

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1865.

ART. I.—*The Development of the Ancient Catholic Hierarchy.*

A HISTORICAL ESSAY BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

THE primitive organisation of the Christian church as a visible body in, though not of, this world, was the *apostolical*; in other words, the church was ruled by men directly chosen by the Saviour, infallibly inspired by the Holy Ghost, and entrusted with a mission not confined to any particular charge, but as extensive as the human race. This form of government stands by itself, and differs from all subsequent organisations, which are under the control of fallible men with limited power and jurisdiction. Nevertheless, it lies at the foundation of all later forms of government, and is the permanent fountain of all that is essential and truly valuable in them. For the apostles are not dead, they still live in and for the church, they speak through their inspired writings with absolute authority, and through the testimony of every faithful minister, be he a Greek or Latin or Anglican bishop, or a presbyterian pastor, or a congregational preacher.

The second form of church government known in history may be styled *primitive presbyterian* or *congregational episcopacy*, as distinct from modern *diocesan* episcopacy. It comes clearly to view, first in the famous epistles of Ignatius at the beginning of the second century, and more fully in the writings of the early apologists down to the age of Irenæus and Tertullian. Each bishop here was regarded

as the visible representative of Christ, and the centre around which the college of presbyters and the whole congregation turns. But each bishop stood for himself, and there was as yet no centre of catholic unity except Christ himself, who gave himself as it were a local presence in every episcopal charge. These charges moreover were very small, and in most cases not larger than a respectable congregation.

The next step in the development of the hierarchical principle was the *metropolitan* episcopacy, as we find it from about the middle of the third century, with a special prominence of the so called *sedes apostolicæ* or *ecclesiæ matrices*, of apostolic foundation, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome.

Out of this metropolitan organisation grew, in the Nicene and post-Nicene age, the *patriarchal* form of government, which was retained by the Greek church to this day; while the Latin church went still further, and developed, during the long course of the middle ages, the *papal monarchy*.*

We shall endeavour to trace out the gradual growth and development of the ancient catholic hierarchy from Constantine I., down to the time of Leo I. and Gregory I., when the patriarchal oligarchy was completed in the East, and the

* We feel compelled, with regret and reluctance, to express a qualified dissent from the views here stated by our learned and talented contributor in regard to the primitive government of the Christian church. We could never discover in the New Testament any ground for representing the apostles as governors of the church. As inspired men, they instituted the government of the church, appointed its governors, and prescribed the laws by which it was to be governed. They were the legislators, and not the governors of the church. They were not even builders of the church: they laid its foundations. When Paul speaks of "the care of all the churches" which devolved on him, he can hardly be supposed to refer to anything beyond his paternal care for the welfare of the numerous churches which he had planted. When the apostles had occasion to take part in the administration of church-government, it appears that they associated themselves with the pastors or presbyters in general council (Acts xv. 6), on which occasion Peter "exhorted the presbyters, as being also a presbyter" (1 Pet. v. 1), and "after much disputing," the matter was carried by an unanimous vote of "the whole assembly," and the letters or decrees went forth in the joint names of "the apostles, and elders, and brethren" (Acts xv. 22, 23).

We venture further to question the statement, that the *primitive presbyterian* or *congregational episcopacy*, which appeared in the beginning of the second century, can be justly regarded as a "step in the development of the hierarchical principle," leading on to *metropolitan* episcopacy. In the primitive pastor, with "his college of presbyters," presiding over his flock, we can detect no approximation to the hierarchy. The first step in that direction was unquestionably the elevation of one of the pastors, originally only *primus inter pares*, to the dignity of a perpetual primacy over his brother-pastors of the same city or province; which led, by a process easily conceivable in the circumstances, to the metropolitan prelacy. It is not, however, so easy to see how the congregational superintendence of a pastor over his flock, could have developed itself by a single step into metropolitan hierarchy.—ED. B and F. E. R.

papal monarchy raised its claims in the West, but under the strong protest of the East.

We commence with the distinction made between the clerical order and the laity, which lies at the base of every form of the hierarchy, and forms its corner stone.

CLERGY AND LAITY.

The distinction between the clergy, as a distinct and peculiar order from the body of the laity or the people, is common to all non-Christian religions. The clergy or the priesthood is regarded as mediating between God and the people by prayer, intercession, and the offering of sacrifice on the altar. Here priest, sacrifice, and altar are inseparable conceptions. In the Old Testament, the priesthood was of divine appointment, but with a typical reference to Christ, the eternal high priest, who by his one sacrifice on the cross reconciled men to God, and continues his priestly office by his intercession at the right hand of the Father. By faith in Christ and baptism in his name we are all made partakers of the prophetic, priestly, and kingly character of Christ. This is the ideal which is held up before us, but which can only be gradually realised. The Christian church is an institution and training school for the kingdom of heaven, as well as a communion of saints. It must adapt itself to barbarians as well as civilised nations. Hence the idea of a priestly order, under a modified form, reappeared, or was transferred from the Old Testament to the Christian church, and served there in times past great educational purposes. Ignatius and Cyprian are the first distinguished representatives of the idea of the Christian priesthood or clergy, as distinct from the Christian people. In the Nicene age we find this idea already universally established both in the Greek and the Latin church. The apostolic idea of the universal priesthood of believers retreated in proportion, though it never passed entirely out of sight, but was from time to time asserted by such men as Augustine, Jerome, and even Pope Leo the Great.* The ordination, which was solemnised by the laying on of hands and prayer, with the addition at a later period of an anointing with oil and balsam, marked the formal entrance into the special priesthood, as

* Augustin De civitate Dei, lib. xx. c. 10: "*Erunt sacerdotes Dei et Christi et regnabunt cum eo mille annos* (Apoc. xx. 6): non utique de solis episcopis et presbyteris dictum est, qui proprie jam vocantur in ecclesia sacerdotes; sed sicut omnes Christianos divinus propter mysticum chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes, quoniam membra sunt unius sacerdotis. De quibus Petrus apostolus: *Plebs, inquit sancta, regale sacerdotium.*" Comp. Jerome ad Tit. i. 7; Ambrosiaster ad Eph. iv. 11; Leo I. Sermo iv. 1, (ed. Ballerini).

baptism initiated into the universal priesthood; and, like baptism, it bore an *indefeasible* character (*character indelebilis*). By degrees the priestly office assumed the additional distinction of celibacy, and of external marks, such as tonsure, and sacerdotal vestments, worn at first only during official service, then in everyday life.

The progress of the hierarchical principle also encroached gradually upon the original rights of the people in the election of their pastors;* but it did not as yet entirely suppress them till after the sixth or seventh century. The lower clergy were chosen by the bishops, the bishops by their colleagues in the province, and by the clergy. The fourth canon of Nice, probably at the instance of the Meletian schism, directed that a bishop should be instituted and consecrated by all, or at least by three, of the bishops of the province. This was not aimed, however, against the rights of the people, but against election by only one bishop—the act of Meletius. For the consent of the people in the choice of presbyters, and especially of bishops, long remained at least in outward form, in memory of the custom of the apostles and the primitive church. There was either a formal vote,† particularly when there were three or more candidates before the people, or the people were thrice required to signify their confirmation or rejection by the formula, “Worthy,” or “Unworthy.”‡ The influence of the people in this period appears most prominently in the election of bishops. The Roman bishop Leo, in spite of his papal absolutism, asserted the thoroughly republican principle, long since abandoned by his successors: “He who is to preside over all, should be elected by all.”§ Oftentimes

* According to Clemens Romanus, ad Corinth. c. 44, the consent of the whole congregation in the choice of their officers was the apostolic and post-apostolic custom; and the epistles of Cyprian, especially ep. 68, show that the same rule continued in the middle of the third century. Comp. Schaff's Church History, vol. i. sect. 106.

† Ζήτηση, Ψήφισμα, Ψήφος, scrutinium.

‡ Ἀξιος, dignus, or ἀνάξιος, indignus. Constitut. Apost. viii. 4. Concil. Aurelat. ii. (A.D. 452) c. 54. Gregor. Naz. Orat. xxi. According to a letter of Peter of Alexandria in Theodor. Hist. Eccl. iv. 22, the bishop in the East was elected *ἰσσηρίων συνίδω, ψήφω κληρικῶν, αἰτήσῃ λαῶν*. He himself was elected archbishop of Alexandria, and successor of Athanasius (A.D. 378), according to the desire of the latter, “by the unanimous consent of the clergy and of the chief men of the city” (iv. cap. 20), and, after his expulsion, he objected to his wicked successor Lurios among other things, that “he had purchased the episcopal office with gold, as though it had been a secular dignity, . . . and had not been elected by a *synod of bishops, by the votes of the clergy, or by the request of the people, according to the regulations of the church*,” iv. c. 22.

§ Epist. x. c. 4 (ed. Ballerini): “Expectarentur certa vota civium, testimonia populorum, quaereretur honoratorum arbitrium, electio clericorum.” In the same epist. c. 6: “*Qui praefuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur.*”

the popular will decided before the provincial bishops and the clergy assembled and the regular election could be held. Ambrose of Milan and Nectarius of Constantinople were appointed to the bishopric even before they were baptised; the former by the people, the latter by the Emperor Theodosius; though in palpable violation of the eightieth apostolic canon and the second Nicene.* Martin of Tours owed his elevation likewise to the popular voice, while some bishops objected to it on account of his small and wasted form.† Chrysostom was called from Antioch to Constantinople by the Emperor Arcadius in consequence of a unanimous vote of the clergy and people.‡ Sometimes the people acted under outside considerations and the management of demagogues, and demanded unworthy or ignorant men for the highest offices. Thus there were frequent disturbances and collisions, and even bloody conflicts, as in the election of Damasus in Rome. In short, all the selfish passions and corrupting influences which had spoiled the freedom of the popular political elections in the Grecian and Roman republics, and which appear also in the republics of modern times, intruded upon the elections of the church. And the clergy likewise often suffered themselves to be guided by impure motives. Chrysostom laments, that the presbyters, in the choice of a bishop, instead of looking only at spiritual fitness, were led by regard for noble birth, or great wealth, or consanguinity and friendship.§ The bishops themselves sometimes did no better. Nectarius, who was suddenly transferred in 381 by the Emperor Theodosius from the prætorship to the bishopric of Constantinople, even before he was baptised,|| wished to ordain his physician Martyrius deacon, and when the latter refused on the ground of incapacity, he replied, "Did not I, who am now a priest, formerly live much more immorally than thou, as thou thyself well knowest, since thou wast often an accomplice of

* Paulinus, Vita Ambros.; Sozomen, H. E. l. iv. c. 24, and vii. 8. This historian excuses the irregularity by a special interposition of Providence.

† Sulpitius Severus, Vita Mart. c. 7: "Incredibilis multitudo non solum ex eo oppido [Tours], sed etiam ex vicinis urbibus ad suffragia ferenda convenerat," &c.

‡ Socrates, H. E. vi. 2: Ψηφίσματα πανῶ ἡμῶ πάντων κλήρου τι φημι καὶ λαῶ.

§ De sacerdotio, lib. iii. c. 16. Further on in the same chapter he says even, that many are elected on account of their badness, to prevent the mischief they would otherwise do: Οἱ δὲ, διὰ πονηρίας (eis τὴν τοῦ κλήρου καταλίγονται τὰξιν), καὶ ἵνα μὴ, παρεφθίνουσιν, μεγάλην ἰσχύονταί κανά. Quite parallel is the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen in his Carmen: εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ περὶ ἰσχυρότων, or De se ipso et de episcopis, ver. 330 sqq. and elsewhere. (Opera ed Bened. Par. tom. ii. p. 796).

|| Sozomen., Hist. Eccl. vii. c. 8. Sozomen sees in this election a special interposition of God.

my many iniquities?" Martyrius, however, persisted in his refusal, because he had continued to live in sin long after his baptism, while Nectarius had become a new man since his.*

The emperor, also, after the middle of the fourth century, exercised a decisive influence in the election of metropolitans and patriarchs, and often abused it in a despotic and arbitrary way.

Thus every mode of appointment was evidently exposed to abuse, and could furnish no security against unworthy candidates, if the electors, whoever they might be, were destitute of moral earnestness, and the gift of spiritual discernment.

Towards the end of the period before us, the republican element in the election of bishops entirely disappeared. The Greek church after the eighth century vested the franchise exclusively in the bishops.† The Latin church after the eleventh century vested it in the clergy of the cathedral church, without allowing any participation to the people. But in the West, especially in Spain and France, instead of the people the temporal prince exerted an important influence, in spite of the frequent protest of the church.

Even the election of pope, after the downfall of the West Roman empire, came largely under control of the secular authorities of Rome; first, of the Ostrogothic kings; then, of the exarchs of Ravenna in the name of the Byzantine emperor; and, after Charlemagne, of the emperor of Germany; till in 1059, through the influence of Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII.), it was lodged exclusively with the college of cardinals, which was filled by the pope himself. Yet the papal absolutism of the middle age, like the modern Napoleonic military despotism in the state, found it well under favourable prospects to enlist the democratic principle for the advancement of its own interests.

MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

Another strong pillar of the hierarchy, closely connected with the idea of a special priesthood in distinction from the laity, is the celibacy of the clergy, which assumed a legal form likewise in the Nicene age. The progress and influence

* Sozomen. vii. c. 10. Otherwise he, as well as Socrates, H. E. v. c. 8, and Theodoret, H. E. v. c. 8, speak very favourably of the character of Nectarius.

† The seventh ecumenical council, at Nice, 787, in its third canon, on the basis of a wrong interpretation of the fourth canon of the first council of Nice, expressly prohibited the people and the secular power from any share in the election of bishops. Also the eighth general council prescribes, that the bishop should be chosen only by the college of bishops.

of monasticism, the general exaltation of the ascetic life above the social, and of celibacy above the married state, together with the increasing sharpness of the distinction between clergy and laity, all tended powerfully towards the celibacy of the clergy. What the apostle Paul, expressly discriminating a divine command from a human counsel, left to each one's choice, and advised in view of the oppressed condition of the Christians in the apostolic age, as a safer and less anxious state only for those who felt called to it by a special gift of grace, now through the stress of circumstances was made, at least in the Latin church, an inexorable law. What had been a voluntary and therefore an honourable exception now became the rule, and the former rule became the exception. Connubial intercourse appeared incompatible with the dignity and purity of the priestly office and of priestly functions, especially with the service of the altar. The clergy, as the moral order, could not remain below the moral ideal of monasticism extolled by all the fathers of the church, and must exhibit the same unconditional and undivided devotion to the church within the bosom of society, which monasticism exhibited without it. While placed by their calling in unavoidable contact with the world, they must vie with the monks, at least, in the virtue of sexual purity, and thereby increase their influence over the people. Moreover, the celibate life secured to the clergy greater independence towards the state and civil society, and thus favoured the interests of hierarchy. But on the other hand, it estranged them more and more from the sympathies and domestic relations of the people, and tempted them to the illicit indulgence of appetite, which perhaps did more injury to the cause of Christian morality and to the true influence of the clergy, than the advantage of forced celibacy could compensate.

In the practice of clerical celibacy, however, the Greek and the Latin churches diverged in the fourth century, and are to this day divided. The Greek church stopped half way, and limited the injunction of celibacy to the higher clergy, who were accordingly chosen generally from the monasteries or from the ranks of presbyters who had lost their wives; while the Latin church extended the law to the lower clergy, and at the same time carried forward the hierarchical principle to absolute papacy. The Greek church differs from the Latin, not by any higher moral standard of marriage, but only by a closer adherence to earlier usage, and by less consistent application of the ascetic principle. It is in theory as remote from the evangelical Protestant church as the Latin is, and approaches it only in practice.

It sets virginity far above marriage, and regards marriage only in its aspect of negative utility. In the single marriage of a priest, it sees in a measure a necessary evil, at best only a conditional good, a wholesome concession to the flesh for the prevention of immorality,* and requires of its highest office-bearers total abstinence from all matrimonial intercourse. It wavers, therefore, between a partial permission and a partial condemnation of priestly marriage.

In the East, one marriage was always allowed to the clergy, and at first even to bishops, and celibacy was left optional. Yet certain restrictions were early introduced, such as the prohibition of marriage *after* ordination (except in deacons and sub-deacons), as well as of *second* marriage *after* baptism; the apostolic direction, that a bishop should be the husband of *one* wife,† being taken as a prohibition of successive polygamy and, at the same time, as an allowance of one marriage. Besides second marriage, the marrying of a concubine, a widow, a harlot, a slave, and an actress, was forbidden to the clergy. With these restrictions, the "Apostolic Constitutions" and "Canons" expressly permitted the marriage of priests contracted *before* ordination, and the continuance of it *after* ordination.‡ The synod of Ancyra, in 314, permitted deacons to marry even *after* ordination, in case they had made a condition to that effect beforehand; otherwise they were to remain single or lose their office.§ The synod of New Caesarea, which was held at about the same time, certainly before 325, does not go beyond this, decreeing: "If a presbyter (not a deacon) marry (that is, after ordination), he shall be expelled from the Clergy; and if he practise lewdness, or become an adulterer, he shall be utterly thrust out and held to penance."|| At the general council of Nice, 325, it was proposed, indeed, probably by the western bishop Hosius,¶ for to forbid entirely the marriage of priests; but the motion met with strong opposition, and was rejected. A venerable Egyptian bishop, Paphnutius, though himself a strict ascetic from his youth up, and a confessor who in the

* 1 Cor. vii. 9.

† 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6.

‡ Lib. vi. cap. 17 (ed. Ueltzen, p. 144): 'Επίσκοποι και κρησβύτηροι και διάκονοι [thus including the bishop] ἵστανται μονογάμοι καθίστασθαι . . . μὴ ἕξειναι ἄλλα μετὰ χειροτονίας ἀγάμοι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπιγάμοι ἱερωσῆται, &c. Can. Apost. can. 17 (p. 241): 'Ο δυοὶ γάμοι συμπλακίσι μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα . . . οὐ δύνασται εἶναι ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κρησβύτης ἢ διάκονος ἢ ἄλλος τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ. Comp. can. 18 and can. 5.

§ Can. 10. Comp. Dr Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. p. 198.

|| Can. 1. In Harduin, tom. v. p. 1499. Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. 211, sq. This canon passed even into the Corpus juris can. c. 9, Dist. 28.

¶ Hosius of Cordova, who was present at the council of Elvira in Spain in 305, where a similar proposition was made and carried (can. 88). In the opinion above given, Theiner, Gieseler, Robertson, and Hefele agree.

last persecution had lost an eye and been crippled in the knee, asserted with impressiveness and success, that too great rigour would injure the church and promote licentiousness, and that marriage and connubial intercourse were honourable and spotless things.* The council of Gangra in Paphlagonia, (according to some, not till the year 380), condemned, among several ascetic extravagances of the bishop Eustathius of Sebaste and his followers, contempt for married priests, and refusal to take part in their ministry. The so-called *Apostolic Canons*, which, like the *Constitutions*, arose by a gradual growth in the East, even forbid the clergy, on pain of deposition and excommunication, to put away their wives under the pretext of religion.† Perhaps this canon likewise was occasioned by the hyper-asceticism of Eustathius.

Accordingly, we not unfrequently find in the Oriental church, so late as the fourth and fifth centuries, not only priests, but even bishops, living in wedlock. One example is the father of the celebrated Gregory Nazianzen, who while bishop had two sons, Gregory and the younger Caesarius, and a daughter. Others are Gregory of Nyssa, who, however, wrote an enthusiastic eulogy of the unmarried life, and lamented his loss of the crown of virginity; and Synesius (about 490), who, when elected bishop of Ptolemais in Pentapolis, expressly stipulated for the continuance of his marriage connection.§ Socrates, whose Church History reaches

* See the account in Socrates, H. E. I. c. 11, where that proposition to prohibit priestly marriage is called an innovation, a *νόμος νεωρέος*; in Sozomen, H. E. I. c. 28; and in Gelasius, Hist. Conc. Nic. II. 32. The statement is thus sufficiently accredited, and agrees entirely with the ancient practice of the oriental church and the directions of the apostolic constitutions and canons. The third canon of the council of Nice goes not against it, since it forbids only the immorality of *mulieres subintroductae*. The doubts of several Roman divines (Baronius, Bellarmine, Valesius), who would fain trace the celibacy of the clergy to an apostolic origin, arise evidently from dogmatic bias, and are sufficiently refuted by Hefele, a Roman Catholic historian, in his *Concilien-geschichte*, vol. i. p. 417, sqq.

† Comp. Hefele, l. c. i. 763, sqq.

‡ Can. 5. (ed. Ueltzen, p. 289): "Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μὴ ἐβαλλῆναι προφάσει ὑλαβείας· ἰὰν δὲ ἐβαλλῆ, ἀφορίζεσθαι, ἰαμίριον δὲ παταγίσθαι." Comp. Const. Apost. VI. 17.

§ Declaring, "God, the law, and the consecrated hand of Theophilus (bishop of Alexandria), have given me a wife. I say now beforehand, and I protest, that I will neither ever part from her, nor live with her in secret as if in an unlawful connection; for the one is utterly contrary to religion, the other to the laws; but I desire to receive many and good children from her" (Epist. 105 ad Basil., cited in the original Greek in Gieseler). Comp. on the instances of married bishops, Bingham, *Christ. Antiq. b. iv. ch 5*; J. A. Theiner and A. Theiner, *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit der christl. Geistlichen w. ihre Folgen* (Altenburg, 1828), vol. i. p. 263, sqq., and Gieseler, vol. i., div. 2, § 97, notes at the close. The marriage of Gregory of

down to the year 445, says of the practice of his time, that in Thessalia matrimonial intercourse after ordination had been forbidden under penalty of deposition since Heliodorus of Trica, who in his youth had been an amatory writer; but that in the East the clergy and bishops voluntarily abstained from intercourse with their wives, without being required by any law to do so; for many, he adds, have had children during their episcopate by their lawful wives.* There were Greek divines, however, like Epiphanius, who agreed with the Roman theory. Justinian I. was utterly opposed to the marriage of priests, declared the children of such connection illegitimate, and forbade the election of a married man to the episcopal office, (A.D. 528). Nevertheless, down to the end of the seventh century many bishops in Africa, Libya, and elsewhere, continued to live in the married state, as is expressly said in the twelfth canon of the Trullan council; yet this gave offence and was forbidden. From that time the marriage of bishops gradually disappears, while marriage among the lower clergy continues to be the rule.

This Trullan council, which was the sixth ecumenical,† (A.D. 692), closes the legislation of the Eastern church on the subject of clerical marriage. Here, to anticipate somewhat, the continuance of a first marriage contracted before ordination was prohibited in the case of bishops on pain of deposition; but, in accordance with the apostolic constitutions and canons, allowed in the case of presbyteries and deacons (contrary to the Roman practice), with the Old Testament restriction, that they abstain from sexual intercourse during the season of official service, because he who administers holy things must be pure.‡ The same relation is thus condemned in the one case as immoral, in the other, approved and encouraged as moral; the bishop is deposed if he retains his lawful wife and does not, immediately after being ordained, send her to a distant cloister; while the presbyter or deacon is threatened with deposition and even

Nyssa with Theosabia is disputed by some Roman Catholic writers, but seems well supported by Greg. Naz. Ep. gs., and Greg. Nyss. De virg. 3.

* Hist. Eccl. V. cap 22: Τῶν ἰν ἀνατελῆ πάντων γάμῃ (i. e. from principle or voluntarily,—according to the reading of the Florentine codex) ἀπιχομίμων, καὶ τῶν ἰσιεκόντων, εἰ καὶ βούλονται, οὐ μὴ ἀνάγκη νόμου τοῦτο ποιούτων. Πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἰν τῷ κληρῷ τῆς ἰσισοκτῆς καὶ παιδῆς ἰν τῆς νομίμῃ; γαμμητῆς πιστοῦσασιν.

† More precisely, the second Trullan council, held in the Trullan hall of the imperial palace in Constantinople; also called *Consilium quinisextum*, συνέδριος πενθίκτη, being considered a supplement to the fifth and sixth general councils Comp. respecting it Hefele. iii. 298, sqq.

‡ Can. 8, 4, and especially 12, 13, and 48. In the latter canon, bishops are directed, after ordination, to commit their wives to a somewhat remote cloister though to provide for their support

excommunication for doing the opposite, and putting his wife away.

The Western church, starting from the perverted and almost Manichæan ascetic principle, that the married state is incompatible with clerical dignity and holiness, instituted a vigorous effort at the end of the fourth century, to make celibacy, which had hitherto been left to the option of individuals, the universal law of the priesthood; thus placing itself in direct contradiction to the Levitical law, to which, in other respects, it made so much account of conforming. The law, however, though repeatedly enacted, could not for a long time be consistently enforced. The canon, already mentioned, of the Spanish council of Elvira in 305, was only provincial. The first prohibition of clerical marriage, which laid claim to universal ecclesiastical authority, at least in the West, proceeded in 385 from the Roman Church in the form of a decretal letter of the bishop Siricius to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona in Spain, who had referred several questions of discipline to the Roman bishop for decision. It is significant of the connection between the celibacy of the clergy and the interest of the hierarchy, that the first properly papal decree, which was issued in the tone of supreme authority, imposed such an unscriptural, unnatural, and morally dangerous restriction. Siricius contested the appeal of dissenting parties to the Mosaic law, on the ground that the Christian priesthood has to stand not merely for a time, but perpetually, in the service of the sanctuary, and that it is not hereditary like the Jewish; and he ordained, that second marriage and marriage with a widow should incapacitate for ordination, and that continuance in the married state after ordination should be punished with deposition.* And with this punishment he threatened not bishops only, but also presbyters and deacons. Leo the Great subsequently extended the requirement of celibacy even to the subdiaconate.

* Epist. ad Himerium Episc. Tarraconensem (in Harduin, i. 849-850), c. 7, "Il vero, qui illiciti privilegii excusatione nituntur, ut sibi asserant veteri hoc lege concessum: noverint se abomini ecclesiastico honore, quo indigne usi sunt, apostolicæ sedis auctoritate dejectos.—Quilibet episcopus, presbyter atque diaconus, quod non optamus, deinceps fuerit talis inventus, jam nunc sibi omnem per nos indulgentiæ aditum intelligat observatum; quia ferro necesse est excidantur vulnere, quæ fomentum non senserint medicinam." The exegesis of Siricius is utterly arbitrary in limiting the demand of holiness, Lev. xx. 7, to the priests and to abstinence, from matrimonial intercourse, and in referring the words of Paul respecting walking in the flesh, Rom. viii. 8, 9, to the married life, as if marriage were thus incompatible with the idea of holiness. Compare also the striking remarks of Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, vol. i. p. 265, sq., and Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, i. 119 (Amer. ed.), on Siricius.

The most eminent Latin church fathers, Ambrose, Jerome, and even Augustine, though the last with more moderation, advocated the celibacy of priests. Augustine, with Eusebius of Vercella before him (370), united their clergy in a cloister life, and gave them a monastic stamp; and Martin of Tours, who was a monk from the first, carried his monastic life into his episcopal office. The councils of Italy, Africa, Spain, and Gaul followed the lead of Rome. The synod of Clermont, for example, A.D. 535, declared in its twelfth canon, "No one ordained deacon or priest may continue matrimonial intercourse. He is become the brother of her who was his wife. But since some, inflamed with lust, have rejected the girdle of the warfare [of Christ], and returned to marriage intercourse, it is ordered that such must lose their office for ever." Other councils, like that of Tours, 461, were content with forbidding clergymen, who begat children after ordination, to administer the sacrifice of the mass, and with confining the law of celibacy *ad altiorem gradus*.*

But the very fact of the frequent repetition of these enactments, and the necessity of mitigating the penalties of transgressions, shew the great difficulty of carrying this unnatural restriction into general effect. In the British and Irish church, isolated as it was from the Roman, the marriage of priests continued to prevail down to the Anglo-Saxon period.

But with the disappearance of legitimate marriage in the priesthood, the already prevalent vice of the cohabitation of unmarried ecclesiastics with pious widows and virgins "secretly brought in"† became more and more common. This spiritual marriage, which had begun as a bold ascetic venture, ended only too often in the flesh, and prostituted the honour of the church.

The Nicene council of 325 met the abuse in its third canon with this decree, "The great council utterly forbids, and it shall not be allowed either to a bishop, or a priest, or a deacon, or any other clergyman, to have with him a *coniugata*, unless she be his mother, or sister, or aunt, or some such person, who is beyond all suspicion."‡ This canon forms the basis of the whole subsequent legislation of the church *de cohabitatione clericorum et mulierum*. It had to be

* Compare Hefele, ii. 568, and Gieseler, l. c. (§ 97, note 7).

† The so called *sorores*, or *mulieres subintroductae*, or *arbitræ coniugatae*. Compare on the origin of this practice, Schaff's Church History, vol. i. § 95.

‡ By a misinterpretation of the term *coniugata*, the sense of which is fixed in the usage of the early church, Baronius and Bellarmine erroneously find in this canon a universal law of celibacy, and accordingly deny the above mentioned statement respecting Paphnutius. Compare Hefele, i. 364.

repeatedly renewed and strengthened; shewing plainly that it was often disobeyed. The council of Toledo in Spain, A.D. 527 or 531, ordered in its third canon, "No clergyman, from the subdeacon upward, shall live with a female, be she a free woman, freed woman, or slave. Only a mother, or a sister, or other near relative, shall keep his house. If he have no near relative, his housekeeper must live in a separate house, and shall under no pretext enter his dwelling. Who-soever acts contrary to this, shall not only be deprived of his spiritual office, and have the doors of his church closed, but shall also be excluded from all fellowship of catholics." The Concilium Agathense in South Gaul, A.D. 506, at which thirty-five bishops met, decreed in the tenth and eleventh canons, "A clergyman shall neither visit nor receive into his house females not of his kin; only with his mother, or sister, or daughter, or niece, may he live. Female slaves also, and freed women, must be kept away from the house of a clergyman." Similar laws, with penalties more or less severe, were passed by the council of Hippo, 393, of Angers, 453, of Tours, 461, of Lerida in Spain, 524, of Clermont, 535, of Braga, 563, of Orleans, 538, of Tours, 567.* The emperor Justinian, in the twenty-third novelle, prohibited the bishop having any woman at all in his house, but the Trullan council of 692 returned simply to the Nicene law.† The western councils also made attempts to abolish the exceptions allowed in the Nicene canon, and forbade clergymen all intercourse with women, except in presence of a companion.

This rigorism, however, which sheds an unwelcome light upon the actual state of things that made it necessary, did not better the matter, but rather led to such a moral apathy, that the Latin church in the middle age had everywhere to contend with the open concubinage of the clergy, and the whole energy of Gregory VII. was needed to restore, in a measure, the old laws of celibacy, without being sufficient to prevent the secret, and to morality, far more dangerous violations of it.‡ The latter ecclesiastical legislation respecting the *mulieres subintroductae* is more lenient, and without limiting the intercourse of clergymen to near kindred, gene-

* Compare the relevant canons of this and other councils in the second and third volumes of Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte*.

† Can. 5, "No clergyman shall have a female in his house, but those allowed in the old canon (Nicaen. c. 3). Even eunuchs are to observe this."

‡ "Throughout the whole period," says Milman (*Hist. of Latin Christianity*, i. 123), "from Pope Siricius to the Reformation, as must appear in the course of our history, the law [of clerical celibacy] was defied, infringed, eluded. It never obtained anything approaching to general observance, though its violation was at times more open, at times more clandestine."

rally excludes only concubines and those women, "*de quibus possit haberi suspicio.*"*

MORAL CHARACTER OF THE CLERGY IN GENERAL.

Augustine gives us the key to the true view of the clergy of the Roman empire in both light and shade, when he says of the spiritual office, "There is in this life, and especially in this day, nothing easier, more delightful, more acceptable to men, than the office of bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, if the charge be administered superficially and to the pleasing of men; but nothing in the eye of God more wretched, mournful, and damnable. So also there is in this life, and especially in this day, nothing more difficult, more laborious, more hazardous, than the office of bishop, or presbyter, or deacon; but nothing in the eye of God more blessed, if the battle be fought in the manner enjoined by our captain."† We cannot wonder, on the one hand, that in the better condition of the church and the enlarged field of her labour, a multitude of light-minded and unworthy men crowded into the sacred office, and on the other, that just the most earnest and worthy bishops of the day, an Ambrose, an Augustine, a Gregory Nazianzen, and a Chrysostom, trembled before the responsibility of the office, and had to be forced into it in a measure against their will by the call of the church.

Gregory Nazianzen fled into the wilderness when his father, without his knowledge, suddenly consecrated him priest in the presence of the congregation (361). He afterwards vindicated this flight in his beautiful apology, in which he depicts the ideal of a Christian priest and theologian. The priest must above all, he says, be a model of a Christian, offer himself a holy sacrifice to God, and be a living temple of the living God. Then he must possess a deep knowledge of souls, and, as a spiritual physician, heal all classes of men of the various diseases of sin, restore, preserve, and protect the divine image in them, bring Christ into their hearts by the Holy Ghost, make them partakers of the divine nature, and of eternal salvation. He must, moreover, have at command the sacred philosophy or divine science of the

* So the Concilium Tridentinum, Sess. xxv. de reform. cap. 14. Compare also the article *Subintroductæ* in the tenth vol. of Wetzer and Welte's Cath. Church Lexicon.

† Epist. 21 ad Valerium, "Nihil esse in hac vita et maxime hoc tempore facilius et lætius et hominibus acceptabilius episcopi aut presbyteri aut diaconi officio, si perfunctorie atque adulatorie res agatur: sed nihil apud Deum miserius et tristius et damnabilius. Item nihil esse in hac vita et maxime hoc tempore difficilius, laboriosius, periculosius episcopi aut presbyteri aut diaconi officio, sed apud Deum nihil beatius, si eo modo militetur, quo noster imperator jubet."

world, and of the worlds of matter and spirit, of good and evil angels, of the all-ruling providence, of our creation and regeneration, of the divine covenants, of the first and second appearing of Christ, of his incarnation, passion, and resurrection, of the end of all things, and the universal judgment, and, above all, of the mystery of the blessed Trinity; and he must be able to teach and elucidate these doctrines of faith in popular discourse. Gregory sets forth Jesus as the perfect type of the priest, and next to him he presents in an eloquent picture the apostle Paul, who lived only to Christ, and under all circumstances, and amid all trials by sea and land, among Jews and heathen, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness, in freedom and bonds, attested the divine power of the gospel for the salvation of the world. This ideal, however, Gregory found but seldom realised. He gives, on the whole, a very unfavourable account of the bishops, and even of the most celebrated councils of his day, charging them with ignorance, unworthy means of promotion, ambition, flattery, pride, luxury, and worldly-mindedness. He says, even, "our danger now is, that the holiest of all offices will become the most ridiculous; for the highest clerical places are gained not so much by virtue, as by iniquity; no longer the most worthy, but the most powerful take the episcopal chairs."* Though his descriptions, especially in the satirical poem, "to himself and on the bishops," composed probably after his resignation in Constantinople (A.D. 381), may be in many points exaggerated, yet they were in general drawn from life and from experience.†

Jerome also, in his epistles, unsparingly attacks the clergy of his time, especially the Roman, accusing them of avarice and legacy-hunting, and drawing a sarcastic picture of a clerical fop, who, with his fine scented clothes, was more like a bridegroom than a clergyman.‡ Of the rural clergy, however, the heathen Ammianus Marcellinus bears a testi-

* "Orat. xliii. c. 46, (opera ed. Bened. tom. i. p. 791), in the Latin translation, "Nunc autem periculum est, ne ordo omnium sanctissimus, sit quoque omnium maxime ridiculus. Non enim virtute magis, quam malefiris et scelere, sacerdotium paratus; nec digniorum sed potentiorum, throni sunt." In the following chapter, however, he represents his friend Basil as a model of all virtues.

† Compare Ullman, Gregor. von Nazianz., Erste Beilage, p. 509-527, where the views of this church father on the clerical office and the clergy of his time are presented at large in his own words. Also Gieseler, i. § 103, gives copious extracts from the writings of Gregory on the vices of the clergy.

‡ Hieron. ad Eustochium, and especially ad Nepotianum de vita Clericorum et monasteriorum (Opera ed. Vall. tom. i. p. 262 sqq.). Yet neither does he spare the monks, but says, ad Nepot., "Nonnulli sunt ditiores monachi quam fuerant seculares et clerici, qui possident opes sub Christo paupere, quas sub locuplete et fallaci Diabolo non habuerant."

mony, which is certainly reliable, to their simplicity, contentment, and virtue.*

Chrysostom, in his celebrated treatise on the priesthood,† written probably before his ordination (somewhere between the years 275 and 381), or while he was deacon (between 381 and 386), portrayed the theoretical and practical qualifications, the exalted duties, responsibilities, and honours of this office, with youthful enthusiasm in the best spirit of his age. He requires of the priest, that he be in every respect better than the monk, though, standing in the world, he have greater dangers and difficulties to contend with.‡ He sets up as the highest object of the preacher, the great principle stated by Paul, that in all his discourses he should seek to please God alone, not men. "He must not indeed despise the approving demonstrations of men; but as little must he court them, nor trouble himself, when his hearers withhold them. True and imperturbable comfort in his labours he finds only in the consciousness of having his discourse framed and wrought out to the approval of God."§ Nevertheless, the book as a whole is unsatisfactory. A comparison of it with the "Reformed Pastor" of Baxter, which is far deeper and richer in all that pertains to subjective experimental Christianity and the proper care of souls, would result emphatically in favour of the English Protestant Church of the seventeenth century.

We must here particularly notice a point, which reflects great discredit on the moral sense of many of the fathers, and shews that they had not wholly freed themselves from the chains of heathen ethics. The occasion of this work of Chrysostom was a ruse, by which he had evaded election to the bishopric, and thrust it upon his friend Basil.¶ To justify this conduct, he endeavours at large in the fifth chapter of the first book to prove, that artifice might be lawful and useful; that is, when used as a means to a good end. "Manifold is the potency of deception, only it must not be

* Lib. xxvii. c. 3, sub ann. 367.

† *Περὶ ἱερωσύνης*, or *De Sacerdotio*, libri sex. The work has been often published separately, and several times translated into modern languages (into German, for example, by Hasselback, 1820, and Ritter, 1821; into English by Hollier, 1740, and Bunce, 1759). Compare the list of twenty-three different separate editions and translations in Lomler; *Joh. Chrysoet. Opera præstantissima* Gr. et Lat. Rudolph, 1840, pp. viii.-ix.

‡ *De Sacerdotio*, lib. vi. cap. ii.-viii.

§ *Περὶ ἀείσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*, lib. v. c. 7.

¶ Not Basil the Great (as Socrates supposes), for he was much older, and died in 379; but probably (as Montfaucon conjectures) the bishop of Raphanea in Syria, near Antioch, whose name appears among the bishops of the council of Constantinople in 381.

employed with knavish intent. And this should be hardly called deception, but rather a sort of accommodation (*οἰκονομία*), wisdom, art, or sagacity, by which one can find many ways of escape in an exigency, and amend the errors of the soul." He appeals to biblical examples, like Jonathan and the daughter of Saul, who, by deceiving their father, rescued their friend and husband; and, unwarrantably, even to Paul, who became to the Jews a Jew, to the Gentiles a Gentile, and circumcised Timothy, though in the Epistle to the Galatians he pronounced circumcision useless. Chrysostom, however, had evidently learned this loose and pernicious principle respecting the obligation of truthfulness, not from the holy Scriptures, but from the Grecian sophists.* Besides, he by no means stood alone in the church in this matter, but had his predecessors in the Alexandrian fathers,† and his followers in Cassian, Jerome, and other eminent catholic divines.

Jerome made a doubtful distinction between *γυμναστικῶς scribere*, and *δογματικῶς scribere*, and, with Origen, explained the severe censure of Paul on Peter in Antioch, for example, as a mere stroke of pastoral policy, or an accommodation to the weakness of the Jewish Christians at the expense of truth.‡ But Augustine's delicate Christian sense of truth revolted at this construction, and replied that such an interpretation undermined the whole authority of holy Scripture; that an apostle could never lie, even for a good object; that, in extremities, one should rather suppose a false reading, or wrong translation, or suspect his own apprehension; but that in Antioch Paul spoke the truth, and justly censured Peter openly for his inconsistency, or for a practical (not a theoretical) error, and thus deserves the praise of righteous

* Even the purest moral philosopher of antiquity, Plato, vindicates falsehood, and recommends it to physicians and rulers as a means to a good end, a help to the healing of the sick, or to the advantage of a people. Compare *De republ.* iii., p. 266, ed. Bipont.—*Εἰ γὰρ ἰσθῶς ἰλίγομεν ἄρτι, καὶ τῷ ὄντι θιοῖς μὴν ἀχρηστοῦ ψυδῶς, ἀνθρώπου δι χρέσιμον, ὡς ἐν φαρμάκου ἰδίῳ, δῆλον ἔστι τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτον ἰατροῖς δότιον, ἰδιώταις δὲ οὐχ ἄσπιον. Δῆλον, ἴφη. Τοῖς ἀρχουσι δὲ τῆς πολιτείας, ἵνα τισὶν ἄλλοις, προσήκει ψυδῆσθαι ἢ πολιτῶν ἵνεκα, ἢ ἀφιλίῃ τῆς πόλιως. τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις πασὶν οὐχ ἄσπιον τοῦ τοιοῦτου.* The Jewish philosophising theologist, Philo, had a similar view in his work, *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, p. 302.

† Clemens Alex., *Strom.* vi. p. 802, and Origen, *Strom.* vi. (in Hieron. *Apol.* i. adr. Ruf. c. 18), where he adduces the just cited passage of Plato in defence of a doubtful accommodation at the expense of truth. See the relevant passages in Gieseler, i. § 63, note 7.

‡ *Epist.* 48 (ed. Vall., or *Ep.* 30 *Ep.* ed. Bened., *Ep.* 50 in older editions), ad Pammactrium, pro libris contra Soviniauum, et *Comm.* ad Gal. ii. 11, sqq. Also Johannes Cassianus, a pupil of Chrysostom, defends the lawfulness of falsehood and deception in certain cases, *Col.* xvii. 8 and 17.

boldness, as Peter, on the other hand, by his meek submission to the censure, merits the praise of holy humility.*

Thus in Jerome and Augustine we have the representatives of two opposite ethical views: one, unduly subjective, judging all moral acts merely by their motive and object, and sanctioning, for example, tyrannicide or suicide, to escape disgrace, or breach of faith with heretics (as the later jesuitical casuistry does with the utmost profusion of sophistical subtlety); the other, objective, proceeding on eternal, immutable principles, and the irreconcilable opposition of good and evil, and freely enough making prudence subservient to truth, but never truth subservient to prudence.

Meantime, in the Greek church also, as early as the fourth century, the Augustinian view here and there made its way; and Basil the Great, in his shorter monastic rule,† rejected even accommodation (*οικονομία*) for a good end, because Christ ascribes the lie, without distinction of kinds, exclusively to Satan.‡ In this respect therefore, Chrysostom did not stand at the head of his age, but represented without doubt the prevailing view of the Eastern church.

The legislation of the councils with reference to the clergy shews in general the earnestness and rigour with which the church guarded the moral purity and dignity of her servants. The canonical age was on the average, after the analogy of the Old Testament, the five and twentieth year for the diaconate, the thirtieth for the priesthood and episcopate. Catechumens, neophytes, persons baptized at the point of death, penitents, energumens (such as were possessed of a devil), actors, dancers, soldiers, curials (court, state, and municipal officials),§ slaves, eunuchs, bigamists, and all who led a scandalous life after baptism, were debarred from ordination. The frequenting of taverns and theatres, dancing

* Comp. the somewhat sharp correspondence of the two fathers in Hieron. Epist. 101-105, 110, 112, 115, 134, 141, in Vallarsi's ed. (tom. i. 625, sqq.) or Epist. 65-70 and 76 &c., in the Bened. ed. of Jerome's works, and August. De mendacio et Contra mendacium; also the treatise of Möhler mentioned above, §. 41, on this controversy, so instructive in regard to the patristic ethics and exegesis.

† Regul. brev. interrogat. 76, cited by Neander in his monograph on Chrysostom (3d. ed.), i. p. 97. Neander there adduces still another similar testimony against the lawfulness of the lie by the contemporaneous Egyptian monk, John of Lycopolis, from Pallad. Hist. Lausiaca.

‡ John viii. 44.

§ The ground, on which even civil officers were excluded, is stated by the Roman council of 402, which ordained in the 10th canon: "One who is clothed with a civil office cannot, on account of the sins almost necessarily connected with it, become a clergyman without previous penances." Comp. Mansi, iii. 1133, and Hefele, ii. 75.

and gambling, usury and the pursuit of secular business, were forbidden to clergymen. But on the other hand, the frequent repetition of warnings against even the lowest and most common sins, such as licentiousness, drunkenness, fighting, and buffoonery, and the threatening of corporal punishment for certain misdemeanours, yield an unfavourable conclusion in regard to the moral standing of the sacred order.* Even at the councils the clerical dignity was not seldom desecrated by outbreaks of coarse passion; in so much that the council of Ephesus in 449 is notorious as the "council of robbers."

In looking at this picture, however, we must not forget that in this period of the sinking empire of Rome the task of the clergy was exceedingly difficult, and amidst the nominal conversion of the whole population of the empire, their numbers and education could not keep pace with the sudden and extraordinary expansion of their field of labour. After all, the clerical office was the great repository of intellectual and moral force for the world. It stayed the flood of corruption, rebuked the vices of the times, fearlessly opposed tyrannical cruelty, founded institutions of charity and public benefit, prolonged the existence of the Roman empire, rescued the literary treasures of antiquity, carried the gospel to the barbarians, and undertook to educate and civilise their rude and vigorous hordes. Out of the mass of mediocrities tower the great church teachers of the fourth and fifth centuries, combining all the learning, the talent, and the piety of the time, and through their immortal writings mightily moulding the succeeding ages of the world.

THE LOWER CLERGY.

As the authority and influence of the bishops after the accession of Constantine increased, the lower clergy became more and more dependent upon them. The episcopate and the presbyterate were now rigidly distinguished. And yet the memory of their primitive identity lingered. Jerome, at the end of the fourth century, reminds the bishops that they owe their elevation above the presbyters not so much to divine institution as to ecclesiastical usage; for before the outbreak of controversies in the church, there was no dis-

* Comp. the decrees of councils in Hefele, ii. 574, 638, 686, 687, 753, 760, &c. Even the Can. Apost. 27, 65, and 72, are directed against common crimes in the clergy, such as battery, murder, and theft; which, therefore, must have already appeared; for legislation always has regard to the actual state of things. The pastoral Epistles of Paul contain no exhortations or prohibitions of this kind.

inction between the two, except that *presbyter* is a term of age, and *bishop* a term of official dignity; but when men, at the instigation of Satan, erected parties and sects, and instead of simply following Christ, named themselves of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, all agreed to put one of the presbyters at the head of the rest, that by his universal supervision of the churches he might kill the seeds of division.*

The great commentators of the Greek church agree with Jerome in maintaining the original identity of bishops and presbyters in the New Testament.†

In the episcopal or cathedral churches, the PRESBYTERS still formed the council of the bishop. In town and country congregations, where no bishop officiated, they were more independent. Preaching, administration of the sacraments, and care of souls, were their functions. In North Africa, they were for a long time not allowed to preach in the presence of the bishop; until Augustine was relieved by his bishop of this restriction. The *seniores plebis* in the African church of the fourth and fifth centuries were not clergymen, but civil personages, and other prominent members of the congregation.‡

In the fourth century arose the office of *archpresbyter*, whose duty it was to preside over the worship, and sometimes to take the place of the bishop in his absence or incapacity.

The DEACONS, also called *Levites*, retained the same functions which they had held in the preceding period. In the West, they alone, not the lectors, were allowed to read

* Hieron. Comm. ad Tit. i. 7: "Idem est ergo presbyter qui episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent . . . communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesie gubernabantur," &c. Comp. Epist. ad Evangelum (Ep. 146 ed. Vall. Opera i. 1074, sqq., Ep. 101 ed. Bened.) and Epist. ad Oceanam (Ep. 9 ed. Vall., Ep. 82 ed. Bened.). In the latter epistle he remarks: "Apud veteres idem episcopi et presbyteri fuerunt, quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc aetatis."

† Chrysostom, Hom. i. in Ep. ad Philipp. (Phil. i. 1, on the words *ἐπιεικόποις*, which imply a number of bishops, *i. e.* presbyters in one and the same congregation) observes; *Τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους οὕτως ἱεράρεις ὅτι γὰρ τίς ἱκανώτερος τοῖς ἰσχυραῖς.* Of the same opinion are Theodoret, ad Phil. i. 1, et ad Tim. iii. 1; Ambrosiaster, ad Eph. iv. 11; and the author of the pseudo Augustinian quaestiones V. et N. T., qu. 101. Comp. on this whole subject of the original identity of *ἐπιεικόποις* and *πρεσβύτεροις*, my History of the Apostolic Church, § 132 (Engl. transl. p. 522-531), and Rich. Rothe, *Aufänge der christlichen Kirche*, i. p. 207-217.

‡ Optatus of Mileve calls them indeed *ecclesiasticos viros*; not, however, in the sense of *clerici*, from whom, on the contrary, he distinguishes them, but in the broad sense of catholic Christians as distinguished from heathens and heretics. Comp. on these *seniores plebos*, or *lay elders*, as they are called, the discussion of Dr Rothe, *Die Aufänge der christl. Kirche u. ihrer Verfassung* p. 227, sqq.

in public worship the lessons from the Gospels; which, containing the words of the Lord, were placed above the Epistles or the words of the apostles. They were also permitted to baptize and to preach. After the pattern of the church in Jerusalem, the number of deacons, even in large congregations, was limited to seven; though not rigidly, for the cathedral of Constantinople had, under Justinian I., besides sixty presbyters, a hundred deacons, forty deaconesses, ninety subdeacons, a hundred and ten lectors, twenty-five precentors, and a hundred janitors; a total of five hundred and twenty-five officers. Though subordinate to the presbyters, the deacons frequently stood in close relations with the bishop, and exerted a greater influence. Hence they not rarely looked upon ordination to the presbyterate as a degradation. After the beginning of the fourth century an archdeacon stood at the head of the college, the most confidential adviser of the bishop, his representative and legate, and not seldom his successor in office. Thus Athanasius first appears as archdeacon of Alexander, at the council of Nice, clothed with important influence, and upon the death of the latter he succeeds to the patriarchal chair of Alexandria.

The office of DEACONESS, which, under the strict separation of the sexes in ancient times, and especially in Greece, was necessary to the completion of the diaconate, and which originated in the apostolic age,* continued in the eastern church down to the twelfth century. It was frequently occupied by the widows of clergymen, or the wives of bishops who were obliged to demit the married state before entering upon their sacred office. Its functions were the care of the female poor, sick, and imprisoned, assisting in the baptism of adult women, and in the country churches of the east, perhaps also of the west, the preparation of women for baptism by private instruction.† Formerly, from regard to the apostolic precept in 1 Tim. v. 9, the deaconesses were required to be sixty years of age.‡ The general council of Chalcedon, however, in 451, reduced the canonical age to forty years, and in the fifteenth canon ordered: "No female shall be consecrated deaconess before she is forty years old, and not then without careful probation. If, however, after

* Comp. Rom. xii. 1, 12.

† Comp. Pelagius ad Rom. xvi. 1. Neander (iii. p. 814, note, Torey's transl. ii. p. 158) infers from a canon of the fourth council of Carthage, that the latter custom prevailed also in the west, since it is there required of "viduæ quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur," "ut possint apto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres."

‡ Comp. Codex Theodos. l. xvi., Tit. ii. lex 27: "Nulla nisi emensis 60 annis secundum præceptum apostoli ad diaconissarum consortium transferatur."

having received consecration, and having been some time in the service, she marry, despising the grace of God, she, with her husband, shall be anathematised. The usual ordination prayer in the consecration of deaconesses, according to the Apostolic Constitutions, runs thus: "Eternal God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Creator of man and women, who didst fill Miriam, and Deborah, and Hannah, and Huldah, with the Spirit, and didst not disdain to suffer thine only begotten Son to be born of a woman; who also in the tabernacle and the temple didst appoint women keepers of thine holy gates; look down now upon this thine handmaid, who is designated to the office of deacon, and grant her the Holy Ghost, and cleanse her from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, that she may worthily execute the work entrusted to her, to thine honour and to the praise of thine Anointed; to whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be honour and adoration for ever. Amen."*

The noblest type of an apostolic deaconess, which has come down to us from this period, is Olympias, the friend of Chrysostom, and the recipient of seventeen beautiful epistles from him.† She sprang from a respectable heathen family, but received a Christian education; was beautiful and wealthy; married in her seventeenth year (A.D. 384) the prefect of Constantinople, Nebridius, but in twenty months after was left a widow, and remained so in spite of the efforts of the emperor, Theodosius, to unite her with

* Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 20. We have given the prayer in full. Neander (iii. p. 332, note) omits some passages. The custom of ordaining deaconesses is placed by this prayer and by the canon quoted from the council of Chalcedon beyond dispute. The 19th canon of the council of Nice, however, appears to conflict with this, in reckoning deaconesses among the laity, who have no consecration (*χειροτονία*). Some therefore suppose that the ordination of deaconesses did not arise till after the Nicaenum (325), though the Apostolic Constitutions contradict this; while others (as Baronius, and recently Hefele, Concilien Gesch., 1855. vol. i. p. 414) would resolve the contradiction by distinguishing between the proper *χειροτονία* and the simple benediction. But the consecration of the deaconesses was certainly accompanied with imposition of hands in presence of the whole clergy; since the Apost. Const., l. viii. c. 19, expressly say to the bishop; *Ἐπιθήσει αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας, παριστῶντες τοῦ περιβουρίου καὶ τῶν διακόνων καὶ τῶν διακονισσῶν*. The contradiction lies, however, in that Nicene canon itself; for (according to the Greek Codices) the *deaconesses* are immediately before counted among the clergy, if we do not, with the Latin translation, read *deacons* instead. Neander helps himself by a distinction between proper deaconesses and widows *abusivè* so called.

† They are found in Montfaucon's Bened. edition of Chrysostom, tom. iii. p. 524-604, and in Lomber's edition of Joann. Chrysost. Opera præstantissima. 1840, p. 168-252. These seventeen epistles to Olympias are, in the judgment of Photius, as quoted by Montfaucon (Op. iii. 524), of all the epistles of Chrysostom. "longissimæ, elegantissimæ, omniumque utilissimæ." Compare also Montfaucon's prefatory remarks on Olympias.

one of his kindred. She became a deaconess; lived in rigid asceticism; devoted her goods to the poor; and found her greatest pleasure in doing good. When Chrysostom came to Constantinople he became her pastor, and guided her lavish benefaction by wise counsel. She continued faithful to him in his misfortune; survived him by several years; and died in 420, lamented by all the poor and needy in the city and in the country around.

In the west, on the contrary, the office of deaconess was first shorn of its clerical character by a prohibition of ordination passed by the Gallic councils in the fifth and sixth centuries;* and at last it was wholly abolished. The second synod of Orleans, in 533, ordained in its eighteenth canon: "No woman shall henceforth receive the *benedictio diaconalis* (which had been substituted for *ordinatio*), on account of the weakness of this sex." The reason betrays the want of good deaconesses, and suggests the connection of this abolition of an apostolic institution with the introduction of the celibacy of the priesthood, which seemed to be endangered by every sort of female society. The adoption of the care of poor and sick by the state, and the cessation of adult baptisms and of the custom of immersion, also made female assistance less needful. In modern times the Catholic church, it is true, has special societies or orders of women, like the Sisters of Mercy, for the care of the sick and poor, the training of children, and other objects of practical charity; and in the bosom of Protestantism also similar benevolent associations have arisen, under the name of Deaconess Institutes, or Sisters' Houses, though in the more free evangelical spirit, and without the bond of a vow.† But, though quite kindred in their object, these associations are not to be identified with the office of deaconess in the apostolic age and in the ancient church. That was a regular standing office in every Christian congregation, corresponding to the office of deacon; and it has

* A mere benediction was appointed in place of ordination. The first synod of Orange (Arausicana i.), in 441, directed in the 20th canon: "Diaconæ omnimodis non ordinandæ [thus they had previously been ordained in Gaul also, and reckoned with the clergy]; si quæ jam sunt, benedictioni, quæ populo impenditur, capita submittant." Likewise was the ordination of deaconesses forbidden by the council of Epaon in Burgundy in 517, can. 21, and by the second council of Orleans, in 533, can. 17 and 18.

† The Deaconess House (Mutterhaus) at Kaiserswerth on the Rhine, founded in 1836; Bethany in Berlin, 1847; and similar evangelical hospitals in Dresden, 1842, Strassburg 1842, Paris (institution des diaconesses des églises evangéliques de France), 1841, London (Institution of Nursing Sisters), 1840 New York (St Luke's Hospital), Pittsburg, 1849, Smyrna, Jerusalem, &c.

never since the twelfth century been revived, though the local work of charity has never ceased.

To the ordinary clergy there were added in this period sundry extraordinary church offices, rendered necessary by the multiplication of religious functions in large cities and dioceses:—

1. STEWARDS.* These officers administered the church property under the supervision of the bishop, and were chosen in part from the clergy, in part from such of the laity as were versed in law. In Constantinople, the "great steward" was a person of considerable rank, though not a clergyman. The council of Chalcedon enjoined upon every episcopal diocese the appointment of such officers, and the selection of them from the clergy, "that the economy of the church might not be irresponsible, and thereby the church property exposed to waste and the clerical dignity be brought into ill repute."† For conducting the litigation of the church sometimes a special advocate, called the *ἔκδικος*, or defensor, was appointed.

2. SECRETARIES,‡ for drawing the protocols in public ecclesiastical transactions (*gesta ecclesiastica*). They were usually clergymen, or such as had prepared themselves for the service of the church.

3. NURSES OR PARABOLANI,§ especially in connection with the larger church hospitals. Their office was akin to that of the deacons, but had more reference to the bodily assistance, than to the spiritual care, of the sick. In Alexandria, by the fifth century, these officers formed a great guild of six hundred members, and were not rarely misemployed as a standing army of episcopal domination.|| Hence, upon a complaint of the citizens of Alexandria against them to the emperor Theodosius II., their number was reduced to five hundred. In the west they were never introduced.

4. BURIERS OF THE DEAD† likewise belonged among these *ordines minores* of the church. Under Theodosius II. there were more than a thousand of them in Constantinople.

* *Οἰκόνομοι*. Beside these there were also *κιμωλιάρχαι*, sacellarii, thesaurarii.

† Conc. Chalced. can. 26. This canon also occurs twice in the Corp. jur. can., c. 21. c. xvi. q. 7, and c. 4. dist. lxxix.

‡ *Ταχιγράφοι*, notarii, excerptores.

§ Parabolani, probably from *παραβάλλειν τὴν ζωὴν*, to risk life; because in contagious diseases they often exposed themselves to the danger of death.

|| A perversion of a benevolent association to turbulent purposes similar to that of the Firemen's Companies in the large cities of the United States.

¶ *Κοπιάται*, copiatæ, fossores, fossarii.

THE BISHOPS.

The Bishops now stood with sovereign power at the head of the clergy and of their dioceses. They had come to be universally regarded as the vehicles and propagators of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the teachers and lawgivers of the church in all matters of faith and discipline. The specific distinction between them and the presbyters was carried into every thing; while yet it is worthy of remark, that Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, just the most eminent exegetes of the ancient church, expressly acknowledge the original identity of the two offices in the New Testament, and consequently derive the proper episcopate, not from divine institution, but only from church usage.

The traditional participation of the people in the election, which attested the popular origin of the episcopal office, still continued, but gradually sank to a mere formality, and at last became entirely extinct. The bishops filled their own vacancies, and elected and ordained the clergy. Besides ordination, as the medium for communicating the official gifts, they also claimed from the presbyters in the west after the fifth century the exclusive prerogatives of confirming the baptized and consecrating the chrism or holy ointment used in baptism.* In the east, on the contrary, confirmation (the chrism) is performed also by the presbyters, and, according to the ancient custom, immediately follows baptism.

To this spiritual pre-eminence of the bishops was now added, from the time of Constantine, a civil importance. Through the union of the church with the state the bishops became at the same time state officials of weight, and enjoyed the various privileges which accrued to the church from this connection. They had thenceforth an independent and legally valid jurisdiction; they held supervision of the church estates, which were sometimes very considerable, and they had partial charge even of the city property; they superintended the morals of the people, and even of the emperor, and they exerted influence upon the public legislation. They were exempt from civil jurisdiction, and could neither be brought as witnesses before a court, nor be compelled to take an oath. Their dioceses grew larger, and their power and revenues increased. *Dominus beatissimus* (*μακαριώτατος*), or *sanctissimus*, (*ἀγιώτατος*), *reverendissimus*, *Beatitudo* or *Sanctitas tua*, and similar high-sounding titles,

* Innocent I. Ep. ad. Decent.: "Ut sine chrismate et episcopi jussione neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi."

passed into universal use. Kneeling, kissing of the hand, and like tokens of reverence, came to be shewn them by all classes, up to the emperor himself. Chrysostom, at the end of the fourth century, says, "The heads of the empire (hyparchs) and the governors of provinces (toparchs) enjoy no such honour as the rulers of the church. They are first at court, in the society of ladies, in the houses of the great. No one has precedence of them."

To this position corresponded the episcopal insignia, which from the fourth century became common: the ring, as the symbol of the espousal of the bishop to the church; the crosier or shepherd's staff (also called crook, because it was generally curved at the top); and the pallium,* a shoulder cloth, after the example of the ephod of the Jewish high priest, and perhaps of the sacerdotal mantle worn by the Roman emperors as *pontifices maximi*. The pallium is a seamless cloth hanging over the shoulders, formerly of white linen, in the West subsequently of white lamb's wool, with four red or black crosses wrought in it with silk. According to the present usage of the Roman church, the wool is taken from the lambs of St Agnes, which are every year solemnly blessed and sacrificed by the pope in memory of this pure virgin. Hence the later symbolical meaning of the pallium, as denoting the bishop's following of Christ, the good Shepherd, with the lost and reclaimed sheep upon his shoulders. Alexandrian tradition traced this vestment to the evangelist Mark; but Gregory Nazianzen expressly says, that it was first given by Constantine the Great to the bishop Macarius of Jerusalem.† In the East it was worn by all bishops, in the West by archbishops only, on whom, from the time of Gregory I., it was conferred by the pope on their accession to office. At first the investiture was gratuitous, but afterwards came to involve a considerable fee, according to the revenues of the archbishopric.

* ἱερα σπολή, ἀμφοτέρων, superhumerales, pallium, also ephod (ἱζβξ, ἱσωμῆς) The ephod (Ex. xxviii. 6-11, and xxxix. 2-5), in connection with the square breast-plate belonging to it (ἱζβπ, comp. Ex. xxviii. 15-30; xxxix. 8-21), was the principal official vestment of the Jewish high priest, and no doubt sacred as the precedent for the archiepiscopal pallium, but exceeded the latter in costliness. It consisted of two shoulder pieces (like the pallium and the chasubles), which hung over the upper part of the body before and behind, and were skilfully wrought of fine linen in three colours, fastened by golden rings and chains, and richly ornamented with gold thread, and twelve precious stones, on which the names of the twelve tribes were graven. Whether the sacred oracle, Urim and Thummim (LXX. θήλωσις καὶ ἐλήθια, Ex. xxviii. 30), was identical with the twelve precious stones in the breastplate, the learned are not agreed. Comp. Winer, *Bibl. Reallex.*, sub *Urim u. Thummim*.

† Orat. xlvii. So Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 27, at the beginning. Macarius is said to have worn the gilded vestment in the administration of baptism.

As the bishop united in himself all the rights and privileges of the clerical office, so he was expected to shew himself a model in the discharge of its duties, and a follower of the great Archbishop and Archshepherd of the sheep. He was expected to exhibit in a high degree the ascetic virtues, especially that of virginity, which, according to Catholic ethics, belongs to the idea of moral perfection. Many a bishop, like Athanasius, Basil, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Martin of Tours, lived in rigid abstinence and poverty, and devoted his income to religious and charitable objects.

But this very power and this temporal advantage of the episcopate became also a lure for avarice and ambition, and a temptation to the lordly and secular spirit. For even under the episcopal mantle the human heart still beat, with all those weaknesses and passions which can only be overcome by the continual influence of divine grace. There were metropolitans and patriarchs, especially in Alexandria, Constantinople, and Rome, who, while yet hardly past the age of persecution, forgot the servant form of the Son of God, and the poverty of his apostles and martyrs, and rivalled the most exalted civil officials, nay, the emperor himself, in worldly pomp and luxury. Not seldom were the most disgraceful intrigues employed to gain the holy office. No wonder, says Ammianus, that for so splendid a prize as the bishopric of Rome men strive with the utmost passion and persistence, when rich presents from ladies, and a more than imperial sumptuousness, invite them.* The Roman prefect, Praetextatus, declared jestingly to the bishop Damasus, who had obtained the office through a bloody battle of parties, that for such a price he would at once turn Christian himself.† Such an example could not but shed its evil influence on the lower clergy of the great cities. Jerome sketches a sarcastic description of the Roman priests, who squandered all their care on dress and perfumery, curled their hair with crimping pins, wore sparkling rings, paid far too great attention to

* Amm. Marsell. xxvii. c. 3, sub anno 367. . . . "ut dotentur oblationibus matronarum procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspicte vestiti, epula curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia regales superent mensas." But then with this pomp of the Roman prelates he contrasts the poverty of the worthy country bishops.

† Besides Ammianus, Jerome also states this in one of his epistles, ad Pammach. "Miserabilis ille Praetextatus, qui designatus consul est mortuus, homo sacrilegus et idolorum cultor, solebat ludens beato papae Damaso dicere, 'Facite me Romanae urbis episcopum, et ero protinus Christianus.'" (In my MS. this passage was credited to Epist. ad Pammach. 38, (al. 61), but in looking carefully over Vallarsi's edition, which I use in the final revision, and which follows a different order, I cannot find it, though it is no doubt genuine.)

women, and looked more like bridegrooms than like clergymen.* And in the Greek church it was little better. Gregory Nazianzen, himself a bishop and for a long time patriarch of Constantinople, frequently mourns the ambition, the official jealousies, and the luxury of the hierarchy, and utters the wish that the bishops might be distinguished only by a higher grade of virtue.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HIERARCHY, COUNTRY BISHOPS,
CITY BISHOPS, AND METROPOLITANS.

The episcopate, notwithstanding the unity of the office and its rights, admitted the different grades of country bishop, ordinary city bishop, metropolitan, and patriarch. Such a distinction had already established itself on the basis of free religious sentiment in the church, so that the incumbents of the apostolic sees, like Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome, stood at the head of the hierarchy. But this gradation now assumed a political character, and became both modified and confirmed by attachment to the municipal division of the Roman empire.

Constantine the Great divided the whole empire into four præfectures (the Oriental, the Illyrian, the Italian, and the Gallic); the præfectures into vicariates, dioceses, or proconsulates, fourteen or fifteen in all,† and each diocese again into several provinces.‡ The præfectures were governed by *Præfecti Prætorio*, the dioceses by *Vicarii*, the provinces by *Rectores*, with various titles, commonly *Presides*.

It was natural that, after the union of church and state, the ecclesiastical organization and the political should, so far as seemed proper, and hence of course with manifold exceptions, accommodate themselves to one another. In

* Epist. ad Eustochium de virginitate servanda.

† The dioceses or vicariates were as follows:—

I. The Præfectura *Orientalis* consisted of the five dioceses of *Oriens*, with Antioch as its political and ecclesiastical capital; *Aegyptus*, with Alexandria; *Asiæ proconsularis*, with Ephesus; *Pontus*, with Cæsarea in Cappadocia; *Thraciæ*, with Heraklea, afterwards Constantinople.

II. The Præfectura *Illyrica*, with Thessalonica as its capital, had only the two dioceses of *Macedonia* and *Dacia*.

III. The Præfectura *Italica* embraced *Roma*, (i. e. South Italy and the islands of the Mediterranean, or the so-called Suburban provinces); *Italia*, or the Vicariate of Italy, with its centre at Mediolenum (Milan); *Illyricum occidentale*, with its capital at Sirmium; and *Africa occidentalis*, with Carthage.

IV. The Præfectura *Gallica* embraced the dioceses of *Gallia*, with Triveri, (Trier) and Lugdunum (Lyons); *Hispania*, with Hispalis (Seville); and *Brittania*, with Eboracum (York).

‡ Thus the diocese of the Orient, for example, had five provinces, Egypt nine, Pontus thirteen, Gaul seventeen, Spain seven. Comp. Wiltisch, Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik, i. p. 57, sqq., where the provinces are all quoted, as is not necessary for our purpose here.

the east, this principle of conformity was more palpably and rigidly carried out, than in the west. The council of Nice in the fourth canon proceeds upon it, and the second and fourth ecumenical councils confirm it. The political influence made itself most distinctly felt in the elevation of Constantinople to a patriarchal see. The Roman bishop Leo, however, protested against the reference of his own power to political considerations, and planted it exclusively upon the primacy of Peter; though evidently the Roman see owed its importance to the favourable co-operation of both these influences. The power of the patriarchs extended over one or more municipal dioceses; while the metropolitans presided over single provinces. The word *diocese* (*διοίκησις*) passed from the political into the ecclesiastical terminology, and denoted at first a patriarchal district, comprising several provinces (thus the expression occurs continually in the Greek acts of councils), but afterwards came to be applied in the west to each episcopal district. The circuit of a metropolitan was called in the east an *eparchy* (*ἐπαρχία*), in the west *provincia*. An ordinary bishopric was called in the east a *parish* (*παροικία*), while in the Latin Church the term (*parochia*) was usually applied to a mere pastoral charge.

The lowest rank in the episcopal hierarchy was occupied by the *country bishops*,* the presiding officers of those rural congregations, which were not supplied with presbyters from neighbouring cities. In North Africa, with its multitude of small dioceses, these country bishops were very numerous, and stood on an equal footing with the others. But in the east they became more and more subordinate to the neighbouring city bishops; until at last, partly on account of their own incompetence, chiefly for the sake of the rising hierarchy, they were wholly extinguished. Often they were utterly unfit for their office; at least Basil of Cæsarea, who had fifty country bishops in his metropolitan district, reproached them with frequently receiving men totally unworthy into the clerical ranks. And moreover, they stood in the way of the aspirations of the city bishops; for the greater the number of bishops, the smaller the diocese and the power of each, though probably the better the collective influence of all upon the church. The council of Sardica

* *Χωρικοὶ ἐπίσκοποι*. The principal statements respecting them are: Epist. Synodi Antioch. A.D. 270, in Euseb. H. E. vii., 36 (where they are called *ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ἰσθμῶν ἀγρῶν*); Concil. Ancy. A.D. 315, can. 13 (where they are forbidden to ordain presbyters and deacons); Concil. Antioch. A.D. 341, can. 10 (same prohibition); Conc. Lardic., between 320 and 372, can. 57 (where the creation of new country bishoprics is forbidden); and Conc. Sardic. A.D. 343, can. 6 (where they are wholly abolished).

in 343, doubtless had both considerations in view, when, on motion of Hosius, the president, it decreed: "It is not permitted, that, in a village or a small town, for which a single priest is sufficient, a bishop should be stationed, lest the episcopal dignity and authority suffer scandal; * but the bishops of the eparchy (province) shall appoint bishops only for those places where bishops have already been, or where the town is so populous, that it is considered worthy to be a bishopric." The place of these chorepiscopi was thenceforth supplied either by visitators (*περιοδεύσαι*), who in the name of the bishops visited the country congregations from time to time, and performed the necessary functions, or by resident presbyters (*parochi*) under the immediate supervision of the city bishop.

Among the city bishops towered the bishops of the capital cities of the various provinces. They were styled in the east *metropolitans*, in the west usually *archbishops*.† They had the oversight of the other bishops of the province, ordained them, in connection with two or three assistants; summoned provincial synods, which, according to the fifth canon of the council of Nice, and the direction of other councils, were to be held twice a year; and presided in such synods. They promoted union among the different churches by the reciprocal communication of synodal acts, and confirmed the organism of the hierarchy.

This metropolitan constitution, which had gradually arisen out of the necessities of the church, became legally established in the east in the fourth century, and passed thence to the Græco-Russian church. The council of Nice, at that early day, ordered in the fourth canon, that every new bishop should be ordained by all, or at least by three of the bishops of the eparchy (the municipal province) under the direction, and with the sanction of the metropolitan.‡ Still clearer is the ninth canon of the council of Antioch, in 341: "The bishops of each eparchy (province) should know, that upon the bishop of the metropolis (the municipal capital) also devolves a care for the whole eparchy, because in the metropolis all, who have business, gather together from all

* Can. 6: . . . *ἵνα μὴ κακιωτίζηται τὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὄνομα καὶ ἡ αὐθεντία*; or, in the Latin version: "Ne vilescat nomen episcopi et auctoritas." *Comp. Hefele*, i. p. 556. The differences between the Greek and Latin text in the first part of this canon have no influence on the prohibition of the appointment of country bishops.

† *Μητροπολίτης*, metropolitanus, and the kindred title *ἱεραρχος* (applied to the most powerful metropolitans); *ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, archiepiscopus, and *primas*.

‡ This canon has been recently discovered also in a Coptic translation, and published by Pitra, in the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, i. 526, sq.

quarters. Hence it has been found good, that he should also have a precedence in honour,* and that the other bishops should do nothing without him—according to the old and still binding canon of our fathers—except that which pertains to the supervision and jurisdiction of their own parishes (*i. e.* dioceses in the modern terminology) and the provinces belonging to them; as in fact they ordain presbyters and deacons, and decide all judicial matters. Otherwise they ought to do nothing without the bishop of the metropolis, and he nothing without the consent of the other bishops." This council, in the nineteenth canon, forbade a bishop being ordained without the presence of the metropolitan and the presence or concurrence of the majority of the bishops of the province.

In Africa, a similar system had existed from the time of Cyprian, before the church and the state were united. Every province had a Primas; the oldest bishop being usually chosen to this office. The bishop of Carthage, however, was not only primate of Africa *proconsularis*, but at the same time, corresponding to the proconsul of Carthage, the ecclesiastical head of Numidia and Mauretania, and had power to summon a general council of Africa.†

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—Augustine.

Histoire de St Augustine. Par M. PONJOLAT.

Die Kirche Christi, I. 3. Augustinus v. FR. BÖHRINGER.

Der heilige Augustinus. V. C. BINDEMANN, I. II.

Mozley's Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination.

Der heilige Augustinus, v. P. SCHAFF.

Tableau de l'Eloquence Chretienne au IV.^e Siecle. Par M. VILLEMAIN.

ALGERIA is only three days' sail from Marseilles. It is no difficult matter, therefore, for French *litterateurs* to take a holiday in the nearest of French colonies, and give forth their Algerian impressions or reminiscences in the journals. Some excellent tourist notes have thus been furnished to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and other high class French magazines. But M. Ponjoulat has had higher objects in view than contributing to the amusement or passing interest of the readers of magazines. He has

* Καὶ τῇ τιμῇ ἀπονομιᾶται αὐτός.

† Cyprian, Epist. 45, says of his province of Carthage, 'Latius fusa est nostra provincia; habet enim Numidiam et Mauretanium sibi coherentes.'

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

JANUARY 1866.

ART. I.—*Rome and the Romans.*

IN the course of last winter, Pio Nono resigned himself with exemplary piety to the disposal of divine providence, refusing, in spite of the efforts of the Emperor of France, to bestir himself for his own defence, notwithstanding the prospect of the withdrawal of the army of occupation. The expostulations of Count de Sarteges received no other reply at the time from the holy father but that his trust was in a higher power. He was even ready, rather than take the sword for his defence, to go forth from the Vatican with his staff in the one hand and his book in the other, and fill up the remainder of his few and evil days with a pilgrimage through Europe, receiving the homage and reviving the faith of his spiritual children. The pontiff's trust has since receded from that high tide mark. Another lingering look at St Peter's has staggered his pilgrim purpose, and once more his spiritual children witness the head of the Church sinking to dependence on an arm of flesh. Even at the highest season of the pontiff's faith, it was whispered in Rome that the enrolment of soldiers was being made *in petto*, and that the trust in providence was not so absolute as was announced to Count de Sarteges. At all events, the season of romantic submission has passed. Napoleon was not to be deceived by the profession of the pope into a change of his measures; and the pope, baulked in his hopes of the Emperor's conversion, has had recourse once more to arms—to arms for the defence of himself against his Roman subjects.

A thousand foreign soldiers were ordered last August to

VOL. XV.—NO. LV.

▲

of the Free Church of Scotland at Florence, a Christian literature, designed to meet the wants and guide into a right track the spirit of inquiry now abroad throughout Italy. Four thousand a year is being expended in these operations, and the limits to their extension are alone the limits imposed by financial prudence.

The work of ages is oftentimes crowded into years, and is done quickly, because the right reason is apprehended for the doing of it. The present is Italy's day. She had a brief earlier day when the Reformation broke with its light upon Europe. Calvin found at that era a pulpit in the court of Ferrara, and a shield beneath the wing of the good Princess Renée. Modena, under the government of the House of Este, had at the same period her numerous disciples of the Reformation; whilst Bologna boasted of her prince who was ready to raise six thousand soldiers in defence of its friends. Even Venice with reluctance consented to the publication of the papal bull against Luther, and took care, after consenting, that it should not be read in St Mark's till the people had left the church. That day of bright hopes was quenched in blood; it proved but a rent in the cloud, which closing left in thicker darkness the plains of Italy. Three centuries have since passed, and the Alps have been the barrier beyond which the foot of the evangelical missionary has not trod. That barrier the sword of Napoleon III. at Magenta, and Solferino, has cleft asunder, and Italy, once more open to the churches of the Reformation, calls upon them to renew their long suspended work. Shall the opening be allowed a second time to close, and the work of the Italian Reformation be again left unfinished? We may not now fear that it shall be closed in blood, but it were not less fatal to truth if, in her freedom of choice, Italy should rest in some one of the many forms of a rationalised Christianity, to awake, on the discovery of its meagreness and barrenness, to renewed superstition and subjection to priestly bondage.

ART. II.—*Development of the Ancient Catholic Hierarchy.*

(Continued from last Number.)

BY THE REV. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., MERCERSBURGH, U.S.

THESSE patriarchs, in the official sense of the word, as already fixed at the time of the fourth ecumenical council, were the bishops of the four great capitals of the empire,

Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, to whom was added, by way of honorary distinction, the bishop of Jerusalem, as president of the oldest Christian congregation, though the proper continuity of that office had been broken by the destruction of the holy city. They had oversight of one or more dioceses, at least of two or more provinces or eparchies.* They ordained the metropolitans, rendered the final decision in church controversies, conducted the ecumenical councils, published the decrees of the councils and the church laws of the emperors, and united in themselves the supreme legislative and executive power of the hierarchy. They bore the same relation to the metropolitans of single provinces as the ecumenical councils to the provincial. They did not, however, form a college; each acted for himself; yet in important matters they consulted with one another, and had the right also to keep resident legates (*apocrisarii*) at the imperial court at Constantinople.

In prerogative they were equal, but in the extent of their dioceses and in influence they differed, and had a system of rank among themselves. Before the founding of Constantinople, and down to the Nicene council, Rome maintained the first rank, Alexandria the second, and Antioch the third, in both ecclesiastical and political importance. After the end of the fourth century, this order was modified by the insertion of Constantinople, as the second capital, between Rome and Alexandria, and the addition of Jerusalem as the fifth and smallest patriarchate.

The patriarch of Jerusalem presided only over the three meagre provinces of Palestine; † the patriarch of Antioch over the greater part of the political diocese of the Orient, which comprised fifteen provinces, Syria, Phenicia, Cilicia, Arabia, and Mesopotamia, &c.; ‡ the patriarch of Alexandria, over the whole diocese of Egypt with its nine rich provinces, *Ægyptus prima* and *secunda*, the lower and upper Theboid, lower and upper Libya, &c.; § the patriarch of Constantinople over the dioceses Pontus, Asia Minor, and Thrace, with eight-and-twenty provinces, and at the same time over the bishoprics among the barbarians; || the patriarch of Rome

* According to the political division of the empire after Constantine. Comp. the preceding section.

† Comp. Wiltch, i. p. 206, sqq. The statement of Ziegler, which Wiltch quotes and seems to approve, that the fifth ecumenical council of 553 added to the patriarchal circuit of Jerusalem the metropolitans of Berytus in Phenicia and Ruba in Syria, appears to be an error. Ruba nowhere appears in the acts of the councils, and Berytus belonged to Phenicia prima, consequently to the patriarchate of Antioch. La Quien knows nothing of such an enlargement of the patriarchate of Hierosolyma.

‡ Wiltch, i. 189, sqq. § Ibid. i. 177, sqq. || Ibid. p. 143, sqq.

gradually extended his influence over the entire west, two prefectures, the Italian and the Gallic, with all their dioceses and provinces.*

The patriarchal system had reference primarily only to the imperial church, but indirectly affected also the barbarians, who received Christianity from the empire. Yet even within the empire several metropolitans, especially the bishop of Cyprus in the eastern church, and the bishops of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna in the western, during this period maintained their autocracy with reference to the patriarchs, to whose dioceses they geographically belonged. In the fifth century, the patriarchs of Antioch attempted to subject the island of Cyprus, where Paul first had preached the gospel, to their jurisdiction; but the ecumenical council of Ephesus, in 431, confirmed to the church of Cyprus its ancient right to ordain its own bishops.† The North African bishops also, with all respect for the Roman see, long maintained Cyprian's spirit of independence, and in a council at Hippo Regius in 393, protested against such titles as *princeps sacerdotum*, *summus sacerdos*, assumed by the patriarchs, and were willing only to allow the title of *primae sedis episcopus*.‡

When, in consequence of the Christological controversies, the Nestorians and Monophysites split off from the orthodox church, they established independent schismatic patriarchates which continue to this day, shewing that the patriarchal constitution answers most nearly to the oriental type of Christianity. The orthodox Greek church, as well as the schismatic sects of the east, has substantially remained true to the patriarchal system down to the present time; while the Latin church endeavoured to establish the principal of monarchical centralisation so early as Leo the Great, and in the course of the middle age produced the absolute papacy.

SYNODICAL LEGISLATION ON THE PATRIARCHAL POWER AND JURISDICTION.

To follow now the ecclesiastical legislation respecting this patriarchal oligarchy in chronological order.

The germs of it already lay in the anti-Nicene period, when the bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, partly in virtue of the age and apostolic origin of their churches, partly on account of the political prominence of those three cities, as the three capitals of the Roman empire, steadily asserted a position of pre-eminence. The apostolic origin of the churches

* More of this below.

† Comp. Wilsch, i. p. 232, sq., and ii. 469.

‡ Cod. can. eccl. Afr. can. 89, cited by Neander, iii. p. 385 (Germ. ed.).

of Rome and Antioch is evident from the New Testament. Alexandria traced its Christianity, at least indirectly, through the evangelist Mark to Peter, and was politically more important than Antioch, while Rome from the first had precedence of both in church and in state. This pre-eminence of the oldest and most powerful metropolitans acquired formal legislative validity and firm establishment through the ecumenical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries.

The first ecumenical council of Nice, in 325, as yet knew nothing of five patriarchs, but only the three metropolitans above named, confirming them in their traditional rights.* In the much-canvassed sixth canon, probably on occasion of the Meletian schism in Egypt, and the attacks connected with it on the rights of the bishop of Alexandria, that council declared as follows :

“ The ancient custom which has obtained in Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis, shall continue in force, viz., that the bishop of Alexandria have rule over all these [provinces], since this also is customary with the bishop of Rome [that is, not in Egypt, but with reference to his own diocese]. Likewise also at Antioch and in the other eparchies the churches shall retain their prerogatives. Now it is perfectly clear, that if any one has been made bishop without the consent of the metropolitan, the great council does not allow him to be bishop.” †

The Nicene fathers passed this canon, not as introducing anything new, but merely as confirming an existing relation on the basis of church tradition, and that with special reference to Alexandria, on account of the troubles existing there. Rome was named only for illustration ; and Antioch and all the other eparchies or provinces were secured their admitted rights. ‡ The bishoprics of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch were placed substantially on equal footing, yet in such tone,

* Accordingly Pope Nicholas, in 866, in a letter to the Bulgarian Prince Bogoris, would acknowledge only the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch as patriarchs in the proper sense, because they presided over apostolic churches, whereas Constantinople was not of apostolic founding, and was not even mentioned by the most venerable of all councils, the Nicene. Jerusalem was named indeed by these councils, but only under the name of *Ælia*.

† In the oldest Latin Cod. canonum (in Mansi vi. 1186), this canon is preceded by the important words, *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*. These are, however, manifestly spurious, being originally no part of the canon itself, but a superscription, which gave an expression to the Roman inference from the Nicene canon. Comp. Gieseler, i. 2, sect. 93, not. 1 ; and Hefele, History of Councils, vol. i. 284, sqq.

‡ So Greenwood also views the matter, *Cathedra Petri*, 1859, vol. i. p. 181 : “ It was manifestly not the object of this canon to confer any new jurisdiction upon the church of Alexandria, but simply to confirm its customary prerogative. By way of illustration it places that prerogative, whatever it was, upon the same level with that of the two other eparchal churches of Rome and

that Antioch, as the third capital of the Roman empire, already stands as a stepping-stone to the ordinary metropolitans. By the "other eparchies" of the canon are to be understood, either all provinces, and therefore all metropolitan districts, or more probably, as in the second canon of the first council of Constantinople, only the three eparchates of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Ephesus, and Asia Minor, and Heraclea in Thrace, which, after Constantine's division of the east, possessed similar prerogatives, but were subsequently overshadowed and absorbed by Constantinople. In any case, however, this addition proves that at that time the rights and dignity of the patriarchs were not yet strictly distinguished from those of the other metropolitans. The bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, here appear in relation to the other bishops simply as *primi inter pares*, or as metropolitans of the first rank, in whom the highest political eminence was joined with the highest ecclesiastical. Next to them, in the second rank, come the bishops of Ephesus in the Asiatic diocese of the empire, of Neo-Cæsarea in the Pontic, and of Heraclea in the Thracian; while Constantinople, which was not founded till five years later, is wholly unnoticed in the Nicene council, and Jerusalem is mentioned only under the name of Ælia.

Between the first and second ecumenical councils arose the new patriarchate of Constantinople or new Rome, built by Constantine in 330, and elevated to be the imperial residence. The bishop of this city was not only the successor of the bishop of the ancient Byzantium, hitherto under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Heraclea, but, through the favour of the imperial court and the bishops who were always numerous assembled there, it placed itself in a few decennia among the first metropolitans of the east, and in the fifth century became the most powerful rival of the bishop of old Rome.

This new patriarchate was first officially recognised at the second ecumenical council, held at Constantinople in 381, and was conceded "*the precedence in honour, next to the bishop of Rome,*" the second place among all bishops, and that on the purely political consideration, that New Rome was the residence of the emperor.* At the same time, the imperial

Antioch. Moreover, the words of the canon disclose no other ground of claim but custom, and the customs of each eparchia are restricted to the territorial limits of the diocese or eparchia itself. And though within those limits the several customary rights and prerogatives may have differed, yet beyond them no jurisdiction of any kind could, by virtue of this canon, have any existence at all."

* Conc. Constant. i. can. 8, Τὸ μόνον Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ἐπίσκοπων ἔχει πρῶτον

city and the diocese of Thrace (whose ecclesiastical metropolis hitherto had been Heraclea) were assigned as its district.*

Many Greeks took this as a formal assertion of the equality of the bishop of Constantinople with the bishop of Rome, understanding "next" or "after" (*μῆστρά*) as referring only to time, not to rank. But it is more natural to regard this as conceding a primacy of honour, which the Roman see could claim on different grounds. The popes, as the subsequent protest of Leo shews, were not satisfied with this, because they were unwilling to be placed in the same category with the Constantinopolitan fledgling, and at the same time assumed a supremacy of jurisdiction over the whole church. On the other hand this decree was unwelcome also to the patriarch of Alexandria, because this see had hitherto held the second rank, and was now required to take the third. Hence the canon was not subscribed by Timotheus of Alexandria, and was regarded in Egypt as void. Afterwards, however, the emperors prevailed with the Alexandrian patriarchs to yield this point.

After the council of 381, the bishop of Constantinople indulged in manifold encroachments on the rights of the metropolitans of Ephesus and Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and even on the rights of the other patriarchs. In this extension of his authority, he was favoured by the fact that, in spite of the prohibition of the council of Sardica, the bishops of all the districts of the east continually resided in Constantinople, in order to present all kinds of interests to the emperor. These concerns of distant bishops were generally referred by the emperor to the bishop of Constantinople and his council, the *σύνδοκος ἐνδημοῦσα*, as it was called, that is, a council of the bishops resident (*ἐνδημοῦντων*) in Constantinople, under his presidency. In this way his trespasses, even upon the bounds of other patriarchs, obtained the right of custom by consent of parties, if not the sanction of church legislation. Nectarius, who was not elected till after that council, claimed the presidency at a council in 394, over the two

συνεβῆναι τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νῆα Ῥώμης. This canon is quoted also by Socrates, v. 8, and Sozomen, vii. 9, and confirmed by the council of Chalcedon (see below), so that it must be from pure dogmatical bias that Baronius (Anal. ad ann. 381, n. 35, 36) questions its genuineness.

* The latter is not indeed expressly said in the above canon, which seems to speak only of an *honorary* precedence; but the canon was so understood by the bishops of Constantinople, and by the historians, Socrates (v. 8) and Theodoret (Epist. 86 ad Flavianum), and so interpreted by the Chalcedonian council (can. 28). The relation of the bishop of Constantinople to the metropolitan of Heraclea, however, remained for a long time uncertain, and at the council *ad quercum* 403 in the affair of Chrysostom, Paul of Heraclea took the presidency, though the patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria was present. Comp. Le Quien, tom. i. p. 18, and Wiltch, i. p. 139.

patriarchs who were present, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Flavian of Antioch, decided the matter almost alone; and thus was the first to exercise the primacy over the entire east. Under his successor, Chrysostom, the compass of the see extended itself still further, and, according to Theodoret,* stretched over the capital; over all Thrace, with its six provinces; over all Asia (*Asia proconsularis*), with eleven provinces; and over Pontus, which likewise embraced eleven provinces; thus covering twenty-eight provinces in all. In the year 400, Chrysostom went, "by request, to Ephesus," to ordain there Heraclides of Ephesus, and, at the same time, to institute six bishops, in the places of others deposed for simony.† His second successor, Atticus, about the year 421, procured from the younger Theodosius a law that no bishop should be ordained in the neighbouring dioceses without the consent of the bishop of Constantinople.‡ This power still needed the solemn sanction of a general council, before it could have a firm legal foundation. It received this sanction at Chalcedon.

The fourth ecumenical council, held at Chalcedon in 451, confirmed and extended the power of the bishop of Constantinople, by ordaining in the celebrated twenty-eighth canon:—

"Following throughout the decrees of the holy fathers, and being acquainted with the recently read canon of the hundred and fifty bishops [*i. e.* the third canon of the second ecumenical council of 381], we also have determined and decreed the same in reference to the prerogatives of the most holy church of Constantinople or New Rome. For with reason did the fathers confer prerogatives (*τὰ προεβεία*) on the throne (the episcopal chair) of ancient Rome, on account of her character as the imperial city (*διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν*); and, moved by the same consideration, the hundred and fifty bishops recognised the same prerogatives (*τὰ ἴσα προεβεία*) also in the most holy throne of new Rome; with good reason judging that the city, which is honoured with the imperial dignity and the senate [*i. e.* where the emperor and senate reside], and enjoys the same [municipal] privileges as the ancient imperial Rome, should also be equally elevated in ecclesiastical respects, and be the second after her (*δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην*)."

"And [we decree] that of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia [*Asia proconsularis*], and Thrace, only the metropolitans, but in such districts of those dioceses as are occupied by barbarians, also the [ordinary]

* H. E., lib. v. cap. xxviii.

† According to Sozomen it was thirteen, according to Theophilus of Alexandria at the council *ad quercum* seventeen, bishops whom he instituted; and this act was charged against him as an unheard of crime. See Wiltsch, i. 141.

‡ Socrates, H. E., l. vii. cap. xxviii., where such a law is incidentally mentioned. The inhabitants of Cyzicus, in the Hellespont, however, transgressed the law, on the presumption that it was merely a personal privilege of Atticus.

bishops, be ordained by the most holy throne of the most holy church at Constantinople; while, of course, every metropolitan in those dioceses ordains the new bishops of a province in concurrence with the existing bishops of that province, as is directed in the divine (Θείας) canons. But the metropolitans of those dioceses, as already said, shall be ordained by the archbishop (ἀρχιεπίσκοπος) of Constantinople, after they shall have been unanimously elected in the usual way, and he [the archbishop of Constantinople] shall have been informed of it."

We have divided this celebrated Chalcedonian canon into two parts, though, in the Greek text, the parts are (by καὶ ὡςτι) closely connected. The first part assigns to the bishop of Constantinople the second rank among the patriarchs, and is simply a repetition and confirmation of the third canon of the council of Constantinople; the second part goes further, and sanctions the supremacy, already actually exercised by Chrysostom and his successors, of the patriarch of Constantinople, not only over the diocese of Thrace, but also over the dioceses of Asia Minor and Pontus, and gives him the exclusive right to ordain both the metropolitans of these three dioceses, and all the bishops of the barbarians* within those bounds. This gave him a larger district than any other patriarch of the east. Subsequently, an edict of the emperor Justinian, in 530, added to him the special prerogative of receiving appeals from the other patriarchs, and thus of governing the whole Orient.

The council of Chalcedon, in this decree, only followed consistently the oriental principle of politico-ecclesiastical division. Its intention was to make the new political capital also the ecclesiastical capital of the east, to advance its bishop over the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, and to make him, as nearly as possible, equal to the bishop of Rome. Thus was imposed a wholesome check on the ambition of the Alexandrian patriarch, who, in various ways, as the affair of Theophilus and Dioscurus shews, had abused his power to the prejudice of the church.

But thus, at the same time, was roused the jealousy of the bishop of Rome, to whom a rival in Constantinople, with equal prerogatives, was far more dangerous than a rival in Alexandria or Antioch. Especially offensive must it have been to him, that the council of Chalcedon said not a word of the primacy of Peter, and based the power of the

* Among the barbarian tribes, over whom the bishops of Constantinople exercised an ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were the Huns on the Bosphorus, whose king, Gorda, received baptism in the time of Justinian; the Heruliens, who received the Christian faith in 527; the Abasgiens and Alanians on the Euxine Sea, who, about the same time, received priests from Constantinople. Comp. Wiltch, i., 144 and 145.

Roman bishop, like that of the Constantinopolitan, on political grounds; which was, indeed, not erroneous, yet only half of the truth, and in that view unfair.

Just here, therefore, is the point, where the eastern church entered into a conflict with the western, which continues to this day. The papal delegates protested against the twenty-eighth canon of the Chalcedonian council, on the spot, in the sixteenth and last session of the council; but in vain, though their protest was admitted to record. They appealed to the sixth canon of the Nicene council, according to the enlarged Latin version, which, in the later addition, "*Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*," seems to assign the Roman bishop a position above all the patriarchs, and drops Constantinople from notice; whereupon the canon was read to them in its original form from the Greek acts, without that addition, together with the first three canons of the second ecumenical council, with their express acknowledgment of the patriarch of Constantinople in the second rank.* After the debate on this point, the imperial commissioners thus summed up the result:—"From the whole discussion, and from what has been brought forward on either side, we acknowledge that the primacy over all (πρὸ πάντων τὰ πρωτεύοντα) and the most eminent rank (καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρέτου τιμῆν), are to continue with the archbishop of old Rome; but that also the archbishop of new Rome should enjoy the same precedence of honour (τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς), and have the right to ordain the metropolitans in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace," &c. Now they called upon the council to declare whether this was its opinion; whereupon the bishops gave their full, emphatic consent, and begged to be dismissed. The commissioners then closed the transactions with the words:—"What we a little while ago proposed, the whole council hath ratified;" that is, the prerogative granted

* This correction of the Roman legates is so little to the taste of the Roman Catholic historians, especially the ultramontane, that the Ballerini, in their edition of the works of Leo the Great, tom. iii. p. 37, sqq., and even Hefele, Conciliengesch. i. p. 885, and ii. p. 522, have without proof declared the relevant passage in the Greek acts of the council of Chalcedon a later interpolation. Hefele, who can but concede the departure of the Latin version from the original text of the sixth canon of Nice, thinks, however, that the Greek text was not read in Chalcedon, because even this bore *against* the elevation of Constantinople, and therefore *in favour* of the Roman legates. But the Roman legates, as also Leo in his protest against the 28th decree of Chalcedon, laid chief stress upon the Roman addition, *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*, and considered the equalisation of any other patriarch with the bishop of Rome incompatible with it. Since the legates, as is conceded, appealed to the Nicene canon, the Greeks had first to meet this appeal, before they passed to the canons of the council of Constantinople. Only the two together formed a sufficient answer to the Roman protest.

to the church of Constantinople is confirmed by the council in spite of the protest of the legates of Rome.*

After the council, the Roman bishop, Leo, himself protested in three letters, of the 22d May 452; the first of which was addressed to the emperor Marcian, the second to the empress Pulcheria, the third to Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople.† He expressed his satisfaction with the doctrinal results of the council, but declared the elevation of the bishop of Constantinople to the patriarchal dignity to be a work of pride and ambition—the humble, modest pope!—to be an attack upon the rights of other eastern metropolitans—the invader of the same rights in Gaul! especially upon the rights of the Roman see guaranteed by the council of Nice, on the authority of a Roman interpolation! and to be destructive of the peace of the church, which the popes have always sacredly kept! He would hear nothing of political considerations as the source of the authority of his chair, but pointed rather to divine institution and the primacy of Peter. Leo speaks here with great reverence of the first ecumenical council, under the false impression that that council, in its sixth canon, acknowledged the primacy of Rome; but with singular indifference of the second ecumenical council, on account of its third canon, which was confirmed at Chalcedon. He charges Anatolius with using, for his own ambition, a council which had been called simply for the extermination of heresy and the establishment of the faith. But the canons of the Nicene council, inspired by the Holy Ghost, could be superseded by no synod, however great, and all that came in conflict with them was void. He exhorted Anatolius to give up his ambition, and reminded him of the words:—*Tene quod habes, ne alius accipiat coronam tuam.*‡

But this protest could not change the decree of the council nor the position of the Greek church in the matter, although, under the influence of the emperor, Anatolius wrote an humble letter to Leo. The bishops of Constantinople asserted their rank, and were sustained by the Byzantine emperors. The twenty-eighth canon of the Chalcedonian council was expressly confirmed by Justinian I. in the 131st Novelle (c. 1), and solemnly renewed by the Trullan council (can. 36), but was omitted in the Latin collections of canons by Prisca, Dionysius, Exiguus, and Isidore. The loud contradiction of Rome gradually died away; yet she has never

* Monsi, vii. pp. 446–454. Harduin, ii. 639–643. Hefele, ii. 524, 525.

† Leo, Epist. 104, 105, and 106 (al. ep. 78–80). Comp. Hefele, l. c. ii. 580, 599.

‡ Rev. iii. 11.

formally acknowledged this canon, except during the *Latin* empire and the *Latin* patriarchate at Constantinople, when the fourth Lateran council under Innocent III., in 1215, conceded that the patriarch of Constantinople should hold the next rank after the patriarch of Rome, before those of Alexandria and Antioch.*

Finally, the bishop of Jerusalem, after long contests with the metropolitan of Cæsarea and the patriarch of Antioch, succeeded in advancing himself to the patriarchal dignity; but his distinction remained chiefly a matter of honour, far below the other patriarchates in extent of real power. Had not the ancient Jerusalem in the year 70 been left with only a part of the city wall and three gates to mark it, it would doubtless, being the seat of the oldest Christian congregation, have held, as in the time of James, a central position in the hierarchy. Yet as it was, a reflection of the original dignity of the mother city fell upon the new settlement of Ælia Capitolina, which, after Adrian, rose upon the venerable ruins. The pilgrimage of the empress Helena, and the magnificent church edifices of her son on the holy places, gave Jerusalem a new importance as the centre of devout pilgrimage from all quarters of Christendom. Its bishop was subordinate, indeed, to the metropolitan of Cæsarea, but presided with him (probably *secundo loco*) at the Palestinian councils.† The council of Nice gave him an honorary precedence among the bishops, though without affecting his dependence on the metropolitan of Cæsarea.

At least this seems to be the meaning of the short and somewhat obscure seventh canon: "Since it is custom and old tradition, that the bishop of Ælia (Jerusalem) should be honoured, he shall also enjoy the succession of honour,‡ while the metropolis (Cæsarea) preserves the dignity allotted to her." The legal relation of the two remained for a long time uncertain, till the fourth ecumenical council, at its seventh session, confirmed the bishop of Jerusalem in his patriarchal rank, and assigned to him the three provinces of Palestine as a diocese, without opposition.

THE RIVAL PATRIARCHS OF OLD AND NEW ROME.

Thus at the close of the fourth century we see the catholic church of the Græco-Roman empire under the oligarchy of

* Harduin, tom. vii. 23; Schröckh, xvii. 43; and Hefele, ii. 544.

† Comp. Eusebius, himself the metropolitan of Cæsarea, H. E. V. 23. He gives the succession of the bishops of Jerusalem, as well as of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch; while he omits those of Cæsarea.

‡ Ἀκολουθία τῆς ἐμῆς; which is variously interpreted. Comp. Hefele, i. 389, sq.

five co-ordinate and independent patriarchs, four in the east and one in the west. But the analogy of the political constitution, and the tendency towards a visible, tangible representation of the unity of the church, which had lain at the bottom of the development of the hierarchy from the very beginnings of the episcopate, pressed beyond oligarchy to monarchy; especially in the west. Now that the empire was geographically and politically severed into east and west, which, after the death of Theodosius in 395, had their several emperors, and were never permanently reunited, we can but expect in like manner a double head in the hierarchy. This we find in the two patriarchs of old Rome and new Rome; the one representing the western or Latin church, the other the eastern or Greek. Their power and their relation to each other we must now more carefully observe.

The organisation of the church in the east being so largely influenced by the political constitution, the bishop of the imperial capital could not fail to become the most powerful of the four oriental patriarchs. By the second and fourth ecumenical councils, as we have already seen, his actual pre-eminence was ratified by ecclesiastical sanction, and he was designated to the foremost dignity.* From Justinian I. he further received supreme appellate jurisdiction, and the honorary title of *ecumenical* patriarch, which he still continues to bear.† He ordained the other patriarchs, not seldom decided their deposition or institution by his influence, and used every occasion to interfere in their affairs, and assert his supreme authority, though the popes and their delegates at the imperial court incessantly protested. The patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria were distracted and weakened in the course of the fifth and

* Τὰ περιβῆα τῆς τιμῆς . . . διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν (i. e. Constantinople) οἶον Ῥώμην.

† The title *oikoumenikῆς πατριάρχης, universalis episcopus*, had before been used in flattery by oriental patriarchs, and the later Roman bishops bore it, in spite of the protest of Gregory I., without scruple. The statement of popes Gregory I. and Leo IX., that the council of Chalcedon conferred on the Roman bishop Leo the title of *universalis episcopus*, and that he rejected it, is erroneous. No trace of it can be found either in the acts of the councils or in the epistles of Leo. In the acts Leo is styled *ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς μεγάλης καὶ περιβουτρίας Ῥώμης*; which, however, in the Latin acts sent by Leo to the Gallican bishops, was thus enlarged: 'Sanctus et beatissimus *Papa, caput universalis ecclesie, Leo*.' The papal legates at Chalcedon subscribed themselves, *Vicarii apostolici universalis ecclesie papa*, which the Greeks translated, *τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησίας ἱεραπόστολοι*. Hence probably arose the error of Gregory I. The popes wished to be *papa* *universalis ecclesie*, not *episcopi* or *patriarchæ universales*; no doubt because the latter designation put them on a level with the eastern patriarchs. Comp. Gieseler, i. 2, p. 192, not. 20, and p. 228, not. 72; and Hefele, ii. 526, sq.

sixth centuries by the tedious monophysite controversies, and subsequently, after the year 622, were reduced to but a shadow by the Mahomedan conquests. The patriarchate of Constantinople, on the contrary, made important advances south-west and north; till, in its flourishing period, between the eighth and tenth centuries, it embraced, besides its original diocese, Calabria, Sicily, and all the provinces of Illyricum, the Bulgarians, and Russia. Though often visited with destructive earthquakes and conflagrations, and besieged by Persians, Arabians, Hungarians, Russians, Latins, and Turks, Constantinople maintained itself to the middle of the fifteenth century as the seat of the Byzantine empire and centre of the Greek church. The patriarch of Constantinople, however, remained virtually only *primus inter pares*, and has never exercised a papal supremacy over his colleagues in the east, like that of the pope over the metropolitans of the west; still less has he arrogated, like his rival in ancient Rome, the sole dominion of the entire church. Towards the bishop of Rome, he claimed only equality of rights and co-ordinate dignity.

In this long contest between the two leading patriarchs of Christendom, the patriarch of Rome at last carried the day. The monarchical tendency of the hierarchy was much stronger in the west than in the east, and was urging a universal monarchy in the church.

The patriarch of Constantinople enjoyed indeed the favour of the emperor, and all the benefit of the imperial residence. New Rome was most beautifully and most advantageously situated for a metropolis of government, of commerce, and of culture, on the bridge between two continents; and it formed a powerful bulwark against the barbarian conquests. It was never desecrated by an idol temple, but was founded a Christian city. It fostered the sciences and arts at a time when the west was whelmed by the wild waves of barbarism; it preserved the knowledge of the Greek language and literature through the middle ages; and after the invasion of the Turks it kindled, by its fugitive scholars, the enthusiasm of classic studies in the Latin church, till Greece rose from the dead with the New Testament in her hand, and held the torch for the Reformation.

But the Roman patriarch had yet greater advantages. In him were united, as even the Greek historian Theodoret concedes,* all the outward and the inward, the political and the spiritual conditions of the highest eminence.

In the first place, his authority rested on an ecclesiastical

* Epist. 113, to pope Leo I.

and spiritual basis, reaching back, as public opinion granted, through an unbroken succession, to Peter the apostle; while Constantinople was in no sense an *apostolica sedes*, but had a purely political origin, though by transfer, and in a measure by usurpation, it had possessed itself of the metropolitan rights of Ephesus.* Hence the popes after Leo appealed almost exclusively to the divine origin of their dignity, and to the primacy of the prince of the apostles over the whole church.

Then, too, considered even in a political point of view, old Rome had a far longer and grander imperial tradition to shew, and was identified in memory with the bloom of the empire; while new Rome marked the beginning of its decline. When the western empire fell into the hands of the barbarians, the Roman bishop was the only surviving heir of this imperial past, or, in the well-known dictum of Hobbes, "the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof."

Again, the very remoteness of Rome from the imperial court was favourable to the development of a hierarchy independent of all political influence and intrigue; while the bishop of Constantinople had to purchase the political advantages of the residence at the cost of ecclesiastical freedom. The tradition of the *donatio Constantini*, though a fabrication of the eighth century, has thus much truth: that the transfer of the imperial residence to the east broke the way for the temporal power and the political independence of the papacy.

Further, amidst the great trinitarian and christological controversies of the Nicene and post-Nicene age, the popes maintained the powerful prestige of almost undeviating ecumenical orthodoxy and doctrinal stability; † while the see of Constantinople, with its Grecian spirit of theological restlessness and disputation, was sullied with the Arian, the Nestorian, the Monophysite, and other heresies, and was in general, even in matters of faith, dependent on the changing humours of the court. Hence even contending parties in the east were accustomed to seek counsel and protection

* That the apostle Andrew brought the gospel to the ancient Byzantium, is an entirely unreliable legend.

† One exception is the brief pontificate of the Arian Felix II., whom the emperor Constantius, in 355, forcibly enthroned during the exile of Liberius, and who is regarded by some as an illegitimate anti-pope. The accounts respecting him are, however, very conflicting, and so are the opinions of even Roman Catholic historians. Liberius also, in 357, lapsed for a short time into Arianism, that he might be recalled from exile. Another and later exception is pope Honorius, whom even the sixth ecumenical council of Constantinople, 681, anathematized for monophysite heresy.

from the Roman chair, and oftentimes gave that see the coveted opportunity to put the weight of its decision into the scale. This occasional practice then formed a welcome basis for a theory of jurisdiction. The *Roma locuta est* assumed the character of a supreme and final judgment. Rome learned much and forgot nothing. She knew how to turn every circumstance, with consummate administrative tact, to her own advantage.

Finally, though the Greek church, down to the fourth ecumenical council, was unquestionably the main theatre of church history, and the chief seat of theological learning, yet, according to the universal law of history, "Westward the star of empire takes its way," the Latin church, and consequently the Roman patriarchate, already had the future to itself. While the eastern patriarchates were facilitating by internal quarrels and disorder the conquests of the false prophet, Rome was boldly and victoriously striking westward, and winning the barbarian tribes of Europe to the religion of the cross.

THE LATIN PATRIARCHS.

These advantages of the patriarch of Rome over the patriarch of Constantinople are at the same time the leading causes of the rise of the papacy, which we must now more closely pursue.

The papacy is undeniably the result of a long process of history. Centuries were employed in building it, and centuries have already been engaged upon its partial destruction. Lust of honour 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 entrusted 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 world and church according to an eternal plan, not only pre-

* 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 the authority of the Nicene council; and the later 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.

pires in silence, and in 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 civilisation, and trained by an awe-inspiring ecclesiastical authority and a firm hierarchical organisation, 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 of Christianity. The full exhibition of this pedagogic purpose belongs to the history of the middle age; but the foundation for it we find already being laid in the period before us.

The Roman bishop claims, that the four dignities of bishop, metropolitan, patriarch, and pope or primate of the whole church, are united in himself. The first three offices must be granted him in all historical justice; the last is denied him by the Greek church, and by the Evangelical, and by all non-catholic sects.

His bishopric is the city of Rome, with its cathedral church of St John Lateran, which bears over its main entrance the inscription, *Omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater et caput*; thus remarkably outranking even the church of St Peter,—as if Peter, after all, were not the last and highest apostle, and had to yield at last to the superiority of John, the representative of the ideal church of the future. Tradition says that the emperor Constantine erected this basilica by the side of the old Lateran palace, which had come down from heathen times, and gave the palace to pope Sylvester; and it remained the residence of the popes and the place of assembly for their councils (the Lateran councils) till after the exile of Avignon, when they took up their abode in the Vatican, beside the ancient church of St Peter.

As metropolitan or archbishop, the bishop of Rome had immediate jurisdiction over the seven suffragan bishops, afterwards called cardinal bishops, of the vicinity: Ostia,

Portus, Silva candida, Sabina, Præneste, Tusculum, and Albanum.

As patriarch, he rightfully stood on equal footing with the four patriarchs of the east, but had a much larger district and the primacy of honour. The name is here of no account, since the fact stands fast. The Roman bishops called themselves not patriarchs, but popes, that they might rise the sooner above their colleagues; for the one name denotes oligarchical power, the other, monarchical. But in the eastern church and among modern Catholic historians the designation is also quite currently applied to Rome.

The Roman patriarchal circuit primarily embraced the ten suburban provinces, as they were called, which were under the political jurisdiction of the Roman deputy, the Vicarius Urbis, including the greater part of central Italy, all upper Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.* In its wider sense, however, it extended gradually over the entire west of the Roman empire, thus covering Italy, Gaul, Spain, Illyria, south-eastern Brittania, and north-western Africa.†

* Concil. Nicaen. of 325, can. 6, in the Latin version of Rufinus (Hist. Eccl. x. 6): "Et ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic *suburbicariarum ecclesiarum* sollicitudinem gerat." The words *suburb. eccl.* are wanting in the Greek original, and are a Latin definition of the patriarchal diocese of Rome at the end of the fourth century. Since the seventeenth century, they have given rise to a long controversy among the learned. The jurist Gothofredus, and his friend Salmasius, limited the *regiones suburbicariæ* to the small province of the *Præfectus Urbis*, i. e. to the city of Rome, with the immediate vicinity to the hundredth mile stone; while the Jesuit Sirmond extended it to the much greater official district of the *Vicarius Urbis*; viz., the ten provinces of Campania, Tuscia, with Umbria, Picenum suburbicarium, Valeria, Samnium, Apulia, with Calabria, Lucania and Brutii, Sicilia, Sardinia, and Corsica. The comparison of the Roman bishop with the Alexandrian in the sixth canon of the Nicene council favours the latter view; since even the Alexandrian diocese likewise stretched over several provinces. The *Prisca*, however,—a Latin collection of canons from the middle of the fifth century—has perhaps hit the truth of the matter, in saying in its translation of the canon in question: "Antiqui moris est ut urbis Romæ episcopus habeat principatum, ut *suburbicaria loca* [i. e. here, no doubt, the smaller province of the *Præfectus*] et *omnem provinciam suam* [i. e. the larger district of the *Vicarius*, or a still wider, indefinite extent] sollicitudine sua gubernet." Comp. Nansi, Coll. Conc. vi. 1127, and Hefele, i. 380, sqq.

† According to the political division of the empire, the Roman patriarchate embraced in the fifth century three præfectures, which were divided into eight political dioceses and sixty-nine provinces. These are (1) the præfectura of Italy, with the three dioceses of Italy, Illyricum, and Africa; (2) the præfectura Galliarum, with the dioceses of Gaul, Spain, and Britain; (3) the præfectura of Illyricum (not to be confounded with the *provinces* of Illyria, which belonged to the præfectura of Italy), which, after 379, was separated indeed from the western empire, as Illyricum orientale, but remained ecclesiastically connected with Rome, and embraced the two dioceses of Macedonia and Dæia. Comp. Wiltch, l. c. i. 67, sqq.; Maassen, p. 125; and Hefele, i. 383.

The bishop of Rome was from the beginning the only *Latin* patriarch, in the official sense of the word. He stood thus alone, in the first place, for the ecclesiastical reason, that Rome was the only *sedes apostolica* in the west, while in the Greek church three patriarchates and several other episcopal sees, such as Ephesus, Thessalonica, and Corinth, shared the honour of apostolic foundation. Then again, he stood politically alone, since Rome was the sole metropolis of the west, while in the east there were three capitals of the empire, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. Hence Augustine, writing from the religious point of view, calls once pope Innocent I. the "ruler of the western church;"* and the emperor Justinian, on the ground of political distribution, in his 109th Novelle, where he speaks of the ecclesiastical division of the whole world, mentions only five known patriarchates, and therefore only one patriarchate of the west. The decrees of the ecumenical councils, also, know no other western patriarchate than the Roman, and this was the sole medium through which the eastern church corresponded with the western. In the great theological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, the Roman bishop appears uniformly as the representative and the organ of all Latin Christendom.

It was, moreover, the highest interest of all orthodox churches in the west, amidst the political confusion and in conflict with the Arian Goths, Vandals, and Suevi, to bind themselves closely to a common centre, and to secure the powerful protection of a central authority. This centre they could not but find in the primitive apostolic church of the metropolis of the world. The Roman bishops were consulted in almost all important questions of doctrine or of discipline. After the end of the fourth century, they issued to the western bishops in reply pastoral epistles and decretal letters,† in which they decided the question at first in the tone of paternal counsel, then in the tone of apostolic authority, making that which had hitherto been left to free opinion, a fixed statute. The first extant decretal is the *Epistola* of pope Siricius to the Spanish bishop Himerius, A.D. 385, which contains, characteristically, a legal enforcement of priestly celibacy, thus of an evidently unapostolic institution; but in this Siricius appeals to "generalia decreta," which his predecessor Liberius had already issued.

* *Contra Julianum*, lib. i. cap. 6.

† *Epistolæ decretales*; an expression which, according to Gieseler and others, occurs first about 600 in the so-called decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis et non rec.

In like manner the Roman bishops repeatedly caused the assembling of general or patriarchal councils of the west (*synodos occidentales*), like the synod of Arles in 514. After the sixth and seventh centuries, they also conferred the pallium on the archbishops of Salona, Ravenna, Messina, Syracuse, Palermo, Arles, Autun, Sevilla, Nicopolis (in Epirus), Canterbury, and other metropolitans, in token of their superior jurisdiction.*

CONFLICTS AND CONQUESTS OF THE LATIN PATRIARCHATE.

But this patriarchal power was not from the beginning, and to a uniform extent, acknowledged in the entire west. Not until the latter part of the sixth century did it reach the height we have above described.† It was not a divine institution, unchangeably fixed from the beginning for all times, like a biblical article of faith; but the result of a long process of history, a human ecclesiastical institution under providential direction. In proof of which we have the following incontestable facts:

In the first place, even in Italy, several metropolitans maintained, down to the close of our period, their own supreme headship, independent of Roman and all other jurisdiction.‡ The archbishops of Milan, who traced their church to the apostle Barnabas, came into no contact with the pope till the latter part of the sixth century, and were ordained without him or his pallium. Gregory I., in 593, during the ravages of the Longobards, was the first who endeavoured to exercise patriarchal rights there; he reinstated an excommunicated presbyter who had appealed to him.§ The metropolitans of Aquileia, who derived their church from the evangelist Mark, and whose city was elevated by Constantine the Great to be the capital of Venetia and Istria, vied with Milan and even with Rome, calling themselves "patriarchs," and refusing submission to the papal jurisdiction even under Gregory the Great.||

* See the information concerning the conferring of the pallium in Wilsch, i. 68, sq.

† This is conceded by Hefele, i. 383, sq.: "It is, however, not to be mistaken that the bishops of Rome did not *everywhere*, in all the west, exercise *full* patriarchal rights; that, to wit, in several provinces simple bishops were ordained without his co-operation." And not only simple bishops but also metropolitans. See the text.

‡ *Ἀντιπάρις*, also *ἀκίφαλοι*, as in the east especially the archbishops of Cyprus and Bulgaria were called, and some other metropolitans, who were subject to no patriarch.

§ Comp. Wilsch, i. 234.

|| Comp. Gregor. I. Epist. l. iv. 49; and Wilsch, i. 236, sq. To the metro-

The bishop of Ravenna likewise, after 408, when the emperor Honorius selected that city for his residence, became a powerful metropolitan, with jurisdiction over fourteen bishoprics. Nevertheless, he received the pallium from Gregory the Great, and examples occur of ordination by the Roman bishop.*

The North African bishops and councils in the beginning of the fifth century, with all traditional reverence for the apostolic see, repeatedly protested, in the spirit of Cyprian, against encroachments of Rome, and even prohibited all appeal in church controversies from their own to a transmarine or foreign tribunal, upon pain of excommunication.† The occasion of this was an appeal to Rome by the presbyter Apiarius, who had been deposed for sundry offences by Bishop Urbanus of Sicca, a disciple and friend of Augustine, and whose restoration was twice attempted, by Pope Zosimus in 418, and by Pope Cœlestine in 424. From this we see that the popes gladly undertook to interfere for a palpably unworthy priest, and thus sacrificed the interests of local discipline, only to make their own superior authority felt. The Africans referred to the genuine Nicene canon (for which Zosimus had substituted the Sardinian appendix respecting the appellate jurisdiction of Rome, of which the Nicene council knew nothing), and reminded the pope that the gift of the Holy Ghost, needful for passing a just judgment, was not lacking to any province, and that he could as well inspire a whole province as a single bishop. The last document in the case of this appeal of Apiarius is a letter of the (twentieth) council of Carthage, in 424, to Pope Cœlestine I. to the following purport :‡—“ Apiarius asked a new trial, and gross misdeeds of his were thereby brought to light. The papal legate Faustinus has, in the face of this, in a very harsh manner demanded the reception of this man into the fellowship of the Africans, because he has appealed to the pope and been received into fellowship by him. But this very thing ought not to have been done. At last has Apiarius himself acknowledged all his crimes. The pope may hereafter no longer so readily give audience to those who came from Africa to Rome, like Apiarius, nor receive

polis of Aquileia belonged the bishoprics of Verona, Tridentum (the Trent, since become so famous), Emona, Altinum, Torcellum, Pola, Celina, Sabiona, Forum Julii, Bellunum, Concordia, Feltria, Tarvisium, and Vicentia.

* Baron. Ann. ad ann. 433; Wiltch, i. 69, 87.

† Comp. the relevant Acts of Councils in Gieseler, i. 2, p. 221, sqq., and an extended description of this case of appeal in Greenwood, Cath. Petri, i. pp. 299-310, and in Hefele, Concilien-Gesch. ii. 107, sqq., 120, 123, sq.

‡ Mansi, iii. 839, sq.

the excommunicated into church communion, be they bishops or priests, as the council of Nice (can. 5) has ordained, in whose direction bishops are included. The assumption of appeal to Rome is a trespass on the rights of the African church, and what has been (by Zosimus and his legates) brought forward as a Nicene ordinance for it, is not Nicene, and is not to be found in the genuine copies of the Nicene Acts, which have been received from Constantinople and Alexandria. Let the pope, therefore, in the future send no more judges to Africa, and since Apiarius has now been excluded for his offences, the pope will surely not expect the African church to submit longer to the annoyances of the legate Faustinus. May God the Lord long preserve the pope, and may the pope pray for the Africans." In the Pelagian controversy the weak Zosimus, who, in opposition to the judgment of his predecessor Innocent, had at first expressed himself favourably to the heretics, was even compelled by the Africans to yield. The North African church maintained this position under the lead of the greatest of the Latin fathers, St Augustine, who in other respects contributed more than any other theologian or bishop to the erection of the Catholic system. The first made submission to the Roman jurisdiction, in the sense of her weakness, under the shocks of the Vandals. Leo (440-461) was the first pope who could boast of having extended the diocese of Rome beyond Europe into another quarter of the globe.* He and Gregory the Great wrote to the African bishops entirely in the tone of the paternal authority, without provoking reply.

In Spain, the popes found from the first a more favourable field. The orthodox bishops there were so pressed in the fifth century by the Arian Vandals, Suevi, Alani, and soon after by the Goths, that they sought counsel and protection with the bishop of Rome, which, for his own sake, he was always glad to give. So early as 385, Siricius, as we have before observed, issued a decretal letter to a Spanish bishop. The epistles of Leo to Bishop Turibius of Asturica, and to the bishops of Gaul and Spain, † are instances of the same authoritative style. Simplicius (467-483) appointed the Bishop Zeno of Sevilla papal vicar, ‡ and Gregory the Great, with a paternal letter, conferred the pallium on Leander, bishop of Sevilla. §

* Epist. 87. Mansi, vi. 120.

† Ep. 93 and 95. Mansi, vi. 131 and 132.

‡ Mansi, vii. 972.

§ Greg. Ep. i. 41. Mansi, ix. 1059. Comp. Wiltch, i. 71.

In Gaul, Leo succeeded in asserting the Roman jurisdiction, though not without opposition, in the affair of the archbishop Hilary of Arles, or Arelate. The affair has been differently represented from the Gallican and the ultramontane points of view.* Hilary (born 403, died 449), first a rigid monk, then, against his will, elevated to the bishopric; an eloquent preacher, an energetic prelate, and the first champion of the freedom of the Gallican church against the pretensions of Rome, but himself not free from hierarchical ambition, deposed Celidonius, the bishop of Besançon, at a council in that city (*synodus Vesontionensis*), because he had married a widow before his ordination, and had presided as judge at a criminal trial and pronounced sentence of death; which things, according to the ecclesiastical law, incapacitated him for the episcopal office. This was unquestionably an encroachment on the province of Vienne, to which Besançon belonged. Pope Zosimus had indeed, in 417, twenty-eight years before, appointed the bishop of Arles, which was a capital of seven provinces, to be papal vicar in Gaul, and had granted him metropolitan rights in the provinces Viennensis and Narbonensis prima and secunda, though with the reservation of *causæ majores*.† The metropolitans of Vienne, Narbonne, and Marseilles, however, did not accept this arrangement, and the succeeding popes found it best to recognise again the old metropolitans.‡ Celidonius appealed to Leo against that act of Hilary. Leo, in 445, assembled a Roman council (*concilium sacerdotum*), and reinstated him, as the accusation of Hilary, who him-

* This difference shews itself in the two editions of the works of Leo the Great respectively: that of the French PASQUIER GUESNEL, which also contains the works and a vindication of Hilary of Arles (Par. 1675, in 2 vols.), and was condemned in 1676 by the Congregation of the Index, without their even reading it; and that of the two brothers BALLERINI, which appeared in opposition to the former (Ven. 1755-57, 3 vols.), and represented the Italian ultramontane side. Comp. further on this contest of Hilarius Arlatensis (not to be confounded with Hilarius Pictaviensis, Hilarius Narbonensis, and others of the same name), with Pope Leo, the Vita Hilarii of Honoratus Massiliensis, of about the year 490 (printed in Mansi, vi. 461, sqq., and in the Acta Sanct. ad d. 5 Maji); the article by Perthel in Illgen's Zeitschrift for. hist. Theol. 1843; Greenwood, l. c. i. pp. 350-356; Milman, Lat. Christianity, i. pp. 269-276 (Amer. ed.); and the article "Hilarius" in Wetzer and Welte's Kirchenlexic. vol. v. p. 181. sqq.

† "Nisi magnitudo causæ etiam nostrum exquirat examen." Gieseler, i. 2, p. 218; Greenwood, i. p. 299.

‡ Comp. Bonifacii, I. Epist. 12 ad Hilarium Narbon. (not Arelatensem), A.D. 422, in Gieseler, p. 219. Boniface here speaks in favour of the Nicene principle, that each metropolitan should rule simply over one province. Greenwood overlooks this change, and hence fully justifies Hilary on the ground of the appointment of Zosimus. But even though this appointment had stood, the deposition of a bishop was still a *causa major*, which Hilary, as vicar of the pope, should have laid before him for ratification.

self journeyed on foot in the winter to Rome, and protested most vehemently against the appeal, could not be proven to the satisfaction of the pope. In fact, he directly or indirectly caused Hilary to be imprisoned, and when he escaped and fled back to Gaul, cut him off from the communion of the Roman church, and deprived him of all prerogatives in the diocese of Vienne, which had been only temporarily conferred on the bishop of Arles, and were by better judgment (*sententia meliore*) taken away. He accused him of assaults on the rights of other Gallican metropolitans, and above all of insubordination towards the principality of the most blessed Peter; and he goes so far as to say:—“Whoso disputes the primacy of the apostle Peter, can in no way lessen the apostle’s dignity, but puffed up by the spirit of his own pride, he destroys himself in hell.”* Only out of special grace did he leave Hilary in his bishopric. Not satisfied with this, he applied to the secular arm for help, and procured for the weak western emperor, Valentinian III., an edict to Ætius the *magister militum* of Gaul, in which it is asserted almost in the words of Leo, that the whole world (*universitas*; in Greek, *οικουμένη*) acknowledges the Roman see as director and governor; that neither Hilary nor any bishop might oppose its commands; that neither Gallican nor other bishops should, contrary to the ancient custom, do anything without the authority of the venerable pope of the eternal city, and that all decrees of the pope have the force of law.

The letter of Leo to the Gallican churches, and the edict of the emperor, give us the first example of a defensive and offensive alliance of the central spiritual and temporal powers in the pursuit of an unlimited sovereignty. The edict, however, could of course have power, at most, only in the west, to which the authority of Valentinian was limited. In fact, even Hilary and his successors maintained, in spite of Leo, the prerogatives they had formerly received from Pope Zosimus, and were confirmed in them by later popes. † Beyond this, the issue of the contest is unknown. Hilary of Arles died in 449, universally esteemed and loved, without, so far as we know, having become formally reconciled with Rome; ‡ though, notwithstanding this, he figures in a re-

* Leo, Epist. 10 (al. 89) ad Episc. provinciæ Viennensis.

† The Popes Vigil, 539–555, Pelagius, 555–559, and Gregory the Great conferred on the Archbishop of Arles, besides the pallium, also the vicariate (vices). Comp. Wiltch, i. 71, sq.

‡ At all events, no reconciliation can be certainly proved. Hilary did, indeed, according to the account of his disciple and biographer, who, some forty years after his death, encircled him with the halo, take some steps towards

markable manner in the Roman calendar by the side of his papal antagonist Leo, as a canonical saint. Undoubtedly Leo proceeded in this controversy far too rigorously and intemperately against Hilary; yet it was important that he should hold fast the right of appeal as a guarantee of the freedom of bishops against the encroachments of metropolitans. The papal despotism often proved itself a wholesome check upon the despotism of subordinate prelates.

With northern Gaul the Roman bishops came into less frequent contact; yet in this region also there occur in the fourth and fifth centuries examples of the successful assertion of their jurisdiction.

The early British church held from the first a very isolated position, and was driven back by the invasion of the pagan Anglo-Saxons, about the middle of the fifth century, into the mountains of Wales, Cornwallis, Cumberland, and the still more secluded islands. Not till the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons under Gregory the Great did a regular connection begin between England and Rome.

Finally, the Roman bishops succeeded also in extending their patriarchal power eastward, over the præfecture of east Illyria. Illyria belonged originally to the western empire, remained true to the Nicene faith through the Arian controversies, and for the vindication of that faith attached itself closely to Rome. When Gratian, in 379, incorporated Illyricum orientale with the eastern empire, its bishops nevertheless refused to give up their former ecclesiastical connection. Damasus conferred on the metropolitan Acholius of Thessalonica, as papal vicar, patriarchal rights in the new præfecture. The patriarch of Constantinople endeavoured, indeed, repeatedly to bring this ground into his diocese, but in vain. Justinian, in 535, formed of it a new diocese, with an independent patriarch at Prima Justiniana (or Achrida, his native city), but this arbitrary innovation had no vitality, and Gregory I. recovered active intercourse with the Illyrian bishops. Not until the eighth century, under the emperor Leo the Isaurian, was east Illyria finally severed from the Roman diocese and incorporated with the patriarchate of Constantinople.*

reconciliation, and sent two priests as delegates with a letter to the Roman præfect Auxiliarius. The latter endeavoured to act the mediator, but gave the delegates to understand that Hilary, by his vehement boldness, had too deeply wounded the delicate ears of the Romans. In Leo's letter a new trespass is charged upon Hilary, on the rights of the Bishop Projectus, after the deposition of Celidonius. And Hilary died soon after this contest (449).

* Comp. Gieseler, i. 2, p. 215, sqq.; and Wiltch, i. 72, sqq., 481, sqq.

THE PAPACY.

At last the Roman bishop, on the ground of his divine institution, and as successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, advanced his claim to be primate of the entire church, and visible representative of Christ, who is the invisible supreme head of the Christian world. This is the strict and exclusive sense of the title Pope.*

Properly speaking, this claim has never been fully realised, 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 for ever 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 Niceno-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 period before us, but could not make themselves good beyond the limits of the west. Consequently the papacy, as an 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 word, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church."† This

* The name *papa*—according to some an abbreviation of *pater patrum*, but more probably, like the kindred *abbas*, πάππας or πάππας, *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 *pabat*, are used. In the Greek and Russian churches, on the contrary, all priests are called *popen* (from πάππας, *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.

† Matthew xvi. 18: Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃα (mark the change

passage was at all times taken as an immoveable 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 converse.

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 of 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 neutralised by the absence of any clear Scripture evidence, and by the much more certain fact, given in the New Testament itself, that Paul laboured 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 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 honour 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 (A.D. 258), was the first to give to that passage of the 16th of Matthew, innocently as it were, and with no suspicion of the future use and abuse of

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) *εὐαγγελίσθη μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. καὶ πύλαι ἔδου οὐ κτισθήσονται ἐντῆς.* Comp. the commentators, especially Meyer, Lange, Alford, Wordsworth, *ad loc.*; and Schaff's *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, sec. 90 (N. Y. ed. p. 350, sqq.

his view, a papistic interpretation, and to bring out clearly the idea of a perpetual *cathedra Petri*. The same Cyprian, however, whether consistently or not, was at the same time equally animated with the consciousness of episcopal equality and independence, afterwards actually came out in bold opposition to Pope Stephen in a doctrinal controversy on the validity of heretical baptisms, and persisted in this protest to his death.*

OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS.

We now pursue the development of this idea in the church fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. † In general, they 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 Matt. xvi. 18, now to the person of Peter, now to his confession, now to Christ. Then, as the bishops in general were regarded as successors of the apostles, the fathers saw in the Roman bishop, 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 emperor Rudolph: *Petra* [i. e. Christ] *dedit, Petro* [i. e. 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-coloured beast, full of names of blas-

* Comp. vol. i. sec. 110.

† A complete collection of the patristic utterances on the primacy of Peter and his successors, though from the Roman point of view, may be found in the work of Rev. Jos. BERINGTON and Rev. JOHN KIRK: "The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church," 3d ed. Lond. 1846, vol. ii. pp. 1-112. Comp. the works quoted, *sub* sec. 55, and a curious article of Prof. FRED. PIPER, on "Rome, the Eternal City," in the *Evang. Jahrbuch* for 1864, pp. 17-120, where the opinions of the fathers on the claims of the *urbs æterna* and its many fortunes are brought out.

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

phemy, 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.†

1. The views of the *Latin* fathers.

The Cyprianic idea was developed primarily in North Africa, where it was first clearly pronounced.

OPTATUS, bishop of Milevi, the otherwise unknown author of an anti-Donatist work about A.D. 384, is, like Cyprian, thoroughly possessed with the idea of the visible unity of the church; declares it without qualification the highest good, and sees its plastic expression and its surest safeguard in the immoveable *cathedra Petri*, the prince of the apostles, the keeper of the key of the kingdom of heaven, who, in spite of his denial of Christ, continued in that relation to the other apostles, that the unity of the church might appear in outward fact as an unchangeable thing, invulnerable to human offence. All these prerogatives have passed to the bishops of Rome, as the successors of the apostles.‡

AMBROSE of Milan (A.D. 397), speaks indeed in very high terms of the Roman church, and concedes to its bishops a religious magistracy like the political power of the emperors of pagan Rome; § yet he calls the primacy of Peter only a "primacy of confession, not of honour; of faith, not of rank,"|| and places the apostle Paul on an equality with Peter.¶ Of any dependence of Ambrose, or of the bishops

* Hieronymus, Adv. Sovin. lib. ii. c. 38 (opera, t. ii. p. 382), where he addresses Rome: "Ad te loquar, quæ scriptam in fronte blasphemiam Christi confessione delcti." Prosper: "Æterna sum diritur quæ temporalis est, utique nomen est blasphemix." Comp. Piper, l. c. p. 46.

† So Chrysostom ad 2 Thess. ii. 7; Hieronymus, Ep. cxxi. qu. 11, tom. i. p. 860, sq.; Augustine, De Civit. Dei, lib. xx. cap. 19.

‡ De schismate Donatistarum, lib. ii. cap. 2, 8, and l. vii. iii. The work was composed while Siricius was bishop of Rome, hence about 384.

§ Ambr. Sermo. ii. in festo Petri et Pauli: "In urbe Romæ, quæ principatum et caput obtinet nationum: scilicet ut ubi caput superstitionis erat, illic caput quiesceret sanctitatis, et ubi gentilium principes habitabant; illic ecclesiarum principes morerentur." In Ps. 40: Ipse est Petrus cui dixit: Tu es Petrus . . . ubi ergo Petrus, ibi ecclesia; ubi ecclesia, ibi nulla mors, sed vita eterna." Comp. the poetic passage in his Morning Hymn, in the citation from Augustine further on. But in another passage he likewise refers the rock to Christ, in Luc. ix. 20, "Petra est Christus," &c.

|| De incarnat. Domini, c. 4: "Primatam confessionis utiquæ, non honoris, primatam fidei, non ordinis."

¶ De Spiritu S. ii. 12: "Nec Paulus inferior Petro, quamvis ille ecclesiæ fundamentum." Sermo ii. in festo P. et P., just before the above quoted passage: "Ergo beati Petrus et Paulus eminent inter universos apostolos, et peculiari quadam prærogativa præcellunt. Verum inter ipsos, quis cui præponatur, incertum est. Puto enim illos æquales esse meritis, qui æquales

of Milan in general during the first six centuries, on the jurisdiction of Rome, no trace is to be found.

JEROME (A.D. 419), the most learned commentator among the Latin fathers, vacillates in his explanation of the *petra*; now, like Augustine, referring it to Christ,* now to Peter and his confession.† In his commentary on Matthew xvi., he combines the two interpretations thus: "As Christ gave light to the apostles, so that they were called after him the light of the world, and as they received other designations from the Lord; so Simon, because he believed on the rock, Christ, received the name Peter, and in accordance with this figure of the rock, it is justly said to him, *I will build my church upon thee (super te).*" He recognises in the Roman bishop the successor of Peter, but advocates elsewhere the equal rights of the bishops,‡ and in fact derives even the episcopal office, not from direct divine institution, but from the usage of the church and from the presidency in the presbyterium.§ He can therefore be cited as a witness at most for a primacy of honour, not for a supremacy of jurisdiction. Beyond this, even the strongest passage of his writings, in a letter to his friend, Pope Damasus (A.D. 376), does not go: "Away with the ambition of the Roman head; I speak with the successor of the fisherman and disciple of the cross. Following no other head than Christ, I am joined in the communion of faith with thy holiness, that is, with

sunt passione." Augustine, too, once calls Paul, not Peter, *caput et princeps apostolorum*, and in another place that he *tanti apostolatus meruit principatum*.

* Hieron. in Amos vi. 12: "Petra Christus est, qui donavit apostolis suis, ut ipsi quoque petre vocentur." And in another place: "Ecclesia Catholica super Petram Christum stabili radici fundata est."

† Adv. Jovin. l. i. cap. 26 (in Vallas. ed. tom. ii. 279), in reply to Jovinian's appeal to Peter in favour of marriage: "At dicis: super Petrum fundatur ecclesia; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipient, et ex æquo super eos fortitudo ecclesiæ solidetur, tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio." So Epist. ad Damasum papam (ed. Vall. i. 37).

‡ Comp. Epist. 146, ed. Vall. i. 1076 (or Ep. 101 ed. Bened., al. 85), ad Evangelium: "Ubicunque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis [an intentional collocation of the most powerful and most obscure bishoprics], ejusdem est meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt."

§ Comp. J. Craigie Robertson, Hist. of the Christian Church to 590 (Lond. 1854), p. 286, note, finds a remarkable negative evidence against the papal claims in St Jerome's Ep. 125: "Where submission to one head is enforced on monks by the instinctive habits of beasts, bees, and cranes, the contentions of Esau and Jacob, of Romulus and Remus, the oneness of an emperor in his dominions, of a judge in his province, of a master in his house, of a pilot in a ship, of a general in an army, of a bishop, the archpresbyter, and the archdeacon in a church; but there is no mention of the one universal bishop."

the chair of Peter. On that rock I know the church to be built."* Subsequently this father, who himself had an eye on the papal chair, fell out with the Roman clergy, and retired to the ascetic and literary solitude of Bethlehem, where he served the church by his pen far better than he would have done as the successor of Damasus.

AUGUSTINE (A.D. 430), the greatest theological authority of the Latin church, at first referred the words, "*On this rock I will build my church*," to the person of Peter, but afterwards expressly retracted this interpretation, and considered the *petra* to be Christ, on the ground of a distinction between *petra* (*ἐπι ταύτη τῇ πέτρῃ*) and *Petrus* (*ὁ εἰ Πέτρος*); a distinction which Jerome also makes, though with the intimation that it is not properly applicable to the Hebrew and Syriac *Cephas*.† "I have somewhere said of St Peter"—thus Augustine corrects himself in his *Retractationes*, at the close of his life;—"that the church is built upon him as the rock; a thought which is sung by many in the verses of St Ambrose:—

'Hoc ipsa petra ecclesiam
Caute, culpam diluit.' §
(The Rock of the church himself,
In the cock-crowing atones his guilt.)

"But I know that I have since frequently said that the word of the Lord, 'Thou art *Petrus*, and on this *petra* I will build my church,' must be understood of him whom Peter confessed as Son of the living God; and Peter, so named after this rock, represents the person of the church which is founded on this rock, and has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him, 'Thou art a rock' (*petra*), but 'Thou art Peter' (*Petrus*); and the rock was Christ, through confession of whom Simon received the name of Peter. Yet the reader may decide which of the two interpretations is the more probable." In the same strain, he says, in another place, "Peter, in virtue of the primacy of his apostolate, stands, by a figurative generalisation, for

* Ep. xv. (alias 57) ad Damasum papam (ed. Vall. i. 37, sq.): "Tacet invidia: Romani culminis recedat ambitio, cum successore piscatoris et discipulo crucis loquor—Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum sequens, Beatitudinituæ, id est cathedræ Petri, communionem consocior. Super illam petram edificatam ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, profanus est. Si quis in Noe arca non fuerit, peribit regnante diluio."

† Hier. Com. in Ep. ad Galat. ii. 11, 12 (ed. Vallars. tom. vii. col. 409): "Non quod aliud significat *Petrus*, aliud *Cephas*, sed quod quam nos Latine et Græcè *petram* vocemus, hanc Hebræi et Syri, propter linguæ inter se viciniam, *Cephan* nuncupant."

‡ *Retract.* l. i. c. 21.

§ In the Ambrosian Morning Hymn, "Æterne rerum conditor."

the church. . . . When it was said to him, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c., he represented the whole church, which in this world is assailed by various temptations, as if by floods and storms, yet does not fall, because it is founded upon a rock, from which Peter received his name. For the rock is not so named from Peter, but Peter from the rock (*non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra*), even as Christ is not so called after the Christian, but the Christian after Christ. For the reason why the Lord says, 'On this rock I will build my church,' is that Peter had said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' On this rock, which thou hast confessed, says he, I will build my church. For Christ was the rock (*petra enim erat Christus*), upon which also Peter himself was built; for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Thus the church, which is built upon Christ, has received from him, in the person of Peter, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins.* This Augustinian interpretation of the *petra* has since been revived by some Protestant theologians in the cause of Anti-Romanism.† Augustine, it is true, unquestionably understood by the church, the visible Catholic church, descended from the apostles, especially from Peter, through the succession of bishops; and, according to the usage of his time, he called the Roman church, by eminence, the *sedes apostolica*.‡ But on the other hand, like Cyprian and Jerome, he lays stress upon the essential unity of the episcopate, and insists that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed, not to a single man, but to the whole

* Tract. in *Evang. Joannis*, 124, sec. 5. The original is quoted, among others, by Dr Gieseler, i. 2, p. 210 (4th ed.), but with a few unessential omissions.

† Especially by Calov in the Lutheran church, and quite recently by Dr Wordsworth in the Church of England. But Dr Alford decidedly protests against it, with most of the modern commentators.

‡ *De utilit. credendi*, sec. 35, he traces the development of the church, "ab apostolica sede per successiones apostolorum," and *Epist. xliiii.*, he incidentally speaks of the "*Romana ecclesia, in qua semper apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus.*" *Greenwood*, i. p. 296, sq., thus resolves the apparent contradiction in Augustine: "In common with the age in which he lived, he (St Augustine) was himself possessed with the idea of a visible representative unity, and considered that unity as equally the subject of divine precept and institution with the church-spiritual itself. The spiritual unity might therefore stand upon the *faith* of Peter, while the outward and visible oneness was inherent in his person; so that while the church derived her esoteric and spiritual character from the faith which Peter had confessed, she received her external or executive powers from Peter through 'the succession of bishops' sittings in Peter's chair. Practically, indeed, there was little to choose between the two theories." Comp. also the thorough exhibition of the Augustinian theory of the Catholic church and her attributes, by Dr Rothe, in his work, *Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*, i. pp. 679-711.

church, which Peter was only set to represent.* With this view agrees the independent position of the North African church, in the time of Augustine, towards Rome, as we have already observed it in the case of the appeal of Apiarius, and as it appears in the Pelagian controversy, of which Augustine was the leader. This father, therefore, can at all events be cited only as a witness to the limited authority of the Roman chair. And it should also, in justice, be observed that, in his numerous writings, he very rarely speaks of that authority at all, and then for the most part incidentally; shewing that he attached far less importance to this matter than the Roman divines.†

The later Latin fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries prefer the reference of the *petra* to Peter and his confession, and transfer his prerogatives to the Roman bishops as his successors, but produce no new arguments. Among them we mention MAXIMUS of Turin (about 450), who, however, like Ambrose, places Paul on a level with Peter;‡ then OROSIUS, and several popes; above all, LEO, of whom we shall speak more fully in the following section.

2. As to the *Greek* fathers: EUSEBIUS, CYRIL of Jerusalem, BASIL, the two GREGORIES, EPHRAIM SYRUS, ASTERIUS, CYRIL of Alexandria, CHRYSOSTOM, and THEODORET, refer the *petra* now to the confession, now to the person, of Peter, sometimes to both. They speak of this apostle uniformly in very lofty terms, at times in rhetorical extravagance, calling him the "coryphæus of the choir of apostles," the "prince of the apostles," the "tongue of the apostles," the "bearer of the keys," the "keeper of the kingdom of heaven," the "pillar," the "rock," the "firm foundation of the church." But, in the first place, they understand by all this, simply an honorary primacy of Peter, to whom that power was but first committed, which the Lord afterwards conferred on all the apostles alike; and, in the second place, they by no means favour an *exclusive* transfer of this prerogative to the bishop of Rome, but claim it also for the bishops of Antioch, where Peter, according to Gal. ii., sojourned a

* De diversis serm. 108: "Has enim claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesie. Hinc ergo Petri excellentia prædicatur, quia ipsius universitatis et unitatis figuram gessit quando ei dictum est: *tibi trado, quod omnibus traditum est,*" &c.

† Bellarmine, in Præf. in Libr. de Pontif., calls this article even *rem summam fidei Christianæ!*

‡ Hom. v., on the feast of Peter and Paul. To the one, says he, the keys of knowledge were committed, to the other the keys of power. "Eminent inter universos apostolos et peculiari quadam prærogativa præcellunt. Verum inter ipsos quis cui præponatur, incertum est."

long time, and where, according to tradition, he was bishop, and appointed a successor.

So CHRYSOSTOM, for instance, calls Ignatius of Antioch a "successor of Peter, on whom, after Peter, the government of the church devolved;* and, in another place, says still more distinctly, "Since I have named Peter, I am reminded of another Peter [Flavian, bishop of Antioch], our common father and teacher, who has inherited as well the virtues as the chair of Peter. Yea, for this is the privilege of this city of ours [Antioch], to have first (ἡ ἀρχὴ) had the coryphæus of the apostles for its teacher. For it was proper that the city, where the Christian name originated, should receive the first of the apostles for its pastor. But, after we had him for our teacher, we did not retain him, but transferred him to imperial Rome.†

THEODORET also, who, like Chrysostom, proceeded from the Antiochian school, says of the "great city of Antioch," that it has the "throne of Peter."‡ In a letter to pope Leo he speaks, it is true, in very extravagant terms of Peter and his successors at Rome, in whom all the conditions, external and internal, of the highest eminence and control in the church are combined.§ But in the same epistle he remarks, that the "thrice blessed and divine double star of Peter and Paul rose in the east and shed its rays in every direction;" in connection with which it must be remembered that he was at that time seeking protection in Leo against the Eutychian robber-council of Ephesus (449), which he had unjustly deposed, both himself and Flavian of Constantinople.

His bitter antagonist also, the arrogant and overbearing CYRIL of Alexandria, descended some years before, in his battle against Nestorius, to unworthy flattery, and called pope Cælestine "the archbishop of the whole [Roman] world."|| The same prelates, under other circumstances,

* In S. Ignat. Martyr. n. iv.

† Hom. ii. in Principium. Actorum, n. vi. tom. iij. p. 70 (ed. Montfaucon). The last sentence (ἀλλὰ προσχωρήσαμεν τῇ βασιλίδι Ρώμῃ) is by some regarded as a later interpolation in favour of the Papacy. But it contains no concession of superiority. For Chrysostom immediately goes on to say, "We have, indeed, not retained the body of Peter, but we have retained the faith of Peter; and while we retain his faith, we have himself."

‡ Epist. lxxxvi.

§ Epist. cxviii. Comp. Bennington and Kirk, l. c. p. 91-93. In the Epist. cxvi., to Renatus, one of the three papal legates at Ephesus, where he entreats his intercession with Leo, he ascribes to the Roman see the control of the churches of the world (τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιῶν τῆν ἡγεμονίαν), but certainly in the oriental sense of an honorary supervision.

|| Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης (i. e. of the Roman empire, according to the well-known *usus loquendi*, even of the N. T., comp. Lu ii. 1), *πατέρα τι κα πατριάρχην Κιλιστίνου τῶν τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως Ρώμης*. Encom. in S. Mar. Diep (tom. v. p. 384). Comp. his Ep. ix. ad Cælest.

repelled with proud indignation the encroachments of Rome on their jurisdiction.

THE DECREES OF COUNCILS ON THE PAPAL AUTHORITY.

Much more important than the opinions of individual fathers are the formal decrees of the councils.

First mention here belongs to the council of SARDICA in Illyria (now Sofia in Bulgaria), in 343,* during the Arian controversy. This council is the most favourable of all to the Roman claims. In the interest of the deposed Athanasius and of the Nicene orthodoxy it decreed:—

(1.) That a deposed bishop, who feels he has a good cause, may apply, out of reverence to the memory of the apostle Peter, to the Roman bishop Julius, and shall leave it to him either to ratify the deposition, or to summon a new council.

(2.) That the vacant bishopric shall not be filled till the decision of Rome be received.

(3.) That the Roman bishop, in such a case of appeal, may, according to his best judgment, either institute a new trial by the bishops of a neighbouring province, or send delegates to the spot with full power to decide the matter with the bishops.†

Thus was plainly committed to the Roman bishops an appellate and revisory jurisdiction in the case of a condemned or deposed bishop, even of the east. But, in the first place, this authority is not here acknowledged as a right already existing in practice. It is conferred as a new power, and that merely as an honorary right, and as pertaining only to the bishop Julius in person.‡ Otherwise, either this bishop

* That this is the true date appears from the recently discovered Festival Epistles of Athanasius, published in Syriac by Cureton (London, 1848), in an English translation by Williams (Oxford, 1854), and in German by Larsov (Leipzig, 1852). Mansi puts the council in the year 344 but most writers, including Gieseler, Neander, Milman, and Greenwood, following the erroneous statement of Socrates (ii. 20) and Sozomen (iii. 12), place it in the year 347. Comp. on the subject Larsov, Die Festbriefe des Athanasius, p. 31; and Hefele, Conciliengesch. i. p. 513, sqq.

† Can. 3, 4, and 5 (in the Latin translation can. 3, 4, and 7), in Mansi iii. 23, sq., and in Hefele i., 589, sqq., where the Greek and the Latin Dionysian text is given with learned explanations. The Greek and Latin texts differ in some points.

‡ So the much discussed *canones* are explained not only by Protestant historians, but also by Catholic of the Gallican school, like Peter de Marca, Quesnel, Du-Pin, Richer, Febronius. This interpretation agrees best with the whole connection; with the express mention of Julius (which is lacking, indeed, in the Latin translation of Prisca and in Isidore, but stands distinctly in the Greek and Dionysian texts: 'ἰουλίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης, Julio Romano episcopo); with the words, "Si vobis placet" (can. 3), when by the appeal in question is made dependent first on the decree of this council; and, finally, with the

would not be expressly named, or his successors would be named with him. Furthermore, the canons limit the appeal to the case of a bishop deposed by his com-provincials, and say nothing of other cases. Finally, the council of Sardica was not a general council, but only a local synod of the west, and could therefore establish no law for the whole church. For the eastern bishops withdrew at the very beginning, and held an opposition council in the neighbouring town of Philippopolis; and the city of Sardica, too, with the whole præfecture of Illyricum, at that time, belonged to the western empire and the Roman patriarchate; it was not detached from them till 379. The council was intended, indeed, to be ecumenical; but it consisted at first of only a hundred and seventy bishops, and after the secession of the seventy-six orientals, it had only ninety-four, and even by the two hundred signatures of absent bishops, mostly Egyptian, to whom the acts were sent for their approval, the east, and even the Latin Africa, with its three hundred bishoprics, were very feebly represented. It was not sanctioned by the emperor Constantius, and has, by no subsequent authority, been declared ecumenical.* Accordingly, its decrees soon fell into oblivion, and in the further course of the Arian controversy, and even throughout the Nestorian, where the bishops of Alexandria, and not those of Rome, were evidently at the head of the orthodox sentiment, they were utterly unnoticed.† The general councils of 381, 451, and 680, knew nothing of such a supreme appellate tribunal, but unanimously enacted, that all ecclesiastical matters, without exception, should first be decided in the provincial councils, with the right of appeal—not to the bishop of Rome, but to the patriarch of the proper diocese. Rome alone did not forget the Sardican decrees, but built on this single precedent a universal right. Pope Zosimus, in the case of the deposed presbyter Apiarius of Sicca (A.D. 417–418) made the significant mistake of taking the Sardican decrees for Nicene, and thus giving them greater weight than they really possessed; but he was referred by the Africans to the genuine

words, "Sancti Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus," which represent the Roman bishop's right of review as an honorary matter. What Hefele urges against these arguments (i. 548, sq.), seems to me very insufficient.

* Baronius, Natalis Alexander, and Mansi have endeavoured indeed to establish for the council an ecumenical character, but in opposition to the weightiest ancient and modern authorities of the Catholic church. Comp. Hefele, i. 596, sqq.

† It is also to be observed, that the synodal letters, as well as the orthodox ecclesiastical writers of this and the succeeding age, which take notice of this council, like Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Basil, make no mention of those decrees concerning Rome.

text of the Nicene canon. The later popes, however, transcended the Sardican decrees, withdrawing from the provincial council, according to the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the right of deposing a bishop, which had been allowed by Sardica, and vesting it, as a *causa major*, exclusively in themselves.

Finally, in regard to the four great *ecumenical* councils, the first of NICE, the first of CONSTANTINOPLE, that of EPHESUS, and that of CHALCEDON, we have already presented their position on this question in connection with their legislation on the patriarchal system. We have seen that they accord to the bishop of Rome a precedence of honour among the five officially co-equal patriarchs, and thus acknowledge him *primus inter pares*, but, by that very concession, disallow his claims to supremacy of jurisdiction, and to monarchical authority over the entire church. The whole patriarchal system, in fact, was not monarchy, but oligarchy. Hence the protest of the Roman delegates, and of Pope Leo, against the decree of the council of Chalcedon in 451, which coincided with that of Constantinople in 381. This protest was insufficient to annul the decree, and in the east it made no lasting impression; for the subsequent incidental concessions of Greek patriarchs and emperors, like that of the usurper Phocas in 606, and even of the sixth *ecumenical* council of Constantinople in 680, to the see of Rome, have no general significance, but are distinctly traceable to special circumstances and prejudices.

It is, therefore, an undeniable historical fact, that the greatest dogmatic and executive authorities of the ancient church bear as decidedly against the specific papal claims of the Roman bishopric, as in favour of its patriarchal rights and an honorary primacy in the patriarchal oligarchy. The subsequent separation of the Greek church from the Latin proves to this day that she was never willing to sacrifice her independence to Rome, or to depart from the decrees of her own greatest councils.

Here lies the difference, however, between the Greek and the Protestant opposition to the universal monarchy of the papacy. The Greek church protested against it from the basis of the oligarchical patriarchal hierarchy of the fifth century; in an age, therefore, and upon a principle of church organisation, which preceded the grand agency of the papacy in the history of the world. The evangelical church protests against it on the basis of a freer conception of Christianity, seeing in the papacy an institution, which indeed formed the legitimate development of the patriarchal system, and was necessary for the training of the Romanic and Germanic

nations of the middle ages, but which has virtually fulfilled its mission and outlived itself. The Greek church never had a papacy; the evangelical historically implies one. The papacy stands between the age of the patriarchal system and the age of the Reformation, like the Mosaic theocracy between the patriarchal period and the advent of Christianity. Protestantism rejects at once the papal monarchy and the patriarchal oligarchy, and thus can justify the former as well as the latter for a certain time and a certain stage in the progress of the Christian world.*

ART. III.—*Arithmetical Criticism.*

- Egypt's Place in Universal History.* By Chevalier BUNSEN. 1840–60.
The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically Examined. By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. 1862.
A Key to Bishop Colenso's Biblical Arithmetic. By THOMAS LUND, B.D. 1863.
The Exodus of Israel: its Difficulties examined, and its Truths confirmed. By the Rev. T. R. BIRKS, M.A. 1864.
An Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties with regard to the Pentateuch. By the Rev. ALEXANDER M'CAUL, D.D. (People's Edition.) 1864.

IN recent times, a favourite point of attack on the reality of Old Testament history has been the numbers, to which the sacred writers pledge their faith. More than one master

* We are sorry to say a word in the way of protest against the sentiments of our excellent contributor; but admiring as we do the whole preceding sketch, we cannot allow the concluding sentences to pass, without indicating our entire dissent from the views which they suggest. Dr Schaff, we are aware, only echoes the sentiment propounded by many, especially in Germany, who have written on the History of Doctrines, when he speaks of the papacy as having been "necessary for the training of the Romanic and Germanic nations." Only in so far as providence overrules evil for good, and "maketh the wrath of man to praise him," can we allow that the papacy has "fulfilled its mission;" and only in the sense in which the liberties of Great Britain at the period of the Revolution implied a previous state of despotism and misrule, can we admit that "the evangelical church historically implies a papacy." We cannot subscribe to the idea that the papacy, whose coming, the Scriptures assert, was "after the working of Satan," and which bore, in the whole of its progress, such manifest traces of human ambition, avarice, treachery, artifice, and deception, as well as ignorance and superstition, can be likened, with any propriety, to the divinely contrived and appointed system of "the Mosaic theocracy." We pen these lines after having perused, with feelings of no common delight, the splendid oration of Mr Gladstone, on demitting his office as rector of Edinburgh University; in which the providential training of the world through the Grecian mythology is eloquently traced.—ED. B. & F. E. Review.