

his subsequent confirmation of the Acts) were not in contradiction with the Tome which they subscribed, nor the Tome in contradiction with them.¹

Further, it was left to the council to draw up some short definition which would serve as a test of orthodoxy on the point in question. St. Leo's Tome was not intended for that; it supplied the τύπος,² the mould and the material, the necessary norm and measuring-line, but not a definition adapted for practical purposes; this would be best effected in a council, after an investigation and exposition of the needs of the case.

Again, St. Leo had left it to the council to deal with the cases of those bishops who had been illegitimately extruded from their sees, and whose cases could now be heard in person—such as Eusebius and Theodoret; and the cases of those bishops who had subscribed the condemnation of Flavian by putting their signatures to a blank paper.

Such was the work before the council. It met in the Church of St. Euphemia, on whose intercessions the bishops avowed their reliance, and on whose altar they placed their definition, that it might be presented before saints and angels, and to Almighty God, by her intercessory mediation.

There were at least 600 bishops present, the largest number that had yet met together. They were, almost to a man, Eastern prelates. The scene of their meeting is described in glowing terms by Evagrius, and is to this day one of the most exquisite spots in that beautiful region.

II. Dioscorus at once took his seat as Archbishop of Alexandria. He had just before gathered together ten bishops and executed the farce of excommunicating St. Leo—an act of madness, which eventually afforded the bishops their chief ground for deciding upon his impenitence, and in consequence for carry-

¹ It is important to remember this, because some writers, in dealing with the exclamations of the bishops during the council concerning Cyril, seem to imagine that they were quoting Cyril simply, as the authority before which they bowed; indeed, they even suppose that the bishops put the authority of Cyril on a par with that of Leo. But it was because Cyril's orthodoxy had been established by Pope and council, particularly by Celestine and Sixtus (who are expressly mentioned—cf. fifth session), that his authority is quoted.

² Ep. ci. *Anatoli ad Leonem*.

ing out the sentence of Leo, committed to their charge. Whether by this means he thought to make it technically impossible for the legates to sit and condemn him, or whether he acted out of mere *bravado*, and by way of insult to the Apostolic See, it is impossible to say. He now sat down in the place of honour, as the occupant of the second see in Christendom.

But the Papal legates intervened, and refused to proceed until Dioscorus was removed from the seat he had occupied. They wished him to go out. They held a commission (said Paschasinus) 'from the most holy and most apostolic Bishop of Rome, who is the head of all Churches, to see that Dioscorus should have no seat in the council.' When questioned further, the legates said that Dioscorus 'had dared to arrange' a synod without leave from the Apostolic throne.¹

The imperial commissioners wished to resist this decision of the legates, but in vain. They had to obey 'the head of all Churches,' and cause Dioscorus to leave his place. His presence, however, was required, and he was therefore allowed to sit in the middle, without, that is to say, a seat as a constituent member of the synod, which was the gist of the legates' demand. There he maintained that Flavian was rightly condemned by the council which the Emperor Theodosius had convoked at Ephesus. His position really was that the imperial supremacy was sufficient for the case, and that Flavian was involved in heresy.

Accordingly the Acts of the Robber Synod were read. In these the name of Theodoret occurred, who had been deposed by Dioscorus. Theodoret was called for, and he presently entered. A scene of tumultuous confusion ensued. The Egyptian bishops saw in Theodoret only the enemy of St. Cyril. They shouted and protested, and maintained that to admit Theodoret into the assembly was to cast out Cyril, whom Theodoret had once anathematized. The statement, which the commissioners and senate made, that Leo had rein-

¹ ποιῆσαι. I have translated the word 'arrange,' as being a term which is both covered by the Greek word, and which fits in with the facts of the case. St. Leo had sent legates, but Dioscorus took precedence of them by order of the emperor, or with his consent. This was his sin in the matter.

stated him in his bishopric, and that the emperor had ordered his presence, availed nothing for awhile with these Egyptian partisans. They were furious at the idea of one who had anathematised their former holy patriarch, appearing in the council in the character of bishop. They cared for neither Pope or emperor, nor for the Patriarch of Antioch, who had likewise testified to the orthodoxy of Theodoret; they believed them all to be unaware of the true character of the man. They were calmed, however, by the compromise of admitting his presence on the understanding that his sitting as accuser should not prejudice the question of his proper place in the synod, which could be settled afterwards, as was in fact done in Theodoret's favour.

The pith of the accusation now brought against Dioscorus lay in the fact that he had suppressed the Tome of Leo; and he persisted throughout that Flavian was rightly condemned, because he had said that 'after the union' (*i.e.* the Incarnation) 'there were two natures in Christ.' Dioscorus and his party were willing to acknowledge that Christ was 'of two natures,' but not that there 'are two natures' in Him.¹

The obduracy, therefore, of Dioscorus being duly established, it only remained to pronounce sentence, in accordance with St. Leo's direction, in canonical form—which, however, was deferred for another session. The Oriental bishops, *i.e.* those in the patriarchate of Antioch, were in favour of all the leaders of the Robber Synod being included in the condemnation of Dioscorus, but on the Illyrian bishops exclaiming, 'We have all erred: we all ask for pardon,' it was decided, for the present, that Dioscorus alone should suffer deposition.

When the bishops reassembled, neither Dioscorus nor the imperial commissioners made their appearance; the latter, because the deposition of a bishop was so completely the affair of the spirituality, and the former, doubtless, because he had clearly seen how things were going. Eusebius of Dorylæum, who had been 'deposed' by the Robber Synod, now preferred

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 690.

his complaint against Dioscorus, and the latter was accordingly summoned in the usual way to attend the synod. Meanwhile, three clerics of Alexandria and a layman were admitted to the synod, to prefer their several complaints against their patriarch. These petitions were each one of them addressed 'to the *Œcumenical Archbishop and Patriarch* of great Rome, Leo, and to the holy and *Œcumenical Synod*.' They revealed the fact that Dioscorus was a man of notoriously loose morality and intolerably overbearing temper. The priest from Alexandria concluded by saying to the bishops, 'I, miserable Athanasius, presbyter of the most renowned city of Alexandria, have presented these petitions to the most holy *Œcumenical Archbishop and Patriarch* Leo, and to the most holy *Œcumenical Council* of holy Fathers and Bishops.' The layman Sophronius concluded in the same way.¹ These petitions, *thus addressed*, were ordered to be inserted in the Acts, and read to Dioscorus in case he came to the synod. But Dioscorus, like Nestorius, refused to obey the summons, saying that he 'adhered to what he had previously said,' thus confessing his obstinate perseverance, and bringing himself under the condemnation of Leo.

III. The sentence was forthwith pronounced by Paschasinus, at the desire of the bishops. Julian, Bishop of Hypepæ, not merely concurred with the rest in calling on Paschasinus to give the sentence, but made the following short speech:— 'Holy fathers, listen. Since in the metropolis of Ephesus Dioscorus held the authority' (from the emperor) 'for judging between holy Flavian and the most religious Bishop Eusebius' (on the one hand) 'and Eutyches' (on the other), 'and issued a thoroughly iniquitous judgment, himself first pronouncing an unjust sentence, and then forcing the rest to follow him—now your holiness holds the authority of the most holy Leo; and all the holy synod, gathered together according to the will of God and the decree of our most pious emperor knows,

¹ Mr. Gore (*Dict. of Chr. Biog.* p. 663) alludes to these addresses as the 'expressions of individuals,' as though they were nothing further. It must be remembered that these petitioners were endeavouring to ingratiate themselves, not with St. Leo, but with the council, and that the council was prepared to use their petitions as evidence. The context makes their use emphatic.

as does your holiness, all that was done in Ephesus; and Dioscorus has been thrice summoned and would in no wise obey. We ask your holiness, therefore, who holds, or rather your holinesses' (*i.e.* the other legates), 'who hold the place of the most holy Pope Leo, to promulgate and issue against him' (*viz.* Dioscorus) 'the sentence contained in the canons. For we all, and the whole œcumenical synod, are of one mind with your holiness.'

The whole assembly reiterated its perfect oneness of mind with Paschasinus.

Let us pause for a moment. The whole enormous assembly of Eastern bishops can hear St. Leo addressed by the Alexandrian clerics as the 'œcumenical' archbishop *par excellence*, and not a word of protest, but the letters are placed in the archives for use in the tremendous scene that is being now enacted—nothing less than the deposition of the occupant of the second see in Christendom.

Again, the deposition of the Patriarch of Alexandria is yielded by the synod to the legates on the ground that they hold the authority of Leo. The authority of the synod in Chalcedon is said to differ from that of the synod of Ephesus under Dioscorus, in deriving from the Bishop of Rome, who, through his legates, is present at the synod, and forms a constituent necessary and sovereign element of that assembly.

Nothing in the life of the Church could require a more sovereign act of jurisdiction than the deposition of the Archbishop of Alexandria. St. Athanasius tells us how St. Julius in the last century said that the canons required that all matters concerning the deposition of an Alexandrian archbishop should be referred to Rome, that 'a just judgment may be issued thence.' St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, had been deposed by a synod with the authority of the emperor. But the Pope treated the deposition as null and void, reopened the question, and acquitted Athanasius. In the case of Dioscorus, a Bishop of Alexandria was now being deposed, and the whole Church accepted his deposition. But he was deposed by the authority of the See of St. Peter, whose agent was the synod of bishops, including the

representative of the Apostolic See. If anyone doubts this, let him ponder the following sentence, adopted by the council.¹

Paschasinus, Lucentius (bishops), and Boniface (priest), 'holding' (as the Acts say) 'the place of the most holy and blessed Leo, Archbishop of the Apostolic See of great and older Rome,' stood up and pronounced the sentence of deposition on the following grounds:

1. 'Because Dioscorus on his own authority received Eutyches, of one mind with him, into communion when he had been canonically condemned by his own archbishop'—'this he did before he sat in council with the bishops at Ephesus.'

2. 'The Apostolic See has pardoned the other bishops.' They acted under compulsion, and they have repented and have 'continued to adhere² to the most holy Archbishop Leo and the holy and Œcumenical Council.' (How could the 'Apostolic See' be said by an œcumenical synod to have 'pardoned' bishops, unless that synod held that the said see represented 'the prince and head of the Apostles'? And what obedience could Eastern bishops owe to Leo, except on the supposition that he was the 'œcumenical archbishop'?)

But Dioscorus 'has continued to boast over those things on account of which he ought to groan and throw himself on to the ground.' (So that his obstinacy, which Leo mentioned as necessary to be established before he was finally condemned, was substantiated.)

3. He did not allow the Tome of Leo to be read—'which not being read, the Holy Churches of God throughout the world have suffered scandal and injury.' (Notice the relation of the Papal utterance to the whole Church of God.)

All this, however (they say), might have been pardoned. But this was not all. The climax was reached when—

4. 'He presumed to issue an excommunication against the most holy and blessed Archbishop of Greater Rome.'

5. Lastly, he had rendered himself technically liable to deposition, for he refused to appear when thrice summoned to a synod. (St. Athanasius also refused to appear when summoned to a synod; but it had been convoked by the

¹ Mansi, t. vi. p. 1046.

² ἐπόμενοι.

emperor without the consent of the Pope, as the Eastern historians notice in condemning it.)

'Wherefore Leo, the most holy and blessed Archbishop of great and older Rome, by us and by the present holy synod, together with the thrice blessed and worthy of all praise, the blessed Apostle Peter, who is the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the orthodox faith, *has stripped him of his episcopate* and deprived him of all sacerdotal dignity. Wherefore this great synod will decree what is according to the canons.'

Anatolius signed first, saying that 'he agreed in all things with the Apostolic throne.' Dioscorus had disobeyed the canons of the holy Fathers and had refused to obey the three-fold summons.

Maximus of Antioch recorded his agreement with Leo and Anatolius.

Diogenes, Bishop of Cyzicum, 'consented to those things which had been decreed by the most holy and blessed Roman Archbishop Leo,' and by Anatolius and the present holy and oecumenical synod.

One bishop calls the meeting 'your angelical meeting.'

In the version of this sentence which Leo himself sent to the Gallic bishops the indictment against Dioscorus that he had 'excommunicated' the Pope is omitted, as was natural; otherwise the differences are purely verbal.¹

The sentence, however, as communicated to Dioscorus, did not give the bishops' reasons in full, but merely mentioned the technical point of his disobedience to the summons of the synod, besides 'his other offences.'

But in their official report to the emperor,² which is of the highest importance, they give the grounds of their condemnation in full.

First, Dioscorus had prevented the Pope's letter to Flavian being read at Ephesus.

Next, he had restored Eutyches, 'sick with the impiety of the Manichæans,' to his priesthood and position in his

¹ Mr. Gore calls this version 'widely different.' But a comparison of the two line by line will convince the reader that this is not correct.

² Mansi, t. vi. p. 1098.

monastery 'after the Bishop of Rome had decreed what was fitting, and had condemned the *perfidy* of Eutyches in saying, "I confess, indeed, that our Lord Jesus Christ was of (ἐκ) two natures before the union, but that there was one nature after the union."'

The quotation is from the Tome of Leo, and shows that they understood the latter part of the Tome as a juridical sentence. Dioscorus had seen this sentence which the Pope passed on Eutyches, and had suppressed the Tome in which it occurs.

Thirdly, his misconduct to Eusebius of Dorylæum was scandalous.

Fourthly, he had received into communion those who had been put out of communion, thereby offending against the canon which 'teaches that those who are excommunicated by one should not be received into communion with others.'

But all this (the synod says) might have been forgiven; in fact, the Pope had expressly said that a door of repentance was to be left to the last. But Dioscorus (probably just before the council actually met) gathered together ten bishops and induced them to execute the farce of excommunicating St. Leo himself. This was the climax of his madness. And so the synod continues to report to his Imperial Majesty by saying that—

Fifthly, 'beyond all this, he has also opened his mouth like a mad dog against the Apostolic See itself, and has endeavoured to effect letters of excommunication against the most holy and blessed Pope Leo, and—

Lastly, 'has persisted in his iniquities and been obstinate against the holy and oecumenical synod, refusing to answer to various accusations brought against him.'

He remains, therefore (so they wrote to the Empress Pulcheria), 'a pillar of salt, and the rulers of the various Churches have regained their sees, Christ our Lord having prosperously directed their course, Who shows the truth in the wonderful Leo—for as He used the sapient Peter, so He uses also this champion of the truth' ('ita et isto utitur assertore'), viz. Leo.

Such is the verdict of the great Eastern Synod, viz. that St. Peter is the rock in Matt. xvi.,¹ and that Leo takes the place, in the Church's government of souls, of the blessed Apostle Peter, being the Vicar of Christ in his direction of the Church—a statement which is correctly summed up in the more modern phrase 'Papal supremacy,' or 'infallibility.'

IV. In the session which followed, the imperial commissioners, who, although not presidents in the ecclesiastical sense of the term, arranged the external order of the assembly, brought forward the question of the faith in which the body of bishops were now to proclaim their unity. Dioscorus, if this is the third session, had now been deposed, and the case of his assistants in the Robber Council—viz. Juvenal of Jerusalem and four other bishops—had yet to be dealt with. None of these were present at this session. The business before the bishops was, according to the commissioners, that of 'expounding the faith purely;' and the object in view was that 'those who seem not to have held the same ideas as all the rest should be brought back to unity of mind by the full knowledge (*ἐπὶ γνῶσις*) of the truth, for the lord of the earth holds, as we do, the faith handed down by the 318 Fathers at Nicæa, and the 150, and by the rest of the most holy and glorious Fathers.'

This description of the business before the meeting is of great importance for understanding what follows. It was the 'pure faith' which was to bind the bishops together; and the commissioners themselves had no doubt as to what that pure faith was. It was no open question. Those who were to be 'brought back' were the bishops who had acquitted Eutyches and condemned Flavian, asserting that Flavian had contravened and Eutyches had accepted the Nicene Creed. By voting for the condemnation of Flavian they had seemed to hold ideas which were at variance with the meaning of the Nicene Creed, as interpreted by the Council of Ephesus and by Leo. But the emperor (said the commissioners) held to the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creed as interpreted by the present Pope.

¹ Cf. the 'Sentence' above, p. 406.

On the mention of the emperor's faith in the Nicene Creed, all agreed by acclamation that they held no other faith than that of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus.

So far all was well; but a Eutychian could say that. Accordingly, Cecropius of Sebastopol rose and introduced the real subject before them. He said that besides these declarations of faith, the matter concerning Eutyches had arisen, and that a dogmatic decision had been given by the most holy archbishop in Rome, 'And we follow him, and have all subscribed his letter.'

The bishops exclaimed, 'We all say this: the expositions given are sufficient; it is not in our power to make another.'

This is a crucial point in estimating the position which St. Leo's letter occupied in their minds. It stood on a level with those writings which had been accepted by the previous councils. It had not been synodically discussed; it never was. The bishops from the first refused to discuss its contents in open synod. *They followed Leo.* They had signed his letter, and that was enough. They maintained that it was not open to them to make another exposition. It had not yet been synodically accepted, but they still had no cause to frame another exposition.¹

But as Rusticus in the next century annotates the bishops' acclamation, it was not the case that quite all the bishops were satisfied with this. The great majority were of one mind, but it could not be taken for granted that every one of them was agreed with the rest. Accordingly the commissioners proposed that the patriarchs of each of the provinces should, with one or two from each province, pass into the middle and deliberate in common concerning the faith, so that if there should be any difference of opinion, *which they thought there could not be*, that difference might be clearly expressed.

The bishops, however, refused to do this. They were satisfied with things as they were. They flatly refused to make out any written formulary, for those already in existence were sufficient. They had already agreed to Cecropius'

¹ It was (they said) Leo's sentence (*τύπος*) which made it unnecessary. Mansi, vi. 953.

statement that the Pope's dogmatic interpretation sufficed for the Eutychian matter.

V. But Florentius of Sardes pleaded that 'a certain time should be given so that we may approach the truth of the matter with becoming consideration, although most certainly as concerns ourselves, who have subscribed the letter of the most holy Leo, we do not need setting right.'

He considered, and very properly, after the circumstances of the Robber Council, that some did need setting right, but not those who had subscribed to the letter of Leo.

Cecropius, accordingly, proposed that the decisions of the 318 Fathers and of the most holy Leo be read. He prefaced his proposal by saying that 'the faith has been well discussed by the 318 holy Fathers, and has been confirmed by the holy Fathers Athanasius, Cyril, Celestine, Hilary, Basil, Gregory, and now again by the most holy Leo.'

It may be noticed that Leo is here said to have 'confirmed' the faith confessed by the Nicene Fathers, which shows that nothing can be argued from the council being said to confirm the letter of Leo as to its thinking itself a superior court. St. Leo was not superior to the Nicene faith, nor the synod to Leo. In each case the meaning of the word 'confirmation' must be determined by the context. It will be seen that the final confirmation by Leo was certainly that of a superior authority.

The Nicene Creed was read, and amongst the exclamations that burst from the bishops were such as 'Pope¹ Leo so believes!' 'Cyril so believes!' The great point in their minds was that the condemnation of Eutyches did not involve the condemnation of Cyril, and that, therefore, in signing the Tome of Leo they were not disagreeing with what the Church had already taught through St. Cyril.

Two letters of Cyril were then read; the first on the ground that it had been confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, and the second, to John of Antioch, had as a matter of fact been sanctioned by Pope and emperor and the whole Church.

¹ ὁ Πάπας, the Pope (Mansi, t. vi. p. 955). I do not lay stress on the definite article, but the occurrence of the word by way of contrast. Cyril was also a pope, but they do not call him so here.

After this the bishops again cried out that 'This is the faith of Leo,² the archbishop—Leo thus believes—Leo and Anatolius² thus believe!' No one who considers the circumstances under which Anatolius signed the Tome of Leo will for a moment suppose that Anatolius is placed on a level with Leo by saying that they believed alike.

They further cried out, 'As did Cyril, so do we all believe!' and 'Leo the archbishop thus thinks, thus believes, thus wrote!' The whole contention of the Eutychians had been that they were following Cyril, whose letters had been adopted by the whole Church. The orthodox bishops were, therefore, anxious to emphasise the fact that in subscribing to Leo's teaching they, too, were not divorcing themselves from the doctrine of Cyril. They believed both. If they had been asked, Is it likely, is it possible that Leo under the circumstances *could* have led them astray, and differed from those writings of Cyril which had received oecumenical sanction? they would doubtless have replied that it was impossible. But this was not the question before them. They were only dealing with the truth, that as a matter of fact St. Leo did not contradict Cyril. And they no more sat in judgment on the Pope and St. Cyril as superiors than a man acts as superior to St. James and St. Paul when he declares that they do not contradict one another in their doctrine of justification; neither do they put St. Leo on the same official level as St. Cyril by mentioning them together, any more than a man would equalise St. Paul the Apostle and a Greek poet, if he showed that the Apostle agreed with the poet. It must be remembered, too, that St. Cyril's writings had Papal sanction.

The Tome of Leo was now read. At two points, such was the stupidity of some of the bishops of Illyricum and Palestine (who had been exposed to adverse influences) that they could not see how the words of the Tome could be reconciled with St. Cyril's teaching. They did not say that the Tome was wrong, but they did not see their way to reconcile the two.¹

¹ Their difficulty was, doubtless, to distinguish the two concepts of 'nature' and 'person,' especially as their relationship had been expressed in Latin, and had to be translated into Greek. Members of the Church of England may

Aetius the archdeacon ventured to show the bishops that they had forgotten two passages in St. Cyril, and Theodoret quoted to them some words of the saint. They were satisfied that they were mistaken. At the end of the reading the bishops exclaimed, 'This is the faith of the Fathers! This is the faith of the Apostles! . . . *Peter has thus spoken by Leo!* The Apostles thus taught! Cyril thus taught! . . . As Catholics we hold this! . . . Why were not these things read at Ephesus? Dioscorus concealed these things.'

The commissioners and senate asked, 'After all this, who doubts?'

The bishops replied, 'No one doubts.' They saw, then, in Leo's dogmatic epistle the teaching of the Apostles, but specially of the Apostle Peter. They refused to examine the contents of the letter in synod which they had already subscribed out of synod, but persisted that they heard in it the voice of Peter speaking through Leo, and explaining his own confession of faith at Cæsarea Philippi. It is not to be supposed that they used the expression 'Peter hath spoken by Leo' without reference to the teaching then in vogue, and actually emphasised in this very council, that Leo was the successor of Peter. The question before them was not, indeed, whether the successor of Peter *could* be untrue to the teaching of Peter; they were simply asserting that as a matter of fact he was true to the Apostle's teaching. But their exclamation suggests their belief that it followed from his official position.

But although no single voice was raised to break the force of the unanimous cry which rose from the bishops, 'We all believe!' and 'No one doubts!' and 'Peter hath spoken by Leo!' still there was something more needed; for they had not merely to believe, but to understand, since they had to meet their former friends, the bishops who had led them at the Robber Synod. They were absent now; but their case had to be dealt with—and amongst these was the patriarch of the Palestinian bishops. If this was the second session, and

remember the difficulties felt by Dean Stanley even in this century on the same subject, when he was endeavouring to suppress the Athanasian Creed.

Dioscorus was not yet condemned, as the order given by Mansi indicates, then they must have been in the utmost need of being well prepared to face Dioscorus, as well as the other ringleaders of the Latrocinium. But if (as so many old copies give the order, and as the Ballerini hold) this was the session immediately after the deposition of Dioscorus, they had still to reckon with the other bishops, to say nothing of their own flocks. And some shorter formulary, some condensed form of the Tome, would have to be provided for practical use; and they would need to have the teaching of Leo thoroughly in hand to know how to comport themselves in the coming trial.

Accordingly Atticus of Nicopolis asked for a concession of five days, so that they might decide upon this. They especially asked to be supplied with the letter of Cyril, containing the twelve anathematisms which had not been read to them, but on which their opponents outside had laid the greatest stress. They say, 'The letter of our lord¹ and holy Father and Archbishop, Leo, who adorns the Apostolic See, has been read to us,' and the expression implies that they receive that without question. But they wish for the other letter of Cyril's. Why? That they may settle their own judgment as to the orthodoxy of Leo? By no means. But 'that we may be properly provided in the time of closer examination.'

Many of the bishops then proposed that they should all look into this together. The commissioners agreed to an interval of five days, during which those bishops who wished might meet at the house of Anatolius and treat in common, out of synod, concerning the faith, 'that those who doubt may be taught.' Those who doubt were not allowed to meet for mere discussion, but for instruction.

The word 'doubt' seems to have roused the bishops, and they disclaimed against there being such a thing as doubt in the matter. 'We all believe as Leo;' 'No one of us doubts;' 'We have already subscribed.'

The commissioners then explained that it was not meant

¹ One article governs them all. Hence the translation I have given in the text. Mansi, vii. 974.

for them all to meet together. 'But since it is fitting to persuade all who doubt, let Anatolius choose from amongst those who have subscribed such as he thinks fitted to instruct such as doubt.'

It was not, then, the council that discussed the contents of the Tome in synod, but some of the bishops, who, from difficulties of language, and as the event proved, lack of acquaintance with Cyril's teaching, were willing to be 'instructed' in the house of Anatolius between the sessions. They had signed a blank paper at the Robber Council in fear of their lives. They would be asked by others in Chalcedon and by their flocks at home, whether they understood what they signed now. If they replied that they did not understand, but simply accepted everything on the word of Leo, they would, indeed, have done homage to a truth in owning allegiance to St. Peter in his successor; but what was then needed was not an act of faith in the infallibility of the Vicar of Christ, but an intelligent adhesion to his dogmatic decree, such as was necessary for those who had to teach. The Fathers of the synod did, indeed, in writing to the emperor on this very subject, bestow unlimited praise on the faith which in some did not need any discussion. 'To those who believe, a perception not submitted to discussion' suffices 'for the useful purposes of faith, drawing the devout soul to confess the holy dogma.' But these bishops could not really say they believed with an intelligent faith, when they did not thoroughly *understand* the agreement between Cyril and Leo, although *they assumed its existence*; having a difficulty in grasping the coincidence of teaching by reason of the different languages in which the several letters were written. That this was the principle on which the hesitating bishops acted is rendered quite certain by what they said in the following session. After the legates had described the attitude of the synod towards the Tome of Leo as being precisely the same as their attitude towards the Council of Nice and the Council of Ephesus, and after the bishops as a body had accepted this as their position,² the bishops of Illyricum made a declaration in the person of one of their number named Sozon. They said

¹ 'Indiscussa.'

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 10.

that their hesitation had not proceeded from any doubt as to the orthodoxy of Leo.¹ The only question was whether one or two expressions conveyed the sense which they were quite persuaded was intended by the 'Holy Father.' The legates had elucidated ('nobis dilucidaverunt') the matter. It is therefore beyond dispute that the examination of the Tome was not in their minds connected with the idea of revision but of elucidation.

St. Leo expressly alludes to this scene in the synod with satisfaction. He speaks of the danger of their consent being a mere mechanical and pretended assent,² and consequently welcomes the news that some doubted about his 'judgments.' He reckons it a misfortune on their part, and, in the case of some doubts on the part of the ringleaders at the Latrocinium, calls it an evil thing, and due to the instigation of 'the author of dissension,' but rejoices that evil was overruled for good, for it removed all suspicion of an unreasoning, unintelligent adhesion having been given by the other sees 'to that one which the Lord of All has appointed to preside over the rest.' He says that the net result was that what Almighty 'God had previously defined by our ministry,' He confirmed 'by the irreversible assent of the whole brotherhood,' i.e. of bishops. It was already, as it came from his own pen, irreversible; for he says it was that which 'God had defined,' but it was further strengthened by the irreversible sentence of the episcopate. That sentence, it must be remembered, contained within it the Pope by representation, his legates being a constituent part of it, and it needed his further confirmation. Further on he says that 'truth shines more brightly, and is more strongly held, when what faith had first taught examination has afterwards confirmed.' It was already of faith; but it received an accession of strength within the soul, when the 'fides querens intellectum' had enabled that understanding to sit in its light.

The examination, then, of the Tome of St. Leo accorded

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 30. They say the language is obscure. ἡ ἡ φράσις διόστῳν ἡνίκα. It was a translation.

² Leonis Ep. cxx. ad Theod.

to these less enlightened bishops was an investigation for the purposes of elucidation, not of revision. No orthodox Christian could seriously maintain that any of the bishops were free to revise that dogmatic letter. They were free to examine, but not to reject. Freedom of dissent would indeed be fatal to the infallibility of the Holy See; the liberty of examining, and turning a blind obedience into an intelligent adhesion, in no way derogates from her position of authority. It does but secure that 'the members should agree with the head,' to use the words of St. Leo, by an enlightened and not merely a blind faith.

A palmary instance of such examination occurs in history soon after this—after the council had passed its sentence and promulgated its definition under anathema. Its decision was then, in the eyes of bishops and of Pope, irreversible. And yet, at the request of the emperor Leo, the Eutychians were allowed to re-examine the synodical sentence. In the case of those who after such examination gave in their adhesion, the council was considered to be confirmed anew, not by a superior authority, but by the additional judgment of concurring bishops. Those who refused adhesion were counted as heretics. They were free to examine, but not to refuse obedience. And we have only to ask ourselves what would have happened if these bishops at Chalcedon had refused to listen to the teaching of Anatolius, and withheld their subscription to the Tome of Leo, to see that they, too, were free to examine, but not to dissent, and that their approval was not that of superiors, but the submission of subordinates. There is not the slightest trace in the actual evolution of the synod's action at Chalcedon of any approval as of superiors. The contrary appears quite clearly in the fifth session. The Tome of Leo would have remained the charter of the Christian faith precisely as much if they had disagreed. As a matter of fact, it was involved in the promise of Christ to His Church, that the episcopate should sooner or later adhere as members to their head. One Dioscorus was as much as the Church could bear at that time, and one victory over the truth, such as the Robber Synod, all that Christ willed to allow to the prince of darkness in a

single period. And consequently the bishops in the next session subscribed their assent to the letter of Leo as a symbol agreeing, in point of fact (as, indeed, it was bound to do by reason of the Petrine privilege of the Apostolic See) with the faith of Nicæa. They did not say the Vicar of Christ has exercised his prerogative of infallibility (these are modern terms); but the thing was there.

Anatolius, who signed first, said that the 150 Fathers at Constantinople had 'confirmed' the faith of Nicæa. In that same sense he might have said that the 600 Fathers of Chalcedon confirmed the Tome of Leo. In neither case was it the confirmation of a superior authority, but an exhibition of the oneness of the Church's faith.

The Illyrian bishops said that they found the explanation of the legates about the passage they could not understand, nor reconcile with what Cyril taught, helpful and sufficient.¹ And as when some asked of the Apostle Peter how he could reconcile his action with the teaching of the Apostle James and others, he—all apostle as he was—condescended to explain his conduct, and forthwith they acquiesced (*ἡσυχασαν*), so here these bishops, after due explanation, signed the letter of the Apostolic See, saying they were fully assured of its agreement with all previous standards of the Christian faith. They did not by this means judge Anatolius, who had signed long ago, nor the whole of the council, nor its head, St. Leo; they simply recorded their intelligent submission. Any instructed Christian might say 'this or that *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement of the Holy See agrees of necessity with all previous *ex cathedrâ* utterances; but for my part I do not see that it does, though I am bound to believe it. I should like to see as well as believe—I should like to 'believe and know.'

There was nothing more than this in what took place at this session in the case of orthodox bishops in regard to St. Leo's dogmatic epistle to Flavian.

In 1845 some remarkable words fell from the lips of Dr. Döllinger, in addressing a company of *savants* as an historian at Munich: 'Gentlemen, the question is this: It is true that the infallibility of the Pope is not a dogma defined

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 31.

by the Church ; yet anyone who should maintain the contrary would put himself in opposition to the conscience of the whole Church, in the present as in the past.'¹

It is this that results from our study of the Council of Chalcedon. The conscience of the whole Church was penetrated through and through with that conception of the Pope's relation to the rest of the episcopate which has been defined only twenty years, but believed in for eighteen centuries and a half.

And yet the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography' can admit to its columns the following sentence by Mr. Gore:— 'It will be seen, then, that Leo's letter was treated by the council like the letter of any highly respected Churchman'! (Art. *Leo*, p. 663.)

¹ Cf. *Christianity and Infallibility*. Longmans, 1891. P. 245.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE DEFINITION OF FAITH.

BISHOP HEFELE has remarked concerning the fifth session of the Council of Chalcedon, that it is 'one of the most important in Christian antiquity.'

In his Tome or letter to Flavian, Leo had censured the Synod of Constantinople for passing by the expression which Eutyches used in its presence, saying, 'I confess that our Lord was *of two natures* before the union, but I confess one nature after the union.'

In the discussions of this fifth session everything turned on this expression. As Neander said, 'The "in two natures," or "or two natures," was the turning-point of the whole controversy between monophysitism and dyophysitism.' Anatolius and others were prepared to accept the expression 'of two natures,' giving to it their own meaning, but not denying the coexistence of the two natures after the union at Nazareth. With Eutyches the expression was meant to exclude their coexistence.

On October 22 the bishops met, without the senators, who were not needed on the matter of faith. The imperial commissioners were present as usual to manage the business part of the meeting.

It was known that the bishops who had met in Anatolius' house had drawn up a formula, and it seems that the Papal legates were more or less acquainted with its contents. The commissioners accordingly ordered the formulary in question to be read, which was done by Asclepiades, Deacon of Constantinople. It had been drawn up at least in concert with Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Cæsarea, who had been the offenders at the Robber Synod, and probably by Anatolius himself, Archbishop of Constantinople now, but with

antecedents of sympathy with Dioscorus, whose secretary he had been during the persecution of Flavian.

The formula contained the expression 'of two natures.' It was at once objected to by the Bishop of Germanicia, but defended by Anatolius, and the clamorous approval of a mass of bishops filled the church. It was one of those crises in the history of the Church at which, as in a critical passage in the *dénouement* of a well-drawn plot, one involuntarily stops to take breath. Who could stem the tide of secret sympathy with Eutychian teaching which was again setting in? The bishops clamoured for the insertion of the expression 'Mother of God' in the Creed. They were still possessed of the idea that somehow orthodox teaching concerning the 'two natures' in Christ involved the heresy of Nestorius—which spoke of 'two persons' in the Incarnate Word. The Papal legates now stepped forward and condemned the proposed definition (*τύπος*); they announced their determination to quit the scene unless the letter of Leo was strictly adhered to. The bishops, however, still clamoured in favour of their own formula. The commissioners endeavoured to calm the meeting by drawing their attention to the fact that the term which they had inserted in their definition, viz. 'or two natures,' might be understood in an heretical sense, since Dioscorus had condemned Flavian for using the opposite expression 'IN two natures' of our Incarnate Lord. Anatolius replied that Dioscorus was not condemned on account of his faith, but for the attitude he had assumed towards the Pope, and for not appearing when twice summoned by the synod. The archbishop's sympathy with his old master, Dioscorus, had evidently not been quite exorcised. He was followed in his defence of the questionable formula by the great majority of the bishops.

It is evident that the commissioners perfectly understood the crisis that had now arisen. The bishops had signed the Tome of Leo, but some did not perfectly understand what they had signed; some were still in sympathy with error, and others were still terrified by the ghost of Nestorius and Nestorian proclivities, which seemed to them to haunt all orthodox statements of the two natures in our Lord.

It fell to the lot of the imperial commissioners, placing themselves on the side of the legates (by whom they were guided) to bring the Eastern bishops to a better mind. They brought the matter to its true issue by asking practically whether they were prepared to withdraw themselves from the Supreme Pontiff?

They said, 'Do you accept the letter of Leo?'—a question which, put as it was, shows that the commissioners did not consider the synod a superior authority. In fact the whole tone of the session shows that the bishops had to accept the Tome of Leo in the fulness of its meaning, or submit to be superseded by a council in the West. For this was what the legates had threatened. The bishops, however, exclaimed that they had both received and put their signatures to the letter.

Thereupon the commissioners pressed home the rigorous conclusion that what was in that letter must be inserted in their definition. 'No!' cried the bishops, 'it is not another definition that is being made; nothing is lacking to the definition.' And Eusebius of Dorylæum repeated their statement, 'It is not another definition that is being made.' He held that it was in perfect agreement with the Tome. 'The definition has confirmed the letter,' i.e. by its *agreement* with it, just as the bishops at Constantinople are said to have 'confirmed' the Nicene Creed, not as in a superior court, but by a loyal acceptance of it. 'Archbishop Leo,' they continued, 'believes as we believe.' 'The definition contains everything.' 'The definition contains the faith.' 'Leo said the same as Cyril said; Celestine the Pope confirmed what Cyril said; Xystus the Pope confirmed what Cyril said.' 'There is one Baptism, one Lord, one Faith.'

It is to be noticed how they bring in Celestine's and Xystus' confirmation of Cyril's writings, and assert that Celestine and Leo are at one. They would not dispute the orthodoxy of Leo; but they feared, or pretended to fear, lest their submission to his letter should be taken to imply a denial of Cyril's orthodoxy, which had, they say, been guaranteed by two Popes.

The commissioners now appealed to the emperor, who

was near at hand, to know what should be done; and his Imperial Majesty sent word that a commission of bishops (which had already been proposed) must meet, or else a council in the West, as the legates had threatened, would be inevitable.

The Illyrian bishops, whose signature to the Tome after their instruction in Anatolius' house, had evidently been to a certain extent a matter of mechanical obedience, still pressed for the disputed definition, when at length the commissioners put before them straight and nakedly the choice which they must make, viz. Dioscorus or Leo. 'Which will you follow, the most holy Leo or Dioscorus?' 'We believe with Leo' was their immediate reply. 'Then you must admit into your definition the teaching of Leo, which has been stated,' was the commissioner's logical conclusion—alluding to the expression 'in two natures,' and not 'of two natures.'

The commission met for discussion, but as there is no record of the nature of the discussion, we only know that they gave up their point and elected to follow Leo, and to insert in their definition the truth that our Divine Lord subsisted 'in two natures': that is to say, that in His One Person there are two natures, the Human and Divine, unmingled after the union effected at Nazareth in the womb of the Mother of God.

When they returned to the church the altered definition was read, and agreed upon without dissent.

Thus the legates, by their firmness, had saved the position. And they had saved it as legates. Nothing short of the supreme position of Leo could have given to his legates the authority which they exercised so well at this session. After all that had been effected at this wonderful council, it would have ended in a catastrophe, but for the firm stand which they made on behalf of a single preposition, which had become the watchword of the orthodox party. No one else in that assembly could have opposed himself as an impassable barrier to the acceptance of an expression so minute, but so all-important. And the simple issue had at length been presented to these Eutychian sympathisers from Illyricum and Palestine, viz. would they follow Leo or not? They had once

obeyed Dioscorus; they were now induced to obey 'the most holy Leo.'

It was a momentous hour in the history of Christendom. And we, whose religion centres in our adoration of our Divine Lord, have to attribute its successful issue to the firmness of the legates of the successor of that Apostle 'who lives and exercises judgment in his successor;' and that firmness was due to the prayer of his Divine Master, through whom he 'confirmed the brethren.' But for the legates, the end would have been professed submission of the bishops to the teaching of Leo, and yet at the same time the adoption of a definition which let in the false teaching which Leo opposed. As it was they 'followed Leo' in their definition, as they professed to have followed him in their subscription to his Tome.

It was probably at this session that the synod drew up the allocation which was afterwards presented or read to the emperor. The synod suddenly glows with warm sympathy towards him whom it had so often called 'the Holy Father,' and it says, 'God has given the synod a champion against every error in the person of the Roman bishop, who, like the ardent Peter, desires to lead everyone to God.' They then go on to deny that Leo's Tome was a different confession of faith from the Nicene. The object of such explanations is (they assert) to stop the mouths of 'innovators'—doubtless in allusion to the late emperor's condemnation of St. Flavian as one who had 'innovated in religion.' They quote amongst other instances the synods of Sardica and Ephesus as having added useful explanations, saying that those who met at Sardica 'against the remains of Arius,' 'sent their judgment to those in the East'—the West had done the same in the person of Leo—and they end with asking the emperor to be gracious in 'setting his seal to their godly decrees, and confirming the preaching of the *See of Peter*.'

So far, then, there were two principles on which the action of the Church had been based.

I. The contention throughout the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon was that it was not enough for anyone accused of heresy to say that he was willing to recite the Nicene

Creed. The Nicene Creed needed explanation in view of fresh perversions; that explanation was given by the Church, and these explanations must be received by those who would remain in the Church. The orthodox were those who 'heard the Church,' the present living Church. That which was decided under anathema by an œcumenical council (including, of course, its head), was just as necessary to be believed as the original scheme of doctrine. It was contained in that scheme, and to reject the voice of the living Church was tantamount to rejecting the original deposit of the faith. Men could not go behind the living voice and appeal to antiquity when that voice had decided that Mary was the Mother of God, or that there are two natures in our Divine Lord after the Incarnation. It belonged to the Church to expound her own deposit, and her children must receive as history that, and that alone, which she delivered to them as such. If a member of the Christian Church maintained that his researches into the early Fathers led him to decline the judgment of Celestine upon Nestorius, or Leo on Dioscorus, and to maintain the orthodoxy of the opinions championed by these heretics, he was subject to excommunication.

II. Again, they more and more spoke of the See of Peter; and as their needs multiplied, they had recourse more and more to its judgment as a court of appeal. Nothing, indeed, could exceed in fulness of statement the description of the relation of the Bishop of Rome to the Apostle Peter, given and accepted at the Council of Ephesus; but at Chalcedon the references were more frequent and from all quarters. Rome is the See of Peter to the Emperor Marcian, to the Empress Pulcheria, to the synod at Chalcedon; she is welcomed as such by Flavian, and described as such by St. Peter Chrysologus; her own assertion is *never once questioned* even in the East, though made again and again, and made in such momentous acts of the Church's life as the excommunication of the Patriarch of Alexandria and the dogmatic exposition of the Catholic faith on points on which masses of Eastern bishops were going miserably astray. If Anglicanism consists mainly in a protest against the supremacy of the Pope, not a whisper of Anglicanism was heard during the fourth

General Council, unless it be from the coarse-minded, ferocious heretic Dioscorus, who was deposed and excommunicated by St. Leo through ('per') the instrumentality of the Holy Synod. The exposition of faith given by the Holy See—the Tome, that is, of Leo, or dogmatic epistle to Flavian—was signed by the greater number of bishops before it was brought before the synod; it was not revised, nor reviewed, nor examined, but only publicly read, *in the council itself*. It was virtually enforced in the house of Anatolius upon the Illyrian bishops who were tainted with Eutychianism, and upon the Palestinian bishops, who had been more or less influenced by Juvenal, soon to be their patriarch. They wished to see *how* Cyril and Leo agreed, rather than *whether* they did. For Cyril (as the bishops afterwards said) was confirmed by Celestine, and therefore his teaching was the teaching of the Church. They came to see that Leo's teaching had not contradicted that of Celestine and (said the bishops) Leo resembled Peter in his championship of the faith. The Illyrian bishops were instructed by the Bishop of Constantinople on the points on which their ignorance led them astray, and they subscribed it as what it was bound to be, in harmony with the writings of St. Cyril; their judgment was a submission and their submission was a judgment. And when all strife for the present was over they called it not only the voice of Peter, but 'the doctrine of the chair of Peter' (τῆς καθέδρας Πέτρου κήρυγμα), and this in the presence of the emperor himself.

For at the following session (the sixth) Marcian and Pulcheria, with their imperial suite, were present. The emperor told them why he had convened the synod. He does not say it was to decide open questions. On the contrary, it was convened in order 'that no one in future should venture to maintain concerning the birth of our Lord and Saviour anything else than that which the apostolic preaching and the decree, in accordance therewith, of the 318 holy Fathers had handed down to posterity, and which was also testified by the letter of the holy Pope Leo of Rome to Flavian.' And they asked him to give the force of civil law to the 'teaching of the chair of Peter.'

CHAPTER XXV.

THEODORET AND MAXIMUS.

AFTER the sixth session the bishops continued their meetings, but no longer on the same footing. The council, in its strictly œcumenical character, was closed. The business transacted in the following meetings was of a comparatively local character, and consisted in the settlement of disputes between certain Eastern bishops. Thalassius of Cæsarea, although present at the later sessions, took back with him the record of the council's action up to this sixth session, and no further. Pelagius II. distinctly says in his letter to the Istrian bishops that the authoritative nature of the council ceased after the sixth action, and what followed was concerned with 'private matters.' And St. Leo describes the work submitted to the council as having consisted only of the definition of the faith and the restoration of the bishops who had lapsed at the Robber Synod. The rest of its proceedings, he says, were of a different nature; and accordingly the official report of the synod included in its unquestionable programme only the two matters just mentioned; they placed the rest on a different footing.¹ The emperor had desired the bishops to remain a few days for the consideration of other matters, for the settlement of which it was natural to take advantage of such a gathering. Whilst, therefore, considerable importance attached to the arrangements which were made, they could not claim the same high level of authority as belonged to the series of sessions which culminated and closed with the address to their Imperial Majesties.

I shall select three of their actions, the restoration of

¹ They excuse themselves for entering on the subject of Constantinople's position.

Theodoret, the acceptance of Maximus, and the twenty-eighth canon, as bearing specially on the subject of this book.

I. A great deal has been made of the case of Theodoret, as a supposed proof of the repudiation of Papal supremacy. It will be, therefore, well to state it somewhat fully.¹

He had been condemned by Dioscorus at the Robber Synod for his sympathy with Nestorius. Thereupon he appealed to Rome. He wrote to Leo and said that 'if Paul, the herald of the truth, the trumpet of the Spirit, ran to the great Peter . . . much more do we, in our littleness, run to your Apostolic throne that from you we may receive healing for the wounds of the Church: for it is fitting that you should have the primacy in all things.' He then enumerates the advantages with which the Apostolic throne is adorned, viz. 'abundance of spiritual gifts as compared with others; superabundant splendour; the presidency over the whole world;² abundance of subjects;³ present rule, and the communication of her name to her subjects; supereminent faith, as in the days of the Apostles; the tombs of the common Fathers and teachers of the truth, Peter and Paul, . . . who arose in the East but died in the West, and from that West now illuminate the whole world—these have made your throne most illustrious.' Then, after setting forth his condemnation at the Latrocinium (Robber Synod) in his absence by Dioscorus, he adds, 'But I await the sentence of your apostolic throne.' He desires to know whether he is to acquiesce in this unjust deposition or not. 'For I await' (he repeats) 'your sentence, and if you should command me to acquiesce in the adverse decision, I acquiesce.'⁴

Again he says to Leo: 'I beseech and entreat your Holiness that your upright and just tribunal would assist me,

¹ Canon Bright writes (*Ch. Hist.* p. 417, third edition) about St. Leo: 'His judgments, whether as to an individual or as to a doctrine, were first reviewed and then confirmed,' as a proof of the supposed difference between his position and that of the Holy See amongst ourselves now. The 'individual' is Theodoret. We have seen that his doctrine was not 'reviewed and confirmed' as by a superior court.

² τῆς οἰκουμένης προκαθήμενη. Cf. St. Ignatius' προκαθῆται τῆς ἀγάπης, president of the [covenant of] love—said of Rome.

³ οἰκητόρων, lit. inhabitants.

⁴ ἐμμένω (Theod. *Ep.* cxiii.).

who am appealing to it, and would bid me come to you and show that my teaching treads in the footsteps of the Apostles.¹ To Renatus, a priest of the Church of Rome, employed as legate to Ephesus,² he writes: 'Concerning this case, I beseech your Holiness that you would persuade the most holy and blessed archbishop to use his apostolic authority and bid me fly to your council'³—that is, the council which the Pope invariably used in the determination of greater causes. Theodoret adds words which are omitted by Quesnel, who, in defiance of the context, endeavoured to show that it was not to the authority of the Pope himself that Theodoret appealed—words which even if the preceding quotations were to be forgotten would be sufficient to show that it was the exercise of the authority of the Holy See that he was invoking, viz.: 'For that most holy See has the sovereignty over the Churches which are in the whole world on many counts; and before all these, in that it has remained free from the stain of heresy, and none has ever sat in it with thoughts contrary [to the faith]; it has kept the Apostolic grace whole and uncorrupt.' He then expresses his readiness to acquiesce in its judgment, whatever it may be.

It is clear from this that it was not the judgment of the synod at Rome in itself that he sought, but the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff, expressed, as it was wont to be, in synod. The synod was the apparatus, the machinery, the setting of the Papal judgment. The bishops of this synod could not be considered infallible as compared with other synods, except by reason of their relationship to the Holy See. It was the infallibility of this latter on which he distinctly placed reliance.

At the same time he wrote to Constantinople to Archbishop Anatolius, to induce him to persuade the emperor to allow him (since a bishop could not move without imperial leave and the assistance of the imperial purse)⁴ 'to go to the

¹ *Ep.* xcii. c. 5.

² He was probably dead when Theodoret wrote to him. But Theodoret was insufficiently informed, according to Tillemont.

³ *Ep.* cxvi.

⁴ Through orders to the civil officials—as we should say, by free passes.

West and be judged by those bishops most beloved of God.' Theodoret was not simpleton enough to ask the emperor's leave for anything that contravened the laws of the Church as understood in the East; and yet he did ask the Bishop of Constantinople to get him leave to have his case tried at Rome. From which we may justly conclude that the transference of the case of a Greek bishop to Rome was not considered by either the Bishop of Constantinople or the emperor to be in contravention of the laws of the Church. It was not here the case of anything claimed by the Pope, but a glimpse of how Greek bishops understood the matter amongst themselves. These Western bishops, 'most beloved of God,' could possess no rights over an Eastern bishop, except as being the council of the sovereign ruler of the Church, as Theodoret had called the Roman Pontiff. But as the custom was ever to exercise the Pontifical authority by means of a council, it was all one to appeal to the Episcopal Council at Rome or to the Bishop of Rome himself. Theodoret's expressions concerning the latter necessitate this conclusion so far as his own judgment was concerned, and his letter to Anatolius gives his estimate of what the Bishop of Constantinople deemed a proper course for justice to take. It would, indeed, be difficult to express in clearer terms the teaching of the Vatican Council concerning the relationship of the Holy See to the rest of the Church than has been done by Theodoret. According to him that See is the Holy See, the Apostolic throne, the sovereign ruler of the Church throughout the world, and the one pure, true channel of the Church's faith.

It seems that the writings which Theodoret promised to send to Rome for inspection and judgment did not reach Leo until after the legates had left for Chalcedon; but on receiving them St. Leo at once passed sentence in Theodoret's favour. He was worthy to be restored to his see. Both St. Leo¹ and the commissioners² speak of the Papal 'judgment.' So that there can be no doubt that St. Leo passed actual sentence on Theodoret's individual case, and it follows that it was a regular appeal on the part of Theodoret. We may assume, indeed, that there was a careful examination of

¹ *Ep.* cxx. 5.

² *Actio* viii.

the case at Rome, considering the caution invariably exercised by this great Pontiff in admitting anyone to communion, who had been suspected of heresy. And Theodoret had been in active sympathy with Nestorius, but had detached himself from that heretic when the reconciliation took place between St. Cyril and John of Antioch. It is, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that St. Leo would pass judgment without careful and, presumably, conciliar examination of his present teaching. He had probably signed the dogmatic epistle to Flavian, or offered to sign it.

When, therefore, Theodoret came to Chalcedon, he was in the position of a man whose rights were secured by the Papal judgment, and who was entitled to act as bishop. The council, however, was called for the special purpose, amongst other things, of restoring the bishops who had been deposed in the Latrocinium (Robber Synod);¹ and St. Leo had commissioned it to act in the matter of such restoration.² Consequently it would seem that St. Leo wrote at once to the legates to say that he received Theodoret to communion and restored him to his see, so far as the right was concerned, although the complete execution of his sentence involving the actual restitution to this see would naturally remain in the hands of the synod, having been already devolved upon them by Leo himself.

When, therefore, the council opened its proceedings and Eusebius of Dorylæum had preferred the accusation against Diodorus, Theodoret was told by the imperial commissioners to enter; but the Eutychian sympathisers amongst the bishops were indignant at his restoration. They were certain that Leo had been overreached; and considering Theodoret's antecedents (his opposition to Cyril) it is not surprising that they should think this. For it was a matter in which, on the principles of the Vatican decrees, Leo might have been deceived. And the Eutychians, long years after this, maintained that Theodoret was insincere, and that St. Leo had been overreached. They ought, however, on any but the Papal theory of government, to have said that it made no difference whether he was deceived or not; for what right had the

¹ *Ep.* lxxvii¹

² *Ep.* xciii. c. 3.

Bishop of Rome to restore a Greek bishop to his see at all? But this was not their contention; they neither blamed Theodoret for appealing to Rome, nor Rome for hearing his case. They simply objected that Theodoret had not placed his case honestly before the Bishop of Rome.¹ And in like manner, at Chalcedon, they demurred to the synodical acceptance of Theodoret as bishop, and clamoured for his extrusion.

The imperial commissioners, however, and the synod, decided that Theodoret's restoration by St. Leo must stand good so far as this, that he was to act as bishop, whilst any charge they had to prefer against him should be investigated later on. He was, I say, to act as bishop, for he was allowed to take his place as accuser, and was accepted as such by the whole council on the ground that he had been restored, or rather his deposition declared null and void, by the judgment of Leo. According to the arrangement of the Council of Constantinople (382), a degraded bishop could not act as accuser of another bishop; so that in admitting Theodoret as accuser of Dioscorus, the synod accepted the sentence of the Pope.

And, in point of fact, he subsequently acted as fully bishop in the course of the council. When the Illyrian bishops doubted about the meaning of some words in Leo's letter, Theodoret set them right, quoting from St. Cyril, on which the commissioners said: 'After this, who doubts?' and the bishops exclaimed, 'No one doubts!'²

In the fourth act Theodoret gave his judgment on the Tome of Leo; and in the sixth act he signed, saying, 'I, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, defining have subscribed.'³

And now, in the seventh session (the eighth act), the bishops proceeded to satisfy the demands of the Illyrian and other bishops that Theodoret should anathematise Nestorius. They had consented to sit with him in synod on the ground that Leo had pronounced his deposition null and void; but they now—at least a certain portion of them—in deference to the clamours of the Egyptian bishops, desired that he should

¹ *E.g.* in the conference held before Justinian in 533.

² Mansi, t. vii. p. 19.

³ *Ibid.* t. vii. p. 146.

assure the council that, whatever might have been his dispositions or avowals when Leo pronounced sentence in his favour, he was prepared to do what every bishop might be called upon to do, *i.e.* anathematise Nestorius. In this they were perfectly within their rights. The Egyptian bishops had been put off during the synod with the promise that they should have satisfaction later on. Theodoret, after a little fencing, anathematised Nestorius by name, and immediately the bishops burst into an exclamation of tremendous force, saying, 'Leo has judged after' (*i.e.* in accordance with the mind of) 'God!' It was Leo's judgment, as I have said above.

That the action of the bishops was in no way (on the principles of the Vatican decrees) an infringement of the authority of the Holy See, which Theodoret had invoked and described as presiding over the whole world, is certain from the following facts,¹ viz. that the legates took part in the matter and actually gave the decision—that the leader of the Illyrians was the Bishop of Thessaly, who entirely depended on Rome, being the Papal vicar in that region—and that Leo himself saw in the bishop's action no derogation of his authority,² and that in spite of the commissioners' attempt to soothe the Egyptians by saying Theodoret should not act as judge, he did, as a matter of fact, act as such though not in the case of Dioscorus which was the point of their objection.

So that the matter may be fairly summarised thus, St. Leo had given the bishops the fullest authority to deal with the cases of the bishops who had been 'deposed' at the Robber Synod. He had declared Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, to be deserving of his bishopric, having certified to his orthodoxy. Accordingly, in spite of the clamours of the Egyptian bishops, who had had to see their patriarch Dioscorus disgraced, and, *en revanche*, desired to make out that Theodoret had deceived St. Leo, he was allowed to act as judge in the matter of faith, though not in the deposition of their patriarch. When all was over, he was required to do what would satisfy the irritated Egyptian bishops, viz. anathematise Nestorius, and then, after saying, as it were, to these bishops, 'You see that Leo, as usual, was right,' they placed him in possession of his

¹ Cf. Natalis Alexander, *Diss. de Theodoro*. ² *Ep. xciii. ad Theod.*

bishopric, their decision being expressed by the Papal legates. There was nothing in all this that placed the council above the Pope; on the contrary, the admission of Theodoret to the council as judge in doctrine, though not in the case of Dioscorus, of whom nevertheless he was allowed to be an accuser, which was forbidden to a degraded bishop, was a signal instance of the deference which was felt to be due to the sentence of the Bishop of Rome on the case of an Eastern bishop, who had expressly appealed to that judgment.

Another matter settled by the council concerned the See of Antioch, which had been occupied at the Robber Synod by a bishop named Domnus.

There was something pathetic about this man's career. He was nephew to the celebrated John of Antioch, and experienced a call to the solitary life. Fired, however, with the idea of recalling his uncle from his sympathies with Nestorius, he left his cell, contrary to the advice of the Abbot Euthymius, who predicted the misfortune that actually befel him. At Antioch he won his way to the episcopal throne, succeeding his uncle as successor of Peter in that third see of Christendom. But his weakness led him to show the white feather at the Robber Synod, and, cowed by Dioscorus, he consented to the restoration of Eutyches, and the condemnation of Flavian. But he reaped a rich reward of his cowardice in being deposed by Dioscorus, to whom he had truckled, on the ground of supposed sympathy in the past with Nestorius, and of having condemned Cyril. The indulgence shown to the other leaders of the Robber Synod on their repentance was not extended to Domnus by St. Leo, who forbade his restoration to the See of Antioch. He ended his days in penitent retirement.

Anatolius, in contravention of the Nicene Canons, ordained Maximus Bishop of Antioch in place of Domnus. And on the restoration at Chalcedon of the bishops who had lapsed at the Latrocinium, whilst other bishops were restored to their sees, Maximus was allowed to retain his intruded position on the sole ground that St. Leo had ordered that his ordination should hold good.¹

A writer² who professes the greatest regard for the prero-

¹ Mansi, t. vii. p. 258.

² Quesnel.

gatives of the Sovereign Pontiff, but takes every opportunity of undermining their historical basis, remarks on this treatment of Domnus and Maximus, that if only the Act in which their case occurs were genuine, we should have in our hands an unequivocal testimony to 'the supreme authority of the Pontiff both over synods and over the Oriental bishops—the bishops of the greater sees.' His arguments against the genuineness of the record of this session were dealt with in a very satisfactory manner by Baluze, and in a still more trenchant way by Tillemont, who, in spite of his Gallican sympathies, pronounces Quesnel's array of arguments nothing less than imbecile. It was reserved, however, for the brothers Ballerini to set the matter at rest by means of a manuscript which Quesnel had not seen, and which is older even than Rusticus. Their refutation of Quesnel's objections is complete.¹

The prerogative admitted, in this Act, as belonging to Leo, covers everything ever claimed by the Holy See in the way of jurisdiction. St. Leo dispensed with the irregularity of Maximus' ordination in contravention of the Nicene canons, doubtless because he had shown his fidelity to the true faith, whilst Domnus, after his cowardly conduct at the Latrocinium, did not ask for reinstatement, but eventually² elected to retire to his original seclusion.

Now the authoritative settlement on the part of the Bishop of Rome of the succession to that Oriental see, one of the three 'first' or 'greater' sees, was, if anything ever was, an exercise of Papal supremacy; and the acceptance of the settlement by these bishops assigning no other ground except that the settlement had been made by the Pope, amounts to a demonstration that, in the minds of the Eastern bishops of that time, the government of the Church was strictly and properly Papal.

But further, the acceptance of the Papal decision concerning the Antiochene succession occurred in the midst of a

¹ See an excellent summary of Baluze's proofs of the genuineness of the Act in Migne's *Leo the Great*, vol. ii. pp. 1269–75. The Ballerini afterwards clenched the matter by the Latin copy of an older Greek MS. alluded to in the text.

² For the sequence of events, see Migne's *Leonis Opp.* ed. Baller. t. ii. p. 726.

session which was dealing with the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa.¹ It was proposed that the minutes of the Robber Synod should be read. To this the Papal legates objected on the ground that the acts of that synod had been rendered null and void by 'the Apostolic Bishop of the city of Rome.' The Bishop of Constantinople (Anatolius) at once rose and said that he agreed that all that was done at that ill-fated synod was invalid, excepting only what was done in the matter of Maximus, Bishop of Antioch; and he gave as his reason for saying so, that the most holy Archbishop of Rome had received Maximus into communion, and had 'decided that he should preside over the Church of the Antiocheans.'² To this the rest of the bishops agreed.

So that the invalidity of the Robber Synod was assigned by these Eastern bishops simply and solely to the decision of the Bishop of Rome; and the single exception made to the general invalidity of its proceedings was one that the Pope had ordered, and its validity was attributed by these bishops to the Papal decision.

But whilst the Pope gave his sanction to Maximus' ordination to the See of Antioch, he refused it to the following compact now entered into by that bishop in regard to some provinces of his patriarchate.

Juvenal of Jerusalem had long set his heart upon the extension of his jurisdiction. He had succeeded in so completely gaining the ear of the emperor, Theodosius II., that he had been allowed to count in his rule the provinces of Phœnicia, and also of Arabia, and the three provinces of Palestine, which properly belonged to Antioch. St. Cyril had done his utmost to oppose this iniquitous proceeding, and appealed to the Pope, entreating him with earnest prayer ('sollicitâ prece')³ to give no ground for such 'illicit attempts.' But Juvenal gained his case with the secular power by means of forged documents.

The quarrel over this lust of jurisdiction had gone on until

¹ The history of Ibas does not come within the scope of this book, but belongs rather to that of the fifth council.

² ἔρχην τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἐκκλησίας ἐδικάωσεν (Mansi, t. vii. p. 258).

³ *Leonis Ep.* cxix. *ad Maximum*.

the time of the council, when Maximus acquiesced in a compromise, by which Antioch was to be shorn of the three provinces of Palestine, and Juvenal was to give up all claim to the Phœnicians and Arabians. But Maximus consented to this arrangement only 'if it was approved by our venerable Father, the Archbishop of Greater Rome.'¹ Leo, however, withheld his sanction, and desired the Bishop of Antioch to keep him well informed as to what went on, reminding him that there must be some better reason for his allowing Antioch and Jerusalem to break the Nicene settlement than had been adduced.² He also informed him that the assent of his legates was necessarily provisional on matters on which they had no definite directions from himself. But the Pope did not, at least in that letter, absolutely and finally decide the matter. He only withdrew his sanction, and urged upon Maximus that he should 'share with the Apostolic See in this anxious matter,' and recognise the privileges of the 'third see' of Christendom.³

¹ Cf. MS. of Actio, edited by the Ballerini. The expression 'Greater Rome' is due to the account being from a Greek source.

² *Ep. cxix. ad Maximum.*

³ The writer in the *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* (vol. iii. p. 881) has completely misunderstood this phrase. He speaks of Leo exhorting Maximus, 'as a sharer in an Apostolical See,' to maintain the doctrine, &c. St. Leo says: 'Dignum est enim te Apostolicæ sedis in hac sollicitudine esse consortem et . . . privilegia tertie sedis agnoscere.'

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE BYZANTINE PLOT.

It had been well for the Church if the council had now dispersed. But it was not to be. The bishops who remained now engaged in a project which had long agitated the minds of a few leading spirits.

For more than eighty years Constantinople had nursed a thought which was destined to change the course of ecclesiastical history, and plunge her into a permanent schism. Photius, who consummated the schism between the East and West in the ninth century, claimed for the Bishop of Constantinople the title and position of 'Universal Bishop.' The Bishop of Rome had been such, according to his theory, until the capital of the empire passed from Rome to Byzantium. But the position of universal bishop was based, according to Photius, on the secular grandeur of the city; so that when Constantine left Rome it was only a matter of time for Byzantium to succeed to the honours of the original capital.

The difference between this theory and that which obtained in the fifth century involved the whole question of the property attributed to the Church in the Nicene Creed under the title 'Apostolic.' Under that title, in the mind of the early Church, was included the government of the Church by the Apostles and their successors; understanding by 'the Apostles,' as the primitive Church did, a body of men who were associated together by our Lord under a visible head. 'It has been known to all ages,' so it was said at Ephesus, 'and it is doubtful to none, that the blessed Apostle Peter, the Prince and head of the Apostles, the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Saviour the keys of the Kingdom.' And the see of that Apostle, consecrated by the

blood of the two Apostles, himself and St. Paul, became, in the words of St. Irenæus and St. Cyprian, the principal or ruling Church, that which, according to St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing in the second century, 'presided over the [covenant of] love,' and in which, according to St. Augustine, 'the principalship had ever been in force,' and was designated in the terminology of the whole Church, East and West, in the fifth century, 'the Apostolic See.'

The chasm between the teaching of the schismatic Bishop of Constantinople, Photius, in the ninth century, and his predecessor in the see in the fifth century at Chalcedon, is exactly expressed in the words of the latter when he said to Leo 'The see of Constantinople has for its parent your own Apostolic See, having specially joined itself thereunto.'¹

But although Anatolius thus expressed the true relation between Rome and Constantinople, his action at Chalcedon prepared the way for the unhappy schism into which the East eventually plunged, under the guidance of the miserable Photius, with his claim to be 'universal bishop.' The term 'universal bishop' is one which might be properly used to express the relation of the Apostolic See to the rest of the Church, but even so it needed a certain care lest it should be thought to mean that other bishops were but legates or vice-bishops of the one universal bishop. In fear of this meaning being attached to the term, St. Gregory repudiated it. It was, however, freely used at the Council of Chalcedon. And there is no fear of any Catholic nowadays giving it such an unorthodox interpretation as St. Gregory detected in John's use of the term, and so there is no ground for refusing it to the occupant of the See of Rome. But on the lips of a bishop of Constantinople it necessarily implied a heresy, for it also implied the idea that the government of the Church was not apostolic but Erastian. The earthly emperor, according to this theory, by moving his capital, moved the centre of the Church's unity. So Photius argued. Neither he nor his predecessors were really prepared to carry out their theory to its logical issue, for, as a Sovereign Pontiff asked of his predecessors, were they prepared to call Ravenna, or Gangra, or

¹ 'Anatolius ad Leonem' (*Ep. ci.*).

Sirmium, the centre of the Church's government when the emperor made these, as he did, the centre of his rule?

The attack on the original constitution of the Church, which culminated, under favourable political circumstances, in the schismatic action of the East under Photius, was commenced in fact at the Council of Constantinople. There the bishops assembled under Nectarius had decreed a certain precedence of honour to the 'New Rome,' as Byzantine pride delighted to call the city of Constantine.

But they had not so much as ventured to send their canon to the West. It was a purely local arrangement, not sanctioned even by the rest of the East.¹ But it was continually being acted upon, and the titular precedence presently grew into a very real jurisdiction. Constantinople, being the centre of political and commercial interests, continually saw bishops from various parts staying in her midst, and convenience led to the custom of settling many an ecclesiastical dispute in meetings² composed of the Bishop of Constantinople and those bishops who happened to be in the imperial city. It came also to be sometimes a matter of convenience and sometimes a matter of secular advantage for bishops to be consecrated at Constantinople. And what began as an occasional practice attained in course of time to the rank of a regular custom, attended, as such customs usually are, with pecuniary advantages to the see that thus became an increasing centre.³

The lust of power, so infectious in an imperial centre, and sometimes a certain immediate disciplinary gain to the Church, had thus led to claims in the way of jurisdiction which found no countenance even in the third canon of the Council of Constantinople. Large provinces of the Church in the East had come under the practical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople, though not without struggles and alternations of submission and resistance.

Had Constantinople remained satisfied even with this, her

¹ Mr. Gore says (*Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, art. 'Leo,' p. 663) that 'Leo's statement that this canon had never taken effect is entirely untrue.' What St. Leo said was that the canon was null and void so far as the sanction of the West was concerned, and this was strictly true.

² Called the *σύνδοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*.

³ Cf. *Conc. Chalced.* Act xvi.

relations to the autonomous eparchies of Asia Minor and Pontus and Thrace might have been capable of adjustment. But she was continually being brought into contact with the 'greater sees,' as they were called, of Alexandria and Antioch. And their position of recognised superiority stood in the way of that programme of universal domination in the East which was now looming before her mind. She had made an enormous stride in the third canon of the Council of Constantinople. By the arrangement there proposed she took honorary precedence of Alexandria and Antioch. But this canon, having received no ecclesiastical sanction, had done no more than keep before the minds of the Eastern bishops her ideal of Church government.

It must not, however, be supposed that that ideal as at present conceived included any real equality of jurisdiction with Rome herself. Constantinople wished to be in the East what Rome was as patriarch of the West. Πατριάρχης κληρούσθε was St. Gregory of Nazianzus' condemnation of the East. The relation of Rome to the whole Church as the See of St. Peter—as in a peculiar and inalienable sense, the Apostolic See—was too firmly rooted in the mind of the Christian world for any idea of subverting that to enter as yet into even Byzantine schemes of exaltation; that was an after-thought. To be the Patriarch of the East over Alexandria and over Antioch was the summit of Constantinople's present ambition. And, as we shall see, Constantinople did not dream of the possibility of really securing this object of her ambition, *except with the permission of Rome, as representing the blessed Apostle Peter.*¹

Now, Constantinople had met with more than one serious rebuff at the Council of Chalcedon. In discussing the complaint of Photius of Tyre a matter had come before the Fathers which touched the influence of Constantinople in her most sensitive part. The question had arisen whether the meetings of the Bishop of Constantinople and the other bishops resident or sojourning in the city could be called a synod, and the bishops at Chalcedon had refused to say that they could.

¹ Letter of the bishops to Leo.

This was throwing a serious slight on Constantinople's method of action at its very core.

Again, the bishops of Asia had desired that the bishops of Ephesus should not be ordained at Constantinople, and the council had refused to support Constantinople in this her growing custom.

Once more, the bishops had refused to give a definite sanction to Constantinople's custom of ordaining a bishop for Basilinopolis.

The time had therefore come for Constantinople to make one desperate effort to gain a quasi-synodical sanction for the position which she claimed as second only to Rome. Everything favoured her ambitious project. The bishops had left Chalcedon by the hundred, and amongst those that were left there was not one that might not be counted on for either assent or silence.

Of the two 'greater sees' Alexandria was vacant, and Antioch was occupied by a partisan of Anatolius, who owed to him his irregular elevation, which had been pardoned by Rome only (as Leo said) 'for the sake of peace.'¹

Constantinople, therefore, had nothing to fear from these. She only needed a lack of scrupulous fairness on her own part to enable her to press the matter to a successful issue under these favourable circumstances. But further, she could count upon at least the silence of another leading prelate, viz. Juvenal of Jerusalem, who had himself just gained the object of his ambition for the last twenty years in the compromise by which he had wrested three provinces from Antioch. He at any rate was not in a position to complain of any illicit stretch of jurisdiction on the part of another. And Juvenal and Anatolius had a further bond in that both had come under the influence of Dioscorus and coquetted with Eutychianism. Then the Bishop of Heraclea, the Primate of Thrace, was absent, and he was very closely concerned in the project that Constantinople had before her of extending her actual jurisdiction as well as securing the semblance of synodical sanction for titular precedence. This primate was represented by Lucian, who was so friendly to Anatolius that

¹ 'Studio pacis.'

he was sent by him to Rome on this very matter. Ephesus, again, of supreme importance, as one of the exarchies to be robbed of its autonomy, was vacant, Bassian and Stephen having been deposed. Thalassius of Cæsarea was there, but did not subscribe. The Illyrians were not there, not even Thessalonica, neither was Ancyra, Corinth, Nicomedia, Cos, or Iconium, all of them important centres. In fact, the little knot of bishops whom Constantinople gathered round herself by various means could not by any stretch of language be called a representative ecclesiastical body. Moreover they had no leave from Rome to discuss the question now forced upon the bishops by Constantinople; it was no part of the council's programme. It was simply a plot against the Church's order, with hardly a name that would command the confidence of the Church except Eusebius of Dorylæum. The imperial commissioners were asked to assist at the session, but they refused. The legates also withdrew. There was not a single Western bishop present. But these 'astute' Orientals, as the African bishop Facundus called them, drew up a canon which flung the Nicene settlement as to precedence to the winds, and assigned, on the one hand, the first place in the East to Constantinople, and on the other hand gave her jurisdiction over Asia Minor, Thrace, and Pontus. Their metropolitans were to be deprived of their position as left to them by the Nicene Fathers, and Constantinople was to be not only New Rome in the civil order, but in the ecclesiastical hierarchy she was to stand second to Rome in point of titular precedence, and at the same time to receive an enormous extension of her jurisdiction in the East. She had hoped and tried to gain the confirmation and ordination of the provincial bishops as well as of the metropolitans, but owing to the opposition of some metropolitans she failed in this part of her project.

On the following day the Papal legates demanded an explanation of what had been done in their absence. They had absented themselves on the technical ground that after the definition of faith had been drawn up, and the matter of the lapsed bishops dealt with, their commission ended. But it turned out that they had also received orders from Rome

to oppose any attempt at altering the relations of bishops on the ground of the civil *status* of their sees. Leo was already well aware of the ambitious projects of Constantinople.

Aetius, the archdeacon, now did his best to purge the action of the bishops of its irregularity. He said that it must be owned that the matters of faith had been decided in a fitting way, but pleaded that it was customary to take in hand other necessary matters; that they had asked the legates to be present, but without success, and that they had received the permission of the imperial commissioners to proceed with the business. The legates, however, maintained, and were probably justified in maintaining, that the bishops had signed in fear; that the proposed canon contravened the Nicene settlement; that it was professedly grounded on canons which had not been enrolled amongst those of the Church;¹ and, lastly, that if they had been benefiting by the said canon up till now, what need of anything further?—and if they had not, why do they now apply for sanction for that which is an infringement of the canons?—reasoning which was unanswerable.

In consequence of this mention of the canons, the commissioners requested that each side should read the canons on which they relied. The legates accordingly read the sixth canon of Nicæa, in which Alexandria and Antioch, and not Constantinople, come after Rome. Aetius is then supposed to have read first a slightly different version of the same canon, and then the third of Constantinople. But this is in the highest degree improbable, since his supposed reading of that version makes nothing for the point at issue. The rise of Constantinople took place after the Council of Nicæa; no one pretends, or pretended, that the Nicene canons in any way assisted Constantinople in its present aims. It was then an inferior see, and left so by the Nicene Fathers. It was on the third canon of Constantinople that these bishops took their stand, as their resolution in the previous session shows. The Nicene canon was their difficulty. Indeed, in one of the oldest versions of the Acts of Chalcedon that we possess, this

¹ 'Non conscripti.'

recitation of the sixth canon by Aetius does not appear.¹ There are also other indications that the text has been tampered with here; for between the supposed recitation of the sixth canon and that of the third of Constantinople occurs the statement that 'the same secretary read from the same codex the synodicon of the second synod,' which Mansi rightly transfers to the margin, as an impossible statement to have occurred in the original. The Council of Constantinople was not called 'the second synod' until after the Council of Chalcedon had placed it in that rank. The expression, therefore, belongs to a later period than the original of the Council of Chalcedon. Accordingly, Rusticus, who had before him very early manuscripts, omits this expression, although the sixth canon appears in his manuscript. The insertion, therefore, had been made before his time, doubtless, as has been suggested above, by a Greek scribe, who, seeing a Greek version of the sixth canon in the margin, put it into the text, and some after copyist inserted the remark about the second synod. Dr. Bright refers to the expression 'œcumenical,' used by the council of 382 of the council of 381;² but this could at that date only mean that it was a council of all the East, and it is certain that it had not yet been reckoned by the Church in general as the second synod. It would have been a simple impertinence to call it the second synod before it had received such a designation from the whole Church. Hefele seems to have misunderstood the Ballerini's argument, in urging that it was at Chalcedon that the Council of Constantinople took its place as second in the general councils. This is, of course, true; but the original of this Act could hardly have started the phrase.³

What, however, is of greater importance is the conclusion which the imperial commissioners now drew from the whole discussion. The legates had quoted the sixth Nicene canon,

¹ The *Codex Julianus*, now called *Parisiensis*. Baluze first noticed this, and has been followed by the Ballerini.

² *Notes on the Canons, &c.*, 1892, p. 228. The reader must not suppose that the reference to Theodoret which Dr. Bright gives contains any expression of that writer in favour of his opinion; it only contains the letter of the council of 382.

³ Ballerini, *De Antiq. Collect. Canonum*, Part I. cap. vi. 8.

beginning 'Rome has always held the primacy,' and had read onwards about Alexandria and Antioch. The Archdeacon of Constantinople had read the third Canon of Constantinople. Several of the bishops had taken the side of Constantinople, and expressed their perfect willingness to subordinate their sees to that of the imperial city; Eusebius of Ancyra, however, whilst he proclaimed his willingness to do the same, protesting against the pecuniary exactions with which this subordination had been accompanied. The commissioners decided that two things were plain from the Acts and depositions—first, that the primacy (πρωτεία—the very word used in the sixth Nicene canon, as cited by the Papal legate) belonged to Old Rome. About this there had been no question, and it is obvious that the imperial commissioners could decide nothing about that. But, secondly, they decided that New Rome ought to have—not a primacy such as Rome had, which the whole history of the council proves to have involved jurisdiction in the minds of all the bishops—but the same honorary privileges, as Rome, besides her primacy, and as a consequence of it, also possessed. Rome, they had said, possessed two things—honorary precedence and primacy; Constantinople ought to possess in the East that honorary precedence which Rome possessed over the whole Church.¹

Thus Constantinople laid the foundation of her desired patriarchate over the East, and supplied the premiss from which Photius was one day to draw the conclusion in claiming universal jurisdiction.

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Gore could manage to see 'Rome's self-assertion' at the bottom of all this. Canon Bright also reproduces with approval the sentence in which Mr. Gore makes the strange statement, that it is 'more than probable [*sic*] that the self-assertion of Rome excited the jealousy of the East, and thus Eastern bishops secretly

¹ πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὰ πρωτεία καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρετον τιμὴν κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῇ τῆς πρεσβυτέρου Ῥώμης θεοφιλεστάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ φυλάττεσθαι. I do not see how, in view of this undisputed original, it can be maintained, as it is by so many Anglican writers, that the legates' version was a forgery. I may mention Canon Bright, Canon Carter, Mr. Puller, and the Bishop of Lincoln, as amongst recent writers who lay great stress on this imaginary forgery. The Council clearly accepted the Papal legate's quotation as accurate.

felt that the cause of Constantinople was theirs.' It must have been *very* 'secretly' felt, for there is not a solitary allusion in their speeches to such an idea, whilst they are from end to end of the council brimful of acknowledgments of the service which Leo had rendered to the Church of God. So far as the records go, the bishops, whatever they 'secretly felt,' were open in their avowals that, to use their own words, 'God has given the synod a champion against every error in the person of the Roman bishop, who, like the ardent Peter, desires to lead everyone to God.' (Synod's letter to Marcian.) St. Nicolas said to Photius, of the crisis which arose in consequence of the Latrocinium, 'If the great Leo had not been divinely moved to open his mouth, the Christian religion would have perished outright.'

Mr. Gore's suggestion bears, indeed, no serious relation to the facts. It may be fairly said of it, as Canon Bright has said of a contention of the Ballerini, mentioned above, that 'nothing but an intelligible bias could account for a suggestion so futile.'¹ The 'self-assertion' was all on the part of Constantinople.

The legates entered their protest on the technical ground that the Apostolic See had not been consulted as to the discussion of this question,² and that the proposal was a violation of the Nicene canons. They ask that the proceedings of the previous day be cancelled, or else that their opposition be recorded, 'so that we may know what we ought to report to the Apostolic man, the Pope of the Universal Church, so that he himself may pass sentence on the injury done to his see or on the overthrow of the canons'—the injury done to the Holy See by debating the question without its consent, and the overthrow of the canons by displacing Alexandria in favour of Constantinople.

In spite, however, of the legates' protest the bishops voted the canon.

The matter could not, of course, stand there. Comparatively speaking, as we have seen, they were but a handful of

¹ Bright's *Notes on the Councils*, p. 148.

² This seems to be the meaning of the legates' words, which are obscure. It is most in accordance with what Leo says in his letters on the subject.

bishops,¹ most of them of sees grouped round Constantinople, and their leaders far from enjoying the esteem of the Catholic world. Their canon was the work 'rather of Greek sophists than of Fathers of the Church.'² They had adroitly tacked on their new claim over three large metropolitanates (which by the Nicene Council had been left autonomous) to the third canon of Constantinople, so that the new and old parts read like one, in which, as Canon Bright remarks, they were more 'astute than candid.' It was not true, as they asserted, that the Fathers (if the Nicene Fathers were meant) 'gave' her (patriarchal³) privileges to the See of Rome; they only recognised what was already ancient. It was not true that what the Nicene Fathers recognised as ancient custom was due to the secular position of the See of Rome. Her privileges were settled by herself as See of St. Peter. It was not true that the Fathers of Constantinople had bestowed anything in the way of jurisdiction, but merely the second rank in the way of honorary precedence. It was not true that Constantinople had any right over Pontus, Thrace, and Asia Minor. The bishops, moreover, enunciated a principle, which had its natural sequel in the present subservience of the Greek schism to the Czar on the one hand and to the Sultan on the other.⁴ It so mixed up the movements of the Church and the State as to secularise the former and ensconce the latter in the position of the real determinant of the Church's jurisdiction. No wonder that only about 150 bishops out of the original 600 could be induced to sign, and that St. Leo could fearlessly call it an 'extorted subscription,' even after some few at the session had denied that they were compelled to subscribe. St. Leo knew that his legates were right in their estimate of the kind of influence that had been brought to bear upon these subservient bishops.

The matter, then, could not rest there. Indeed these bishops

¹ And yet Mr. Puller says that 'the Council, as a whole, passed it' (*Primitive Saints*, p. 20). Canon Bright more correctly speaks of the difference in number between these bishops and those who signed the Tome as 'significant.'

² Rohrbacher, *Hist.* vol. iv. p. 539.

³ There is no indication that these bishops at Chalcedon were professing to deal with anything but the patriarchal rights of Rome: her primacy was left as it was.

⁴ Cf. Rohrbacher, *Hist.* loc. cit.

themselves did not entertain the idea that their act was final; and accordingly they set to work to gain a favourable decision from Leo, in spite of his legates' protest. They had the emperor on their side, and the game was worth pursuing; for even if they lost in the present, they had taken a step forward for the future.

It is certainly astonishing that writers who are so full of Rome's supposed 'self-assertion' and 'exorbitant claims' should not only pardon but defend these arrogant pretensions of Constantinople. Yet it is the case that the most universally accepted writers amongst Anglicans have for the last three centuries taken their stand on this canon, and seen in it an acceptance, *by the Church*, of the principle that Rome owed *all* her privileges, not to her relationship to the Apostle Peter, and through him to our Lord's institution, but to her secular position as the capital of the Roman Empire. How, it may be asked, can the Church be identified with these Eastern adventurers, men whose antecedents were in almost every case sufficiently suspicious to deprive their judgment on such a matter of half its value? Anatolius, originally secretary to Dioscorus, and wavering in the Eutychian troubles; Juvenal, one of the leaders at the Robber Synod, and himself involved in an ambitious scheme for the stretch of his jurisdiction; Maximus, who had been irregularly ordained by Anatolius himself, his ordination only sanctioned by Leo for the sake of peace; Alexandria vacant; and the rest, most of them, in no position to withstand the pressure which the legates asserted had been put upon them by Constantinople—how can these be taken to represent the Church?

It may be asked, how did the Emperor Marcian come to second Constantinople's ambition? Perhaps the true answer is, that he saw in the proposed arrangement certain conveniences which commended it to his mind from a political point of view.¹ And it was undoubtedly the case that the proposed arrangement had something in its favour, and might have passed muster had it not conflicted with a higher principle of action. As things then stood, Constantinople having become the actual centre of life in the East, it was certainly a natural

¹ Cf. Hefele, *in loco*.

position for a politician to adopt, that the ecclesiastical apparatus should adapt itself to the new circumstances, and that the London of the East should become the root and womb of the Church in the future. But Marcian did not see that another principle was being introduced, which, if admitted, must have been subversive of the Church's spiritual and supernatural order, as, indeed, it proved to be under Peter the Czar. When Marcian saw this—indeed, as soon as he found that St. Leo was opposed to the arrangement—he dropped his patronage of the scheme.¹ But the bishops braced themselves to the work of persuading Leo that their canon was harmless and worthy of his necessary sanction.

¹ Cf. *infra*, p. 459.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE EASTERNS' RECOGNITION OF PAPAL SUPREMACY.

No one will deny the incomparable importance of the letter which was now addressed to Leo by the remnant of the synod concerning their new proposal. The twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon is really the sheet-anchor of the Anglican position. Relying as that position does on the first four general councils, it is maintained that the judgment of the Council of Chalcedon, supposed to be expressed in this canon, is sufficient to establish the theory that the primacy of the Bishop of Rome was considered in the East to be due, not to his relation to St. Peter, but to the imperial position of the city of Rome. The belief in any real relationship to St. Peter postulates a divine origin for the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, for it involves the belief that our Lord included that primacy in His words to the Apostle.¹ And if the primacy be in any sense divine, it is indispensable. No amount of misconduct on the part of its representatives can justify us in altering the lines laid down by our Divine Lord Himself. But this twenty-eighth canon proves, so it is confidently asserted, that the Bishop of Rome only held a certain primacy by reason of his being Bishop of the Imperial City. He was, so it is said, only *primus inter pares*. Constantinople (it is urged) was placed by this canon in the second position on a principle which proves that Rome's primacy was one of mere presidency, of honour 'without definite powers'—in a word that the Bishop of Rome was only the 'First Patriarch.'

Now it is important to remember that the Bishop of Rome

¹ Cf. Lanfranc's argument at the Council of Windsor, which assumed that the commission to Peter included his successors—an assumption accepted on both sides, i.e. by the whole English Church.

was the first patriarch, and this canon recognises him as such. There is no dispute about this. Leo XIII. is to-day not only Bishop of Rome, but Patriarch of the West. The fault of the so-called twenty-eighth canon, therefore, did not lie in its recognition of Rome's patriarchal position; its mistake lay in attributing even that position purely to her connection with the imperial city, whereas the matter really stood thus:—St. Peter selected Rome, and Rome was the capital of the empire. His successors reaped the fruit of his wise choice, and utilised, as they were meant to do, the advantages of a natural centre. Ecclesiastical Rome was able to be what she was because she was the See of Peter; she was also able to do her work at first as she did because her influence radiated from the metropolis of the empire. Her patriarchal sway was subordinate to her apostolical jurisdiction; but it was a reality. It is difficult to draw the line between the apostolical and patriarchal elements of her position, for the latter is necessarily overshadowed, and coloured, and informed by the former; but her relationship to Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, is clear, and occupied an unmistakable place in the thoughts of the bishops at Chalcedon. It was expressed emphatically and in the most precise terms by the comparatively few bishops who passed this canon in favour of Constantinople. The terms which they use in their letter to Leo cannot, without doing violence to the laws which govern men's minds, be attributed simply to flattery or general Eastern courtesy. This, which is the favourite Anglican explanation of these bishops' statements, is excluded by the circumstances which produced the letter.¹

The bishops were, it is true, concerned to flatter St. Leo, if possible; they wanted to gain something from him. But what they wanted to gain was of that nature that the particular terms used by them were the last in the world that they would have dreamt of addressing to him at this juncture, merely with a view to flatter, even if they supposed that Leo was the man to be seduced by honeyed words in a matter of such supreme importance. Consider the circumstances under which they wrote. Leo had shown himself above all things

¹ *Leonis Ep. xeviii.*

zealous for the canons of the Church. It was this trait which the Emperor Marcian singled out for praise in his encomium of the Pontiff during this whole transaction. And the bishops at Chalcedon who passed the twenty-eighth canon were, as the African bishop Facundus described them in the next century, 'astute as serpents.' Is it to be supposed that these astute bishops would give away their case by telling St. Leo that he was in precisely that position which their canon, according to the Anglican interpretation, was concerned to deny or ignore? If they admitted that St. Leo was their 'head,' they were admitting that their position next after him was secondary in the sense of subordinate, and that their canon was valueless without his sanction. If they asserted that St. Leo was the instrument whereby the teaching of the Prince of the Apostles was made known to them, they were giving away the whole position which Anglicans consider essential to their own security. Complimentary terms which expressed, in plain Greek and Latin, a truth which Leo had all along maintained and acted upon, cease to be complimentary in the ordinary sense of the term; they denote the acceptance of the position.

Now the bishops did tell St. Leo that 'he was their head, and they but members.' What could be their idea in using, by way of compliment, such an expression as that? Did they suppose that Leo would not take them at their word and treat them as members and act as their head?

Then, again, they did tell St. Leo that he was their 'leader' in the council, through his legates. They used the very word which our Lord used to His Apostles when He told them that there should be a leader amongst them, and that their leader should be as He Himself was in their midst—'Even as I am amongst you'—not lording it over them, but teaching, guiding, governing. Did they suppose that Leo would smile at the term and take no advantage of it?

Again, they did tell St. Leo that he had been to them 'the interpreter of the voice of Peter.' It was, on the Anglican supposition, exactly the wrong occasion to say that. They were not Eastern heathens addressing heathen rajahs, or Hindu suppliants before their conquerors. They were Christian bishops—not, it is true, the best specimens; but still, all

Eastern as they were, they had not lost all Christian sense of truth in spite of their Eastern cunning. On the other hand, they knew that it was the teaching of Leo that he was the successor of Peter, and as such the ruler of the Christian Church. And they were not so utterly devoid of all sense of truth, and of ordinary common sense, as to suppose that in putting such a weapon into Leo's hand as their own recognition of his position as successor of Peter, they would advance the cause of Constantinople. Whereas if the Christian world held that Leo was their head, their language was natural, for then they lost nothing by saying so.

Again they did tell St. Leo that 'the vineyard had been entrusted to him by the Saviour,' in a way which implied that he stood in a different relation to that vineyard from the rest of the bishops. And they did tell him that he was the 'father' of Constantinople, and trusted that he would 'extend his wonted care over that part of the vineyard.' In fact they as much as said there is no such thing as an independent national Church. Although we are the East, and under one emperor, and you are in the West and under another, still you have responsibilities towards the East, and a paternal relation to it, and you acted as our ruler in the council, and were the interpreter to us of the Prince of the Apostles, and we apply to you for that sanction without which our canon can never be the voice of the Catholic Church. This was what they said.

Indeed, they said more than this; for they told St. Leo that their own delivery of the truth to the children of the Church was but as the flowing forth of a stream from him as its apostolic source. 'Thou wast constituted the interpreter of the voice of blessed Peter to us all, and didst bring to all the blessing of his faith. Whence we also show the inheritance of truth to the children of the Church.'¹ And hence unity of teaching is secured through what they distinctly state as the mediatorial position of their head.

Of Eutyches, who, be it remembered, was deposed by the Synod of Constantinople, the Acts of which were sent to Leo,

¹ 'Unde et nos . . . ecclesiæ filiis hæreditatem sortemque veritatis ostendimus' (*Leon. Ep. xcvi. c. 1*).

these bishops say that 'his dignity was taken away by your Holiness'—which is the result arrived at above from a consideration of the facts. (Cap. 2.)

And of Dioscorus they say that he meditated an excommunication 'against thee, when thou wast all eager to unite the Church,' and 'he repudiated the letter of your Holiness.'

They speak also of being eager to 'confirm' the mercy of the Saviour towards him (which was what Leo had desired them to do)—not as if 'confirming' necessarily implies the action of a superior court, but in obedience to their Saviour's words. (Cap. 3.)

They speak of the actual help derived from St. Euphemia—'God was with us and Euphemia was with us'—on whose altar we know they placed their definition.

And then they ask that Leo will 'accept and confirm' their canon.

When they mention the legates' opposition to their canon, they profess to ascribe that opposition to the idea in the legates' minds that everything ought to originate with his Holiness, 'so that even as the right settlement of the faith is set down to your account, so also should that of good discipline.' They in fact acknowledge that the matter of faith was settled by Leo, but they thought that they might initiate a matter of discipline, which they had now brought before his Holiness for his acceptance and confirmation. 'Therefore, we entreat thee, honour the decision with your favourable judgment, and as we have introduced harmony with the head in the things that are excellent, so the head would supply to the children that which is becoming.'

They have (they say) sent the Acts to Leo, and they expressly state that 'the force of all' rests with his confirmation and ordering.

Now these are, many of them, positive statements of doctrine. Is sentence after sentence to be dismissed as mere compliment? Could anything but the exigencies of controversy have led Dr. Bright and Mr. Gore to disregard all these definite statements on the part of the bishops on the ground that they were mere compliments?

If they were 'compliments,' they were those of men who found themselves compelled to couch their compliments in terms which, if they wished to be independent of Rome, cut the ground from under their feet, sentence after sentence. They are not in the place in which compliments would come, nor are they of the nature of honorific expletives. They form the substance of the letter.

If insincerely used, they testify to the necessity under which these bishops found themselves, of crouching at the feet of a master in order to gain the object of their desires. If used in sincerity, they are the testimony of witnesses, naturally the most unwilling, to the position of headship which the East recognised in the occupant of the See of Peter. We cannot claim for them the authority of the council, for these men were not the council; but we are compelled to see in these terms the strongest possible evidence that the idea of the connection between Rome and St. Peter, and of such a consequent 'headship' of Rome over Constantinople that the latter could not arrange its own relations with other sees in the East without the acquiescence of Rome—we are compelled, I say, to acknowledge that this was so deeply rooted in the mind of the Eastern Church that it was simply useless to ignore it, and that the only thing to be done was to admit it plainly and to win the adhesion of Rome to their projected canon.

But side by side with this letter of the bishops is another written by Anatolius himself, not less emphatic in its witness to the Constantinopolitan conviction as to the Pope's supremacy. Anatolius speaks of the bishops at Chalcedon having confirmed 'the faith of the blessed and venerable Fathers' of Nicæa, 'and also your Holiness' letter agreeing with them'—showing that the attitude of the synod towards the Tome was the same as towards the Nicene faith, and that their confirmation of it was an acceptance of an authoritative statement. He then says that Bishop Lucentius is bringing the Acts of the synod, since 'it was a matter of necessity that all things should be brought to the cognisance of your Holiness.'¹ But beside these things, since some matters were trans-

¹ ἔδει πάντα ἀναγκαίως. Leon. Ep. ci. cap. 1.

acted which specially concerned themselves,¹ and these *must also of necessity be brought to the knowledge of his Holiness*, Anatolius says that he sent these letters by the same messengers, to receive an answer concerning them. He then mentions the acts in order. First came Dioscorus' excommunication, which he feels sure will obtain his Holiness' assent. Next (Cap. 3) he speaks of the reception of the Tome in exact accordance with what we have seen above. He says that it was needful that 'the understanding of all should agree with the meaning of your orthodox faith,' and that this was the end for which the emperor convened the council—words which are completely corroborative of the view of the matter taken in chapter xv. Anatolius' words express the object of the session held after Dioscorus' excommunication, as that of obtaining an *intelligent* *adhesion* to the faith as propounded by Leo—*ut in recta vestra fidei sensum omnium conveniret intelligentia*. Consequently, Anatolius says, that with prayers and tears, and with the help of Leo himself, assisting in spirit and co-operating by means of the well-beloved men whom his Holiness sent to the council, and under the protection of St. Euphemia, he and those with him had devoted themselves to the work—in allusion to the 'instruction' given in Anatolius' house to the Illyrian bishops. And when the time had come for all to issue an harmonious definition, they had done so, in spite of some contentious opposition from the first, and for the confirmation of their definition 'in accordance with that holy epistle of yours,' they placed it on the holy altar. This latter remark explains the statement of the bishops that their definition was offered by Euphemia to her divine Spouse.

So that Anatolius, writing thus publicly an account of the synod, emphasises (1) the *necessity* of agreement with the definition of faith issued by Leo, and (2) the *necessity* of reporting to the Pontiff whatever was done at the synod; and (3) describes the confirmation of their acts by Leo as at once necessary for them and free on his part.²

¹ διὰ τὸ ἰδικῶς ἡμῶν πέπραχθαι τινα—called 'negotia privata' in Pelagius II.'s letter to the Istrian bishops.

² Cf. *Leonis Ep. ci.*, ed. Ballerini, note.

Having thus described the relation of a council to the Pope, in exact accordance with the present teaching of Leo XIII., Anatolius proceeds to introduce the subject of the canon. He describes it as having for its object the confirmation of the canon of the 150 Fathers, who decreed that the Bishop of Constantinople should have honour and precedence (not *πρωτεία*, primacy) next after the most holy throne of Rome, by reason of her being 'New Rome.' And, he says it decided (*i.e.* the canon drawn up at Chalcedon) that the ordination of the metropolitans of the diocese of Pontus, of Asia, and of Thrace, should rest with Constantinople; but that the bishops under them should not be ordained, as had been the case for sixty or seventy years, by the latter, but by their own metropolitans.

He then complains of the legates' opposition to all this, and speaks of the sanction of the emperor. He says that they paid all possible respect to the legates, but that they have now reported their decision to his Holiness, in hope of gaining his assent and confirmation, which they entreat him to give. 'For the throne of Constantinople has your Apostolic throne as its Father, having specially attached itself to you.' And so he asks for the ratification of the canon. Later on,¹ the archbishop tells the Pope that 'all the force and confirmation of what was thus done was reserved for the authority of your Blessedness.'

Now after these two letters—the one from the enacting bishops at Chalcedon, and the other from the Archbishop of Constantinople himself, it is idle to talk of the 'self-assertion' of Rome as having anything to do with the twenty-eighth canon. St. Leo doubtless knew how to magnify his office. But, indeed, there was no need to do that here; it was already done for him. He was recognised publicly and unmistakably by these bishops of the Eastern part of the Church as the natural, and, indeed, the necessary guardian of the canons of the whole Church, and this, too, in virtue of his relationship, through his see, to the blessed Apostle Peter. To attribute all this plain dogmatic and public exposition of the

¹ *Ep. cxxxii. c. 4*: 'Cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritati vestrae beatitudinis fuerit reservata.'

relationship of the Holy See to the rest of the Church to mere courtesy can only be the shift of those who find themselves driven hard to explain untoward facts. The facts are that the bishops who drew up the twenty-eighth canon did avow their entire dependence on Rome as the See of St. Peter, and that the Archbishop of Constantinople himself counted the proposal canonically null and void without the subsequent confirmation of the Bishop of Rome. The explanation proposed and adopted by those writers who are out of communion with Rome, and have drawn up canons independently of her, is that all this plain speech was mere pretence. But something more than a mere conjecture is needed to set aside the plain facts of the case.

The letters of St. Leo in regard to all this are full of Christian royalty. Majestic, uncompromising, and tender, they would by themselves be sufficient to establish his claim to the title which Christendom has accorded to him—Leo the Great.

To Anatolius he wrote,¹ reminding him of the suspicion which had originally attached to his orthodoxy, praising the faith which he now exhibited, but regretting that he had allowed himself to be influenced by the lust of honour and power. He blames him for endeavouring to use a council, assembled for the matter of faith, for his ambitious projects, and for imagining that any number of bishops could override the Nicene settlement (cap. 2). He considers that Anatolius' blame of the Papal legates is their commendation, for they were bound to oppose any infringement of the Nicene canons (cap. 3). He says he is sure that Anatolius will please the royalties more by self-restraint than by ambition. The decision of 'some bishops,' sixty years ago, 'never transmitted to the Apostolic See,' is no support whatever. (In other words, the third canon of Constantinople is of no account.) Alexandria ought not to suffer because of Dioscorus, nor Antioch, where Peter first preached, be degraded (cap. 5). The Pontiff concludes with most earnestly and lovingly entreating Anatolius to cultivate humility and charity.

Already² Leo had written to the emperor, severely blam-

¹ *Ep. cvi.*

² *Ep. civ.*

ing Anatolius for not being content with being bishop of the royal city, but aiming at the rank of an apostolic see, which Constantinople can never become. And he tells the emperor that the Nicene arrangement cannot thus be set aside, and that in their defence, by the help of Christ, it is necessary for him to be a faithful servant unto the end, 'since a dispensation has been entrusted to me' ('dispensatio mihi credita est'), 'and the guilt will be mine if the rules sanctioned by the Fathers in the Synod of Nicæa, for the government of the whole Church, by the assistance of the Spirit of God, should be violated with my connivance, which God forbid.'

But as Leo's passing over the ordination of Maximus of Antioch by Anatolius might seem to be negligence, he adds that he has not rehandled that, out of love for the recovery of the faith and desire for peace.

To Pulcheria he writes¹ in the same strain, saying that he renders null and void ('in irritum mittimus') what the bishops agreed to contrary to the Nicene regulations, and that he does so by the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter.

In the following year the emperor wrote to St. Leo, telling him that he was unwilling to resort to extreme measures with the monks in Palestine until he could show them his (Leo's) confirmation of the Chalcedonian definition. He says that the Eutychianisers had thrown doubts on that confirmation.² The emperor, in this letter, yields the point of the twenty-eighth canon, and expresses his warm sympathy with the Pope for the stand he had made on behalf of historical veracity and the ancient ways. 'For assuredly,' wrote his Imperial Majesty, 'your Holiness did excellently well, as became the Bishop of the Apostolic See, in so guarding the canons of the Church, as not to suffer any innovation on ancient custom or the order settled of old, and inviolably observed to this day.' Considering what Leo had written to Marcian, this public acknowledgment of the position of the Apostolic See as guardian of the canons, from an Eastern emperor who had his desires as to a rise in dignity for his

¹ *Ep. cv.*

² 'Whether your Blessedness has confirmed the things decreed (συμβαθέντα) in the synod,' i.e. on the matter of faith and excommunication of Dioscorus.

imperial city, and had for a moment been led away by the Bishop of Constantinople, is at once a tribute to his real goodness and a witness, if further witness were needed, to the ingrained conviction of Christendom that the Holy See had a special dispensation committed to it, and that its charge was nothing less than the government of the universal Church.

St. Leo left Julian, Bishop of Cos, as his legate at Constantinople ('vice meâ functus'), 'lest either the Nestorian or the Eutychian heresy should revive, since there is not the vigour of a Catholic in the Bishop of Constantinople.'¹ And he wrote to the bishops who had been at Chalcedon to say that they could have had no doubt about his approval of what had been done at Chalcedon in regard to the faith, had Anatolius only shown the letter he had received, which he had kept back because of what concerned himself. And he says, wherefore 'if anyone shall dare to hold the perfidy of Nestorius or Eutyches and to defend the impious dogma of Dioscorus, let him be cut off from the communion of Catholics.' At the same time they will see from his letters to Anatolius with what reverence the Apostolic See deals with the regulations of the Nicene Fathers, and that he (Leo) is guardian of the faith of our fathers and the canons of the Church.²

As it is the duty of a king to guard the laws, and himself to set an example of their observance, so Leo, as the divinely instituted governor of the Christian Church, whilst, for the sake of peace, he allowed Maximus, though otherwise uncanonically ordained, to remain in his episcopate, would not allow the ambition of a prelate in the imperial city to oust Alexandria and Antioch from the position assigned to them by the Nicene Fathers, on a principle fatal to the spiritual character of the Church, viz. that civil dignity could of itself, apart from the action of the See of Peter, raise a see to the rank which Alexandria and Antioch then held.

¹ Ep. cxiii.

² Ep. cxiv. c. 1.

CONCLUSION.

THE verdict, then, of history, so far as the period dealt with above is concerned, is this. In the earliest records of the Christian Church agreement with Rome in matters of faith is seen to be a principle, clearly announced by St. Irenæus, which does not grow or develop as a substantial truth, but which becomes clearer in its action, and more and more definitely recognised, as time goes on. The Church develops as a whole, and this principle of action does not remain stagnant without a proportionate unfolding of its powers. It becomes clearer as the records grow in fulness; and the opponent of Papal supremacy is compelled to take refuge only in the absence of record, as at Nicæa, or in the plea that occasional resistance to particular acts of authority are equivalent to a denial of the authority itself. No imperial enforcement of Church laws can account for the existence and recognition of those laws as belonging to the Kingdom of God before they impressed themselves on the legislature of the day; the Church then became 'in' the world in a new sense, but was none the less not 'of' the world. The guardianship of the faith was recognised as belonging pre-eminently to the See of Peter; hers was a leadership so pre-eminent, with the support of a divine decree, that where, as St. Gregory says, 'fault is to be found in bishops,' her leadership is, by its very nature and of divine appointment, an ἀρχή, a rule, a supremacy.

There is one expression used¹ by a French priest, more often quoted by a certain class of respected writers than those who are not familiar with Anglican writings would believe to be possible. It appears in the last work of a justly esteemed writer in the Anglican communion, whose name has been

¹ I.e. 'gangrened with fraud.'

often mentioned in these pages. But he speaks of this French priest (Père Gratry) as 'noble and truth-loving.'¹ Now this 'noble and truth-loving' priest accepted the Vatican decree under peculiar circumstances. He had written against it in unmeasured terms, which he lived to regret. In the full exercise of his faculties, with the certainty that he must shortly stand before his Judge, owing to the rapid inroads of a fatal disease, he sent in to his archbishop his submission to that decree. He also wrote the following words to a friend: 'What I combated was *inspired* infallibility; the decree of the Council repudiates inspired infallibility. I combated *personal* infallibility; the decree lays down *official* infallibility. Writers of the school which I thought excessive would have no more infallibility *ex cathedrâ*, as being too narrow a limit; the decree lays down *ex cathedrâ* infallibility. I feared almost *scientific* infallibility, *political* and *governmental* infallibility, and the decree lays down only *doctrinal* infallibility in the matter of faith and morals. This does not mean that I have not committed error in my polemics. I have without doubt committed some on this and other subjects; but so soon as I perceive an error I efface it, and do not feel myself thereby humiliated.'²

It is with the prayer that some may perceive the error of opposing the dogma of Papal Supremacy and follow the example of this 'noble and truth-loving' priest, as Canon Bright calls him, that this work has been written. *Dominus illuminatio mea.*

¹ *Waymarks in Church History*, by W. Bright, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, p. 241.

² *Souvenirs de ma Jeunesse*, par le P. Gratry. Œuvres Posthumes, p. 238.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

Rev. F. W. Puller's Interpretation of St. Cyprian.

MR. PULLER says, in reference to St. Cyprian's treatise on Unity, and especially the opening passage, 'Now, I put it to any candid Roman Catholic, Is this the way that he would write on the great subject of the Church's unity?' And again, 'You may read the whole treatise on Unity from beginning to end, and you will not find one single word about Rome, or about the Pope, or about any Papal jurisdiction derived from St. Peter.'¹ The argument from silence is very freely used by Mr. Puller throughout his book; but it requires an accurate knowledge of the circumstances under which a treatise is written to use such an argument with justice. The book of Esther does not contain the name of God; but it does not follow that the writer did not believe in God. St. John in his first epistle says nothing about the Church, but it does not follow that he did not believe in the Church. The question is, would it have been *ad rem* to write about the Papacy in St. Cyprian's case? The answer must be, that it would have been distinctly beside the purpose of his treatise, if the above estimate of that purpose is correct. It would have been nothing less than absurd to press the Papal jurisdiction on the Novatianists, with whom the question was, not as to the powers of the Papacy, but the legitimate occupant of the See of Rome. It would have been beside the purpose in the case of the lapsed, when the great point was to induce them to repair to their several dioceses for the requisite certificates. When Mr. Puller says further on,² 'The subject of the Church's unity required some treatment of the central jurisdiction. So St. Cyprian felt'—he is simply romancing.

¹ *Primitive Saints*, &c. p. 351.

² P. 353.

Where is there any evidence that St. Cyprian felt anything of the kind *at the time* when he wrote that short treatise?

Just before Mr. Puller says, 'Notice how twice over in this short passage St. Cyprian insists that St. Peter received no peculiar power,' that 'the other Apostles were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honour and power. Can anything be more frigid and senseless than the Ultramontane reply that St. Cyprian is speaking of the power of order and not of the power of jurisdiction?' (p. 352).

Mr. Puller ought to have remembered that amongst these frigid and senseless Ultramontanes Bossuet himself must be numbered, to say nothing of his own master, Tillemont. But he ought, moreover, not to have forgotten that St. Cyprian qualifies the above statement when he says, in one of the passages to which Mr. Puller refers, that '*although* he gave the rest equal power, *nevertheless*, in order to manifest unity, he by his own authority instituted the *origin* of the same unity.' He is speaking, of course, of Peter. Why is it frigid and senseless to suppose that, since St. Cyprian plainly attributes a primacy of some kind to Peter (and Mr. Puller admits thus much), the equality is that of sacerdotal power and the difference that of supreme and subordinate jurisdiction? ¹ Such an obvious explanation may seem 'frigid' to Mr. Puller, but to those who make it, it is full of inspiring teaching, since it shows that our Lord provided for the guardianship of unity by an institution whose history is the very history of the Church herself. On the other hand, what shall we say of the supposition that St. Cyprian knew so little of Holy Scripture as to imagine that our Lord consecrated St. Peter to the Apostleship first, apart from the others (which is Mr. Puller's curious interpretation of the Cyprianic teaching ²), merely that the Apostles and

¹ *I.e.* whilst they all had jurisdiction, it was to be exercised in subordination to St. Peter.

² 'Some little time before the others' (p. 352). 'As we have already seen, St. Cyprian held that St. Peter was not only called first, but that he was also consecrated first. This notion is doubtless based on a mistake, but it ought to be kept in mind if we would understand St. Cyprian aright' (p. 354). Mr. Puller not merely corrects the frigid and senseless interpretations of Ultramontanes, but convicts St. Cyprian of a blunder of the first magnitude. If St. Cyprian blundered in such a vital manner as this concerning St. Peter, what is his witness worth? The fact is that the mistake is Mr. Puller's; but it was necessary that the mistake should have been Cyprian's, else his witness must be placed on the Papal side. What St. Cyprian held is what Bossuet expressed with his usual felicity when he said, in his sermon on the Unity of the Church, that our Lord first places all (Apostles included) under Peter by promising him

others might have an object lesson about unity? What shall we say of the theory that the place of honour assigned to Peter (and Mr. Puller says that the 'stream of Anglican Divines' assign the pre-eminence of leadership to Peter) did not even include presidency at a council? that his relationship to the other Apostles was only that of the Duke of Norfolk to the other peers of the realm? ¹ I will not call such an explanation 'frigid' or 'senseless,' for that would not advance my argument, but I am bound to say it has no warrant in St. Cyprian's actual words.

Another of Mr. Puller's misinterpretations concerns the crucial expression which, as we shall see, St. Cyprian uses of the See of Peter, viz. 'the root' of the Church, but which Mr. Puller interprets of the Church herself. He rightly feels the importance of the expression, and informs us that if it could be 'solidly proved' that the Church of Rome is 'the centre and the root, the source and the matrix of Catholic unity' (as Father Bottalla correctly says it is, according to St. Cyprian), 'for the first time in my life I should begin to fear that the faith which God in His great mercy has ever given me in the Catholicity of my mother the Church of England has been the result of some illusion.' It is to be hoped that Mr. Puller may yet come to see that, so far as the Cyprianic literature is taken for evidence of the Church's teaching, it is certainly true that the Church of Rome is the 'root of Catholic unity.'

The word 'root' is connected by St. Cyprian with three other words. Speaking of the Church of Rome, he calls her 'the head and root of the Catholic Church,' 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church,' and 'the root and mother' of Catholic unity.

In using the first of these expressions, he is speaking of Pope St. Stephen. 'We, who hold the head and root of the one Church, know assuredly and are confident that to him' (*i.e.* Novatian, the anti-Pope at Rome), 'being outside the Church, nothing is lawful; and that baptism, which is one, is with us, where he also himself was formerly baptised.'² St. Cyprian's argument is that there is but one Church, and therefore but one baptism. He was mistaken

the keys first and alone, and then he says 'the sequel does not reverse the beginning.' Golden words, which are the equivalent of St. Cyprian's teaching that our Lord 'provided (*disposuit*) by His own authority the origin of the same unity, beginning from one.' These words are absolutely subversive of Mr. Puller's fundamental contention that our Lord made Peter an object-lesson of unity 'as being the first-designated Apostle,' and so 'the symbol of unity' (p. 351). This would not be an exercise of 'authority,' nor the origination of unity, nor the beginning of a stream, such as St. Cyprian elsewhere describes the unity which started with Peter.

¹ P. 229, note 2.

² *Ep.* lxxiii. 2.

in his application of this truth, but that does not affect the question as to the meaning of the expression 'head and root.' There were then at Rome two opposed heads. The Novatianists, he had already said, had set up an 'adulterous and opposed head without the Church.' St. Cyprian repudiated this 'adulterous and opposed head,' and says that he, together with Jubaianus, held to 'the head and root of the one Church,' i.e. St. Stephen, the legitimate Pope. Consequently (he argues) the baptism of Novatian is invalid. Mr. Puller appears to have missed the meaning of these words, from imagining that St. Cyprian is arguing with the Novatians. He thinks St. Cyprian is contrasting 'himself with Novatian' (p. 345, line 13); and he supposes that Novatian might answer, 'I am the Pope; I am the head and the root of the one Church.' But St. Cyprian is not arguing this question at all; he is engaged with a wholly different topic, viz. whether those whom he himself and Jubaianus both agreed were outside the Church, could validly baptise. It was not a 'controversy with Novatian' in which he was engaged, but a controversy with certain bishops in Africa, destined soon, alas! to become a controversy with St. Stephen himself. Soon—but it had not as yet reached that stage. And consequently, Mr. Puller's argument² that 'it would have been absurd to base his argument in favour of baptising Novatians on his fellowship with Stephen, who *was treating him*' (the italics are mine) 'as a heretic because he baptised Novatians,' falls to the ground. He was doing no such thing.

Previously to this, St. Cyprian, writing to Cornelius, the Pope, speaks of the Novatians as having 'refused the bosom and embrace of the root and mother'³—not, as Mr. Puller translates it, 'of her who is their root and mother,' but simply 'the root and mother,' which is the same as the true 'head,' as he goes on to explain. Here we have the head, and root, and mother all in one, as in the treatise on the unity of the Church, he says 'there is one head, one origin, and one mother,' meaning the Church and Peter, whom Christ instituted as 'the origin of unity;' and as there he sees in the legitimate bishop the Peter for the time being, so here, in leaving Cornelius, they had left the true head and taken up (he says) with 'an adulterous and opposed head,' and so had 'refused the bosom and embrace of the root and mother,' the legitimate bishop. For the legitimate bishop is the root of the Church in each region, being himself rooted in that past which goes up to Peter and to his institution as the rock and key-bearer by Him

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² P. 346.

³ 'Radice et matris sinum atque complexum' (*Ep.* xlv. 1).

Who is the Root of David, as He is the Rock, and the Father of the world to come, His own institution being the mother of us all.

But on another occasion St. Cyprian supplies an expression which is doubtless meant to be understood in the above passage. He calls the Church of Rome 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church.'¹ He is explaining to Cornelius that although he had not given those who sailed from Africa to Rome letters to himself, whilst there was a doubt, or strife, as to the validity of his election to the See of Rome, he had yet in no way opposed him. He had told them to 'recognise and hold to the root and womb of the Catholic Church,' whichever that might seem to be on proper inquiry.

Mr. Puller thinks that St. Cyprian meant simply by the above expression that the Catholic Church is 'the root and womb' to her children. And he thinks that 'St. Cyprian's advice was evidently meant to help them to discriminate.'² But this could hardly be the case if he merely told them to hold to the Catholic Church. How would that help them?

The fact is that Mr. Puller has misinterpreted the passage through omitting to notice (i.) one important word which he has omitted in his translation,³ and (ii.) from stopping short when he ought to have gone to the end of the paragraph.

St. Cyprian told his people during this period of difficulty (for it is obvious that he refers to that alone) that they were to be careful to 'acknowledge and hold to the root and womb of the Catholic Church.' No one would talk of *acknowledging* the Catholic Church; but it is the natural word to use of the bishop, who is the root and womb of the Church.⁴ It is true that this would not help them to know which was the root and womb of the Catholic Church; but neither would his advice as interpreted by Mr. Puller. It was general advice. But St. Cyprian goes on to say that no sooner had he gained reliable information as to Cornelius' ordination than he had sent letters from all, everywhere throughout the province, so that 'all our colleagues might *approve and hold to*' (compare '*acknowledge and hold to* the root and womb') 'thee and thy communion, that is as well the unity as the charity of the Catholic Church.' I do not know why Mr. Puller has separated the two limbs of this paragraph and dealt with them,

¹ *Ep.* xlviii. 2.

² P. 344.

³ P. 343, line 3.

⁴ St. Pacian—whose works Dr. Pusey calls 'further fruits of the mind of St. Cyprian, whose writings St. Pacian quotes with reverence' (Pref. p. xxii), which he therefore bound up with St. Cyprian's Epistles in the *Lib. of the Fathers*—calls Cyprian the 'root' of his flock (*Ep.* ii. 3).

one on p. 344 and the other on p. 347; but it seems to me that through omitting to piece them together rightly, he has himself to accuse of 'forgetfulness,' and not Father Bottalla (p. 347, note 3). For had he taken the sentence as it stands in St. Cyprian he must, one would think, have seen that 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church,' which he (the Bishop of Carthage) told his subjects to acknowledge and hold to when at Rome, was, in that bishop's judgment, after all, Cornelius and his communion, which, on full examination, he bade all his colleagues 'approve and hold to,' being 'as well the unity as the charity of the Catholic Church.'

Thus the Church is our mother, *but the Church as represented and actualised by the See of Peter*, which is the root, and head, and origin of Catholic unity, on the principles which St. Cyprian's language, occasionally obscure and rhetorical, yet unmistakably enunciates.

Once more. Mr. Puller quotes Bossuet as on his side in this matter: 'He [Bossuet] understands the *radix et matrix*, as I do, of the Church's unity:—"Cette tige, cette racine de l'unité!"' But Bossuet makes the 'root' something in the Church, not the Church herself—or, to speak more correctly, it is the Church putting herself forth in a long chain of teachers within the unity of the chair of Peter. 'There is in the Catholic Church a stem, a root, a force to reproduce ceaselessly new pastors to fill the same chairs with one and the same doctrine.'² And then he proceeds to explain this root of unity more fully. 'There is need of only a little good sense and good faith for one to acknowledge that the Christian Church has had from its origin for a mark of its unity its communion with the chair of St. Peter, in which all the other "sees have preserved unity" ("in quâ sola unitas ab omnibus servaretur"—Opt. 'c. Parmen.' lib. 11), as the holy Fathers say; so that by remaining therein as we² do, without anything being capable of withdrawing us from it, we are the body which has seen all those who separate themselves fall on the right and on the left. . . . When He [our Lord] said to His Apostles "I am with you," St. Peter was there with the rest, but he was there with his prerogative as the first of the stewards, *primus Petrus* (Matt. x. 2)—he was there with the mysterious name of Peter, which Jesus Christ had given to him (Mark iii. 17) to mark the solidity and force of his ministry; he was there, in fine, as he who was to be the first to announce the faith in the name of his brethren, the Apostles, to confirm them in

¹ *Prim. SS.* p. 343, note 1.

² He is contrasting the Catholic (Roman) Church with schismatics.

it, and thereby to become the rock on which an "immortal edifice" should be built. Jesus Christ spoke to his successors as He spoke to the successors of the other Apostles, and the ministry of Peter became ordinary, principal, and fundamental in the whole Church.'¹

This is the way in which Bossuet explains the root of unity. And in this last passage he gives the truth which corrects Mr. Puller's misunderstanding of St. Cyprian and of the general teaching of the Church. Peter was to have his successor, as the other Apostles had theirs; and if Peter were even merely a symbol and object-lesson of unity, we should expect that there would still be a successor of Peter distinct from the rest of the Episcopate, were it only to keep before our eyes the symbol of unity. As a matter of fact, our Lord made him the *origin*, not merely the symbol, of unity, and according to St. Cyprian, he was such, as having a chair, a succession—'the chair of Peter, whence episcopal unity took its rise.'

Mr. Puller's interpretation of St. Cyprian's doctrine comes to this:—Our Lord, according to that saint, ordained Peter first, and said, as it were, to His Apostles and others: 'Keep before your mind the unity of Peter, and how I ordained him by himself, that he might be a symbol of unity. He is one man, ordained by himself, and this will teach you unity. It is a picture for you to think about, and so keep together. It will always remind you that the Church ought to be one.'

APPENDIX II.

Are the Sardican Canons Nicene?

ST. JULIUS, standing in the midst of Eastern bishops, who had been driven out by the Eusebians and had taken shelter in Rome, 'gave back,' says Sozomen, 'to each of them his own Church, inasmuch as the care of all belonged to him by reason of the dignity of his see,' or throne.² He also wrote the letter quoted above (p. 177), blaming the Eusebians for maintaining in the Council of Antioch that the Council of Tyre, which condemned Athanasius,

¹ *Instruction Pastorale sur les Promesses de l'Eglise* (Œuvres, ed. 1816, xxii. pp. 423, 424).

² οἱ δὲ τῆς πάντων κηδεμονίας αὐτῷ προσηκούσης διὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ θρόνου ἐκάστω τὴν ἰδίαν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέδωκε (Soz. iii. 8).

was subject to no revision on his (Julius') part. St. Athanasius was Bishop of Alexandria, and as such his case came necessarily under the cognisance of Rome.

In support of this assertion, St. Julius appealed to 'the directions of the Fathers,' which 'prescribed' the contrary course to that adopted by the Eusebians. He appealed to something 'written' by the Nicene Fathers—in other words, to a Nicene canon.¹ Where, then, is this canon containing 'the directions of the Fathers' to be found?

St. Athanasius, who produced this letter of Julius in his own behalf, must have known of it. St. Julius knows of no question as to its existence and genuineness. The exact contents as described by St. Julius are comprised in the 'Commonitorium' of St. Zosimus, sent to the African bishops when he commissioned his legate Faustinus to settle the affair of Apiarius in Africa. St. Zosimus called the canons, which embodied the principle for which St. Julius was contending, Nicene.

These canons have, since the seventh century, been called Sardican, and the question is, On what ground?

There are many reasons for believing that no canons were drawn up at Sardica. St. Athanasius, who was present at the Council of Sardica, and who professes to give an account of everything that happened there, says not a word about any canons, and his account leaves no room for any. Neither Soerates nor Sozomen, although professing to enumerate the acts of the council, make mention of any canons. No Pontiff, no one of the Fathers, of that century or the next, mentions any canons of Sardica; whilst St. Ambrose,² dealing with exactly the point settled in the so-called Sardican canons, appeals to the regulations of Nicæa, but not to Sardica.

But the most startling evidence against any canons having been drawn up at Sardica occurs in a letter of St. Innocent to the clergy of Constantinople.³ The situation was exactly that which is contemplated in the so-called seventh (al. fifth) Sardican canon. St. Chrysostom had been deposed, and had appealed. On his return from exile, he had induced the emperor to summon a synod to put things right. Theophilus of Alexandria, who had done the mischief, and been told by the Pope to return to Constantinople and hold another synod in accordance with Nicene (or so-called Sardican) regulations,⁴ had sent to Constantinople a copy of the very

¹ Athan. *Apol. c. Arianos*, n. 22.
³ *Ep.* vii.

² *Ep.* lvi. 'ad Theophilum.'
⁴ *Ep.* v. 'ad Theophilum.'

canon which the Eusebians had originally passed at Antioch, to prevent St. Athanasius from ministering again, because of his condemnation by the Council of Tyre. Thereupon,¹ St. Innocent joined issue on the subject of this said canon, and said that *no canons but the Nicene* were received by the Church, and these countenanced another synod being held. In the same paragraph he mentioned the Council of Sardica as having taken the same line, but not as having drawn up any canon. His language excludes the idea of there being any canons of Sardica. The evidence of this letter, if it stood alone, seems to me sufficient to warrant us in concluding against there having been any actually Sardican canons. But it does not, as a matter of fact, stand alone.

Further, St. Augustine and the African bishops had never heard of Sardican canons, though this may be otherwise explained.

St. Leo sketches the so-called Sardican canons, but calls them 'decrees of the canons drawn up at Nicæa,' when there was no reason for quoting them as Nicene, if they were Sardican, since as Sardican they would have been a sufficient authority for his purpose.² The same is true of St. Zosimus, St. Boniface, and St. Celestine, all of whom call these Sardican canons Nicene. They must have fallen back on the authority of Sardica, in meeting the difficulty of the African bishops, had any Sardican canons existed, for the Council of Sardica was only not numbered amongst the oecumenical councils because it did not deal with any new matter of faith but merely confirmed the Nicene.

Again, the formula used in these so-called Sardican canons is unique, except in Africa. They are introduced thus: 'Hosius said,' or 'Gratus said.'

And the introduction of the name of the reigning Pope in the third canon (viz. Julius, in some copies Sylvester) is altogether without precedent.

On these and other grounds it seems reasonable to conclude that these canons are possibly not Sardican.

And yet, whatever they were, they have been universally received in the Church, having been acted upon in the East, as well as in the West, and having been eventually incorporated even into the African code of canons, though for a while doubted there. John of Antioch incorporated them into the code of his Church in the reign of Justinian; and the Constantinopolitan Council in Trullo, assembled to supply canons omitted in the fifth and sixth

¹ *Ep.* vii. 3.

² *Ep.* xlv. 'ad Theodosium.'

General Councils, inserted them in the Oriental code. But the most significant piece of evidence is their insertion into the 'Nomenclon' of Photius. It is true that Photius, in writing to Pope Nicolas, denied that these canons had ever been received at Constantinople. But it is as certainly true that Photius was telling a falsehood.¹ The Pope told Photius in reply that he was unable to believe his statement. He would have been able to convict him of a barefaced falsehood had he known that Photius had included these canons in every one of his successive editions of the canons considered to be binding on the whole Church. Theodore Balsamon, afterwards Patriarch of Antioch, wrote a commentary on the work of Photius and included the Sardican canons under those received in the East.²

Therefore, whatever these canons are, they express the mind of the Church as a whole. They can boast of oecumenical reception. What, then, is their real origin?

Some thirty years ago a theory was started by a professor at Rome, named Luigi Vincenzi, which satisfactorily accounts for most of the facts of the case.³ This writer has endeavoured to show that in their present form the so-called Sardican canons are a commentary, or set of notes, on the Nicene canons by orthodox African bishops, the original Greek copies of those canons having been mutilated by the Arians. On the one hand we are led by the facts to doubt as to any canons having been drawn up at Sardica; on the other hand we are confronted with witness of unimpeachable character to the effect that the Nicene Fathers sanctioned certain canons for the guardianship of ecclesiastical discipline and with special reference to appeals to the Holy See, which correspond

¹ Photius also coined the Acts of a council, and tried to palm them off on the Catholic Church. He forged hundreds of signatures. His forgeries were committed to the flames by the eighth General Council. Nevertheless Mr. Puller (p. 153) uses his assertion to Pope Nicolas as conclusive evidence, prefacing that evidence with the recommendation that Photius 'was the most learned man who had ever sat on that throne.' Possibly he was, but he was also the most unscrupulous.

² Photius wrote first a collection of canons, then an arrangement in order of subject (*Syntagma*), and then a shorter form of the latter. The Sardican canons appear in all. The Pope had blamed Photius for reaching the episcopate *per saltum*, and had referred to the Sardican canons. Photius replied that these had not been received at Constantinople. As a matter of fact, he had quoted the tenth canon of Sardica by name under the heading 'concerning those who become bishops from lay condition,' both in his *Syntagma* and in his *Nomenclon*.

³ *De Sacra Monarchia Hebr. et Christianorum*. Roma, 1875.

to the provisions of the so-called Sardican canons. And again, in their present form these canons wear an African dress.

This seems to be the only adequate explanation of the passage in St. Julius' letter, which St. Athanasius considered so important that he incorporated it in his own defence. St. Julius there speaks of appeals to the Holy See, in case of difference arising amongst bishops, as a 'custom,' and he also calls this 'custom' something 'prescribed by the directions of the Fathers,' i.e. the Nicene Fathers, and also a custom sanctioned by 'the Great Synod,' thus appearing to indicate that he is referring to the sixth canon of Nicæa, which begins with speaking of 'ancient customs' prevailing. In its present condition that canon *suggests*, as has been shown above,¹ that Rome had jurisdiction over Alexandria; but it is only as expanded in the so-called Sardican canons that it fully justifies the argument derived from it by St. Julius and produced by St. Athanasius, himself the Bishop of Alexandria.

This theory also explains the otherwise inexplicable fact that when St. Julius told the Eusebians that they ought to come to Rome and have their cause tried there (in exact accordance with the provisions of the so-called Sardican canons); and this, on the ground that the Nicene Synod prescribed such a course, the Eusebians did not contradict St. Julius in their reply as to the canonical mode of procedure. They only made excuses which St. Athanasius calls unworthy of credit (*ἀπιθάνους*), such as the stress of circumstances and the length of the journey. They had, indeed, as St. Athanasius points out, themselves originally proposed to act on this very principle of having Julius for their judge (c. 20).

The explanation of the matter given by Canon Bright and others does not satisfy the facts of the case. St. Julius, says that writer (the italics are mine), 'when he wrote to the Eusebians that the Nicene Fathers decreed that one council's resolutions might be reviewed by another [Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ari.* 22], means only that *they acted on this principle* by considering the Arian question *de novo* after it had been determined by the Synod of Alexandria.'² But St. Julius does not quote the example of the Nicene Fathers; he refers to their 'directions,' and he gives reasons, as does St. Athanasius, for the utility of the provision, showing that it was an actual *direction* for the future, and he emphasises in particular the special provision made in regard to the Bishop of Alexandria (the second Petrine See). His words, in fact, suggest the sixth Canon of 'the

¹ P. 166, seq.

² *Notes on the Canons of the first four General Councils*, 1882.

great Synod' (as he calls the Nicene), only in its fuller form, as quoted by his successors, and preserved, more or less, in the so-called Sardican canons. Indeed, this settlement at Nicæa, as I am supposing it to have been, runs through the action and letters of the Pontiffs and of the Fathers of the last half of the fourth century to an extent that requires some more reasonable explanation than that conscientious, high-minded, Christian rulers invented it or hailed the invention for their own ends.

But, further, St. Julius goes on to say that he is speaking of an 'ancient custom,' which was 'borne in mind and written down' in the Nicene Council.¹ It must then have been a definite regulation made in that council, not merely a principle of action to be deduced from their example.

Canon Bright says also: 'Just as the Roman series of canons in the fifth century confounded Sardican canons with Nicene, and led the Roman bishops, first in ignorance, as in the case of Zosimus and Boniface, and afterwards *in spite of authentic information* (as in the case of Leo, *Ep.* xliii.) to quote as Nicene what was really Sardican,' &c.

It has taken Canon Bright some years to arrive at a theory which thus impugns the honesty of the great champion of the Incarnation, the 'great' representative of the Christian religion at that era, whose holiness breathes through every line of his sermons and letters. In 1877 Canon Bright had only got as far as asking the question about St. Leo, 'Can he have known no better?'² In the former passage the question has become an assertion, and St. Leo the Great is presented to his readers as a deliberate liar.

The theory maintained in these pages makes no such demand on our moral sense. It requires us to believe, on the contrary, that when Pontiff after Pontiff quotes a canon as Nicene, and quotes it after it has been questioned as such, it is as good historical evidence as can well be obtained that the provision it contains was properly called Nicene.

It was, we may suppose, preserved after a while at Rome only, the home of accuracy, the metropolis of canonical lore. The various allusions in the letters of St. Julius and (by implication) St. Athanasius, of St. Ambrose, St. Innocent, St. Boniface, St. Celestine, and later on, in Gelasius' letter to Faustus, supply such strong evidence that there was some Nicene direction (for they all call it

¹ ἔθος παλαιὸν τυγχάνον, μνημονευθὲν δὲ καὶ γραφὴν ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ (*loc. cit.*).

² Cf. *Roman Claims tested by Antiquity*, p. 11.

Nicene) dealing with the question of appeals to Rome, corresponding to the provisions of the Sardican canons, that we may fairly suppose there has been some foul play in regard to some of the Nicene canons. It requires no stretch of imagination to suppose that the Arians, when in possession of the Eastern Sees, mutilated or burnt some of the canons. They were busy forgers—this we know from St. Athanasius. Their successor in heresy, the Emperor Anastasius, had the Acts of Chalcedon burnt outright; a more distant successor, Photius, forged a whole council, signatures and all. Rome alone was a safe refuge and guardian. Rome alone enjoyed an uninterrupted succession of high-minded orthodox prelates, and the maintenance of the canons of Nicæa was their special boast and glory. Their witness is a safer guide than the records of Alexandria and Constantinople, after these records had been in the perilous keeping of heretical bishops, who did worse things, as a matter of fact, even than mutilating records.

We may therefore safely reject the theory that saintly men like St. Innocent or St. Leo, with that uniform and tremendous sense of responsibility for the care of all the Churches which pervades their writings, were either ignorant of the laws they had to administer or deliberately changed their terms.

At the same time I am far from saying that this, which seems to me the most satisfactory, is the only tenable theory.

It is, I need hardly say, a perfectly tenable theory that these Sardican canons, having been passed at Sardica, were considered an appendix and explication of Nicene directions, and were, in such sense, Nicene. In that case they were launched upon the world with the authority of a council which reasserted the Nicene Faith, and whose acts received the confirmation of the Holy See. They were then part and parcel of the Nicene settlement, being a reassertion or explication of Nicene prescriptions, only not embodied in canons at Nicæa, because already considered part of 'ancient custom.'

At the Council of Florence, Mark, Bishop of Ephesus, when asked why the Constantinopolitan Creed was always called Nicene, replied, 'Because the latter virtually contains the former.' The Constantinopolitan was only a more lucid expression on a misunderstood portion of the Nicene Creed. In like manner the Nicene canons virtually contained the Sardican. The latter were only an authoritative explanation of the Nicene settlement, given to meet new emergencies and throw the cover of the Nicene rules over the champion of our Lord's Divinity. The Nicene Fathers had said, 'Let the Churches preserve their own privileges;' the Sardican

Fathers, many of them the same as at Nicæa, with the same president, explained what these privileges were: namely, that, for instance, the Bishop of Alexandria had an appeal to Rome from the Council of Tyre.

And if these canons were really Sardican, one can imagine a reason for speaking of them as Nicene to Africans.¹ For the Eusebians at Philippopolis called their meeting the Sardican Council, and sent their condemnation of St. Julius, St. Athanasius, and other orthodox bishops who had appealed to Rome, to Donatus at Carthage, and the Creed drawn up at this schismatic meeting was disseminated in Africa. This was what the Africans understood by Sardican, and therefore to call these canons Sardican would have been confusing. They were really (on the supposition which I am entertaining) Nicene, as confirmed at the true Council of Sardica. In point of authority and obligation to obedience they were Nicene. And possibly it was the discovery of this that led to the Church of North Africa dropping the matter and never returning to it, but eventually, when the fire of persecution had burnt out and they had been knit closer in bonds of amity to the See of Rome, incorporating them into their own African code.

On the whole, then, Canon Bright's theory may be said to be one that is not required by the facts of the case, and is somewhat revolting to Christian piety. Of the two counter-theories mentioned above, one is quite possible (namely, that these canons were Nicene in the same sense that the Constantinopolitan Creed is ever called the Nicene Creed), whilst the other (namely, that they were literally Nicene, and came, we know not how, to be called Sardican in the seventh century) explains all the facts.

One fact that specially makes for this theory is that St. Julius practically acted on a provision of the so-called Sardican canons, and that he wrote before the Council of Sardica met. And he called the provision one that had been 'written' in the 'great Synod.'

Note.—The discussion between Rome and Africa as to the Sardican canons throws no light on the question treated here, for we have no record as to its termination. Indeed, we have only two letters for the whole history of this discussion—one from African bishops to St. Boniface; the other to St. Celestine. The latter has every possible mark of forgery (cf. p. 303); and there are suspicious circumstances about the former. For the difference between Rome and Africa, as given in these letters, is mentioned nowhere else. Van Espen expresses himself as quite nonplussed

¹ Of course there are difficulties in this supposition, as is implied in what has been said above.

in regard to the council from which the letter to Boniface is supposed to have emanated.¹ The matter is not mentioned in Prosper's 'Chronicon,' nor in Possidius' 'Life of St. Augustine,' nor in Marius Mercator, nor in Paulinus' 'Libellus,' nor in Photius' 'Bibliotheca' (c. 52). Further, Balsamon gives the supposed letter from St. Cyril and from Atticus of Constantinople (accompanying their copies of the Nicene canons), which is obviously a translation from the Latin, suggesting that the original was a Latin forgery, and containing terminology found nowhere else in Cyril's writings. And how was it that Balsamon, himself of Antioch, could not produce the letter from Antioch? It must be admitted that grave suspicion rests on the whole of this supposed discussion.

APPENDIX III.

The Rev. F. W. Puller on St. Ambrose.

ST. AMBROSE was one of the primitive saints, and a very great saint. We have seen that he altogether differs from Mr. Puller on some points concerning the See of Rome, holding, as he did, that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome ('De Sacr.' i. 5), and that from that see 'the rights of venerable communion flow forth to all.' (Mansi, t. iii. p. 622.) But Mr. Puller has, nevertheless, claimed him as being to a certain extent on his side, on the ground that he says (Ep. xiii.), in reference (so Mr. Puller imagines) to the disputed succession at Antioch, and to a similar difficulty at Constantinople, in A.D. 381 or 382, that 'we do not assume to ourselves the prerogative of examining such things, but we ought to have a share in their examination.' This he considers moderate as compared with later claims; but Theodosius' answer 'to the Italians' (i.e. St. Ambrose and his council) decided that such matters should be 'settled in the East and by the East,' and this Mr. Puller considers to be the 'immemorial practice of the Church.' ('Primitive Saints,' &c. p. 274.) St. Ambrose says, No.

Theodosius had succeeded to the entire empire on Gratian's death. On his return to Constantinople from the West, he determined to make an effort to bring the schism at Antioch to an end. He accordingly summoned a synod to meet at Rome, and engaged that Flavian should attend. Flavian was accordingly summoned to Constantinople, to sail thence for Rome. He managed, however, to satisfy the emperor that he could not be expected to travel thus far in the winter season, in his eighty-second year, but promised to attend in

¹ *Jus Eccl.* vii. § 10, Art. 2. Lovanii, 1766.

the summer. The synod was held at Capua, and it was decided that both parties, whether they held to Flavian or Evagrius, should be considered to be in communion with Rome, so long as they held the true faith. The contest concerning the bishopric was remanded to the judgment of Theophilus of Alexandria, as having kept himself neutral, and the matter was to be confirmed by the Apostolic See.¹

St. Ambrose, however, discovering that Flavian had 'had recourse again to the help of petitions and of imperial rescripts,' wrote a more stringent letter to Theodosius, and complained of the bishops having had all the trouble of going to Capua for nothing. He wrote at the same time to Theophilus, and spoke of Flavian as standing 'alone outside the law.' He neither came to Capua nor presented himself to the judges provided by the synod. The emperor wrote back somewhat sharply, and St. Ambrose replied. The letter of the emperor is not extant, and we can only guess at what he said from St. Ambrose's reply. The latter says (Ep. xiv.), that he must congratulate the emperor on seeming to have restored unity between the East and the West. He had summoned a council for the purpose. St. Ambrose and the bishops will not, they say, enter into the question of whose fault it has been that things were disturbed. He is glad that they made the endeavour, as it witnessed to their desire for peace. They deny that they could be accused of any partisanship, or too great readiness to believe either side, and they had met, not for the sake of defining, but of instruction. And since they have delegated the matter, they must be considered to have sought a just judgment rather than deferred to prejudice. The East had themselves wished for the council as well, and moreover had themselves set the example in reference to Paul, the Presbyter of Constantinople, when they asked for a synod within Achaia; but the West had thought Capua better, because they could travel more safely by sea than through Illyricum, which was in a state of disturbance ('movebatur'). They say that they are not innovating; they are not removing the landmarks of the Fathers, nor violating the rights of the Easterns; but on the contrary they are keeping the things defined by St. Athanasius, of holy memory, who was, as it were, a pillar of the faith, and by their holy Fathers of old in councils; neither are they violating the rights of hereditary communion, but whilst reserving the respect due to the Imperial Majesty, they are showing themselves eager for peace and quiet.²

¹ Ambros. Ep. lvi. 7.

² St. Ambrosii Epistol. Classis i. Ep. xiv. Migne, vol. xv. The councils are obviously Nicæa and Sardica.

In an early part of the letter they remind the emperor that they had met together to consider also the case of those who tried to introduce the teaching of Apollinarius, who ought to be cut off in their presence, 'for he who has been convicted in the absence of the parties, as your clemency laid down in your august and magisterial (*principali*) reply, will always seize on a handle for questioning' the decision. And then they say that they asked for the council that 'no one might be able to compose a falsehood against the absent.'

These bishops, therefore, headed by St. Ambrose, do not admit to the emperor that this matter is one of those which must be concluded in the East, as neither does it appear that the emperor laid down the principle that *all* such matters should be concluded where they arose, seeing that he had originally contemplated the appearance of Flavian before Western bishops—namely, at Rome.

Tillemont, however, has made a conjecture concerning this letter of St. Ambrose which supports his Gallican views of the administration of the Church; and his conjectures have recently been transformed into historical facts by Mr. Puller in his 'Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.'

Tillemont thought, as, indeed, others have, that the above letter of St. Ambrose was written *à propos* of the demand of the Council of Milan in 382 for a general council. But a close inspection of the letter will probably satisfy most readers that this is an untenable theory. For the council to which the letter refers is stated to have been summoned, not only to extinguish the Antiochian schism, but 'to take cognisance of those who are endeavouring to bring into the Church the dogma which Apollinarius is asserted to teach,' and this at a time when Illyricum was suspected of being in a state of disturbance, and therefore the sea journey (*i.e.* to Capua) was desired as being safer.¹ Now this was the state of things when Theodosius returned from Italy in 391. The Apollinarian heresy was then rising into greater prominence, and the barbarians were coming out of their hiding places and causing disturbance in Macedonia and Thessaly. Whereas there was no Gothic war nor known disturbances in Illyricum in 382. Things had been settled in 380. So that on these grounds the theory of Tillemont and others will not hold. Again, there was no idea of the West having in any way behaved reproachfully about the Convocation of the East in 381, as this letter of St. Ambrose states of the occasion of the council to which it alludes. The East answered the summons of the West

¹ 'Ideo maritima et tutiora quæsitæ sunt' (Ambr. Ep. iv. 3).

most courteously. So that the letter does not fit into the circumstances of 382. Further, on the occasion of St. Ambrose's letter, the West had been summoned by Theodosius, which could not be the case until Gratian's death. And since Theodosius could not, on Tillemont's theory, have written thus to St. Ambrose until towards the end of 382, it seems inconceivable that St. Ambrose should have answered in the name of the bishops whom he mentions, and not in that of the Roman Synod. Whereas everything fits in with the time immediately subsequent to the Synod of Capua, and it would seem that the very prominent paragraph about the Apollinarians applies to Vitalis, who had organised the Apollinarian party at Antioch, and took refuge under the pretext that he had not been condemned in person, which was true, and which was one main reason of St. Ambrose's wish for a general council, to which the said Apollinarian bishop, whom I am supposing to be Vitalis, should be summoned.

Mr. Puller, however, has improved on Tillemont. For Tillemont adds that what he says about the letter of Theodosius is only conjectured from this letter of St. Ambrose.¹ Mr. Puller professes to adduce Theodosius' letter itself, and compares it with that of St. Ambrose, and then compares the two with the action of Rome in 484 in deposing Acacius, and hence deduces 'a proof of the growth of the Papal and Italian claims.'² He first applies the letter to the circumstances of 382—which, as we have seen, is, to say the least, most improbable—and then quotes from another letter of St. Ambrose as follows: 'St. Ambrose and his council expressly say, "We do not assume to ourselves the prerogative of examining such things, but we ought to have a share in their examination."'

It must be noticed for the sake of English readers that the full force of the word 'prerogative' in the Latin is that of having the first vote in a matter, and that St. Ambrose and his council (in 382) do not repeat the word 'examination,' but use the word 'judgment' or 'decision.' They had just said (for we are now back in 382) that since Maximus was pleading his cause in the West they (the Easterns) 'ought to have waited for our judgment concerning him.' They in effect invoked the Niceno-Sardican canons. They then say that in thus claiming that the Easterns ought to have waited for the judgment of Rome—for that is what they certainly meant—'we do not claim the prerogative of examination [*i.e.* the examina-

¹ 'Nous avons tiré ces choses par conjecture de la réponse que S. Ambroise et ses collègues firent à Théodose' (*Mémoires*, vol. x. p. 151).

² *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 273, 274.

tion of the matter in the first instance), but there ought nevertheless to have been the participation of a common judgment.' It is to be noticed that there is no exact equivalent of Mr. Puller's words, 'such things,' which introduce the idea of a general rule instead of confining the sentiment to this particular matter. Mr. Puller then proceeds: 'The emperor wrote back to the Italians, &c., but he does not let his readers know that the emperor's letter is not extant, nor that Tillemont, from whom his words are taken, only gives them as conjectures. As has been seen above, 'the presence of the parties,' on which Mr. Puller lays stress, refers in all probability not to the affair of Nectarius at all, but to Flavian having absented himself on the ground that it was winter-time. But Mr. Puller proceeds more boldly still. He informs his readers that 'there can be no question that the emperor was stating the immemorial practice of the Church, not only in the East, but in Africa and elsewhere;' whereas St. Ambrose goes on to say that, on the contrary, there can be, or ought to be, no question that the immemorial practice of the Church has been precisely the other way. He instances St. Athanasius, and alludes to the Nicene Fathers as being against whatever it was that Theodosius said. It is but fair to retort on Mr. Puller what he says of some one else (*Prim. SS.* p. 327): 'If one may set aside evidence in such a way as that, history becomes an impossibility.'

APPENDIX IV.

The Apostolic See: Meaning of the Phrase.

THERE is one expression occurring again and again in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, which gives what might be called the Christian name of the Bishop of Rome. He is the Archbishop of 'the Apostolic See, or Throne.' It is curious to notice how some writers fight shy of this title. Now Rome is, it is true, according to the Acts of the Councils, the Apostolic Throne of Greater or Old Rome; but it is also, what no other is, simply 'the Apostolic See.' It is a title accorded to her by emperors, empresses, patriarchs, individual bishops, and the entire synod of Ephesus.

The See of Rome, then, was, in 431, 'the Apostolic See;' hers was 'the' Apostolic throne; not, indeed to the exclusion of others, but in a super-eminent sense. During the Council of Ephesus, as a matter of fact, no other see is called apostolical at all, unless we except a doubtful passage in the speech of Juvenal of Jerusalem,

à propos of the action of John of Antioch, in which he calls his see the Apostolic throne of Jerusalem—not simply ‘the Apostolic See.’

Now, the natural inference from the use of the term ‘the Apostolic See’ as applied to Rome in the early councils is that the apostolicity of the Church in the matter of government was vested in the See of Rome, and flowed forth from thence to the rest of the sees of Christendom. This is the explanation which St. Leo gives in his sermon on St. Peter and St. Paul’s Day. Canon Bright admits that ‘on the whole, what Rome said in 431 amounts to this: All bishops succeed the Apostles, but Celestine, as heir of him who was the foremost Apostle, has a right to be foremost among bishops.’¹ The question is, of course, what constitutes the ‘foremost place,’ and by what sort of ‘right’ does Rome hold it? What did the Church at that date mean by so persistently attributing to Rome the title ‘Apostolic’? Canon Bright says that in 431 ‘Rome did not say, as she now practically says, “The apostolic authority is concentrated in St. Peter’s successor.”’ It is not quite plain what Dr. Bright means by ‘concentrated.’ But what is the explanation given by the history of the Council of Ephesus? It is as follows.

Celestine regarded himself, and was considered by others, as occupant of ‘the Apostolic See.’ As such he considered himself as, in a peculiar sense, clothed with apostolic authority, which he could exercise, as we have seen, in the way of deposing an Eastern bishop, the Bishop of Constantinople, the imperial city. No one in presence of the Acts of this council will deny thus much—viz. that he spoke of the authority of his see as in some sense pre-eminently apostolic, and that bishops (even Capreolus of Carthage²) speak of it as such, and that Celestine regarded his sentence on Nestorius as the judgment of God.

But he regards all the bishops as also true successors of the Apostles;³ he rejoices in their gathering; he sees in their assembly a visible manifestation of the presence of the Holy Spirit, who is given to them all in common. He does not, indeed, say that all are *equally* partakers of the Holy Spirit, from an official point of view: that they all *equally* inherit the duties and graces of the apostolate. Dr. Pusey, in his endeavours to find contradictions between Popes on matters of faith, says that Celestine, according to the ‘Roman’ theory, must have been infallible when he said to the Council of Ephesus (the italics are his own) that—

‘The charge of teaching has descended [from the Apostles] *equally* upon all bishops. We are all engaged in it *by an hereditary*

¹ *Church History*, p. 336, note d.

² Cf. *Ep. Capreoli ad Syn.* Act i.

³ *Cel. Ep. ad Syn.* Act ii.

right; all we who have come in their stead preach in the name of the Lord to all countries in the world, according to what was said to them, “Go ye and teach all nations.” You are to observe, my brethren, that the order (*mandatum*) we have received is a general order or command, and that He intended that we should all execute it when He charged them with it, as a duty devolving *equally* upon all. We ought all to enter into the labours of those *whom we have all succeeded in dignity.*¹

On this Dr. Pusey says, by way of comment, ‘Not the Pope alone, but, according to Pope Celestine, the “assembly of priests,” is the visible display of the presence of the Holy Ghost.’

Dr. Pusey here gives a turn to Celestine’s words which neither the Greek nor Latin expresses. Celestine does not say that the assembly of priests is ‘the visible display,’ but merely that it ‘manifests (*εμφανίζει*, testatur) the presence of the Holy Ghost,’ which is true on what Dr. Pusey calls the Ultramontane theory. Neither does Celestine use the word ‘equally’ at all; he says, ‘in common,’ and a gift received in common may be received in diversity of share.

As for its not being ‘the Pope alone,’ as Dr. Pusey puts it, no one ever supposed that the Pope enjoys a monopoly of the gifts of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of teaching or governing. The same remark applies to what Canon Bright says:

‘It is certain that Celestine knew nothing of the theory which is now called “Ultramontane.” He recognised apostolic authority in all bishops alike.’

It is curious that in the text² to which this is a note Canon Bright, in giving the applauses of the bishops at the council, omits precisely the exclamation which suggests the peculiarity of the Pope’s position. The bishops called Celestine ‘the guardian of the faith.’ Canon Bright omits that. If by the word ‘alike,’ in the above note, he means ‘equally,’ then he is contradicted by the whole of Celestine’s conduct at the council, and by the ending of this very letter. If Dr. Bright does not mean ‘equally,’ viz. that all bishops enjoyed, according to Celestine, equal apostolic authority, but uses the word ‘alike’ simply as redundant, he misinterprets the teaching to which he alludes. No Catholic theologian denies that the bishops ‘all’ enjoy apostolic authority. As Hettinger expresses it,³ ‘all received the same authority, but not all in the

¹ *Eirenicon*, p. 307.

² *Church History*, p. 336.

³ Cf. *The Supremacy of the Apostolic See*, by Hettinger. Eng. trans. Edited by Archbishop Porter, S.J. (Burns & Oates), p. 15.

same degree or to the same extent.' And, as the same writer observes elsewhere, this does not the less make the bishops true bishops and true successors to the Apostles. For it will be admitted that Timothy and Titus were true bishops, and yet they were under apostolic authority. The Apostles had jurisdiction over the universal Church; and yet the bishops appointed by them, under their jurisdiction, were true bishops, placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God. The share of the episcopate in the apostolate of the Church is thus described by Hettinger:

'We know where to find the Catholic episcopate, the episcopate of the true Church of Christ, by the approbation its teaching receives from the Apostolic See; for where the members are in communion with their head, there is the unity appointed by God, the Catholic Church. . . . The primacy and the episcopacy are *both holders of the teaching office of the Church, but not ex æquo, on a par*. The head must teach the members and oblige them to accept his teaching; but the converse does not hold.'¹

Bossuet, who insisted strongly on the apostolic authority of all bishops, nevertheless writes:

'When Christ chose St. Peter to be the foundation of His Church, He created for him a superiority in the Church and conferred on him the fullest plenitude of authority and majesty, that he might keep all bound together in unity.'² And he tells us that Celestine acted in the persuasion that he alone could judicially deal with Nestorius.

So that Dr. Pusey has no ground for translating Celestine's expression 'in common,' as though it were 'equally;' and Canon Bright is mistaken in supposing that our attribution of *special* authority to the Holy See annihilates the apostolic authority of the rest of the episcopate. And each of these writers is mistaken in supposing that St. Celestine held the equality of all bishops in their possession of the teaching office. They held it, according to St. Celestine, in common, but not in equal measure.³

¹ *Op. cit.* Part 2, ch. xviii.

² *Def. Decl. Cler. Gall.* xxi.

³ Since writing the above I have noticed that Canon Bright translates Celestine's expression in the same way that Dr. Pusey does, as though he said that the teaching office 'had descended *equally* to all bishops' (*Roman Claims tested by Antiquity*, p. 11, note). St. Celestine says *in common*. 'Common Prayer' does not mean that Priest and people who pray are officially equal.

INDEX.

AETIUS, of Constantinople, reads the third Canon of Constantinople (not the sixth of Nicæa), 443

Africa, causes of bishops not to be terminated there, 142, 143; accepted Papal Infallibility, 289, 296; forbade inferior clergy to appeal to Rome, 297; deprecated legates *a latere*, 299; supposed letter to the Pope, probably spurious, 303

Alexandria, a see of Peter, 120; why above Antioch, 125; jurisdiction of, 167; subject to Rome, 177; Council of, 195; Acts sent to Rome, 197

Allies, T. W., 173

Ambrose, St., Bishop of Milan, on Damasus' election, 204; Gratian's adviser, 235, 237; teaching on the See of Peter, 242; at Aquileia, 264; at Rome, 273; contradicted by Mr. Puller, 479

Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, submits to Leo's demands, 393-396; signs the Tome and sends it round, 397; instructs bishops at council, 414; defends an inadequate formula, 419; grasps at supremacy in the East, 440; favouring circumstances, 441; his letter to Leo on the synod, 455

Anthony, Bishop, 301

Antioch, a see of Peter, 120; its relation to Rome, 123; to Alexandria, 126; Council of, 176, 179; dissensions under Meletius, 193

Apiarius, African priest, deceived the Pope, 297

Apollinarius, his heresy detected by Damasus, 212; condemned at Rome, 276

Aquileia, Council of, 264

Arles, Marcian, Bishop of, 70

Arles, Council of, 144; not superior to the Pope, 146; British bishops at, 146; regulation of Easter, 147; Archbishop Laud on the Council, 149, 152

Ascholius, St., baptises Theodosius, 243; Papal vicar, 246; meeting St. Ambrose, 273

Athanasius, St., and Julius' letter, 175, 178

Augustine, St., on Peter's primacy, 83; on Cyprian's speech, 93; opinion of St. Stephen, 113; on the Donatists, 140; on Melchior's judgment, 141, 142; on the See of Peter, 143; on the Donatists' appeal, 144, 147; misinterpreted by Laud, 149; at Milevis, 287; letter to Pope Innocent, 288; his belief in Infallibility of the Holy See, 290; as Papal legate, 300

Auxentius, Bishop, 209

BARDESANES, 26

Basil, St., tender to Apollinarius, 211; looks to the West, 213; wishes for Papal legates, 214; letter of complaint as to Damasus, 220; on Western superciliousness, 222; recognises special grace in the Holy See, 224; admits Pope's power over Eastern bishops, 225; and to consecrate Bishop of Antioch by legate, 225

Basilides, Bishop, 73

Bigg, Dr., on the Clementine literature, 30

Bossuet, on *principalitas*, 36; on Victor and Irenæus, 43; on the Papal sentence against Nestorius, 335

Bottalla, Father, S.J., on relation of bishops to the Pope, 330

Bright, Dr. W., on *convenire ad*, 35; on Infallibility, 155; on 6th Nicene Canon, 171; quoted, 262; inadequate version of Celestine's judgment on Nestorius, 314; misunderstanding, 330; description of the sentence at Ephesus, 336; on John of Antioch's delay, 341; on the legate's speech at Ephesus, 349; on a supposed allusion to the Pope, 358 *seq.*; accusation of forgery, 445; translation of *communis*, 483

CÆCILIAN, Bishop of Carthage, 139 *seq.*

Canons, sixth of Nicæa, 166; of Sardica, 178, 183 *note*; why Popes quote, 183; third of Constantinople, 258 *seq.*; Nicene quoted as Sardican, 298, 302; third of Constantinople read at Chalcedon, 443; sixth Nicene only once, 444; twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, how carried, 441 *seq.*

Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, letter on authority of Holy See, 317, 360

Carter, Canon, accusation of forgery, 445

Carthage, third Council about baptism, 89; letter to Pope Innocent, 286

Celestine, St. (Pope), 299; his character, 306, 311; letter condemning Nestorius, 309; real president at Ephesus, 321; his judgment on Nestorius accepted as authoritative, 334, 335; last letters, 354

Chalcedon, Nicene Canon at, 170. *See* Leo, Anatolius, Dioscorus, Theodoret, Maximus

Chrysologus, St. Peter, advises Eutyches to obey the Pope, 367

Church of Rome, authority same as that of the Bishop, 4

Church, the Catholic, its head and root, 85; her unity, 118, 119

Clement, St., of Rome, letter to Corinth, 1 *seq.*

Clementine literature, description, 12; used by Tübingen school, 13; by anti-papal writers, 13; not the parent of phrase 'See of Peter,' 16 *seq.*; subsequent to list of Hegesippus, 17-22; subsequent to Tertullian, 25; and Bardesanes, 26; reason of its acceptance at Rome, 31

Cœlestius, the Pelagian, 285; deceived the Pope, 292; was condemned, 295

Constantine, his wish for a council, 157

Corinth, Epistle of St. Clement to, 1; its effect, 32

Cyprian, St., treatise on Unity, reasons for writing, 50, 55; teaching as to Peter, 49, 54, 55; on the chair of Peter, 57; meaning of 'the head,' 61; on difference between orders and jurisdiction, 62; on Fortunatus going to Rome, 69; on Marcian of Arles, 70; deposition of Basilides, 73; on baptism by heretics, error, 77; on tradition, 82; expression 'bishop of bishops,' 92; his irritation, 99; summary by St. Vincent, 112

Cyprus, decision about, at Ephesus, wrong, 356

Cyril, St., of Alexandria, why intervened about Nestorius, 306; appeals to the Pope for judgment, 308; presided for the Pope, 321 *seq.*; presided after the legates' arrival, 350; sent by Celestine to preside, 348; his summary of the council, 351; defended by the synod, 353; praised by Celestine, 355; and by Sixtus, his successor, 356; his authorised letters accepted at Chalcedon, 411. *See* Ephesus.

DAMASUS, St. (Pope), his greatness, 203 *seq.*; election valid, 207; his rule, 208; estimate of Liberius' stand, 209; detection of Apollinarius, 211; and Macedonius, 212; his belief as to his see, 213; defined the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, 214; differed from Basil as to a legation, 215; annoyed Basil, 219; cool towards Meletius, 227; his religion as successor of Peter enforced in the East, 244, 247; on Maximus, 248; changes his opinion, 266; action in A.D. 382, 269; his glory, 278

Dionysius, St., of Rome, acts as supreme ruler, 122; on *Homoousios*, 156

Dionysius, St., of Alexandria, intercedes with the Pope, 81; letter for guidance, 114; defends himself to the Pope, 122

Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, moves for a council, 368; presides at Ephesus, 379; acquitted Eutyches, 379; has to leave his seat at

Chalcedon, 400; sentenced by the Papal legates, 404

Döllinger, Dr., translation of St. Ignatius, 33; on *principalitas*, 36, 58; on communion with Rome, 38; on excommunication, 41; on Peter's primacy, 61; on Firmilian's letter, 100; on the sees of Peter, 125; on the peace at Antioch, 232; on the Pope as patriarch, 262; absurd notion of infallibility, 310; correct appreciation of Cyril's relation to Celestine, 313

Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, 433

Donatists, their origin, 139; ask for Gallic judges, 140; their appeal to the emperor, 144; their action misinterpreted by Laud, 149

EPHESUS, Council of (A.D. 431), due to Nestorius, 316; and to the emperor, 319; Celestine the president, 321; Cyril acted for him, 322; use of term 'Apostolic See' at Council of, App. IV. 479

Ephesus, Robber Council of (A.D. 449), not wished by Flavian, 369; Eutyches' plan, 368; why consented to by Leo, 375, 377; its constituents, 378; Flavian condemned, 379; appealed to Rome, 380; ill treated, 380

Epiphanius, St., on St. Clement's succession, 5, 21; at Rome, 273

Eusebians, their programme, 177, 179

Eusebius, on St. Clement's letter, 7; Papal lists, 19 *seq.*; on the Council of Nicæa, 157

Eusebius of Constantinople, 174

Eusebius of Vercellæ, Papal legate, 194; at Antioch, 199

Eustathius, St., Bishop of Antioch, 191

Eutyches, his teaching, 365; condemned by his bishop, 365; appeals to Rome, but not at the synod, 367; gains the emperor, 367; in concert with Dioscorus, moves for a council, 368; brings charges against his synod, 370; condemned by Leo, 373; acquitted at the Latrocinium, 379; his acquittal rendered null and void by the Pope, 385. *See* Flavian and Leo

Excommunication, different kinds, 41; of Asiatics by St. Victor, 42; of Marcian by the Pope, 71; of Firmilian, 81; lesser kind, 105; autho-

rities against Cyprian's, 107; esp. St. Augustine, 109

FAUSTINUS, Papal legate, 299; not infallible, 300

Firmilian, 98; his letter, 101; probably altered his teaching, 111

Flavian, St., of Antioch, 253, 265

Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, condemns Eutyches, 365; writes to the greater sees, but sends the Acts to Rome, 367; accepts censure from Leo, 369; prefers Papal brief to a general council, 369, 370; accepts legates from Rome, 373; murdered, 380; had appealed to Rome, 383

Francis of Sales, St., on Peter *quid* foundation, 49

Freppel, Bishop, summary of Cyprianic dispute, 115

GELASIUS of Cyzicus, value of his lists, 163

Gore, Rev. C., refutation of Lightfoot, 7; interpretation of Irenæus, 36; his depreciation of Leo, 418; misinterpretation of Leo, 439; curious suggestion, 446

Gratian, Emperor, his attitude to the Church, 234; relationship to St. Ambrose, 235; gave civil effect to ecclesiastical judgments, 236; his rescripts conterminous with ecclesiastical arrangements, 237 *seq.*

Gregory, St., of Nazianzus, 245, 248; election confirmed, 249; opposes the election of Flavian, 252; resigns, 255

HEGESIPPUS, 17, 21, 30

Homoousios (Consubstantial), taught by St. Dionysius, 156

Hosius, Bishop, Papal legate at Nice, 163

IGNATIUS, St., on St. Clement's letter, 2, 19; the Church of Rome presiding, 83

Illyrian bishops at Chalcedon, their difficulty, 417

Infallibility, Papal, involves concurrence of the Church, 3; taught by Irenæus, 38; implied by Cyprian, 72; not inconsistent with Nicene

Council, 154; nor with Basil's words about Meletius, 220; accepted by the Church of North Africa, 290; assumed by Leo in writing to Theodosius, 387; Dr. Dollinger on infallibility, 417

Innocent I., St. (Pope), letters to Africa, 288; claim to infallibility received in Africa, 290

Irenæus, St., on St. Clement's letter, 2, 9; list of Popes, 22; on the sovereignty of the Church of Rome, 34-38

JEROME, St., on St. Peter's episcopate, 21; on Liberius, 187; witness to Papal supremacy, 227; his age, 228; at Rome, 273, 277

John, Bishop of Antioch, counsels Nestorius to obey the Papal judgment, 315; his delay intentional, 320; holds a schismatic synod, 341; refuses to attend the council, 352; his deposition reserved to Rome, 353

Jubaianus, Cyprian's letter to, 85

Julian, Bishop, Pelagian, 317; wishes for a council, 318

Julius, St. (Pope), letter to the Eusebians, 175

Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, on obedience to Rome, 352; wrests provinces from Antioch, 435

LATROCINIUM, *i.e.* Robber Synod. See Ephesus, Flavian, Dioscorus, Leo, Laud, Archbishop, mistranslation, 150
Leo the Great, St. (Pope), blames Flavian, 367; judges Eutyches in his Tome, 373; revises the Acts of the Eastern Synod, 373; consents to a council, 375; describes his Tome to the Archimandrites as *ex cathedra*, 376; and to the synod, *ibid.*; annulled the sentence on Eutyches, 385; acts on the Sardican Canon, 385; expounds Papal Infallibility to the emperor, 387; his demands on Anatolius, 393, 396; his Tome accepted as authoritative, 409; difficulty of some bishops about it, 413; instructed in committee, 414; free to examine, not to dissent, 416; Tome the rule of faith, 420; called by the synod 'the preaching of the See of Peter,' 422; Marcian's allocution on the Tome,

425; absolved Theodoret, 427; actual restoration left to the synod, 430; rejects the twenty-eighth Canon as contrary to Nicene Canons by virtue of his apostolic authority, 458-460

Liberius, St. (Pope), his support of Athanasius, 186; his lapse not proven, 187; his acts, 188; his second stand, 189; after Ariminum, 190

Lightfoot, Dr., on St. Clement's letter, 3, 8; on the Clementine literature, 14; on Hegesippus' list, 21; translation of St. Ignatius, 33

Lincoln, Bishop of, on the Clementine Romance, 14, 25; on Nicene Council, 168; unsubstantiated accusation of forgery, 445

Linus, successor of St. Peter, 19, 21, 22

Littledale, Dr., on Damasus, 205

Lucifer, St., of Cagliari, Papal legate, 194; consecrated Paulinus to Antioch, 199

Luciferians, 198, 206

MARCELLUS of Ancyra, 223

Marcian, Bishop of Arles, 70

Marcian, Emperor, why called a Council, 391-392; first supports, then gives up, the twenty-eighth Canon, 448, 459

Maximus of Constantinople, 246; ordination rejected, 249; appears in the West, 275

Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, his ordination validated by the Pope, 433; Eastern acceptance of Papal supremacy, 434; agrees to Juvenal's desire conditionally upon Leo's consent, 436

Melchades, St., Bishop of Rome, his judgment on African bishops, 141; misrepresented by Laud, 149

Meletius, St., Bishop of Antioch, his election, 191; exile, 192; statement before Sapor, 194; dealt with at Alexandria, 195; Damasus cool towards, 227; compact with Paulinus, when made, 229; at peace with Rome (A.D. 379), 230; at Constantinople, 248; last acts and death, 250; proof that he died in communion with Rome, 267

Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, held Nestorius condemned before the council, 319

Milan, Council of, 265

Milman, Dean, on the sentence of the Council of Ephesus, 337

NECTARIUS, Bishop, 255

Nestorius, his character and teaching, 306; idea of the council, 316; accused St. Cyril, 319

Nicæa, Council of, reasons for, 151; its president, 161; St. Boniface on, 165; sixth Canon, 166; supposed forgery, 171; directed from Rome, 210; are the Sardican Canons Nicene? 467 *seq.*

Norfolk, Duke of, not a type of the Pope, 224

OPTATUS, St., of Africa, on communion with Rome, 88, 274

PASCHAL Feast, dispute on, 39 *seq.*

Paschasius, Papal legate, pronounces the deposition of Dioscorus, 405

Paul, St., relationship to See of Rome, 23

Paul of Samosata, his case referred to Rome, 123

Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch, 192; position sanctioned at Alexandria, 195 *seq.*; ordained by three bishops, 199; compact with Meletius, 229

Pelagius, his heresy, 284

Peter, St., ordained Clement, 19; relationship to the See of Rome, 23; Church built on, 47, 49, 60; place of, 55; chair of, 57, 67; primacy over Apostles, 83; three sees of, 120; mention of in the Sardican Canons, 180, 182

Philip, Papal legate at Ephesus, his exposition of Papal supremacy, 344; its acceptance by the synod, 347

Photius, of Constantinople, on Hosius, 163; his falsehood and forgeries, 470

Polycrates, 41

Popes, their witness, 129 *seq.*

Pulcheria, Empress, 389; beauty of character, 391; her joy at Anatolius' submission, 396

Puller, Rev. F. W., on the Clementine Romance, 14, 15, 25; on *principalitas*, 36; on St. Victor, 40, 42, 44; translations of Eusebius, 42, 46; on St. Cyprian, 47, 53; translation of *sacerdotalis unitas*, 58, 59; of *primatus*, 83; Old Testament teach-

ing on unity compared with Cyprian's, 66; on going from Carthage to Rome, 69 *n.* 2; translation of *consulere rei*, 76; on the head and root of the Church, 85; on Stephen's excommunication of Cyprian, 106-111; mistake as to the sees of Peter, 126; repudiation of Popes as witnesses, 127; on the Nicene Council, 164; on sixth Canon, 167; on the Meletians at Antioch, 196 *n.* 1, 197 *n.* 3; note on his account of Meletius, 201; depreciation of Damasus, 205; on election of Damasus, 207; argument from titles unsound, 215 *n.* 2; on *ἀντὶστα*, 217 *n.* 2; mistaken idea of papal teaching, 223; makes Gratian's Rescript wider than Rome's request—wrongly, 237 *seq.*; on the Council of Aquileia, 264 *n.* 2; mistranslation, 267; collapse of his argument about Meletius, 268; contradicts St. Ambrose, 271, 479; on North African Church, 283; assumption about African obedience, 302; on Philip's words at Ephesus, 350; on the Cyprian dispute, 357; accusation of forgery, 445; interpretations of Cyprian, App. I. 461-467; on St. Ambrose, App. III. 475
Pusey, Dr., argument about infallibility, 154; misunderstanding, 157; on Church of North Africa, 284; mistakes about St. Zosimus, 291 *seq.*; answered by St. Augustine, 293; account of the Council of Ephesus, 319; on John of Antioch's delay, 341; translation of *communis*, 483

RECOGNITIONS, the. Cf. Clementine literature

Rome, Church of. See Church

Rome, See of, relation to St. Peter and St. Paul, 23, 24; the Apostolic See, 118, App. IV

SALMON, Dr., tone of Clement's letter, 8, 11; his use of the Clementine literature, 13; undue depreciation of Council of Ephesus, 320; on the presidencies of councils, 321; ignoring Celestine's work, 327; depreciation of Nicene Council, 332; argument from resistance, 338

Sardica, Canons of, their meaning, 178 *seq.*, 183 *note*; quoted as Nicene,

- 298, 302; acted on by Leo towards the East, 385; are they Nicene? 467 *seq.*
 Stephen, St. (Pope), asked to depose Marcian, 70; restores Basilides, 73; St. Vincent of Lerins on, 81; his letter to Cyprian, 89; his decree, 95; and the African legates, 97; his excommunication of Cyprian not proved, 107 *seq.*
 Sylvester, St. (Pope), his action towards the Donatists, 146; sat in seat of the Apostles, 147; reason for accepting a Council, 158, 161
- TERTULLIAN, not deceived by the Clementine Romance, 17; not contradicted by Irenæus, 23; definition of *principalitas*, 58
 Theodoret, bishop and historian, account of compact at Antioch, 229; not allowed to judge Dioscorus, 401; acted as judge of the faith at Chalcedon, 431; synod did not review Papal judgment on, 432
 Theodosius I., Emperor, enforces the faith of Rome, 244; decides on an Eastern Œcumenical Council, 246; second edict (A.D. 381), 247
 Theodosius II., idea of the council at Ephesus, 319; takes Eutyches under his patronage, 367; appointed Dioscorus president at Ephesus, 379; ordered the presence of Barsumas, 378; refuses to convoke another council, 388
 Timothy, of Alexandria, 251
 Tyana, Synod of, admits Pope's power to restore Eastern bishops, 225
 Tyre, Council of, 176, 179
- URSINUS, schismatic, 207
- VALENTINIAN, Emperor, letter to Theodosius on Papal jurisdiction, 389
 Victor, St., 40 *seq.*
 Vincent of Lerins, St., estimate of Stephen, 81; on the Donatists' use of Cyprian's name, 98; summary of Cyprian's case, 112; never mentioned by Mr. Puller, 112
 Vitalis, Bishop, at Antioch, 218
- WARD, Wilfrid, 224
 Wordsworth, Bishop Christopher, 147; on the Ephesine sentence, 337
- ZOSIMUS, St. (Pope), caution as to Cœlestius, 294; did not approve his heresy, 293; Marius Mercator, 294; his *ex cathedra* teaching, 296; received Apiarius, 298; quoted Nicene Canon, 298