by the Church, it would be wanting in the presence of the Supreme Pastor, whose authority alone is supreme, and from whom alone authoritative decrees can issue. This is very plain from these Western Synods which have been dubbed Œcumenical by Papalists, but which have no right to be so considered. As has been seen, in them the Pope is the legislator,[1] and they have been but mere assemblages for registering the decrees of the Pontiff. On Papalist principles the *criterion* under consideration is fully justified, consequently, if Papalism were true, that condition of Œcumenicity would be found to have been satisfied in the case of every one of the Synods so acknowledged by the Church. It is, however, plain that this is not the case. Six at least of these Councils, viz., the first of Nicæa, A.D. 325,[2] the first of Constantinople, A.D. 381,[3] that of Ephesus, A.D. 431,[4] the second of Constantinople, A.D. 535,[5] the third of Constantinople, A.D. 680,[6] and the second of Nicæa, A.D. 787,[7] were not so presided over by the 'Roman Pontiff,' a fact which at once destroys the Papalist contention.[8] It may be added that, supposing such a Presidency had been found in the case of all the Œcumenical Synods, it would have been of no value to the Papalist contention ; it would simply have shown that where they or their representatives are present they were allowed to take the first place, as being, or as the representatives of, the Bishops of that See, which by ancient custom, was admitted to occupy the first place in the hierarchy.

The third of the Papalist *criteria*, viz., that in order for a Council to be Œcumenical its decrees must have received Papal confirmation has been already proved to be contradicted by historical facts ;[9] such 'confirmation' of the decrees of a Synod as was given by Bishops of Rome being exactly the same in nature as that given by any other member of the Episcopal College, *i.e.* 'Episcopal' and not 'Papal.'

The Papalist *criteria* are thus as useless as those of Field for the purpose of deciding what Councils are to be recognised as Œcumenical.

1280. Some *criterion* there must be, because not one of these Synods so recognised has been representative of the 'One Episcopate,' not one of them could be said to be the *Ecclesia congregata*, so that the 'One Episcopate' therein assembled, acting in its corporate capacity, would have a right to exercise that supreme power of ruling and teaching which belongs to the 'One Episcopate.' Clearly the answer to this difficulty must be that inasmuch as this has been so in the case of all these Synods, the assent of the whole Church must have been given to their acts in some other way. Now, how is this possible? It must be borne in mind that the One Apostolate, to which the 'One Episcopate' has succeeded *jure divino* as the means whereby

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 291.
[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 297 *et seq.*
[3] *Vide supra*, n. 339.
[4] *Vide supra*, nn. 364 *et seq.*
[5] *Vide supra*, n. 940.
[6] *Vide supra*, n. 746.
[7] *Vide supra*, n. 1036
[8] On the Presidency of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, *vide supra*, nn. 391, 392.
[9] *Vide supra*, nn. 1021 *et seq.*, 1023 *et seq.*, 1026, 1029, 1031, 1034 *et seq.*, 1038.

it abides until the end of the world, is the supreme authority constituted in the Church by her divine Founder,[1] the assent therefore of the 'One Episcopate' as that of the supreme authority representing Christ the King, would necessarily be that of the whole Church. How then is this assent obtained? The answer is, By the 'confirmation' of the Acts of a Council by the 'One Episcopate.' Such 'confirmation,' it appears from the history of the past, has been given in three ways: (*a*) First, it may be given by the recognition of a Council as Œcumenical by a succeeding Council which itself attained Œcumenical rank. This has certainly been the case with the first six Synods. (*b*) Secondly, by Bishops who were not present at the Synod signifying their assent to their decrees in Synod or otherwise. Such assent when given at once enlarged the area in which the authority of the Council was recognised, and when given by all, the Synod attained Œcumenical authority and rank. (*c*) Lastly, such assent might be given tacitly without any formal act on the part of the absent Bishops, the authority simply being unquestioned by any part of the 'One Episcopate.'

1281. The second of these ways was, it would appear, that by which the Council of Nicæa received the confirmation of the 'One Episcopate.' That Synod, the greatest and most authoritative of all the Œcumenical Councils, was not regarded at once as Œcumenical, as being, that is, the one Episcopate itself acting as the supreme authority in the Church, and so itself, without any further action being needed, settling the questions before it finally, and in a manner *ipso facto* binding at once on the whole Church. On the contrary, St. Athanasius himself does not appeal to this Council as possessing such authority when arguing with reference to the Arians. 'Had they believed aright,' says he, 'they would have been satisfied with the confession put forth at Nicæa by the whole Œcumenical Synod.'[2] He does not appeal to it as the final authority; *that* it became gradually. Various Synods at different times accepted its decrees, so that St. Athanasius could say in A.D. 363 that the Nicene Faith was approved by all the Churches in the world save the few which followed Arianism,[3] and, six years later, that 'to that Council the whole world has long ago agreed';[4] words which plainly show *whence* the Council derives its title to Œcumenical authority.

1282. The Fifth and Sixth Synods have a like witness, the *Decrees* in these instances, as doubtless in others, being sent to absent Bishops for the express purpose of obtaining their confirmation. If it be sought to object that to make the Œcumenicity of a Council depend upon the confirmation thereof by the 'One Episcopate' is to postpone the Œcumenicity of a Council being recognised by the Church, and therefore to destroy the value of such Synod, it is to be replied—(*a*) First, that, as a matter of fact, that is the way in which Councils have attained to such rank and authority, the Fifth and Seventh Councils not being held to be Œcumenical at first by considerable portions of the Church;[5] ultimately such recognition being accorded by the whole Episcopate, these Councils by such confirmation obtained Œcumenical rank and authority in the whole Church. (*b*) Secondly, since the 'One Episcopate'

[1] *Vide supra*, nn. 34 *et seq.*

[2] S. Athanasius, *Epistola Encyclica ad Episc. Ægypti et Lybyæ*; P.G. xxv. 549.

[3] *Ep. ad Jovinianum Imp.*; P.G. xxvi. 816, 817.

[4] *In Africæ Episcopos Ep. Synodica*; P.G. xxvi. 1032.

[5] *Vide supra*, nn. 946, 1044.

is the divinely appointed supreme power of authority and teaching in the Church, by no other way has the whole Episcopate hitherto exercised its power, never having been assembled in its entirety, or even by its duly appointed representatives in any one Synod. Further, when it is remembered that the primary object of an Œcumenical Synod is to bear witness to truth universally held it is plain that under the given circumstances by no other means could that witness be satisfactorily given than by the assent of the remaining members of the 'One Episcopate' to the Acts of such Council.

1283. If it be further objected that the necessity of this 'confirmation' by the 'One Episcopate' renders it impossible for there ever to be an Œcumenical Synod, inasmuch as the refusal of a few members of the Episcopate to confirm the Acts of any particular Synod would serve to vitiate the confirmation thereof by the *Unus Episcopatus*, the answer is plain. The question would simply be, Were the Bishops who so refused acting in accord with the general consent of the Fathers in the past, or were those who did give their assent? This was exactly the question which presented itself to the Church with regard to the Council of Nicæa. The action of the Arians in rejecting that Council was perceived by the Church to be contrary to her teaching in the past, whilst, on the other hand, the witness to, and agreement with, that teaching by the Council was gradually emphasised by the fact that the universal assent of the world was given to that Council by Councils held in various parts as just noted, so that thus the Synod received the 'confirmation of the *Unus Episcopatus*.' On the other hand, the refusal of St. Leo to 'confirm' Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon[1] cannot be held to detract from the authority which that Canon possesses, inasmuch as it was enacted by a Council which admittedly has attained Œcumenical rank, and the reasons on which St. Leo based his refusal were such as involved the denial of the Episcopate to make such a Canon in accord with the right which the Fathers of old had exercised in cases of similar character; hence his refusal could not be justified, since the decree of the Council was in accordance with the principle embodied in the 'ancient custom' by which the Church had hitherto settled the precedence of the chief Sees in her hierarchy. Therefore it is that the law laid down in the Canon has always prevailed in the East, and the precedence of the chief Sees as laid down therein was ultimately adopted by Rome itself.[2]

1284. From what has been said it is plain that the evidence shows that the sole criterion by which the claim of any particular Council to be considered Œcumenical can be determined is, Has it received the assent of the Church or not?—such assent being necessarily expressed by means of the confirmation of the Acts of such Council by the *Unus Episcopatus*, such confirmation being given by any of the three ways named above. It is in this way alone that the assent of the Catholic Church dispersed throughout the world can be signified, an assent which secures that no Council shall be received as Œcumenical which does not comply in its proceedings with the Vincentian Canon of Universality, Antiquity, and Consent. Other *criteria* may be suggested, but it is submitted that they all will be found to be insufficient when brought to a test, since in each case there will be found some one or more admittedly Œcumenical Councils which such suggested criterion fails to cover.

[1] *Vide supra*, n. 437.

[2] *Vide supra*, n. 1222.

Note 62, n. 1090.

On the Quinquennial Faculties required by Roman Bishops.

1285. The power of dispensing from certain requirements of the Church is inherent in the Episcopal office. In the Latin Church many of the cases in which the Diocesan used to exercise this power of dispensation have gradually been reserved to the Pope. This has been brought about in various ways, especially by Emperors and Kings demanding dispensations from the Popes which might have been granted by their own Bishops.[1] Innocent III. was especially active in reserving cases to himself.[2] These reserved cases have largely to do with marriage and other practical matters. Many of these reserved cases the Pope grants faculties to Bishops to deal with. These faculties are granted for periods of five years, and are clearly necessary for the due administration of their 'Dioceses.' If they are not granted, dispensations have to be obtained from Rome at great trouble and expense. It is obvious that there can be no stronger hold on a Bishop than this need of the quinquennial faculties; if they are refused, the whole Diocesan administration is thrown out of gear, and it can be only a question of time before the 'Bishop' is reduced to submission, for the people who suffer would inevitably put the strongest pressure on the Bishop to yield. The many degrees of 'spiritual relationship' and other diriment impediments to marriage existing according to the Canon Law obviously frequently call for the exercise of this dispensing power, and to mark the complete subjection of the Bishop he is expressly ordered in all such dispensations to insert a clause that he grants such dispensation *tanquam sedis Apostolicæ delegatus*, *i.e.* in his quality as delegate of 'the Apostolic See.'[3]

1286. The inconveniences are great, and it is not surprising that some of the Bishops tried to lessen the bondage they are in by making certain *Postulata* to Pope Pius IX. at the time of the Vatican Council. In these *Postulata* of the French Bishops they said that 'faculties are such as a Bishop requires during the whole of his Episcopate; they should not, therefore, be granted for a year, or for three years, or five years, but should extend throughout the whole time of his Episcopate, for two reasons: first, that the Bishops should not be put to the useless annoyance of asking for them so frequently; and, secondly, which is the chief reason, that many important Episcopal Acts, *e.g.* Dispensations, Absolutions, etc., may not be exposed very easily to the danger of nullity, when, as not unfrequently happens, the Bishop or his Chancellor through forgetfulness omits to make application at the proper time for the renewal of the indults. The obligation of obtaining by renewed indults faculties necessary for the proper discharge of a public office is nowhere seen, as we think, except in the ecclesiastical régime, which ought to be the most simple of all, and in which the Bishops hold a

[1] *Dict. de Discipline Ecclésiastique* (vol. i. 1891), sub. v. 'Dispenses.' [Migne, *Encyclopédie Théologique*, vol. xxv. p. 891.]

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 892.

[3] Wetzer and Welte, *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Théologie Catholique*. Trans. by I. Goschler, sub v. 'Dispenses,' tom. v. p. 39.

more illustrious place than do Prefects and other officials in the civil régime.'[1]

1287. These *Postulata* were laid before Pius IX. and the Vatican Council by the Archbishop (Darboy) of Paris, the Archbishop of Sens, the Archbishop of Albi, the Bishop of Orleans (Dupanloup), and by seven other French Bishops. The Council was adjourned without these and other *Postulata* of a similar import[2] from German and all the Belgian Bishops being considered. These 'faculties' clearly render the Bishops helpless; their position as 'Vicars' of the 'Roman Pontiffs' could not be more plainly shown than by the necessity of obtaining them. Their entire dependence is emphasised by the journey *ad limina* which they are compelled to take every five years. These journeys had their origin in the ancient custom of Bishops visiting their Metropolitans, and the faithful their Cathedral Church, once a year. Pope Zachary in A.D. 745 enjoined a yearly visit to Rome on all Bishops ordained by the Pope if they were near Rome. With the growth of Papalism these journeys to Rome became more and more widely frequent. They were at first voluntary, but Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) began to oblige Bishops to pay these visits, and under Urban II., his successor, this became more and more fixed.[3]

Note 63, n. 1102.

On the Pallium.

1288. The difference between the position claimed by St. Gregory and that which his successors were recognised as possessing when the Papalist claims had been further developed is seen when the meaning attached to the gift of the *Pallium* in his days is compared with that which such gift was considered to have at the later date. The *Pallium* itself was probably originally equivalent to the outer garment—ἱμάτιον—worn over the tunic, similar to, but not the same as, the toga, and usually made of wool. It became much diminished in size, and ultimately assumed the form of a scarf, worn outside the outer cloak, draped round the shoulders. It was part of the dress of the Consuls, high officers of State, and the Emperors afterwards granted it to certain high ecclesiastical dignitaries, and it was worn by them in the same manner as it was by the Consuls, 'except that the second end, instead of being brought round in front to terminate on the left hand, is left free, and falls down behind. To prevent it from dragging on the ground it is cut short at the ankles, or even rather higher,'[4] the one end of the scarf thus hanging behind, the other in front. Its very form, therefore, betrays its civil origin; it is not an ecclesiastical garment at all. This is further confirmed by the fact that the Bishops of Gaul and Spain

[1] *Postulata a pluribus Galliarum Episcopis SS. DD. NN. Pio Papæ IX. et SS. Concil. Vaticano reverenter proposita*, 1869. *Collectio Lacensis*, vol. vii. 838.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. vii. 874, 877.

[3] Vide *Dictionnaire de Discipline Ecclésiastique*, sub v. 'Voyage a Rome,' vol. ii. pp. 1578-84. [Migne, *Encyclopédie Théologique*, vol. xxvi. pp. 1578-84.]

[4] Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 373. [E.T. p. 387.]

in the sixth century wore the *Pallium*. Bishops,[1] indeed, were ordered by the Sixth Canon of the Council of Mâcon, A.D. 581, not to celebrate Mass without the *Pallium*.[2] They certainly did not receive the *Pallium* from the Roman Bishop, and as Gaul was then outside the limits of the Roman Empire, the privilege of wearing it had probably been bestowed by imperial grant in the first half of the fifth century. So also the Bishops of Africa wore it as an ensign of their dignity, and they, too, must have received the privilege before the invasion of the Vandals. Thus the custom of the Emperor bestowing the Pall on ecclesiastical dignitaries had its origin at least as early as the fifth century, if not, indeed, the fourth.

1289. Amongst such ecclesiastical dignitaries the Bishops of Elder Rome — the Imperial City — would naturally be amongst those who secured this mark of imperial favour, consequently they are found wearing it in the fifth century. Its civil origin is, moreover, evident from the fact that when the Bishops of Rome began to make use of the *Pallium* in a similar manner to that of the Emperor, they first obtained his permission to so bestow it. Vigilius, for example, sought such permission before bestowing it on the Bishops of Arles, Auxanius and Aurelian, and if it is not noted that he did so in the case of their successors it is to be supposed that the imperial authorisation had been granted in such form as to enable Vigilius to make such grants to the Bishops of Arles without obtaining the imperial sanction on each occasion. Duchesne points out that the evidence that the sanction of the Emperor was necessary is 'corroborated by the fact that it was still the opinion of the fabricator of the *Donation of Constantine*.'[3] As then the *Pallium* was civil in its origin, it continued to retain the character it originally possessed, *i.e.* when the Roman Bishops first granted it they bestowed it for a like reason as the Emperors had when they gave it, viz., as a mark of honour, and in no way was it implied that a grant of authority was made therewith.

1290. This character it maintained even in later days in certain instances, whilst in others it was used by the Bishops of Rome as the ensign of a delegation of that authority which they claimed to exercise in the West to certain Bishops, to be exercised by them as their 'Vicars' in a certain specified district. It was in this way that St. Gregory sent it to Vigilius of Arles, but at the same time it was sent to other Bishops with its original meaning of a mark of honour. In this sense by custom the occupants of certain Sees, such as the Archbishop of Milan, the Bishop of Ostia, who was the ordinary consecrator of the Pope, and others received it. To others it was sent by favour as individuals from whom much support was expected for the good of the Church, as many as were prominent for their virtues, their good birth, or their high favour with kings. On this score Syagrius [Bishop of Autun] was presented with the Pall by 'Gregory the Great.'[4] In St. Gregory's time the *Pallium* was thus granted to three classes of persons: (1) as a sign that the Bishop on whom it was bestowed was entrusted with the office of representing the Bishop of Rome as his

[1] The word 'archepiscopus' which is found in the printed texts is merely the editor's correction, the MSS. read 'episcopum'.—Duchesne, *l.c.*

[2] Mansi, ix. 934.

[3] Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 371. [E.T. p. 385.]

[4] P.L. lxxvii. 951, 952, note *b*.

'Vicar' in a certain district in the 'West,' as it was before the division of the Empire by Gratian; (2) it was sent as a mark of honour to the Bishops of certain Sees who had a right by custom to have it; and (3), lastly, it was sent as a mark of honour by favour to certain individual Bishops.

1291. From what has been said it will be seen that in St. Gregory's day there was not yet attached to the *Pallium* the idea that the grant thereof was necessary to Metropolitans as the means by which they received their Metropolitical authority from him who possessed *jure divino* as Pope the plenitude of authority; on the other hand, it is clear that in certain cases it was the sign that those who received it were appointed 'Vicars' of the Roman Bishops in certain specified areas, receiving as such 'Vicars' certain powers *additional* to those which they as Metropolitans already possessed, powers which the grantor had come to exercise in the West. Thus, for example, Vigilius of Arles had been exercising for several years Metropolitical authority before he received the Pall, by which he had conferred upon him 'Vicarial' authority. This important distinction must be carefully borne in mind, for the next development was that the gift of the *Pallium* was made the means of conferring 'Metropolitical' as distinct from 'Vicarial' authority on those called to occupy Metropolitical Sees. With this development the original idea of the *Pallium* as a mark of honour became for the time completely ignored. St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, was a devoted adherent of Rome, and made great efforts to place the Churches founded by him or which he could influence completely in subjection to the Roman See. To this end he laid down in A.D. 774, some one hundred and fifty years after St. Gregory's day, that Metropolitans should henceforth ask for the *Pallium* from Rome 'that they might be numbered amongst the sheep committed' to Peter.[1] St. Boniface's efforts in this direction were not entirely successful. 'Of these [Metropolitans] on whom the Pope intended to confer the *Pallium*, and who had been persuaded to apply for it, two afterwards refused it, probably in consequence of having further considered the obligations to Rome which it involved.'[2] Even St. Lull, the special disciple of St. Boniface, had not made application for the *Pallium* eighteen years after his appointment to the Metropolitical See of Mainz in 754.[3]

1292. Pope Nicholas I. went further, and in A.D. 866 ordained in his *Responsio ad Consulta Bulgarorum*, c. 75, that no Metropolitan should be enthroned or consecrate the Eucharist until he had received the *Pallium* from the Roman See. The *Pallium* thus became the ensign of the delegation of Metropolitical jurisdiction by the Pope as being the source of it, so that without the gift of a Pall a Metropolitan was powerless. They were thus reduced to complete obedience to, and dependance on, the Pope, an oath being extracted from them which made the relative positions of Bishop and Pope plain. As time went on, the form of the oath was made even more stringent, it being turned by Gregory VII. into an oath of personal loyalty to the Pope, couched in terms borrowed from oaths of civil fealty. It is obvious

[1] S. Bonifacius, *Ep. ad Cuthbertum*, Ep. xxv.; P.L. lxxxix. 763, 764.

[2] Robertson, *op. cit.*, bk. iv. ch. v. vol. iii. p. 74. Edit. 1874.

[3] *Vide* Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History*, p. 138, quoted Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, sub v. 'Pope,' vol. ii. p. 1674.

that the gift of the *Pallium* to Metropolitans thus assumed a very different position to what a similar gift possessed in the days of St. Gregory, a mark of honour being transformed into a means of bestowing that jurisdiction which had hitherto, including the age of St. Gregory, been held to be inherent by ancient custom in the Metropolitical See, and so not needing to be delegated by the Pope as its source, or received by the person appointed to such office from the Supreme Pastor. This important distinction must be carefully remembered, as the grant of *Pallia* by St. Gregory is sometimes assumed to be of that significance possessed by a like grant by those who succeeded him in days when Papalism had developed to a far greater extent than it had arrived at in his day, considerable though the advance had been since the days of Innocent I. and St. Leo the Great, when the germ thereof made its appearance.

1293. A question is sometimes asked which is of considerable interest to the English Church—What was the *Pallium* which Gregory granted to St. Augustine and to the Archbishops of London and York? for it is plain from St. Gregory's letter on the subject that he intended the former place, and not Canterbury, to be the Metropolitical See of the southern Province, when it was constituted. St. Gregory's letter just referred to is dated June 22, A.D. 601, and was written by him in his capacity as the virtual founder of the new English Church, the real 'Apostle' of the English, 'Gregory our Father,' who 'sent us baptism,' as he was called by early English Christians.[1] In this letter he laid down what he desired should be the constitution of that Church which St. Augustine was labouring to bring into existence. He says, 'Although it is certain that the ineffable rewards of the eternal kingdom are reserved for those who labour for the Omnipotent God, it is, however, necessary for us to render to them the benefits of honours, that from this remuneration they may be able to labour more abundantly in the study of their spiritual work, and because the new Church of the English is brought to the grace of the Omnipotent God by the bounty of the same Lord, and by your labour we have granted you the use of the Pall in the same,' and he goes on to say that 'the Bishop of London [of which See he was evidently under the impression St. Augustine was the first occupant] ought always hereafter to be consecrated by his own Synod, and may receive the *Pallium* of honour—*honoris Pallium*—from the holy and Apostolic See which by the grace of God I serve.'[2] He further signifies his intention of granting the *Pallium* to the Bishop of York (when consecrated), who, according to the scheme which he sets forth, was to be the Metropolitan of the northern Province.

1294. This letter makes it quite plain that the *Pallium* sent to St. Augustine by St. Gregory was 'a mark of honour'—the *Pallium honoris*. Further, that this *Pallium honoris* was not simply granted to St. Augustine himself, but to him and his successors in the southern Metropolitical See, and to the Metropolitan of York. It would thus become the right of the Metropolitans of Canterbury and York to receive the *Pallium honoris* by custom, as it was

[1] Vide *Council of Clovesho*, A.D. 747. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 368. *S. Chr.*, *c.* 565, referred to by Bright, *Early English Church History*, ch. ii. p. 35.

[2] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Augustinum Epis. Anglorum*, Epist. lxv. lib. xi.; P.L. vol. lxxvii. p. 1200.

the right of the Archbishop of Milan. There was no question of it being an ensign of jurisdiction, this is, moreover, clearly proved to be the case from the way in which the Palls were to be sent to London [*i.e.* Canterbury] and York in the future; it was to be their right as a customary mark of honour, and was not a personal favour to St. Augustine and the first Bishop of York. And so in practice this is found to be the case. Laurentius and Mellitus were the two immediate successors of St. Augustine in the Metropolitical See of Canterbury, the former being Metropolitan for fifteen years (A.D. 604 to 619), the latter for five years (A.D. 619 to 624); neither of them received the Pall. If it had been Gregory's intention to bestow the Pall as an ensign conferring Metropolitan jurisdiction on St. Augustine, and to be received by his successors as such ensign, it is clear that they both would necessarily have received it at once, whereas, being the *Pallium honoris*, there was no such necessity for availing themselves of Gregory's grant. Honorius, too, the fifth Metropolitan of Canterbury, was consecrated in A.D. 628,[1] but did not receive the Pall till A.D. 634; having been thus in the active discharge of his duties as Metropolitan for six years, this fact bears the same witness. Further, Paulinus, consecrated first Bishop of York in A.D. 625,[2] did not receive it until after he had consecrated Honorius to Canterbury, and his subsequent acceptance, after his flight from York, when he had been Bishop six years, at the hands of that Prelate of the See of Rochester. At Rochester he clearly wore this *Pallium*, for Bede records, 'in which Church at his death he left the Pall which he had received from the Pope of Rome.'[3]

That as time went on the *Pallium* sent to the English Metropolitans came to be regarded in the same light as those granted to other Metropolitans, viz., as signifying the grant of 'Metropolitical' authority, so that without it any appointment to a Metropolitical See would be useless, is, of course, true, but that does not alter the fact as to the meaning of the *Pallium* as originally granted, viz., as the *Pallium honoris*, to the Metropolitans of London (*i.e.* Canterbury, the See which Ethelbert and St. Augustine considered to be more suited to be the Metropolis of the southern province than that designated by St. Gregory) and of York. The idea that the gift of the *Pallium* conveyed *Metropolitical* authority was the invention of later times, for as the Benedictine editors of St. Gregory's works say, 'the theory of the necessity of the *Pallium* had not up to that time been introduced.'[4]

Note 64, n. 1142.

On the foundation of the Church of the English.

1295. Roman controversialists sometimes argue that the fact that the Church of the English was founded by the Mission, headed by St. Augustine, which was sent from Rome, is a plain proof that it of necessity must be subject to the Church of Rome, and therefore that when it rejected the Papal Supremacy it

[1] Bright, *Early English Church History*, p. 122. Stubbs' *Registrum Sacrum*, p. 1, gives A.D. 627 as the year.

[2] Stubbs, *l.c.*

[3] Ven. Beda, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. iii. ch. xx.; P.L. xcv. 116.

[4] S. Greg. M., *Ep. ad Vigilium Episcopum Arelatensem*, Ep. lib. v. Ep. liii.; P.L. lxxvii. 782, nota *b*.

ceased to be part of the Catholic Church. Admitting to the full that St. Gregory was the real founder of the Church of the English,[1] yet that fact in no way justifies the conclusion sought to be drawn from it. That conclusion, in the first place, assumes that the recognition of the Papal Monarchy is an essential condition to being in 'the One Flock,' the Catholic Church, an assumption which has been proved by the evidence to be entirely without any basis in fact. Consequently, this 'argument' is of no value whatever. Secondly, the fact of such foundation, granted to the very fullest extent, obviously could not on Catholic principles impose on the English Church the obligation to accept or to continue to acknowledge for ever, if once accepted, claims which are contrary to the Divine Constitution of the Church. The Catholic verity as to that Constitution, 'the venerable and constant belief of every age' on the subject, has been shown to be essentially different from the Papalist doctrine thereon, which indeed perverts the Divine Constitution of the Church by its unhistorical accretions and assumptions; the Roman 'argument' is thus a palpable absurdity bearing on its face its own refutation.

1296. It may be worth while to add that the conduct of the African Bishops, in rejecting claims made by the Bishop of Rome[2] far less momentous in character than those which the English Church has rejected, is an historical instance that the fact that a Church which owed its foundation to the Roman See in no way involves any loss of the rights which such a Church possessed as an integral part of the Catholic Church, since the African Church undoubtedly was founded by Rome.[3] In fact, to allege such foundation as involving of necessity the recognition of the Papalist claims is clearly disingenuous. Further, such a demand has the most unfortunate but inevitable result of raising a barrier in the way of the payment of that natural deference in all things lawful and honest which such a Church should gladly pay to the See to which it owed its foundation, inasmuch as the danger exists lest the recognition of such natural deference, harmless in itself, and involving the sacrifice of no principle, should be twisted into the recognition of that which is uncatholic, and consequently to be rejected.

[1] *Council of Clovesho*, c. 17. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 368.

[2] *Vide supra*, nn. 609, 614, 634.

[3] S. Aug., *Ep.* xlii.; P.L. xxiii. 183. S. Greg., *Epist.*, lib. i., Ep. lxxvii.; P.L. lxxvii. 331; lib. viii. *Ep.* xxxiii.; P.L. lxxvii. 955.

APPENDIX A

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA—*SATIS COGNITUM*

[*S.D.N. Leonis, Papae XIII. Allocutiones, Epistolae, Constitutiones, etc.* Vol. vi. pp. 156-89. Bruges, 1900]

VENERABILIBVS FRATRIBVS
PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBVS ARCHIEPISCOPIS EPISCOPIS
ALIISQVE LOCORVM ORDINARIIS
PACEM ET COMMVNIONEM CVM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBVS

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES

SALVTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

Satis cognitum vobis est, cogitationum et curarum Nostrarum partem non exiguam illuc esse conversam, ut ad *ovile* in potestate positum summi pastoris animarum Iesu Christi revocare devios conemur. Intento hac in re animo, non parum conducere salutari consilio propositoque arbitrati sumus, Ecclesiae effigiem ac velut lineamenta describi: in quibus praecipua consideratione dignissima *unitas* est, quam in ea, velut insigne veritatis invictaeque virtutis, divinus auctor ad perpetuitatem impressit. Multum in intuentium animis nativa Ecclesiae pulchritudo speciesque posse debet: neque abest a veri similitudine, tolli eius contemplatione posse inscientiam; sanari opiniones falsas praeiudicatasque, maxime apud eos qui non sua ipsorum culpa in errore versentur: quin imo excitari etiam in hominibus posse Ecclesiae amorem utique similem caritati, qua Iesus Christus eam sibi sponsam, divino cruore redemptam, optavit: *Christus dilexit Ecclesiam, et se ipsum tradidit pro ea.*[1] Reversuris ad amantissimam parentem, aut non probe cognitam adhuc, aut iniuria desertam, si reditum stare oporteat non sanguine quidem, quo tamen pretio est Iesu Christo quaesita, sed labore aliquo molestiaque multo ad perpetiendum leviore, saltem perspicuum erit non voluntate humana id onus homini, sed iussu nutuque divino impositum, ob eamque rem, opitulante gratia caelesti, facile veritatem experiendo intelligent divinae eius sententiae: *Iugum enim meum suave est, et onus meum leve.*[2] Quamobrem spe maxima in *Patre luminum* reposita, unde *omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum* descendit,[3] ab eo scilicet, *qui incrementum dat*[4] unus, enixe petimus, ut Nobis vim persuadendi impertire benigne velit.

[1] Ephes. v. 25.
[2] Matth. xi. 30.
[3] Ep. Iac. i. 17.
[4] 1 Corinth. iii. 6.

Etsi Deus, quaecumque a naturis creatis efficiuntur, omnia ipse efficere sua solius virtute potest, nihilominus tamen ad iuvandos homines ipsis uti hominibus, ex benigno providentiae consilio, maluit: et quemadmodum in rerum genere naturalium perfectionem debitam, ita in iis, quae modum naturae transiliunt, sanctitatem homini ac salutem non nisi hominum opera ministerioque impertire consuevit. Sed perspicuum est, nihil inter homines communicari, nisi per externas res quae sensibus percipiantur, posse. Hac de caussa humanam naturam assumpsit Dei Filius, *qui cum in forma Dei esset . . . semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus*:[1] atque ita, in terris agens, doctrinam suam suarumque praecepta legum hominibus, colloquendo, tradidit.

Cum divinum munus eius perenne ac perpetuum esse oporteret, idcirco nonnullos ille sibi adiunxit alumnos disciplinae suae, fecitque potestatis suae participes: cumque *Spiritum veritatis* in eos devocasset e caelo, praecepit, peragrarent orbem terrarum, quodque ipse docuerat quodque iusserat, id omne fideliter universitati gentium praedicarent: hoc quidem proposito, ut eius et professione doctrinae et obtemperatione legibus posset hominum genus sanctitatem in terris, felicitatem adipisci in caelo sempiternam.—Hac ratione atque hoc principio Ecclesia genita: quae quidem, si extremum illud quod vult, caussaeque proximae sanctitatem efficientes spectentur, profecto est *spiritualis*: si vero eos consideres, quibus cohaeret, resque ipsas quae ad spiritualia dona perducunt, *externa* est necessarioque conspicua. Docendi munus accepere Apostoli per cognoscenda visu audituque signa: idque illi munus non aliter executi quam dictis factisque, quae utique sensus permoverent. Ita quidem illorum vox extrinsecus illapsa per aures, fidem ingeneravit in animis: *Fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi*.[2] Ac fides ipsa, scilicet assensio primae supremaeque veritati, mente quidem per se comprehenditur, sed tamen eminere foras evidenti professione debet: *Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam: ore autem confessio fit ad salutem*.[3] Simili modo nihil est homini gratia caelesti, quae gignit sanctitudinem, interius: sed externa sunt ordinaria ac praecipua participandae instrumenta gratiae: sacramenta dicimus, quae ab hominibus ad id nominatim lectis, certorum ope rituum, administrantur. Iussit Iesus Christus Apostolis perpetuisque Apostolorum successoribus, gentes ut edocerent ac regerent: iussit gentibus, ut illorum et doctrinam acciperent et potestati obedienter subessent. Verum isthaec in christiana republica iurium atque officiorum vicissitudo non modo permanere, sed ne incohari quidem potuisset nisi per interpretes ac nuntios rerum sensus.—Quibus de caussis Ecclesiam cum *corpus*, sum etiam *corpus Christi* tam crebro sacrae litterae nominant: *Vos autem estis corpus Christi*.[4] Propter eam rem quod corpus est, oculis cernitur Ecclesia: propterea quod est Christi, vivum corpus est actuosum et vegetum, quia eam tuetur ac sustentat, immissa virtute sua, Iesus Christus, in eum fere modum quo cohaerentes sibi palmites alit ac fructuosos facit vitis. Quemadmodum autem in animantibus principium vitae in occulto est ac penitus abditum, indicatur tamen atque ostenditur motu actuque membrorum, sic in Ecclesia supernaturalis principium vitae perspicue ex iis, quae ab ipsa aguntur, apparet.

[1] Philippens. ii. 6-7.
[2] Roman. x. 17.
[3] *Ibid.* 10.
[4] 1 Corinth. xii. 27.

Ex quo consequitur, in magno eodemque pernicioso errore versari, qui ad arbitrium suum fingunt Ecclesiam atque informant quasi latentem minimeque conspicuam : item qui perinde habent atque institutum quoddam humanum cum temperatione quadam disciplinae ritibusque externis, et sine perenni communicatione munerum gratiae divinae, sine rebus iis, quae haustam a Deo vitam quotidiana atque aperta significatione testentur. Nimirum alterutram esse posse Iesu Christi Ecclesiam tam repugnat, quam solo corpore, vel anima sola constare hominem. Complexio copulatioque earum duarum velut partium prorsus est ad veram Ecclesiam necessaria, sic fere ut ad naturam humanam intima animae corporisque coniunctio. Non est Ecclesia intermortuum quiddam, sed corpus Christi vita supernaturali praeditum. Sicut Christus, caput et exemplar, non omnis est, si in eo vel humana dumtaxat spectetur natura visibilis, quod Photiniani ac Nestoriani faciunt ; vel divina tantummodo natura invisibilis, quod solent Monophysitae : sed unus est ex utraque et in utraque natura cum visibili tum invisibili ; sic corpus eius mysticum non vera Ecclesia est nisi propter eam rem, quod eius partes conspicuae vim vitamque ducunt ex donis supernaturalibus rebusque ceteris, unde propria ipsarum ratio ac natura efflorescit. Cum autem Ecclesia sit *eiusmodi* voluntate et constitutione divina, permanere sine ulla intermissione debet *eiusmodi* in aeternitate temporum : ni permaneret, profecto nec esset condita ad perennitatem, et finis ipse, quo illa contendit, locorum esset temporumque certo spatio definitus : quod cum veritate utrumque pugnat. Istam igitur et visibilium et invisibilium conjunctionem rerum, quia naturalis atque insita in Ecclesia nutu divino inest, tamdiu permanere necesse est, quamdiu ipsa permansura Ecclesia. Quare Chrysostomus : *Ab Ecclesia ne abstineas : nihil enim fortius Ecclesia. Spes tua Ecclesia, salus tua Ecclesia, refugium tuum Ecclesia. Caelo excelsior et terra latior est illa. Numquam senescit, sed semper viget. Quamobrem eius firmitatem stabilitatemque demonstrans, Scriptura montem illam vocat.*[1] Augustinus vero : *Putant* (gentiles) *religionem nominis christiani ad certum tempus in hoc saeculo victuram, et postea non futuram. Permanebit ergo cum sole, quamdiu sol oritur et occidit ; hoc est quamdiu tempora ista volvuntur, non deerit Ecclesia Dei, id est Christi corpus in terris.*[2] Idemque alibi : *Nutabit Ecclesia, si nutaverit fundamentum : sed unde nutabit Christus ? . . . Non nutante Christo, non inclinabitur in saeculum saeculi. Ubi sunt qui dicunt, periisse de mundo Ecclesiam, quando nec inclinari potest ?*[3]

His velut fundamentis utendum veritatem quaerenti. Scilicet Ecclesiam instituit formavitque Christus Dominus : propterea natura illius cum quaeritur cuiusmodi sit, caput est nosse quid Christus voluerit quidque reapse effecerit. Ad hanc regulam exigenda maxime Ecclesiae unitas est, de qua visum est communis utilitatis caussa, nonnihil his litteris attingere.

Profecto unam esse Iesu Christi germanam Ecclesiam, ex luculento ac multiplici sacrarum litterarum testimonio, sic constat inter omnes, ut contradicere christianus nemo ausit. Verum in diiudicanda statuendaque natura unitatis, multos varius error de via deflectit. Ecclesiae quidem non solum ortus sed tota constitutio ad rerum voluntate libera effectarum pertinet genus :

[1] Hom., *De capto Eutropio*, n. 6.
[2] *In Psal. lxxi.*, n. 8.
[3] *Enarratio in Psal. ciii.*, sermo ii., n. 5.

quocirca ad id quod revera gestum est, iudicatio est omnis revocanda, exquirendumque non sane quo pacto una esse Ecclesia queat, sed quo unam esse is voluit, qui condidit.

Iamvero, si ad id respicitur quod gestum est, Ecclesiam Iesus Christus non talem finxit formavitque, quae communitates plures complecteretur genere similes, sed distinctas, neque iis vinculis alligatas, quae Ecclesiam individuam atque unicam efficerent, eo plane modo, quo *Credo unam . . . Ecclesiam* in symbolo fidei profitemur. *In unius naturae sortem cooptatur Ecclesia quae est una, quam conantur haereses in multas discindere. Et essentia ergo et opinione, et principio et excellentia unicam esse dicimus antiquam et catholicam Ecclesiam . . . Ceterum Ecclesiae quoque eminentia, sicut principium constructionis, est ex unitate, omnia alia superans, et nihil habens sibi simile vel aequale.*[1] Sane Iesus Christus de aedificio eiusmodi mystico cum loqueretur, Ecclesiam non commemorat nisi unam, quam appellat *suam: aedificabo Ecclesiam meam.* Quaecumque, praeter hanc, cogitetur alia, cum non sit per Iesum Christum condita, Ecclesia Christi vera esse non potest. Quod eminet etiam magis, si divini auctoris propositum consideretur. Quid enim in condita condendave Ecclesia petiit, quid voluit Christus Dominus? Hoc scilicet; munus idem, idemque mandatum in eam continuandum transmittere, quod ipse acceperat a Patre. Id plane statuerat faciendum, idque re effecit. *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.*[2] *Sicut tu me misisti in mundum, et ego misi eos in mundum.*[3] Iamvero Christi muneris est vindicare ab interitu ad salutem *quod perierat*, hoc est non aliquot gentes aut civitates, sed omnino hominum, nullo locorum temporumve discrimine, universum genus: venit *Filius hominis . . . ut salvetur mundus per ipsum.*[4] *Nec enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri.*[5] Itaque partam per Iesum Christum salutem, simulque beneficia omnia quae inde proficiscuntur, late fundere in omnes homines atque ad omnes propagare aetates debet Ecclesia. Quocirca ex voluntate auctoris sui unicam in omnibus terris, in perpetuitate temporum, esse necesse est. Plane plus una ut esse posset, excedere terris et genus hominum fingere novum atque inauditum oporteret.

Hoc ipsum de Ecclesia una, quotquot essent ubique et quovis tempore mortales complexura, vidit ac praesignificavit Isaias, cum futura prospicienti, obiecta species montis est, celsitudinis exsuperantia conspicui, qui imaginem *Domus Domini*, videlicet Ecclesiae, expressam gerebat: *Et erit in novissimis diebus praeparatus mons domus Domini in vertice montium.*[6] Atqui *unus* iste mons est, in vertice montium locatus: *una* domus Domini, ad quam *omnes gentes* vivendi normam petiturae aliquando confluerent: *Et fluent ad eam omnes gentes . . . et dicent: venite et ascendamus ad montem Domini, et ad domum Dei Iacob, et docebit nos vias suas, et ambulabimus in semitis eius.*[7] Quem locum cum Optatus Milevitanus attingeret, *Scriptum est*, inquit, *in Isaia propheta: ex Sion prodiet lex, et verbum Domini de Hierusalem. Non ergo in illo monte Sion Isaias aspicit vallem, sed in monte sancto, qui est Ecclesia, qui per omnem orbem romanum caput tulit sub toto caelo. . . . Est ergo spiritalis Sion Ecclesia, in qua a Deo Patre*

[1] Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromatum* lib. vii. cap. 17.
[2] Ioan. xx. 21. [3] Ioan. xvii. 18. [4] Ioan., iii. 17.
[5] Act. iv. 12. [6] Isaias ii. 2. [7] *Ibid.*, 2-3.

rex constitutus est Christus, quae est in toto orbe terrarum, in quo est una Ecclesia catholica.[1] Augustinus vero: *Quid tam manifestum quam mons? Sed sunt et montes ignoti, quia in una parte terrarum positi sunt . . . Ille autem mons non sic, quia implevit universam faciem terrae: et de illo dicitur; paratus in cacumine montium.*[2] Illud accedit, quod Ecclesiam Filius Dei mysticum corpus suum decrevit fore, quocum ipse velut caput coniungeretur, ad similitudinem corporis humani quod susceptit: cui quidem naturali conglutinatione inhaeret naturale caput. Sicut igitur mortale corpus sibi sumpsit unicum, quod obtulit ad cruciatus et necem, ut liberationis humanae pretium exsolveret, sic pariter unum habet corpus mysticum, in quo et cuius ipsius opera facit sanctitatis salutisque aeternae homines compotes: *Ipsum* (Christum) *dedit* (Deus) *caput supra omnem Ecclesiam, quae est corpus ipsius.*[3] Dispersa membra atque seiuncta non possunt eodem cum capite, unum simul effectura corpus, cohaerere. Atqui Paulus, *Omnia autem*, inquit, *membra corporis cum sint multa, unum tamen corpus sunt: ita et Christus.*[4] Propterea corpus istud mysticum *compactum* ait esse *et connexum. Caput Christus: ex quo totum corpus compactum, et connexum per omnem iuncturam subministrationis, secundum operationem in mensuram uniuscuiusque membri.*[5] Quamobrem dispersa a membris ceteris siqua membra vagantur, cum eodem atque unico capite conglutinata esse nequeunt: *Unus Deus est, et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia eius et fides una et plebs una in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae glutino copulata. Scindi unitas non potest, nec corpus unum discidio compaginis separari.*[6] Quo melius Ecclesiam effingat unicam, similitudinem animati corporis informat, cuius non aliter victura membra sunt, nisi colligata cum capite, vim ad se vitalem ex capite ipso traducant: seiuncta, necesse est emori: *Non potest* (Ecclesia). . . *divulsis laceratione visceribus in frusta discerpi. Quidquid a matrice discesserit, seorsum vivere et spirare non poterit.*[7] Mortuum vero corpus quid habet cum vivo similitudinis? *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit: sed nutrit, et fovet eam, sicut et Christus Ecclesiam: quia membra sumus corporis eius, de carne eius et de ossibus eius.*[8] Aliud igitur simile Christo incohetur caput, alius Christus, si praeter eam, quae corpus eius est, fingi Ecclesiam alteram libeat. *Videte quid caveatis, videte quid observetis, videte quid timeatis. Contingit, ut in corpore humano, imo de corpore aliquod praecidatur membrum, manus, digitus, pes: numquid praecisum sequitur anima? Cum in corpore esset, vivebat: praecisum amittit vitam. Sic et homo christianus catholicus est, dum in corpore vivit: praecisus, haereticus factus est: membrum amputatum non sequitur spiritus.*[9] Est igitur Ecclesia Christi unica et perpetua: quicumque seorsum eant, aberrant a voluntate et praescriptione Christi Domini, relictoque salutis itinere, ad interitum digrediuntur. *Quisquis ab Ecclesia segregatus adulterae iungitur, a promissis Ecclesiae separatur, nec perveniet ad Christi praemia qui reliquit Ecclesiam Christi . . . Hanc unitatem qui non tenet, non tenet Dei legem, non tenet Patris et Filii fidem, vitam non tenet et salutem.*[10]

[1] *De Schism. Donatist.*, lib. iii. n. 2.
[2] *In Epist. Ioan.*, tract. i., n. 13.
[3] Ephes. i. 22-23.
[4] 1 Corinth. xii. 12.
[5] Ephes. iv. 15-16.
[6] S. Cyprianus, *De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 23.
[7] Ibid. *loc. cit.*
[8] Ephes. v. 29-30.
[9] S. Augustinus, sermo celxvii., n. 4.
[10] S. Cyprianus, *De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 6.

At vero qui unicam condidit, is idem condidit *unam*: videlicet eiusmodi, ut quotquot in ipsa futuri essent, arctissimis vinculis sociati tenerentur, ita prorsus ut unam gentem, unum regnum, corpus unum efficerent: *Unum corpus, et unus spiritus sicut vocati estis in una spe vocationis vestrae.*[1] Voluntatem hac de re suam Iesus Christus sanxit, propinqua iam morte, augusteque consecravit, ita Patrem adprecatus: *Non pro eis rogo tantum, sed et pro eis, qui credituri sunt per verbum eorum in me . . . ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint . . . ut sint consummati in unum.*[2] Imo tam intime nexam iussit esse in sectatoribus suis unitatem tamque perfectam, ut coniunctionem cum Patre suam ratione aliqua imitaretur: *Rogo . . . ut omnes unum sint, sicut, tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te.*[3] Tantae autem inter homines ac tam absolutae concordiae necessarium fundamentum est convenientia coniunctioque mentium: ex quo conspiratio voluntatum atque agendorum similitudo naturâ gignitur. Quamobrem, pro sui divinitate consilii, *unitatem fidei* in Ecclesia sua iussit esse: quae quidem virtus primum est in vinculis iis quae hominem iungunt Deo, et inde nomen *fideles* accepimus. *Unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma*:[4] videlicet sicut unus Dominus, et baptisma unum, ita omnium christianorum, qui ubique sunt, unam esse fidem oportet. Itaque Paulus Apostolus christianos, ut idem sentiant omnes, effugiantque opinionum dissidia non rogat tantum, sed flagitat ac plane obsecrat: *Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per nomen Domini nostri Iesu Christi: ut idipsum dicatis omnes et non sint in vobis schismata: sitis autem perfecti in eodem sensu, et in eadem sententia.*[5] Quae loca sane non indigent interprete: satis enim per se loquuntur ipsa. Ceteroqui unam esse fidem debere, qui se profitentur christianos, vulgo assentiuntur. Illud potius maximi momenti ac prorsus necessarium, in quo multi errore falluntur, internoscere quae sit istius species et forma unitatis. Quod ipsum, ut supra fecimus in caussa simili, non opinatione aut coniectura est, sed scientia rei gestae iudicandum: quaerendo scilicet statuendoque qualem in fide unitatem Iesus Christus esse praeceperit.

Iesu Christi doctrina caelestis, tametsi magnam partem consignata litteris affatu divino, colligare tamen mentes, permissa hominum ingenio, ipsa non poterat. Erat enim proclive factu ut in varias incideret atque inter se differentes interpretationes: idque non modo propter ipsius vim ac mysteria doctrinae, sed etiam propter humani ingenii varietatem, et perturbationem in studia contraria abeuntium cupiditatum. Ex differentia interpretandi dissimilitudines sentiendi necessitate nascuntur: hinc controversiae, dissidia, contentiones, qualia incumbere in Ecclesiam ipsa vidit proxima originibus aetas. De haereticis illud scribit Irenaeus: *Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt.*[6] Atque Augustinus: *Neque enim natae sunt haereses et quaedam dogmata perversitatis illaqueantia animas et in profundum praecipitantia, nisi dum scripturae bonae intelliguntur non bene.*[7] Ad coniugandas igitur mentes, ad efficiendam tuendamque concordiam sententiarum, ut ut extarent divinae litterae, omnino erat alio quodam *principio* opus. Id exigit divina sapientia: neque enim Deus unam esse fidem velle potuit, nisi conservandae unitatis rationem quamdam idoneam providisset:

[1] Ephes. iv. 4.
[2] Ioan. xvii. 20-21-23.
[3] *Ibid.*, 21.
[4] Ephes. iv. 5.
[5] 1 Corinth. i. 10.
[6] Lib. iii. cap. 12, n. 12.
[7] *In Evang. Ioan.*, tract. xviii. cap. 5, n. 1.

quod et sacrae litterae perspicue, ut mox dicturi sumus, significant. Certe infinita Dei potentia nulli est vincta vel adstricta rei, omniaque sibi habet obnoxie, velut instrumenta, parentia. De isto igitur principio externo, dispiciendum, quodnam ex omnibus, quae essent in potestate sua, Christus optarit. Quam ob rem oportet christiani nominis revocare cogitatione primordia.

Divinis testata litteris, eademque vulgo cognita commemoramus. Iesus Christus divinitatem divinamque legationem suam miraculorum virtute comprobat: erudire verbo multitudinem ad caelestia insistit, omninoque iubet ut sibi fides docenti adiungatur, hinc praemiis illinc poenis propositis sempiternis: *Si non facio opera Patris mei, nolite credere mihi.*[1] *Si opera non fecissem in eis, quae nemo alius fecit, peccatum non haberent.*[2] *Si autem facio* (opera), *et si mihi non vultis credere, operibus credite.*[3] Quaecumque praecipit, eâdem omnia auctoritate praecipit: in exigendo mentis assensu nihil excipit, nihil secernit. Eorum igitur qui Iesum audissent, si adipisci salutem vellent, officium fuit non modo doctrinam eius accipere universe, sed tota mente assentiri singulis rebus, quas ipse tradidisset: illud enim repugnat, fidem vel una in re non adhiberi Deo.

Maturo in caelum reditu, qua ipse potestate missus a Patre fuerat, eâdem mittit Apostolos, quos spargere ac disseminare iubet doctrinam suam: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra. Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes . . . Docentes eos servare omnia, quaecumque mandavi vobis.*[4] Salvos fore, qui Apostolis paruissent, qui non paruissent, interituros: *Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit: qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur.*[5] Cumque illud sit providentiae Dei maxime congruens, ut muneri praesertim magno atque excellenti praeficiat neminem, quin pariter suppeditet unde liceat rite defungi, idcirco Iesus Christus missurum se ad discipulos suos Spiritum veritatis pollicitus est, eumque in ipsis perpetuo mansurum: *Si autem abiero, mittam eum* (Paraclitum) *ad vos. . . . Cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem.*[6] *Et ego rogabo Patrem, et alium Paraclitum dabit vobis, ut maneat vobiscum in aeternum, Spiritum veritatis. . . .*[7] *Ille testimonium perhibebit de me: et vos testimonium perhibebitis.*[8] Hinc doctrinam Apostolorum religiose accipi sancteque servari perinde imperat ac suam: *Qui vos audit, me audit: qui vos spernit, me spernit.*[9] Quamobrem legati Apostoli a Iesu Christo sunt non secus ac ipse legatus a Patre: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos:*[10] propterea quemadmodum dicto audientes Christo esse Apostolos ac discipulos oportuit, ita pariter fidem adhibere Apostolis debuerant, quoscumque ipsi ex mandato divino docuissent. Ergo Apostolorum vel unum repudiare doctrinae praeceptum plane non plus licuit, quam de ipsius Christi doctrina reiecisse quicquam.—Sane Apostolorum vox, illapso in eos Spiritu sancto, quam latissime insonuit. Quacumque vestigium posuissent, perhibent se ab ipso Iesu legatos. *Per quem* (Iesum Christum) *accepimus gratiam, et apostolatum ad obediendum fidei in omnibus gentibus pro nomine eius:*[11] divinamque eorum legationem passim Deus per prodigia in aperto ponit: *Illi autem*

[1] Ioan. x. 37.
[2] Ioan. xv. 24.
[3] Ioan. x. 38.
[4] Matt. xxviii. 18-19-20.
[5] Marc. xvi. 16.
[6] Ioan. xvi. 7-13.
[7] Ioan. xiv. 16-17.
[8] Ioan. xv. 26-27.
[9] Luc. x. 16.
[10] Ioan. xx. 21.
[11] Rom. i. 5.

profecti praedicaverunt ubique, Domino cooperante, et sermonem confirmante, sequentibus signis.[1] Quem vero sermonem? eum utique, qui id omne comprehenderet, quod ipsi ex magistro didicissent: palam enim aperteque testantur, nihil se eorum posse, quae viderant quaeque audierant, non loqui.

Sed, quod alio loco diximus, non erat eiusmodi munus apostolicum, ut aut cum personis Apostolorum iuterire posset, aut cum tempore labi, quippe quod et publicum esset et saluti generis humani institutum. Apostolis enim mandavit Iesus Christus ut praedicarent *evangelium omni creaturae*, et *portarent nomen ipsius coram gentibus et regibus*, et *ut sibi testes essent usque ad ultimum terrae.* Atque in tanti perfunctione muneris adfore se pollicitus eis est, idque non ad aliquot vel annos vel aetates, sed in omne tempus, *usque ad consummationem saeculi.* Quam ad rem Hieronymus: *Qui usque ad consummationem saeculi cum discipulis se futurum esse promittit, et illos ostendit semper esse victuros et se numquam a credentibus recessurum.*[2] Quae quidem omnia in solis Apostolis, supremae necessitati ex humana conditione obnoxiis, qui vera esse potuissent? Erat igitur provisum divinitus ut magisterium a Iesu Christo institutum non iisdem finibus, quibus vita Apostolorum, terminaretur, sed esset perpetuo mansurum. Propagatum revera ac velut in manus de manu traditum videmus. Nam consecravere episcopos Apostoli, quique sibi proxime succederent in *ministerio verbi*, singillatim designavere.—Neque hoc tantum: illud quoque sanxere in successoribus suis, ut et ipsi viros idoneos adlegerent, quos eadem auctoritate auctos, eidem praeficerent docendi officio et muneri: *Tu ergo, fili mi, confortare in gratia, quae est in Christo Iesu: et quae audisti a me per multos testes, haec commenda fidelibus hominibus, qui idonei erunt et alios docere.*[3] Qua de caussa sicut Christus a Deo, et Apostoli a Christo, sic episcopi et quotquot Apostolis successere, missi ab Apostolis sunt: *Apostoli nobis Evangelii praedicatores facti sunt a Domino Iesu Christo, Iesus Christus missus est a Deo. Christus igitur a Deo, et Apostoli a Christo, et factum est utrumque ordinatim ex voluntate Dei . . . Per regiones igitur et urbes verbum praedicantes, primitias earum spiritu cum probassent, constituerunt episcopos et diaconos eorum qui crediturі erant. . . . Constituerunt praedictos, et deinceps ordinationem dederunt, ut quum illi decessissent, ministerium eorum alii viri probati exciperent.*[4] Permanere igitur necesse est ex una parte constans atque immutabile munus docendi omnia, quae Christus docuerat: ex altera constans atque immutabile officium accipiendi profitendique omnem illorum doctrinam. Quod praeclare Cyprianus iis verbis illustrat: *Neque enim Dominus noster Iesus Christus, cum in Evangelio suo testaretur inimicos suos esse eos, qui secum non essent, aliquam speciem haereseos designavit: sed omnes omnino qui secum non essent et secum non colligentes, gregem suum spargerent, adversarios esse ostendit, dicens: Qui non est mecum adversus me est; et qui non mecum colligit, spargit.*[5]

His Ecclesia praeceptis instituta, sui memor officii, nihil egit studio et

[1] Marc. xvi. 20.
[2] *In Matt.*, lib. iv. cap. 28, v. 20.
[3] 2 Tim. ii. 1-2.
[4] S. Clemens Rom., Epist. i. ad Corinth., capp. 42, 44.
[5] Epist. lxix. ad Magnum, n. 1.

contentione maiore, quam ut integritatem fidei omni ex parte tueretur. Hinc perduellium habere loco et procul amandare, a se, qui de quolibet doctrinae suae capite non secum una sentirent. Ariani, Montanistae, Novatiani Quartadecumani, Eutychiani certe doctrinam catholicam non penitus omnem, sed partem aliquam deseruerant: haereticos tamen declaratos, electosque ex Ecclesiae sinu quis ignorat fuisse? Similique iudicio damnati, quotquot pravorum dogmatum auctores variis temporibus postea consecuti sunt. *Nihil periculosius his haereticis esse potest, qui cum integre per omnia decurrant, uno tamen verbo, ac si veneni gutta, meram illam ac simplicem fidem Dominicae et exinde apostolicae traditionis inficiunt.*[1] Idem semper Ecclesia mos, idque sanctorum Patrum consentiente iudicio: qui scilicet communionis catholicae expertem et ab Ecclesia extorrem habere consueverunt, quicumque a doctrina, authentico magisterio proposita, vel minimum discessisset. Epiphanius, Augustinus, Theodoretus haereseon sui quisque temporis magnum recensuere numerum. Alia Augustinus animadvertit posse genera invalescere, quorum vel uni si quis assentiatur, hoc ipso ab unitate catholica seiungitur: *Non omnis, qui ista* (numeratas videlicet haereses) *non credit, consequenter debet se christianum catholicum iam putare vel dicere. Possunt enim et haereses aliae, quae in hoc opere nostro commemoratae non sunt, vel esse vel fieri, quarum aliquam quisquis tenuerit, christianus catholicus non erit.*[2]

Istam tutandae unitati, de qua dicimus, institutam divinitus rationem urget beatus Paulus in epistola ad Ephesios; ubi primum monet, animorum concordiam magno studio conservandam: *solliciti servare unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis*:[3] cumque concordes animi caritate esse omni ex parte non possint, nisi mentes de fide consentiant, unam apud omnes vult esse fidem: *Unus Dominus, una fides:* ac tam perfecte quidem unam, ut errandi discrimen omne prohibeat: *Ut iam non simus parvuli fluctuantes, et circumferamur omni vento doctrinae in nequitia hominum, in astutia ad circumventionem erroris.* Idque non ad tempus servari docet oportere, sed *donec occurramus omnes in unitatem fidei . . . in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi.* Sed eiusmodi unitatis ubinam Iesus Christus posuit principium inchoandae, praesidium custodiendae? In eo videlicet, quod, *Ipse dedit quosdam quidem Apostolos . . . alios autem pastores, et doctores, ad consummationem sanctorum in opus ministerii, in aedificationem corporis Christi.* Quare vel inde ab ultima vetustate hanc ipsam regulam doctores Patresque et sequi consueverunt et uno ore defendere. Origenes: *Quoties autem* (haeretici) *canonicas proferunt scripturas, in quibus omnis christianus consentit et credit, videntur dicere: ecce in domibus verbum est veritatis. Sed nos illis credere non debemus, nec exire a prima et ecclesiastica traditione, nec aliter credere, nisi quemadmodum per successionem Ecclesiae Dei tradiderunt nobis.*[4] Irenaeus: *Agnitio vera est Apostolorum doctrina . . . secundum successiones episcoporum . . . quae pervenit usque ad nos custoditione sine fictione scripturarum tractatio plenissima.*[5] Tertullianus vero: *Constat proinde, omnem doctrinam, quae cum illis Ecclesiis apostolicis matricibus et originali-*

[1] Auctor *Tractatus de Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos.*
[2] *De Haeresibus*, n. 88. [3] IV. 3 *et seq.*
[4] *Vetus Interpretatio Commentariorum in Matth.*, n. 46.
[5] *Contra Haereses*, lib. iv. cap. 33, n. 8.

bus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam, sine dubio tenentem quod Ecclesiae ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit . . . Communicamus cum Ecclesiis apostolicis, quod nulli doctrina diversa: hoc est testimonium veritatis.[1] Atque Hilarius: *Significat* (Christus e navi docens) *eos, qui extra Ecclesiam positi sunt, nullam divini sermonis capere posse intelligentiam. Navis enim Ecclesiae typum praefert, intra quam verbum vitae positum et praedicatum hi qui extra sunt et arenae modo steriles atque inutiles adiacent, intelligere non possunt.*[2] Rufinus Gregorium Nazianzenum laudat et Basilium, quod *solis divinae scripturae voluminibus operam dabant, earumque intelligentiam non ex propria praesumptione, sed ex maiorum scriptis et auctoritate sequebantur, quos et ipsos ex apostolica successione intelligendi regulam susceptisse constabat.*[3]

Quamobrem, id quod ex iis, quae dicta sunt, apparet, instituit Iesus Christus in Ecclesia *vivum, authenticum*, idemque *perenne magisterium*, quod suapte potestate auxit, spiritu veritatis instruxit, miraculis confirmavit: eiusque praecepta doctrinae aeque accipi ac sua voluit gravissimeque imperavit.—Quoties igitur huius verbo magisterii edicitur, traditae divinitus doctrinae complexu hoc contineri vel illud, id quisque debet certo credere, verum esse: si falsum esse ullo modo posset, illud consequatur, quod aperte repugnat, erroris in homine ipsum esse auctorem Deum: *Domine, si error est, a te decepti sumus.*[4] Ita omni amota dubitandi caussâ, ullamne ex iis veritatibus potest cuiquam fas esse respuere, quin se det hoc ipso praecipitem in apertam haeresim? quin, seiunctus ab Ecclesia, doctrinam christianam una complexione repudiet universam? Ea quippe est natura fidei, ut nihil tam repugnet quam ista credere, illa reiicere. Fidem enim Ecclesia profitetur esse *virtutem supernaturalem, qua, Dei adiuvante et aspirante gratia, ab eo revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsecam rerum veritatem naturali rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis, qui nec falli nec fallere potest.*[5] Si quid igitur traditum a Deo liqueat fuisse, nec tamen creditur, nihil omnino fide divina creditur. Quod enim Iacobus Apostolus de delicto indicat in genere morum, idem de opinionis errore in genere fidei iudicandum: *Quicumque . . . offendat . . . in uno, factus est omnium reus:*[6] imo de opinionis errore, multo magis. Omnis enim violata lex minus proprie de eo dicitur qui unum peccavit, propterea quod maiestatem Dei legum latoris sprevisse, non nisi interpretanda voluntate, videri potest. Contra is, qui veritatibus divinitus acceptis vel uno in capite dissentiat, verissime fidem exuit funditus, quippe qui Deum, quatenus summa veritas est et *proprium motivum fidei*, recusat vereri: *In multis mecum, in paucis non mecum: sed in his paucis, in quibus non mecum, non eis prosunt multa, in quibus mecum.*[7] Ac sane merito: qui enim sumunt de doctrina christiana, quod malunt, ii iudicio suo nituntur, non fide: iidemque minime *in captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi*,[8] sibimetipsis verius obtemperant, quam Deo: *Qui in Evangelio quod vultis, creditis; quod vultis, non creditis, vobis potius quam Evangelio creditis.*[9]

[1] *De Prescrip.*, cap. xxi.
[2] *Comment. in Matth.*, xiii., n. 1.
[3] *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. ii. cap. 9.
[4] Richardus de S. Victore, *De Trin.*, lib. i., cap. 2.
[5] Conc. Vat. sess. iii., cap. 3.
[6] II. 10.
[7] S. Augustinus, *in Psal. liv.*, n. 19.
[8] 2 Corinth. x. 5.
[9] S. Augustinus, lib. xvii. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, cap. 3.

Quocirca nihil Patres in Concilio Vaticano condidere novi, sed institutum divinum, veterem atque constantem Ecclesiae doctrinam, ipsamque fidei naturam sequuti sunt, cum illud decrevere : *Fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesia sive solemni iudicio, sive ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata proponuntur.*[1] Itaque cum appareat, omnino in Ecclesia sua velle Deum unitatem fidei, compertumque sit cuiusmodi eam esse, et quo principio tuendam ipse iusserit, liceat Nobis, quotquot sunt qui non animum induxerint aures veritati claudere, iis Augustini verbis affari : *Cum igitur tantum auxilium Dei, tantum profectum fructumque videamus, dubitabimus nos eius Ecclesiae condere gremio, quae usque ad confessionem generis humani ab apostolica Sede per successiones episcoporum, frustra haereticis circumlatrantibus, et partim plebis ipsius iudicio, partim Conciliorum gravitate, partim etiam miraculorum maiestate damnatis, culmen auctoritatis obtinuit? Cui nolle primas dare, vel summae profecto impietatis est, vel praecipitis arrogantiae . . . Et si unaquaeque disciplina, quamquam vilis et facilis, ut percipi possit, doctorem aut magistrum requirit : quid temerariae superbiae plenius, quam divinorum sacramentorum libros et ab interpretibus suis nolle cognoscere, et incognitos velle damnare?*[2]

Hoc igitur sine ulla dubitatione est officium Ecclesiae, christianam doctrinam tueri eamque propagare integram atque incorruptam. Sed nequaquam in isto sunt omnia : imo ne finis quidem, cuius caussâ est Ecclesia instituta, officio isto concluditur. Quandoquidem, ut Iesus Christus pro salute humani generis se ipse devovit, atque huc, quae docuisset quaeque praecepisset, omnia retulit, sic iussit Ecclesiam quaerere in veritate doctrinae, quo homines cum sanctos efficeret, tum salvos.—Verum tanti magnitudinem atque excellentiam propositi consequi sola fides nullo modo potest : adhiberi necesse est cum Dei cultum iustum ac pium, qui maxime sacrificio divino et sacramentorum communicatione continetur, tum etiam sanctitatem legum ac disciplinae.—Ista igitur omnia inesse in Ecclesia oportet, quippe quae Servatoris munia in aevum persequitur : religionem, quam in ea velut *incorporari* ille voluit, mortalium generi omni ex parte absolutam sola praestat : itemque ea, quae ex ordinario providentiae consilio sunt instrumenta salutis, sola suppeditat.

At vero quo modo doctrina caelestis nunquam fuit privatorum arbitrio ingeniove permissa, sed principio a Iesu tradita, deinceps ei separatim, de quo dictum est, commendata magisterio : sic etiam non singulis e populo christiano, verum delectis quibusdam data divinitus facultas est perficiendi atque administrandi divina mysteria, unâ cum regendi gubernandique potestate. Neque enim nisi ad Apostolos legitimosque eorum successores ea pertinent a Iesu Christo dicta : *Euntes in mundum universum, praedicate Evangelium. . . baptizantes eos . . . Hoc facite in meam commemorationem . . . Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis.* Similique ratione non nisi Apostolis, quique eis iure successissent, mandavit ut *pascerent*, hoc est cum potestate regerent universitatem christianorum, quos hoc ipso eis subesse debere atque obtemperare est consequens. Quae quidem officia apostolici muneris omnia generatim Pauli sententia complectitur : *Sic*

[1] Sess. iii. cap. 3.
[2] *De Utilitate Credendi*, cap. xvii., n. 35.

nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi, et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei.[1]

Quapropter mortales Iesus Christus, quotquot essent, et quotquot essent futuri, universos advocavit, ut ducem se eumdemque servatorem sequerentur, non tantum seorsum singuli, sed etiam consociati atque invicem re animisque iuncti, ut ex multitudine populus existeret iure sociatus ; fidei, finis, rerum ad finem idonearum communione unus, uni eidemque subiectus potestati. Quo ipse facto principia naturae, quae in hominibus societatem sponte gignunt, perfectionem naturae consentaneam adepturis, omnia in Ecclesia posuit, nimirum ut in ea, quotquot filii Dei esse adoptione volunt, perfectionem dignitati suae congruentem assequi et retinere ad salutem possent. Ecclesia igitur, id quod alias attigimus, dux hominibus est ad caelestia, eidemque hoc est munus assignatum a Deo ut de iis, quae religionem attingunt, videat ipsa et statuat, et rem christianam libere expediteque iudicio suo administret. Quocirca Ecclesiam aut non recte norunt aut inique criminantur qui eam insimulant, velle se in civitatum rationes inferre, aut in iura potentatus invadere. Imo Deus perfecit, ut Ecclesia esset omnium societatum longe praestantissima : nam quod petit ipsa tanquam finem, tanto nobilius est quam quod ceterae petunt societates, quanto naturâ gratia divina, rebusque caducis immortalia sunt praestabiliora bona.—Ergo Ecclesia societas est ortu *divina* : fine, rebusque fini proxime admoventibus, *supernaturalis* : quod vero coalescit hominibus, *humana* communitas est. Ideoque in sacris litteris passim videmus vocabulis societatis perfectae nuncupatam. Nominatur enim non modo *Domus Dei*, *Civitas supra montem posita*, quo convenire gentes omnes necesse est : sed etiam *Ovile*, cui praesit pastor unus, et quo recipere se oves Christi omnes debent : imo *Regnum quod suscitavit Deus*, quodque *stabit in aeternum* : denique *Corpus* Christi, *mysticum* illud quidem, sed tamen vivum apteque compositum, multisque conflatum membris ; quae membra non eumdem actum habent : copulata vero inter se, gubernante ac moderante capite, continentur. Iamvero nulla hominum cogitari potest vera ac perfecta societas, quin potestate aliqua summa regatur. Debet igitur Iesus Christus magistratum Ecclesiae maximum praefecisse, cui obediens ac subiecta omnis esset christianorum multitudo. Qua de caussâ sicut ad unitatem Ecclesiae, quatenus est *coetus fidelium*, necessario unitas fidei requiritur, ita ad ipsius unitatem, quatenus est divinitus constituta, societas requiritur iure divino *unitas regiminis*, quae *unitatem communionis* efficit et complectitur : *Ecclesiae autem unitas in duobus attenditur : scilicet in connexione membrorum Ecclesiae ad invicem seu communicatione, et iterum in ordine omnium membrorum Ecclesiae ad unum caput.*[2]—Ex quo intelligi licet, excidere homines ab Ecclesiae unitate non minus schismate, quam haeresi : *Inter haeresim et schisma hoc esse arbitrantur, quod haeresis perversum dogma habeat : schisma propter episcopalem dissensionem ab Ecclesia separetur.*[3] Quibuscum illa Ioannis Chrysostomi in eamdem rem sententia concordat : *Dico et protestor, Ecclesiam scindere non minus esse malum, quam incidere in haeresim.*[4] Quamobrem si nulla potest esse honesta haeresis, pari ratione schisma nullum est, quod possit iure factum videri :

[1] 1 Corinth. iv. 1. [2] S. Thomas, 2ª 2ae, q. xxxix, a. 1.
[3] S. Hieronymus, *Commentar. in Epist. ad Titum*, cap. iii., v. 10-11.
[4] Hom. xi. *in Epist. ad Ephes.*, n. 5.

Non est quicquam gravius sacrilegio schismatis . . . praecidendae unitatis nulla est iusta necessitas.[1]

Quae vero et cuiusmodi summa ista potestas sit, cui christianos parere oportet universos, non aliter nisi comperta cognitaque voluntate Christi statuendum. Certe in aeternum rex Christus est, itemque moderari in aeternum tuerique regnum suum e caelo non visus perseverat: sed quia conspicuum illud esse voluit, designare debuit qui gereret in terris vices suas, postea quam ipse ad caelestia rediisset: *Si quis autem dicat quod unum caput et unus pastor est Christus, qui est unus unius Ecclesiae sponsus, non sufficienter respondet. Manifestum est enim, quod ecclesiastica sacramenta ipse Christus perficit: ipse enim est qui baptizat, ipse est qui peccata remittit, ipse est verus sacerdos, qui se obtulit in ara crucis, et cuius virtute corpus eius in altari quotidie consecratur; et tamen quia corporaliter non cum omnibus fidelibus praesentialiter erat futurus, elegit ministros, per quos praedicta fidelibus dispensaret, ut supra* (*cap.* 74) *dictum est. Eadem igitur ratione, quia praesentium corporalem erat Ecclesiae subtracturus, oportuit ut alicui committeret qui loco sui universalis Ecclesiae gereret curam. Hinc est quod Petro dixit ante ascensionem: Pasce oves meas.*[2] Iesus Christus igitur summum rectorem Ecclesiae Petrum dedit, idemque sanxit ut eiusmodi magistratus saluti communi ad perennitatem institutus, ad successores hereditate transferretur, in quibus Petrus ipse esset auctoritate perpetua superstes. Sane insigne illud promissum beato Petro fecit, praeterea nemini: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam.*[3]—*Ad Petrum locutus est Dominus: ad unum, ideo ut unitatem fundaret ex uno.*[4]—*Nulla siquidem oratione praemissa . . . tam patrem eius, quam ipsum nomine appellat* (beatus es Simon Bar Iona), *et Simonem cum non iam vocari patitur, cum sibi pro sua potestate iam tum ut suum vindicans, sed congrua similitudine Petrum a petra vocari placuit, puta super quem fundaturus erat suam Ecclesiam.*[5] Quo ex oraculo liquet, Dei voluntate iussuque Ecclesiam in beato Petro, velut aedes in fundamento consistere. Atqui fundamenti propria natura et vis est, ut cohaerentes efficiat aedes variorum coagmentatione membrorum, itemque ut operi sit necessarium vinculum incolumitatis ac firmitudinis: quo sublato, omnis aedificatio collabitur. Igitur Petri est sustinere Ecclesiam tuerique non solubili compage connexam ac firmam. Tantum vero explere munus qui possit sine potestate iubendi, vetandi, iudicandi, quae vere proprieque *iurisdictio* dicitur? Profecto non nisi potestate iurisdictionis stant civitates resque publicae. Principatus honoris ac pertenuis illa consulendi monendique facultas, quam *directionem* vocant, nulli hominum societati admodum prodesse neque ad unitatem neque ad firmitudinem queunt. Atque hanc, de qua loquimur, potestatem illa declarant et confirmant: *Et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam.—Quam autem eam? an enim petram supra quam Christus aedificat Ecclesiam? an Ecclesiam? Ambigua quippe locutio est: an quasi unam eamdemque rem, petram et Ecclesiam? Hoc ego verum esse existimo, nec enim adversus petram, super quam Christus*

[1] S. Augustinus, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, lib. ii., cap. 11, n. 25.
[2] S. Thomas, *Contra Gentiles*, lib. iv., cap. 76.
[3] Matt. xvi. 18.
[4] S. Pacianus ad Sempronium, epist. iii., n. 11.
[5] S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *in Evang. Ioan.*, lib. ii., in cap. i., v. 42.

Ecclesiam aedificat, nec adversus Ecclesiam portae inferi praevalebunt.[1] Cuius divinae sententiae ea vis est: quamcumque visi invisique hostes vim, quascumque artes adhibuerint, numquam fore ut fulta Petro Ecclesia succumbat, aut quoquo modo deficiat: *Ecclesia vero tamquam Christi aedificium, qui sapienter aedificavit 'domum suam supra petram,' portarum inferi capax non est, praevalentium quidem adversus quemcumque hominem, qui extra petram et Ecclesiam fuerit, sed invalidarum adversus illam.*[2] Ergo Ecclesiam suam Deus idcirco commendavit Petro, ut perpetuo incolumem tutor invictus conservaret. Eum igitur auxit potestate debita: quia societati hominum re et cum effectu tuendae, ius imperii in eo qui tuetur est necessarium. Illud praeterea Iesus adnexuit: *Et tibi dabo claves regni caelorum.* Plane loqui de Ecclesia pergit, quam paullo ante nuncuparat *suam*, quamque ipsam velle se in Petro dixit, tamquam in fundamento, statuere. Expressam non modo *aedificii*, sed etiam *regni* imaginem gerit Ecclesia: ceteroqui insigne usitatum imperii claves esse, nemo nescit. Quapropter *claves regni caelorum* cum Iesus dare Petro pollicetur, potestatem et ius in Ecclesiam pollicetur daturum: *Filius vero et Patris et sui ipsius cognitionem per totum orbem illi (Petro) disseminare commisit, ac mortali homini omnem in caelo potestatem dedit, dum claves illi tradidit, qui Ecclesiam per totum orbem terrarum extendit, et caelis firmiorem monstravit.*[3] Concinunt cetera: *Quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in caelis, et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in caelis.* Ligandi solvendique translata locutio ius ferendarum legum, item iudicandi vindicandique designat potestatem. Quae quidem potestas tantae amplitudinis virtutisque dicitur fore, ut quaelibet decreta eius rata sit habiturus Deus. Itaque summa est planeque sui iuris, quippe quae nullam habet in terris superiorem gradu, Ecclesiamque totam et quae sunt Ecclesiae commissa, universa complectitur.

Promissum exsolvitur, quo tempore Christus Dominus, post anastasim suam, cum ter a Petro, num se diligeret plus quam ceteri, quaesisset, praecipientis in modum ei, *Pasce*, ait, *agnos meos . . . pasce oves meas.*[4] Nimirum quotquot essent in ovili suo futuri, omnes illi velut pastori committit: *Dominus non dubitat, qui interrogat, non ut disceret, sed ut doceret, quem elevandus in caelum amoris sui nobis velut vicarium relinquebat . . . Et ideo quia solus profitetur ex omnibus, omnibus antefertur . . . perfectiores ut perfectior gubernaret.*[5] Illa vero sunt pastoris officia et partes, gregi se praebere ducem, eumdemque sospitare salubritate pabulorum, prohibendo pericula, cavendo insidias, tutando a vi: brevi, regendo gubernando. Cum igitur Petrus est gregi christianorum pastor impositus, potestatem accepit gubernandi omnes homines, quorum saluti Iesus Christus profuso sanguine prospexerat: *Cur sanguinem effudit? Ut has emeret oves, quas Petro et successoribus eius tradidit.*[6]

Quoniamque immutabilis communione fidei christianos omnes oportet esse invicem coniunctos, idcirco suarum virtute precum Christus Dominus impetravit Petro, ut in gerenda potestate numquam fide laberetur: *Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua.*[7] Eidem praeterea mandavit

[1] Origenes, *Comment. in Matth.*, tom xii., n. 11.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] S. Ioannes Chrysostomus, Hom. liv., *in Matth.*, n. 2.
[4] Ioan. xxi., 16-17.
[5] S. Ambrosius, *Exposit. in Evang. secundum Lucam*, lib. x., nn. 175-6.
[6] S. Ioannes Chrysostomus, *De Sacerdotio*, lib. ii.
[7] Luc. xxii., 32.

ut, quoties tempora postularent, ipse impertiret fratribus suis lumen animi et robur: *Confirma fratres tuos.*[1] Quem igitur fundamentum Ecclesiae designarat, eumdem esse vult columen fidei: *Cui propria auctoritate regnum dabat, huius fidem firmare non poterat, quem cum petram dicit, firmamentum Ecclesiae indicavit?*[2] Hinc ipse Iesus certa quaedam nomina, magnarum indicia rerum, quae *sibi potestate sunt propria, voluit esse Petro secum participatione communia*,[3] nimirum ut ex communione titulorum appareret communio potestatis. Ita ipse, qui *lapis est angularis, in quo omnis aedificatio constructa crescit in templum sanctum in Domino.*[4] Petrum velut *lapidem* statuit, quo fulta esse Ecclesia deberet. *Cum audisset 'petra es' praeconio nobilitatus est. Quamquam autem petra est, non ut Christus petra, sed ut Petrus petra. Christus enim essentialiter petra inconcussa; Petrus vero per petram. Nam Iesus dignitates suas largitur, nec exhauritur. . . . Sacerdos est, facit sacerdotes . . . petra est, petram facit.*[5] Rex idem Ecclesiae, *qui habet clavem David: qui aperit et nemo claudit: claudit et nemo aperit*,[6] traditis Petro *clavibus*, principem christianae reipublicae declaravit. Pariter pastor maximus, qui se ipse *pastorem bonum* nuncupat,[7] *agnis atque ovibus suis* pastorem Petrum praeposuit: *Pasce agnos, pasce oves.* Quare Chrysostomus: *Eximius erat inter Apostolos, et os discipulorum et coetus illius caput. . . . Simul ostendens ei, oportere deinceps fidere, quasi abolita negatione, fratrum ei praefecturam committit. . . . Dicit autem: Si amas me, fratribus praecesto.*[8] Demum qui confirmat *in omni opere et sermone bono*,[9] mandavit Petro ut *confirmaret fratres suos.* Iure igitur Leo magnus: *De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi et omnibus Apostolis, cunctisque Ecclesiae patribus praeponatur: ut quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes sint multique pastores, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus.*[10] Itemque Gregorius magnus ad Imperatorem Mauritium Augustum: *Cunctis evangelium scientibus liquet, quod voce dominica sancto et omnium Apostolorum Petro principi apostolo totius Ecclesiae cura commissa est. . . . Ecce claves regni caelestis accepit, potestas ei ligandi ac solvendi tribuitur, et cura ei totius Ecclesiae et principatus committitur.*[11]

Eiusmodi autem principatum, quoniam constitutione ipsa temperationeque Ecclesiae, velut pars praecipua, continetur, videlicet ut principium unitatis ac fundamentum incolumitatis perpetuae, nequaquam cum beato Petro interire, sed recidere in eius successores ex alio in alium oportuit: *Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans, suscepta Ecclesiae gubernacula non reliquit.*[12] Quare Pontifices, qui Petro in episcopatu romano succedunt, supremam Ecclesiae potestatem obtinent iure divino. *Definimus, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium totiusque Ecclesiae caput, et omnium christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a*

[1] Luc. xxii. 32.
[2] S. Ambrosius, *De Fide*, lib. iv., n. 56.
[3] S. Leo M., sermo iv., cap. 2.
[4] Ephes. ii. 21.
[5] Hom. *de Poenitentia*, n. 4 in Appendice opp. S. Basilii.
[6] Apoc. iii. 7.
[7] Ioan. x. 11.
[8] Hom. lxxxviii. *in Ioan.*, n. i.
[9] 2 Thessalon. ii. 16.
[10] Sermo iv., cap. ii.
[11] *Epistolarum*, lib. v., epist. xx.
[12] S. Leo M., sermo iii., cap. 3.

Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.[1] Similiter Concilium Lateranense IV.: *Romana Ecclesia . . . disponente Domino, super omnes alias ordinariae potestatis obtinet principatum, utpote mater universorum Christifidelium et magistra.* Antecesserat consensus antiquitatis, quae episcopos romanos sine ulla dubitatione sic semper observavit et coluit ut beati Petri legitimos successores. Quem vero lateat quot in eamdem rem extent et quam luculenta sanctorum patrum testimonia? Illud valde praeclarum Irenaei qui cum de Ecclesia romana dissereret, *ad hanc enim*, inquit, *Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.*[2] Ac Cyprianus itidem de Ecclesia romana affirmat, eam esse *Ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem*,[3] *Petri Cathedram atque Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*[4] *Cathedram* Petri appellat quippe quam insidet Petri successor: *Ecclesiam principalem* ob principatum Petro ipsi et legitimis successoribus collatum: *unde unitas exorta*, quia in christiana republica caussa efficiens unitatis est Ecclesia romana. Quare Hieronymus iis verbis Damasum affatur: *Cum successore piscatoris et discipulo crucis loquor. . . . Beatitudini tuae, id est Cathedrae Petri communione consocior. Super illam petram aedificatam Ecclesiam scio.*[5] Sollemne illi est, catholicum hominem ex coniunctione cum romana Petri sede internoscere: *Si quis Cathedrae Petri iungitur, meus est.*[6] Neque absimili ratione Augustinus, palam testatus, *in romana Ecclesia semper Apostolicae cathedrae viguisse principatum*,[7] negat esse catholicum quicumque a fide romana dissentiat: *Non crederis veram fidem tenere catholicam, qui fidem non doces esse servandam romanam.*[8] Item Cyprianus: Communicare cum Cornelio, *hoc est cum catholica Ecclesia communicare.*[9] Similiter Maximus Abbas hanc verae fidei veraeque communionis notam esse docet, subesse Pontifici romano: *Itaque si vult haereticus non esse neque audire, non isti aut illi satisfaciat. . . . Festinet pro omnibus sedi romanae satisfacere. Hac enim satisfacta, communiter ubique omnes pium hunc et orthodoxum praedicabunt. Nam frustra solummodo loquitur, qui mihi similes suadendos putat, et non satisfacit et implorat sanctissimae romanorum Ecclesiae beatissimum Papam, id est Apostolicam Sedem.* Cuius rei caussam rationemque in eo affirmat residere, quod *ab ipso incarnato Dei Verbo, sed et omnibus sanctis synodis, secundum sacros canones et terminos, universarum quae in toto terrarum orbe sunt sanctarum Dei Ecclesiarum in omnibus et per omnia percepit et habet imperium, auctoritatem et potestatem ligandi et solvendi. Cum hoc enim ligat et solvit, etiam in caelo Verbum, quod caelestibus virtutibus principatur.*[10] Quod igitur erat in fide christiana, quod non una gens, aut una aetas, sed aetates omnes, et Oriens pariter atque Occidens agnoscere atque observare consueverat, id meminit, nullo contradicente, ad Ephesinam Synodum Philippus presbyter, a Pontifice legatus: *Nulli dubium est, imo saeculis omnibus notum, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiae catholicae*

[1] *Concilium Florentinum.*
[2] *Contra Haereses*, lib. iii., cap. 3, n. 2.
[3] Epist. xlviii. ad Cornelium, n. 3.
[4] Epist. lix. ad eumd., n. 14.
[5] Epist. xv. ad Damasum, n. 2.
[6] Epist. xvi. ad Damasum, n. 2.
[7] Epist. xliii., n. 7.
[8] Sermo cxx., n. 13.
[9] Epist. lv. n. 1.
[10] *Defloratio ex Epistola ad Petrum illustrem.*

fundamentum, a Domino nostro Iesu Christo, salvatore humani generis ac redemptore, claves regni accepit, solvendique ac ligandi peccata potestas ipsi data est, qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus vivat et iudicium exercet.'[1] Eademque de re in omnium cognitione versatur Concilii Chalcedonensis sententia: *Petrus per Leonem . . . loquutus est:*[2] cui vox Concilii Constantinopolitani III. resonat, tamquam imago: *Summus nobiscum concertabat Apostolorum princeps: illius enim imitatorem et Sedis successorem habuimus fautorem . . . charta et atramentum videbatur, et per Agathonem Petrus loquebatur.*[3] In formula catholicae professionis ab Hormisda conceptis verbis, ineunte saeculo sexto, proposita, cui tum Iustinianus Imperator, tum Epiphanius, Ioannes, et Menna Patriarchae subscripserunt, illud est magna vi sententiarum declaratum: *Quia non potest Domini nostri Iesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis:* Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam . . . *haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica citra maculam semper est catholica servata religio.*[4] Nolumus quidem persequi singula: libet tamen formulam fidei meminisse, quam Michael Palaeologus in Concilio Lugdunensi II. professus est: *Ipsa quoque sancta romana Ecclesia summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinet, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro, Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cuius romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit. Et sicut prae ceteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones, suo debent iudicio definiri.*[5]

Si Petri eiusque successorum plena ac summa potestas est, ea tamen esse ne putetur sola. Nam qui petrum Ecclesiae fundamentum posuit, idem *elegit duodecim . . . . quos et apostolos nominavit.*[6] Quo modo Petri auctoritatem in romano Pontifice perpetuam permanere necesse est, sic Episcopi, quod succedunt Apostolis, horum potestatem ordinariam hereditate capiunt; ita ut intimam Ecclesiae constitutionem ordo episcoporum necessario attingat. Quamquam vero neque plenam neque universalem ii, neque summam obtinent auctoritatem, non tamen *vicarii* romanorum pontificum putandi, quia potestatem gerunt sibi propriam, verissimeque populorum, quos regunt, antistites *ordinarii* dicuntur.

Verum quia successor Petri unus est, Apostolorum permulti, consentaneum est perspicere quae sint istorum cum illo, divina constitutione, necessitudines. —Ac primo quidem coniunctionis episcoporum cum eo qui Petro succedit, non obscura est neque dubia necessitas: hoc enim soluto nexu, solvitur ac diffluit multitudo ipsa christianorum, ita plane ut nullo pacto queat unum corpus conflare unumque gregem: *Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesia efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes.*[7] Idcirco ad id praestat advertere animum: nihil esse Apostolis seorsum a Petro collatum; plura seorsum ab Apostolis ac separatim Petro. Ioannes Chrysostomus in Christi edisserenda sententia (Ioan. xxi. 15) cum percontatus esset, *Cur, aliis praetermissis, de his Christus Petrum alloquitur?* omnino respondet: *Eximius erat inter Apostolos, et os discipulorum, et coetus illius caput.*[8] Hic

[1] Actio iii. [2] Actio ii. [3] Actio xviii.
[4] Post Epistolam xxvi. ad omnes Episc. Hispan., n. 4. [5] Actio iv.
[6] Luc. vi. 13. [7] S. Hieronymus, Dialog. *Contra Luciferianos*, n. 9.
[8] Hom. lxxxviii., *in Ioan.*, n. 1.

enim unus designatus a Christo est fundamentum Ecclesiae: ipsi *ligandi* copia *solvendique* permissa, eidemque *pascendi* data potestas uni. Contra quidquid auctoritatis ac muneris accepere Apostoli, coniuncte cum Petro accepere: *Divina dignatio si quid cum eo commune ceteris voluit esse principibus, nunquam nisi per ipsum dedit, quidquid aliis non negavit.*[1] *Ut cum multa solus acceperit, nihil in quemquam sine ipsius participatione transierit.*[2] Ex quo plane intelligitur, excidere episcopos iure ac potestate regendi, si a Petro eiusve successoribus scientes secesserint. Nam a fundamento, quo totum debet aedificium niti, secessione divelluntur; itaque exclusi *aedificio* ipso sunt: ob eamdemque caussam ab *ovili* seiuncti, cui dux est pastor maximus, *regnoque* extorres, cuius uni Petro datae divinitus claves.

Quibus rebus rursus noscimus in constituenda christiana republica caelestem descriptionem mentemque divinam. Videlicet cum Ecclesiam divinus auctor fide et regimine et communione unam esse decrevisset, Petrum eiusque successores delegit in quibus principium foret ac velut centrum unitatis. Quare Cyprianus: *Probatio est ad fidem facilis compendio veritatis. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum:* Ego tibi dico, *inquit*, Quia tu es Petrus . . . *Super unum aedificat Ecclesiam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, et dicat: sicut misit me Pater . . . , tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit.*[3] Atque Optatus Milevitanus: *Negare non potes, scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est: in qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur: ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram collocaret.*[4] Unde est illa ipsius Cypriani sententia, cum haeresim tum schisma ex eo ortum habere gignique, quod debita supremae potestati obedientia abiicitur: *Neque enim aliunde haereses obortae sunt aut nata sunt schismata quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur.*[5] Nemo igitur, nisi cum Petro cohaereat, participare auctoritatem potest, cum absurdum sit opinari, qui extra Ecclesiam est, eum in Ecclesia praeesse. Quare Optatus Milevitanus reprehendebat hoc nomine Donatistas: *Contra quas portas* (inferi) *claves salutares accepisse legimus Petrum, principem scilicet nostrum, cui a Christo dictum est: tibi dabo claves regni caelorum, et portae inferi non vincent eas. Unde est ergo, quod claves regni caelorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra cathedram Petri . . . militatis?*[6]

Sed Episcoporum ordo tunc rite, ut Christus iussit, colligatus cum Petro putandus, si Petro subsit eique pareat: secus in multitudinem confusam ac perturbatam necessario delabitur. Fidei et communionis unitati rite conservandae, non gerere honoris caussâ priores partes, non curam agere satis est; sed omnino auctoritate est opus vera eademque summa, cui obtemperet tota communitatis. Quid enim Dei Filius spectavit, cum claves regni caelorum *uni* pollicitus est Petro? Summum fastigium potestatis nomine *clavium* eo loco designari, *usus biblicus* et Patrum consentientes sententiae dubitari non

[1] S. Leo M., sermo iv., cap. 2. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *De Unit Eccl.*, n. 4.
[4] *De Schism. Donat.*, lib. *Donat.*, lib. ii. [5] Epist. xii. ad Cornelium, n. 5.
[6] Lib. ii. nn. 4, 5.

sinunt. Neque secus interpretari fas est, quae vel Petro separatim tributa sunt, vel Apostolis coniunctim cum Petro. Si ligandi, solvendi, pascendique facultas hoc parit in episcopis, successoribus Apostolorum, ut populum quisque suum vera cum potestate regat, certe idem parere eadem facultas in eo debet, cui pascendi *agnos* et *oves* assignatum est, Deo auctore, munus: *Non solum pastorem (Petrum), sed pastorum pastorem (Christus) constituit: pascit igitur Petrus agnos, pascit et oves, pascit filios, pascit et matres: regit subditos, regit et praelatos quia praeter agnos et oves in Ecclesia nihil est.*[1] Hinc illae de beato Petro singulares veterum locutiones, quae in summo dignitatis potestatisque gradu locatum luculente praedicant. Appellant passim *principem coetus discipulorum: sanctorum Apostolorum principem: chori illius coryphaeum: os Apostolorum omnium: caput illius familiae: orbis totius praepositum: inter Apostolos primum: Ecclesiae columen.* Quae omnia concludere Bernardus iis verbis videtur ad Eugenium Papam: *Quis es? Sacerdos magnus, summus pontifex. Tu princeps episcoporum, tu heres Apostolorum . . . Tu es, cui claves traditae, cui oves creditae sunt. Sunt quidem et alii caeli ianitores et gregum pastores; sed tu tanto gloriosius, quanto et differentius utrumque prae ceteris nomen hereditasti. Habent illi sibi assignatos greges, singuli singulos, tibi universi crediti, uni unus, nec modo ovium, sed et pastorum, tu unus omnium pastor. Unde id probem quaeris. Ex verbo Domini. Cui enim, non dico episcoporum, sed etiam Apostolorum, sic absolute et indiscrete totae commissae sunt oves? Si me amas, Petre, pasce oves meas. Quas? illius vel illius populos civitatis aut regionis, aut certi regni? Oves meas, inquit: cui non planum, non designasse aliquas, sed assignasse omnes? Nihil excipitur, ubi distinguitur nihil.*[2]

Illud vero abhorret a veritate, et aperte repugnat constitutioni divinae, iurisdictioni romanorum Pontificum episcopos subesse *singulos*, ius esse; *universos*, ius non esse. Haec enim omnis est caussa ratioque fundamenti, ut unitatem stabilitatemque toti potius aedificio, quam *partibus* eius *singulis* tueatur. Quod est in caussâ, de qua loquimur, multo verius, quia Christus Dominus fundamenti virtute confieri voluit, ut portae inferi non praevaleant adversus Ecclesiam. Quod promissum divinum constat inter omnes de Ecclesia universa intelligi oportere, non de singulis eius partibus, quippe quae utique vinci inferorum impetu possunt, nonnullisque earum, ut vincerentur, singillatim evenit. Rursus, qui gregi praepositus est universo, eum non modo in oves dispersas, sed prorsus in multitudinem insimul congregatarum habere imperium necesse est. Num regat agatque pastorem suum universitas ovium? Num successores Apostolorum, simul coniuncti, fundamentum sint, quo Petri successor, adipiscendi firmamenti caussâ, innitatur? Profecto cuius in potestate sunt claves regni, ei ius atque auctoritas est non tantum in provincias singulares, sed in universas simul: et quo modo episcopi in regione quisque sua non solum privato cuique, sed etiam communitati vera cum potestate praesunt, ita Pontifices romani, quorum potestas christianam rempublicam totam complectitur, omnes eius partes, etiam una collectas, subiectas atque obedientes habent potestati suae. Christus Dominus, quod iam dictum satis, Petro eiusque successoribus tribuit ut essent *vicarii* sui, atque eamdem in Ecclesia perpetuo gererent potestatem, quam ipsemet

[1] S. Brunonis Episcopi Signiensis *Comment. in Ioan.* part iii., cap. 21, n. 55.
[2] *De Consideratione*, lib. ii., cap. 8.

gesserat in vita mortali. Num Apostolorum collegium magistro suo praestitisse auctoritate dicatur?

Hanc vero, de qua dicimus, in ipsum episcoporum collegium potestatem, quam sacrae litterae tam aperte enuntiant, agnoscere ac testari nullo tempore Ecclesia destitit. Illa sunt in hoc genere effata Conciliorum: *Romanum pontificem de omnium Ecclesiarum praesulibus iudicasse legimus: de eo vero quemquam iudicasse, non legimus.*[1] Cuius rei ea ratio redditur, quod *auctoritate Sedis Apostolicae maior non est.*[2] Quare de Conciliorum decretis Gelasius: *Sicut id quod prima Sedes non probaverat, constare non potuit, sic quod illa censuit iudicandum, Ecclesia tota suscepit.*[3] Sane Conciliorum consulta et decreta, rata habere vel infirmare semper romanorum Pontificum fuit. Conciliabuli Ephesini acta rescidit Leo magnus: Ariminensis, reiecit Damasus: Constantinopolitani, Hadrianus I.; canonem vero XXVIII Concilii Chalcedonensis, quod assensu et auctoritate caruit Sedis Apostolicae, velut incassum quiddam constat iacuisse. Recte igitur in Concilio Lateranensi V. Leo X. statuit: *Solum romanum Pontificem, pro tempore existentem, tamquam auctoritatem super omnia concilia habentem, tam Conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum, ac dissolvendorum plenum ius ac potestatem habere, nedum ex sacrae Scripturae testimonio dictisque Patrum ac aliorum romanorum Pontificum, sacrorumque canonum decretis, sed propria etiam eorumdem Conciliorum confessione manifeste constat.* Sane claves regni caelorum uni creditas Petro, item ligandi solvendique potestatem Apostolis una cum Petro collatam, sacrae litterae testantur: at vero summam potestatem *sine Petro* et *contra Petrum* unde Apostoli acceperint, nusquam est testatum. Profecto a Iesu Christo nullo pacto accepere.—Quibus de caussis, Concilii Vaticani decreto, quod est de vi et ratione primatus Romani Pontificis, non opinio est invecta nova, sed vetus et constans omnium saeculorum asserta fides.[4]

Neque vero potestati geminae eosdem subesse, confusionem habet administrationis. Tale quicquam suspicari, primum sapientia Dei prohibemur, cuius consilio est temperatio isthaec regiminis constituta. Illud praeterea animadvertendum, tum rerum ordinem mutuasque necessitudines perturbari, si bini magistratus in populo sint eodem gradu, neutro alteri obnoxio. Sed romani pontificis potestas summa est, universalis, planeque sui iuris; episcoporum vero certis circumscripta finibus, nec plane sui iuris: *Inconveniens est, quod duo aequaliter super eumdem gregem constituantur. Sed quod duo, quorum unus alio principalior est, super eamdem plebem constituantur, non est inconveniens; et secundum hoc super eamdem plebem immediate sunt et Sacerdos parochialis et Episcopus et Papa.*[5] Romani autem Pontifices, officii sui memores, maxime omnium conservari volunt quidquid est in Ecclesia divinitus constitutum: propterea quemadmodum potestatem suam ea qua par est cura vigilantiâque tuentur, ita et dedere et dabunt constanter operam ut sua Episcopis auctoritas salva sit. Imo quidquid Episcopis tribuitur honoris, quidquid obsequii, id omne sibimetipsis

[1] Hadrianus II., *in Allocutione iii.* ad Synodum Romanam, an. 869. Cf. Actionem vii. Concilii Constantinopolitani iv.

[2] Nicolaus in epist. ixxxvi., ad Michael. Imperat. *Patet profecto Sedis Apostolicae, cuius auctoritate maior non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de eius liceat iudicare iudicio.*

[3] Epist. xxvi. ad Episcopos Dardaniae, n. 5.

[4] Sess. iv. cap. 3.

[5] S. Thomas. *in iv. Sent.* dist. xvii. a. 4, ad q. 4, ad 3.

tributum deputant. *Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tunc ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*[1]

His quae dicta sunt, Ecclesiae quidem imaginem atque formam ex divina constitutione fideliter expressimus. Plura persecuti de unitate sumus ; cuiusmodi hanc esse, et quo conservandam principio divinus auctor voluerit, satis explicavimus. Quotquot divino munere beneficioque contigit, ut in sinu Ecclesiae catholicae tamquam ex ea nati vivant, eos vocem Nostram apostolicam audituros, non est cur dubitemus : *Oves meae vocem meam audiunt.*[2] Atque hinc facile sumpserint quo et erudiantur plenius, et voluntate propensiore cum pastoribus quisque suis et per eos cum pastore summo cohaereant, ut tutius queant intra ovile unicum permanere, fructumque ex eo salutarium maiorem ubertatem capere. Verum aspicientibus Nobis *in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Iesum*,[3] cuius vicaria potestate, tametsi impares dignitati et muneri, fungimur, caritate eius inflammatur animus ; illudque de se a Christo dictum, de Nobismetipsis non sine caussâ usurpamus : *Alias oves habeo, quae non sunt ex hoc ovili : et illas oportet me adducere, et vocem meam audient.*[4] Nos igitur audire et caritati Nostrae paternae obsequi ne recusent, quotquot sunt, qui impietatem tam late fusam oderunt, et Iesum Christum Filium Dei eumdemque servatorem generis humani agnoscunt et fatentur, sed tamen vagantur ab eius Sponsa longius. Qui Christum sumunt, totum sumant necesse est : *Totus Christus caput et corpus est : caput unigenitus Filius Dei, corpus eius Ecclesia : sponsus et sponsa, duo in carne una. Quicumque de ipso capite a Scripturis sanctis dissentiunt, etiamsi in omnibus locis inveniantur in quibus Ecclesia designata est, non sunt in Ecclesia. Et rursus, quicumque de ipso capite Scripturis sanctis consentiunt, et unitati Ecclesiae non communicant, non sunt in Ecclesia.*[5] Ac pari studio ad eos provolat animus Noster, quos impietatis non funditus corrupit pestilens afflatus, quique hoc saltem expetunt, sibi patris esse loco Deum verum, terrae caelique opificem. Hi quidem apud se reputent ac plane intelligant, numerari se in filiis Dei nequaquam posse, nisi fratrem sibi Iesum Christum simulque Ecclesiam matrem adsciverint. Omnes igitur peramanter, sumpta ex Augustino ipso sententia, compellamus : *Amemus Dominum Deum nostrum, amemus Ecclesiam eius : illum sicut patrem, istam sicut matrem. Nemo dicat : ad idola quidem vado, arreptitios et sortilegos consulo, sed tamen Dei Ecclesiam non relinquo : catholicus sum. Tenens matrem, offendisti patrem. Alius item dicit : absit a me, non consulo sortilegum, non quaero arreptitium, non quaero divinationes sacrilegas, non eo ad adoranda daemonia, non servio lapidibus : sed tamen in parte Donati sum. Quid tibi prodest non offensus pater, qui offensam vindicat matrem ? Quid prodest si Dominum confiteris, Deum honoras, ipsum praedicas, Filium eius agnoscis, sedentem ad Patris dexteram confiteris, et blasphemas Ecclesiam eius ? . . . Si haberes aliquem patronum, cui quotidie obsequereris ; si unum crimen de eius coniuge diceres, num quid domum eius intrares ? Tenete ergo, carissimi, tenete omnes unanimiter Deum patrem et matrem Ecclesiam.*[6]

[1] S. Gregorius M., *Epistolarum*, lib. viii., epist. xxx. ad Eulogium.
[2] Ioan. x. 27. [3] Hebr. xii. 2. [4] Ioan. x. 16.
[5] S. Augustinus, *Contra Donatistas Epistola, sive De Unit. Eccl.*, cap. iv., n. 7
[6] *Enarratio in Psal. lxxxviii.*, sermo ii., n. 14.

Plurimum misericordi Deo confisi, qui maxime potest animos hominum permovere, et unde vult, et quo vult, impellere, benignitati eius universos, quos in oratione spectavimus, vehementer commendamus. Caelestium vero donorum auspicem et benevolentiae Nostrae testem vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, Clero populoque vestro Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die XXIX Iunii, An. MDCCCLXXXXVI, Pontificatus Nostri decimo nono.

LEO PP. XIII.

APPENDIX B

CONCILII VATICANI SESSIO QUARTA

CONSTITUTIO PRIMA DOGMATICA DE ECCLESIA CHRISTI.

[*Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii. pp. 482-8]

PIUS EPISCOPUS
SERVUS SERVORUM DEI
SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO
ad perpetuam rei memoriam

Pastor aeternus et episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutiferum redemptionis opus perenne redderet, sanctam aedificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in qua veluti in domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et charitatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis, qui credituri erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes unum essent, sicut ipse Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre : ita in Ecclesia sua Pastores et Doctores usque ad consummationem saeculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohaerentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum caeteris Apostolis praeponens in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum, super cuius fortitudinem aeternum exstrueretur templum, et Ecclesiae coelo inferenda sublimitas in huius fidei firmitate consurgeret.[1] Et quoniam portae inferi ad evertendam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam contra eius fundamentum divinitus positum maiori in dies odio undique insurgunt ; Nos ad catholici gregis custodiam, incolumitatem, augmentum, necessarium esse iudicamus, sacro approbante Concilio, doctrinam de institutione, perpetuitate ac natura sacri Apostolici primatus, in quo totius Ecclesiae vis ac soliditas consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam, secundum antiquam et constantem universalis Ecclesiae fidem, praeponere, atque contrarios, dominico gregi adeo perniciosos, errores proscribere et condemnare.

CAPUT I. De Apostolici primatus in beato Petro institutione.

Docemus atque declaramus, iuxta Evangelii testimonia primatum iurisdictionis in universam Dei Ecclesiam immediate et directe beato Petro Apostolo promissum atque collatum a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum enim

[1] S. Leo M., sermo. iv. (al iii.), cap. 2, in diem Natalis sui. [Migne, P.L. liv. 150.]

Simonem, cui iam pridem dixerat: *Tu vocaberis Cephas*,[1] postquam ille suam edidit confessionem inquiens: *Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi*, solemnibus his verbis allocutus est Dominus: *Beatus es Simon Bar Iona: quia caro, et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed Pater meus, qui in coelis est. Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum. Et quodcunque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in coelis et quodcunque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in coelis.*[2] Atque uni Simoni Petro contulit Iesus post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris iurisdictionem in totum suum ovile, dicens: *Pasce agnos meos: pasce oves meas.*[3] Huic tam manifestae sacrarum Scripturarum doctrinae, ut ab Ecclesia catholica semper intellecta est, aperte opponuntur pravae eorum sententiae, qui constitutam a Christo Domino in sua Ecclesia regiminis formam pervertentes negant, solum Petrum prae ceteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque iurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum; aut qui affirmant, eundem primatum non immediate directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesiae, et per hanc illi ut ipsius Ecclesiae ministro delatum fuisse.

Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesiae militantis visibile caput; vel eundem honoris tantum, non autem verae propriaeque iurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit.

CAPUT II. De perpetuitate primatus beati Petri in Romanis Pontificibus.

Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro princeps pastorem et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Iesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesiae instituit, id, eodem autore, in Ecclesia, quae fundata super petram ad finem saeculorum usque firma stabit, iugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane dubium, immo saeculis omnibus notum est, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiae catholicae fundamentum, a Domino nostro Iesu Christo, Salvatore humani generis ac Redemptore, claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctae Romanae Sedis ab ipso fundatae, eiusque consecratae sanguine, vivit et praesidet et iudicium exercet.[4] Unde quicumque in hac Cathedra Petro succedit, is secundum Christi ipsius institutionem primatum Petri in universam Ecclesiam obtinet. Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans suscepta Ecclesiae gubernacula non reliquit.[5] Hac de causa ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, ut in ea Sede, e qua venerandae communionis iura in omnes dimanant, tanquam in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent.[6]

Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione seu iure divino, ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat per-

[1] Ioan. i. 42. [2] Matt. xvi. 16-19. [3] Ioan. xxi. 15-17.
[4] Cf. Ephesini Concil., Act iii. [Hard. C.C., i. 1478.]
[5] S. Leo M., serm. iii. (al ii.), cap. 3. [Migne, P.L. liv. 146.]
[6] S. Iren, adv. haer. i. iii. c. 5 et Conc. Aquilei, a 381 inter epp. S. Ambros., ep. xi. [Migne, P.G. vii. 849; P.L. xvi. 946.]

petuos successores ; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem ; anathema sit.

CAPUT III. De vi et ratione primatus Romani Pontificis.

Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum litterarum testimoniis, et inhaerentes tum Praedecessorum Nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis, perspicuisque decretis, innovamus oecumenici Concilii Florentini definitionem, qua credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere ; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi, ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse ; quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.

Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam, disponente Domino, super omnes alias ordinariae potestatis obtinere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis iurisdictionis potestatem, quae vere episcopalis est, immediatam esse : erga quam cuiuscunque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicae subordinationis, veraeque obedientiae obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae pertinent ; ita ut custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis, quam eiusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesia Christi sit unus grex sub uno summo pastore. Haec est catholicae veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare, salva fide atque salute, nemo potest.

Tantum autem abest, ut haec Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinariae ac immediatae illi episcopalis iurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tanquam veri pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali Pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni : *Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*[1]

Porro ex suprema illa Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam ius eidem esse consequitur, in huius sui muneris exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totius Ecclesiae, ut iidem ab ipso in via salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitis cum pastoribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eandem reddunt saeculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quae ab Apostolica Sede vel eius auctoritate ad regimen Ecclesiae constituuntur, vim ac valorem non habere, nisi potestatis saecularis placito confirmentur.

Et quoniam divino Apostolici primatus iure Romanus Pontifex universae Ecclesiae praeest, docemus etiam et declaramus, eum esse iudicem supremum fidelium,[2] et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad

[1] Ep. ad Eulog. Alexandrin., (viii. ep. xxx. [Migne, P.L. lxxvii. 933.]
[2] Pii P. VI., Breve, *Super soliditate*, d. 28 Nov. 1786.

psius posse iudicium recurri;[1] Sedis vero Apostolicae cuius auctoritate maior non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de eius licere iudicare iudicio.[2] Quare a recto veritatis tramite aberrant, qui affirmant, licere ab iudiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad œcumenicum Concilium tanquam ad auctoritatem Romano Pontifice superiorem appellare.

Si quis itaque dixerit, Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium-inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem iurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem huius supremae potestatis; aut hanc eius potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles; anathema sit.

Caput IV. De Romani Pontificis infallibili magisterio.

Ipso autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex tanquam Petri principis Apostolorum successor in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendi, haec Sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiae usus comprobat, ipsaque oecumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Oriens cum Occidente in fidei charitatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, maiorum vestigiis inhaerentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem: Prima salus est, rectae fidei regulam custodire. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Iesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab huius ergo fide et doctrina separari minime cupientes, speramus ut in una communione, quam Sedes Apostolica praedicat, esse mereamur, in qua est integra et vera Christianae religionis soliditas.[3] Approbante vero Lugdunensi Concilio secundo, Graeci professi sunt: Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro Apostolorum Principe sive vertice, cuius Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit; et sicut prae caeteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et, si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones, suo debent iudicio definiri. Florentinum denique Concilium definivit: Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.

Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Praedecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes terrae

[1] Concil. œcumen. Lugdun. ii. [Hard. C.C., vii. 698.]

[2] Ep. S. Nicolai i. ad Michaelem Imperatorem. [Migne, P.L. cxix. 954]

[3] Ex formula S. Hormisdae Papae, prout ab Hadriano ii. Patribus Concilii œcumenici viii., Constantinopolitani iv., proposita et ab iisdem subscripta est. [Hard, v. 773 *et seq.*].

populos propagaretur, parique cura vigilarunt, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquae regulae formam sequentes, ea praesertim pericula, quae in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum resarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum.[1] Romani autem Pontifices, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocatis oecumenicis Conciliis aut explorata Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae sententia, nunc per Synodos particulares, nunc aliis, quae divina suppeditabat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda definiverunt, quae sacris Scripturis et apostolicis Traditionibus consentanea, Deo adiutore, cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum quidem apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti Doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri divinam pollicitationem discipulorum suorum principi factam: *Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua: et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.*[2]

Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei numquam deficientis charisma Petro eiusque in hac Cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, coelestis doctrinae pabulo nutriretur, ut sublata schismatis occasione Ecclesia tota una conservaretur, atque suo fundamento innixa, firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

At vero cum hac ipsa aetate, qua salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur, qui illius auctoritate obtrectant; necessarium omnino esse censemus, praerogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastorali officio coniungere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianae exordio perceptae fideliter inhaerendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicae exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae irreformabiles esse.

Si quis autem huic Nostrae definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, praesumpserit; anathema sit.[3]

[1] Cf. S. Bern. Epist. cxc. [Migne, P. L. clxxxii. 1053.] [2] Luc. xxii. 32.

[3] 'Datum Romae in publica Sessione in Vaticana Basilica solemniter celebrata anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die decima octava Iulii, Pontificatus Nostri vigesimo quinto.' Haec addit authentica hujus Constit. editio e typographia Conc. Vatic. Romae, 1870.

. . . Fabrianensis Episcopus surgens ita Patres interrogavit :

Rm̃i Patres, placentne Vobis Decreta et Canones qui in hac Constitutione continentur ?

. . . Suffragiorum . . . recensione peracta, compertum est ex omnibus Patribus, qui hac in Sessione aderant, duos tantum respondisse *non placet*, reliquos vero omnes per verbum *placet* suum assensum et adprobationem declarasse. . . .

. . . Secretarius thronum ascendens Sanctissimo Domino de suffragiorum exitu retulit hac formula :

Beatissime Pater, Decreta et Canones placuerunt omnibus Patribus, duobus exceptis.

Qua relatione audita, Summus Pontifex surgens suprema sua auctoritate Constitutionem hac formula confirmavit :

Decreta et Canones, qui in Constitutione modo lecta continentur, placuerunt Patribus omnibus, duobus exceptis; Nosque, sacro approbante Concilio, illa et illos, ut lecta sunt, definimus et Apostolica auctoritate confirmamus.

INDEX

The figures in Clarendon *type refer to the marginal numbers.*

ABERCIUS, Bishop of Hierapolis, inscription for the tomb of, 1232, *footnote* 5.

Acacius of Cæsarea and Arianism, 665.

Acacius of CP., and the *Henoticon*, 800; name of, removed from the Diptychs, 805, 928; and Felix, P. II., 805, 922; case of, 922 *et seq.*; supported by the East, 927; witness of the case of, against Papalism, 928; and Peter Mongus, 1055.

Acerno, Thomas de, cited, 977.

Acts of the Apostles i. 15-26, 903; ii. 14, 37, 38, 903; v. 2, 3, 8-10, 903; v. 47, 1162; vi. 2 *et seq.*, 904; vii. 13, 1181; viii. 14, 905; viii. 27, 1162; ix. 28, 1162; xi. 5, 907; xi. 18, 1163; xii. 17, 76; xv. 7, 76; xv. 7-9, 1164; xv. 12, 76; xv. 19-40, 907; xv. 32, 154; xviii. 23, 154; xx. 28, 136; xxi. 18, 76.

—— —— nothing in, about the appointment of a 'Visible Head' of the Church, 32; witness of, against Papalism, 32, 903 *et seq.*, 1065 *et seq.*

Adrumetum, The Church of, and the title of Cornelius to the See of Rome, 547, 548, 1156.

Aao, The Martyrology of, on the fall of Liberius, 769.

Aetius, Archdeacon of CP., and the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, 421, 424, 445; and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 452.

African Bishops, the, did not know of the 'Sardican Canons,' 332, 333, 610; and the title of Cornelius to the See of Rome, 546 *et seq.*, 568; and the case of Basilides and Martial, 575; and Rebaptism, 578; and St. Stephen, 582; of the age of St. Cyprian knew nothing of Papalism, 584; and the case of Apiarius, 609 *et seq.*; and Zosimus, 610, 643; wrote to CP., Alexandria, and Antioch for genuine copies of the Nicene Acts, 611; and Boniface, P., 613; of the age of St. Augustine knew nothing of Papalism, 614, 635; and Celestine, P., 620 *et seq.*; did not know of any 'Appeal' to Rome, 621; held an Œcumenical Council to be the supreme authority in the Church, 621; and Pelagianism, 633 *et seq.*, 643 *et seq.*, and Innocent, P. I., 633 *et seq.*; and the *Judicatum* of Vigilius, 939; apply to the Bishops of Rome and Milan conjointly *re* Infant Baptism, 1160.

African Canon on Appeals, 609, 1251 *et seq.*; Vincenzi on, 623, 1252; Gratian's treatment of, in his *Decretum*, 1252.

—— Church, The, founded from Rome, 1296.

—— conception of the 'See of Peter,' 135, 556, 571, 865.

—— —— of the position of St. Peter, 86, 112, 556, 571; incompatible with Papalism, 572.

—— custom as to the *Prima Sedes* of a Province, 1176.

Agapetus, P., 804, *footnote* 2.

Agatho, P., on St. Luke xxii. 32, 157 *et seq.*, 1169; *Epistola Dogmatica* of, 743, 748; the Sixth Synod and the letter of, 749, 1269; letter of the Sixth Synod to, 953; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Sixth Synod, 1034.

Agrippinus, and Rebaptism, 577; St. Cyprian on the action of, as to Rebaptism, 1154.

Alcuin and the Seventh Synod, 1044.

Aleatoribus, the tract *De*, 601, 1247 *et seq.*; written by a Bishop, 1248; author of, knew nothing of Papalism, 1248.

Alexander of Antioch puts St. Chrysostom's name on the Diptychs, 692.

—— of Alexandria styled 'Pope,' 1195.

—— Natalis on the Council of Florence, 1191.

—— P. I., fifth Bishop of Rome, 477.

—— P. V., elected at the Council of Pisa, 984; 'confirmed' by implication the Council of Pisa, 985.

Alexandria, Bishop of, styled 'Pope,' 1196.
—— Synod of, A.D. 362, and the Antiochene troubles, 586, 667, 684; St. Jerome on, 685; Tillemont on, 685.
—— See of, position of the, 312, 513; extent of the jurisdiction of, 312; ground of the jurisdiction assigned to the, by the Nicene Synod, 313; Canon II. of the Second Synod on the, 343; founded by St. Mark, 352, 1060, 1258; St. Julius, P., and the, 709, 1258 *et seq.*; reason assigned for the precedence of, by Gelasius, P., 1060; relation of, to the See of Rome, 1258 *et seq.*
Allatius, cited, 256, 257; on the Council of Florence, 259.
Alypius, and the pretended Nicene Canons, 611.
Amatus, Bishop of Nusco, 1194.
Ambition of the holders of great Sees, 70, 412 *et seq.*
Ambrose, St., on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 57, 60, 63; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 123, 130; on St. John xxi. 15, 132; St. Gaudentius on, 135; on St. Luke xxii. 32, 147 *et seq.*; at the Council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, 537; on Western Bishops and Eastern affairs, 541; on the appeal of St. Athanasius to the Westerns, 541, 714; knew nothing of Papalism, 541; reply of the Easterns to the Synodal letter written by, 543, 716, 1024; use of term *summus sacerdos* by, 833, *footnote* 2; letter of, to Theodosius, 1024; appealed to conjointly with the Bishop of Rome by the Bishops of Spain, 1177, *footnote* 3; letter of, to Satyrus, 1236; meaning of the phrase *Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia* used by, 1237; and the Novatian intruder into the See of Rome, 1238.
Amelli, Dom G., 727, 1266.
Amyrutius, on the Council of Florence, 259.
Anacletus, Pseudo-, P., 1181, 1183, 1185.
Anastasius, P. II., mentioned, 599; referred to conjointly with Venerius of Milan by the Council of Carthage, A.D. 391, 1161; and the Primacy of Gaul, 1176.
—— of Antioch, letter of St. Gregory to, 1114.
—— of C P., 1051.
—— Bibliothecarius, on the title *Œcumenical Bishop*, 1107.
Anatolius of CP., position of, at the time of the convocation of the Fourth Synod, 392; vote of, in the case of Dioscurus, 394; precedence of, recognised by the Roman legates at Chalcedon, 423; letter of St. Leo to, 460; and St. Leo, 444 *et seq.*, 880; letters of, to St. Leo, 444, 445; sentence of, on Timothy, 'the Cat,' 449; consecrated Maximus to Antioch, 445, 880; position of, recognised during the proceedings against Timothy, 'the Cat,' 449; and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 453.
Anatolius, a Patrician of CP., letter of Theodoret to, 398.
Ancyra, Council of, Canons of the, confirmed at the Synod of Chalcedon, 402.
Andrew, St., titles applied to, 176, 594.
—— of Escobar, on the *Decree* of the Council of Constance, as to General Councils, 992.
Andrewes, Bishop, on the Roman Primacy, 1144.
Andronicus, the Emperor, and the 'Confession of Michael Palæologus,' 820.
Anencletus, second Bishop of Rome, 475, 477.
Anianus, Bishop of Capitolias, 454.
Anicetus, tenth Bishop of Rome, 476; and St. Polycarp, 499, 526 *et seq.*, 1233.
Anthimus, 807. 937.
Anthony of Fussala, case of, 618.
—— of Heraclea, and his assent to the Florentine *Decretum Unionis*, 255.
Antioch, application by the Christians at, to the Apostles, 906; St. Peter and St. Paul at, 913, 1167.
—— City of, Josephus on the position of, in the Roman Empire, 415.
—— Council of, A.D. 269, and Paul of Samosata, 1264.
—— —— *in Encæniis*, A.D. 341, Canon IX. of, 347, 412, 511, 1235; Canons of, confirmed by the Fourth Synod, 402, 717; Canon XII. of, 403; Canons XIV. and XV. of, 715 *et seq.*; the Synods of Chalcedon and *in Trullo* and the Canons of, 717.
—— See of, occupied by St. Peter, 186, 688, 1060; precedence of, 311, 415, 417, 513; Gelasius, P., on, 1060.
Antiquissima version, the, of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa, 316.
Antonianus, letter of St. Cyprian to, 564 *et seq.*, 1242, *footnote* 7.
Apiarius, the case of, 609 *et seq.*; and Zosimus, P., 609; and Celestine, P., 619.
Apollinaris, the heretic, 682.
—— of Alexandria, 940.
—— Sidonius, styles Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, 'Father of Fathers and Bishop of Bishops,' 436; styles French Bishops 'Popes,' 1195.
Apostle, *The*, St. Augustine and St.

Chrysostom on the title, 28, *footnote* 4.
Apostles, the, position of, in the Acts, 21, 27, 903 *et seq.*; St. Paul on, 27, 74; commission to, 30, 843, 899, 900; St. Chrysostom on the position of, 31, 188 *et seq.*; all, in a sense, the foundation of the Church, 74, 90; St. Cyril on the position of, 94 *et seq.*; all received 'The Gift of the Keys,' 116 *et seq.*, 1064; St. Cyprian on the position of, 571; St. Jerome on the position of, 595, 596; the *Satis Cognitum* on the jurisdiction of, 845; the *Satis Cognitum* on the relative positions of St. Peter and, 846 *et seq.*, 1064; position of, at the time of the Ascension, 899; the ordinary power of, 900 *et seq.*; the application by the Christians at Antioch to, at Jerusalem, 906.
Apostolate, The One, power of, 30 *et seq.*; the commission to, 30, 900; St. Chrysostom on the position of, 31, 188; must continue to the end of time, 33; St. Cyril on the position of, 94 *et seq.*; institutes the Diaconate, 904.
Apostolatus Ducatus, meaning of the term, 601, 1247 *et seq.*
'Apostolic See, The,' Papalist use of the title, 8, 9, 598; Nicholas, P. I., on the authority of, 970 *et seq.*; appointment of delegate of, to the U.S.A., 1094 *et seq.*; '*By the Grace of God and of*,' 1194.
Apostolical Churches, Tertullian on, 10, 525, 598; influence of, 417; St. Irenæus on, 499, 525.
—— Sees, St. Augustine on, 11, 598 *et seq.*; Pelagius, P. I., on St. Augustine's use of the term, 11; use of the term by Basil of Ancyra, 12; use of the term by St. Paulinus of Nola, 12; term, applied to Sees not founded by Apostles, 12, 1195; influence of, 417.
'Appeal' of Leo, P. XIII., in the *Satis Cognitum*, why the, must be disregarded, 1145.
'Appeals,' Canons IX. and XVII. of Chalcedon on, 404, 409; African Canon on, 609; Canon of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, on, 715 *et seq.*
—— to Rome, *Edict* of Valentinian III. as to, 206; *Rescript* of Valentinian I. as to, 207; *Rescript* of Gratian as to, 207 *et seq.*; 'Sardican Canons' on, 324 *et seq.*; African Bishops on, 609; alleged, of Easterns, 696 *et seq.*; nature of alleged, of Easterns, 733.
approbante sacro Concilio, meaning of the phrase, 292; not used at Trent, 1192.
Aquileia, Council of, A.D. 381, 536 *et seq.*; Vatican Council cites words from the letter of, 536; witnesses against Papalism, 537 *et seq.*; letter of, to Gratian, 539; and Maximus, 'the Cynic,' 540.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, *vide* Thomas Aquinas, St.
Arcadius, one of the legates of Celestine at the Third Synod, 366.
—— the Emperor, 722.
Archbishops, English, and the *Pallium*, 1293, 1294.
Archidamus, one of the legates of St. Julius, P., at the Council of Sardica, 302.
ἀρχήν, Bishops possess, 601.
ἄρχοντες, the Apostles designated, 31, 189.
Arian persecution in Africa, 628 *et seq.*
Arianism, the Nicene Synod and, 295; demanded the exercise of the 'Papal Prerogatives,' 296; St. Basil's appeal to Westerns for assistance against, 670; spread of, in the East, 671, 683; Liberius, P., and, 758 *et seq.*; Hosius and, 759.
Ariminum, Council of, A.D. 356, why the, was rejected by the Church, 1048 *et seq.*; the Orthodox at, deceived by the Arians, 1049; St. Jerome on, 1049; St. Damasus on, 1050.
Aristolaus, the notary, 379.
Arles, Council of, A.D. 314, by whom was the, convoked? 301, 606; president of the, 301, 306; legates of St. Sylvester at, 301; on Rebaptism, 583, 1214; on Donatism, 606; why the, was convoked, 1157; meaning of the phrase *qui majores dioeceses tenes*, used by, 1206.
—— the See of, position of, 213 *et seq.*, 1173 *et seq.*
Armagasta, an African captive, 629.
Arsenius of C P., 815.
Artepus of Gaza, 1263.
Arsenius, Bishop of Orba, 237.
Ascholius of Thessalonica, position of, 1023, 1174, 1209; attended the Second Synod as an Eastern, 1209 *et seq.*
Ascellus, one of the legates of Zosimus, P., in the case of Apiarius, 610.
Asiatics, the, and St. Victor, P., 529; and St. Stephen, P., 577, 583.
Asterius, St., of Petra, 667.
Athanasius, St., on the authority of the Nicene Synod, 45, 1281; on the position of Hosius, 298; did not know of the 'Sardican Canons,' 331; St. Basil on the position of, 436, 670, 684; St. Gregory Nazianzen on the position of, 436; and the Synod of Alexandria, A.D. 362, 667, 685; on the treatment of those who rejected the ὁμοούσιον, 664, 684; and the dispute at Antioch,

667; exiled, 705; and St. Julius, P., 705 *et seq.*, 1258, 1263; alleged 'Appeal' of, to Rome, 705 *et seq.*, 1263; Tarasius of CP. on the authority of, 685; on the fall of Liberius, 765; *Decretals* of, 1160.
Athanasius of CP., 257.
—— of Pyrrha, 220, 701.
Athanasius, Pseudo-, 1181, 1182, 1183, 1184.
Attalus, 537.
Atticus of CP., 43; sends a copy of the genuine Acts of Nicæa to Africans, 617; and St. Chrysostom, 692 *et seq.*
'Auctores' of Apostolical Churches, 482 *et seq.*, 493, 499, 501.
Augustine, St., on 'Apostolic Sees,' 11, 598; makes communion with 'Apostolic Sees' the condition of being in the Church, 11, 599; on the Body of Christ, 24; on Christ the Head of the Church, 24; regarded Bishops as successors of the Apostles, 35; on the responsibility of Bishops towards the whole Church, 43; on the authority of General Councils, 45, 603, 648 *et seq.*; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 61 *et seq.*; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 117 *et seq.*, 562; on the representative character of St. Peter, 117 *et seq.*; on St. John xvi. 15, 132, 137; did not know of the 'Sardican Canons,' 332; on the Donatists, 599, 603; 607, 646, 1145; meaning of the term *principatus Apostolicæ Cathedræ*, used by, 599 *et seq.*; on the authority of Bishops, 604, 608, 640, 641; treatise *De Unitate* of, contains no reference to the Roman Bishop as the 'Supreme Pastor' and necessary centre of unity, 607; meaning of the statement *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* made by, 608, 1249; knew nothing of, and witnesses against Papalism, 605, 614 *et seq.*, 621 *et seq.*; and the case of Anthony of Fussala, 618; 'Sermo cxx.' attributed to, cited by the *Satis Cognitum*, 625 *et seq.*; is the 'Sermo cxx.' attributed to, genuine? 626; meaning of the word *Romana* in 'Sermo cxx.' attributed to, 628 *et seq.*; did not say *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*, 632 *et seq.*; on the condemnation of Cœlestius and Pelagius, 640, 641, 645, 1270; and Zosimus, P., 649; treatise *De Unitate* of, cited by the *Satis Cognitum*, 1145; styled 'Pope,' 1195; meaning of the phrase 'President of the Church of the West' used by, 1206; did not know of the 'interpolations' in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 1242; two passages from the works of, sometimes cited in support of Papalism, 1254 *et seq.*; on Zosimus and Pelagius, 1270.
Augustine, St., of Canterbury, throne of, 465; meaning of the gift of the *Pallium* to, by St. Gregory the Great, 1293 *et seq.*; founded the Church of the English, 1295.
Aurelian, Bishop of Arles received the *Pallium* from Vigilius, P., 1289.
—— the Emperor and Paul of Samosata, 1265.
Aurelius of Carthage, 317, 385, 610 *et seq.*, 633.
'Aurelius, Peter,' on the power of the Episcopate, 37.
Autocarius, 230.
Auxentius, Arian Bishop of Milan, 761, 1235.
Auxanius, Bishop of Arles, received the *Pallium* from Vigilius, P., 1289.
Auxiliaris on Roman pride, 217.

Baldwin II., 815.
Bahanes, at the Synod of C P., A.D. 869, on the position of the five Patriarchs, 244, 817, 931; on the 'judgment' of Nicholas, P. I., on Photius, 929.
Ballerini, the, on the *Vetus*, 317; on Canon IX. of Chalcedon, 396; on the authority of 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 451; on the words δευτέρα σύνοδος applied to the Ephesine Synod, 1221.
—— P., on the election of Alexander, P. V., 985.
Balsamon, on the Sixth Canon of Nicæa, 1205.
Baluze, on Canon IX. of Chalcedon, 396; and the 'interpolations' in the *De Unitate* of St. Cyprian, 1245.
Baptism and the unity of the Church, 22.
Barnabas, St., 184, 906, 907.
Baronius, says that St. Damasus convoked the Second Synod, 328; and Canon III. of the Second Synod, 349; cited, 1120, 1121; on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1180; on the meaning of the term 'Suburbicarian Churches,' 1203; and the condemnation of Honorius, P., by the Sixth Synod, 1273.
Basil, St., regarded Bishops as representatives of Christ, 38; on the responsibility of Bishops for the Universal Church, 43; on St. John xxi. 15, 136; on the position of St. Athanasius, 436, 670, 684; on the position of St. Cyprian, 436; on the position of the See of Antioch, 513; did not regard communion with Rome as necessary to being in the Catholic Church, 663; on the position of St. Meletius, 663, 678 *et seq.*; on St. Athanasius and St. Meletius, 669; letters of, to St.

Athanasius on the necessity of Western assistance against Arianism, 670; on the struggle against Arianism, 671 *et seq.*; letter of, to St. Damasus, P., 671; appeal of, to Westerns for assistance against Arianism, 671 *et seq.*; on St. Dionysius of Rome, 671, 672; letter of, to Italian and Gallic Bishops, 676; letter of, to Terentius, 678, 1218; on the authority of a Synod of East and West, 678 *et seq.*; knew nothing of Papalism, 678 *et seq.*; and Paulinus, 678; letter of, to St. Meletius, 679, 1217; letter of, to St. Eusebius of Samosata, 680; opinions of, as to Western pride, 680, 683, 1217; letter of, to Dorotheus, 683, 1217; testimony of, against Papalism, 683; *Decretals* of, 1160.

Basil of Ancyra, on Apostolic Sees, 12; on the letter of Hadrian, P. I., to the Seventh Synod, 1272.

—— of Antioch, 447.

—— the Emperor, on the position of the Patriarchal Sees, 817, 931; and Photius, 918.

—— of Seleucia, on St. John xxi. 15, 139.

Basil, Pseudo- (1), on 'The Rock,' 163.

—— (2) on 'The Rock,' 164.

Basilides and Martial, case of, 574 *et seq.*, 699, 1155; witness of, against Papalism, 576.

Basle, Council of, A.D. 1431, on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 129; on Provincial Synods, 310; and Eugenius, P. IV., 1008; received the *Decree* of the fifth Session of the Council of Constance, 1009; did not regard the Pope as the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' 1009, 1014; and the Bull *Dudum Sacrum*, 1010; and the legates of Eugenius, P. IV., 1012; value of the testimony of, against Papalism, 1013; Œcumenical on Papalist principles, 1013.

Batiffol, Mgr., cited, 1232, *footnote* 5; on the 'Roman copy' of St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 1243.

Bede, The Ven., on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 123, 129; on St. John xxi. 15, 136, 889; calls St. Gregory the Great 'the Apostle of the English,' 1119; on Paulinus and the *Pallium*, 1294.

Bektos, John, intruded into the See of CP., 820.

Belisarius, deposes Sylverius, P., 936.

Bellarmine, on Canon VI. of Nicæa, 319; on the Papal Primacy, 577; on the jurisdiction of Bishops, 850; on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1180.

Benedict, P. II., and the Spanish Bishops, *re* the Sixth Synod, 1042.

Benedict, P. XIII., 978; oath of, before election, 978, *footnote* 2; deposed by Council of Constance, 996.

—— P. XIV., cited, 72, 1063; on the power of the Pope, 1103.

—— Levita, 229, 230.

Benson, Archbishop, on the term *in solidum*, 36; on the meaning of the title *Princeps*, 504; cited, 574, *footnote* 3, 1151, 1197, 1234, 1245, 1246.

Bernard, St., on the value of the testimony of, to Papalism, 892.

Beroncianus, 421.

Bessarion, at the Council of Florence, 253; after the Council of Florence, 1190.

Besulas, African Deacon, represents Capreolas of Carthage at the Third Synod, 385.

'Binding and Loosing,' meaning of the phrase, 115, 116; power of, given to all the Apostles, 115 *et seq.*, 843.

Bingham, cited, 1204.

Bishop, Mr. E., on the early 'style' of the Roman Bishops, 1234.

—— the, position of, in his diocese, 40; the local centre of unity, 46, 835; the highest ecclesiastical authority known to St. Jerome, 837 *et seq.*

Bishops, successors of the Apostles, 35; power of the, 37, 553, 597, 1088 *et seq.*; vicars of Christ, 38; vicars of the Apostles, 38; St. Ignatius on the position of, 39, 835; St. Cyprian on the position of, 40, 46, 553, 570, 835, 860, *et seq.*; responsibility of, for the whole Church, 41 *et seq.*, 436 *et seq.*, 576, 672, 686, *et seq.*; St. Pacian on the position of, 86, 87; St. Cyril on the position of, 97; all, in Peter received 'The Gift of the Keys,' 130; all, in Peter, received the commission 'Feed My Sheep,' 134, 136; all, 'successors of Peter,' 133, 556; position of, in the Western Councils falsely called Œcumenical, 291; had a 'decisive' vote in the ancient Synods, 292; form of subscription of, to Acts of the ancient Synods, 292; prohibited from interfering in other dioceses by Canon II. of C P., A.D. 381, 343; in Œcumenical Synods not *Mandatarii* of the Pope, 376, 920; votes of, in sentencing Dioscurus, 394; the Fifth Synod on the position of, 435; and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 451 *et seq.*; St. Irenæus on the position of, 496; St. Irenæus on the succession of, 496; possess 'sovereignty,' 601; are *Principes Ecclesiæ*, 601; power of, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, 823 *et seq.*, 1071 *et seq.*; by whom, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, 'flocks' assigned to,

825, 1090; relations of, to the 'successors of Peter,' according to Papalism, 829 *et seq.*, 1077 *et seq.*; styled *summus sacerdos*, 833; St. Jerome on the position of, 833 *et seq.*; limited power of, according to Papalism, 845 *et seq.*, 1071 *et seq*, 1077 *et seq.*; in what sense, according to Papalism, 'not to be thought *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs,' 850, 1088 *et seq.*; according to Papalism have no jurisdiction except they are in subjection to the 'Roman Pontiff,' 851; 'Confirmation' of Councils by, 1040 *et seq.*; actual power of, according to Papalism, 1071 *et seq.*, 1136; St. Thomas Aquinas on the position of, 1081 *et seq.*; Innocent, P. III., on the position of, 1085 *et seq.*; in reality according to Papalism 'Vicars' of the 'Roman Pontiffs,' 1087 *et seq.*, 1133; the position of, according to Papalism contrasted with that held by them in the Primitive Church, 1088; according to Papalism not in reality 'Ordinaries' of their Dioceses, 1090 *et seq.*, 1132; actual position of, in the Church, according to Papalism, 1132.

Blastus, 528.

Blondel, on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1180.

Blondus, Flavius, and the Latin text of the *Decretum Unionis*, 263, 269.

Bogoris, King of the Bulgarians, 917.

Bona, Card., on the *Liber Diurnus* and the condemnation of Honorius, P., 963.

Boniface, St., on the *Pallium*, 1291.

—— P. I., and the case of Apiarius, 611 *et seq.*; letter of the African Bishops to, 613; and the case of Anthony of Fussala, 618; and Arles, 1175.

—— P. V., 783.

—— P. VIII., Bull *Unam Sanctam* of, 288.

—— the legate of the Bishop of Rome at Chalcedon, 424.

Bossuet, on St. Chrysostom's view of the position of St. Peter at the appointment of St. Matthias, 182; on the effect of the convocation of the Third Synod on the 'sentence' of Celestine, P., on Nestorius, 375; on the deposition of Timothy Ælurus, 449; on St. Basil's attitude towards the Roman Bishop, 681; on the statement by Honorius, P., *re* the legates of Sophronius, 791, *footnote* 1; on the letters of Honorius, P., 797; on the *Liber Diurnus* and the condemnation of Honorius, P., 965; on the Spanish Bishops and the Sixth Synod, 1042; on St. Optatus and 'The Gift of the Keys,' 1165; cited, 1272.

Bower, on the Synodal letter of the Council of Sardica, 1208.

Bramhall, on the meaning of *Schisma* in St. Jerome's *Ep. ad Jovinianum*, 596; on the 'privileges of St. Peter,' 1144.

Breviary, the Roman, and the fall of Liberius, 769; on the condemnation of Honorius, P., 964; 'Reformation' of, in the sixteenth century, 769, 964.

Bright, Dr. W., on 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 204; on Gratian's *Rescript*, 209; on the *Prisca* version of Canon VI. of Nicæa, 316; on St. Cyril's position at the Third Synod, 365; on the 'Eighth' Canon of Ephesus, 385; on the 'Synodicon' of the Second Synod read at Chalcedon, 426; on the letter of Anatolius of C P. to St. Leo, 445; on the meaning of *principalitas* in the 'Irenæan Passage,' 502; on the Synodal letter of the Council of Milevis, A.D., 411, to Innocent, P. I., 634; on Euzoius, 666; on the 'restoration' to Sees, 732; on Sozomen's account of the fall of Liberius, 765; on the meaning of *qui majores dioeceses tenes*, 1206; cited, 1210.

Britain, in the *Præfectura Galliæ*, 209; when, ceased to be within the limits of the Roman Empire, 212.

Bruno of Segni, St., on St. John xxi. 15, 887.

Bubalius and Tauranus, case of, 332.

Burchard of Worms, collection of Canons by, 240.

Cæcilian, case of, 209; and the Donatists, 603.

Cæsar Bardas, 915.

Cæsarini, Card. Juliano, legate of Eugenius, P. IV., at the Council of Basle, 1008.

Cæsarias, St., 1178.

Caius, testifies to the presence of St. Peter at Rome, 473.

Caldonius, 546, 549, 1156.

Callistus, P., 1234.

Calixtus, Pseudo-, P., 1181.

Cano, Melchior, on St. Luke xxii. 32, 156; used *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 156, 1167.

Canterbury, Archbishop of, styled Patriarch, 1200; and the *Pallium*, 1293, 1294.

Capreolus, 385.

Caprera, Card., legate *a latere* of Pius, P. VII., 1101.

Carthage, Bishop of, position of the, 1176, 1204; title of 'Pope' applied to the, 1197.

—— Sixteenth Council of, Canon XVII. of the, 609, 638, 1251 *et seq.*

Carthage, Twentieth Council of, letter of the, to Celestine, P. I., 620 *et seq.*
Catalogus Liberianus, 489.
Celestine, P. I., and Nestorius, 351 *et seq.*; Synodal letter of, to St. Cyril, 353; letter of, to Nestorius, 453; test of the truth laid down by, 354; legates of, at the Third Synod, 366; the Third Synod and the Synodal letter of, to St. Cyril, 368, 920; on the position of the Bishops in the Church, 373, 736; places himself in the ranks of the Bishops, 374, 736; legates of, and Nestorius at the Third Synod, 376; legates of, at the Third Synod represented the Bishops of the West, 377; and the case of Anthony of Fussala, 618; and the case of Apiarius, 619; letter of the Twentieth Council of Carthage to, 620 *et seq.*; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Third Synod, 1026.
Celidonius, case of, 213.
Cerularius, Michael, Patriarch of CP., excommunicated Leo, P. IX., 244.
Chalcedon, Synod of, A.D. 451, ignorant of the 'Sardican Canons,' 333, 402; before the, St. Leo deprecates the holding of a Synod, 387 *et seq.*; convoked by the Emperor, 388; president of, 391; case of Dioscurus at, 393 *et seq*; the Imperial Commissioners at, on the deposition of Dioscurus, 393, 395; languages of the legates of St. Leo at, on the deposition of Dioscurus, 394; Bishops at, sentence Dioscurus, 394; deposes Dioscurus, 395; case of Theodoret at, 397 *et seq.*; 'restores' Theodoret, 400, 401; Canon I. of, 402 *et seq.*; Canon IX. of, bestows a privilege on C P., 404 *et seq.*, 1056; Nicholas, P. I., on Canon IX. of, 408; Canon XVII. of, 409, 754, 1056; creates the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 415; Fathers of, knew nothing of Papalism, 418; conduct of the legates of St. Leo at, and the second Canon of the Second Synod, 423; Synodal letter of, to St. Leo, 431 *et seq.*, 1027, 1028; reply of St. Leo to the Synodal letter of, 441; treatment of 'The Tome' of St. Leo by, 452 *et seq.*; 'Exclamation of the Fathers' at, 458, 459, 742; test of St. Leo's orthodoxy applied by the Fathers of, 462; the *Henoticon* and, 923; nature of the 'assent and confirmation' of St. Leo asked for by, 1027 *et seq.*; on the action of the Fathers of the Second Synod, 1039; *Edict* of the Emperor with reference to the *Definitio* of, 1039.
—— Canon XXVIII. of, 410; ground of the privileges of CP. stated in, 411; meaning of, 412 *et seq.*; privileges granted to CP. by, 413; principles embodied in, 415; witnesses against Papalism, 418; ground of the objection of St. Leo's legates to, 422, 424; reply of the Imperial Commissioners to the protest of the legates of St. Leo against, 429; ground of St. Leo's refusal of assent to, 438 *et seq.*, 1030, 1283; result of St. Leo's action with reference to, 443 *et seq.*, 1054; Anatolius of C P. and, 444 *et seq.*; Liberatus of Carthage on, 450; position of, confirmed by the Council *in Trullo*, 450, 754; position of, 450, 1054; civil authority given by Justinian to, 450.
Chapman, Dom J., on the 'interpolations' in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 1241 *et seq.*; on the MSS. which contain the 'interpolations,' 1241; on the 'citations' of the 'interpolations,' 1242; does not suppose that St. Augustine knew of the 'interpolations,' 1242; on the resemblances to the 'interpolations' in the genuine works of St. Cyprian, 1242; on St. Cyprian's use of the word *primatus*, 1242, *footnote* 7; on Novatian's 'claims' as 'Anti-Pope,' 1242, *footnote* 7; on the copy of the *De Unitate* sent to Rome, 1243; on the reason of the composition of the *De Unitate*, 1243.
'Chapters, The Three,' meaning of the term, 935; Vigilius, P., and, 937 *et seq*; the Fifth Synod and, 942.
Charlemagne, and Hadrian, P. I., 1044; and the Seventh Synod, 1044.
Charles of Anjou, 815.
Creighton, Bishop, cited, 978, 980, *footnote* 2, 987, *footnote* 1, 1008.
Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, and St. Chrysostom, 719; 'styled' Pope, 1195.
Chrysostom, St., held the Apostles to be rulers of the whole Church, 31; on the responsibility of Bishops for the whole Church, 42; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 56; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 124; on the position of St. Paul in the Church, 126, 175, 912; on the position of St. John in the Church, 127, 175; on St. John xxi. 15, 138 *et seq.*; on the position of St. Peter in the Apostolate, 134, 177 *et seq.*; regarded St. Peter as the typical Bishop, 134; on St. Luke xxii. 32, 149; on St. Peter at the appointment of St. Matthias, 151 *et seq.*, 179 *et seq.*; meaning of terms applied to St. Peter by, 172 *et seq.*, 840; titles applied to St. John and St. Paul by, 175; on the position of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem, 177; on St. Paul's conten-

tion with St. Peter at Antioch, 183, 913; Did, call St. Peter the 'Master' of the Apostolate? 183, 911; on the position of the See of Antioch, 185; on St. Flavian of Antioch, 185, 689; on the position of the Apostolate, 188; on the Œcumenical jurisdiction of the Apostles, 189; witness of, against Papalism, 189, 689 *et seq.*; deposes Gerontius, Bishop of Nicomedia and Asiatic Bishops, 220; on St. Meletius of Antioch, 593, 688; was baptised and ordained when out of communion with Rome, 688; and Evagrius, 689; consecration of, 690; and Theophilus of Alexandria, 690, 718 *et seq.*; brought about reconciliation of East and West, 690; knew nothing of Papalism, 691, 724; 'Appeal' of the 'Long brothers' to, 700, 718; alleged 'Appeal' to Rome of, 718 *et seq.*; letter of, to Bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia of, 719; on St. Paul's visit to St. Peter, 911; the 'old text' of the *Homilies on the Acts* of, 1170; are the *Homilies on the Acts* of, genuine? 1171; forged passage attributed to, 1215.

Church, The, the *Satis Cognitum* on, 14 *et seq.*; St. Paul on the unity of, 21; baptism and the unity of, 22; the Eucharist and the unity of, 23; the supreme authority in, instituted by Christ, 30 *et seq.*; the 'foundation' of, 842.

Claudianus, one of the representatives of St. Sylvester, P., at Arles, 301.

Clemens Romanus, S., and the connection of St. Peter and St. Paul with Rome, 468, 1228; Epistle of, to the Corinthians, 468, 1224; third Bishop of Rome, 475, 476, 483 *et seq.*, 1227; Tertullian on the ordination of, 482; *Letter of, to James*, 486; witness of the Epistle to the Corinthians of, against Papalism, 1227 *et seq.*

Clemens Romanus, Pseudo-, 1185.

Clement, P. IV., and the 'Confession' of Michael Palæologos, 816, 821.

—— P. V., 977.

—— P. VII., 279.

Clement, P. VII., 977.

Clementine Literature, 486.

Clovis, 1195.

Cœlestius and Zosimus, 643, 774, 921; condemned by African Bishops, 633, 643; *Libellus of*, 771 *et seq.*

Colossians ii. 19, 23

Columbanus, St., on the position of the Roman Bishop, 1120, 1121.

Conciliariter, meaning of the term, used by Martin, P. V., at the Council of Constance, 1001.

'Confirmation of Councils,' what is meant by 'Papal,' 293, 1017 *et seq.*; by Bishops, 1029 *et seq.*, 1040 *et seq.*, 1279 *et seq.*; 'Papal,' not necessary, 1016 *et seq.*, 1279.

Constance, the Council of, A.D. 1414, 986 *et seq.*; position of the Papacy at the time of, 986; decreed the supremacy of a General Council, 991 *et seq.*; deposed John, P. XXIII., 995; deposed Benedict, P. XII., 996; did not regard the Pope as the 'Master' of 'the Episcopal College,' 997; witnesses against Papalism, 998; Papalist objections to, considered, 998 *et seq.*; 'title' of Martin, P. V., derived from, 999; not an Œcumenical Council, 999; *Decrees* of, 'confirmed by Martin, P. V., 1000 *et seq.*; *Decrees* of the fifth Session of, *in materiis fidei*, 1002, 1003; Eugenius, P. IV., on the authority of, 1005; Pius, P. II., on the authority of, 1006; the Council of Basle and the *Decrees* of the fifth Session of, 1009.

Constans II., the Emperor, and the *Typus*, 792, 1268.

Constantine I., the Emperor, convoked the Nicene Synod, 285; why, did not appeal to St. Sylvester, P., for a 'final decision' against Arianism, 295; did not preside at the Nicene Synod, 298; founded CP., 346; and the Donatists, 603 *et seq.*; and the Council of Arles, 603, 606, 1157; *Donation of*, 1179.

Constantine IV., Pogonatus, the Emperor, letter of Agatho, P., to, 157; action of, in convoking the Sixth Synod witnesses against Papalism, 747; presided at the Sixth Synod, 949; on the condemnation of Honorius, P., 955; 'confirmed' the Sixth Synod, 955; on the convocation of the Sixth Synod, 1277.

Constantine V., Compronymus, convoked the Synod of C. P., A.D. 754, 1051.

Constantine VI., Porphyrogenitus, letter of Hadrian, P. I., to, 1271.

Constantine XII., 257.

Constantine, Bishop of Constantia, 1272.

Constantinople, the Bishop of, ambition of, 70, 346, 412; precedence granted to, by Canon III. of the Second Synod, 346; privileges granted to, by the Fourth Synod, 404, 409, 410 *et seq.*; original position of, 411.

—— the City of, founded, 346; St. Gregory Nazianzen on, 517; captured, 259.

—— the Latin Patriarch of, position of, 450, 1222; privileges of, 1222, 1223; ambition of, 1223.

—— the Synod of, A.D. 381, ignorant

of the 'Sardican Canons,' 333; why, was convoked, 336; convoked by the Emperor, 338; president of, 339; and the case of Paulinus, 340; and the case of Maximus, 'the Cynic,' 341; Canon II. of, 342 *et seq.*; the 'Sixth Canon' of, 345; Canon III. of, 346; grants precedence to C P., 348; letter of the Synod of C P., A.D. 382, on, 1024; no 'Papal' confirmation of, by St. Damasus, P., 1025; 'confirmed' the faith of the Nicene Fathers, 1039.

Constantinople, the Synod of, A.D. 382, on Provincial Synods, 345; Synodal letter of, to the Italian Bishops, 1024.

—— —— A.D. 553, on the Œcumenical responsibility of Bishops, 435, 942; convocation of, 940; Vigilius, P., declines to be present at, 941; and 'The Three Chapters,' 942; witnesses against Papalism, 942 *et seq.*, 1030; pronounced judgment on Vigilius, P., 943, 1032; opposition of Western Bishops to, 946; did not receive 'Papal' confirmation from Vigilius, P., 1031; acted as the supreme authority in the Church, 1033.

—— —— A.D. 680, cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, 743; convoked by the Emperor, 746; president of, 746, *footnote* 2; and Monothelitism, 747; did not hold the action of St. Martin, P. v., as to Monothelitism as 'final,' 747; treatment of the *Epistola Dogmatica* of Agatho, P., by, 749 *et seq.*; put 'The Tome' of St. Leo and two letters of St. Cyril on the same level, 750; condemned Honorius, P., 751, 968, 1054; witnesses against Papalism, 752, 954; Leo, P. II., and the sentence of, on Honorius, P., 798, 956 *et seq.*; condemned Sergius of CP., 950; letter of, to Agatho, P., 953; acts of, genuine, 958, *footnote* 1; held itself to be Œcumenical, 1034; did not receive 'Papal' confirmation from Agatho, P., 1034; Leo, P. II., on the authority of, 1035; Spanish Bishops 'confirm' the acts of, 1035, 1041; did not receive 'Papal' confirmation from Leo, P. II., 1035; not convoked as Œcumenical, 1277.

—— —— A.D. 754, 1051 *et seq.*; why, was rejected, 1051 *et seq.*; the Seventh Synod and, 1051, 1052.

—— —— A.D. 869, Easterns at the Council of Florence on, 266, 919; not Œcumenical, 266, 915, 918; reaffirms the judgment of the Sixth Synod on Honorius, P., 796, 961; and the *Formula of Hormisdas*, 813, *footnote* 2; 'reviews' the judgment of Nicholas, P. I., on Photius, 918, 919; deposes Photius, 918, 932, 937; the Council of CP., A.D. 879, on, 918; position of the five patriarchs at the time of, 931; styles the Pope and the Patriarch of CP. 'Supreme Pontiffs,' 933; influence of Rome at, 933.

Constantius II., the Emperor, and St. Athanasius, 704; and Liberius, 759, 764, 768.

Constitution civile du Clergé, 1098.

convenire ad, meaning of the phrase, 508 *et seq.*, 1233.

Corinth, The Church of, Epistle of S. Clemens Romanus to, 468, 1224 *et seq.*

1 Corinthians iii. 11, 78, 842; iv. 14, 15, 910; v. 3-9, 31: x. 4, 78; x. 17, 23; xi. 28, 31; xii. 12, 27, 21; xii. 13, 22; xii. 25, 21; xii. 28, 21.

2 Corinthians ii. 10, 31; v. 20, 39; xi. 28, 31; xii. 11, 910.

Cornelius, P., letters of St. Cyprian to, 546, 553; the African Bishops and the 'title' of, to the See of Rome, 547; complains against St. Cyprian, 547; in what sense communion with, communion with the Catholic Church, 566.

—— à Lapide, cited, 74, 78.

—— the Centurion, conversion of, 1162 *et seq.*

Cosmas of Alexandria, 1031.

Councils referred to, Agde, A.D. 506, 1234; Aix, A.D. 1409, 980; Alexandria, A.D. 362, 586, 667, 668, 684; A.D. 430, 96, 355; Ancyra, A.D. 314, 402; Antioch, A.D. 264, 584, 1207; A.D. 268, 584, 768; A.D. 269, 584, 1264; A.D. 340, 704; A.D. 341, 402, 511, 715, 1207, 1235; A.D. 361, 665; A.D. 363, 669; Aquileia, A.D. 381, 536 *et seq.*; A.D. 700, 947; Ariminum, A.D. 359, 1048 *et seq.*; Arles, A.D. 314, 301, 583, 606, 1157; A.D. 444, 213; Basle, A.D. 1431, 1007 *et seq.*; Caesarea Mauretania, A.D. 418, 610; Capua, A.D. 391, 689, *footnote* 6; Carthage, A.D. 218, 577, 1148, *footnote* 1; A.D. 249, 1148, *footnote* 2; A.D. 251, 568, 581, 1149, 1151, 1152, 1156; A.D. 252, 699, 1149; A.D. 252 (2), 575, 1155; A.D. 255, 578, 1154; A.D. 256, 579; A.D. 256 (2), 40, 581; A.D. 345, 332; A.D. 397, 1161; A.D. 401, 1161; A.D. 416, 633, 875; A.D. 418, 609, 638, 643; A.D. 418 (2), 644; A.D. 419, 611; A.D. 424, 620; A.D. 550, 939; Chalcedon, A.D. 403 (*ad Quercum*), 692; A.D. 451, 386 *et seq.*, 1027 *et seq.*, 1054, 1207; Clovesho, A.D. 747, 1293, 1295; Compiègne, A.D. 835, 38, 130; Constance, A.D. 1414, 986 *et seq.*; Constantinople, A.D. 381,

336 *et seq.*, 1214; A.D. 382, 349, 716, 1024; A.D. 448, 451, 725, A.D. 453, 447; A.D. 492, 927; A.D. 518, 807; A.D. 536, 807, 1199; A.D. 543, 1107; A.D. 553, 940 *et seq.*, 1031 *et seq.*; A.D. 586, 1107; A.D. 680, 744 *et seq.*, 949 *et seq.*, 1034; A.D. 754, 1051 *et seq.*; A.D. 861, 916; A.D. 867, 917; A.D. 869, 796, 915, 918, 919, 929 *et seq.*; A.D. 879, 918; A.D. 1450, 257; Ephesus, A.D. 431, 351 *et seq.*, 1026; A.D. 449 (the *Latrocinium*), 386, 725, 1047, 1219; Florence. A.D. 1439, 250 *et seq.*, 891, 1189, 1191; Frankfort, A.D. 794, 1044; Gangra, A.D. 343, 402; Iconium, A.D. 230 (?), 577; Jerusalem, A.D. 50, 907; A.D. 715, 632; A.D. 1443, 256; Laodicea, A.D. 343 (?), 402; Lateran, A.D. 649, 659, 747, 793, 1268; A.D. 1123, 985; A.D. 1215, 450; A.D. 1512, 286; Lydda (Dioscopolis), A.D. 415, 633; Lyons, A.D. 1274, 819; Macon, A.D. 581, 1288; Meaux, A.D. 845, 38; Milan, A.D. 345, 1235; A.D. 347, 1235; A.D. 381, 540; A.D. 381 (2), 540 *et seq.*, 714; Milevis, A.D. 416, 633; Myra, A.D. 458, 1257; Mitylene, A.D. 357, 665; Nicæa, A.D. 325, 284 *et seq.*, 1020, 1281; A.D. 787, 795, 1036 *et seq.*; Pavia, A.D. 1423, 1007; Pisa, A.D. 1409, 980 *et seq.*; Rome, A.D. 251, 1150; A.D. 260, 1260; A.D. 341, 707; A.D. 369, 1050; A.D. 371, 663, 673; A.D. 374, 677; A.D. 376, 682; A.D. 378, 207, 333, 1060, 1209; A.D. 430, 353; A.D. 445, 215; A.D. 449, 398, 732; A.D. 484, 805, 925; A.D. 485, 925; A.D. 494, 1060; A.D. 495, 1061; A.D. 680, 748; A.D. 863, 917; A.D. 868, 915, 918; A.D. 1073, 1198; A.D 1411, 936; Sardica, A.D. 343, 323 *et seq.*, 1208; Seleucia, A.D. 359, 1048; Sienna, A.D. 1423, 1007; *Sinuessa*, *A. D. 303*, 972; Sirmium, A.D. 357, 759; Synnada, A.D. 230 (?), 577; Toledo, A.D. 400, 1178, *footnote* 3; A.D. 684, 1041 *et seq.*; *in Trullo*, A.D. 692, 717, 753 *et seq.*, 959, 1160; Trent, A.D. 1545, 83, 116, 824; Turin, A.D. 401, 1173, 1178, *footnote* 3; Tyre, A.D. 335, 704; Vatican, A.D. 1870, 92 *etc.*, Appendix B.; Vienne, A.D. 1311, 291, 985.

Councils, the 'Reforming,' of the fifteenth century, testimony of, against Papalism, 1015.

Criteria of an Œcumenical Council, the Papalist, 1279.

Criterion of an Œcumenical Council, the true, 1280.

Cusa, Card. de, on the 'Charter Texts,' 141; on the Synod of C P., A.D. 869, and the 'sentence' of Nicholas, P. I., on Photius, 932; on the *Decrees* of the Council of Constance, 993; on the position of a General Council, 1009.

Cyprian, St., held Bishops to be the successors of the Apostles, 35; says that Bishops hold the One Episcopate *in solidum*, 36; says that the Bishop represents Christ, 38; on the responsibility of Bishops for the whole Church, 41, 697, 1147, *footnote* 2; applied to, conjointly with St. Stephen in the case of Marcian, 41, 1147, *footnote* 2; says that there is only one Bishop in each See, 46, 87, 549, 835, 858, 862; held each Bishop to be the local centre of unity, 46, 549, 835, 858, 862; on the way in which communion with the Catholic Church is maintained, 46, 564 *et seq.*; held that the One Episcopate succeeds Peter, 135; says that Bishops sit in the Chair of Peter, 135, 557; St. Gregory Nazianzen on the position of, 436; importance of the testimony of, 544; position of, 544; testifies against papalism by his words and actions, 544; on *the root and womb of the Catholic Church*, 546 *et seq.*; and Cornelius, P., 546, *et seq.*, 864; and the Church of Adrumetum, 548, 1156; and the Novatians, 549, 1243; meaning of the terms *Petri Cathedra* and *Ecclesia Principalis* used by, 553 *et seq.*; held the Episcopate to be the governing body of the Church, 554, 855; on the representative character of St. Peter, 556, 571, 856 *et seq.*; held that the Roman Bishop occupies the actual 'Chair' in which Peter sat, 558; meaning of the phrase *unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est* used by, 562; on the position of St. Peter, 563, 854 *et seq.*; opinions of, as to the representative character of the Roman See, 563; did not make communion with the Roman See the criterion of a Catholic, 564 *et seq.*, 576; evidence of the *De Unitate* of, against Papalism, 567 *et seq.*, 571, 858; and the case of Felicissimus, 568, 1151, 1243; the 'interpolations' in the *De Unitate* of, 570, 1244; held that the Apostolate was first given to Peter to manifest unity, 570; 571, 855, 857; says that Bishops preside in the Church, 570; on the position of the Apostles, 571, 856 *et seq.*; and the case of Basilides and Martial, 574 *et seq.*, 1155; letter of the Spanish Bishops to, 574; on Rebaptism, 577 *et seq.*, 1154; on the reply of St. Stephen to the Synodal letter of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256, 580; speech of, at the Council of Carthage,

A.D. 256 (2), 581, 1147; excommunicated by St. Stephen, 582; St. Augustine on, and the Rebaptism controversy, 648; 'Canon' of, approved by the Council *in Trullo*, 753, 755; treatise *De Unitate* of, cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, 854; did not make St. Peter and his 'successors' the centre of unity, 854 *et seq.*; letter of, to Jubianus, 857; what, meant by the phrase *there is . . . one judge for the time in Christ's stead*, 860 *et seq.*; letter of, to Rogatianus, 861; on the authority of Councils, 1147 *et seq.*; on the treatment of the lapsed, 1148; and the case of Germinius Victor, 1148; and the case of Fortunatus, 1152; and the case of Privatus, 1153; styled Pope, 1157; on the 'claims' of Novatian as 'Anti-Pope,' 1242, *footnote* 7; text of the 'interpolations' in the *De Unitate* of, 1244; date of the 'interpolations' in the *De Unitate* of, 1246.

Cyprus, the case of, at the Third Synod, 382, 383.

Cyriacus of C P. uses the title of Œcumenical Patriarch, 1113.

—— Roman Deacon, represented St. Sylvester at Arles, 301.

Cyril of Alexandria, St., on the unity of the Church, 23; on the responsibility of Bishops for the whole Church, 43, 696; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 53, 88 *et seq.*; knew nothing of Papalism, 92 *et seq.*, 358 *et seq.*; on the position of the Apostolate in the Church, 93 *et seq.*, 169; considered the Apostles to be Œcumenical Judges, 95 *et seq.*, 169; on Genesis xlix. 16, 95; on St. John i. 9, 97; on the position of Bishops in the Church, 97; considered the Apostles to be Œcumenical Doctors, 128; on St. John xxi. 15, 138; first letter of, to Nestorius, 351; letter of, to the monks of Egypt on Nestorianism, 351; letter of, to Celestine, P., 352; second letter of, to Nestorius, 352; letter of Celestine, P., to, 353; third letter of, to Nestorius, 355; test of orthodoxy presented to Nestorius by, 355, 356; on the 'authority' of the Councils of Alexandria and Rome in the case of Nestorius, 356; makes the teaching of East and West the test of truth, 356; letter of, to John of Antioch, 358; forged 'extracts' from the writings of, in the interests of Papalism, 359, 1215; presides over the Third Synod as Bishop of Alexandria, 364 *et seq.*, 1216; the Third Synod and the second letter of, to Nestorius, 368; the Third Synod and the third letter of, to Nestorius, 368; the Fourth Synod and the second letter of, to Nestorius, 452, 459; sends copies of genuine Acts of Nicæa to the African Bishops, 617; testimony of, against Papalism, 692 *et seq.*, 738 *et seq.*; and the replacing of the name of St. Chrysostom on the Diptychs, 693; and the case of Bishop Peter in the Patriarchate of Antioch, 700; and the case of Athanasius of Pyrrha, 701; the Sixth Synod uses the letters of, to Nestorius as a test of orthodoxy, 750; the Sixth Synod puts the two Synodal letters of, on the same level as 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 750.

Cyril of Jerusalem, St., calls St. Peter and St. Paul 'Presidents of the Churches,' 174; possession of the See of Jerusalem by, confirmed by the Synod of CP., A.D. 382, 1024.

Cyrus of Alexandria and Monothelitism, 785 *et seq.*; condemned by the Sixth Synod, 950.

—— of Aphrodisias, 727.

—— Bishop of Mariamna, 807.

D'Ailly, Peter, on the position of the Pope, 980; on the position of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem, 980; on the Council of Pisa, 988.

Damasus, P., St., grant of jurisdiction to, by Gratian, 207; on Maximus, 'the Cynic,' 540; letters of St. Jerome to, 586, 591; recognised Paulinus as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, 592, 677; letters of St. Basil to, 670; not summoned to the Second Synod, 1023, 1277; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Second Synod, 1023; and the Council of Ariminum, 1050; and the 'Vicariate' of Thessalonica, 1210.

De Aleatoribus, the tract, 601, 1247 *et seq.*, written by a Bishop, 1248; witnesses against Papalism, 1248.

Deacons, the appointment of the Seven, 904.

Declaratio Cleri Gallicani de Ecclesiastica Potestate, cited, 895, 1272.

Decretals, The Forged, vide *The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*.

Decretal Letters of Eastern Fathers confirmed by the Council *in Trullo*, 753, 1160.

Decretals, Papal, the first genuine of the, 69, 736; on the, 1160 *et seq.*

Decretum, the, of Gratian, *vide* Gratian, the *Decretum* of.

Decretum Unionis, the, the Council of Florence and, 256-259; imperfectly cited in the *Satis Cognitum* and the *Vatican Decrees*, 261 *et seq.*; differ-

ence between the Greek and Latin texts of, 262; genuine text of, 264; ground on which the Easterns insisted on the true wording of, 265 *et seq.*; statement cited from, by the *Satis Cognitum* of no value for the purpose for which it is quoted, 275.
Definiens subscripsi, meaning of the phrase, 292, 1039.
Dei et Apostolicæ Sedis gratiâ Episcopus, when the phrase first found, 1194.
Demetrius of Antioch, 1264.
Demophilus and Liberius, 759.
δευτέρα σύνοδος, on the title, as applied to the Ephesine Synod by the *Latrocinium*, 1221.
Deuteronomy xxxii. 18, 77.
Development, theory of, incompatible with Papalism, 50, 1068.
Dianius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 663.
Didache, the, 842.
Dietrich of Niem, on the relative position of a General Council and the Pope, 987; on the position of Bishops according to Papalism, 1102.
'Diocese,' meaning of the word as used by the Third Synod, 384.
—— Synod of the, 'final' Court of Appeal, 223, 345, 403.
Dioecesis Romæ, extent of the, 1201.
Dioeceses, civil division of the Roman Empire into, 1235.
Dionysius of Alexandria, St., and the excommunication of the Bishops of Asia Minor by St. Stephen, P., 583; *Decretals* of, 1160; and St. Dionysius of Rome, 1260 *et seq.*, and Sabellianism, 1260: witness of the case of, and St. Dionysius of Rome against Papalism, 1262; and the case of Paul of Samosata, 1264.
—— the Carthusian, on 'The Rock,' 80, 81.
—— of Corinth, St., and the foundation of the Roman Church, 470; on the influence of the Roman Church, 1230.
—— Count, 704.
—— Duke, 382.
—— Exiguus, 240, 1251; and the 'Apostolical Canons,' 755.
—— of Rome, St., and the Church of Cæsarea, 671, 672; and St. Dionysius of Alexandria, 1260 *et seq.*; and the case of Paul of Samosata, 1264.
—— *Pseudo-*, *P.*, 1181.
Dioscopolis, Synod of, and Pelagius, 633.
Dioscurus, Patriarch of Alexandria, position of, at the Fourth Synod, 393; deposed by the Fourth Synod, 395; and the *Latrocinium*, 726; treatment of Flavian of C P. by, 726, 727; consecrated Anatolius to C P., 880.
'Direction, Power of,' the *Satis Cognitum* on the insufficiency of, 103, 879, 881; the *Vatican Decrees* on the insufficiency of, 104, 884.
'Dispensations,' 1285.
Döllinger, Ignatius von, on the text of the *Decretum Unionis* of Florence, 263; on the influence of the *Letter to James* on the list of the succession of the early Roman Bishops, 489; on the order of the Roman Bishops in the Canon of the Roman Mass, 492.
Domnus of Antioch (1), 1264.
—— of Antioch (2), 220, 397, 445, 880.
Donatists, the, St. Augustine on, 599, 603 *et seq.*, 646; Melchiades, P., and, 603; and Cæcilian, 603; Constantine and, 604; at the Council of Arles, 606; and Marcellinus, P., 646; St. Optatus of Milevis and, 865 *et seq.*
Donation of Constantine, *The*, 1179, 1187.
Donatus, 603.
—— Bishop, Roman legate at the 'Eighth' Synod, 929.
Donus, P., letter of Constantine Pogonatus to, 1268, 1277.
Dorotheus of Antioch, and the Council of Florence, 256 *et seq.*
—— the Antiochene Deacon, 663, 670, 673.
—— —— Priest, 675.
Ducentius of Gubbio, letter of Innocent, P. I., to, 1253.
Duchesne, Mgr., on the practical result of St. Leo's action *re* Canon XXVIII. of the Fourth Synod in the East, 446; adopts the reading 'Peter and Paul' in the 'Irenæan Passage,' 481; on the Clementine Romance, 486; on the Rebaptism controversy, 583, *footnote* 5; on the number of the Churches in the East, 584; on the position of the Church of Milan in the fourth century, 1178; on the 'Vicariate' of Arles, 1178; on the 'Vicariate' of Thessalonica, 1210, 1211; on the origin of the Gallic Church, 1233; on the *Pallium*, 1288, 1289.
Dudum Sacrum, the Bull of Eugenius, P. IV., 1005, 1010 *et seq.*; significance of the refusal of the Council of Basle to receive, as originally worded, 1010; Mgr. Maret on, 1013; Hefele on, 1014, *footnote* 1.
δύο ἐνέργειαι, meaning of the term, 786 *et seq.*

EASTER CONTROVERSY, the, 526.
Easterns, the, at the Council of Florence,

252 *et seq.*; repudiated the Council of Florence, 257; value of complimentary language used by, 265, 432; sense in which, accepted the *Decretum Unionis* of Florence, 272; produce genuine text of the Sixth Nicene Canon at Chalcedon, 426; maintain Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 450; and Western interference, 543, 924, 1024; letters of, to the Westerns asking for help against Arianism, 673, 682; nature of the request of, asking for help against Arianism, 683; alleged 'Appeals' to Rome by, 696 *et seq.*, 1265, 1266; out of communion with Rome from A.D. 484 to A.D. 519, 805, 811; was the *Formula of Hormisdas* accepted by? 811; and the 'Confession' of Michael Palæologus, 821; conclusion as to the testimony of, as to Papalism, 822, 1144; support Acacius of CP., 927, 1061; and the case of Paul of Samosata, 1264 *et seq.*

Eastern Christendom, condition of, at the time of the Council of Florence, 250; in St. Basil's day, 683.

Ebbo of Rheims, and the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 230.

Ebionite Literature, 486 *et seq.*

Ecclesia principalis, meaning of the term, used by St. Cyprian, 559.

Ecthesis, the, 792.

—— of Macarius, 1269.

Egypt, the Bishops of, and the position of Patriarch of CP., 447, 448; letter of, to Anatolius of CP., 447, 448; and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 457.

Eleutherus, twelfth Bishop of Rome, 475, 479, 480, 528.

Eleutherus, Pseudo-, P., 1183.

Eliakim, 115.

Elias Meniates, on the Papacy, 1144.

—— Patriarch of Jerusalem, at the 'Eighth' Synod, and the 'judgment' of Nicholas, P. I., on Photius, 930.

Elpidius, messenger of St. Julius, P., to the Eusebians, 705.

Emperor, the right of the, to convoke Synods, 225; bestowed the *Pallium*, 1288.

Encyclical, the, of the Patriarch of CP., A.D. 1895, 7.

English Church, rejection of Papal Supremacy by, justified, 1144, 1295 *et seq.*

—— Churchmen bound to reject the 'Appeal' of Leo, P. XIII., in the *Satis Cognitum*, 1145.

Ephesians i. 17, 22, 23, 21; ii. 20, 35, 74, 146, 842; iii. 3-5, 23; iv. 12-13, 27; iv. 15-16, 21.

Ephesus, the See of, position of, 416.

—— the Synod of, A.D. 431, sense in which the title 'Apostolic See' was applied to the Roman See by, 8; why, was convoked, 360; convoked by the Emperor, 360 *et seq.*; terms of the summons of, inconsistent with Papalism, 361; witnesses against Papalism, 361, 368, 371, 381, 738 *et seq.*; effect of the convocation of, 362; president of, 364 *et seq.*, 1216; and the case of Nestorius, 367 *et seq.*; did not regard the 'sentence' of Celestine, P., on Nestorius as a 'final' decision, 367, 369; and Celestine's letters to St. Cyril, 368; and St. Cyril's second and third letters to Nestorius, 368; anathematised the letter of Nestorius to St. Cyril, 368; sentence of, on Nestorius, 370; the deposition of Nestorius the act of, 371, 372; value of 'Petrine' language used by the Roman legates at, 376, 381, 736 *et seq.*; the Fathers require the assent of the Roman legates to the judgment of, 377; the Roman legates represent the whole West at, 377, 378, 740; Synodal letter of, to Theodosius, 378; the 'Eighth Canon' of, 382 *et seq.*; Patriarch the highest rank in the Church known to, 384; 'exclamation' of the Fathers at, 460; no 'Papal' confirmation of, 1026; statement as to St. Cyril in the Synodal letter of, 1216; on the title δευτέρα σύνοδος applied to, by the *Latrocinium*, 1221.

Ephesus, the Synod of, A.D. 449 (the *Latrocinium*), and Flavian of CP., 397, 423, 726 *et seq.*, 1047; why, was rejected by the Church, 1047.

Ephraim of Antioch, 936.

Epictetus, Arian Bishop, 761.

Epiphanius of CP., restored the names of Euphemius and St. Macedonius to the Diptychs, 806; and the *Formula of Hormisdas*, 811.

'Episcopal College, The,' superior to the Roman Bishop, 914 *et seq.*, 973 *et seq.*

Episcopate, The, the continuation of the Apostolate, 34 *et seq.*; 'One,' 36; the 'Oneness' of, the instrument of the unity of the Church, 46, 565; Celestine, P., on the power of, 373; power of, 375; instituted in St. Peter according to the Africans, 556, 571, 856.

Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur, meaning of phrase, 36.

Episcopus Episcoporum, meaning of the term, used by Tertullian, 1234.

Epistles, the New Testament, make no reference to a 'Visible Head' of the Church, 32.

Epistola Tractoria, the, of Zosimus, P., 776 *et seq.*
Epistolæ Canonicæ, 1160.
Ervig, King, letter of Leo, P. II., to, 958, 1041 ; and the Spanish Bishops and the Sixth Synod, 1041.
Ethelbert, King, 1294.
Ethiopian Eunuch, the, 1162.
Eucharist, the Holy, and the unity of the Church, 23.
Eugenius, Roman Deacon, represented St. Sylvester, P., at Arles, 301.
—— P. IV., and the Eastern Emperor, 250 ; and the Council of Florence, 251 ; on the authority of the Council of Constance, 1005 ; letter of, to Frederick, King of the Romans, on the validity of the *Decrees* of Constance, 1005 ; the Bull *Dudum Sacrum* of, 1005, 1010 ; and the Council of Basle, 1008 *et seq.*
Eulogius of Alexandria, and the title Œcumenical Patriarch, 1104 *et seq.*
Euphemius of CP., name of, restored to the Diptychs by Epiphanius of CP., 806 ; died out of communion with Rome, 806 ; name of, not removed from the Diptychs in the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, 811 ; orthodox, 927.
Eusebians, the, did not know of the 'Sardican Canons,' 331 ; 'depose' St. Athanasius, 704 ; letter of, to St. Julius, P., 706 ; letter of St. Julius, P., to, 708, 709, 1258 *et seq.*
Eusebius, cited, 298, 583, 1230 ; names of the legates of St. Sylvester at Nicæa given by, 300 ; on the order of the succession of the early Roman Bishops, 477, 490 ; adopts the 'Irenæan' order of the succession of the early Roman Bishops in his *History*, 477, 490 ; *Chronicon* of, on the Episcopate of St. Peter at Rome, 491 ; on Anicetus, P., and St. Polycarp, 526 ; account of the dispute between St. Victor, P., and the Asiatic Bishops given by, 530, 531 ; records the excommunication of the Asiatic Bishops, 577 ; on the Council of Arles, 606 ; on the foundation of the See of Alexandria, 1060 ; on the early use of Councils, 1158 ; use of the word προέδροις by, 1193 ; on the case of Paul of Samosata, 1264.
—— of Ancyra, 393, 727.
—— of Dorylaeum, 726 ; 'Appeal' of, to Rome, 1266 ; and Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 1266.
—— of Nicomedia, 708.
—— of Rome, St., 'Acts' of, on the fall of Liberius, 769.
—— St., of Samosata, orthodox, 665 ; letter of St. Basil to, 680 ; on the responsibility of Bishops for the whole Church, 697.
Eusebius of Vercelli, St., 667.
Eustathians, the, at Antioch, 667.
Eustathius of Antioch, St., St. Chrysostom on, 42 ; deposition of, 586, 664.
—— of Berytus, 393.
—— the Semi-Arian Bishop of Sebaste, 665.
Eustochius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 940.
Eutyches, deposed at the Synod of CP., A.D. 448, 451, 725, 730 ; declared to be orthodox at the *Latrocinium*, 726.
Eutychianism, St. Leo and, 204.
Eutychius of CP. presides at the Fifth Synod, 940.
Euzoius, Arian intruder into the See of Antioch, 666.
Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* of, cited, 363, 407, 922.
—— consecrated to Antioch by Paulinus, 689 ; not recognised by the Patriarchate of Antioch, 689.
—— a priest of Antioch, 675.
Evangelus, letter of St. Jerome to, 35, 597.
Evaristus, fourth Bishop of Rome, 477.
Everest, Canon, on the admission of the Gentiles into the Church, 1162.
Exarch, the title, as used in Canon IX. of the Fourth Synod, 404.
'Exclamations' of the Fathers at Chalcedon, 458 *et seq.*, 742 ; at the Third Synod, 460.

FABIAN, P., St., 1242, *footnote* 7.
Fabian, Pseudo-, P., 1181, 1183.
'Faculties' required by Bishops of the Roman obedience, 1090, 1285 *et seq.*
Facundus on Zosimus and Pelagianism, 781.
Fathers, Greek, forged passages attributed to the, 243 *et seq.*, 656, 1215.
Faustinus of Lyons, and the case of Marcian, 41, 1147, *footnote* 2.
—— of Potentina, and the case of Apiarius, 610, 619 ; and the 'Sardican Canons,' 612 ; African Bishops and the conduct of, 620.
Faustus, letter of Gelasius, P., to, 1055.
Felicissimus, 568, 862, 1151, 1243.
Felix, Pseudo-, P. I., 1182, 1183.
Felix, P. II., adduces the 'Sardican Canons' as Nicene, 329, 925 ; and Acacius, 805, 922, 924, 925, 1055.
—— Anti-Pope, 758, *footnote* 3, 764.
—— *Pseudo-, P. II.*, 1181, 1183.
—— Bishop of Astorga (?), 574.
—— —— of Nantes, styled 'Pope,' and his See Apostolic, 1195.
—— —— of Saragossa, 574, 575.
—— of Treves, 1177, *footnote* 2.

Ferrara, Council of Florence first assembled at, 253.
Ferraris, on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1180.
Fictions, Papalist, cited in the Bull *Pastor Æternus* of Leo, P. X., 287.
Fides Romana, meaning of the term in 'Sermo CXX.' attributed to St. Augustine, quoted in the *Satis Cognitum*, 630.
Field, criteria of General Councils of, 1276 *et seq.*
Filioque, the, at the Council of Florence, 1189.
Firmilian, St., on Bishops successors of the Apostles, 35; and St. Stephen's excommunication of St. Cyprian, 582; venerated as a saint, 584; ignorant of Papalism, 584; on the necessity of Synods, 1157; and the case of Paul of Samosata, 1264.
Firmus of Cæsarea, on Celestine's 'sentence' on Nestorius, 375.
Fisher, Bishop, and the Latin text of the Florentine *Decretum Unionis*, 263; ignorant of the true character of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1188.
Flavian of Antioch, 'sat in Peter's See,' 185, 688; not in communion with Rome, 187; election of, confirmed by the Second Synod, 340, 1024; refused to submit his right to the See of Antioch to the Egyptian Bishops, 689, *footnote* 6.
—— of CP., at the *Latrocinium*, 423, 726, 1047; letter of, to St. Leo *re* Eutyches, 451; 'Appeal' of, to Rome, 725 *et seq.*; St. Leo and the 'Appeal' of, 729; Valentinian III. on the 'Appeal' of, 730.
—— of Philippi, 353, 366.
Fleury, cited, 216, 217, 220, 693, 759; on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 231; on the letter of Celestine, P., to the Fathers of the Third Synod, 374; on the position of St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian, 584; on the reconciliation of the East and the West by the recognition of Flavian of Antioch, 690; on the 'Canon of St. Cyprian,' ratified by the Council *in Trullo*, 755; on Pope Vigilius and the decision of the Fifth Synod on 'The Three Chapters,' 1032; on the position of St. Gregory in the East and the West, 1123; on the Papal 'Legates' in the Middle Ages, 1220.
Florence, the Council of, A.D. 1439, why was, convoked? 250 *et seq.*; Eastern Bishops at, not independent, 252; proceedings of, 252 *et seq.*; repudiated by the Easterns, 254, 257; not Œcumenical, 259; *Decretum Unionis* of, 260 *et seq.*; the *Satis Cognitum* on, 260; Greeks at, decline to recognise the 'Eighth' Synod, 266, 919; on the precedence and privileges of the Patriarchal Sees, 271; value of the witness of, for the purposes of Papalism, 275; styled by Clement, P. VII., the 'Eighth Œcumenical,' 279, 919; precedence of CP. recognised by, 450; subjects discussed by, 1189; not regarded by Gallicans as Œcumenical, 1191.
Forged Decretals, the, *vide* the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*.
Forgeries, Roman, 243 *et seq.*, 1180, 1181, 1187.
Fortunatian and Liberius, 759, 766.
Fortunatus, Amularius, held Bishops to the Vicars of the Apostles, 38.
—— of Carthage, St. Cyprian on, 553, 555; consecrated 'Anti-Pope' of Carthage, 862, 1152; consecrator of, 862, *footnote* 4.
—— of Poitiers, 1195.
—— Bishop of Thuccaboris, 546, 548, 568, 1156.
Frankfort, Council of, A.D. 789, and the Seventh Synod, 1044.
Franto of Milan, 947.
Frederick III., King of the Romans, letter of Eugenius, P. IV., to, on the Council of Constance, 1005.
French Episcopate, The, the national convention and, 1098; Pius, P. VI., and, 1099; protested against the action of Pius, P. VII., 1101.
Freppel, Mgr., on St. John xxi. 15, 141; cites the 'interpolations' in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 1245.
Funk, Dr., on *potior principalitas* in the 'Irenæan Passage,' 502, 505, 515, 1233; on *convenire ad* in the 'Irenæan Passage,' 505, 1233; on the journey of St. Polycarp to Rome, 1233.

Galatians i. 1, 31, 910; i. 18, 911; ii. 4, 912; ii. 6, 912; ii. 9-12, 76; ii. 11, 31, 183, 913; iii. 27, 28, 22.
Gangra, Council of, A.D. 343 (?), Canons of the, confirmed by the Fourth Synod, 402.
Garnier, on the letters of Leo, P. II., *re* Honorius, P., 958, *footnote* 1; and the *Liber Diurnus*, 965.
'Gates of Hell, The,' Origen on, 108 *et seq.*
Gaudentius, St., on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 123; held Bishops to be successors of Peter, 135, 556, *footnote* 4.
Gaul, Primatial See of, 1173 *et seq.*; evangelised from Rome, 1233.
Gelasius of Cyzicus, on the presidency of the Nicene Synod, 301; character of statements made by, 301.
—— P., on the Pope and the decrees of Councils, 1055 *et seq.*; and Papalism,

1055 *et seq.*; probably refers to 'Sardican Canons' as Nicene, 1057; on the 'Second' and 'Third' Sees, 1060; statement by, quoted in the *Satis Cognitum*, useless for the purposes of Papalism, 1062.
Gennadius of CP., 259.
Genseric, 628.
George of CP., on the *Epistola Dogmatica* of Agatho, P., at the Sixth Synod, 749; and the case of Macarius, 1269.
Germinius Faustinus, 1148.
—— Arian Bishop of Sirmium, 761.
—— Victor, case of, 1148.
Gerontius of Nicomedia, deposed by St. Chrysostom, 220.
Gerson, on the position of the Pope, 981; on the position of a General Council, 990.
Gesta Liberii, the, 1187.
Gieseler, cited, 209, 230, 1194; on the position of the Eastern Patriarchates, 223.
Gildas, 556, *footnote* 5.
Gnostics, claims of the, 496; St. Irenæus and the, 497.
Gobel, Bishop, a consecrator of the French 'Constitutional Bishops,' 1099.
Gore, Bishop, on the Greek Fathers and the promise to St. Peter, 72; on St. Leo and the Papacy, 202; on the 'Prophets,' 842; on the distinction between valid and irregular ordinations, 1214.
Gratian, the Emperor, *Rescript* of, 207 *et seq.*; letter of the Council of Rome, A.D. 378, to, 207; 'Civil Powers' granted to the Roman Bishop by the *Rescript* of, 299; *Edict* of toleration of, 336; letter of the Council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, to, 539; and the title *Pontifex Maximus*, 1234.
—— the *Decretum* of, and the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 240, 974; influence of, 241, 974; contains forgeries of his own, 243; and Provincial Synods, 310; falsification of Canon XXXVI. of the *Quinsext* Synod by, 754, *footnote* 1; used by St. Thomas, 974; and the *Donation of Constantine*, 1179; and the African Canon on Appeals, 1252.
Gratry, Père, cited, 972.
Gratus of Carthage, not at Sardica, 332; did not know of the 'Sardican Canons,' 332.
Greek Fathers, catena of forged passages attributed to, 243; object of the forgery of, 244; use of, by Urban, P. IV., 246; influence of, on St. Thomas, 248; result of the forgery of, 248.
—— text, the, of the Florentine *Decretum Unionis*, 262.
Gregory intruded into the See of Alexandria, 704.
Gregory the Great, St., on St. Matthew xviii. 16, 57; on the position of St. Peter, 195, 1109, 1111; cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, 195, 1104; value of 'Petrine' language used by, 196; on the position of St. Paul, 197, 602; on the first four Œcumenical Synods, 281; and the title Œcumenical Patriarch, 1104 *et seq.*; letters of, to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, 1104 *et seq.*; sense in which, denounced the title Œcumenical Patriarch, 1107 *et seq.*, 1116; letters of, to the Emperor Maurice, 1109 *et seq.*; letter of, to John, 'the Faster,' 1111; letter of, to the Patriarch of Antioch, 1112, 1114; and Cyriacus of CP., 1114; letter of, to the Bishops of Illyricum, 1115; meaning of the title 'Universal Bishop' according to, 1116; idea of the Papacy held by, 1117; position of, in the world, 1118; position of, in the West, 1119, 1123; 'Apostle of the English,' 1119, 1125, 1293; and the Istrian Bishops, 1120; position of, in the East, 1122, 1124; power claimed by, not that of Universal Bishop, 1124; probably referred to the 'Sardican Canons,' 1124; and the case of Priest John of Chalcedon, 1124; idea of the Papacy held by, not primitive, 1125; on the 'See of Peter,' 1127; idea of the Papacy held by, not that of Papalism, 1128; deemed himself to have succeeded to St. Peter, 1128; and Illyricum, 1211; use of the *Pallium* by, 1290; granted the *Pallium* to English Archbishops, 1293.
—— of Antioch, 1107.
—— Mamma of CP., deposed, 257.
Gregory of Nazianzen, St., on St. John xxi. 15, 139, 888; labours of, at CP., 336, 518; presided at the Second Synod, 340, 1213; on the position of St. Cyprian in the Church, 436; on the position of St. Athanasius in the Church, 436; on the position of CP. in the Church, 517; on St. Meletius of Antioch, 593; ascribed 'sovereignty' to Bishops, 601; applied the title Patriarch to senior Bishops, 1199.
—— of Nyssa, St., on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 56.
—— P. VII., and the Papacy, 975; and the title 'Pope,' 1198; and the oath taken by Metropolitans, 1292.
—— P. X., 815.
—— P. XI. 977.
—— P. XII. 978; resigned the Papacy, 996.
—— of Syracuse, 915.
—— Thaumaturgus, St., *Decretals* of, 1160.

Gregory of Tours, St. and the title 'Pope,' 1195.
'Guardianship of the Vine,' the, 435.
Guido, Archbishop of Milan, 1204.

HADRIAN, P. I., letter to, of Tarasius of CP., 1036; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Seventh Synod, 1038; treatment of the letter to the Emperor of, by the Seventh Synod, 1038, 1271 *et seq.*; and Charlemagne, 1044; and the title 'Universal Patriarch,' 1271.
—— P. II., cited by the *Satis Cognitum*, 915; on the 'judgments' of the Roman Pontiffs, 915 *et seq.*; on sentences of the Roman Pontiffs, 967; on the condemnation of Honorius, P., 967, 968; value of the citation from, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 967.
Hall, the Rev. H. E., 527, *footnote* 2.
Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, 988.
Hauranne, J. Duvergier du, on the power of the Episcopate, 37.
'Head,' an ambiguous term, 1122, *footnote* 3.
'Head of the Church,' did Christ appoint a Visible, 19 *et seq.*; St. Thomas alleges the necessity of the appointment of a Visible, 25; Holy Scripture witnesses against the appointment of a Visible, 27, 28.
Hefele, on the Latin text of the *Decretum Unionis* of Florence, 269; on the convocation of Œcumenical Synods, 283; on St. Sylvester, P., and the convocation of the Nicene Synod, 285; statement by, as to the convocation of the Nicene Synod, 285; on the number of the Nicene Canons, 309; on the Sixth Canon of Nicæa as to the position of the Bishop of Alexandria, 312; on the 'Sardican Canons,' 325, 326, 334; on St. Meletius and St. Paulinus, 340; on Canons V., VI., VII. of the Second Synod, 349, *footnote* 1; on the genuineness of the Third Canon of the Second Synod, 349; on Canon I. of Chalcedon, 402; on Canon IX. of Chalcedon, 404; on the Roman 'version' of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa produced at Chalcedon, 425; on the production of the genuine text of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa at Chalcedon, 427; on the rejection of the protest of the Roman legates against Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 430; on the Easterns and Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 446; on Constantine and the Donatists, 606; on the presidency of the Council of Arles, 606; on the genuineness of the letter of the Africans to Celestine, P., 623; on St. Athanasius' efforts to heal the Antiochene troubles, 667; on the Luciferians, 668; on the authority of the letter of Agatho, P., to Constantine Pogonatus at the Sixth Synod, 748; on the *Fragments* of St. Hilary, 763; on the Synodical letter of Sophronius, 791; on the condemnation of Honorius, P., at the Sixth Synod, 794, 954, 968; holds that the letters of Honorius, P., are genuine and put forth *Auctoritate Apostolica*, 798; on the *Henoticon*, 923; on the meaning of the term 'The Three Chapters,' 935; on the *Judicatum* of Vigilius, P., 938; testifies that Agatho, P., did not accuse Honorius, P., of heresy, 968; on the pretended Council of *Sinuessa*, *A.D. 303*, 972; on the Council of Pisa, 985; on the Council of Constance, 998; on the Bull *Dudum Sacrum* of Eugenius, P. IV., 1014, *footnote* 1; on the alleged 'confirmation' of the Nicene Synod by St. Sylvester, 1021; says that the title Œcumenical Bishop was not offered to St. Leo by the Fourth Synod, 1104, *footnote* 1; on the position of the Primate of Carthage, 1176, 1204; on the statement of Rufinus *re* the Sixth Nicene Canon, 1203; on the extent of the Roman Patriarchate, 1205; on the convocation of the *Latrocinium*, 1219; on Vitalian, P., and the *Typus*, 1268; on the way in which the letter of Hadrian, P. I., was read at the Seventh Synod, 1271; on Baronius and the condemnation of Honorius, P., at the Sixth Synod, 1274; cited, 632.
Hegesippus, on the succession of the early Roman Bishops, 480.
Helenus, Bishop of Tarsus, 1264.
Hemingburgh, Walter de, on the position of Bishops at the Council of Vienne, A.D. 1311, 291.
Henoticon, the, 800, 923.
Heraclas, Pope, of Alexandria, 1196.
Heraclea, Metropolis of Thrace, 70, 411.
Heraclius, the Emperor, and Monophysitism, 784; gave title of Œcumenical Patriarch to Bishops of CP., 1122.
Heretics, why, flocked to Rome, 487, 519.
Herios, Metropolitan of Arles, 633.
Hesychius, language used by, with reference to St. James and St. Andrew, 176; on the position of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem, 178.
Hilary, St., of Arles, and St. Leo, 213 *et seq.*, 921; died out of communion with Rome, 217.
—— St., of Poitiers, on baptism and the

unity of the Church, 22; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 53, 57; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 123; regarded Bishops as the successors of Peter, 135, 556, *footnote* 4; regarded all Bishops as *Principes Ecclesiæ*, 601; on the Council of Antioch *in Encæniis*, 717; on the fall of Liberius, 762, 768; genuineness of the *Fragments* of, 763.
Hilary of Narbonne, 1174.
—— the Deacon, on the Bishops, 38.
Hilarus, the Roman legate at the *Latrocinium*, 397, 398, 451, 1047.
Himerius, letter of Siricius, P., to, 69, 736.
Hinschius, on the date of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 229; on the authorship of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 230; on Rothad's connection with the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 236.
Hincmar of Rheims, 234; and Rothad, 237, apparently not convinced that the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* were genuine, 237; did not know of the 'Sardican Canons,' 335.
Hippolytus, *Chronicon* of, 489.
Honorius, P. I., and Monothelitism, 787 *et seq.*; letters of Sergius of CP. to, 787, 788; letter of, to Sergius of CP., 789; second letter of, to Sergius, 791; the Lateran Synod, A.D. 649, and, 793; declared by the Sixth Synod to be a Monothelite, 794; the Seventh Synod and the condemnation of, 796, 961; Leo, P. II., and the condemnation of, 798, 956; sentence of the Sixth Synod on, 950; the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus and the condemnation of, 955; the Council *in Trullo* on the condemnation of, 959; the Roman Breviary and the condemnation of, 960; the *Liber Diurnus* and the condemnation of, 962; condemned without the previous consent of the Roman 'Pontiff,' 968; Baronius and the condemnation of, 1273.
—— P. III., and the Latin Patriarchs of CP., 1223.
—— of Canterbury and the *Pallium*, 1294.
—— the Emperor, and Britain, 212: and Pelagius, 644.
Hormisdas, P., regarded the Bishops as representing Christ, 38; and the 'Apostolical Canons,' 755; and Acacius, Euphemius and Macedonius, 805; letter of, to Epiphanius of CP., 811.
Hormisdas, The Formula of, 757 *et seq.*; inaccurate statements in, 758 *et seq.*; object of, 800; text of, 800; John of CP. and, 801 *et seq.*; the Emperor Justin and, 803 *et seq.*; not signed by the whole East, 811; the 'Eighth' Synod and, 813, *footnote* 2.
Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, presided at the Nicene Synod, 298; St. Athanasius and Theodoret on the position of, 298; not a 'Papal Legate' at Nicæa, 299 *et seq.*; presided at the Synod of Sardica, 302, 334; signed an heretical formula, 759; did not assent to the condemnation of St. Athanasius, 759; *letter of, to St. Sylvester re* confirmation of the Nicene Synod, 1021.
Hunneric, 628.
Hurter, Fr., S.J., 1245.
Hyginus, eighth Bishop of Rome, 476 *et seq.*
Hyginus, Pseudo-, P., 1183.

Ibas of Edessa, letter of, 935, 942, 944.
Ignatius of Antioch, St., on the position of Bishops, 39, 835; on the connection of St. Peter and Paul with the Roman Church, 469; made the Bishop the local centre of unity, 835, 861; on the Roman Church, 1232; meaning of the phrase 'Presidency of love' used by, 1232.
—— of CP., 915, 918.
Illyria, Bishops of, and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 452, 454; and the *Judicatum* of Vigilius, P., 939; St. Gregory and the, 1115.
—— position of, in the Roman Empire, 1209 *et seq.*
—— Eastern, position of, in the Church, 1210.
In materiis fidei, meaning of the term, used by Martin, P. V., 1002.
In solidum, meaning of the term, 36.
Innocent, P. I., and the case of Bubalius and Tauranius, 333; did not make any allusion to the 'Sardican Canons' in the case of St. Chrysostom, 333; used the 'Sardican Canons' as Nicene, and the Macedonian Bishops, 333; and Pelagianism, 633 *et seq.*; letter of the African Bishops to, 633 *et seq.*; letter of, to the African Bishops, 636; method of advancing his pretensions in the West used by, 638, 1253; position of, in the Church, 638; letter of St. Chrysostom to, 719; and the case of St. Chrysostom, 721 *et seq.*; letter of, to Theophilus, 722; letter of, to Ducentius, 1253.
—— P. III., used the phrase *Sacro universali Synodo approbante*, 278; on the precedence of CP., 450, 1212; on the position of the Bishops, 975, 1035;

on the jurisdiction of the Pope, 1085 *et seq.*; on the pretensions of the Latin Patriarch of CP., 1213; and 'reserved cases,' 1285.
Innocent, P. VII., 978, *footnote* 2.
Ireland, Bishops of, and 'The Three Chapters,' 1121.
Irenæus, St., held Bishops to be the successors of the Apostles, 34; on the foundation of the Roman Church, 471, 475, 505; excludes the Apostles from the Roman Episcopate, 475 *et seq.*; on the order of the early Roman Bishops, 475 *et seq.*; object of, in giving the succession of the Roman Bishops, 477, 496 *et seq.*; witnesses against Papalism, 478 *et seq.*, 498, 502 *et seq.*, 525; Bishop of Lyons, 479, 1233; value of the witness of, against Papalism, 479, 524, 525; witnesses against the 'Roman Episcopate' of St. Peter, 481; imperfect citation of the 'Irenæan Passage' of, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 494; and Gnosticism, 496 *et seq.*, 519; says that the Apostles committed their 'place of presidency' to the Bishops, 496; reason why, gives the 'succession of the Roman Bishops,' 497, 498; on the authority of Apostolical Churches, 499; on the 'auctores' of the Apostolical Churches, 499; on the position of the Roman Church, 501 *et seq.*; meaning of the term *Principalitas* used by, 502 *et seq.*; use made of the 'Irenæan Passage' by the *Satis Cognitum* contrary to the meaning of, 506; meaning of the phrase *convenire ad* used by, 508, 1233; meaning of the phrase *hoc est eos qui undique fideles* used by, 509; meaning of the phrase *in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio* used by, 516; made communion with the Apostolical Churches the test of being in the Catholic Church, 525; on St. Polycarp and Anicetus, 526, 527; on St. Victor's excommunication of the Asiatics, 534, 1233; imperfect citation of the 'Irenæan Passage' in the *Vatican Decrees*, 535 *et seq.*
Irene, the Empress, and the Seventh Synod, 1036, *footnote* 1, 1037.
Inter Cunctas, the Bull, of Martin, P. V., 999, 1001.
'*Interpolations, The*,' in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 570 *et seq.*, 1239 *et seq.*
Isaiah ii. 19, 164; xxii. 20-22, 115; xliv. 8, 77.
Isidore of Seville, 230.
—— Metropolitan of Russia, 253, 1190.
Istria, the Bishops of, out of communion with Rome for 150 years, 947; and the Fifth Synod, 947; St. Gregory the Great and, 1120; and Pelagius, P. I., on St. Luke xxi. 31, 32, 1168.
Ivo of Chartres made use of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* in his *Decretum*, 240.

James, St., St. Chrysostom on the position of, 127, 177; titles given to, by Hesychius, 176; at the Council of Jerusalem, 178, 907, 980.
—— Liturgy of St., on 'The Rock,' 58.
—— *Letter to*, on the ordination of St. Clement, 486; Döllinger on the influence of, on the early lists of the Roman succession, 489.
Jeremiah vi. 16, 1146.
Jerome, St., held Bishops to be the successors of the Apostles, 35, 597; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 53, 55, 60, 146, 162; on 'The Rock,' 82, 162; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 123, 595; on the equality of the Apostles, 168, 595, 596; Epistles of, to St. Damasus, 586. 591; circumstances under which, wrote to St. Damasus, 586, 587; witness of, to the position of the Roman Bishop, 588 *et seq.*; meaning of the terms 'Chair of Peter,' 'See of Peter,' used by, 590; and St. Meletius of Antioch, 592; and the position of the Apostolate, 594 *et seq.*; calls St. Andrew and St. Peter *Principes Apostolorum*, 594; Epistle of, against Jovinian, 595; reason given by, why St. Peter was appointed head of the Apostolic College, 596; on the equality of Bishops *per se*, 597; on the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, 685, on the fall of Liberius. 766; meaning of the term 'Chief Priest' used by, 832; made the Diocesan Bishop the local centre of unity, 833; witness of, against Papalism, 833 *et seq.*; letter of, to Rusticus, 837; the Bishop the highest ecclesiastical authority known to, 837 *et seq.*; on the Council of Ariminum, 1049.
Jerusalem, the Council of, A.D. 50, 907; president of, 177 *et seq.*, 907; St. Peter at, 907; witnesses against Papalism, 909.
—— the See of, position of, 415, 810; extent of the Patriarchal jurisdiction of, 415.
Joachim of Jerusalem and the Florentine Council, 256.
Jocundus, Arian Presbyter, 629.
John, St., ix. 16, 596; x. 1, 9; St. Cyril on, 97; x. 16, 27; xx. 21, 30, 103, 122, 843, 855, 886. 899, 1165.
—— St., xxi. 15, St. Thomas Aquinas on, 25; the *Satis Cognitum* on, 131;

the commission given to the Episcopate in, 132, 133, 844; St. Ambrose on, 132; St. Augustine on, 132, 137; St. Chrysostom on, 133 *et seq.*; St. Basil on, 136; Ven. Bede on, 136, 889; St. Cyril on, 138; what special reference in, to St. Peter according to the Fathers, 138 *et seq.*; Basil of Seleucia on, 139; St. Gregory Nazianzen on, 139, 888; the Fathers knew nothing of the Papalist interpretation of, 140; Card. de Cusa on, 141; St. Bruno of Segni on, 887.

John, St., St. Chrysostom on the position of, 127; at Ephesus, 416; 'auctor' of the Episcopate of Smyrna, 482, 483.

—— P. I., 804.

—— P. VIII., and Photius of CP., 918.

—— P. XXIII., election of, 986; Bull of, relating to his willingness to resign the Papacy, 989; at the Council of Constance, 995; deposed by the Council of Constance, 995.

—— 'the Faster,' and the title of Œcumenical Patriarch, 1107; and Gregory of Antioch, 1107, 1108; St. Gregory the Great and, 1111.

—— of CP. and the *Formula of Hormisdas*, 801 *et seq.*

—— of Antioch, 253; letter of St. Cyril to, 358; letter of, to Nestorius, 358; on the sentence of the Third Synod on Nestorius, 379; witnesses against Papalism, 380.

—— Talaia of Alexandria, 922, 924.

—— of Germinicia and 'The Tome' of St. Leo at Chalcedon, 453.

—— Bishop of Jerusalem, 632.

—— of Sebaste and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 455.

—— Priest of Chalcedon, case of, 1124.

—— Palæologus, and Eugenius, P. IV., 250; and the complimentary titles given to the Bishop of Rome by the Fathers, 265, 891.

Joseph of CP. and Michael Palæologus, 820.

Josephus, and the position of the city of Antioch, 415.

Jovian, the Emperor, letter of the Synod of Antioch, A.D. 363, to, 669.

Jovinus, African Bishop, 862, *footnote* 4.

Jubianus, letter of St. Cyprian to, 551, 857.

Jude, St., 154.

Julian, Card., and the Council of CP., A.D. 869, 919.

—— Bishop of Æculanium, and the *Epistola Tractoria* of Zosimus, P., 777; appealed to a Plenary Council, 777, 779.

Julius, P., St., legates of, at the Sardican Council, 302; name of, interpolated in the Third 'Sardican Canon,' 324, *footnote* 3; and the case of St. Athanasius, 705, 1258, 1263; letters of, to the Eusebians, 705, 708, 1258 *et seq.*; Sozomen and the letter of the Eusebians to, 706; position taken by, in the letter to the Eusebians inconsistent with Papalism, 710 *et seq.*

Julius, Pseudo-, P., 1181, 1183, 1184.

—— Bishop, legate of St. Leo, at the *Latrocinium*, 451.

Jurisdiction, Episcopal, the *Satis Cognitum* on, 823 *et seq.*, 877 *et seq.*, 1071 *et seq.*; the belief of the Catholic Church as to, 1072; St. Thomas on, 1081 *et seq.*

—— nature of the, granted by Gratian to the Roman Bishop, 209; nature of the, granted by Valentinian III. to the Roman Bishop, 211.

—— Papal, the *Satis Cognitum* on, 101 *et seq.*, 877 *et seq.*, 1079, 1080; the *Vatican Council* on, 104, 884, 1076 *et seq.*, 1142; St. Leo's claims contained germs of, 202 *et seq.*

—— of the Eastern Patriarchs, 220 *et seq.*, 272, 415.

Jus Cyprium, the, 383.

Justin, the Emperor, used pressure to restore union between East and West, 803, 928; and the position of the Church of Jerusalem, 810.

Justinian, the Emperor, and Canon IX. of Chalcedon, 404; and Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 450, 808 *et seq.*; and the title Œcumenical Patriarch, 808; and the position of 'Elder' and 'New' Rome, 808, 809; and 'The Three Chapters,' 935; meaning of the term Five Patriarchates used by, 1206.

Justiniana Prima, Metropolitical See of, 1211.

Juvenal of Jerusalem, 353, 727.

Kenrick, Archbishop, on St. Luke xxii. 32, 159.

Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence, and judgments of the Roman Pontiff, 971, *footnote* 4.

Key-bearer, the title, all Bishops entitled to, 130; all Apostles entitled to, 168, 169; use of, by Hadrian, P. I., 1271.

'Keys, The Gift of the,' meaning attached to, by the *Satis Cognitum*, 114, 886; Council of Trent on meaning of, 116; why, promised to St. Peter, 117, 129; conferred on all the Apostles, 117 *et seq.*; St. Augustine on, 117 *et seq.*; St. Ambrose on, 123, 130; St. Gaudentius on, 123; St. Hilary on, 123; St. Jerome on, 123; Ven. Bede on, 123; Origen on, 123; Theophylact on, 123,

886; the teaching of the Fathers on, incompatible with Papalism, 123; St. Chrysostom on, 124 *et seq.*; Tostatus on, 129; the Fathers of Basle on, 129; conferred on Bishops as the successors of the Apostles, 130; St. Optatus on, 1165.

κεφάλεια, the nine, of Cyrus of Phasis, 785.

Lacey, the Rev. T. A., translation by, of the *Appellatio* of Flavian of CP., 727; do., do., of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 1266.

Lanfranc, Archbishop, 1234.

Langen, on the 'See of Peter,' 865.

Laodicæa, Synod of, A.D. 343 (?), Canons of, confirmed by the Fourth Synod, 402.

Lateran, Council of, A.D. 649, 793; did not condemn Honorius, P., by name, 793, 968; condemned the *Typus*, 1268.

—— First Council of, A.D. 1123, 985.

—— Fourth Council of, A.D. 1215, 276 *et seq.*; not Œcumenical, 276, 280; useless as a witness to Papalism, 277, 280; position of the Pope at, 278; position of the Bishops at, 278; position of the Latin Patriarch of CP. at, 450.

—— Fifth Council of, A.D. 1512, 286.

Latrocinium, the, *vide* Council of Ephesus, A.D. 449,

Launoy, cited, 279, 919; on the forged passages attributed to St. Cyril of Alexandria, etc., 1215.

Laurence II., Archbishop of Milan, 947.

Laurentius, Archbishop of Canterbury, did not receive the *Pallium*, 1294.

Lazarus, Bishop of Aix, 633.

Legates, Papal, in the Middle Ages, 1220.

'Legitimate successors of Peter, the,' meaning of the term, 464 *et seq.*

Leo, the Great, St., on the Popes as the successors of Peter, 70; on the abiding nature of the government of the Church by St. Peter, 70, 201; value of 'Petrine' statements made by, 192, 848; cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, 193, 201, 846; historical position of, 202 *et seq.*; 'The Tome' of, 204; obtained the *Edict* of Valentinian III., 206, 218, 1172; and Celidonius, 213; and St. Hilary of Arles, 213 *et seq.*; letter of, to the Bishops of Vienne as to St. Hilary, 216; and the Primacy of Gaul, 216, 1175; pretensions of, not admitted in the East, 219 *et seq.*; line taken by, when dealing with Easterns, 226, 227, 438 *et seq.*, 461, 880; on the authority of Synods, 226; cited the 'Sardican Canons' as Nicene, 329, 402; and the *Latrocinium*, 386, 398, 725, 1047, 1219; letters of, to Theodosius *re* the convocation of a General Council, 386; and the Emperor Marcian and the convocation of a General Council, 387, 388; and the convocation of the Fourth Synod, 388 *et seq.*; position of the legates of, at Chalcedon, 391; legates of, and the case of Dioscurus, 393; and the case of Dioscurus, 394 *et seq.*, 920; and the case of Theodoret, 398, 731, *et seq.*, 1267; legates of, oppose Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 422 *et seq.*; Synodal letter of Chalcedon to, 431 *et seq.*, 1027, 1028; grounds alleged by, for opposing Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 438 *et seq.*, 1030, 1283; and the 'Canons,' 438 *et seq.*, 729, 880; letter of, to the Emperor Marcian *re* the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, 438; letter of, to the Empress Pulcheria, 439; and Anatolius of CP., 440, 444 *et seq.*, 880; reply of, to the Synodal letter of Chalcedon, 441, 447; the *Satis Cognitum* on the action of, *re* Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 443, 1054; treatment of 'The Tome' of, at Chalcedon, 451 *et seq.*, 742; treats his 'Tome' and the letters of St. Cyril as of equal authority, 461; and the case of Flavian of CP., 729; on the relative positions of St. Peter and the rest of the Apostles, 846 *et seq.*; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Fourth Synod, 1027 *et seq.*; on the *Definitio* as to the faith of the Council of Chalcedon, 1039; on the rejection of the *Latrocinium* by the Fourth Synod, 1047; title of *Universal Bishop* not offered to, at the Fourth Synod, 1104, *footnote* 1; letter of, *re* ordination, 1214; and the convocation of the *Latrocinium*, 1219; on Theophilus of Alexandria, 1257; and the case of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 1266.

Leo, P. II., and the condemnation of Honorius, P., by the Sixth Synod, 798, 956 *et seq.*; and the *Liber Diurnus*, 798, *footnote* 7; on the presidency of the Sixth Synod, 949, *footnote* 2; letter of, to Constantine Pogonatus, 956; letter of, to the Spanish Bishops, 957, 1041; letter of, to King Ervig, 958, 1041; effect of the confirmation of the Sixth Synod by, 1035.

—— P. IX., excommunication of, by the Eastern Patriarchs, 244, 818.

—— P. X., on the Pope and Councils, 286, 1063, 1270; cited the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* in the Bull *Pastor Æternus*, 287; and the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 288.

—— P. XIII., object of, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 5; made Mgr. Satolli his

'delegate' to the R. C. Bishops of the U.S.A., 1094; 'Appeal' made by, must be rejected, 1145.
Leo, the Isaurian, the Emperor, and Illyricum, 1212.
Leontius, and the Primacy of Gaul, 216, 1176; and Hilary, P., 218.
Le Quien, cited, 1214.
Leslie, on the term *in solidum*, 36.
Libellatics, meaning of the term, 574, *footnote* 3.
Libellus, the, of Cœlestius, 771 *et seq.*
—— the, of Hormisdas, 757 *et seq.*
—— the, of John of CP., 801.
—— of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 1266.
Liber Diurnus, the, and the condemnation of Honorius, P., 798, 962 *et seq.*; Leo, P. II., and the third 'Profession of Faith' in, 798, *footnote* 7.
—— *Pontificalis*, the, 284, 1187.
Liberalis, African Bishop, 1056.
Liberatus of Carthage, on Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 450.
Liberius, P., and Arianism, 758 *et seq.*; subscribed an heretical formula, 759, 764, 768; assented to the condemnation of St. Athanasius, 759, 761; letter of, to the Eastern Bishops, 760; letter of, to Ursacius, 761; St. Hilary of Poitiers on the fall of, 762, 768; St. Athanasius on the fall of, 765; St. Jerome on the fall of, 766; Sozomen's account of the fall of, inaccurate, 765; unreformed Roman Breviary testified to the fall of, 769; fell as Bishop of Rome, 769; subservient to Constantius, 1235.
Liberian Catalogue, the, 489.
Licinius, 1158.
Lightfoot, Bishop, on St. Peter's position in the Acts, 76; on the earliest list of the Roman Bishops, 480; on the *Chronicon* of Hippolytus, 489.
Lingard, cited, 212.
Linus, first Bishop of Rome, 475, 481, 490, 492.
Littledale, Dr. R. F., on the letter of Innocent, P. I., to the African Bishops, 637.
Lombards, the, 1117.
'Long Brothers,' the, the case of, 700, 718.
Lorraine, Charles, Card. of, and the Florentine Council, 1191.
Lucentius, legate of the Bishop of Rome, at Chalcedon, and Dioscurus, 393; on Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 422, 1028; protest of, rejected by the Imperial Commissioners, 430.
Lucifer of Cagliari, consecrated Paulinus of Antioch, 586, 668; founded the Luciferian Schism, 668.
Lucius, Pseudo-, P., 1182.
Luke, St., vi. 47, 48, 78; vi. 13, 180; xii. 41, 42, 116; xxii. 24, 900; xxii. 19, 20, 900.
Luke, St., xxii. 32, Papalist interpretation of, 142 *et seq.*; Patristic interpretation of, 146 *et seq.*; St. Ambrose on, 146; St. Chrysostom on, 149 *et seq.*; Scriptural testimony against the Papalist interpretation of, 154; Agatho, P., on, 156; Archbishop Kenrick on, 159; P. D'Ailly on, 988; Pelagius, P. II., on, 1168 *et seq.*
Lull, St., and the *Pallium*, 1291.
Lupus of Ferrières, letter of, to Nicholas, P. I., 235.
—— of Troyes 'styled' Bishop of Bishops, 436.
Lyons, Council of, A.D. 1274, 819.

Macarius, the Monothelite, appeals to the teaching of Honorius, P., 797; and the Sixth Synod, 1269.
Macedonius of CP., deposed, 805; venerated as a saint, 806; name of, not removed from the Diptychs in the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, 811.
Macon, A.D. 581, Council of, on the use of the *Pallium*, 1288.
Mahomet II., the Sultan, 258.
Magdeburg Centuriators, The, 1180, 1188.
Magnus, Epistle of St. Cyprian to, 1242, *footnote* 7.
Mai, Card., ascription by, of 'Sermo cxx.' to St. Augustine considered, 625 *et seq.*
Maistre, De, on the Papacy, 67, 294, 647.
Malesce, Guy, Card., presided at the Council of Pisa, 980.
Mamertus of Vienne and Leontius of Arles, 218.
Mandatarii of the Pope, Bishops in Œcumenical Synods did not consider themselves to be, 376, 920.
Manning, Card., translation of *undique* in the citation of the 'Irenæan Passage' in the *Vatican Decrees* by, considered, 535.
Manuel II., 250.
Manutius, Paulus, 570, 1245.
Maran, Dom, on St. Basil and Paulinus of Antioch, 680.
Marca, De, on the Greek text of the Florentine *Decretum Unionis*, 270; on the nature of an 'Appeal,' 326; on the meaning of προστασία and προεδρία, 413; on Provincial Synods, 555; on the Easterns and Western interference, 1265.
Marcellinus, P., St., 646, 972; first Bishop of Rome to be styled Pope, 1197.

Marcellus, Pseudo-, P., 1181, 1184.
Marcellus, 669, 680, 1263.
Marcian of Arles, 41, 574, 1147, *footnote* 2.
—— the Emperor, convoked the Fourth Synod, 386 *et seq.*; and St. Leo, 387, 390; and the case of Theodoret, 400; letter of St. Leo to, *re* Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 438.
Marcion, the case of, 1250.
Marcus of Arethusa, and the Fourth Sirmium Formula, 1048.
—— of Milan, *vide* Merocles of Milan.
Maret, Mgr., on the *Constitutum* of Vigilius, 942; on Martin, P. V., and the Council of Constance, 999, 1001; on the meaning of the term *Conciliariter*, 1000 *et seq.*; on the *Decrees* of the Council of Constance *re* the Pope, 1003; on Eugenius, P. IV., and the *Decrees* of Constance, 1013; on Eugenius, P. IV., and the Council of Basle, 1013; on the Papal Monarchy, 1134, 1136; on Pope Agatho's letter to the Sixth Synod, 1269.
Marinus of Arles, presided at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, 301, 606.
—— the Deacon, Roman legate at the 'Eighth' Synod, 929.
Mark, St., ix. 34, 596.
—— —— and Alexandria, 417, 440, 1258.
Mark, Pseudo-, P., 1182.
Mark of Ephesus, at the Council of Florence, 252, 253; repudiated the Florentine Union, 256.
Martial and Basilides, case of, *vide* Basilides and Martial, case of.
Martin, P. I., St., and Monothelitism, 747, 793; did not condemn Honorius, P., by name, 968.
—— P. IV., excommunicated Michael Palæologus, 820.
—— P. V., and the Council of Constance, 999 *et seq.*; title of, to the Papacy derived from the Council of Constance, 999, 1002; held the Council of Constance to be Œcumenical, 999; 'confirmed' the *Decrees* of the fifth Session of the Council of Constance, 1001, 1002, 1004; convoked the Council of Basle, 1008.
Massuet, Dom, on the order of the early Roman succession, 478.
'Master' of the 'Apostolic College,' was St. Peter appointed by Christ the? 31, 898 *et seq.*
—— —— 'Episcopal College,' is the Pope the divinely appointed? 894.
Maternus, Bishop of Cologne, 603, *footnote* 1.
Matthæus, Latin Patriarch of CP., 1223.
Matthew, St., v. 14, 82; vii. 24, 25, 78; xi. 17, 30; xvi. 16, 899; xviii. 18, 116, 571, 1165; xx. 25, 900; xxviii. 18, 30; xxvii. 18-20, 901; xxviii. 20, 33.
—— xvi. 18, Papalist interpretation of, 48 *et seq.*; Patristic interpretation of, 52 *et seq.*; St. Jerome on, 53, 55, 60; Origen on, 53, 54, 63, 110; St. Cyril of Alexandria on, 53, 88 *et seq.*; St. Hilary on, 53, 57, 60; Theodoret on, 55, 56; St. Chrysostom on, 56; St. Gregory of Nyssa on, 56; St. Gregory the Great on, 57; St. Ambrose on, 57, 60, 63, 1237; the liturgical interpretation of, 58, 59; St. Augustine on, 61, 62, 64 *et seq.*; what is the true interpretation of? 73 *et seq.*; conclusion to be drawn from the evidence as to the interpretation of, 100; Card. de Cusa on, 141; St. Leo the Great on, 201; cited, 571; Felix, P. II., refers to, 925.
—— xvi. 19, the *Satis Cognitum* on, 114, 124; St. Augustine on, 117 *et seq.*; Origen on, 123; St. Jerome on, 123; St. Hilary on, 123; St. Ambrose on, 123; Theophylact on, 123; St. Gaudentius on, 123; Ven. Bede on, 123; St. Gregory the Great on, 195.
Matthias, St., appointment of, to the Apostolate, 151, 177 *et seq.*, 903.
Maurice, the Emperor, letter of St. Gregory the Great to, on the title Œcumenical Bishop, 1109, 1110.
Maxentius, Donatist Bishop of Rome, 874.
Maximian, the Emperor, 298.
Maximus of Alexandria, 1264.
—— of Antioch, consecrated Bishop of Antioch by Anatolius of CP., 445, 880; judgment of, on 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 453.
—— Bishop, 862, *footnote* 4.
—— the Abbot, 'quoted' in the forged *Thesaurus Græcorum Patrum*, 245; on the prerogatives of the Roman Bishops, 653; and Papalism, 654; meaning of the citation from, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 654 *et seq.*; forged passages attributed to, 656; and the Monothelites, 659 *et seq.*; useless as a witness to Papalism, 659, 662.
—— 'Confessor' at Rome, 549, 697.
—— 'the Cynic,' laid claim to the See of CP., 336; case of, 341, 540.
—— Vicarius of Rome, 1204.
Melchiades, and the Donatists, 603; position of, on the Tribunal on Donatism, 605 *et seq.*
Melchiades, Pseudo-, P., 1183.
Meletius, of Antioch, St., presided over the Second Synod, 339, 1213; orthodox,

586, 666, 669; held by St. Basil, to be the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, 592, 678 *et seq.*; also by St. Chrysostom, 593, 688; also by the Easterns, 592, 682; died out of communion with Rome, 593; venerated as a saint, 593; St. Gregory Nazianzen on, 593; consecrated to Sebaste, 665; appointed to Antioch, 665; Theodoret on, 666; and the Eustathians, 667; knew nothing of Papalism, 678.
Mellitus of Canterbury, did not receive the *Pallium*, 1294.
Mennas of CP., and 'The Three Chapters,' 936; struck the name of Vigilius off the Diptychs, 937.
Merocles of Milan, 603, *footnote* 1.
Metrophanes of CP., 255; deposed, 256.
—— of Smyrna, and the 'judgment' of Nicholas, P. I., on Photius, 929.
Metropolitans, appointed later in the West than in the East, 1235; did not receive their jurisdiction by the bestowal of the *Pallium*, 1291, 1292.
Metropolitical rights safeguarded by the Second Synod, 382 *et seq.*
Mettius, the Carthaginian sub-deacon, 1243.
μία ἐνέργεια, meaning of the term, 784.
Michael III. deposes Ignatius of CP., 915.
—— Cærularius, excommunicated by Leo, P. IX., 244, 818; excommunicates Leo, P. IX., 818.
—— Palæologus, the Emperor, and Urban, P. IV., 246; position of, in the East, 815; exercised pressure on Eastern ecclesiastics, 818, 820; excommunicated by Martin, P. IV., 820.
—— —— the 'Confession' of, 819 *et seq.*; source of, 819, 821; opposed by the Easterns, 818 *et seq.*; had not the authority of the Eastern Churches, 821; Nicholas, P. III., and, 819; valueless as a witness to Papalism, 821.
Milan, Council of (May), A.D. 381, and Maximus, 'the Cynic,' 540.
—— —— (Dec.), A.D. 381, letter of, *re* Maximus, 'the Cynic,' 540; letters of, to Theodosius, 540, 541; witnesses against Papalism, 542 *et seq.*
—— Archbishop of, received the *Pallium honoris*, 1290, 1294.
—— See of, position of, 1178, 1204; not within the limits of the Roman Patriarchate, 1204, 1235; when did the, become a Metropolitical See? 1235; never under the metropolitical jurisdiction of the See of Rome, 1235.
Milevis, Council of, A.D. 416, Synodal letter of, to Innocent, P. I., 633.
Milman (Dean), on St. Leo's position in history, 202; on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 238, 1186; on the position of Innocent, P. I., 638.
Miroudet, Bishop of Babylon, one of the consecrators of the French 'Constitutional Bishops,' 1099.
Missal, the Roman, on 'The Rock,' 59; on the order of the first Bishops of Rome, 485.
Mommsen, on the *Catalogus Liberianus*, 489.
Monophysitism, 784.
Monothelitism, 746 *et seq.*; St. Martin, P. I., and, 747; the Sixth Synod and, 746 *et seq.*, 949 *et seq.*
More, Sir Thomas, ignorant of the spurious nature of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1188.
Morinus on ordinations, 1214.
Morosini, Thomas, Latin Patriarch of CP., 1223.
Murad, the Sultan, 250.

National Convention, the, in France, and the Episcopal Sees, 1098.
Neale, J. M., cited, 413, 1196.
Necesse est, meaning of the phrase in the 'Irenæan Passage,' 506 *et seq.*
Nectarius, Bishop of CP., 341, 540, 1024, 1213.
Nestorius, and St. Cyril, 351; heresy of, 351; and Celestine, P., 353, 354; Third Epistle of St. Cyril to, 355; effect of the convocation of the Third Synod on the 'sentence' of Celestine, P., on, 362; case of, at the Third Synod, 367 *et seq.*; deposition of, by the Third Synod, 370 *et seq.*
Newman, Card., on the spread of Arianism in the East, 683; cites the *Fragments* of St. Hilary, 763.
Nicæa, Synod of, A.D. 325, St. Athanasius on the authority of, 45; convoked by the Emperor, 284; why was the, convoked? 295; president of, 297 *et seq.*; Canon IV. of, 303; Canon V. of, 306; number of the Canons of, 309; Canon VI. of, 311 *et seq.*, 1072, 1201, 1213; ground alleged by Canon VI. of, for confirmation of the jurisdiction of the See of Alexandria, 313; Canon VI. of, witnesses against Papalism, 314; 'Version' of Canon VI. of, produced by the Roman legates at Chalcedon, 316, 425; *Prisca* version of Canon VI. of, 316; object of 'Italian' versions of Canon VI. of, 318, 425; Bellarmine on Canon VI. of, 319; Vincenzi on Canon VI. of, 320; witness of, against Papalism, 322; St. Leo on the authority of the Canons of, 438 *et seq.*; did St. Sylvester give 'Papal' confirmation to,

1020 ; *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* and, 1181, 1183, 1184 ; how the, received the 'confirmation' of the One Episcopate, 1281.
Nicæa, Council of, A.D. 787, condemned Honorius, P., 795, 960; president of, 1036, *footnote* 1 ; did not seek 'Papal' confirmation from Hadrian, P. I., 1036 *et seq.* ; regarded itself as Œcumenical, 1037 ; treated the letters of Hadrian, P. I., as of like authority as those of the other Patriarchs, 1038 ; treatment of the letter of Hadrian, P. I., to the Emperors by, 1271 *et seq.*
Nicholas, P. I., and the case of Rothad, 234 ; and the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 234 *et seq.*, 972 ; the first to make use of the 'Sardican Canons' as Sardican, 335 ; 'explanation' by, of Canon IX. of Chalcedon, 408 ; and Photius of CP., 916 ; and the Bulgarians, 917 ; treatment by the Synod of CP., A.D. 889, of the judgment by, on Photius, 918, 929 ; on the authority of 'the Apostolic See,' 970 ; value of the citation from, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 971 *et seq.* ; and the *Pallium*, 1292.
—— P. III., use of the 'Confession' of Michael Palæologus made by, 819.
—— P. V., and the Florentine Union, 258.
Novatian, 87 ; consecrated 'Anti-Pope' of Rome, 564, 568 ; heresy of, 568.
Novatians, St. Cyprian and the, 547 *et seq.*, 1242, *footnote* 7, 1243.
Novatus, 87, 568, 1265.

Œcumenical Bishop, the title, 1104 *et seq.* ; position of the Pope according to Papalism, that of 1104 *et seq.*
—— —— the title ascribed to Popes in the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1229.
—— Councils, authority of, 44, 380, 621 ; the right of the Emperor to convoke, recognised by St. Leo, 225 ; the formal Acts of the early, not cited by the *Satis Cognitum* in proof of Papalism, 281, 463, 914 ; by whom were they convoked? 283 *et seq.* ; incompatible with Papalism, 290 *et seq.* ; witness of, against Papalism, 322, 339, 345, 403 *et seq.*, 463, 794 *et seq.*, 914, 943, 954, 1031 *et seq.*, 1036 *et seq.* ; the African Bishops on the position of, 620, 621 ; the *Vatican Decrees* assert that the Pope is superior to, 894 ; the *Satis Cognitum* asserts that the Pope is superior to, 894 ; the Council of Pisa on, 982 ; the Council of Constance on, 991 ; the Council of Basle on, 1009 ; what constituted, 1275 *et seq.* ; Field's criteria of, insufficient, 1277 *et seq.* ; Papalist criteria of, useless, 1279 *et seq.* ; true criterion of, 1280 *et seq.*
Œcumenical Councils, the, Nicæa, A.D. 325, 284 *et seq.*, 1020 ; Constantinople, A.D. 381, 336 *et seq.*, 1023 ; Ephesus, A.D. 431, 360 *et seq.*, 1026 ; Chalcedon, A.D. 451, 386 *et seq.*, 1027 *et seq.* ; Constantinople, A.D. 553, 940 *et seq.*, 1031 *et seq.* ; Constantinople, A.D. 680, 746 *et seq.*, 949 *et seq.*, 1034 *et seq.* ; Nicæa, A.D. 787, 795, 1036 *et seq.*, 1271 *et seq.*
—— Doctors, the Apostles, 128.
—— Judges, the Apostles, 95, 169.
—— Patriarch, the title, accorded to John of CP., 807, 808, 1107 ; accorded to Patriarchs of CP., 807, 808, 1107, 1122 ; St. Gregory the Great objects to have, applied to himself, 1104 ; sense in which St. Gregory denounced, 1107 ; not offered to St. Leo by the Council of Chalcedon, 1104, *footnote* 1 ; meaning of, as used by the Greeks, 1107.
—— Rulers, the Apostles, 127, 189.
ὁμοούσιον, St. Athanasius on those who by misapprehension rejected the term, 664.
Optatus, St., gives list of the Bishops who judged the Donatists, A.D. 313, 602, *footnote* 1 ; on the 'sentence' of Melchiades, P., in the case of Cæcilian, 604 ; cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, 864, 875 ; belief of, as to the position of St. Peter, 864 *et seq.* ; belief of, as to the position of the Bishops, 865 ; argument of, against the Donatists, 865 *et seq.* ; on the representative character of the Bishop of Rome, 866 *et seq.* ; on the position of the 'Seven Churches' of Asia, 868 ; argument of, incompatible with Papalism, 872 *et seq.* ; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 1165.
Orbis terrarum, meaning of the phrase, used by St. Augustine, 608, 1249.
Order of the great Sees, how the, was determined, 415 *et seq.*
'Ordinaries,' difference between, and 'Vicars,' 1090 *et seq.*
Ordination, the distinction between 'invalid' and 'irregular,' 1214.
Oriental 'compliments' afford no support to Papalism, 265, 432.
Origen, on 'The Rock,' 53, 54, 63, 110 ; on 'The Gates of Hell,' 108 *et seq.* ; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 110, 123.
ὁρίσας ὑπέγραψα, meaning of the term, 730.
Orosius and Pelagius, 632.

ὅσιαι συλλαβαί, meaning of the term, 797.

PACIAN, ST., held Bishops to be successors of the Apostles, 35, 86; on 1 St. Peter, ii. 25, 40; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 86 *et seq.*; on the representatives of St. Peter, 86; on the One Episcopate, 87; argument of, against Novatian incompatible with Papalism, 87.

Palestine, the Bishops of, and 'The Tome' of St. Leo, 452, 454.

Palladius, Bishop (of Dacia?), 537.

Palladius of Helenopolis, on the 'Appeal' of St. Chrysostom, 719, *footnote* 1, 721, 722.

Pallium, the meaning of, 1288 *et seq.*; given first as a mark of honour by Emperors to ecclesiastical dignitaries, 1288; Council of Macon, on, 1288; civil origin of, 1288; at first given by Popes to Bishops as a mark of honour, 1289; occupants of certain Sees a right to receive, by custom, as a mark of honour, 1290; later, was granted by the Roman Bishops to their 'Vicars' as the ensign of delegated authority, 1290; St. Boniface and, 1291; Nicholas, P. I., and, 1292; on what ground was, given at first to English Archbishops, 1293, 1294.

Pannilini, Bishop of Chiusi, on 'Peter has spoken through Leo,' 742; on the position of the Bishops, 1141.

Papacy, The, De Maistre on, 67, 294, 647; St. Leo's view of, 201, 205; growth of the power of, in the West, 208 *et seq.*, 974 *et seq.*; St. Gregory the Great's view of, 1117, 1129.

Papal Authority, source and nature of, according to the *Satis Cognitum*, 48, 864, 873 *et seq.*, 894; according to the *Vatican Decrees*, 1076 *et seq.*; 'truly Episcopal,' 1077 *et seq.*

'Papal' confirmation of Councils, meaning of, 1016 *et seq.*; not necessary to the Œcumenicity of a Synod, 1017 *et seq.*, 1023 *et seq.*, 1026, 1029, 1031, 1034 *et seq.*, 1036, 1279; not given to the First Synod, 1020 *et seq.*; not given to the Second Synod, 1025; not given to the Third Synod, 1026; not given to the Fourth Synod, 1027; not given to the Fifth Synod, 1031 *et seq.*; not given to the Sixth Synod, 1034 *et seq.*; not given to the Seventh Synod, 1036 *et seq.*

'Papal Decretals,' *vide* Decretals, Papal.

Papal Presidency not necessary to the Œcumenicity of a Council, 297, 1279.

Papalist claims, the, asserted to have been the belief of every age by the *Satis Cognitum*, 1067 *et seq.*; recapitulated, 1134 *et seq.*; must be rejected on the evidence by Catholics, 1143.

Papalist criteria of an Œcumenical Council, 1279.

Paschisinus, legate of St. Leo at Chalcedon, 393; and the case of Dioscurus, 393; on the precedence of Anatolius of CP. at Chalcedon, 423; 'version' of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa produced by, at Chalcedon, 425.

Pasenzo, Bishop, and the Council of Basle, 1008.

'Pastor,' the title, 170.

Pastor Æternus, the Bull, of Leo, P. X., 286 *et seq.*; claims that General Councils must be convoked by the Pope, 286, 1063, 1279; cites the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 287; false statements in, 287; approves the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 288; significance of the citation from, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 289, 1063.

Patriarch, the highest rank in the Hierarchy known to the Third Synod, 384; the title of, 1199.

—— Universal, title of, given to Tarasius of CP. at the Seventh Synod, 1271.

—— of CP., reply of, to the Encyclical *Præclara*, 7; extent of the jurisdiction of, 409, 413; claims of the Latin, 1223.

Patriarchal Sees, position of, at the date of the Fourth Synod, 223; position of, at the Synod of CP., A.D. 869, 244, 817, 931, 933; precedence of, at the Council of Florence, 271, 450; ground of the order of the precedence among, 415, 416; the Seventh Synod on, 1038; Gelasius, P., on the precedence of, 1060.

—— Synods, 44.

Patriarchate of Alexandria, extent of, 312.

—— of Antioch, extent of the, 311, 342, 415.

—— of Constantinople, extent of the, 413.

—— of Jerusalem, extent of the, 415.

—— of Rome, extent of the, 1201 *et seq.*

Patriarchs, the Eastern, excluded from the *fold* according to Papalism, 6; evidential value of the rejection of the Papacy by, 7; Eastern doctrine as to the position of, 223, 817, 931; rejected the Council of Florence, 256; rejected the 'Eighth' Council, 266, 919; and 'The Three Chapters,' 940.

—— Titular Latin, 68, 276, 450.

Patroclus, appointed by Zosimus, P., his 'Vicar' in Gaul, 1174.

Paul, St., doctrine of, as to the Body of Christ, 21 *et seq.* ; on the position of the Apostles, 21, 27, 74 ; on the unity of the Church, 21, 22, 24 ; argument of, on the unity of the Church, incompatible with the Papalist doctrine of the Divine appointment of a Visible Head, thereof, 24, 27 ; did regard St. Peter as his 'Master,' 28, 912 ; St. Chrysostom on the position of, 28, 126 ; and his office as Apostle, 31, 39, 910, 915 ; position of, in the Acts, 76, 910 ; charge of, at Miletus, 136 ; 'strengthens' the brethren, 154 *et seq.* ; St. Gregory the Great on the position of, 197, 612 ; referred to by St. Clement, 468 *et seq.* ; referred to by St. Ignatius of Antioch, 469 ; reasons of visit of, to St. Peter, 911 ; and the 'pillar Apostles,' 912 ; and St. Peter at Antioch, 913, 1065.

Paul, P., II., assumed the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, 1234.

—— P., III., 1200.

—— of CP., the Monothelite, letter of, to Theodore, P., 789 ; drew up the *Typus*, 792 ; cited Honorius, P., in his *Dogmatic Letter* in support of Monothelitism, 793.

—— of Emesa, 1257.

—— of Samosata, condemned by the Synod of Antioch, A.D. 264, 584 ; case of, 1264 *et seq.*

Paulinus of Antioch, consecration of, 586, 668 ; held by the Roman Bishop to be the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, 592, 677 ; not recognised as Bishop of Antioch by Easterns, 592, 689 ; St. Basil on the Roman recognition of, 678 *et seq.*

—— of Aquileia and Rome, 947.

—— of Nola, St., and 'Apostolic Sees,' 12.

—— of York, St., and the *Pallium*, 1294.

Pelagianism, the African Bishops and, 632 *et seq.* ; Innocent, P. I., and, 636 ; St. Augustine and the condemnation of, 640 ; Zosimus, P., and, 643 *et seq.*, 776 *et seq.*, 1270.

Pelagius, at the Synod of Dioscopolis, 633 ; and Zosimus, P., 643, 772.

—— P. I., on St. Augustine and 'Apostolic Sees,' 11 ; and the Bishops of the Italian 'Diocese' and the Fifth Synod, 947.

—— P. II., and the title Œcumenical Patriarch, 1108 ; elected Pope without reference to the Emperor, 1117 ; letters of, to the Bishops of Istria, 1168, 1246 ; use of St. Luke xxii. 32 by, 1168 *et seq.* ; cites the 'interpolations' in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 1246 ; attributes a passage to St. Augustine not found in his works, 1246.

Pepin, 1179.

Perrone on the position of St. Peter, 190.

1 Peter ii. 25, 40 ; v. 2, 136.

Peter, St., Leo on the position of, 70, 193, 201, 846, 1071 ; not *the* foundation of the Church, 74 ; position of, in the first days of the Church, 75 *et seq.*, 903 *et seq.* ; not 'The Rock,' 79 ; why the name Peter was given to, 81 ; St Cyril on the position of, 88 *et seq.* ; why the promise of 'The Keys' was made to, 117 ; African conception of the position of, 117 *et seq.* ; St. Augustine on the position of, 117 ; St. Chrysostom on the position of, 134, 149, 177 *et seq.* ; Bishops sit in the 'Chair' of, 135, 556, 557, 571 ; position of, at the appointment of St. Matthias, 151, 178 *et seq.*, 903 ; titles alleged to be given to, by Christ, 161 *et seq.* ; titles given by the Fathers to, 172, 891 ; St. Gregory the Great on the position of, 195, 1109, 1111 ; 'the legitimate successors of,' according to the *Satis Cognitum*, 464 *et seq.* ; Roman Episcopate of, essential to the Papalist doctrine, 467 ; and St. Paul joint founders of the Roman Church, 468 *et seq.* ; at Rome, 473 ; was not 'Bishop of Rome,' 473 *et seq.* ; no power given to, apart from the Apostles, 840 *et seq.* ; St. Optatus on the position of, 864 *et seq.* ; was, 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College'? 883 *et seq.*, 898 *et seq.* ; on the day of Pentecost, 903 ; at the appointment of the Seven Deacons, 904 ; 'sent' to Samaria, 905 ; at the Council of Jerusalem, 907, 1163 ; and St. Paul at Antioch, 913 ; admitted the first Gentiles into the Church, 1162 *et seq.* ; S. Clemens Romanus ignorant of 'the Roman Episcopate' of, 1224.

'Peter has spoken by Leo,' meaning of the phrase, 458, 459, 742.

'Peter spoke through Agatho,' meaning of the phrase, 743 *et seq.*

—— Bishop and St. Cyril, 700.

—— of Alexandria (1), 1160.

—— of Alexandria (2), 43, 682.

'Peter Aurelius,' on the position of the Bishops, 37.

—— 'the Fuller,' Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, and the *Henoticon*, 800, 924.

—— Mongus, Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, and the *Henoticon*, 800, 922.

—— Patriarch of Jerusalem, and 'The Three Chapters,' 936.

Petri Cathedra, meaning of the term, used by St. Cyprian, 556 *et seq.*
Philip, St., the Deacon, and Samaria, 905; and the Ethiopian Eunuch, 1162.
—— the legate of Celestine, P., at the Third Synod, 366; on the sentence of the Ephesine Synod on Nestorius, 378; with his colleagues held to represent the whole West at the Ephesine Synod, 378, 739; statement of, at the Ephesine Synod, 735 *et seq.*
Philostorgius on Liberius, P., and Hosius, 766.
Philothaeus of Alexandria and the Council of Florence, 256, 257.
Philoxinus, represented with Archidamus St. Julius at the Synod of Sardica, 302; messenger of St. Julius to the Eusebians, 705.
Phocas, the Emperor, and the title Œcumenical Patriarch, 1122.
Photius, the case of, 915; letter of, to Nicholas, P. I., 917; and the intrusion of Nicholas, P. I., into his jurisdiction, 917; deposition of, at the Synod of CP., A.D. 869, 918, 929 *et seq.*; and the alleged 'confirmation' of the Second Synod by St. Damasus, P., 1025.
Pighius, 263.
Pisa, the Council of, A.D. 1409, 980 *et seq.*; decree of, as to its own position, 981; summoned rival Popes before it, 982; deposed Popes, 983; witness of, against Papalism, 984 *et seq.*; authority of, 985.
Pius, P. I., ninth Bishop of Rome, 477.
Pius, Pseudo-, P. I., 1181.
—— P. II., on the authority of the Council of Constance, 1006.
—— P. IV., creed of, on the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, 83; mentioned, 1191.
—— P. VI., and the French 'Constitutional Bishops,' 1099.
—— P. VII., suppression of French Sees by, 1100 *et seq.*
—— P. IX., promulgated the *Constitutio Prima Dogmatica De Ecclesia Christi*, 2; used the formula *sacro approbante Concilio*, 1192; cited the 'interpolations' in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*, 1245.
Polycarp, St., was ignorant of the 'Roman Episcopate' of St. Peter, 479; Tertullian says, was the first Bishop of Smyrna, 483; St. Irenæus on, 499; and Anicetus, P., 526, 1233; was ignorant of Papalism, 527, 1233; did not come to Anicetus, P., as an 'amba-sador,' 527, 1233.
—— Bishop of Adrumetum, 548, 1156.
Polycrates and St. Victor, P., 529, 530.
Pompeius, Bishop, 568, 580.
Pontianus, seventeenth Bishop of Rome, 489.
Pontifex Maximus, Tertullian's use of the term, 1234; title borne by the Roman Emperors, 1234; title of, assumed by Paul, P. II., 1234.
Pontius, St. Cyprian's Deacon, on Xystus, Bishop of Rome, 583; made collection of St. Cyprian's works, 1241.
Pontus and Asia, Bishops of, and Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 428.
'Pope,' title of, 1195 *et seq.*
—— the, position of, in Papal Synods, 292; judgments of, 'reviewed,' 920 *et seq.*; jurisdiction of, 'truly Episcopal,' 1076; the ordinary of every diocese, 1076 *et seq.*, 1090 *et seq.*; position of, according to St. Thomas, 1081 *et seq.*; position of, according to Papalism that of 'Universal Bishop,' 1133; according to Papalism an absolute spiritual monarch, 1134 *et seq.*
Popes, value of 'Petrine' statements made by, 72, 192, 196, 848, 1062.
Postulata, re 'Dispensations,' presented to Pope Pius IX. by Bishops attending the Vatican Council, 1286, 1287.
Pothinus, St., Bishop of Lyons, 479, 1233.
potior principalitas, meaning of term, used by St. Irenæus, 502 *et seq.*; Funk on the term, 502, 505; Puller on the term, 502; Bright on the term, 502.
Præclara, the Encyclical, 7.
Præfectus Urbi, jurisdiction of, 1203.
Preaching of Peter, the, 488.
Precedence of great Sees, how the, was regulated by the primitive Church, 347, 415, 417, 1060.
Presidency of Œcumenical Councils, the, 297, 1279.
'President of the Church of the West,' meaning of the title, 1206.
Prima Sedes, African usage of the term, 1176.
Prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam, source of the proposition, 972.
'Primacy,' Papalist meaning of the term, 101 *et seq.*, 600, 1135.
'Primacy of honour and direction,' insufficient according to Papalism, 102, 879.
Primate, Nicholas, P. I., on the meaning of the term, 408.
primatus, meaning of the term, in corrupt text of Canon VI. of Nicæa, 318, 425; use of the term by St. Cyprian, 1242, *footnote* 7.
Princeps, meaning of the term, 502, 601, 1144, *footnote* 1.
Princeps Ecclesiæ, any Bishop, 601.

principalis, meaning of the term, used by St. Cyprian, 559, 561.
principatus, on the term, used in the *Prisca* version of Canon VI. of Nicæa, 318, meaning of, used by St. Augustine, 600; ascribed by St. Gregory the Great to St. Paul, 602.
Principes Apostolorum, 594.
Prisca version of Canon VI. of Nicæa, 316, 1203.
Priscillianists, The, of Spain, 1178, *footnote* 3.
Privatus of Lambesis, case of, 699, 862, *footnote* 4, 1153.
—— (2), African Bishop, 332.
Proclus of CP., appeal of Athanasius of Perrha to, 701.
Proculus, Bishop of Marsailles, 1175.
προεδρία, meaning of term, 413.
προέδροις, meaning of term, used by the Emperor at the First Synod, 1193.
Projectus, Roman legate at the Third Synod, 366; terms of assent of, to the sentence on Nestorius at the Third Synod, 377.
'Prophets,' the, Bishops, 35, 842.
προστασία, meaning of the term, 174, 413.
προστάται, meaning of the term, applied by St. Cyril of Jerusalem to St. Peter and St. Paul, 174.
Proterius, appointed Bishop of Alexandria at Chalcedon, 396; on Theophilus of Alexandria, 1257.
Provincial Synods, authority of, 44; Canon IV. of Nicæa on, 304 *et seq.*; Canon V. of Nicæa on, 306 *et seq.*; *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* on, 310; Council of Basle on, 310; Canon II. of the Second Synod on, 344; 'Canon VI.' of the Second Synod on, 345.
πρωτεία=*principalitas*, 502.
Psalm xxxi. 23, 77; lxii. 2, 6, 7, 77.
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, the influence of, 26; date of the forgery of, 229, forger of, 229, 230; contents of, 231; 1180 *et seq.*; object of the forgery of, 232; injury done to the Church by, 234; first used by Nicholas, P. I., in the case of Rothad, 236; Van Espen on the use of, by the Roman Curia, 239, 1142; used by Gratian in his *Decretum*, 240; used by Leo, P. X., in the Bull *Pastor Æternus*, 287; on Councils, 310; give the title of Universal Bishop to the Bishop of Rome, 1129; defence of, by Turrianus, 1180; admitted by Roman Catholics to be forged, 1180; influence of, in England in the sixteenth century, 1188.
Pulcheria, the Empress, 387; letter of St. Leo to, 439; letter of the Deacon Hilarus to, 1047.
Puller, Father, on Gratian's *Rescript*, 209; on the meaning of *potior principalitas* in 'the Irenæan Passage,' 502; on the meaning of *convenire ad* in 'the Irenæan Passage,' 508; on the letter of the African Bishops to Celestine, P., 623, *footnote* 3; on the letter of St. Athanasius to Rufinianus, 685; on the forms of the *Libellus* of Hormisdas, 804, *footnote* 2; cited, 928; on the See of Milan, 1235.
Pyrrhus of CP., and Maximus the Abbot, 660.

Qua venerandæ communionis jura in omnes dimanant, meaning of the phrase, 536.
Quæstio, the, of Bishop Ketteler, quoted, 148, 971, *footnote* 4.
Quartodecimanism, 528.
Quinquennial faculties required by Roman Catholic Bishops, 1285 *et seq.*
Qui majores dioeceses tenes, meaning of the phrase, 1206.
Quinsext Council, *vide* Council *in Trullo*.
Quintus, letter of St. Cyprian to, 579.
Quotations, method of making, in the *Satis Cognitum*, 112, 859, 1106, 1131.

Ravinnius of Arles, 216.
Raynaldus, cited, 246, 816, 820, 1222; on the Council of Pisa, 985.
Rebaptism controversy, the, 577 *et seq.*; witnesses against Papalism, 584.
'Reforming Synods, The,' of the fifteenth century, testimony of, against Papalism, 1015.
Regnon, Père, on the effects of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 242.
Regula Fidei, the, of Hormisdas, P., 757 *et seq.*
Rejection of certain Synods by Roman Bishops valueless to Papalism, 1046 *et seq.*
Renatus, legate of St. Leo at the *Latrocinium*, 398, 451, 731; letter of Theodoret to, 398, 731.
Renouf, on the *Fragments* of St. Hilary, 763; cited, 769, 794, *footnote* 2.
Repostus, Bishop, 862, *footnote* 2.
Rescript of Gratian, *vide* Gratian, *Rescript* of.
—— of Valentinian I., *vide* Valentinian I., *Edict* of.
—— of Valentinian III., *vide* Valentinian III., *Edict* of.
Restoration to Sees, meaning of, 732, 1263.
Reticius, Bishop of Autun, 603, *footnote* 1.
Retractatio of Vigilius, P., 945.
Retractationes of St. Augustine, 61, 945.
Reusch, on the writings of St. Maximus, 656, 657.
Revelation iii. 7, 115; xxi. 14, 74.

Rheginus, Archbishop of Constantia, 382.
Riculf, 230.
'Rock, the,' the Papalist interpretation of, erroneous, 48 *et seq.*; the faith confessed by St. Peter, 56, 91 *et seq.*; Christ, 60, 78, 80, 81, 91; use of the term, in Holy Scripture, 77; the 'title' of, 161 *et seq.*
Rogatianus, 35, 861.
Roma locuta est, causa finita est, 632 *et seq.*
Roman Bishops, succession of, to Peter according to the *Satis Cognitum* in the Roman Episcopate, 48; why the claims of, became accepted in the West, 72, 210 *et seq.*, 974 *et seq.*; order of, given by St. Irenæus, 475 *et seq.*; order of, given by Tertullian, 482 *et seq.*; order of, in the Canon of the Roman Mass, 485, 492; order of, given by Eusebius, 490, 491.
—— Episcopate of St. Peter, the alleged, 464 *et seq.*; witness of St. Ignatius against, 469; witness of St. Irenæus against, 475 *et seq.*; witness of Tertullian against, 482; witness of St. Clement against, 1224.
—— forgeries, 243 *et seq.*, 1180, 1187; influence of, in the West, 1188.
—— Liturgy, the, on the order of first Roman Bishops, 485, 492.
—— 'versions' of Canon VI. of Nicæa, 316 *et seq.*, 425, 925.
Romani, meaning of the term, applied to African Catholics, 629 *et seq.*
Romans i. 10, 155.
Rome, the Bishop of, nature of the jurisdiction of, according to Papalism, 101 *et seq.*, 200 *et seq.*, 877 *et seq.*, 894 *et seq.*, 970, 1063, 1064, 1071 *et seq.*, 1074 *et seq.*, 1085, 1104 *et seq.*; representative character of, according to the Africans, 117, 865; jurisdiction of, according to the Nicene Synod, 311 *et seq.*; St. Peter was not, 473 *et seq.*; why, was asked for assistance by other Bishops, 702 *et seq.*; 'Appeal' of St. Athanasius to, 705 *et seq.*; 'Appeal' of St. Chrysostom to, 718; 'Appeal' of Flavian of CP. to, 725 *et seq.*; 'Appeal' of Theodoret to, 731 *et seq.*; early 'style' of, 1234; 'Appeal' of Eusebius of Dorylaeum to, 1266.
—— the City of, ancient position of, in the Roman Empire, 510.
—— the See of, 'the Apostolic See' in the West, 13; position of, in the West, 71, 72; founders of, 468 *et seq.*; what is the *potior principalitas* ascribed to, by St. Irenæus? 502 *et seq.*; sources of influence of, 519 *et seq.*; position of, according to St. Cyprian, 558 *et seq.*; the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* on the 'prerogatives' of, 1181 *et seq.*
Rome, Synods of, *vide* Councils of Rome.
Rothad of Soissons, Nicholas, P. I., used the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* in the case of, 234; and Nicholas, P. I., 236; 'Sardican Canons' at first used by Nicholas, P. I., in the case of, 335.
Rozière, de, on the *Liber Diurnus*, 962, 963.
Rufinianus, letter of St. Athanasius to, 685.
Rufinus on the convocation of the First Synod, 285; and the *Letter to James*, 486; on Canon VI. of Nicæa, 1201 *et seq.*, 1235.
Rufus of Thessalonica, 353, 366.
Rusticus, the Monk, witness of the letter of St. Jerome to, against Papalism, 837 *et seq.*

Sabellianism, St. Dionysius of Alexandria and, 1260.
Sabinus, Bishop of Merida (?), and St. Cyprian, 574.
—— Deacon of the Church of Milan, 663.
Sacro approbante Concilio, 292, 908, 1192.
Salmon, cited, 154, 230; on Gratian's *Decretum* and spurious documents, 241; on Hegesippus' Catalogue of the Roman Bishops, 480; on the 'genuineness' of the *Homilies on the Acts* of St. Chrysostom, 1171.
1 Samuel ii. 2, 77.
2 Samuel xxii. 2, 3, 32, 77.
Sanctissimus, the Antiochene Priest sent to Rome by the Easterns, 675.
'Sardica, Canons of, The,' 323 *et seq.*; right granted to the Roman Bishop by, 325; evidence of, against Papalism, 327 *et seq.*; are, genuine? 331 *et seq.*; *Encyclical* of the Council does not mention, 331; eighteenth of, 333; originally only existed in Latin, 334; used by Innocent, P. I., as Nicene, 334; first made use of as 'Sardican' by Nicholas, P., 335; used by St. Leo as Nicene, 329, 402, 925; used by Felix, P. II., as Nicene, 329, 925; not in the Codex used at Chalcedon, 402; used by Zosimus, P., as Nicene, 610, 775; used by Celestine, P., as Nicene, 620; used by Gelasius, P., as Nicene, 1057; used by St. Gregory the Great as Nicene, 1124; the Council *in Trullo* on, 1207.
—— the Council of, president of, 302; legates of St. Sylvester, P., at, 302; date of, 323; Synodal letter of, 331, 1208.
Satis Cognitum, The, the Encyclical, the text of, Appendix A., pp. 697 *et seq.*; importance of, 2; to whom addressed: 5; object of, 5, 112; excludes the

Eastern Patriarchs from the *fold*, 5; on the foundation of the Church, 14; the unity of the Church the subject of, 15; on the office of the Church, 16, 18; cites St. Irenæus, 17, 494; cites Tertullian, 17; asserts the necessity of a Visible Head of the Church, 19; cites St. Thomas on the necessity of the appointment of a Visible Head of the Church, 25; asserts the appointment of St. Peter as the Visible Head of the Church, 48; appeals to Holy Writ in support of Papalism, 48 *et seq.*, 898, 1064; on St. Matthew xvi. 18, 48, 86, 88; cites St. Pacian, 86; cites St. Cyril of Alexandria, 88; meaning of the 'Primacy' ascribed to the Pope in, 102 *et seq.*, 295; on 'The Gates of Hell,' 107 *et seq.*; cites Origen, 108; method of quotation in, 112, 135, 859, 1106, 1131; on 'binding and loosing,' 114, 886; cites St. Chrysostom, 124, 133, 173, 840; on St. John xxi. 15, 131, 888; cites St. Ambrose, 132, 146; on St. Luke xxi. 32, 142; alleges that certain titles were given to St. Peter by Christ, 161 *et seq.*; alleges certain titles given by the Fathers to St. Peter, 163, 173, 891; cites the Pseudo-Basil, 163; cites St. Leo the Great, 193, 201, 846; cites St. Gregory the Great, 195, 1104; on the 'Supremacy' of the Roman Bishop over the Church, 200, 879 *et seq.*; cites the Council of Florence, 261; cites the Fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, 276; why the, does not cite the formal Acts of the Œcumenical Councils in proof of Papalism, 281; cites the Bull *Pastor Æternus* of Leo, P. X., 286, 1063; on the right of the Roman Bishops to convoke Councils, 286, 1063; on St. Leo's action as to Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 443, 1054; asserts that the Roman Bishops are the legitimate successors of St. Peter, 464; cites the 'Irenæan Passage' imperfectly, 494; sense in which, cites the 'Irenæan Passage,' 495, 500; meaning attributed by, to *potior principalitas*, 502; meaning attributed by, to *ad . . . necesse . . . convenire*, 506; cites St. Cyprian, 545, 553, 564, 854, 860; on the public criterion of a Catholic, 564; cites St. Jerome, 586, 591, 831; cites St. Augustine, 598, 625, 1145; cites Maximus 'the Confessor,' 652; cites 'the Pontifical Legate Philip,' 735; and 'Peter has spoken by Leo,' 742; and 'Peter spoke through Agatho,' 743; cites the *Formula of Hormisdas*, 757; object of citing the *Formula of Hormisdas*, 801; cites *The Confession of Michael Palæologus*, 814; on the power of the Bishops, 823 *et seq.*, 850, 851, 1071 *et seq.*; on the relations existing *jure divino* between the Bishops and the Roman Pontiffs, 829, 1074 *et seq.*; alleges that certain 'powers' were conferred on Peter alone, 840 *et seq.*; on the power of the Apostles, 846 *et seq.*; asserts that Bishops who deliberately secede from Peter and his successors lose all jurisdiction, 851; on the appointment of Peter as the principle and centre of unity, 853 *et seq.*; cites St. Optatus, 864, 873; asserts the subjection of the Episcopal College to Peter and his successors, 877; on the nature of the Papal power, 879, 882 *et seq.*, 893, 1074 *et seq.*; cites St. Bruno of Segni, 887; cites St. Bernard, 892; on the supremacy of the Pope over Œcumenical Councils, 894 *et seq.*, 1016 *et seq.*; asserts that St. Peter was the 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' 898; asserts the supreme power of the Pope over 'the Episcopal College,' 914; asserts that the 'judgments' of the Roman Pontiffs are final, 915 *et seq.*; cites Hadrian, P. I., 915; cites Nicholas, P. I., 970; asserts the necessity of the 'Papal' confirmation of Councils, 1016; on the rejection of Councils by the Roman Pontiffs, 1046; on Gelasius, P. I., on the *Decrees* of Synods and the 'First See,' 1055; on the *Vatican Decrees*, 1076, 1084; asserts Papalism to have been the doctrine of the Church in 'every age,' 1067; implicitly condemns the doctrine of development with regard to the position of the Papacy, 1067 *et seq.*; cites St. Thomas on the position of Bishops, 1080; on the Popes and the Divine Constitution of the Church, 1103; actual position of the Pope according to, 1104 *et seq.*; summary of the position of the Roman Bishops as contained in, 1134 *et seq.*; 'Appeal' of Leo, P. XIII., in, 1145.

Satolli, Mgr., Apostolic delegate to the R.C. Bishops of the U.S.A., 1094 *et seq.*

Satyrus, 1236.

'Schism, The Great,' 976 *et seq.*; witness of, against Papalism, 976; engagements entered into prior to elections to the Papacy during, 978, *footnote* 2.

Schisma, meaning of the term, as used by St. Jerome, 596.

Scholasticus, John, 334.

Scripture, The Holy, on the Church, 21 *et seq.*; evidence of, against the appointment of a Visible Head of the Church, 22, 27; on the meaning of

the word 'Rock,' 77; evidence of, against the appointment of St. Peter as 'Master' of 'the Apostolic College,' 27, 28, 30 *et seq.*, 899 *et seq.*, 1065 *et seq.*; testimony of, against the Papalist interpretation of St. Luke xxii. 31, 154 *et seq.*
Secundianus, 537.
securus judicat Orbis terrarum, meaning of the phrase, used by St. Augustine, 1249.
Sedis Apostolicæ delegatus, phrase used in granting dispensations by Roman Catholic Bishops, 1285.
'See of Peter,' African conception of the, 135, 557, 865.
Seleucia, Council of, A.D. 359, 1049.
Seleucius of Amasea, on 'The Tome' of St. Leo, at Chalcedon, 453.
Sergius of CP., and Maximus the Abbot, 660; and Monophysitism, 784; and Cyrus of Alexandria, 785; heretical character of the letter of, to Honorius, P., 788; second letter of Honorius, P., to, 791, 793; condemned by the Sixth Synod, 794; condemned by the Seventh Synod, 795; condemned by the 'Eighth' Synod, A.D. 869, 796.
'Seven Churches of Asia,' the, St. Optatus on the position of, 868.
Severianus, 764.
Severus of Antioch, 937.
Shebna, 115.
Sigismund, the Emperor, and the Council of Constance, 986; John, P. XXIII., committed to the custody of, 995; and the Council of Basle, 1010.
Silas, St., 154.
Silvanus, 633.
Simplicius, P., 922.
Simplicianus of Milan, applied to conjointly with Siricius, P., by the African Bishops *re* 'Baptism,' 1160; applied to conjointly with Anastasius, P., by the Council of Toledo, A.D. 400, 1177, *footnote* 2; applied to by the Churches of Gaul, 1177, *footnote* 2.
Sidonius Apollinaris, 436, 1195.
Sinuessa, pretended Council of, 972.
Siricius, P., *Decretal* of, 69, 235, 736; Synod of Carthage refers case to, conjointly with Simplicianus of Milan, 1160.
Sisinnius of CP., 351.
Sixtus, P. III., 379.
—— *Pseudo-, P. I.*, 1181, 1183.
—— *Pseudo-, P. II.*, 1183.
—— a Presbyter, letter of St. Augustine to, 1254.
Socrates, on the legates of St. Sylvester, P., at Nicæa, 300; does not mention the 'Sardican Canons,' 331; perversion by, of the letter of St. Julius, P., 1022, *footnote* 2.
Sophronius, of Jerusalem, and Sergius of CP., 786; the *Epistola Synodica* of, 790.
Sotor, eleventh Bishop of Rome, 477; and the Easter controversy, 528.
Soter, Pseudo-, P., 1181.
Soto, on the position of the Apostles, 31.
Sozomen, does not mention the 'Sardican Canons,' 331; on the cessation of intercommunion between East and West, after the Council of Sardica, 664; gives letter of the Eusebians to St. Julius, P., 706; inaccurate in his account of the fall of Liberius, 765 *et seq.*; on the letter of St. Julius, P., in the case of St. Athanasius, 1022, *footnote* 2, 1263.
Sozon, Bishop of Philippi, 454.
Spanish Bishops, the, and St. Cyprian, 574 *et seq.*; action of, as to the Sixth Synod, witnesses against Papalism, 1043; 'confirm' the decrees of the Sixth Synod, 1043; and Benedict, P., II., 1043, *footnote* 1.
Stephen, P., St., and the case of Marcian of Arles, 41; and the case of Basilides and Martial, 574; and Rebaptism, 577 *et seq.*; excommunicated the Bishops of Asia Minor, 577; excommunicated St. Cyprian and the Bishops of Africa, 582, 920; St. Augustine on the action of, *re* Rebaptism, 648 *et seq.*
Stephen, African Bishop, 568.
—— Bishop of Dor, 790.
—— Bishop, Roman legate at the Synod of CP., A.D. 864, 929.
Stilting on Liberius, 763, *footnote* 1.
Syagrius received the *Pallium honoris* from St. Gregory the Great, 1290.
Sylverius, P., 936.
Sylvester, P., St., did not convoke the Nicene Synod, 284 *et seq.*; ignorant of Papalism, 295; was not president of the Nicene Synod, 298; legates of, at Nicæa, 300; legates of, at the Council of Arles, 301; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Nicene Synod, 1021.
Symmachus, P., and the Primacy of Gaul, 1176, 1177.
Sympronian, Epistles of St. Pacian to, 86, 87.
Synesius, and Theophilus, of Antioch, 221.
Synods, the power of Bishops in, 44; St. Augustine and, 45, 648.
'Suburbicarian Churches,' the, 1201 *et seq.*
successio principalis, meaning of the term, used by St. Irenæus, 497, 503, 525.

Successors of Peter, all Bishops, 123, 556.
'Successors of Peter, the legitimate,' meaning of the phrase, 465 *et seq.*
summus sacerdos, meaning of the term, used by St. Jerome, 833 *et seq.*; term, used by Tertullian and St. Ambrose, 833, *footnote* 2.
Supreme Authority, the, instituted by Christ in His Church, 30 *et seq.*
'Supreme Archbishops,' the Bishops of Egypt style the Bishops of Rome, CP., and Antioch the, 447.

Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, consecrator of the French 'Constitutional' Bishops, 1099.
tanquam sedis Apostolicæ delegatus, meaning of the phrase, 1285.
Tarasius of CP., on the authority of St. Athanasius, 685; anathematises Honorius, P., 960; letter of, to Hadrian, P. I., 1036; styled Œcumenical Patriarch at the Seventh Synod, 1271; and the letter of Hadrian, P. I., to the Emperor Constantine at the Seventh Synod, 1272; the Seventh Synod and the *Synodica* of, 1272.
Taurantius and Bubalius, case of, 333.
Terentius, letter of St. Basil to, on the position of St. Meletius, 678.
Tertullian, on 'Apostolical Churches,' 17, 482, 522, 598, 1232; on the martyrdom of St. Peter and Paul at Rome, 474; on the 'auctores' of the 'Apostolical Churches,' 482 *et seq.*; excludes St. Peter from the order of the Roman Bishops, 482, 483; excludes St. John from the order of the Bishops of Smyrna, 483; names St. Clement as the first Bishop of Rome, 484; on the value of the testimony of the 'Apostolical Churches, 522; use of the term *principatus* by, 561; St. Cyprian calls, 'Master,' 561; uses the term *summus sacerdos* of a Bishop, 833, *footnote* 2; on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 1166; use of the title 'Pope' by, 1197; meaning of the term *Pontifex Maximus* used by, 1234.
Thalassius of Cappadocian Cæsarea, 727.
Theodora, the Empress, 936.
Theodore, P., 789.
—— of Antioch, 1051.
—— Ascidas, 935, 939.
—— of CP., 1273.
—— of Jerusalem, 1051.
—— of Mopsuestia, 935; condemned by the Fifth Synod, 942.
—— Lascaris II., 815.
Theodoret of Cyrus or Cyrrhus, identifies Bishops with the Apostles, 35; on 'The Rock,' 55, 56, 78; on the position of Hosius, 298; does not mention the 'Sardican Canons' in his *History*, 331; deposed at the *Latrocinium*, 397; case of, at Chalcedon, 397 *et seq.*, 732; 'Appeal' of, to St. Leo, 398, 731 *et seq.*, 1267; 'restored' to his See by the Synod of Chalcedon, 400, 401, 732; on the orthodoxy of St. Meletius, 666; on St. Eusebius of Samosata, 697; on the position of the Roman Church, 731, 1267; case of, at the Synod of CP., A.D. 553, 942; letter of, to St. Leo, 1267; on the convocation of the Second Synod, 1277.
Theodoric, the Ostrogoth King in Italy, protects the Arians, 803; and Gelasius, P., 1055.
Theodorus of Tarsus, judgment of, on Dioscurus, 394.
Theodosius I., and Arianism at CP., 337; ignorant of Papalism, 337, 338; convoked the Synod of CP., A.D. 381, 338; letter of the Council of Milan, A.D. 381, to, 540 *et seq.*; letter of, to the Councils of Aquileia and Milan, 543.
Theodosius II., convoked the Third Synod, A.D. 431, 360; ignorant of Papalism, 361; Synodal letter of the Third Synod to, 378; applied to by St. Leo to convoke an Œcumenical Council, 386; and Illyricum, 1210.
—— of Alexandria, 937.
—— of Ephesus, 1051.
Theophanes of Jerusalem, 257.
Theophilus of Alexandria, and Synesius of Pentapolis, 221; and St. Chrysostom, 690, 718; helped to restore communion between East and West, 690; and 'The Long Brothers,' 700; letter of Innocent, P. I., to, 722; *Decretals* of, 1160; position of, 1257.
Theophylact, on 'The Gift of the Keys,' 123, 886.
Theopolis, Bishop of, styled Patriarch at the Synod of CP., A.D. 536, 1199.
Thesaurus Græcorum Patrum, 245.
1 Thessalonians iii. 2, 154; v. 21, 1146.
Thessalonica, the Bishop of, position of, 1209.
Thomas, St., the Apostle, St. Cyril on the position of, 128.
—— Aquinas, St., alleges the necessity of the appointment of a Visible Head of the Church, 25 *et seq.*; on St. John xxi. 15, 25; influenced by forgeries in the Papalist interest, 26, 247; and the forged passages attributed to the Greek Fathers, 247, 248, 656, 821, 1215; on the position of the Pope, 1080 *et seq.*;

on the position of the Bishops in the Church, 1081 *et seq.*
Thomassin, on the use of the titles 'Pope,' etc., 12.
'Three Chapters, The,' 935 *et seq.*
Tigistanus, 603.
Tillemont, cited, 41, 352, 619; on the case of Celidonius of Besançon, 213; says St. Hilary died out of communion with Rome, 217; on the case of Athanasius of Pyrrha, 220; on the case of Synesius and Theophilus, 221; on the sentence of the Ephesine Synod on Nestorius, 376; on the position of the city of Alexandria, 415; on the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, 685; on the restoration of the names of Euphemius and Macedonius to the Diptychs, 806; on the position of the Synod of Nicæa, 1020; on the 'Suburbicarian Provinces,' 1204; on the position of Theophilus of Alexandria, 1257; on the cause of the restoration of St. Athanasius to his See, 1263; on St. Augustine's statement as to the action of Zosimus, P., in the case of Cœlestius and Pelagius, 1270.
2 Timothy ii. 1, 2, 31.
Timothy, St., 34.
—— Ælurus, 447, 922.
—— of Alexandria, not present at the Second Synod, 1213.
Titles, given by the Fathers to St. Peter valueless for Papalist purposes, 172 *et seq.*, 891.
Titus, St., 34.
Titus i. 5, 31.
Toledo, Council of, A.D. 401, and Felix of Treves, 1177, *footnote* 2.
—— —— A.D. 684, and the Sixth Synod, 1041; Bossuet on the action of, 1042.
'Tome, the,' of St. Leo, value of, 204; an *Epistola Dogmatica ex Cathedra*, 451; treatment of, at the Council of Chalcedon, 452, 454, 742; the Illyrian and the Palestinian Bishops at Chalcedon and, 452; form of assent given to, by the Fathers of Chalcedon, 453 *et seq.*; witness of the treatment of, by Chalcedon against Papalism, 456, 457; given Œcumenical authority by the Fourth Synod, 457; placed on the same level of authority as the second letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius by St. Leo, 461; placed on the same level of authority as the second letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius by the Fourth Synod, 462; not mentioned in the *Henoticon*, 923.
Tostatus, Alphonsus, on 'The Rock,' 79; on 'The Keys,' 129.
Tractoria, the *Epistola*, of Zosimus, P., 778.
Trent, Council of, on the interpretation of Holy Scripture, 83; on 'The Keys,' 116; on the position of Bishops in the Church, 824, 1192.
Troilus of Constantia, 382.
Trophimus, alleged foundation of the See of Arles by, 1173.
Trullo, in, the Council, renewed Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, 450, 754; Canons of, witness against Papalism, 753 *et seq.*; and the condemnation of Honorius, P., 959; uses προέδροις for Bishops, 1193; on the 'Sardican Canons,' 1207.
Turner, Mr. C. H., cited, 324, *footnote* 3, 1060, *footnote* 4.
Turrianus, on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1180.
Typus, The, and Honorius, P., 792; condemned at the Council of Lateran, A.D. 649, 792, 1268; Vitalian, P., and, 1268.

Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia, meaning of the phrase, used by St. Ambrose, 1237.
Unam Sanctam, the Bull, approved of by Leo, P. X., in his Bull *Pastor Æternus*, 288.
unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, meaning of phrase, used by St. Cyprian, 562.
undique, translation of, in the 'Irenæan Passage,' 535.
Unitas Ecclesiæ, meaning of the phrase, used by St. Augustine, 562.
Unity of the Catholic Church, The, treatise on, by St. Cyprian, 567 *et seq.*; witnesses against Papalism, 567 *et seq.*; circumstances under which, was written, 568, 1243; the 'interpolations' in, 570, 1239 *et seq.*
Unity of the Church, The, treatise on, by St. Augustine, 607 *et seq.*; witnesses against Papalism, 607 *et seq.*; cited in the *Satis Cognitum*, 1145.
'Universal Bishop,' the title, St. Gregory the Great on, 1103 *et seq.*; accurately describes the position of the Pope according to Papalism, 1129, 1133; given to the Pope in the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 1129.
Urban, P. IV., and the forged *Catena* from the Greek Fathers, 246, 1215; sent the *Catena* to St. Thomas Aquinas, 247.
—— P. VI., 977.
—— of Sicca, and the case of Apiarius, 609, 619.
Ursacius, 761, 1049.
Ursinus, 538, 1204.

Valens, Arian Bishop of Mursa, 761, 764; at Ariminum, 1048.

Valens, Julianus, Arian Bishop, 538.
—— the Emperor, and Arianism, 336, 697.
Valentinian I., *Edict* of, powers granted by the, to the Roman Bishop, 207.
Valentinian III. and the 'Appeal' of Flavian, 730.
—— *Edict* of, 206 *et seq.*; powers granted by, to the Roman Bishop, 210 *et seq.*; made the Roman Bishop in the West monarch in the spiritual sphere, 211; had no reference to the East, 211; jurisdiction granted by, civil in nature, 212; statement in, as to the 'Primacy of the Apostolic See,' 1172.
Valerian, St., presided at the Council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, 537.
Vandal Arians, persecution of Catholics by, 628 *et seq.*; applied the name *Romani* to the Catholics of Africa, 628.
Van Espen, on the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, 239; on the use made of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* by the Roman Bishops, 242, 1142; on the 'Eighteenth Canon of Sardica,' 332; on the place of the first African Synod in the case of Apiarius, 610; on the Papalist view of the jurisdiction of Bishops, 850; on the belief of the Primitive Church as to the jurisdiction of Bishops, 1072; on Bishops not 'Ordinaries' but merely 'Vicars' of the Roman Pontiffs, 1090 *et seq.*
Vatican Council, the, asserts Papalism to be *De Fide*, 4; on the interpretation of Holy Scripture, 84; on the 'Primacy,' 93, 101, 104, 105; on St. Luke xxii. 32, 145, 159; cites the *Decretum Unionis* of Florence, 271; on the Supreme Judge of all the Faithful, 308, 341, 406, 555; on the jurisdiction of the Pope, 330, 493, 534, 884, 1068, 1076, 1086; on the right of 'Appeal' to the Pope, 341, 406; asserts the 'Roman Episcopate' of St. Peter, 467; suppresses the fact that St. Paul was joint founder of the Church of Rome, 472; on the Bishop of Rome as the infallible teacher of the Church, 499, 624, 647, 774, 782; cites the 'Irenæan Passage' incompletely, 535; cites the Synodal letter of the Council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, 536; and the 'Confession of Michael Palæologus,' 819; on the power of the Bishops, 824; on the nature of the 'Papal' power, 884, 1076; on the supremacy of the Pope over Œcumenical Councils, 894; asserts the jurisdiction of the Pope is *vere Episcopalis*, 1077; cites St. Gregory the Great, 1105; text of the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima De Ecclesia Christi* of, Appendix B., p. 719.
Venericus of Vercelli, 1245.
Venerius of Milan, 1161.
'Vicariate of Christ, the,' the Apostolate constituted, 902.
—— of Arles, the, 1173 *et seq.*
—— of Thessalonica, the, 1210, 1211.
'Vicariates,' why, were instituted by the Roman Bishop, 1212; holders of, received the *Pallium*, 1291.
'Vicars of Christ,' Bishops, 38.
'Vicars of the Roman Pontiffs,' are Bishops? 826 *et seq.*, 850, 1087 *et seq.*
'Vicars' and 'Ordinaries,' difference between, 1090 *et seq.*
Victor, St., P., and the Asiatics, 528 *et seq.*, 920; and Polycrates, 529, 530; St. Irenæus and, 534; action of, in the Easter controversy, witnesses against Papalism, 532 *et seq.*
Victor, Pseudo-, P., 1183.
—— Garbiensis, 874, 1246.
—— Vitensis, on the persecution of Catholics by the Vandal Arians, 628; use of the term *Romani* by, 629.
Vigilius, P., and the Bishopric of Rome, 936; and 'The Three Chapters,' 937 *et seq.*; and the Monophysites, 937; the *Judicatum* of, 938; Western Bishops and the action of, 939, 946; the *Constitutum* of, 941 *et seq.*; the Fifth Synod on, 942; accepts the decision of the Fifth Synod on, 'The Three Chapters,' 944, 1032; conduct of, witnesses against Papalism, 945; did not give 'Papal' confirmation to the Fifth Synod, 1033; sought permission from the Emperor to give the *Pallium*, 1289.
—— of Arles, received the *Pallium* from St. Gregory the Great as his 'Vicar,' 1290, 1291.
Vincent of Lerins, St., 'Canon' of, 3, 4, 227; on Rebaptism, 577; on Theophilus of Alexandria, 1257.
—— of Capua, 1050.
Vincenzi, on Canon IV. of Nicæa, 305; on Canon V. of Nicæa, 309; on Canon VI. of Nicæa, 320, 654, 655; says Flavian of Antioch was an intruder, 340; on Canon III. of the Second Synod, 349; on Canon XII. of Antioch *in Encaeniis*, 403; on Canon IX. of Chalcedon, 408; on the letters of Atticus of CP. and St. Cyril of Alexandria to the Africans, 617, *footnote* 1; on Canon XVII. of the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, 623, 1252; denies that the Synodal letters of the Africans to Boniface, P., and to Celestine, P., are genuine, 623; witnesses that the received Canons of the early Councils

are imcompatible with Papalism, 654, 655, 914; on *Cephas* in Galatians ii. 11, 913.
Visible Head of the Church, alleged to be necessary by the *Satis Cognitum*, 19; appointment of a, inconsistent with the unity of the Church, 19; Holy Scripture witnesses against the appointment of a, 21 *et seq.*; St. Thomas on the appointment of a, 25; value of the argument of St. Thomas as to the appointment of a, 26.
Vitalian, P., and the *Typus*, 1268.
Vitalis, intruded into Antioch, 587, *footnote* 1; condemned by a Roman Synod, A.D. 376, 682.
Vitus and Vincentius represented St. Sylvester at the Nicene Synod, 300.

Watson, Dr., on the 'interpolations' in the *De Unitate* of St. Cyprian, 1243.
West, the, Papalist claims accepted in, 72.
Western Bishops, the Third Synod regarded the legates of Celestine, P., as representing, 378; claims made by, with reference to Eastern affairs, 542, 714, 716; appealed to, for assistance by Easterns against Arianism, 672, 675, 682.
William of Malmesbury, cited, 1200.
Wiseman, Card., quoted imperfectly the order of the Roman Bishops given by St. Irenæus, 481.
Wordsworth, Dr. J. (Bishop of Salisbury), on the genuineness of the 'Sardican Canons,' 334.

Xystus, P. I., sixth Bishop of Rome, 476.
Xystus, P. II., twenty-third Bishop of Rome, and the African Church, 583; Pontius the African Deacon on, 583.

York, the Archbishop of, and the *Pallium*, 1293, 1294.

Zabarella, Card., at the Council of Constance, 991.
Zachary, P., enjoined a yearly visit to Rome on all Bishops consecrated by the Pope, 1287.
Zeno, the Emperor, put forth the *Henoticon*, 800, 922.
Zephyrinus, P., 1234.
Zephyrinus, Pseudo-, P., 1183.
Zonaras, on the citation of the 'Sardican Canons' as Nicene, 329; on the Sixth Nicene Canon, 1205.
Zosimus, P., adduced 'Sardican Canons' as Nicene, 329, 610, 775; and Apiarius, 609, 614, 920; instructions of, to his legates in the case of Apiarius, 610; use of the 'Sardican Canons' by, incompatible with Papalism, 615, 775; and Pelagianism, 643 *et seq.*, 770 *et seq.*, 1270; and St. Augustine, 643 *et seq.*; approved the *Libellus* of Cœlestius, 771; held Cœlestius and Pelagius to be of 'unimpeachable faith,' 772; on Papalist principles acted as Supreme Judge in the cause of Cœlestius and Pelagius, 774; action of, in the case of Cœlestius and Pelagius incompatible with Papalism, 774; second letter of, to the African Bishops, 775; the *Epistola Tractoria* of, 776; made the Bishop of Arles his 'Vicar,' 1174; St. Augustine on, and Pelagius, 1270.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

APR 30 1966 65
REC'D LD
APR 19 1966
REC. CIR. JUN 9 '77

LD 21A-60m-10,'65
(F7763s10)476B
General Library
University of California
Berkeley