

THE  
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1864.

---

ART. I.—MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

It is a thought lying at the very core of Christian responsibility, that it is not so much man's *effort* which God uses as his instrument to bring men to himself, as *man himself*. Not human arguments and appeals, conflicts and struggles, treasure and tears, so much as human character; not the man's tools or weapons, but the concrete being, himself reflecting God's glory, gushing with divine sympathy, fervent with divine zeal; man the "ambassador of God," intrusted with the responsibility of maintaining the divine honor, bringing his credentials in his look, his tones, his gestures; he it is that is to negotiate with rebellious men in the Great King's behalf, and knit their hearts to his.

It is not, then, the Christian minister's sermons, or visits, or charities, not his logic or his eloquence, his plans or his sacrifices; but it is the *man* that is the weapon in God's hand. And this weapon should be tempered and sharpened by the highest human skill. Nowhere else does the world need so much the highest style of man. In no other business of life can the largest, most liberal culture be so thoroughly employed without crossing the legitimate boundaries of the profession. When the lawyer has finished his argument, his work is done; the scholar elaborates his speculations and throws them upon the world, and they live or die according as they have in them the vitality of truth; what is called political success is cheaply

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XVI.—34

these weighty words of our Lord, unless the necessities of an erroneous theory require it. No, he means just what he says. Nicodemus, and all others in the same moral condition, "must be born again," not because they have fallen and lost their infant regeneration, but because they were never born of the Spirit, but only of the flesh.

VI. Finally, admitting the doctrine in question, nothing could be more shockingly absurd than our Lord's solemn asseveration, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." For according to that doctrine, every man is born again long before this declaration can reach his understanding.

The question now comes back, What is the moral condition of infants? And so far as the objects of the present discussion are concerned, this question may be answered in very few words. It is precisely the same as that of adult sinners, with one single exception. In the infant, depravity is incipient, germinal; in the adult, it is in progress of development. In their legal condition, however, there is an immeasurable difference.

N. B.—It is due to the author of the above article to say that it was written previous to the appearance of Dr. Hibbard's late work on "The Religion of Childhood."—ED.

---

### ART. III.—LEO THE GREAT AND THE PAPACY IN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES.\*

THE Roman bishop, it is well known, claims to unite in his person the fourfold dignity of bishop in his own diocese, metropolitan or archbishop in his province, patriarch of the West

\* I. SOURCES: ST. LEO MAGNUS: *Opera omnia*, (sermones et epistolæ,) ed. Paschas. Quesnel, Par., 1675, 2 vols. 4to., (Gallican, and defending Hilary against Leo, hence condemned by the Roman Index;) and ed. Petr. et Hieron., Ballerini, (two very learned brothers and presbyters, who wrote at the request of Pope Benedict XIV.) Venet. 1753-1757, 3 vols. fol. (Vol. i, contains ninety-six sermons and one hundred and seventy-three epistles, the other two volumes doubtful writings and learned dissertations.) This edition is reprinted in *Migne's Patrologiæ Cursus completus*, vol. liv-lvii, Par., 1846.

II. WORKS: ACTA SANCTORUM, sub Apr. 11, (Apr., tome ii, pp. 14-30, brief and unsatisfactory.) TILLEMONT: Mem., tome xv, pp. 414-832, (very full.) BUTLER:

or of the Latin Church, and pope of the universal Church, East and West, Greek and Latin. He claims to be the successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the visible representative of Christ, who is the invisible head of the Christian world. This is the strict and exclusive sense of the title Pope.\*

Properly speaking, this claim has never been fully realized, and remains to this day an apple of discord in the history of the Church. Greek Christendom has never acknowledged it, and Latin only under manifold protests, which at last conquered in the Reformation, and deprived the papacy forever of the best part of its domain. The fundamental fallacy of the Roman system is, that it identifies papacy and Church, and therefore, to be consistent, must unchurch not only Protestantism, but also the entire Oriental Church from its origin down. By the "una sancta catholica apostolica ecclesia" of the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed is to be understood the whole body of Catholic Christians, of which the *ecclesia Romana*, like the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, is only one of the most prominent branches. The idea of the papacy, and its claims to the universal dominion of the Church, were distinctly put forward, it is true, so early as the fifth century, but could not make themselves

*Lives of the Saints*, sub Apr. 11. W. A. ARENDT (R. C.): *Leo der Grosse u. seine Zeit*, Mainz, 1835, (Catholic Apologetic.) EDW. PERTHEL: *P. Leo's I. Leben u. Lehren*, Jena, 1843, (Protestant.) FR. BÖHRINGER: *Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen*, Zurich, 1846, vol. i, div. 4, pp. 170-309. PH. JAFFE: *Regesta Pontif. Rom.*, Berol., 1851, p. 34 sqq. Comp. also GREENWOOD: *Cathedra Petri*, Lond. 1859, vol. i, book ii, chap. iv-vi. (The Leonine Period;) and H. H. MILMAN: *History of Latin Christianity*, London and New York, 1860, vol. i, book ii, chap. iv.

\* The name *papa*—according to some an abbreviation of *pater patrum*, but more probably, like the kindred *abbas*, *πάππας*, or *πάπας*, *pa-pa*, simply an imitation of the first prattling of children, thus equivalent to *father*—was in the West for a long time the honorary title of every bishop, as a spiritual father; but after the fifth century it became the special distinction of the patriarchs, and still later was assigned exclusively to the Roman bishop, and to him, in an eminent sense, as father of the whole Church. Comp. Du Cange, *Glossar. s. verb. papa* and *pater patrum*; and Hoffmann, *Lexic. univers.* iv, p. 561. In the same exclusive sense the Italian and Spanish *papa*, the French *pape*, the English *pope*, and the German *Papst* or *Pabst*, are used. In the Greek and Russian Churches, on the contrary, all priests are called *popes*—(from *πάπας*, *papa*.) The titles *apostolicus*, *vicarius Christi*, *summus pontifex*, *sedes apostolica*, were for a considerable time given to various bishops and their sees, but subsequently claimed exclusively by the bishops of Rome.

good beyond the limits of the West. Consequently the papacy, as a historical fact, or so far as it has been acknowledged, is properly nothing more than the Latin patriarchate run to absolute monarchy.

By its advocates the papacy is based not merely upon Church usage, like the metropolitan and patriarchal power, but upon divine right; upon the peculiar position which Christ assigned to Peter in the well-known words, "Thou art *Peter*, and on this *rock* will I build my Church."\* This passage was at all times taken as an immovable exegetical rock for the papacy. The popes themselves appealed to it, times without number, as the great proof of the divine institution of a visible and infallible central authority in the Church. According to this view the primacy is before the apostolate, the head before the body, instead of the reverse.

But, in the first place, this pre-eminence of Peter did not in the least affect the independence of the other apostles. Paul especially, according to the clear testimony of his epistles and the book of Acts, stood entirely upon his own authority, and even on one occasion, at Antioch, took strong ground against Peter. Then, again, the personal position of Peter by no means yields the primacy to the Roman bishop without the twofold evidence, first that Peter was actually in Rome, and then that he transferred his prerogatives to the bishop of that city. The former fact rests upon a universal tradition of the early Church, which at that time no one doubted, but is in part weakened and neutralized by the absence of any clear Scripture evidence, and by the much more certain fact, given in the New Testament itself, that Paul labored in Rome, and that in no position of inferiority or subordination to any higher authority than that of Christ himself. The second assumption of the transfer of the primacy to the Roman bishops is susceptible of neither historical nor exegetical demonstration, and is merely an inference from the principle that the successor

\* Matthew xvi, 18: *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ* [mark the change of the gender from the masculine to the feminine, from the person to the thing or the truth confessed—a change which disappears in the English and German versions] *οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾄδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.* Comp. the commentators, especially Meyer, Lange, Alford, Wordsworth, *ad loc.*, and Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, §§ 90, 94, (New York edition, p. 350 sqq., and 374 sqq.)

in office inherits all the official prerogatives of his predecessor. But even granting both these intermediate links in the chain of the papal theory, the double question yet remains open : first, whether the Roman bishop be the only successor of Peter, or share this honor with the bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch, in which places also Peter confessedly resided ; and secondly, whether the primacy involve at the same time a supremacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church, or be only an honorary primacy among patriarchs of equal authority and rank. The former was the Roman view, the latter was the Greek.

An African bishop, Cyprian, (258,) was the first to give to that passage of Matthew xvi, innocently, as it were, and with no suspicion of the future use and abuse of his view, a papistic interpretation, and to bring out clearly the idea of a perpetual *cathedra Patri*. The same Cyprian, however, whether consistently or not, was at the same time equally animated with the consciousness of episcopal equality and independence, afterward actually came out in bold opposition to Pope Stephen in a doctrinal controversy on the validity of heretical baptism, and persisted in this protest to his death.

The Church fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries in general agree in attaching to Peter a certain primacy over the other apostles, and in considering him the foundation of the Church in virtue of his confession of the divinity of Christ ; while they hold Christ to be, in the highest sense, the divine ground and rock of the Church. And herein lies a solution of their apparent self-contradiction in referring the *petra* in Matthew xvi, 18, now to the person of Peter, now to his confessor, now to Christ. Then, as the bishops in general were regarded as successors of the apostles, the fathers saw in the Roman bishops, on the ground of the ancient tradition of the martyrdom of Peter in Rome, the successor of Peter and the heir of the primacy. But respecting the nature and prerogatives of this primacy their views were very indefinite and various. It is remarkable that the reference of the *rock* to *Christ*, which Augustine especially defended with great earnestness, was acknowledged even by the greatest pope of the middle ages, Gregory VII., in the famous inscription he sent with a crown to the Emperor Rudolph : "*Petra* [that is, Christ] *dedit*

*Petro*, [that is, to the apostle;] *Petrus* [the pope] *diadema Rudolpho*.”\*

It is worthy of notice that the post-Nicene, as well as the ante-Nicene fathers, with all their reverence for the Roman see, regarded the heathenish title of Rome, *urbs æterna*, as blasphemous, with reference to the passage of the woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, Rev. xvii, 3.† The prevailing opinion seems to have been, that Rome and the Roman empire would fall before the advent of Antichrist and the second coming of the Lord.‡

We have no room here to trace out in detail the opinions of the Latin and Greek fathers, and the ancient synodical legislation on this subject, and come to the position of the early popes themselves.

In most of the earlier bishops of Rome the person is eclipsed by the office. The spirit of the age and public opinion rule the bishops, not the bishops them. Victor, in the Easter controversy of the second century, Callistus, in that on the restoration of the lapsed, and Stephen, in that on heretical baptism at the time of Cyprian, were the first Roman bishops who came out with hierarchical arrogance; but they were somewhat premature, and found vigorous resistance in Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Cyprian, though on all these questions the Roman view at last carried the day. At the close of the fourth century Damasus, who established the authority of the Latin Vulgate, and Siricuis, who issued the first genuine decretal letter, trod in the steps of those predecessors. Innocent I. (402–417) took a step beyond, and in the Pelagian controversy ventured the bold assertion, that in the whole Christian world nothing should be decided without the cognizance of the Roman see, and that, especially in matters of faith, all bishops must turn to St. Peter.§

\* Baronius, *Annal. ad ann. 1080*, vol. xi, p. 704.

† Hieronymus, *Adv. Jovin.*, lib. ii, chap. 38, (*Opera*, tome ii, p. 382,) where he addresses Rome: “Ad te loquar, quæ scriptam in fronte blasphemiam Christi confessione delesti.” Prosper: “Æterna cum dicitur quæ temporalis est, utique nomen est blasphemiaz.” *Comp. Piper*, l. c. p. 46.

‡ So Chrysostom, ad 2 Thess. ii, 7; Hieronymus, *Ep. cxxi*, qu. 11, (tome i, p. 880 sq.); Augustine, *De civit. Dei*, lib. xx, cap. 19.

§ *Ep. ad Conc. Carthag.*, and *Ep. ad Concil. Milev.*, both in 416. In reference to this decision, which went against Pelagius, Augustine uttered the word so often quoted by Roman divines: “*Causa finita est, utinam aliquando finiatur error.*”

But the first pope, in the proper sense of the word, is LEO I., who justly bears the title of "THE GREAT" in the history of the Latin hierarchy. In him the idea of the papacy, as it were, became flesh and blood. He conceived it in great energy and clearness, and carried it out with the Roman spirit of dominion, so far as the circumstances of the time at all allowed. He marks the same relative epoch in the development of the papacy as Cyprian in the history of the episcopate. He had even a higher idea of the prerogatives of the see of Rome than Gregory the Great, who, though he reigned a hundred and fifty years later, represents rather the patriarchal idea than the papal. Leo was at the same time the first important theologian in the chair of Rome, surpassing in acuteness and depth of thought all his predecessors, and all his successors down to Gregory I. Benedict XIV. placed him (A. D. 1744) in the small class of *doctores ecclesiæ*, or authoritative teachers of the Catholic faith. He battled with the Manichean, the Priscillianist, the Pelagian, and other heresies, and won an immortal name as the finisher of the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ.

The time and place of the birth and earlier life of Leo are unknown. His letters, which are the chief source of information, commence not before the year 442. Probably a Roman,\* if not one by birth, he was virtually a Roman in the proud dignity of his spirit and bearing, the high order of his legislative and administrative talent, and the strength and energy of his will. He distinguished himself, first under Cœlestine (423–432) and Sextus III., (432–440,) as archdeacon and legate of the Roman Church. After the death of the latter, and while himself absent in Gaul, he was elected pope by the united

But when Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, took the part of Pelagius, Augustine and the African Church boldly opposed him, and made use of the Cyprianic right of protest. "Circumstances alter cases."

\* As Quesnel and most of his successors infer from Prosper's Chronicles, and a passage in Leo's Ep. xxxi, chap. 4, where he assigns among the reasons for not attending the council at Ephesus in 449, that he could not "*deserere patriam et sedem apostolicam*." *Patria*, however, may as well mean Italy, or at least the diocese of Rome, including the ten suburban provinces. In the *Liber pontificalis* he is called "*Natione Tuscus*," but in two manuscript copies "*Natione Romanus*." Canisius in the *Acta Sanctorum* adopts the former view. Butler reconciles the difficulty by supposing that he was descended of a noble Tuscan family, but born at Rome.

voice of clergy, senate, and people, and continued in that office one and twenty years, (440-461.) His feelings at the assumption of this high office he himself thus describes in one of his sermons: "Lord, I have heard your voice calling me, and I was afraid: I considered the work which was enjoined on me, and I trembled. For what proportion is there between the burden assigned to me and my weakness, this elevation and my nothingness. What is more to be feared than exaltation without merit, the exercise of the most holy functions being intrusted to one who is buried in sin. O you have laid upon me this heavy burden, bear it with me, I beseech you; be you my guide and my support."

During the time of his pontificate he was almost the only great man in the Roman empire, developed extraordinary activity, and took a leading part in all the affairs of the Church. His private life is entirely unknown, and we have no reason to question the purity of his motives or of his morals. His official zeal and all his time and strength were devoted to the interests of Christianity. But with him the interests of Christianity were identical with the universal dominion of the Roman Church.

He was animated with the unwavering conviction that the Lord himself had committed to him, as the successor of Peter, the care of the entire Church.\* He anticipated all the dogmatical arguments by which the power of the papacy was subsequently established. He refers the *petra*, on which the Church is built, to Peter and his confession. Though Christ himself, to sum up his view on the subject, is in the highest sense the rock and foundation, beside which no other can be laid; yet, by transfer of his authority, the Lord made Peter the rock in virtue of his great confession, and built on him the indestructible temple of his Church. In Peter the fundamental relation of Christ to his Church comes, as it were, to concrete form and reality in history. To him specially and

\* Ep. v, ad Episcopos Metrop. per Illyricum constitutos tome ii, (ed. Ball. I, 617, in Mignes Patristic Libr., vol. i-iv, p. 515.) Quia per omnes ecclesias cura nostra distenditur, exigente hoc a nobis Domino, qui apostolicæ dignitatis beatissimo apostolo Petro primatum fidei suæ remuneratione commisit, universalem ecclesiam in fundamenti ipsius [Quesnel proposes *istius* for *ipstius*] soliditate constituens, necessitatem sollicitudinis quam habemus, cum his qui nobis collegii caritate juncti sunt, sociamus."

individually the Lord intrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven; to the other apostles only in their general and corporate capacity. For the faith of Peter the Lord specially prayed in the hour of his passion, as if the standing of the other apostles would be the firmer if the mind of their leader remained unconquered. On Peter rests the steadfastness of the whole apostolic college in the faith. To him the Lord, after his resurrection, committed the care of his sheep and lambs. Peter is therefore the pastor and prince of the whole Church, through whom Christ exercises his universal dominion on earth. This primacy, however, is not limited to the apostolic age, but, like the faith of Peter, and like the Church herself, it perpetuates itself; and it perpetuates itself through the bishops of Rome, who are related to Peter as Peter was related to Christ. As Christ in Peter, so Peter in his successors lives and speaks and perpetually executes the commission, "Feed my sheep." It was by special direction of Divine Providence that Peter labored and died in Rome, and sleeps with thousands of blessed martyrs in holy ground. The center of worldly empire alone can be the center of the kingdom of God. Yet the political position of Rome would be of no importance without the religious considerations. By Peter was Rome, which had been the center of all error and superstition, transformed into the metropolis of the Christian world, and invested with a spiritual dominion far wider than her former earthly empire. Hence the bishopric of Constantinople, not being a *sedes apostolica*, but resting its dignity on a political basis alone, can never rival the Roman, whose primacy is rooted both in divine and human right. Antioch also, where Peter only transiently resided, and Alexandria, where he planted the Church through his disciple Mark, stand only in a secondary relation to Rome, where his bones repose, and where that was completed which in the East was only laid out. The Roman bishop is, therefore, the *primus omnium episcoporum pastorum*, and on him devolves the *plenitudo potestatis*, the *solicitudo omnium pastorum*, and *communis cura universalis ecclesie*.\*

\* These views Leo repeatedly expresses in his sermons on the festival of St. Peter, and on the anniversary of his own elevation, as well as in his official letters to the African, Illyrian, and South Gallic bishops, to Dioscurus of Alexandria, to the Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, to the Emperor Marcian, and

Leo thus made out of a primacy of grace and of personal fitness a primacy of right and of succession. Of his person, indeed, he speaks in his sermons with great humility, but only thereby the more to exalt his official character. He tells the Romans that the true celebration of the anniversary of his accession is, to recognize, honor, and obey, in his lowly person, Peter himself, who still cares for shepherd and flock, and whose dignity is not lacking even to his unworthy heir.\* Here, therefore, we already have that characteristic combination of humility and arrogance which has stereotyped itself in the expressions, "Servant of the servant of God," "Vicar of Christ," and even "God upon earth." In this double consciousness of his personal unworthiness and his official exaltation, Leo annually celebrated the day of his elevation to the chair of Peter. While Peter himself passes over his prerogative in silence, and expressly warns against hierarchical assumption,† Leo cannot speak frequently and emphatically enough of his authority. While Peter in Antioch meekly submits to the rebuke of the junior apostle Paul,‡ Leo pronounces resistance to his authority to be impious pride and the sure way to hell.§ Obedience to the pope is thus necessary to salvation. Whosoever says he is not with the apostolic see, that is, with the head of the body, whence all gifts of grace descend throughout the body, is not in the body of the Church, and has no part in her grace. This is the fearful but legitimate logic of the papal principle, which confines the kingdom of God to the narrow lines of a particular organization, and makes the universal spiritual reign of Christ dependent on a temporal form and a human organ. But in its very first application this papal ban proved itself a *brutum fulmen*, when, in

the Empress Pulcheria. Particular proof passages are unnecessary. Comp. especially Ep. x, xi, civ, cvi, (ed. Baller.,) and Perthel, 1. c. pp. 226-241, where the chief passages are given in full.

\* "Cujus dignitas etiam in indigno hærede non deficit." Sermo iii, in Natal, ordin. c. 4, (vol. i, p. 13, ed. Ball.) "Etsi necessarium est trepidare de merito, religiosum est tamen gaudere de dono: quoniam qui mihi oneris est auctor, ipse est administrationis adjutor." Sermon ii, c. i.

† 1 Pet. v, 3.

‡ Galatians ii, 11.

§ Ep. x, c. ii, (ed. Ball. i, p. 634; ed. Migne, vol. liv, p. 630,) to the Gallican bishops in the matter of Hilary: "Cui (se Petro) quisquis principatum æstimat denegandum, illius quidem nullo modo potest minuire dignitatem; sed *inflatu spiritu superbiæ suæ semetipsum in inferna demergit.*" Comp. Ep. clxiv, 3; clvii, 3.

spite of it, the Gallican Archbishop Hilary, against whom it was directed, died universally esteemed and loved, and then was canonized. This very impracticability of that principle which would exclude all Greek and Protestant Christians from the kingdom of heaven, is a refutation of the principle itself.

In carrying his idea of the papacy into effect Leo displayed the cunning tact, the diplomatic address, and the iron consistency which characterize the greatest popes of the middle age. The circumstances in general were in his favor: the East rent by dogmatic controversies; Africa devastated by the barbarians; the West weak in a weak emperor; nowhere a powerful and pure bishop or divine, like Athanasius, Augustine, or Jerome in the former generation; the overthrow of the western empire at hand; a new age breaking, with new peoples, for whose childhood the papacy was just the needful school; the most numerous and the last important general council convened; and the system of ecumenical orthodoxy ready to be closed with the decision concerning the relation of the two natures in Christ.

Leo first took advantage of the distractions of the North African Church under the Arian Vandals, and wrote to its bishops in the tone of an acknowledged over-shepherd. Under the stress of the times, and in the absence of a towering character like Cyprian and Augustine, the Africans submitted to his authority, (443.) He banished the remnants of the Manicheans and Pelagians from Italy, and threatened the bishops with his anger if they should not purge their Churches of the heresy. In East Illyria, which was important to Rome as the ecclesiastical outpost toward Constantinople, he succeeded in regaining and establishing the supremacy which had been acquired by Damasus, but had afterward slipped away. Anastasius of Thessalonica applied to him to be confirmed in his office. Leo granted the prayer in 444, extending the jurisdiction of Anastasius over all the Illyrian bishops, but reserving to them a right of appeal in important cases, which ought to be decided by the pope according to divine revelation. And a case to his purpose soon presented itself, in which Leo brought his vicar to feel that he was called indeed to a participation of his care, but not to a plenitude of power, (*plenitudo potestatis*.) In the affairs of the Spanish Church, also, Leo had an

opportunity to make his influence felt, when Turibius, Bishop of Astorga, besought his intervention against the Priscillianists. He refuted those heretics point by point, and on the basis of his exposition the Spaniards drew up an orthodox *regula fidei* with eighteen anathemas against the Priscillianist error.

But in Gaul he met with a strenuous antagonist in Archbishop Hilary of Arles, an energetic and unyielding representative of Gallican independence from Romish interference; and though he called the secular power to his aid, and procured from the Emperor Valentinian an edict entirely favorable to his claims, he attained but a partial victory. Hilary never submitted to Rome, died in the possession of his metropolitan power, and was canonized as a saint alongside with his papal antagonist, who had cut him off from the communion of the Church of Rome. Still less successful was his effort to establish his primacy in the East, and to prevent his rival at Constantinople from being elevated, by the famous twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon, to official equality with himself. His earnest protest against that decree produced no lasting effect. But otherwise he had the most powerful influence in the second stage of the christological controversy. He neutralized the tyranny of Dioscurus of Alexandria, and the results of the shameful robber-council of Ephesus (449) furnished the chief occasion of the fourth ecumenical council, presided over it by his legates, (which the Roman bishop had done at neither of the three councils before,) and gave the turn to the final solution of its doctrinal problem by that celebrated letter to Flavian of Constantinople, the main points of which were incorporated in the new symbol. Yet he owed this influence by no means to his office alone, but most of all to his deep insight of the question, and to the masterly tact with which he held the Catholic orthodox mean between the Alexandrian and Antiochian, Eutychian and Nestorian extremes. The particulars of his connection with this important dogma belong, however, to the history of doctrine.

Besides thus shaping the polity and doctrine of the Church, Leo did immortal service to the city of Rome in twice rescuing it from destruction.\* When Attila, king of the Huns, the "scourge of God," after destroying Aquileia, was seriously

\* Comp. Perthel, l. c. p. 90 sqq., and p. 104 sqq.

threatening the capital of the world, (A.D. 452,) Leo, with only two companions, crozier in hand, trusting in the help of God, ventured into the hostile camp, and by his venerable form, his remonstrances, and his gifts, changed the wild heathen's purpose. The later legend, which Raphael's pencil has employed, adorned the fact with a visible appearance of Peter and Paul, accompanying the bishop with drawn sword, and threatening Attila with destruction unless he should desist.\* A similar case occurred several years after, (455,) when the Vandal king, Genseric, invited out of revenge by the Empress Eudoxia, pushed his ravages to Rome. Leo obtained from him the promise that at least he would spare the city the inflictions of murder and fire; but the barbarians subjected it to a fourteen days' pillage, the enormous spoils of which they transported to Carthage; and afterward the pope did everything to alleviate the consequent destitution and suffering, and to restore the churches.† Leo died in 461, and was buried in the Church of St. Peter. The day and circumstances of his death are unknown.‡

The literary works of Leo consist of ninety-six sermons and one hundred and seventy-three epistles, including epistles of others to him. They are earnest, forcible, full of thought, churchly, abounding in bold antitheses and allegorical freaks of exegesis, and sometimes heavy, turgid, and obscure in style. His collection of sermons is the first we have from a Roman bishop. In his inaugural discourse he declared preaching to be his sacred duty. The sermons are short and simple, and were delivered mostly on high festivals and on the anniversaries of his own elevation.§ Other works ascribed to him, such

\* Leo himself says nothing of his mission to Attila. Prosper, in *Chronicles* ad ann. 452, mentions it briefly and Canisius, in *Vita Leonis*, (in *Acta Sanctorum*, for the month of April tome ii, p. 18,) with later exaggerations.

† Comp. Leo's eighty-fourth sermon, which was preached soon after the departure of the Vandals, and Prosper, *Chronicles* ad ann. 455.

‡ The Roman Calendar places his name on the 11th of April. But different writers fix his death on June 28, Oct. 30, (Quesnel,) Nov. 4, (Pagi,) Nov. 10, (Butler.) Butler quotes the concession of Bower, the apostate Jesuit, who in his *Lives of the Popes* says of Leo that "he was without doubt a man of extraordinary parts, far superior to all who had governed that Church before him, and scarce equaled by any since."

§ *Sermones de natali*. Canisius (in *Acta Sanctorum*, l. c., p. 17) calls Leo "Christianum Demosthenem."

as that on the calling of all nations,\* which takes a middle ground on the doctrine of predestination, with the view to reconcile the Semi-pelagians and Augustinians, are of doubtful genuineness.

The first Leo and the first Gregory are the two greatest bishops of Rome in the first six centuries. Between them no important personage appears on the chair of Peter; and in the course of that intervening century the idea and the power of the papacy make no material advance. In truth, they went further in Leo's mind than they did in Gregory's. Leo thought and acted as an absolute monarch; Gregory as first among the patriarchs; yet both under the full conviction that they were the successors of Peter.

After the death of Leo, the Archdeacon Hilary, who had represented him at the Council of Ephesus, was elected to his place, and ruled (461-468) upon his principles, asserting the strict orthodoxy in the East and the authority of the primacy in Gaul.

His successor, Simplicius, (468-483,) saw the final dissolution of the empire under Romulus Augustulus, (476,) but, as he takes not the slightest notice of it in his epistles, he seems to have ascribed to it but little importance. The papal power had been rather favored than hindered in its growth by the imbecility of the latest emperors. Now, to a certain extent, it stepped into the imperial vacancy, and the successor of Peter became, in the mind of the western nations, sole heir of the old Roman imperial succession.

On the fall of the empire the pope became the political subject of the barbarian and heretical (for they were Arian) kings; but these princes, as most of the heathen emperors had done, allowed him, either from policy, or from ignorance or indifference, entire freedom in ecclesiastical affairs. In Italy the Catholics had by far the ascendancy in numbers and in culture, and the Arianism of the new rulers was rather an outward profession than an inward conviction. Odoacer, who

\* *De Vocatione Omnium Gentium*, a work highly praised even by Erasmus, Luther, Bullinger, and Grotius. Quesnel has only proved the possibility of Leo's being the author. (Comp. Perthel, l. c., p. 127 sqq.) The *Sacramentarium Leonis*, or a collection of liturgical prayers for all the festival days of the year, contains some of his prayers, but also many which are of a later date.

first assumed the kingdom of Italy, (476-493,) was tolerant toward the orthodox faith, yet attempted to control the papal election in 483 in the interest of the state, and prohibited, under penalty of the anathema, the alienation of church property by any bishop. Twenty years later a Roman council protested against this intervention of a layman, and pronounced the above prohibition null and void, but at the same time passed a similar decree against the alienation of church estate.\*

Pope FELIX II., or, according to another reckoning, III., (483-492,) continued the war of his predecessor against the Monophysitism of the East, rejected the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno as an unwarrantable intrusion of a layman in matters of faith, and ventured even the excommunication of the Bishop Acacius of Constantinople. Acacius replied with a counter anathema, with the support of the other eastern patriarchs; and the schism between the two Churches lasted over thirty years, to the pontificate of Hormisdas.

GELASIUS I. (492-496) clearly announced the principle that the priestly power is above the kingly and the imperial, and that from the decisions of the chair of Peter there is no appeal. Yet from this pope we have, on the other hand, a remarkable testimony against what he pronounces the "sacrilege" of withholding the cup from the laity, the *communio sub una specie*.

ANASTASIUS II. (496-498) indulged in a milder tone toward Constantinople, and incurred the suspicion of consent to its heresy.† His sudden death was followed by a contested papal election, which led to bloody encounters. The Ostrogothic king Theodoric, (the Dietrich of Bern in the *Nibelungenlied*,) the conqueror and master of Italy, (493-526,) and, like Odoacer, an Arian, was called into consultation in this contest, and gave his voice for Symmachus against Laurentius, because Symmachus had received the majority of votes, and had been consecrated first. But the party of Laurentius, not satisfied with this, raised against Symmachus the reproach of gross iniquities, even of adultery and of squandering the Church estates. The bloody scenes were renewed, priests were murdered, clois-

\* This was the fifth (al. fourth) council under Symmachus, held in November, 502, therefore later than the *synodus palmaris*. (Comp. Hefele, ii, p. 625 sqq.)

† Dante puts him in hell, and Baronius ascribes his sudden death to an evident judgment of God.

ters were burned, and nuns were insulted. Theodoric being again called upon by the senate for a decision, summoned a council at Rome, to which Symmachus gave his consent; and a synod, convoked by a heretical king, must decide upon the pope! In the course of the controversy several councils were held in rapid succession, the chronology of which is disputed.\* The most important was the *synodus palmaris*,† the fourth council under Symmachus, held in October, 501. It acquitted this pope without investigation, on the presumption that it did not behoove the council to pass judgment respecting the successor of St. Peter. In his vindication of this council—for the opposition was not satisfied with it—the deacon Ennodius, afterward Bishop of Pavia, (521,) gave the first clear expression to the absolution which Leo had already acted: that the Roman bishop is above every human tribunal, and is responsible only to God himself.‡ Nevertheless, even in the middle age, popes were deposed and set up by emperors and general councils. This is one of the points of dispute between the absolute papal system and the constitutional episcopal system in the Roman Church, which was left unsettled even by the Council of Trent.

Under Hormisdas (514–523) the Monophysite party in the Greek Church was destroyed by the energetic zeal of the orthodox Emperor Justin, and in 519 the union of that Church with Rome was restored after a schism of five and thirty years.

Theodoric offered no hinderance to the transactions and embassies, and allowed his most distinguished subject to assert his ecclesiastical supremacy over Constantinople. This semi-barbarous and heretical prince was tolerant in general, and very liberal toward the Catholic Church; even rising to the principle which has waited till the modern age for its recognition, that the power of the prince should be restricted to civil government, and should permit no trespass on the con-

\* Comp. Hefele, ii, p. 615 sqq.

† So named from the building in Rome in which it was held: "A porticu beati Petri Apostoli, quæ appellatur ad Palmaria," as Anastasius says. In the histories of councils it is erroneously given as Synodus III. Many historians, Giesler among them, place it in the year 503.

‡ Libellus apologeticus pro Synodo IV. Romana, in Mansi VIII., 274. This vindication was solemnly adopted by the sixth Roman council under Symmachus, in 503, and made equivalent to a decree of council.

science of its subjects. No one, says he, shall be forced to believe against his will. Yet, toward the close of his reign, on mere political suspicion, he ordered the execution of the celebrated philosopher Boethius, with whom the old Roman literature far more worthily closes than the Roman empire with Augustulus; and on the same ground he caused the death of the senator Symmachus and the incarceration of Pope John I., (523-526.)

Almost the last act of his reign was the nomination of the worthy *Felix III.* (IV.) to the papal chair after a protracted struggle of contending parties. With the appointment he issued the order that hereafter, as heretofore, the pope should be elected by clergy and people, but should be confirmed by the temporal prince before assuming his office; and with this understanding the clergy and the city gave their consent to the nomination.

Yet, in spite of this arrangement, in the election of Boniface II. (530-532) and John II. (532-535) the same disgraceful quarreling and briberies occurred; a sort of chronic disease in the history of the papacy.

Soon after the death of Theodoric (526) the Gothic empire fell to pieces through internal distraction and imperial weakness. Italy was conquered by Belisarius, (535,) and, with Africa, again incorporated with the East-Roman empire, which renewed under Justinian its ancient splendor, and enjoyed a transient after-summer. And yet this powerful orthodox emperor was a slave to the intriguing, heretical Theodora, whom he had raised from the theater to the throne; and Belisarius likewise, his victorious general, was completely under the power of his wife Antonina.

With the conquest of Italy the popes fell into a perilous and unworthy dependence on the emperor at Constantinople, who revered, indeed, the Roman chair, but not less that of Constantinople, and in reality sought to use both as tools of his own State-Church despotism. Agapetus (535-536) offered fearless resistance to the arbitrary course of Justinian, and successfully protested against the elevation of the Eutychian Anthimus to the patriarchal see of Constantinople. But, by the intrigues of the Monophysite empress, his successor, Pope

Silverius, (a son of Hormisdas, 536-538,) was deposed on the charge of treasonable correspondence with the Goths, and banished to the island of Pandataria, whither the worst heathen emperors used to send the victims of their tyranny, and where, in 540, he died, whether a natural or a violent death we do not know.

Vigilius, a pliant creature of Theodora, ascended the papal chair under the military protection of Belisarius, (538-554.) The empress had promised him this office and a sum of money on condition that he nullify the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and pronounce Anthimus and his friends orthodox. The ambitious and double-tongued prelate accepted the condition and accomplished the deposition, and, perhaps, the death of Silverius. In his pontificate occurred the violent controversy of the three chapters and the second general Council of Constantinople, (553.) His administration was an unprincipled vacillation between the dignity and duties of his office and subservience to an alien theological and political influence; between repeated condemnation of the three chapters in behalf of a Eutychianizing spirit and repeated retraction of that condemnation. In Constantinople, where he resided several years at the instance of the emperor, he suffered much personal persecution, but without the spirit of martyrdom, and without its glory. For example, at least according to western accounts, he was violently torn from the altar upon which he was holding with both hands so firmly, that the posts of the canopy fell in above him; he was dragged through the streets with a rope round his neck and cast into a common prison because he would not submit to the will of Justinian and his council. Yet he yielded at last, through fear of deposition. He obtained permission to return to Rome, but died in Sicily of the stone on his way thither, (554.)

PELAGIUS I., (554-560,) by order of Justinian, whose favor he had previously gained as papal legate at Constantinople, was made successor of Vigilius, but found only two bishops ready to consecrate him. His close connection with the East, and his approval of the fifth ecumenical council, which was regarded as a partial concession to the Eutychian christology, and, so far, an impeachment of the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, alienated many western bishops even in Italy, and

induced a temporary suspension of their connection with Rome. He issued a letter to the whole Christian world, in which he declared his entire agreement with the first four general councils, and then vindicated the fifth as in no way departing from the Chalcedonian dogma. But only by the military aid of Narses could he secure subjection; and the most refractory bishops, those of Aquileia and Milan, he sent as prisoners to Constantinople.

In these two Justinian-made popes we see how much the power of the Roman hierarchy was indebted to its remoteness from the Byzantine despotism, and how much it was injured by contact with it.

With the descent of the Arian Longobards into Italy, after 568, the popes again became more independent of the Byzantine court. They continued under tribute indeed to the exarchs in Ravenna, as the representatives of the Greek emperors, (from 554,) and were obliged to have their election confirmed and their inauguration superintended by them. But the feeble hold of these officials in Italy, and the pressure of the Arian barbarians upon them, greatly favored the popes, who, being the richest proprietors, enjoyed also great political consideration in Italy, and applied their influence to the maintenance of law and order amid the reigning confusion.

In other respects the administrations of John III., (560–573,) Benedict I., (574–578,) and Pelagius II., (578–590,) are among the darkest and the most sterile in the annals of the papacy.

But with GREGORY I. (590–604) a new period begins. Next to Leo I. he was the greatest of the ancient bishops of Rome, and he marks the transition of the patriarchal system into the strict papacy of the middle ages. He comes, it is true, with more modest claims than Leo, who surpassed him in boldness, energy, and consistency. He even solemnly protested, as his predecessor Pelagius II. had done, against the title of *universal* bishop, which the Constantinopolitan patriarch, John Jejunator, adopted at a council in 587;\* and he declared it an *anti-christian* assumption, in terms which quite remind us of the

\* Even Justinian repeatedly applied to the patriarch of Constantinople officially the title *οικουμενικός πατριάρχης*, *universalis patriarcha*.

patriarchal equality, and seem to form a step in recession from the ground of Leo. But when we take his operations in general into view, and remember the rigid consistency of the papacy, which never forgets, we are almost justified in thinking that this protest was directed not so much against the title itself as against the bearer of it, and proceeded more from jealousy of a rival at Constantinople than from sincere humility.\* From the same motive the Roman bishops avoided the title of *patriarch*, as placing them on a level with the eastern patriarchs, and preferred the title of *pope*, from a sense of the specific dignity of the chair of Peter. Gregory is said to have been the first to use the humble-proud title, "Servant of the servants of God," (*servus servorum Dei*), which ill agrees with the claims of the vicar of Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, and the representative of God almighty on earth! His successors, notwithstanding his remarkable protest, called themselves freely the "universal bishops of Christendom." What he had condemned in his oriental colleagues as anti-christian arrogance, the latter popes considered but the appropriate expression of their official position in the Church universal.

It is not our object to pursue the development of the papacy any further through its varying fortunes, misfortunes, conflicts, and triumphs during the middle ages; its split, decline, and terrible ordeal during the Reformation; its subsequent revival during the Indian summer of Jesuitical restoration; its present crisis and prospects. We will only offer, in conclusion, a few general reflections from a purely historical point of observation.

The papacy is undeniably the result of a long process of

\* Bellarmine disposes of this apparent testimony of one of the great and best popes against the system of popery which has frequently been urged since Calvin by Protestant controversialists, by assuming that the term *episcopus universalis* is used in two very different senses. "Respondeo," he says in his great controversial work, *De Controversiis Christianæ Fidei, etc., de Romano Pontifice*, lib. ii, cap. 31,) duobus modis posse intelligi nomen universalis episcopi. Uno modo, ut ille, qui dicitur universalis, intelligatur esse solus episcopus omnium urbium Christianarum, ita ut cæteri non sint episcopi, sed vicarii tantum illius, qui dicitur episcopus universalis, et hoc modo nomen hoc est vere profanum, sacrilegum et antichristianum. . . . Altero modo dici potest episcopus universalis, qui habet curam totius ecclesiæ, sed generalem, ita ut non excludat particulares episcopos. Et hoc modo nomen hoc posse tribui Romano pontifici ex mente Gregorii probatur."

history. Centuries were employed in building it, and centuries have already been engaged upon its partial destruction. Lust of honor and of power, and even open fraud,\* have contributed to its development; for human nature lies hidden under episcopal robes, with its steadfast inclination to abuse the power intrusted to it; and the greater the power, the stronger is the temptation and the worse the abuse. But behind and above these human impulses lay the needs of the Church and the plans of Providence, and these are the proper basis for explaining the rise, as well as the subsequent decay, of the papal dominion over the countries and nations of Europe.

That Providence which moves the helm of the history of the world and Church, according to an eternal plan, not only prepares in silence and a secrecy unknown even to themselves the suitable persons for a given work, but also lays in the depths of the past the foundations of mighty institutions, that they may appear thoroughly furnished as soon as the time may demand them. Thus the origin and gradual growth of the Latin patriarchate at Rome looked forward to the middle age, and formed part of the necessary external outfit of the Church for her disciplinary mission among the heathen barbarians. The vigorous hordes who destroyed the West-Roman empire were to be themselves built upon the ruins of the old civilization, and trained by an awe-inspiring ecclesiastical authority and a firm hierarchical organization to Christianity and freedom, till, having come of age, they should need the legal schoolmaster no longer, and should cast away his cords from them. The Catholic hierarchy, with its pyramid-like culmination in the papacy, served among the Romanic and Germanic peoples, until the time of the Reformation, a purpose similar to that of the Jewish theocracy and the old Roman empire respectively in the inward and outward preparation for Christianity. The full exhibition of this pedagogic purpose belongs to the history of the middle age; but the foundation for it we

\* Recall the interpolations of papistic passages in the works of Cyprian; the Roman enlargement of the sixth canon of Nice; the citation of the Sardican canon under the name and authority of the Nicene council; and the latter notorious pseudo-Isidorian decretals. The popes, to be sure, were not the original authors of these falsifications, but they used them freely and repeatedly for their purposes.

find already being laid in the Nicene and post-Nicene age, especially in the reign of that most remarkable man who is the prominent figure in this article.

But the very reason we have assigned for the historical or temporal (not divine or eternal) right and necessity of the papacy is the best reason for its downfall, and instead of weakening the cause of Protestantism, gives it a powerful weapon in its controversy with Rome. Admitting that Romanism and popery were a wholesome school of discipline for the nations of the dark ages, we connect it inseparably with a lower stage of Christianity and civilization, and place its main power and significance in the past. To say that it *has had* its right, its necessity, its glory, is to say that it has it *no more*. The law of Moses was a schoolmaster to lead the Jewish nation to Christ, and looked to the Gospel as its fulfillment. The types and shadows of the Old Testament passed away when the substance appeared: the Jewish Sabbath was lost in the Christian Sunday, circumcision in baptism for the remission of sins, the passover in the holy communion, the daily sacrifice in the one eternal sacrifice of the cross. The whole Jewish religion was a religion of hope and of the future, constantly pointing beyond itself and finding its inmost sense and meaning in the Christian dispensation.

Then, again, every system of discipline looks toward manly self-government and independence. The mother cares and provides for her children, not to keep them in a helpless minority, but with a view to train them up to youth and independent manhood and womanhood. So the whole medieval Catholicism was a training school for evangelical freedom in Christ. Hence it is as impossible to turn Protestantism back into the swaddling clothes of medieval Romanism, as to change a grown man into an infant, or to turn the stream back to its fountain.

But here lies also the great difference between the Greek Catholic and the Evangelical Protestant opposition to the universal monarchy of the papacy. They are allies against Rome, but only in a negative point of view. They equally resist the claims of popery, but from altogether different positions and in a different spirit. The Greek and Russian Church protests against the papacy from the basis of the Nicene age

and the patriarchal oligarchy of the fourth and fifth centuries. Protestantism protests against it from the modern stand-point of religious freedom and popular self-government. The Greek Church rejects and abhors the papacy as a later innovation, which is, in fact, only a further development of its own hierarchical principle; Protestantism rejects and disowns the papacy as a superseded institution of the past, which has substantially answered its providential purposes and fulfilled its mission, at least as far as the great northern and western nations of Europe and America are concerned, who are the main bearers of the present and future history of the race, and represent the Christian religion in its irresistible motion and progress to the ends of the earth.

---

#### ART. IV.—WHEDON ON THE WILL.

*The Freedom of the Will as a Basis of Human Responsibility and of Divine Government.* By D. D. WHEDON, D.D. 12mo., pp. 438. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

THE nature, possibility, and explanation of the Freedom of the Will has been hitherto confessedly the *questio vexata* alike of the theologian and the metaphysician.

Dr. Chalmers, in his chapters on Philosophic Necessity, avows his conviction that the controversy on this subject is interminable. To his eye there seemed no promise of a pacific adjustment, and it bore every appearance of remaining a disputed question to the end of time. So far as the suffrages of learned men are concerned there is a powerful array of great names on both sides. We find Leibnitz, Hobbes, Hume, Lord Kames, Jonathan Edwards on the side of philosophic necessity. "And these are countervailed in authority, and greatly more than countervailed in number, by Clarke, Butler, Locke, Reid, and Stewart," (and we may now add Kant, M. de Biran, Cousin, Hamilton, and Mansel,) on the side of freedom. So that a survey of the entire field presented to the mind of Chalmers such organic and radical difference, both as to matters of fact