4.25.'05.

From the Library of
Professor Samuel Miller
in Memory of
Judge Samuel Miller Breckinridge
Presented by
Samuel Miller Breckinridge Long
to the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BX 953 .B68 1844 v.1
Bower, Archibald,. 1686-176
The history of the popes

VALUABLE HISTORICAL & STANDARD WORK.

TO THE READING COMMUNITY.

GRIFFITH & SIMON,

No. 188 NORTH THIRD STREET, PHILADELPHIA,

ARE NOW ISSUING IN NUMBERS,

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES

TO A. D. 1758,

BY ARCHIBALD BOWER, ESQ.

Formerly public Professor of Rhetoric, History and Philosophy, in the Universities of Rome, Fermo and Macerata, and in the latter place Counsellor of the Inquisition,

WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND A CONTINUATION TO THE PRESENT TIME, BY

REV. SAMUEL HANSON COX, D. D.

Professor Extraordinary of Biblical and Christian History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

This work was originally issued in England, and occupied its author nearly *fifty years in preparation*, and was published in seven quarto volumes, at a heavy cost.

The undersigned propose to furnish the work in handsome style at *Twenty-five Cents* per number, to be completed in twenty-four numbers, making *three handsome volumes*,

AT THE LOW PRICE OF SIX DOLLARS;

Thereby placing it within the reach of all who may desire a correct and faithful History of the Church of Rome, from its foundation to the present time.

THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORK:

From the REV. DR. BERG, *Pastor of the German Reformed Church in Philadelphia.*

Bowers' History of the Popes is a work which has heretofore, from its voluminous character and its scarcity, been accessible to few; and although its high reputation has always kept it in demand, it has never been fairly brought within the reach of the reading public. The work embodies a vast amount of historical information which may be relied upon as authentic. The author having enjoyed the very best opportunities of consulting manuscripts and other documents, in order to verify his statements. The fact that Bower commenced his work an ardent Romanist, and ended it a most zealous Protestant, is in itself sufficient to create an interest in his book. It affords the undersigned great pleasure to commend the work to the favourable notice of all who desire a circumstantial history of the Popes.

JOSEPH F. BERG, D. D.

WE fully concur with REV. DR. BERG in his opinion of the above work,

Rev. Cors. C. Cuyler, D. D., pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John Chambers, pastor of the First Independent Church, Philadelphia,

Rev. Theophilus Storke, pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. Urie, pastor of the Fifth street Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. L. Scott, M. A., pastor of the Union Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Leonard Fletcher, pastor of the Central Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. J. B. Hagany, pastor of the Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. Cooper, pastor of the Wharton st. Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John L. Grant, pastor of the Eleventh Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. James Flannery, pastor of the Sanctuary Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John Street, City Missionary, Philadelphia.

Rev. John M'Dowell, D. D., pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. A. D. Gillette, M. A., pastor of the Eleventh Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Robert Adair, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Southwark.

Rev. George B. Ide, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. W. Loughbridge, pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John J. Kerr, M. D., rector of the Advent Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Joel Parker, D. D., pastor of the Clinton st. Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. J. Castle, pastor of the Nazareth Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Anson Rood, pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Northern Liberties.

Rev. J. Lansing Burrows, pastor of the Broad st. Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. A. Wiggins, pastor of the Western Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Samuel Stevenson, pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Fair Mount.

Rev. James W. Stewart, pastor of the Union Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Willis Lord, D. D., pastor of the Seventh Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. G. B. Perry, D. D., pastor of the New Market st. Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. E. J. Richards, pastor of the Western Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely, D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, N. Liberties.

Rev. E. L. Janes, pastor of St. Georges Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. Ramsey, pastor of the Cedar st. Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John S. Inskip, pastor of the Salem Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John S. Taylor, pastor of the Mariners Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. John Newland Maffitt, professor of Elocution and Belles Letters.

Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, D. D., rector of the Epiphany Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Wm. Shadrach, pastor of the Sansom street Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. James Smith, Presiding Elder of the South Philadelphia District, of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

W. G. E. Agnew, M. D., late Principal of Zane st. Public School, Philadelphia.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

As *Bower's History of the Popes of Rome*, all of them, 245 from the beginning, to Benedict XIV. who died in 1758, and with the continuation, to include the remaining seven to the present reigning Pope, Gregory XVI. the 252 inclusive, are to be published by *Messrs. Griffith & Simon*, of Philadelphia, *Mr. William Moore* being their agent in New York; the undersigned are happy to recommend the work, and the manner of publishing it, and its pre-eminent cheapness, as incomparably valuable and worthy of the patronage of all American Patriots, Protestants, and Christians. There is no other work in the world like it or to compare with it. It is a dictionary of most useful and entertaining knowledge, readable and authentic, and such as every scholar, not only, but every respectable family, that loves knowledge or knows how to value it, ought to possess. As such, we pray for its success through all this nation, and throughout the total English world in both hemispheres, as a standard and an excellent work, which almost any one can better afford to buy than to want.

New York, Dec. 18th, 1844.

Rev. Samuel H. Cox, D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.

Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, D. D., pastor of Mercer st. Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. Joseph McElroy, D. D., pastor of the First Reformed Dutch Church, New York.

Rev. Thomas E. Bond, D. D., Editor of the (Methodist) Christian Advocate, New York.

Rev. Henry Davis, pastor of the Cannon st. Baptist Church, New York.

Rev. William Patton, D. D., pastor of the Spring st. Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. J. W. M'Lane, D. D., New York.

Rev. Mason Noble, pastor of the Eleventh Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. W. J. Cleland, pastor of the Second Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. N. Bangs, D. D., pastor of the Green st. Methodist Episcopal Church, New York.

Rev. George Potts, D. D., pastor of the 9th st. Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. W. W. Phillips, D. D. pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. Erskine Mason, D. D., Pastor of the Bleecker st. Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. Samuel D. Burchard, pastor of the Houston st. Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. J. Owen, D. D., principal of the Cornelius Institute, New York.

Rev. A. Wheelock, pastor of the 16th street Baptist Church, New York.

Rev. D. B. Coe, pastor of the Allen street Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. George Duffield, Jr., Pastor of the 3rd Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.

Rev. S T. Spear, pastor of the 4th Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.

Rev. Edwin F. Hatfield, pastor of the 7th Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. J. Spaulding, Secretary of the Seamen's Friend Society, New York.

Rev. John Hassel, pastor of the primitive Church, New York.

Rev. Charles Read, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, New York.

Rev. S. H. Cone, pastor of the First Baptist Church, New York.

Rev. David Bellamy, pastor of the Stanton st. Baptist Church, New York.

[From Rev. John N. McLeod, D. D., N. Y.]

The proposed republication of "Mr. Bower's Lives of the Popes," is, in my estimation, deserving of all encouragement. Let the American people see what the heads of the Roman apostacy have been from age to age, and they will be greatly aided in determining the moral character of the system they represent, and its ruinous influences on the civil and religious liberties of man. From a gentleman so entirely competent to the task he has undertaken, as is the Rev. Dr. Cox, a continuation of great value may be reasonably expected.

John N. McLeod.

[From Rev. Thomas De Witt, D. D., N. Y.]

I have for some time been acquainted with "Bower's History of the Popes." I esteem it one of great value, being the most full and thorough work of the kind that can be procured, and wish that the proposed republication may meet with adequate patronage.

Thomas De Witt.

New York, Dec. 23d, 1844.

From Rev. John Dowling, A. M., pastor of Berean Baptist Church, New York.

New York, Dec. 20th, 1844.
Berean Parsonage, Bedford, L. I.

MESSRS. GRIFFITH & SIMON,

GENTLEMEN:—Allow me to express to you my pleasure and gratification at the enterprise you have undertaken, in publishing in a form and at a price accessible to almost every body, that valuable and authentic record of the abominations of the papal antichrist as exhibited in the lives of the boasted successors of St. Peter, "Bower's History of the Popes." For many years past this work has chiefly been confined to the shelves of public libraries, or the collections of the curious and the wealthy. During some twenty years of reading and research upon the subject of ecclesiastical history, and especially upon the history of popery, I have found no work so rich in important facts, *confirmed invariably by the citation of original authorities*, as this erudite and valuable work. Papists it is true, because they were unable to confute his facts, have labored hard to blacken the character of the author. But this is no more than they have invariably done, whenever they found themselves unable to reply to facts, or reasonings fatal to their anti-christian system. If Bower were as bad a man as the worst of his popish adversaries represent him, still the facts he adduces would be equally valuable, because they are confirmed, as I have before remarked, by references to the original authorities. A recommendation of such a work as "Bower's History of the Popes," would be both superfluous, and for me at least, presumptuous. Suffice it to say that its author was a man of astonishing erudition and eminently qualified for such a work, and that this is the great work of his life. The work ought to be read and studied by every protestant, and especially by every protestant minister. Yours, respectfully,

JOHN DOWLING.

BOWER'S HISTORY OF THE POPES.

MR. EDITOR:—Permit me, through your columns, to say a word in commendation of *Bower's History of the Popes*, the American edition now appearing from the press in 24 numbers, at 25 cents per number, Messrs. Griffith & Simon, Philadelphia, publishers, and sold at Messrs. Saxton & Miles' Bookstore, No. 205 Broadway, Mr. WILLIAM MOORE being agent in this vicinity for subscriptions, at Messrs. Miller's Bookstore, No. 645 Broadway. I am desirous that all our Protestant countrymen, and especially the Protestant clergy of our country, should possess so rare and incomparable a work. What I think of its great value, I have sufficiently expressed in the published Introduction accompanying the first number.

To correct an error of some persons, permit me to say that the work of *Professor Ranke*, of Berlin, will not compare with it; and however valuable for its purposes and limited modern scope, it is wholly another, and wholly inferior in its design, its character, its magnitude, and its utility. Nothing but ignorance of the facts can induce any gentleman to confound or even to compare them. Bower's is the History of the Popes, all of them, from the beginning, according to the whole numerical calendar of Rome, making 245 to the death of Benedict XIV. inclusive, in 1758, while Ranke's in its very title-page, shows the difference, being only modern, "during the 16th and 17th centuries."

The work of BOWER is every way a great one, with no equal or rival in the English language, or any other in the world. Its second edition in England, London, appeared in 1776, at a very high price, near 25 dollars a volume, and in 7 volumes quarto. It is now scarce, dear, and impracticable in the markets. The mode of the American publishers is perhaps the only one which could insure its sale, and vindicate their enterprise in undertaking it, in this country; and it justly invokes the aid and patronage of all scholars, gentlemen, and Christians, and especially of those who appropriately combine in themselves these three honorary appellations, the Protestant clergy. It is preeminently cheap at $6 for the whole. And it is indeed one of those incomparable works, a thesaurus of events, facts, dates, and authorities, on the whole of Popery, including biography, literature, philosophy, ecclesiastical changes, and hierarchal impieties, in due order digested and displayed, which almost any one can better afford to own than to want. And yet it is to a wonder little known, even by the clergy of this hemisphere.

A distinguished and excellent nobleman of the Church of England, recently, in a letter to the writer, says, "I agree with you that in these days of reviving Jesuitry on the Continent, and of priestly assumption in England and America, authentic information respecting those pretended successors of the apostles, is much needed. I therefore heartily wish your publication success. * * * I hope some copies of your proposed edition will make their way into our Booksellers' shops, for it is more needed in England than in the United States." I am happy to introduce another recommendation, an *instar omnium* from the *Rev. Dr. Miller*, of Princeton, an authority with us, in his appropriate department of Ecclesiastical History and Polity, of deserved eminence and excellent worth. The manner in which our work is published, and its wonderfully reduced price, is, I think, an apposite reply to the very natural queries in his last paragraph. I may just add, gratefully, that I have also received very valuable testimonials from other eminent persons in our country, especially from the *Rev. Dr. Murdock*, of New Haven, and formerly Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

It is but justice to state that I have no pecuniary interest in the work, nor has any one even asked me to make this manifesto in its favor. I do it from love to the cause of truth and righteousness, and from a high conviction that the forthcoming publication is a grand measure to subserve their triumph in our country, against the unique and tremendous organizations, and the fatal but stealthy encroachments of Papal wickedness, and in

favor of that eternal system, which, if it be *Protestant*, is such only because it is identically and primitively *Christian*, and, as such, of an antiquity divine—infinitely anterior to the prophesied developments of papal treason against God. But please read the letter of Dr. Miller. I sincerely thank him for it! It is a document to be perused and preserved—one worthy of the mature learning, the large and ripe experience, the sincere patriotism, and Protestant piety, of the venerated writer. Its sentiments ought to be universal among Americans and Christians, *for they are worthy*.

I simply add that now is the time to subscribe, and that, at 25 cents a number, its possession may be facilitated to all. The last two numbers are to be occupied with the seven remaining Popes, namely, Clement XIII., Clement XIV., Pius VI., Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Gregory XVI., the present Pope, although in consequence of the difficulty of procuring the requisite materials, it is possible that their appearance may encounter some delay, yet as little, the writer promises, as may consist with the propriety of things, and his own duties and engagements.

SAMUEL H. COX.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Dec. 11th, 1844.

From Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

Princeton, Nov. 25, 1844.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—When you requested me, by letter, to give my opinion of *Bower's History of the Popes*, I was confined to my bed by a protracted illness, from which my recovery was so slow, that it is only within a few weeks that my returning strength has been such as to render me capable of using the pen with any comfort. I now proceed to fulfil the promise which I then made by the hand of another.

It is about twenty-five years since I became possessed of Bower's work, in the original edition, in seven volumes quarto; and I can truly say, that the more frequently I have consulted it, the deeper has become my impression of its great value, as a source of information concerning the rise, progress, and abominations of the papacy. I was not indeed ignorant, before I purchased it, that its credit, as a faithful record, had been called in question; that the life of the author had been considerably erratic; and that the Jesuits, whose society he had abandoned long before the publication of this work, had taken unwearied pains to blacken his character in order to dishonor his history. But so they have, for the last three hundred years, treated every conspicuous man, who renounced and exposed their system of enormous corruption. Those who remember the nefarious calumnies which they circulated concerning *Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Melancthon*, and all their noble band of protesting associates, will not wonder that their abuse was heaped without stint upon a man less elevated in reputation, and whose departure from their communion was attended with circumstances peculiarly adapted to provoke their resentment. But, as Mr. Bower had the best opportunities of becoming intimately acquainted with the policy, the management, and the selectest archives of the Papal court—as he regularly refers to his authorities for all his statements—and as, in comparing these with documents accredited by all Protestants, I never found him at fault; I must say the more I have examined his pages, the greater has been my confidence in his fidelity.

It was, therefore, with unfeigned pleasure that I was informed of your movement for promoting an American edition of this work. Perhaps there is no Protestant nation in the world in which the public mind has more need to be enlightened in regard to the real character of the papacy, and to be roused from its torpor respecting the real danger to be apprehended from the acts and the influence of that corrupt body, than that in which it is our privilege to live. Our morbid popular sensibility to any thing that looks like an infringement of the rights of conscience, and our long continued and boasted habit of opening our arms to the poor and oppressed of all nations, have really served in some degree, to blind us even to the duty of defending ourselves against the inroads of the most formidable and fatal errors. It has already come to be considered by many as a sort of persecution to remove the veil from the face and the falsehoods of "the man of sin, the son of perdition," and let his real character be seen. But, in spite of the popular delusion, this painful work must be done; and I know of no more fair and honorable way of effecting the exposure, than simply to bring before the community such authentic exhibitions of the rise, progress, and enormous corruptions of the papal system as the volumes of Bower present. For I have ever been of the opinion, with the author of this work, expressed in his dedication to the King of Great Britain, George II., that, "next to the pure light of the gospel, there is nothing that popery has more to fear, than simple historical truth."

I know that there are multitudes of our fellow citizens who cannot be persuaded to believe that there is any danger to be apprehended, in this Protestant country, from the plausible corruptions and acts of popery. With the writings of the reformers in our hands, and with the high praises of their wisdom, their piety, and their heroic faithfulness on our lips, the popular sentiment seems to be, that the deplorable corruptions and delusions of the antichrist, whom they so worthily opposed, are now harmless. Nay, it would seem that some, who once gloried in the name of Protestant, have become so infected with the views of that soul destroying system, that they are beginning to be ashamed of that glorious reformation for which their fathers were willing to give up all things, and even life itself.

To obviate the cause of this infatuation, I would employ no other means than those of *light* and *love*. I would humbly say, as the divine Author of truth said, in commencing

the work of creation, "*Let there be light.*" Let sound historical and doctrinal knowledge be every where diffused. Let not the people be blinded by the false statements of ignorant and profligate partizans. Let them know the real history, as well as the real character, of those claims, which, if allowed, will infallibly degrade them in this world, and destroy their souls in that which is to come. And in diffusing this light, let no unhallowed means be employed. Let not the most bigoted Romanist be opposed by any weapons which the most rigid law of Christian benevolence will not sanction. I am willing, in my contest with popery, to bury for ever the recollection of the millions, whom, in different ages, she has burned alive, or butchered in cold blood, because they refused to assent to her corrupt dogmas. I am willing even to forget, that, in every country where she reigns without control, her utter denial of the rights of conscience, are, at this hour, universal and terrific. But if she expects me to believe that her superstitions are innocent, and that her claims and policy are consistent with the liberties, civil or religious, of my beloved country ——— this is too much! I must lift a warning voice against all such expectation. If she calls this persecution, be it so. I have *not so learned Christ*. So long as she refuses to let her members *search the Scriptures daily*, to see *whether the things* which she tells them *are so* or not, and, above all, so long as she teaches a system essentially founded on the principle that her priesthood are the "depository of salvation," and that heaven is a part of the domain of the bishop of Rome, to be parceled out, and made over to men for money, just as the avarice or the voluptuousness of that pontiff, or his emissaries, may dictate, I must consider her influence as dangerous, and her reign as fatal, to my country, and to the souls of men.

But, my dear sir, can you prevail on our fellow citizens, and fellow Christians, to *patronize* so large a work? Above all, can you persuade them to *read* it? May our Master in heaven, who has all hearts in his hands, prosper the undertaking!

I am, reverend and dear sir, your friend and brother in Christ,

SAMUEL MILLER.

The Rev. Dr. Cox.

[From the Rev. Drs. Sprague and Fisher.]

Albany, Jan. 18th, 1845.

We have had an opportunity of examining several of the first numbers of Bower's History of the Popes, now in course of being published by Messrs. Griffith & Simon of Philadelphia, and have no hesitation in saying that we regard it as one of the most important works connected with the papal controversy, that has come under our observation. The amount of labor which it must have cost, and of learning of a certain kind which it discovers, are truly wonderful; and there is nothing, that we can discover, in the general spirit of the work, that is fitted at all to discredit its authenticity. If there is any work better adapted than this to operate as an antidote to arrest its progress in this country we know not where to look for it.

WM. B. SPRAGUE,
SAMUEL FISHER.

From the New York Evangelist.

The publishers propose to complete this work in twenty-four numbers of about 100 pages each, at 25 cents a number. It is clearly printed in double columns, and will make a very large and elegant work when completed.

It has long been known, but till now almost entirely inaccessible—this being the only American edition, and taken from an English edition in seven quarto volumes. It possesses a high character for ability, completeness and accuracy, and the publication at the present time in such a form, is certainly a public benefit. Bower, though originally a Scotchman, was for many years a Papist, and a professor in the universities of Rome and other places, and was also counsellor of the Inquisition. By God's good providence he was led back to Protestantism in the latter part of his life, but not until he had enjoyed all possible facilities of knowing both the history and character of Popery, in all its departments. Being a thorough and accurate scholar, his means were made good use of, and the results are here embodied. It may lack some of the erudition and comprehensive learning of Ranke, but it is written in a style better adapted to the edification of English readers than the great work of the learned German.

The additions proposed to be made by Dr. Cox will possess great interest and importance. No man possesses more ample qualifications, by an intimate knowledge of history, enlarged and comprehensive views of men and things, and a thorough appreciation of the character of Popes, and of the genius of the whole system, than he; and but few have the ability in an equal degree, to embody their thoughts in glowing, forcible and eloquent language. The introduction presents some striking and important considerations respecting the present aspect and future doom of that great apostacy, and what may help the public to form a judgment of the work itself, speaks of Bower and his labors, in terms of high but discriminating praise. We hope that the work may realize a sale commensurate to its worth, and to the demand which now exists, for light on this overwhelming subject.

From the Protestant Banner.

Bower's History of the Popes, though known by reputation in this country, has hitherto been beyond the reach of those who were willing to purchase it, owing to its extreme scarcity. The history derives interest from the fact, that the author at the time of commencing his work was an ardent supporter of the Papacy, and designed it as an elaborate vindication of the divine right of papal supremacy, but was soon

constrained by conscientious convictions to acknowledge that he had undertaken more than he was able to perform, and finally renounced the Popish system as contrary to truth. The work is an extensive one and is to be published in 8vo. numbers of 72 pages. We bespeak for it a hearty welcome and an extensive circulation.

From the Albany Daily Advertiser.

This work published originally in seven volumes, quarto, at a cost of one hundred and seventy-five dollars, is here proposed to be published in twenty-four numbers, at twenty-five cents per number. Its author, as appears from the title, was originally not only a member but a dignitary of the Romish church, and has given thirty-five years of his life, with the greatest possible facilities, to the preparation of this work: the only marvel we should suppose to be, that any man, in an entire life, could have accomplished it. From the specimen which we have in the preface and the first No., we have formed a most favorable opinion of the manner in which the work is executed, indicating at once the most patient research and the utmost candor and impartiality. It is by the circulation of such works as these, that the eyes of the community are to be opened to the dangers which threaten from the rapid progress of Romanism.

From the Albany Religious Spectator.

November 9, 1844.

It is matter of just congratulation that this great work is about to be given to the American public, and at so cheap a rate as to ensure to it a very extensive circulation. It is the production of a mind trained to a bigotted attachment to the Romish system, which was actually cured of its errors, in the attempt to establish them. The work was originally published in seven quarto volumes, at the enormous price of a hundred and seventy-five dollars per copy; and it is proposed now to publish it in twenty-four numbers at twenty-five cents each. From the number that has already appeared, we judge that the work does full justice to its subject; that it is the fruit of immense research, and is characterized by great fidelity and impartiality. We recommend to our readers to subscribe for it, as they will be more likely to read the numbers coming out at intervals, than they would be to sit down to the whole work, if it were spread before them at once.

January 18, 1845.

We have already had occasion to speak of the great value of this work; and our impressions of its importance are heightened by each successive number. It is the history of poor human nature in some of its saddest, darkest developments. If it is to gain a circulation in this country proportioned to its deserts, the publication can hardly fail to mark an era in the history of the papal controversy, and to operate, if anything can, as an effective antidote to that terrible evil which it so ably and learnedly exposes.

January 25, 1845.

It is interesting to observe the progress of evil with the progress of centuries. We again recommend to those of our readers who have not already subscribed for this work, to do it, as they would possess themselves of the richest treasure of information on this subject, which the English, and we presume we may add any other language, affords.

From the Christian Observer.

This is the 1st number of a highly interesting and important work, from the pen of an accomplished writer, who was successively Professor of Rhetoric, History, and Philosophy, in the Universities of Rome, Fermo, and Macerata, and a Counsellor of the Inquisition, with a valuable addition from the hand of a well known Master of our own times.

Whoever would understand the Mystery of Iniquity—and the mysteries of our fallen nature—things which are *fully* seen and understood by none but the omniscient Mind—must read the History of the Popes.

From the Boston Recorder.

The author is Archibald Bower, Esq., formerly professor of rhetoric, history, and philosophy, in the universities of Rome, Fermo, and Macerata, and in the latter place counsellor of the Inquisition. The first No. contains an introduction by Rev. Dr. Cox of Brooklyn, N. Y., who will continue the history of the popes down to the present time. The work will be completed in twenty-four numbers, price 25 cents per No. The introduction by Dr. Cox is worth the price of the first number. He speaks of Bower's history of the popes as having been long a desideratum with scholars, and as a work that may now be welcomed by our protestant and christian community. Bower, he states, was born in Scotland in 1685, went to Rome in 1700, and became a Jesuit, became disgusted with the dogmas and corruptions of popery, and fled to England in 1726, where he embraced the protestant faith. In 1747, he published his dissent, and commenced his history of the popes from the ample materials and resources which were at his command. Under the supervision of Dr. Cox, and with the addition which he will make to the history, it will prove a most desirable addition to the protestant literature of this country.

AN ACCOUNT

OF THE

WONDERFUL ESCAPE OF MR. BOWER,

ONE OF THE INQUISITORS AT MACERATA, INTO ENGLAND,

WITH

AN ACCOUNT OF THE INQUISITION IN ITALY.

Mr. Archibald Bower, (author of the history of the Lives of the Popes) was born in Scotland, and at five years of age was sent over by his parents, (who were Roman Catholics) to an uncle in Italy, where he was educated, and became so great a proficient in learning, that he was appointed professor of logic and rhetoric in the college of Macerata. At this place there is an office of the Inquisition, called the Holy Tribunal, which consists of an Inquisitor General, (who is president thereof) and twelve counsellors who are chosen by him indifferently from the ecclesiastics or the laity. Each of these has a salary of about £200, sterling, per annum, and an apartment in the house of the Inquisition, which is a grand building, and the residence of the Inquisitor General, who provides a table for them. Much honor and many great privileges, besides certainty of good preferment, are attached to the situation. One privilege is, that if they commit ever such enormous or flagitious crimes against the law, even murder, they cannot be apprehended, without leave from the Inquisitor General; which gives them opportunity to escape.

The counsellors cannot be absent a single night without leave from the Inquisitor. Offences against the faith or practices of the church, alone come under the cognizance of this court; and these are generally very trifling—such as saying or doing anything disrespectful, with regard to their saints, images, relics, or the like.

When a person is accused, the Inquisitor General summons the council, which always meet in the night, and if any member should happen to be absent, his place is supplied by a notary, for all trials must be in full courts. The president then notifies the crimes, without naming the informer or the criminal.

Any of the council may object to the information; and if the number of objectors amount to four, the Inquisitor is obliged to disclose the evidence, or more properly, the informer; after which, if the objections are still persisted in, the cause must be carried to the high court of Rome: otherwise their opinions are taken whether or not the offence be such as the Holy Tribunal ought to notice. If it is determined to proceed against the criminal, the Inquisitor General orders any one of the council, whom he pleases, to apprehend him at the dead hour of the night. A proper guard is assigned for that purpose, who with dark lanthorns and arms, attend him to the poor wretch's abode; where, with the utmost silence and secrecy, for nobody dare to make any noise or resistance on pain of excommunication, he is seized and conveyed into one of the dismal dungeons under the Inquisition house. There the poor creature is confined seven or eight days, without the least glimpse of light, uninformed of the crime of which he is accused, and without other sustenance than a little bread and water once a day. The key of the dungeon is given to the counsellor who makes the arrest, and is delivered up by him the next morning to the Inquisitor General.

The term of seven days being expired, the court is summoned for the trial, when a notary attends to write down what the criminal says, and a surgeon to feel his pulse, and to tell them how much he can bear. The machines or engines for torture being fixed, the accused is brought in; and without being told either his offence or his accuser, and denied the liberty of expostulating, he is exhorted to confess what crime he has been guilty of; and though he make immediate confession, even of the offence with which he is charged, yet he must ratify it on the torture, that being as they term it, "a witness," if he cannot recollect, or refuse to confess, he is put to the torture, for not exceeding one hour.

A counsellor is placed close to him on one side, to observe that all be done according to their rules, and the surgeon on the other to ascertain the degree of torture he is able to support.

If the accused survive this hour and does not confess, he is carried back to prison for another week, and then tortured again. Should he appear to make any effort to confess, he is borne up a little to relieve him while speaking; but at whatever time he confesses, he is nevertheless tortured afterwards to confirm it, and must likewise undergo such punishment as the Inquisition please to inflict for the supposed crime. This is generally imprisonment in one of their horrid dungeons, for one, two, or three years, or more frequently for life; for

few, very few, that are so unfortunate as to get into the Inquisition, live to get out. Numbers, notwithstanding the barbarous assiduity used to preserve them for farther misery, expire under the torture, or in a few days, sometimes only hours after.

Mr. Bower mentions three different kinds of torture: 1st. That which they reckon the most exquisite, and therefore call it the queen of tortures. In this the criminal's hands are tied behind his back and fastened to a rope, which by means of four cords, drawn over pulleys at each corner of the lofty room, enable them to hoist him up to the ceiling in an instant, when he is let down again within a few inches of the ground. This process is thrice repeated; and by the sudden jerk all his bones are dislocated. The wretch is suffered to hang so disjointed until the hour is expired, or he confesses.

Second torture. The second instrument is something like a smith's anvil, fixed in the middle of the floor, with a spike not very sharp at the top. Ropes are attached to each corner of the room, as in the former instance, to which the criminal's legs and arms are fastened, and he is drawn up a little, and then he is let down with his back-bone exactly on the spike of iron where his whole weight rests.

Third torture. Is that, which they term a slight torture, and applied only to women. Matches of tow and pitch are wrapped round their hands, and then set on fire, until the flesh is consumed.

While Mr. Bower was professor in the college, the Inquisitor General contracted a great intimacy with him. One day, as they were in conversation, he said, "Mr. Bower, I have a design upon you," a speech, which, from an Inquisitor General, notwithstanding his avowed friendship, carried some terror in it. But he soon explained himself, by stating, that one of the members of the council was so ill, that he daily expected his death; and whenever it happened, he intended him the honor of filling the place; Mr. Bower received this declaration with high satisfaction and proper acknowledgments. Soon afterwards the sick member died, when the Inquisitor General sent for Mr. Bower, who, though he had so much reason to guess the occasion, was somewhat alarmed, but went immediately. On his arrival the Inquisitor General informed him that he had sent for him to perform his promise, and embracing him, said "you are now one of us." A council was convened on the same night, and Mr. Bower was presented and received with the usual forms. After taking the oath of secrecy, a book called the directory was delivered to him, containing rules for the decision and conduct of the Inquisitor, and which for greater caution, was in manuscript. When any member is seriously indisposed or is appointed to a higher office, he is obliged to seal his copy with the Inquisition seal; after which it is death to open or retain it. Mr. Bower returned home much pleased with his good fortune; and being desirous to be better acquainted with the nature of his new employment, instead of going to bed perused his directory. But what was his astonishment and concern to find it consist of rules more barbarous, infamous and inhuman, than can be conceived! Rules, however, which he flattered himself could not be observed, until experience convinced him of the contrary, and he saw the practice exemplified.

Within a fortnight after Mr. B's. admission, a poor man was brought to the office. His case was this. He had an only daughter that fell sick, for whom he prayed to the Virgin Mary—"Holy mother of God! command thy son, that my daughter may recover." The daughter died; consequently the Virgin had not heard his prayers; and being grieved to the heart for his loss, he threw away a medal of the Virgin, which he used to carry about him, and the fact being reported to the Inquisition, the poor wretch was put to the torture.

It is not possible to express what Mr. B. then felt, and continued to feel during his attendance at the Inquisition, where he was obliged to be, not only witness, but consenting to, barbarities his heart disapproved, and which were frequently inflicted on persons he believed as innocent as himself. It is extraordinary, that the violent emotions, which in spite of all his endeavours to suppress, would frequently discover themselves, did not give his brethren cause to suspect him, especially as the Inquisitor General once made an observation that Mr. Bower generally objected to the evidence; saying with great warmth, and striking the council board, "Mr. Bower you always object."

On one occasion he evidently proved how little he was gratified by being a member of such a society. It being his turn to sit by a person who was receiving the torture, he chanced to look on the sufferer's countenance, and conceiving that he saw death in his distortions, he instantly fainted away, and was carried to his chair at the council board. When he recovered, the Inquisitor General exclaimed, Mr. Bower! take your place! you do not reflect that what is done to the body is for the good of the soul, or you would not faint thus." Mr. B. replied, that it was the weakness of his nature, he could not help it. "Nature!" said the Inquisitor, "you must conquer nature by grace!" Mr. Bower promised that he would endeavor. The poor man at that moment expiring, the discourse concluded.

Mr. Bower now projected his escape, and revolved in his mind every possible method of effecting it; but when he considered the formidable difficulties with which it was attended, and the fatal consequences if he failed; his suspense, added to the painful circumstances in which he was placed, was scarce supportable. At length an event occurred which fixed his resolution, at the same time that it afforded the Inquisitor General an opportunity to perceive how far dictates, tenderer than those of nature, might be suppressed, (subdued they could not be) in Mr. Bower.

A person* was accused to the Inquisition,

* A nobleman, the most intimate, and only friend of Mr. Bower, who maintained an intercourse with him after being made a counsellor of the Inquisition, (for all ranks of people are cautious how they correspond

for remarking to a companion, on meeting two Carthusian Friars: What fools are these to think they shall gain heaven by wearing sackcloth and going barefoot! they might as well be merry, do as we do, and they would get to heaven as soon."

All Mr. Bower's compassion was excited, for he knew that the culprit would be treated with the utmost malice and severity; this being deemed an heinous offence against the church. But how great was his distress when he heard the name denounced of a nobleman, his dearest, his only friend! and when the Inquisitor concluded by saying—"And you Mr. Bower, I order to apprehend him, and bring him here between two and three this morning." "My lord you know the connexion"—Mr. Bower was proceeding, but the Inquisitor sternly interrupted him—"Connexion! what! talk of connexion when the holy faith is concerned!" and rising up to go away—"see that it be done, the guards shall wait without," and as he passed him, said—"this is the way to conquer nature, Mr. Bower."

What passed in Mr. B's. breast during the interval which elapsed before the time appointed, (being about an hour) those who have not tenderness enough to represent to themselves, cannot be made sensible by all the powers of language. To give his friend notice was impossible; for the myrmidons were waiting without. To refuse going would be fatal to himself, without benefiting his friend. When told that the hour was come, he went with his awful retinue, and knocked at the door; when a maid servant looking out of the window, asked who was there. Mr. Bower replied, "the Holy Inquisition! come down and open the door without waking any body, or making the least noise, on pain of excommunication." Down came the poor girl in her night clothes, in such trepidation as to be scarcely able to stand. "Shew me the way to your master's room!" "I knew the way as well as she," said Mr. B., when he related this, in such a tone of voice and manner as declared that all the sweet familiarity which subsisted between them, and the many friendly interviews they had had, perhaps in that very apartment, occurred at that instant to his mind.

The nobleman and his lady, to whom he had been married but six months, were asleep when they entered. The lady waking first, shrieked out; upon which one of the ruffians gave her a blow on the head that made the blood gush out, for which Mr. Bower severely reproved him. The nobleman, who was by this time awakened, cried out with hands and eyes lifted up in astonishment, "Mr. Bower!" and nothing more, implying thereby every aggravating circumstance, and emphatically expressing the strong emotions of his soul. No wonder that Mr. Bower was obliged to turn from him, whilst executing his commission. Nor did he dare, during the following scenes of this dreadful catastrophe, to look towards him, lest his eyes should speak the language of his heart so plainly as to be understood, not only by his friend, but by the whole court.

The ensuing morning, when Mr. Bower delivered the key of the prison, and announced the arrest, the Inquisitor General said to him, "This is done like one who is desirous at least, to conquer the weakness of nature."

The nobleman underwent the queen of tortures, but was released by death, three days after the infliction. His estate, as usual, was confiscated to the Inquisition, reserving a small provision for his widowed lady, and for the child, if she should prove to be pregnant. It may be supposed that Mr. Bower was now fully determined on an adventure, the most desperate that man ever undertook, and of which history can scarcely produce an equal. The manner of it was all that remained for consideration.

It occurred to him to solicit permission to make a pilgrimage to Loretta, and for that purpose he waited on the Inquisitor General several times; but conscious of his secret intentions whenever he attempted to speak, he dreaded, lest the words should falter on his tongue, and his very confusion betray him; so that he still returned as he went. One day, however, while in familiar conversation, he had the courage to say, "My lord! 'tis long since I was at Loretta; will your lordship give me leave to go thither for a week?" to which the Inquisitor General gave an immediate assent.

The anxiety of a mind filled with a project of such importance, and that Mr. Bower added the following to the many sleepless nights he had already passed, may be readily imagined.

Having made all his preparations, and his valuable papers, (including his directory) being concealed in the lining of his clothes, so soon as the horse which he had hired and ordered to be brought to him early in the morning, was come to the door, he carried down his portmanteau and fastened it on himself. As he was mounting, he told the owner of the horse he did not know whether he should like him or not, as he was a very bad horseman, and asked what he valued him at, in case he should not suit. The man named the price and he gave him the money; and then set forward, armed with two loaded pistols, being determined in case of any exigence, not to be taken alive.

Mr. Bower's plan was to take the bye-roads through the Adriatic states into Switzerland; being a distance of 400 miles, before he could get out of the Pope's jurisdiction, and with the roads through which beyond 150 miles from Macerata, he was perfectly unacquainted.

After travelling 10 miles without meeting any body, he found himself at a place where two ways met, the one leading to Loretta, the other being the road which he proposed going. Here he stood some minutes in the most profound perplexity. The dreadful alternative appeared now in the strongest view, and he was even yet tempted to quit his darling project, and turn towards Loretto. But finally, collecting all the force of his staggering resolu-

with the Inquisition, &c.,) walking in a garden with his lady, and seeing two friars pass, with their feet and heads bare, and as he thought out of hearing, expressed his surprise to his wife that any person should be so far infatuated as to believe that such particular dress could be meritorious in the sight of God. Unhappily the friars overheard him and reported his words to the Inquisition.

tion, he pushed his horse into the contrary road, and at that instant left all his fears behind.

It was in the month of April when Mr. Bower began his journey. During the first 17 days, the nature of the roads he was obliged to pursue, among mountains, woods, rocks, and precipices, in paths generally no better than a sheep track, and often not so good, prevented his travelling more than 100 miles. When he met any person, which was very seldom, he pretended to have lost his way, and enquired for the high road to avoid suspicion; for he well knew that so soon as the papers he conveyed were missing, or that there was any reason to suspect his escape, expresses would be dispatched in every direction, and every possible method adopted to secure him. In fact expresses were sent off, and in a very short time outstripped him above 100 miles.

During these seventeen days he supported himself on goats milk, obtained from the shepherds, with such coarse victuals as he could purchase of the peasants who came to cut faggots; choosing his place of repose for himself where there was most shelter and grass for his horse; at the expiration of this period, having fasted nearly three days, he was compelled to strike into the high road, and enter the first house he came to, which happened to be a post house, with only one small room where gentlemen staid till their horses were changed. He requested the landlady to give him some victuals; but looking about he saw a paper posted up over the door, which contained the most exact and minute description of his own person, offering a reward of the value of £800 to any one who should carry him alive to the Inquisition, and of £600 for his head. This was sufficiently terrifying, as there were two countrymen in the house. He endeavoured to hide his face by rubbing it with his handkerchief and blowing his nose, and when he got into the house, by looking out the window; but one of the fellows presently observing, "This gentleman don't care to be known," Mr. Bower thought there was nothing for him to do but to brave it out; so turning to him, he put his handkerchief in his pocket, and said boldly, "You rascals! what do you mean? What have I done that I need fear to be known? look at me you villain!" The man made no reply but got up, nodded his head, and winking significantly to his companion, they walked out together. Mr. Bower watched them from the window, but a corner obstructed his view in a few minutes. In a short time he espied them with three or four others in close conference. This forboded no good. Not a moment was to be lost. He drew out his pistols, put one in his sleeve, and with the other cocked in his hand, marched into the stable and without saying a word mounted his horse and rode off.

Fortunately the men wanted either presence of mind, or courage to attack him, for they certainly recognized him by the description given in the advertisement. He was now again obliged to seek refuge in the woods, where he must soon have been famished, but for the superintendence of divine providence. At night when he was almost fainting, he met with some woodcutters, who supplied him with excellent provisions. He wandered for some time through paths in which he rendered his horse more assistance than he could derive from him; being obliged to clear the roads and lead him.

As night advanced, he laid himself down in a very disconsolate condition, having no idea where he was, or which way he should turn. When the day began to break, he found he was on a small eminence, whence he discovered a town at a distance, which he concluded to be one of considerable extent, from the number of its steeples, spires, &c. Though this gave him some satisfaction, yet it was not unaccompanied with terror, as he knew not what place it was, and might incur much risk by going into the high road to inquire. Nevertheless he advanced as fast as he could, and asking the first person he met, was informed it was Luzerne, the residence of the Pope's Nuncio, to and from whom all the expresses concerning Mr. Bower must have been despatched. This road not suiting his views he left it, the moment his informer was out of sight, and once more betook him to the woods; where he wandered for some time longer, oppressed by hunger and cold, and perplexed with uncertainty whither he should go.

One dismal, dark, and wet night, he could neither find shelter, nor ascertain where he was, or what course he should pursue; but after some time, he perceived a light at a very great distance, towards which he attempted to proceed; and with much difficulty discovered a track, but so narrow and uneven, that he was forced to extend one foot before the other in the most cautious manner.

With much labor he reached the place from which he had seen the light, which was a miserable hut. He knocked and called until some one looked out, and demanded who he was, and what brought him there. Mr. Bower replied that he was a stranger and had lost his way. "Way!" cried the man, "there is no way here to lose!" "why where am I?" said Mr. B. "In the Canton of Berne!"—"In the Canton of Berne," said Mr. B. "Thank God!" exclaimed Mr. B. in raptures, "that I am in the Canton of Berne!" "Thank God you are!" replied the man, "but for God's sake how came you here?" Mr. B. begged that he would come down and open the door and he would then satisfy him; he did so, and Mr. B. inquired if he had heard anything of a person who had lately escaped from the Inquisition. "Aye! heard of him, we have all heard of him! after sending off so many expresses, and so much noise about him! God grant that he may be safe, and keep out of their hands!" Mr. B. said, "I am the very person!" The peasant in a transport of joy, clasped him in his arms, kissed him, and ran to call his wife, who came with every expression of pleasure in her countenance; and making one of her best courtesies, kissed his hand. Her husband spoke Italian, (as most of the borderers do) but she could not, and Mr. B. not understanding Swiss, she was obliged to make her compliments in pantomime, or by her husband as her interpreter. Both expressed much concern that they had no better accommodation for him,—"if they had a bed for themselves he should have it," "but he

should have some clean straw and what covering they possessed."

The good man hastened to get off Mr. B's. wet clothes, and wrap something about him until they were dry; and the wife to get ready what victuals they had, which, (probably for the first time) they regretted were no better, than a little sour-grout,* and new laid eggs; "a fresh laid egg," Mr. B, said "was a novelty," and no doubt he so esteemed it at the time, and in such company. Three eggs were served up with grout, and he made a comfortable meal; after which he enjoyedwhat may properly be termed repose, for it was quiet and secure.

As soon as he arose in the morning, the honest Swiss and his wife (who had long been awake, but would not stir lest they should disturb him) came to know how he had rested. The good dame was dressed in her holiday clothes. After breakfast the husband set out with him to direct him the road to Berne, which was at no great distance, but previously insisted on returning with him a little way to show him the road he had taken the preceding night. Mr. Bower did not much like this. The man perceiving his doubt reproved him for distrusting that providence which had so wonderfully preserved him; and soon convinced him that he only wanted to increase his dependence on it for the future, by showing him the danger he had escaped; for he saw that he and his horse had passed a dreadful precipice, where the breadth of the path would scarcely admit a horse, and the very sight of which made him shudder. The peasant accompanied him for several miles on the road to Berne, until there was no probability of losing his way, and then left him with a thousand good wishes.

So truly does religion exalt and refine the principles and sentiments, that when Mr. Bower offered to remunerate him, though in such extreme poverty, he obstinately refused to accept anything, saying, "God forbid! he had his reward in being in any manner instrumental to his safety!" In general those who profess the Protestant religion on the confines of the ecclesiastical state are remarkably zealous.

Mr. Bower proceeded towards Berne, at which place he inquired for the minister, to whom he discovered himself, and received from him as hearty a welcome as he had experienced from the honest Swiss, with the addition of more elegant entertainment, but was advised to go forward the next morning to Basle; for though protected from open violence, he was not secure from secret treachery.

Basle being situate on the Rhine, a boat sailed at stated times from thence to Holland, which was usually crowded with people of desperate characters, from all parts of the continent, flying from the laws of their respective countries, for theft, murder, and crimes of every description. This conveyance seemed to be the most expeditious mode of getting to England, and the minister gave Mr. Bower a letter to his friend the minister at Basle, who received him kindly, and approved of the plan suggested.

During the two days following his arrival, before the sailing of the passage boat, Mr. Bower kept close quarters, and equipped himself in a manner suitable to the company with which he was about to associate, putting his own clothes into his portmanteau; of which as he was instructed to be particularly careful, he made a seat by day, and his pillow by night. Being obliged to leave his horse which was endeared to him by the hardships it had shared with him, he was determined to place it in the hands of a good master, and presented it to the friendly minister, who promised it should be rode by no one but himself; and that when it became old or infirm, it should be comfortably maintained. So inseparable are tenderness and humanity, from true greatness of soul, that Mr. Bower shed some tears at parting with his companion and assistant in difficulties.

Disgusting as he found the company in the boat, he was compelled to regret the necessity of leaving it, in consequence of having sprung a leak, which obliged the master to put in at Strasburgh for repairs, which might detain him a fortnight. To stay there was impossible. Mr. Bower, therefore, took off the shabby dress, in which he was disguised, at the first inn he saw, and concealing it beneath the bed, stole out with his portmanteau to a tavern, from whence he sent to engage a seat in the stage to Calais. For the first two or three days of his journey he heard nothing concerning himself; which induced him to hope that the news of his escape had not yet reached France: but in this he was disappointed, for as he approached Calais he found it was the subject of general conversation.

On his arrival at Calais, he was introduced into an apartment in which were two Jesuits, who wore the red cross of the Inquisition, and several officers of the police, he instantly hastened to the quay, and inquiring when the packet sailed for England, was informed not until the Monday following, that day being Friday. Upon this he turned to a fisherman, and asked if he would carry him over in an open boat; but he, as well as others, astonished at the rashness of his design, refused. He was soon convinced this was a wrong step, for the eyes of every body were fixed on him, as a person of extraordinary consequence; concluding that either, he had dispatches of the last importance, or was some enormous offender escaping from justice. Every thing seemed to conspire to distress him, and he began to doubt the possibility of reaching his inn, apprehending that every one he met was about to lay hold of him. When he got there, finding the room where the Jesuits had been unoccupied, he enquired of the woman who belonged to the house, what had become of the good company he had left there. "O sir," said she, "I am sorry to tell you but they are up stairs searching your portmanteau!" What course to pursue he could not determine. By water he knew he could not escape; and in order to get through the gates he must pass the guards, who most probably were prepared to intercept him. If it were practicable to secrete himself till it was dark, and attempt to scale the walls, he was unacquainted with their height; and if detected he was ruined.

The dangers he had surmounted now aggra-

* Grout is cabbage and curds, salted and put down together in a firkin, and is used by the Swiss peasants as their ordinary food.

vated the terrors of his situation. After weathering so long a storm to perish within sight of the desired haven was the most distracting thought. It seemed that a most singular interposition of divine providence alone could prevent it. Whilst engaged in these sad reflections, he heard some company laughing and talking very loud, and listening at the door, he found the conversation was in a language he did not understand. Concluding, therefore, that the party was English, he rushed into the room, and recollecting the face of Lord Baltimore, whom he had seen at Rome, he requested the favor of a word in private with his lordship. The surprise occasioned by his sudden appearance, with one pistol cocked in his hand, and another in his sleeve, was increased with Mr. Bower's request, accompanied by his determined air.

Lord Baltimore desired he would lay down his pistol, which he did, begging pardon for not having done so before; some of the gentlemen then told him of the other, which he likewise laid down. Lord Baltimore then asked him if he had any other arms about him; and being assured that he had not, he directly retired with him into another apartment. On being informed who he was, Lord Baltimore exclaimed. "Mr. Bower! you are undone, and I cannot protect you; they are above searching your apartment." But a lucky thought fortunately occurring, he instantly returned to his company, and proposed that they should rise up, and taking him in the midst of them try to cover him till they could get to his lordship's boat, to which the gentlemen immediately assented, and the scheme succeeded; for the boat being very near, they got to it unobserved, and all jumping in, they rowed with four pair of oars, to a yacht that lay off the shore about two miles, in which the party had come for an excursion, and to drink a bottle of French wine. The wind being fair they soon reached Dover, where he was safely landed.

THE

HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE

FOUNDATION OF THE SEE OF ROME TO A. D. 1758

BY

ARCHIBALD BOWER, ESQ.

FORMERLY PUBLIC PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC, HISTORY, AND PHILOSOPHY, IN THE UNIVERSITIES OF ROME, FERMO, AND MACERATA, AND IN THE LATTER PLACE COUNSELLOR OF THE INQUISITION.

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION,

AND

A CONTINUATION TO THE PRESENT TIME:

BY

REV. SAMUEL HANSON COX, D.D.,

PROFESSOR EXTRAORDINARY OF BIBLICAL AND CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

PHILADELPHIA:
GRIFFITH & SIMON, 188 NORTH THIRD STREET.
STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON.
1844.

ENTERED according to act of Congress, in the year 1844, by
GRIFFITH & SIMON,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON, PHILADELPHIA.

PRINTED BY KING & BAIRD.

AN

ALPHABETICAL CATALOGUE

OF

THE POPES,

FROM THE

FOUNDATION OF THE SEE OF ROME TO A. D. 701.

VOLUME I.

INTRODUCTION,

BY

THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

An edition from the American press, of Bower's History of the Popes, has been long a desideratum with scholars, and may now be welcomed with pleasure by our Protestant and Christian community. It is a valuable thesaurus of facts, dates, and periods, historically arranged, and well digested, authentic and readable, and so a most important accession to our religious literature. It is an interesting and credible history, with themes, topics, and general scope, adapted to the times, seasonable, and capable of appreciation by American Christians. We believe also that it will be eminently useful; that its mission will be favorable to all our social and literary, our civil and religious interests; and that while its whole influence will be congenial with appropriate and genuine American sentiment, its contents are so coincident in effect with the sacred volumes of our common Christianity, as to anticipate for its publication the blessing of heaven. It will serve the place, in every library and in every family, of a great Historical and Biographical Dictionary, for reference and consultation on particular topics or related questions that occur; and yet it will be such a rich, well digested, and systematized historical work, in chronological order and continuity displayed, as to deserve and reward the more mature attention of the professional student. Its reading, too, will be found of that species which is adapted to interest the young, and to form—what ought to be regarded as a most desirable trait of character—a love of historical truth, a pursuit of its very noble science, and a wisdom in practice founded on its indisputable and instructive facts. Indeed, any common citizen might well be arrested, and retained consecutively, in the perusal of the work of Bower to the end, without being accused of singularity—as one, of whom we have heard, and there could be no more than one, who was thought a monomaniac, because he had actually read through, in course, the whole of Webster's quarto Dictionary in two volumes, prolegomena and all!

Our author was a North Briton; born near Dundee in Scotland, January 17, 1685. Of his parentage little is known. He was educated at Douay in France, that school and fountain of Romanism and Jesuitism, whence so many streams have flowed for the contamination of the world! Thence he passed to Rome, about 1700, and became a Jesuit. In the very metropolis of the man of sin, he seems to have prized his opportunity of professional improvement, with all the sincerity of a bigot and all the heathenizing devotion of a formalist. Here he enjoyed great advantages, of which he sedulously availed himself; for knowing the system and practices of the popedom; for studying the character and operations of the hierarchy; for consulting the best historical documents, and amassing stores of patristical learning; and for seeing, and knowing, and fathoming, the debauched politics of the court of Rome. In this occupation he was so absorbed, so romanized in his Latin researches, and so italianized in his daily converse, that he forgot his own

vernacular; and when about forty years of age, could scarcely express himself intelligibly in English. It was at this time probably that his doubts about the apostolicity of the succession of the pseudo chair of St. Peter began. He had to swallow such and so many dogmas, pious frauds, and quasi facts, indigestible and monstrous, that his long obsolete common sense and revived moral consciousness began together to reluctate against their doses—and to void them. He soon found means of escape from such intolerable task-masters, fled to England in 1726, and there embraced the faith of Protestants. His great learning, his Italian training, his familiarity with things, commended him to the great; and it was his good fortune to become acquainted with Lord Aylmer, to whose favor he was indebted, and in whose family he passed several years. Here he gradually reclaimed his English, which when he sufficiently understood, he commenced author, by beginning to labor for the booksellers, in the publication of the Historia Literaria; which however he abandoned in 1734, for a large share in the composition of the Universal History.

His principles were thought by some to be unsteady and insincere, who never doubted, however, his great learning. That they were unestablished is certain; nor is it wonderful to those who consider his education and his deep potations of that worse than circean *cup* of intoxication, with which the mighty Sorceress of nations, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH, has drugged for ages the whole population of the occident. Hence in 1745 the wily influence of the Jesuits prevailed, and he was re-victimized to their inventions. But this miserable relapse was of short continuance. In 1747 he became himself again, re-renounced their errors and their communion, and continued to the end of life a Protestant; having published his dissent from those within whose dark precincts he had so lately sought protection as a penitent. He now commenced his History of the Popes from his very ample materials and resources, and made it the work of his life. He married in 1740, and died Sep. 2, 1766, aged 80, his wife attesting that he died a Protestant. With his quarrels with the Jesuits, and the consequent troubles he experienced in other relations, we have little concern. Some impeach his sincerity, others his piety, none his learning. We view him as the fitting instrument of Providence for a great and peculiar work, in circumstances distinguished and rare, and for ends of great utility to the church. It is not wonderful if his own personal history should be the occasion of many diverse opinions or antipathies.

> With fame in just proportion envy grows,
> And he who makes a character, makes—foes.

He certainly shows some points of great decision, and even of heroic and victorious principle. He seems in his great work to be sincere, and consistent, and scrupulously honest, from beginning to end. His own Introduction, and the concluding paragraph of his last volume, seem to necessitate, while they claim, our confidence in his integrity. As to all his sentiments, his reasonings, his philosophy, in his frequent descants on the themes of his work, we leave the ingenuous reader to his own calm inferences concerning them; while it is mainly in respect to their premises, the facts themselves, that we invite attention and confidence. His work is excellent and peculiar; it is a standard of its kind; it is like no other, and for practical use and reference it has no equal. The Popes appear there in numerical order, from the blessed but dishonored apostle Peter, down to Benedict XIV whose number is 245; making, with those additional, 252, to the present reigning Pope Gregory XVI inclusive. Clement XIII died 1769, and was on the throne of usurpations at the time of our author's publication and decease.

We have here the birth, origin, and personal character of the Popes, as well as their behavior and acts in the Sovereign pontificate; enabling us to know something about each of them, and detailing generally as much as any one wishes to read, about such unlovable monsters; though our author is just to them, discriminating, and sufficiently benign. Contemporaneous events and

persons are well introduced, and the facts of general history are skilfully interwoven. In the times of schism and anti-popes, and also in the sequence and the names of the first popes in the series, since authors and catalogues differ, and the oracles of Infallibility are not particularly invoked, we may take the numeration of our author, with its inclusions and its exclusions, perhaps as safely and as wisely as any other written or human authority. There is, however, quite an ambiguity sometimes in the facts themselves, or rather in persons; as, for example, when two, three, or four, pretenders were all reigning at once; each denouncing and anathematizing his rivals, and the whole world all but distracted to find—just then and just there—the veritable and legitimate succession in the case. This lineage is a tangled skein and a great puzzle, to all the heathenizing simpletons who believe in it. It is with some of them almost the first and the last article in their creed—because no such thing is given or implicated in Holy Writ! They seem to believe the more, where there is the less evidence; and especially if the thing be impossible or plainly false. Thus the strength of their faith seems generously to compensate the poverty of their proof, on the pious principle of *giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked.* We however *have not so learned Christ;* from whom we prefer to follow only in the light, to believe only in accordance with evidence, and to *try the spirits whether they are of God, because* MANY FALSE PROPHETS *are gone out into the world.* "Truth is more wonderful than fiction;" and historic truth, accurately comprehended, is necessary to the statesman, professional to the divine, important to the scholar, and valuable in a thousand ways to its possessor in every relation of life. It is manly and noble as an acquisition. Its illustrations and examples are excellent, where skilfully used by the orator: the light they shed on human character, on the laws of providence, and the moral-mediatorial government of God, is eminently profitable and salutary. The preacher should be familiar with them, and make them tributary to the themes of heaven. And the poet, if he would have truth for his inspiration, ought to sing of realities which are, which have been, and which will be; that thus he may claim a substantial immortality in this and the future world, haloed in celestial honor and wreathed with eternal amaranth.

But such themes of history as the Popes of Rome are paragons of wonder, with no parallel in the universe. Their like never was and never will be. *Simillimi sibi omnes;* they are all like themselves alone. They are the greatest usurpers, the most unprincipled despots, the most cunning politicians, the most sublime impostors, the most consummate hypocrites, often the worst infidels, and, with some shadows and degrees of exception, the worst human beings, as a class, whose horrible system of wickedness, called in scripture THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY, produced through many centuries, ever scourged and cursed this world of apostacy, delusion, and sin.

And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration. Thus in the apocalypse, was the beloved John overwhelmed with consternation, when, in the progress of the visions of God, the Church of Rome, with sanctity and sin commingled—and the latter only genuine—was symbolized in this way to his view. The angel explains it to him, and plainly identifies that miserable harlot, when he says, *And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reigneth* [present tense] *over the kings of the earth.* There was only one city in his day so reigning, and only one known to history that answers the description. The Church of Rome, with her pyramid of hierarchy, and a monarch Pope radiating on its summit, answers it completely. For one, the writer has no more doubt of the meaning of scripture, in its prophetic outline, as exemplified so fully in Daniel, Paul, and John, touching the Roman Antichrist, than in their testimony about the resurrection of the dead, the immortality of the soul, or the messianic character of Jesus of Nazareth. It is monstrous ignorance, or

rabid prejudice, or awful judicial blindness, or stupid and false charity, that veils it from the vision of thousands and millions in Christendom. And hence many nominal Protestants are not half Protestants—nor half Christians, as the consequence. They have a wonderfully elastic "charity," which ignorantly includes among its objects especially all manner of sin, and error, and absurdity, and falsehood. Just as if the genuine charity of the New Testament was a silly, indiscriminate, or alterable affection; as if it had no eyes, and did not REJOICE IN THE TRUTH. Such persons have ordinarily no charity for God; hence to contradict him, or, as he resents it, to *make him a liar*, is a very easy affair and a cheap reckoning to their consciences. The time is come when enlightened and Christian Protestants and patriots in this country, must not only *hold the truth*, but *hold it fast*. Now the positions of a true Protestant are mainly the following—

1. The Holy Scriptures are the supreme rule of faith and practice, intelligible and true, and with no equal or proper rival in the world.

2. The Scriptures are given to all mankind, *and, by the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.* A *regium donum* from the King of heaven to all the people on his footstool.

3. Every man has the right, as well as the duty, on his own accountability to God, to exercise his private judgment, to know the truth, and learn those oracles, *which are able to make us wise to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.*

4. The ministry of the gospel is of no use, but, on the contrary, is a huge usurpation, and an intolerable nuisance, except as it is both totally subordinate, and totally subservient, to the genuine influence of *the glorious gospel of the blessed God*, according to the Holy Scriptures, on the minds and the manners of men in the world.

5. The Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ, nor any longer a church of Christ; having retrograded and apostatized from his ways, and now, instead of being and continuing *the Bride, the Lamb's wife*, she has become, in her corruptions, in her idolatries, in her blasphemies, and in her persecutions, a repudiated harlot, nay, by way of eminence, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. As such, Jesus Christ has solemnly and unequivocally excommunicated her, in his own holy word. This he has done himself, by his holy apostles and prophets. And hence—exceptions of individuals possibly apart—he knows how many and who, they are the Church of Christ no more, but only the Church of Rome and the Synagogue of Satan.

There are some semi-Protestants, that are not half Protestants; and they cannot distinguish between the meretricious monster of Revelation, and the chaste spouse of the Son of God! though both of them are there described in awful juxta-position and even frightful contrast, set in opposition, and with all the symbols and the picturesque delineations of contrariety, and antipathy, and dissimilitude. The angel had shown to the apostle at large and in varying phases, the awful megatherium of the Romish establishment, when, at last, chapter twenty-first, verse ninth, he says, *Come hither, I will show thee the Bride, the Lamb's wife.* And where was the scene of the vision? Was it Rome? Was it the city of seven hills? No! indeed. The scene changes to a great distance. *And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain*, and there was the vision realized, there was the Bride of Christ.

Hence God has ordered all his pious people to retreat from the confines of Rome. *And I heard another voice from heaven, saying,* COME OUT OF HER, MY PEOPLE, *that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.* Hence the divine vindication of the noble army of the Reformers! It was no schism that they made; it was only REFORMATION. And next to Christianity itself, it was one of the greatest blessings from God ever realized to man. Away with that superficial and smattering philosophy, becoming fashionable lately among a certain class

of ultra fanatical conservatives, the cringing exquisites and ostentatious dandies of literature, which affects to impeach or doubt the principles of our glorious Reformation. They are the real, though disguised, enemies of liberty in church and state—and we are almost tempted, when we witness their incorrigibleness, and their inconsistency, and their ingratitude, to hand them over to the inquisition for a day or two, that the venerable and sublime conservative fathers of the inquisitorial commission may teach them subjectively a thing or two, which will REFORM their transcendentalism, and bring them to their senses. They might then become better citizens, possibly, better Christians, and so better Protestants, as well as better philosophers.

It is a part of Rome's policy to deal in mystery, and mummery, and pageantry, and be sublimated away from all comprehension of the multitude. Hence there are clouds and darkness superinduced. A halo of lugubrious night envelopes the ROMAN ANOMOS in his serene orgies of devotional abominations. The Pope is the great master of religious masquerade; and while *the world* is not yet done *wondering after the Beast*, what a piece of service to mankind and to God himself—just to lift the great veil of all disguises, and show things and sinners behind it, considerably as they are! Our author approximates this consummation. He enables us to go with him, where he has often been, behind the scenes; and into the green-room, and the black-room, and the fire-room, and the grand vestibule of pandemonium—and see facts, with calm fidelity in the light of truth. Reader, do you like the truth? or is your appetite too delicate, too refined, too exquisite, for any thing but rainbows and sun-sets and luxuries of fancy? If so, possibly you are neither a Protestant, nor a Christian, nor a patriot, nor an American, nor a friend of your species, nor a scholar in history, nor a man of sense! Well for you, that others think.

There is one objection, which deserves an answer here. It is frequently a difficulty to the uninformed and wavering, and very commonly a specious cavil in the argumentation or the surmises of infidels. The hardened apostate, who wrote that fine history, the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, as well as his colleague and counterpart, Hume,* often insinuates it, and makes it as plausible and taking, as if there were any solidity or truth in it. It is in substance this: The abuses of Christianity were many, and mighty, and monstrous, without any parallel in history. They began soon after the death of its author. They had progression and amplification, till literally they occupied by usurpation the throne of the Cæsars, and on the top of the pyramid of domination, claimed, and almost realized, the subjugation of the universe. Did this system come from heaven? Is its author God Almighty? What! Would he allow himself to be so superseded, misrepresented, dethroned? Incredible! Therefore Christianity is—all a *cunningly devised fable!* and we are the philosophers of the school of Porphyry and Tom Paine, who have discovered it.

To this we reply the more particularly, as our publication will disclose facts and scenes sufficient to suggest, or seemingly to confirm the objection, possibly, in the minds of some readers.

1. It is admitted, in the very terms of the objection, that they are all abuses of Christianity, and not Christianity itself. The objection then proceeds on the principle, that unless a religion be so

*It is the policy of Hume, especially in his History of England, to magnify—and that is needless—the abuses of religion by the clergy, to elicit for them the indignation of his reader, and then ingeniously to confound them with religion itself, and so to procure the abhorrence of the reader, before he knows it, not to the abuses, as such, but to religion itself! Thus he insidiously makes an infidel, in a way as hypocritical as any thing he records, and as injurious to religion as any of the abuses he portrays. Thus his reader comes to feel, and then to say, that Christianity has done more evil than good in the world, and that Christianity is a corrupt system and cannot be of God! Thus has he done more hurt by his History than by his Philosophical Essays—since these are read by comparatively few, and often not comprehended when read. But in the other, the poison is more deleterious, because unsuspected and comparatively unexposed; while its principle is silly, unjust, false, and worthy only of the perverted conscience of an infidel.

good that it is incapable of being abused in this world of infidels and hypocrites, it cannot be true. This is the fundamental logic of the objection, an *experimentum crucis* with them. It is the same as to say that the ten commandments are not good, or not from God, because men break them; and that no law is divine unless men keep it. A fine criterion, truly; and splendid philosophers are they whose candor and love of truth prompt them to entertain the objection.

2. Christianity has a native tendency, an adaptation, and a perfect scope, to produce effects of goodness, and to emit influences of salvation, on the minds of men. Now, we inquire, Are these abuses the proper fruit of Christianity, or do they come by impious perversion only? and are they the abominations which it denounces and abhors more, infinitely more, than any other system which the world ever saw? If the latter, then blame the sun for the mists and exhalations, that, rising from the marshes and fens of the earth, breed pestilence and shroud the face of heaven, shutting out his light; or criminate and break your perfect mirror, for the sin of showing you the impurities on your face that need cleansing away: do these things first and forever—before you blame Christianity or doubt its truth, because wicked men pervert, abuse, and violate its glorious tendency and nature, in order to their own gratification in sin.

Religion is not sin; nor does religion, by which we mean Christianity, in any wise encourage, or patronize, or approve sin. Religion is therefore irresponsible, and that gloriously, for all those abuses, and perversions, and hypocrisies, however organized, or practised on system, or wide-reaching in their influence, or long-lasting in their devastation, or conspicuous and central and audacious in their enactment, which have ever disgraced the nominal worshippers of God, since Cain or Satan began them in the world. Religion not only has a tendency, but its tendency is incomparably mighty, and to good alone. Its tendency, resulting from the very nature and the wonderful adaptation of Christianity, is to enlighten and purify, to refine, expand, and elevate, to reform and bless and save mankind. In all the relations and spheres and interests of human life, it has this tendency—and it has no other tendency—it alone has this tendency—and it has this tendency so powerful, and with such moral omnipotence of God in it, that it is therefore well entitled in his own word, *the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.* And even where it becomes in effect *the savor of death unto death*, making blind eyes blinder and hard hearts harder, until the wicked are ripe and *fitted to destruction;* we inquire, How comes it to pass? Is it not by resisting, or neglecting, or perverting its tendency, and in no other way? If not, is it by coinciding with the gospel—by meeting cordially its genuine influences, and by concurring with them? Is it by obeying the gospel, believing it, and acting in accordance with it? Is perdition, and its antecedent obduracy, the genuine fruit of the system of salvation? Or, is it only by counteraction, by hostility, by perversion, by abusing the gospel, and by such impious abuse alone, that, in such circumstances, the result of damnation is realized to its proper heirs!

3. The truth of Christianity, however, can both survive this objection, and overrule it for her own greater establishment and triumph.

Let these sceptical and cavilling philosophers remember that all these abuses were foreseen of God from all eternity, not only, but predicted copiously, graphically, and consecutively, through different and distant centuries of time; that they were fore-doomed, as abuses, abhorred of God, but never taking him by surprise; and that, therefore, their actual development or occurrence, as proved so amply in the very histories written by these philosophers, while it grieves the heart of the Christian, yet it edifies his faith, and is itself not a reason of doubt, but of confidence, as a necessary demonstration, in fact, of the truth of Christianity. These philosophers, so profound, seem to have discovered that the exact fulfilment of prophecy is a

demonstration of its falsity, and not of its truth! Whence we infer, that, if no such abuses had ever occurred, the system would have been abundantly more credible, which, in this sense, requires them to occur! Hence Providence fulfilling prophecy before our eyes, is no proof that prophecy is true! How sagacious are these philosophers, who never knew that *the foolishness of God is wiser than men!* The fact is, all these abuses were requisite in order to vindicate the truth of our divine system. We repeat it, that, while it tries our feelings and grieves our heart, it demonstrates the divine truth of Christianity, and so establishes our cordial confidence, *that our faith and hope might be in God.* We regard the cavil or the innuendo, therefore, as vastly contemptible; and worthy not of the talents or the attainments of these philosophers, but only of their cause, their master, and their reward!

Nor can there be any rational doubt as to the relation of the prophecy and the history, as mutually the counterparts of each other. Compare, for example, Dan. 7: 7. 8. 19—27, with II Thes. 2: 1—12, I Tim. 4: 1—5, and almost the whole of Revelation after the fifth chapter. They contain a series of prophetic announcements, extending through more than six hundred years, and which have now been fulfilling for a period of more than twenty-four hundred years—since Daniel wrote. They all refer to the same mystical personage, *the man of sin*, *the son of perdition*, *that wicked* one. They are all pictures and portraits, and good likenesses. We can easily identify the original—by the help especially of Hume and Gibbon, with their excellent histories. The correspondence is curious and wonderful. It contains rational evidence, to which Newton, and Locke, and Boyle, and Bacon, and Barrow, and Paley, and Edwards, and Dwight, and Washington, and a thousand others, bowed their full assent—while these rare philosophers skepticise, as above illustrated, in their serene vanity and madness.

There is another sentiment or principle not more definitive of the enlightened Protestant, than consolatory to the humble Christian and encouraging to the church of God—It is, THE CERTAIN, THE SPEEDY, AND THE FINAL DOWNFALL OF ROME.

> Rome shall perish! Write that word
> In the blood that she has spilt;
> Perish hopeless and abhorred,
> Deep in ruin as in guilt.

The eighteenth chapter of Revelation is a solemn prophetic dirge, with all heaven's ovation, over her hastening and irremediable ruin. THE MAN OF SIN, says the blessed apostle Paul, is also THE SON OF PERDITION, and THAT WICKED—*whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.* And says Daniel, that lucid Prince of the Prophets, *I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame—the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.* AND THE KINGDOM AND DOMINION, AND THE GREATNESS OF THE KINGDOM UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, SHALL BE GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SAINTS OF THE MOST HIGH, WHOSE KINGDOM IS AN EVERLASTING KINGDOM, AND ALL DOMINIONS [or rulers on the earth] SHALL SERVE AND OBEY HIM.

These are only a few specimens of what the Word of God contains throughout, relative to the destined end of these tremendous and far-reaching abominations. For that end we ought sincerely to pray, that it may be hastened in its time. Nay, we hold it impossible to pray, *Thy kingdom come*, in faith and sincerity, without praying for the destruction of POPERY—and PUSEYISM, her own sister, now no longer veiled. They are both morally one, belonging to the *genus Romanum et Paganum*, and not to the *genus Christianum et divinum.* They are both inimical to *the truth as it is in Jesus.* They preach *another gospel, which is not* ANOTHER. And we know whose word is plighted for it, that—*Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.*

As to the time when Romanism shall perish, and the papacy be forever exploded by the promised judgments of

God, we pretend not to know with chronological certainty. Future events are predicted so in outline, as to give a general and practical assurance of them, without dividing with his creatures his own prerogatives, who alone sees the future as the present or the past. But the time is certainly near. Before the present century is passed, with fifty-six years yet to run, great revolutions will occur, great changes and transformations in the organizations of society will have been developed. It is doubted by some eminent scholars, if the popedom will exist a quarter of a century longer. The Pope is now most execrated in his own dominions; and by intelligent Italians, who anticipate YOUNG ITALY speedily redeemed from the tyrannous incubus of ages. The bayonets of Austrian and Swiss mercenaries are potential just now, by the policy and the gold of the Imperial Court at Vienna, to subdue or rather repress the patriotic ardor of the nation, and furnish to the triple Tyrant an adequate protection against the swelling indignation of his own subjects. But he is in the last stages of an incurable consumption. His life is only a dying process, and the symptoms of senility, and decay, and dissolution, are multiplied and aggravated on the limbs and features of the execrated body. Its doom is certain and its end is nigh.

Some, indeed, auger differently, from the strenuous efforts of propagandism, now making, with great zeal, and some success, and loud boasting, by the Jesuit missionaries, in different and distant places, and especially in our own menaced republic. To this, we say, the signs are equivocal and portentous. It is no new thing, that, when the tide of life begins to subside near the heart, the extremities should become spasmodically vitalized with extraordinary vigor. But the action is unnatural, morbid, and soon to subside in death. We know of another personage, whose mightiest efforts are the presages and the results of his own anticipated destruction; *having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time;* and HE is the father of popery. These temporary and local successes have been expected by the students of prophecy; they have been often and long foretold by them; and we are more edified than intimidated by their recent presumption and arrogance. It will be only like the festal impiety, the proud security, and the reckless drunken sleep of ancient Babylon, which God chose as the fitting occasion of her memorable capture and irreparable fall. And so will it be with BABYLON THE GREAT. *Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.*

Our publication will be among the means, we trust, used by eternal Providence to consummate this end. It is adapted to the wants of our country, and will, we think, be read and valued by our intelligent citizens. Let us pity the poor deluded papal laity, "more sinned against than sinning." Let us pray for their conversion, and use every wise and honest expedient to accomplish it, by the blessing of God. Can Americans read the History of the Popes—and yet believe them to be the prophets of heaven and the hallowed masters of the earth! Can they accord to the present dominant *Gregory*, the pompous titles which he claims—VICARIUS FILII DEI, VESTRA SANCTITAS, SERVUS SERVORUM DOMINI, ET DOMINUS REGUM IN ORBE TERRARUM,* with other profane and blasphemous appellations without end! A temporal prince as well as a spiritual tyrant, the sword and the keys are quartered on his arms, and significantly united in all his public influence—as it has been for nearly eleven hundred years. From Leo or Gregory the Great, from Hildebrand, from Borgia, to the present time, has this huge ANTICHRIST been enthroned and dominant among the nations. But his days are limited and near their close. The oriental ANTICHRIST rose contemporaneously with the occidental, Mahommed and the

* That is—THE VICAR OF THE SON OF GOD; YOUR HOLINESS; THE SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF THE LORD; THE LORD OF THE KINGS OF THE WHOLE EARTH: only a few of a much greater assortment. What false humility and nauseous hypocrisy is the third—which ought to be replaced thus: THE WHOLESALE PERSECUTOR AND MURDERER OF THE SAINTS OF GOD!

Pope of Rome, and they shall perish in quick succession—if not both together. The order of events anticipated as probable, which are surely predicted and must be near at hand, and which give hope to faith and will soon give triumph to piety, is as follows:

I. The subversion and destruction of the Roman Antichrist.

II. The fall and explosion of Mahommedism.

III. The conversion of the Jews.

IV. The universal propagation of the gospel, and its ascendency among the nations.

V. The reign of the millennium—not as a new dispensation, but only as the glory of the present one, with the spiritual—not personal—presence of the Redeemer.

VI. The second coming of Christ; the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of all nations, the conflagration of the world, the punishment of the wicked, the glorification of the righteous, and—

VII. The mystery of God is finished.

No doubt there will be judgments and the ministrations of blood, in various places, before the consummation. It will not be all mercy, that is to prepare the way for the grandest triumphs of mercy. But come what will, we know that *the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth;* that his veracity is inviolable, his purposes are not to be frustrated, his cause shall be finally victorious, and his praises celebrated by hundreds of millions of the ransomed to all eternity. His enemies are as weak as they are wicked; and God will manage them as becomes his glory, at whose feet subordinate roll the seasons and the times, and against whose ample and generous and all-perfect monarchy no man ever *hardened himself and prospered. And we know that all things work* [are working] *together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose.*

Our greatest national dangers arise from our lamentable apathy; as this arises mainly from our ignorance. *While men slept*, says our Saviour, *the enemy sowed tares.* And if "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance," it ill becomes the heirs of such a boon, from such ancestors as ours, to lose or even to peril the freedom which was purchased by them at the cost of blood. Nor will any thing like indifference suit the occasion. America expects every citizen, as Christ every Christian, to do his duty. And to omit this—on any pretence—is criminal. It is suiting and serving the enemy. It is servility and subserviency to the common foe. Sleep on, says Rome, and we will have you! We need do nothing, but only omit to do our duty, and we act for him; and our ruined posterity may remember only to accuse us, only to execrate our memories. Shall we then be indifferent, and so abet the interests of antichrist? What could we do more truly to favor the worst adversary of this most noble and desirable nation?

Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ.

This suits the policy and aim of Rome,
And seals deceitfully our country's doom.
The Pope and all his Cardinals would yield
Their crownly jewels for so fair a field.
Such apathy were treason to the state
And church, as well as perfidy ingrate.

We have nothing to do but our duty, as Christians; and that is, to trust God at all times, so to avail our ignorance of his omniscience, our weakness of his almightiness, our ruin of his salvation, and thus to twine the hand of our infantile feebleness in the mighty grasp of his paternal strength, *who is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy.*

Brooklyn, N. Y. July 26, 1844.

THE PREFACE.

The work which I now offer to the public, I undertook some years since at Rome, and brought it down to the pontificate of Victor, that is, to the close of the second century. As I was then a most zealous champion for the pope's supremacy, which was held as an article of faith by the body I belonged to, my chief design, when I engaged in such a work, was to ascertain that supremacy, by showing, century by century, that from the apostles' times to the present, it had ever been acknowledged by the catholic church. But, alas! I soon perceived that I had undertaken more than it was in my power to perform. Nay, while, in order to support and maintain this cause, I examined, with particular attention, the writing of the apostles, and of the many pious and learned men who had flourished in the three first centuries of the church, I was so far from finding any thing that seemed the least to countenance such a doctrine, that, on the contrary, it appeared evident, beyond all dispute, that, during the above mentioned period of time, it had been utterly unknown to the Christian world. In spite then of my endeavors to the contrary, reason getting the better of the strongest prejudices, I began to look upon the pope's supremacy, not only as a prerogative quite chimerical, but as the most impudent attempt that had ever been made: I say, in spite of my endeavors to the contrary; for I was very unwilling to give up a point upon which I had been taught, by Bellarmine, that the whole of Christianity depended;[1] especially in a country, where a man cannot help being afraid even of his own thoughts, since, upon the least suspicion of his only calling in question any of the received opinions, he may depend upon his being soon convinced by more cogent arguments than any in mood and figure. But great is the power of truth; and at last it prevailed: I became a proselyte to the opinion which I had proposed to confute; and sincerely abjured, in my mind, that which I had ignorantly undertaken to defend.

Being thus fully convinced that the pope's so much boasted supremacy was a bold and ungodly usurpation, I could not help censuring with myself the men of learning who had countenanced such a pretension, especially the two great champions of the papal power, Bellarmine and Baronius. Did they not see what every man, who but dips into the primitive writers, must see; what is obvious to common sense? The poor shifts they are often put to, their ridiculous evasions and cavils, their unmeaning distinctions, their wresting several passages, contrary to the plain and natural meaning of the authors they quote, and, above all, their unsatisfactory answers to the objections of the adverse party, show but too plainly that they wrote not from conviction, nor aimed at truth, but, perhaps, at the red hat, which was afterwards bestowed upon them, as a reward for betraying the truth. Few have written in defence of the pope's supremacy, that have not been preferred; and none perhaps who had not preferment in view. Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II, being asked, before he was raised to the papal chair, how it happened, that, in all disputes between the popes and the councils, many divines sided with the former, and very few with the latter? Because the popes, answered he, have benefices to give, and the councils have none. Had he been asked the same question after he was pope, he would not perhaps have returned the same answer; but said, upon his being put in mind of it, as Gregory XIII did afterwards on a like occasion, that, being raised higher, he saw better and farther. Those, therefore, who have stood up in defence of

[1] Bellar. Præf. de Sum. Pont.

the liberty of the church against papal usurpation, cannot be supposed to have had any other inducement to espouse the cause of truth, but truth itself. And this some have had the Christian courage to do, even in Italy, and almost in the pope's hearing, at the peril of their liberty, of their lives, of all that was dear to them; as I shall have occasion to show hereafter. But to return, in the mean time, to the present history: I no sooner found myself in a country where truth might be uttered without danger, than I resolved to resume and pursue, in my native tongue, as soon as I recovered the use of it, the work I had begun in a foreign language. On the one side I saw the only obstruction to an undertaking, which had already cost me no small pains and labour, happily removed; while I flattered myself on the other, that as a complete History of the Popes was still wanting, such a performance might meet with a favorable reception from the public. I am well apprized, that others have at different times, and in different languages, treated the same subject: but whether any of their several works may deserve the name of complete, or even of a tolerable history; I leave those to judge who have perused them; and shall only say in respect to myself, that instead of diverting me from undertaking the same province, they have more than any thing else encouraged me to it. Anastasius and Platina, the two classics, as they are deemed, in this branch of history, have indeed given us the *lives of the popes*, from the foundation of the see of Rome to their times, but in so broken, imperfect, and unsatisfactory a manner, that from them we learn but very little, even concerning those of whom they have said most. It was not their design to write a history, but only to draw as it were in miniature the portraits of the Roman bishops, by relating, in a summary way, such of their actions as appeared to them most worthy of being recorded; and to say the truth, they have both betrayed no less want of discernment in choosing what they should relate, than of exactness in relating what they had chosen.

Anastasius the monk, surnamed Bibliothecarius, that is, library-keeper, secretary, and chancellor of the church of Rome, (for all these employments anciently centred in one person, and were comprised under the common name of Bibliothecarius,) flourished in the ninth century, under Nicolas I, Adrian II, and John VIII. He wrote a succinct account of the bishops who governed the church of Rome, from St. Peter to Nicolas I, who died in 867. But the memoirs he made use of were none of the best. In his time the world was overrun with forged or corrupted pontificals, martyrologies, legends, &c., which were then no less universally received than they have been since rejected by the learned of all persuasions. However, that from these the bibliothecarian borrowed the greater part of his materials, at least for the six first centuries, is but too apparent, from his overlooking, nay, and often contradicting, the unexceptionable testimonies of contemporary writers; as will be seen in the sequel of the present history. As therefore the records, which he copied, are so justly suspected, and his own authority can be of no weight with respect to those distant times, the reader must not be surprised to find that, in this history, I have paid no manner of regard to an author who has been hitherto blindly followed by those who have written on the same subject. There may, indeed, be some truth in what he relates; but his frequent mistakes render that truth too precarious to be relied on, unless confirmed by the concurring testimonies of other more credible and less credulous authors. However, in the times less remote from his own, I shall readily allow his authority its due weight; the rather, as he seems not to have written with a design of imposing upon others, but to have been imposed upon himself by frauds and forgeries; for he wrote in an age when the world lay involved in the thickest mist of ignorance, when superstition and credulity triumphed without control, and spurious pieces, filled with idle and improbable stories, had thrust every grave writer, nay, and the gospels themselves, out of doors.

Platina, so called from the Latin name of Piadena, a village in the Cremonese, the place of his nativity, (for his true name was Battista, or Bartolomeo Sacchi,) flourished six hundred years after Anastasius, that is, in the fifteenth century, under Calixtus III, Pius II, Paul II, and Sixtus IV. Under Pius II he was secretary of the Datary, the office where vacant benefices are disposed of; but, being dis-

missed by Paul II, though he had purchased the place in the height of his resentment, he appealed to the future council. What he suffered under that pope, first in prison, and afterwards on the rack, we shall hear from himself, in a more proper place. Sixtus IV, the successor of Paul, well apprized of his innocence, took him into favor, and, having enlarged, endowed, and enriched the Vatican library with a great number of valuable books, in different languages, he committed the care of them to him. It was probably at this time that he wrote, or rather transcribed, the Lives of the Popes, from St. Peter, whom he supposes the founder of that see, to Paul II, who died in 1471. I say transcribed; for, if we except the few popes who lived in or near his own times, namely, Eugene IV, Nicolas V, Calixtus III, Pius II, and Paul II, he copied, almost verbatim, all he has said of the rest, only interweaving now and then the profane history with the ecclesiastic.[1] The lives of the fourteen succeeding popes, from Paul II to Pius V, elected in 1566, were compiled by Onuphrius Panvinius, of the Augustin order, a man more commendable for his learning than for his candor and veracity. These are, as we may style them, the original compilers of the lives of the popes: Platina adopted Anastasius's concise method of writing, and Panvinius, Platina's, contenting themselves with bare hints; and thereby putting their readers to the trouble of consulting other writers, in order to gratify the curiosity they had raised. "Much has been said of the popes by other historians, but very little by their own," as the learned Pagi observed, after comparing the authors I have mentioned, with the contemporary historians of other nations. I might well add, that the *very little* they have said has been thought too much; whence some of them, and Platina in particular, have been made, in all their editions since the middle of the sixteenth century, to speak with more reserve, and to suppress or disguise some truths they had formerly told.

As for those who in later times have engaged in the same province, we need only dip into their works to be satisfied, that to search out truth was not their business. Some are all praise and panegyric, others all satire and gall: some have made it their study to excuse the worst of popes, others to arraign the best. That many of the popes have been wicked men, abandonedly wicked, is undeniable, notwithstanding the pains that have been taken to extenuate their crimes; but neither are there wanting some good men among them, of innocent lives, and unblemished characters, whose only crime is their having been popes; and to misrepresent or misconstrue the virtuous actions of these, as some have done, is no less blamable in an historian, than to dissemble or gloss over the criminal actions of the others. This partiality may be easily accounted for with respect to one great period of the present history. During the quarrels and wars between the popes and emperors, which lasted many years, and occasioned, in seventy-eight battles, the destruction of an infinite number of innocent people, two powerful factions reigned, as is well known, both in Germany and Italy, distinguished by the names of Guelphs and Ghibbelines; the former being zealously attached to the papal, and the latter to the imperial interest. In the midst of these distractions, few writers stood neuter, but, siding, according to their different interests or inclinations, with one party or the other, drew their pens, each against the head of the party he opposed, with more rage than the soldiers did their swords. And hence it is, that we find the same facts related by contemporary authors with such different circumstances; the same persons, the emperors especially and the popes, painted in such different colours. Of this very few writers in the later times have been aware; and therefore have, as their bias led them to favor one cause more than the other, adopted as undoubted truths the many groundless aspersions and undeserved reproaches

[1] The authors he thus copied were Anastasius Bibliothecarius, from St. Peter, or rather Linus, to Nicolas I; Gulielmus, likewise Bibliothecarius, from Nicolas I to Alexander II; Pandulphus Pisanus, from Alexander II to Honorius II; Martinus Polonus, from Honorius II to Honorius IV; Theodorus of Niem, from Honorius IV to Urban VI, and from Urban VI to Martin V, who died in 1431; other writers, whose works are extant, but their names unknown. He likewise borrowed a great deal of Ptolemæus Lucensis, a Dominican friar, who flourished, and compiled the lives of the popes, in the time of Boniface VIII, chosen in the year 1294.

which party zeal had suggested to the Ghibbelines against the popes, or to the Guelphs against the emperors. I wish I could entirely clear an eminent Italian historian of our own times from this imputation.

But, after all, as it was not merely with a view to supply the want of a complete history of the popes, that I formerly undertook so laborious a task; neither is it now with that view alone I resume it. What I proposed to myself, when I first undertook it, I have said already; but, being convinced that I labored in vain, and convinced by such evidence as the strongest prejudice could not withstand, I thought it a duty owing to truth, to set it forth to others in the same irresistible light; and to defend, at least with as much zeal, the best of causes, as I had done the worst. A disloyal subject, who had taken up arms against his lawful sovereign, would not be thought entirely to comply with his duty, by only laying them down: he ought, if actuated by a true spirit of loyalty, and truly convinced of the badness of his cause, to range himself under the banners of his injured lord, and devote to his service and defence the sword he had drawn against him. By a like obligation, a writer, who has, even ignorantly, combated truth, is bound, not only to lay down his pen, as soon as he finds himself engaged in a bad cause, but, when occasion offers, to turn against error in favor of truth the very weapon he had employed against truth in favor of error.

But to give the reader some account of the history itself, and the method I have pursued in delivering it: I have entitled it, *The History of the Popes;* but might as well have styled it, *The History of Popery;* since it not only contains an account of the lives and actions of the popes, but of every Popish tenet; when, by whom, on what occasion, and to serve what purpose, each of them was broached; those more especially which relate to the pope as *Christ's Vicar upon earth*, as *the Supreme Head of the Church*, as *an Infallible Guide to salvation;* for these are the prerogatives he claims, as entailed upon, and inseparable from the Roman see. But that no such doctrines were known in the first and purest ages of Christianity; that the Bishop of Rome was then, nay, and thought himself, upon the level with other bishops; that the Catholic Church acknowledged no power, authority, or jurisdiction in the Bishop of Rome, but what was common to him with all other bishops, will appear so plain from the following history, that I can hardly conceive it possible for any man, however prejudiced in favor of the papal power and popish religion, to peruse it without abjuring the one and the other: I am but too well apprized of the strength of prejudice; but, strong as it is, it can never be proof against plain matter of fact. For who can believe, for instance, in the pope's infallibility, who can help looking upon such an article of belief as the grossest affront that ever was offered to human understanding, when he reads of a Liberius admitting and signing the Arian creed, or confession of faith, declared heretical by all his successors; of an Honorius condemned by the fathers of the sixth œcumenical council, as *an organ of the devil*, for holding the heresy of the Monothelites; of John XXII preaching up and propagating, both by his missionaries and his legates *a latere*, a doctrine which he himself retracted on his death-bed; of seven popes[1] cursing and damning, in emulation of one another, all who denied a certain tenet,[2] and another pope[3] as heartily cursing and damning all who maintained it, nay, and recurring to the *ultima ratio* of the later popes, the fagot, in order to *root out of the Church* (these are his very words) *so pestilential, erroneous, heretical, and blasphemous a doctrine?* This occasioned great scandal in the church, insomuch that some even took the liberty to represent to his holiness, that the decrees and constitutions of one pope could not be reversed by another. The pope replied, (and what other reply could he make?) "That they were mistaken, since it might be proved by innumerable instances, that what had been decreed wrong or amiss by one pope or council could be rectified and

[1] Gregory IX, Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Nicolas III, Martin IV, Nicolas IV, Clement V.

[2] That the Franciscan friars had no property, in common or in private; a question, if any ever was, *de lana caprina*. What was it to mankind? what to the Christian religion, whether a few friars had, or had not, any property? No man was the better for believing they had, no man the worse for believing they had not. And yet to read the bulls of the popes, one would think that the whole of Christianity had been at stake.

[3] John XXII.

amended by another." This answer silenced them at once, says our historian: and well it might; I am only surprised that the word infallibility has ever been since heard of. The Franciscan friars, who had occasioned the dispute, paid dear for it: as they continued to plead the infallibility of seven popes against that of one, and obstinately adhered to their doctrine. Pope John, losing all patience, ordered all to be burnt alive who did not receive his constitution; which was done accordingly, and many of those unhappy wretches chose rather to expire in the flames than to yield. These remarkable transactions are related by several contemporary writers of unquestionable authority, and among the rest by Nicolaus Eymericus, who was inquisitor of the province of Tarragon, and has inserted them in his Directorium Inquisitorum.[1] Other facts without number, of the same nature, and alike irreconcilable with the other prerogatives claimed by the popes, as well as with the chief articles of the Roman Catholic religion, will occur in this history, and all so well attested, that nothing, I think, can withstand the force of truth thus displayed. Logical arguments and controversial reasoning cannot be well adapted to every understanding, and therefore are not always attended with the desired effect, however skilfully managed; but historical facts lie level to the meanest capacities, and the consequences thence deducible are to the meanest capacities plain and obvious. It is true, the sticklers for the see of Rome have endeavored to darken the clearest facts, since they could not deny them, as being vouched by their own approved authors; but they have done it in so awkward a manner, with such absurd, ridiculous, and unintelligible interpretations, comments, distinctions, &c., that, were it not well known it was their interest to defend that cause, one would be apt to think they intended rather to ridicule than defend it.

But if the popes were originally mere bishops, upon the level with other bishops; if they had no power but what was common to them with all other bishops; by what means could they thus exalt themselves above their colleagues, nay, *above all that is called God?* What could induce their colleagues, and with them the greater part of the *Christian* world, to acknowledge such an unheard-of power, and submit to a yoke of all others the most heavy and tyrannical? For an answer to these questions I refer the reader to the following history, where he will find every branch of power, authority, or jurisdiction claimed by the popes, traced from its first origin, and the various steps pointed out, by which they raised themselves from the lowest beginnings to the highest pitch of greatness; which is opening a school of the most refined policy that ever was known or practised upon earth. In this respect we must own the popes to have been, generally speaking, men of extraordinary talents, the ablest politicians we read of in history, statesmen fit to govern the world, and equal to the vast dominion they grasped at; a dominion over the minds as well as the bodies and estates of mankind; a dominion, of all that ever were formed, the most wide and extensive, as knowing no other bounds but those of the earth; nay, and not even those, since these mighty princes claim to themselves all power in heaven as well as in earth, all power over the dead as well as the living. To establish the spiritual part of this wondrous authority upon the gospel of Christ, which contradicts it in every line, was an undertaking of no little difficulty, and that required no common skill; to establish the temporal dominion without a fleet, without an army; to subject to it not only the ignorant and superstitious multitude, but kings themselves, nay, and to prevail upon them to employ both their arms and their interest in promoting a power evidently derogatory to and inconsistent with their own; was a work not to be accomplished but by men of superior talents, thoroughly acquainted with all the arts of insinuation and address, and steady in pursuing, by the best concerted measures, the great point that they constantly had in their view.

Two things, however, concurred to facilitate, in some degree, the establishing the one and the other: namely, the profound ignorance of the times, and the matchless cunning of the persons employed by the popes as their emissa-

[1] Direct. Inquis. part. ii. quæst. 51. See also Antoninus in his Summa Theologiæ, part. iv. tit. ii. c. 7, num. 5; Petrus Alliacus Cameracensis; Continuator Nangii ad ann. 1333; Joannes Gerso in Ser. de Fest. Paschat. Longus in Monas. Cicestr. Chronic. and Gobelinus Cosmodromii ætat. vi. c. 71.

ries and agents; without which helps no imposture was ever carried on with success.

It was *in the night, while men slept*, while the earth was overspread with the darkest night of ignorance, that *the enemy came, and sowed his tares*. From the beginning of the seventh century to the time of the reformation, letters were utterly neglected; and in proportion to that neglect, credulity and superstition, the inseparable companions of ignorance, prevailed among the laity even of the highest ranks: the little knowledge that still remained (and very little did remain) was wholly confined to the clergy, chiefly to the monks, men most zealously attached to the interest of the pope, as well knowing that by promoting his interest they promoted at the same time their own. It was in this period of time, in this long darkness of ignorance, credulity, and superstition, that the pope and his agents introduced maxims and notions concerning the papal prerogatives, very different from those which the world had entertained to that time. In the beginning of the seventh century, that is, in the year 606, Pope Boniface III, a man of great address, having craftily insinuated himself into the favor of Phocas, obtained of that traitor and murderer[1] the famous rescript settling the supremacy on the see of Rome, in opposition to the claim of the patriarch of Constantinople. As Phocas bore an irreconcilable hatred to Cyriacus, who was then vested with the patriarchal dignity, he was the more easily prevailed upon to decide the controversy, which had already lasted a long time between the two sees, in favor of the see of Rome. If this hatred in the usurper was owing to the zeal of Cyriacus in laying before him the enormity of his crime, and exhorting him to repentance, Boniface, nay, and his predecessor St. Gregory the Great,[2] knew better how to make their court to men in power than to take the least notice of their sins, however public, or mention *repentance* in their hearing. Be that as it will, it is certain that to this monster of wickedness the Church of Rome owes her supremacy. And it was this grant from Phocas that, more than any thing else, inspired the bishops of Rome with pride and presumption; which increasing as their power increased, they were carried by degrees to all the excesses an unbounded ambition can suggest, when free from all curb of conscience, morality, and religion.

Yet, after all, the supremacy granted by Phocas was but a supremacy of order and dignity; it gave no *new* power to the Bishop of Rome, but only raised him above his colleagues, especially his rival, the patriarch of Constantinople: and made him, as some express it, *the first among his equals*. But his successors, thirsting after power, and scorning to hold their dignity by so precarious a tenure as the emperor's pleasure, which might hereafter revoke the decision of Phocas, and give the precedence in rank to Constantinople instead of Rome, began to disown the favor they had received, to set up for themselves, and to claim the supremacy, as inherent by divine right in their see, and derived from St. Peter, as chief of the apostles, and head of the church. Thus was the foundation of the supremacy changed; and wisely changed, according to the rules of human policy. The old foundation was no ways proportioned to the immense superstructure which they now began to design; since they could claim but very little power, if any at all, in virtue of the emperor's grant. But the new foundation was capable of bearing whatever the most unbounded and aspiring ambition could build on it. Besides, the Bishop of Rome could not challenge, by a rescript of the Roman emperor, any superiority over the churches that had no dependence on the Roman empire. But a supremacy, inherent by divine right in the papal dignity, raised him at once above all the bishops of the catholic church. What therefore now remained was, to improve this extensive supremacy into a no less extensive power and jurisdiction. And here no time was lost, many circumstances concurring to promote and forward the execution of their attempt. Besides the ignorance of the times, and the influence

[1] Phocas settled himself on the imperial throne by the murder of Mauritius, his lawful sovereign, and the massacre of his six children, and of all his friends and relations. Five of his children he caused to be inhumanly butchered in the presence of their father.

[2] Gregory styles him a most pious and religious prince; caused his image, and that of his wife Leontia, who was no better than he, to be lodged in an oratory at Rome; and, congratulating him on his advancement to the throne, ascribes it to a particular providence.

of the monks, which operated strongly in their behalf, the princes of Europe were quarrelling among themselves about the western parts of the Roman empire, and all glad to purchase, at any rate, the friendship of the Bishop of Rome, who, after the famous donation of Pepin in 754, had taken great state upon him, and bore a considerable sway in all public affairs. As for the bishops, and the rest of the secular clergy, they looked upon the pope, especially after he had added the sword to the keys, as their protector and defender; and were on that consideration disposed to concur in strengthening his power, and rendering it formidable, though at the expense of their own; choosing rather to subject themselves to an ecclesiastical master than to submit to the civil authority. I might add, that some now began to mind the fleece more than the flock: and with that it was some time before the popes thought it proper to meddle; but when they did, they soon retrieved, by the haste that they made, the time they had lost.

Yet I do not believe that they designed at first to run those lengths, or carry the papal prerogative to that extravagant height they afterwards did. The success that attended them in the pursuit of one claim, encouraged them to set up and pursue another. Of this no one can doubt, who peruses with the least attention the records of those ages, and compares the popes in the beginning of the seventh century with the popes in the latter end of the eleventh. We shall find them, in the first-mentioned period of time, submitting with all humility to princes; claiming no kind of authority or jurisdiction whatsoever but in virtue of the canons of councils, or the rescripts of emperors; glorying, or pretending to glory, in the humble title of servants of servants; acknowledging themselves subjects and vassals of the emperors, and patiently waiting the will and pleasure of their liege-lords to take upon them the episcopal dignity, or exercise the functions of that office. Such were the bishops of Rome in the beginning of the seventh century. How different from those in the latter end of the eleventh! They were then vested with the *plenitude of all power*, both spiritual and temporal; above councils, and uncontrolled by their canons; the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and authority; and, by divine sanction, empowered to enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, all ecclesiastical laws and constitutions: they were then become lords and masters; the most haughty and imperious lords, the most severe masters mankind had ever groaned under: they no more begged, but dispensed titles, boasting a power of setting up kings, and pulling them down at pleasure; of calling them to an account, absolving their subjects from their allegiance, divesting them of their dominions, and treating in every respect as their slaves and vassals, those whom one of their best and greatest predecessors[1] had acknowledged *superior to all men*, and thought himself *in duty bound to obey*. This *plenitude of power*, as they style it, was not acquired at once, but by degrees, as I have observed above; some of the popes being more, and some less active, crafty, and aspiring. But what is very remarkable, of the one hundred and fourteen between Boniface III, who laid the foundation of the papal grandeur, and Gregory VII, who raised it to the highest pitch, not one ever lost an inch of ground his predecessors had gained. And thus, by constantly acquiring, and never parting with what they had acquired, nay, and tying the hands of their successors by the irreversible entail of a divine right, they became the sole spiritual lords, and had almost made themselves the greatest temporal lords of the whole Christian world.

But by what particular means they rose to such a height of grandeur and majesty, by what artifices and subtle contrivances they maintained what they had usurped, and strove to retrieve what they had lost, when it pleased Divine Providence to check and restrain within more narrow bounds their overgrown power, the reader will learn from the following history. Some of the arts they have made use of are of the most refined, and some of the blackest nature; and both I have endeavored, in this work, to set forth in their truest light, without disguise or exaggeration; those more especially which the popes and their agents have formerly employed, and still employ, to bring anew under their yoke such nations as have had the Christian courage to shake it off, and assert that *liberty, wherewith Christ has*

[1] Gregory the Great.

made us free. If I shall be so happy as thereby to keep awake and alive, in the breast of every true Englishman, that noble ardor, which has, on a late occasion, exerted itself in so distinguished a manner; if it shall please Heaven to second my undertaking so far, as to alarm by it those Protestants (I wish I might not say those *many* Protestants) who are not aware of, nor sufficiently guarded against, the crafty insinuations, the secret views and attempts of the papal emissaries; I shall think the time and pains it has cost me abundantly paid.

I am well apprized of the reception a work of this nature must meet with, and of the treatment its author must expect, both at home and abroad, from the popish zealots. But let them vent their zeal in what manner they please, I shall neither answer nor resent their reproaches and censures, however malignant and groundless: nay, I shall hear them with as much pleasure and satisfaction as I should the praises and commendations of others; it being no less meritorious in a writer to have displeased the enemies of truth, than to have pleased the friends. And these, I flatter myself, will find no great room for censure: it would grieve me if they should, since I have done all that lay in my power to leave none. I have advanced nothing for which I have not sufficient vouchers: and these I have taken care to quote in the margin, that the reader, by recurring to the places pointed out in each author, may be convinced of my sincerity and candor. I have always preferred the contemporary writers, when equally credible, to those who wrote after, though not without taking notice of their disagreement; and such as flourished nearest the times when the transactions happened, which they relate, to those who lived at a greater distance. Pursuant to this rule, in delivering the lives of the bishops who governed the Church of Rome during the first ages of Christianity, I have confined myself wholly to the primitive writers, trusting no modern any farther, than as he wrote from the ancients. From these there is no appeal; it is by them, and them alone, that the papal supremacy must stand or fall. If they have all conspired to misrepresent the sense of the ages in which they lived, (and it is only by this hypothesis that the supremacy can be supported,) in what other monuments shall we search for it?

The partiality, which I have so much complained of above in the works of others, I have taken all possible care to avoid in my own; checking the very first emotions of that zeal, which, on my reflecting how long, and how grossly I had been imposed upon, would, if not carefully watched, have proved as strong a bias in me against the pope, and the popish religion, as the opposite zeal has proved for them in others. The vices and vicious actions of the bad popes I have not dissembled; but neither have I magnified them: the virtues and commendable actions of the good popes I have neither lessened nor misconstrued; nay, I have more than once justified the conduct and character of some pious men among them, greatly injured by their own historians, because they lived, and suffered mankind to live, in peace; applying themselves solely, as it became good bishops, to the discharge of their pastoral duty. These their historians have strangely misrepresented, measuring the merit of each pope by the great things they achieved, no matter by what means, for the exaltation of their see; which, in other terms, is measuring their merit by their pride and ambition.

The length of this history requires, I presume, no apology. Every one knows that the popes acted, for several ages, as the umpires of Europe, or rather as the sovereigns; several princes being actually their vassals, and the rest affecting to pay them the same respect as if they were. This emboldened them to intermeddle in the public affairs of each state and kingdom; insomuch that no remarkable event happened, no revolution, no change of government or constitution, which they did not either promote or oppose, as it suited their interest, with too many of them the only standard of right and wrong; and their authority, through the ignorance, credulity, and superstition of those unhappy times, was, generally speaking, of such weight as to turn the scale into which it was thrown. Besides, they had, in every kingdom and nation, their legates or vicars, who, together with the clergy, formed, as it were, a separate state, and one kingdom or empire within another. These, at the instigation of the popes, their lords and masters, were constantly encroaching on the civil authority and jurisdiction, on the rights of the people, and prerogatives of princes. Hence

arose innumerable disputes, which, if princes did not comply with their demands, ended in anathemas, interdicts, civil wars, rebellions, private assassinations, and public massacres. Those who are versed in the histories of other nations, as well as in that of our own, and know what a considerable part the detail of these fatal disputes takes up in the particular histories of each state and kingdom, will not find fault with the length of this, which, if complete, and as such I offer it to the public, must comprise them all. Besides, I have given a summary account of the many heresies that have sprung up in the church; of the councils that have been held; of the religious and military orders; of their founders, institutions, fundamental laws, &c.; subjects all, in some degree, connected with the history of the popes.

I do not doubt but this work will meet with a favorable reception from Protestants of all denominations; such a reception, I mean, as is due to truth. It will, I flatter myself, retard, at least, the daily increase of the papal interest in these happy kingdoms. As for the Roman Catholics here, would they but lay aside their prejudices, so far as to peruse it with the least degree of candor and attention, I am confident truth would exert its power no less efficaciously upon some of them than it has done upon me. They cannot surely be more biassed in favor of the errors they had been brought up in, than I was. In them truth has but one enemy to contend with, education; in me it had two, education and interest; and the latter is but too often the more powerful of the two. What I forfeited by adhering to truth, most of the Roman Catholics in England well know; and I am very confident none of them can say that I have ever yet reaped, or sought to reap, the least temporal benefit from it. If, therefore, the power of truth, when duly displayed, is so great as to triumph thus over the combined force of education and interest, we may well hope that it will, at least in some, triumph over education alone: I most heartily wish it may in all.

THE

HISTORY OF THE POPES.

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

POPES, OR BISHOPS OF ROME.

ST. PETER.

That St. Peter was ever at Rome, known only by tradition. Tradition not to be depended upon. Fabulous accounts of St. Peter. The greatest men imposed upon by false traditions.

It is out of some regard to an ancient tradition, that I have placed St. Peter at the head of the Bishops of Rome, though I am well apprized that this, like most other traditions, will hardly stand the test of a strict and impartial examination. To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. If it is affirmed by him alone, we can at most but suspend our belief, not rejecting it as false, because a liar may sometimes speak truth; but we cannot, upon his bare authority, admit it as true. Now that St. Peter was at Rome, that he was Bishop of Rome, we are told by tradition alone, which, at the same time, tells us of so many strange circumstances attending his coming to that metropolis, his staying in it, his withdrawing from it, &c., that, in the opinion of every unprejudiced man, the whole must savor strongly of romance. Thus we are told, that St. Peter went to Rome chiefly to oppose Simon, the celebrated magician; that, at their first interview, at which Nero himself was present, he flew up into the air, in the sight of the emperor, and the whole city; but that the devil, who had thus raised him, struck with dread and terror at the name of Jesus, whom the apostle invoked, let him fall to the ground, by which fall he broke his legs. Should you question the truth of this tradition at Rome, they would show you the prints of St. Peter's knees in the stone, on which he kneeled on this occasion, and another stone still dyed with the blood of the magician.[1]

The Romans, as we are told, highly incensed against him for thus maiming, and bringing to disgrace, one to whom they paid divine honours, vowed his destruction; whereupon the apostle thought it advisable to retire for a while from the city, and had already reached the gate, when, to his great surprise, he met our Saviour coming in, as he went out, who, upon St. Peter's asking him where he was going, returned this answer, "I am going to Rome to be crucified anew:" which, as St. Peter understood it, was upbraiding him with his flight; whereupon he turned back, and was soon after seized by the provoked Romans, and, by an order from the emperor, crucified. These, and a thousand like stories, however fabulous and romantic they may seem, we cannot, without great incoherency, reject, if we admit St. Peter to have been at Rome; since the whole is equally vouched by the same authority, and has been upon the same authority equally believed by those who are called in, by the advocates for the see of Rome, to witness St. Peter's having preached the gospel in that city. These are Arnobius,[1] Cyril of Jerusalem,[2] Eusebius,[3] Irenæus,[4] Tertullian,[5] Jerom,[6] and Justin the martyr.[7] These have all supposed St. Peter to have been at Rome, and, together with St. Paul, to have planted Christianity in that great metropolis of the world; but this they took upon tradition, and consequently their authority is of no greater weight than tradition itself, which, had they duly examined, they would not perhaps have so readily pinned their faith upon it. False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them. How many tradi-

[1] This account seems to have been borrowed from Suetonius, who speaks of a person that, in the public sports, undertook to fly in the presence of the Emperor Nero; but, on his first attempt, fell to the ground; by which fall his blood sprang out with such violence, that it reached the emperor's canopy. Suet. l. 6, c. 12.

[1] Arnob. l. 2, in Gent.
[2] Cyril. catech. 6.
[3] Euseb. l. 2, c. 14.
[4] Iren. l. 2, c. 20.
[5] Tert. de anim. c. 24.
[6] Hier. de vir. illustr. c. 2.
[7] Justin. apol. 2.

How little regard paid to them by some popes. No mention in the Scripture of St. Peter's having ever been at Rome. St. Paul, in the many letters he wrote from Rome, never mentions St. Peter.

tions, after having reigned for ages without control, were, upon the Reformation, when men took the liberty to examine what they believed, rejected by the church, ashamed to own them, and degraded into popular errors! But that of St. Peter's having been at Rome, and the first bishop of that city, was a tradition of too great consequence not to be maintained at all events, since upon that chiefly was founded the claim of his pretended successors to an uncontrolled authority, and universal jurisdiction; a foundation infinitely too weak for such an immense superstructure.

And here I cannot help observing the little regard that the popes themselves have shown to tradition, though received by the greatest lights of the church, when it did not promote the honour or interest of their see. Of this we have a glaring instance in a parallel case; for as St. Peter, according to tradition, travelled to Rome, so did St. Paul, according to tradition, travel into Spain: the former tradition was received by the writers I have quoted above, and the latter by some of the same writers, namely, by Cyril of Jerusalem,[1] and Jerom,[2] and by Athanasius.[3] Chrysostom,[4] Theodoret,[5] Gregory the Great,[6] and many others; yet such a tradition was rejected, perhaps justly, by Pope Innocent I., who would not allow St. Paul to have ever been in Spain.[7] Have we not an equal right to question, or even to deny, St. Peter's having ever been at Rome? Are not the authorities at least equal on both sides? Why then must the travels of one apostle be looked upon as an article of faith, and those of the other be deemed fabulous?

And truly, if we examine narrowly into this matter, the former tradition will appear no less groundless to us than the latter did to that pope: for, in the first place, neither St. Peter himself, nor any of the sacred writers, give us the least hint or intimation of his having ever been at Rome. We are told of his being at Antioch, at Jerusalem, at Corinth, at Babylon;[8] but of the great metropolis of the empire, where he is supposed to have fixed his see, not the least mention is made. And may we not, from that silence, question, to say no more, his having ever been there? I know that by Babylon, from whence St. Peter wrote his first epistle,[9] Eusebius,[10] Jerom,[11] the venerable Bede,[12] Oecumenius,[13] and Grotius,[14] understood Rome; but this is a bare conjecture, and no better grounded than that of others, who thought that by Babylon was meant Jerusalem.[15] The learned Dr. Pearson, Bishop of Chester, seeing no occasion here to recur to a figurative sense, is of opinion, that the above-mentioned epistle was written not from Babylon in Chaldæa, which then lay in ruins, but from Babylon in Egypt; and no man has taken more pains to make the world believe that St. Peter preached at Rome, and founded that see.[1] But, in this controversy, the silence of St. Paul in particular, if duly attended to, must be thought, by every unbiassed man, a far more convincing proof of St. Peter's not having been at Rome, than all the authorities that have been yet alleged are of his having been there. For that apostle, while at Rome, had frequent opportunities of mentioning his fellow-apostle, and fellow-labourer; and yet, naming several others, he is quite silent as to him. From Rome he wrote to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, to Timothy, and to Philemon, without ever mentioning Peter, or sending any salutation from him; nay, it is certain, that St. Peter was not at Rome when the apostle of the gentiles wrote to the Colossians; for, mentioning Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus, he adds, "These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, who have been a comfort unto me."[2] Peter was not there, when St. Paul wrote his second epistle to Timothy, where he says, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me:"[3] nor was he there immediately before St. Paul's death, when "the time of his departure was at hand;" for he tells Timothy, that "all the brethren did salute him;" and, naming Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia,[4] he omits Peter, whom we may thence conclude not to have been there. And yet it is a received tradition in the Church of Rome, that St. Peter was then not only in that metropolis, but confined and bound in the same prison with St. Paul. As that apostle, in writing from Rome, sends no salutations from Peter, so in writing to Rome he greets many others, but never mentions him.[5] Now who would not sooner choose to reject such traditions, than to suppose St. Paul guilty of such an unfriendly and unaccountable omission?

From what has been hitherto said, every impartial judge must conclude, that it is, at least, very much to be doubted whether St. Peter was ever at Rome; but, allowing him to have been there, it still remains to be proved that he was bishop of that see. This the sticklers for the papal authority spare no pains to make out, being well apprized that the whole of their cause lies here at stake; and yet I find nothing alleged by them in so material a point, but a few misinterpreted passages out of the ecclesiastical writers: for the right understanding of which it is to be observed, that such of the ancients as called Peter Bishop of Rome, and Rome the place, the chair, the see of Peter, meant no more

1 Cyr. cat. 17.
2 Athan. ad Drac.
3 Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 17.
4 Concil. tom. 2, p. 1245.
5 Hier. in Isai. xi. 14.
6 Chrys. ad Hebr. præf.
7 Greg. in Joh. xxiii. 22.
8 Acts xi 2, xv 7; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9; Gal ii. 11; 1 Pet. v. 13; 1 Cor i 12.
9 1 Pet. v. 13.
10 Eusch l. 2, c. 15.
11 Hier. vir. illust. c. 8.
12 Bed. tom. 5, p. 713.
13 Oecu p. 526.
14 Grot. synops. in Pet.
15 Vide Grot. ib. p. 1541.

1 Pears. oper. posth. p. 56, et seq.
2 Coloss. iv. 11.
3 2 Tim. iv 6.
4 Ibid. iv. 21.
5 Ad. Rom. xvi. 3—15.

St. Peter, though at Rome, not Bishop of Rome. In what sense St. Peter and St. Paul styled Bishops of Rome. The duties of a bishop and an apostle inconsistent. Whether James the apostle was Bishop of Jerusalem.

than that he was superintendent of that church, that he founded it by converting men to the faith, and erected the episcopal chair, by appointing the first bishops. That this was their true meaning, is apparent from what we read in Ruffinus; who, having mentioned Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as succeeding each other in the see of Rome, while Peter was still alive, thus accounts for their episcopacy: they were, says he, appointed bishops by Peter, to the end that, they taking upon them the episcopal charge, he might be at leisure to discharge the duties of his apostolical office. And this, he tells us, was not a notion of his own, but the common opinion.[1] Irenæus speaks to the same purpose: "the apostles," says he, "founding that church, delivered the episcopal office into the hands of Linus."[2] Hence the most ancient writers, who lived nearest the fountain of tradition, never style St. Peter Bishop of Rome, but only say, that, by ordaining bishops, he founded that church.[3] St. Peter, therefore, was not Bishop of Rome in the strict sense, to which that word is now confined, but in the more large sense, of which I have taken notice above: and in that St. Paul has as good a claim to the high-sounding titles of Pope, Bishop of Rome, &c. as St. Peter, since, together with him, he is said to have founded that church. The popes indeed will not allow him that honor, nor condescend to reckon him among their predecessors; but Epiphanius and Eusebius have been more complaisant; of whom the former says, "Peter and Paul were the first at Rome, both bishops and apostles;"[4] and the latter speaking of the succession of the Bishops of Rome, "Alexander derived his succession in the fifth place from Peter and Paul."[5] Both therefore were Bishops of Rome, or neither; both in the sense of the ancient writers, but neither in that which is now annexed to the word *bishop*. And truly the office of an apostle, and that of a bishop, as the word is now understood, are incompatible. An apostle, says Chrysostom,[6] is charged with the instruction not of any particular nation or city, but of the whole world; but a bishop must reside, says the same writer,[7] and be employed in one place: and therefore St. Peter, who knew these two duties to be inconsistent, if he was ever at Rome, committed there, as he did in other places, the episcopal charge to others, and pursued his apostolical office, which required a more extensive care.

But St. James, say the popish writers, though an apostle, was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem; and why might not St. Peter, though an apostle, undertake the episcopacy of Rome? It is surprising they should lay so much stress as they do on this objection, since they must know it to be grounded on an uncertainty; as Eusebius the greatest antiquary of former times,[1] Hegesippus the most ancient historian,[2] Epiphanius,[3] Jerom,[4] Gregory of Nysse,[5] Chrysostom,[6] and many others, reckon James, bishop of Jerusalem, not among the apostles, but the seventy disciples. Of the same opinion among the moderns, are Grotius,[7] Dr. Hammond,[8] Valesius,[9] Blondel,[10] and Salmasius.[11] The last of these saying, after his positive and confident manner, "It is certain that he was not one of the twelve," I may at least say, it is not certain that he was; and consequently the objection can be of no considerable weight. But allowing him to have been one of the twelve, as some of the ancients seem to think,[12] there was a special reason, why one of the apostles should be appointed to reside at Jerusalem, that city being the metropolis, the fountain, the centre of the Christian religion; our faith had there had its birth; the church was there very numerous, consisting of many thousands of believing Jews;[13] and thither resorted great numbers of those of that nation, who were converted to Christ in other countries. On these considerations it might seem expedient, that a person of the greatest authority should preside there. But there was no special reason why an apostle should constantly reside at any other place, nor does it appear that any did: St. Peter especially could not reside at any one place, since to him, as "the apostle of the circumcision," was committed the charge of converting the dispersed Jews in all parts of the world.

As for the appellations of the apostolic see, chair, throne, &c., given by the ancients to the see of Rome, they import no more than that it was erected by an apostle; for they are bestowed indiscriminately on all the sees, in which bishops had been placed by the apostles; viz., of Ephesus,[14] of Smyrna,[15] of Alexandria,[16] of Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi,[16] &c. The title of apostolic see, common to many, was, in process of time, by the ambition of the Bishops of Rome, appropriated to their own. They had, as they thought, till the year 1662, a pregnant proof not only of St. Peter's erecting their chair, but of his sitting in it himself; for till that year, the very chair, on which they believed, or would make others believe, he had sat, was shown and exposed to public adoration on the 18th of January, the festival of the said chair. But while it was cleaning, in order to be set up in some conspicuous place of the Vatican, the Twelve Labours of Her-

[1] Ruffin. in præf. ad Clem. recogn.
[2] Iren. apud Euseb. c. 5, 6.
[3] Constit. apost. 7, 46; Iren. 3, 3.
[4] Epiph. hær. 7.
[5] Euseb. l iv. c 2.
[6] Chrys. tom. 8, p. 115.
[7] Idem, Eph. iv. 11.

[1] Euseb. l. i. c. 12.
[2] Heges. apud Euseb. l. 2, c. 2.
[3] Epiph. hær 78.
[4] Hier. de vir. ill.
[5] Greg. p. 279.
[6] Chrys in Mat. hom. 33.
[7] Grot in Jac. i. 1.
[8] Hamm. dissert. Ignat. 4, 3.
[9] Val in Euseb. i. 12.
[10] Blond. in epist Clem. ad Jacob.
[11] Wal. Mess. p 20.
[12] Aug. cont. Cres. l. 2, c. 37. Vide Pears. Ann. Paulin p. 58.
[13] Acts xxi. 20.
[14] Iren. l. 3, c. 3.
[15] Idem ib. et Tertull. de præs. hæret. c. 32; Euseb. l. 3, c. 36.
[16] Tertull. ib. c. 36.

St. Peter how, or by whom, placed in the See of Rome. Other Bishops of Rome appointed by St. Peter.
St. Peter bishop at Rome, not of Rome. Linus, and not Clement the Bishop of Rome.

cules unluckily appeared engraved on it. Our worship however, says Giacomo Bartolini, who was present at this discovery, and relates it, was not misplaced, since it was not to the wood we paid it; but to the prince of the apostles, St. Peter.[1] An author of no mean character, unwilling to give up the holy chair, even after this discovery, as having a place and a peculiar solemnity among the other saints, has attempted to explain the labours of Hercules in a mystical sense, as emblems representing the future exploits of the popes.[2] But the ridiculous and distorted conceits of that writer are not worthy our notice, though by Clement X. they were judged not unworthy of a reward.

But to return to our subject; it may be inquired, If St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, who placed him in that see? Did our Lord appoint him? Did the apostles name him? Did the people choose him? Did he assume it himself? To these queries no answers have been yet given, but such as are so ridiculously weak, that it is not worth my while to relate them, nor the reader's to hear them. Bellarmine, in one place, positively affirms, that "God commanded St. Peter to fix his see at Rome;"[3] but elsewhere contents himself with saying, "It is not improbable that God commanded St. Peter to fix his see at Rome."[4] If it is no more than not improbable, it is uncertain; it may be a mere conjecture, a dream.

St. Peter, either alone, or jointly with St. Paul, as we read in Irenæus, and in the Apostolical Constitutions,[5] appointed other bishops of Rome. Now, when he appointed others, did he resign his episcopacy, or retain it? If he resigned it, he did not die Bishop of Rome; which shakes the very foundation of the pope's claim to supremacy: if he retained it, there were two bishops on the same see at one time; which Pope Innocent I. in his epistle to the clergy and people of Constantinople, condemned as an irregularity never known till his time:[1] he did not, it seems, recollect that it had been practised by his predecessor, Pope Peter. Theodoret tells us, in his Ecclesiastical History, that when the Emperor Constantius would have had Felix to sit in the see of Rome, together with Liberius, upon the return of the latter from banishment, the people of Rome would not consent to it, crying out, "One God, one Christ, one bishop." Felix died soon after, and upon his death Theodoret makes the following remark: "It was," says he, "a special providence, that Peter's throne might not suffer infamy, being held by two prelates.[2] He did not consider, or rather did not believe, that it had been held by St. Peter and St. Paul, by St. Peter and by Linus.

To conclude, St. Peter was perhaps bishop at Rome, not of Rome.[3] He was bishop at Rome, if he ever was there, being, in virtue of his apostleship, empowered to discharge, at Rome, and everywhere else, all episcopal functions; but was not specially Bishop of Rome, or any other place; that is, he did not take upon him the charge of any particular bishop, the administration of any particular bishopric, that being inconsistent both with the dignity and office of an apostle, or universal bishop.

LINUS, FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[NERO, GALBA, OTHO, VITELLIUS, VESPASIAN, TITUS.]

[Year of Christ, 66.] THERE is a great disagreement among the ancients about the first Bishops of Rome: Tertullian makes Clement, whom he supposes to have been ordained by St. Peter, the immediate *successor of that apostle*.[6] He was followed therein by Ruffinus,[7] and Ruffinus by the Latins in general; among whom that opinion universally prevailed towards the end of the fourth century. But Jerom, rejecting the opinion of the Latins, places Linus immediately after the apostles, Anacletus next to him, and Clement in the third place.[4] His opinion is supported by the authority of Irenæus,[5] Eusebius,[6] Theodoret,[7] and likewise of Epiphanius,[8] Optatus Milevitanus,[9] and St. Augustin,[10] with this difference, that Epiphanius gives the name of Cletus to the successor of Linus, and both Optatus and St. Augustin place him after Clement; but in this they all agree, that Linus was the first, after the apostles, who governed the Church of Rome. To the authority of these writers I may add that of the Apostolic Constitutions, telling

[1] Bartol. Antichità sacre di Roma, p. 32.
[2] Luchesini catedra restituita a S. Pietro.
[3] Bell. de sum. Pont. l. 4, c. 4.
[4] Idem ib. l. 2, c. 12.
[5] Iren. apud Euseb. l. 5, c. 6, et Const. Apost. l. 7, c. 46.
[6] Tert. de præsc. hæret. c. 32. [7] Recog. p. 398.

[1] Inn. I. apud Soz. l. 8, c. 26.
[2] Theod. Hist. Eccles. l. 2, c. 17.
[3] 'Tis a distinction made by a pope, King in Etruria, not of Etruria.
[4] Hier. vir. illust. c. 15. [5] Iren. l. 3, c. 3.
[6] Euseb. l. 3, c. 2, 4, 21. [7] Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 21.
[8] Epiph. hær. 27 c. 6. [9] Optat. l. 2, p. 48.
[10] Aug. ep. 165.

Whether Clement appointed by St. Peter to succeed him. Linus no martyr, though placed among the Martyrs. Books ascribed to him.

us, in express terms, that Linus was ordained Bishop of Rome by St. Paul.[1] As to what we read in Tertullian and Ruffinus, namely, that Clement was ordained by St. Peter, and named to succeed him; Dr. Hammond answers, that Clement governed with episcopal power and jurisdiction the converted Jews, while Linus and Anacletus governed, with the same power, the converted gentiles. He adds, That upon the death of Anacletus, both churches were united under him.[2] Thus he strives to reconcile the opinion of the Latins, placing Clement immediately after the apostles, with that of the Greeks, allowing him only the third place: for granting what he advances to be true, and reasons are not wanting to support it, Clement was, agreeably to the opinion of the Latins, the immediate successor of the apostles, with respect to the Jews; but, with respect to the gentiles, he succeeded Anacletus, agreeably to the opinion of the Greeks.[3] This answer Cotelerius applauds as an ingenious, learned, and probable solution; but, at the same time, rejects it as contradicting, in his opinion, the Apostolic Constitutions, and not supported by the authority of any ancient writer.[4] The learned Dr. Pearson will admit no opinion that supposes two bishops to have presided together in one city,[5] that being an irregularity, according to St. Cyprian,[6] *contrary to the ecclesiastic disposition, contrary to the evangelic law, contrary to the rules of the catholic institution*, and condemned as such by the council of Nice.[7] It is very much to be doubted, as I have shown above, whether St. Peter ever was at Rome, and consequently whether Clement was ordained, by him, bishop of that city. His not succeeding him is a proof that he was not; for who can imagine that the people and clergy of those days would have thought of choosing any other, or that any other, though chosen, would have accepted of a dignity, to which Clement had been named by St. Peter himself, and which he was actually possessed of at the apostle's death? Be that as it will, Linus is now universally acknowledged both by the Greeks and Latins for the first Bishop of Rome.

As for the life and actions of Linus, all I can find in the ancients concerning him, is, that it was he whom St. Paul mentioned in his epistle to Timothy;[1] that, upon the authority of the Apostolic Constitutions, he was supposed, by some, to have been the son of Claudia, whom the apostle mentions in the same place;[2] and that his life and conversation were much approved of by the people.[3] The Church of Rome allows him, in the canon of the mass, a place among the martyrs; but no mention is made of his having suffered for the faith, either in the ancient martyrologies, or in Irenæus, who, speaking of him, and his immediate successors, distinguishes none but Telesphorus with the title of Martyr. Baronius, determined to maintain, right or wrong, the credit of the sacred canon, in opposition to all the ancients, nay, and to his own system, cuts off one year from the pontificate of Linus, that he may place his death under Vespasian, and not, as Eusebius has done,[4] under Titus, in whose reign he owns none to have suffered for the faith.[5] Had he remembered what he must have read in Tertullian and Eusebius, he had saved himself that trouble: for Tertullian assures us, that Vespasian made no laws against the Christians;[6] and Eusebius, that he did not molest them, though he caused a diligent search to be made after those who were of the race of David, which occasioned a dreadful persecution against the Jews.[7] Linus governed the Church of Rome, according to Eusebius[8] and Epiphanius,[9] twelve years; so that, if we place, with them, the death of St. Peter in 66, Linus must have died in the year 78, of the Christian era. We have, under the name of Linus, two books of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul;[10] but they are generally looked upon as supposititious.[11] Trithemius makes him the author of the Life of St. Peter, in which a particular account was given of the dispute between that apostle and Simon the magician. This piece has not reached our times, and was perhaps of the same stamp with the other, since it is never mentioned either by Eusebius, or St. Jerom. The decrees, that are ascribed to him, are nowhere to be found but in Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and suchlike writers, whose authority is of no weight in matters so distant, unless supported by the testimony of the ancients.

[1] Const. Apost. l. 7, c. 46.
[2] Hamm. l. 5, c. 1.
[3] Idem ib. p. 247, 258.
[4] Cotel. in not. Const. p. 298.
[5] Pears. posthum. p. 159, 161.
[6] Cypr. ep. 44, 46, 52, 55.
[7] Syn. Nic. can. 8.

[1] Iren. l. 3, c. 3; Euseb. l. 3, c. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 21.
[2] Const. Apost. l. 7, c. 46.
[3] Tert. in Marc. c. 3.
[4] Euseb. l. 3, c. 13.
[5] Bar. annal. ad ann. 80.
[6] Tert. apol. c. 5.
[7] Euseb. l. 3, c. 12.
[8] Idem ib. c. 13.
[9] Epiph. l. 27, c. 6.
[10] Bib. Patr. tom. 7.
[11] Vide Baron. ad ann. 69, et Voss. Hist. Græc. l. 2, c. 9.

Cletus and Anacletus not two, but one pope. How they were first distinguished. Decretals ascribed to him.

CLETUS, OR ANACLETUS, SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[TITUS, DOMITIAN.]

[Year of Christ 78.] LINUS was succeeded by Cletus, or Anacletus, whom the Greeks constantly style Anencletus, that is, irreprehensible. An opinion has long obtained in the Church of Rome, distinguishing Cletus and Anacletus as two popes, nay, as two saints; the festival of the one being kept on the 26th of April, and that of the other on the 23d of July.[1] But this distinction is now given up by the most learned men of that church, not only as groundless, but as plainly contradicting the most celebrated writers of antiquity, Irenæus, Eusebius, and St. Jerom, to whom we may add Caius, a priest of Rome, who, writing in the beginning of the third century, reckoned Victor the thirteenth bishop of that city.[2] Baronius, however, spares no pains to keep up that distinction; but alleges nothing to countenance it, except the poem against Marcion, ascribed to Tertullian, the pontifical of Anastasius, and some martyrologies.[3] Who was the author of that poem is not well known, but all agree that it was not written by Tertullian.[4] Besides, the author, whoever he was, places both Cletus and Anacletus before Clement; which Baronius condemns as a gross mistake. As for the pontifical, the annalist often finds fault with it; and complains, in this very place, that Anastasius's whole chronology is overcast with an impenetrable mist.[5] The martyrologies he quotes are of too modern a date to deserve any regard, since none of them were heard of before the ninth century.[6] But how, says Baronius, was this distinction first introduced? We may, perhaps, account for it thus: Irenæus, with all the Greeks, and St. Jerom, among the Latins, place Anacletus, as we have observed above, before Clement; whereas St. Austin and Optatus Milevitanus place him after. This, and his being called Cletus by Epiphanius, and in several copies of Ruffinus, might induce some to imagine, that as the names and places were different, so were the persons. Thus, as we conjecture, of one pope, two popes were made, two saints, and two martyrs; for, in the canon of the mass, he has a place with Linus among the martyrs; though neither was acknowledged for such by Irenæus, or any of the ancients; nay, Anacletus is said, in some pontificals, to have *died in peace*, that is, according to the phrase of those days, of a natural death.[7] Bollandus, after having much laboured, but laboured in vain, to maintain the distinction between Cletus and Anacletus, yields at last, and gives up the point. But yet, unwilling to make the least alteration in the catalogue of the popes, which places, with the approbation of the holy see, Clement between Cletus and Anacletus, he strives to save it with a new and pretty extraordinary invention; for he pretends Anacletus or Cletus to have resigned the chair to Clement, and Clement, in his turn, to have yielded it to him again. Thus, according to him, though Cletus and Anacletus are one and the same person, yet no fault is to be found with the catalogue; and Clement is rightly placed both after and before him.[1] This is a speculation of his own, altogether groundless, and therefore not worthy of a place here, were it not to show what low shifts and subterfuges even men of parts, in the Church of Rome, choose to submit to, rather than to yield to reason, in points that seem to derogate from the authority of that see. Anacletus governed the church twelve years, according to Eusebius;[2] to which some add two months, some three, and some only one; so that he must have died in the year 91. He is supposed to have been buried next to St. Peter, in the Vatican, where his supposed body is shown, and worshipped to this day.[3] We find, in the collection of Isidorus Mercator, three decretals, under the name of Cletus; but such decretals as are anterior to the pontificate of Pope Syricius, who was elected in the year 384, are now universally looked upon as bare-faced forgeries.[4, 5]

[1] Martyrol Roman.
[2] Euseb. l. 5, c. 28; Pearson posthum p. 147, 148.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 69.
[4] Halloix in vit Iren. p. 646.
[5] Bar. ad ann 69.
[6] Bolland. Pœnl. p. 217.
[7] Vide Pears. posthum. p. 19.

[1] Bolland. Pœnl. p. 217.
[2] Euseb. l. 3, c. 15.
[3] Bolland. 26 Apr. 410, 411.
[4] Vide Card. Bon. liturg. l. 1, c. 3, et Natal. Alexand. hist. Eccles. p. 743, &c.
[5] All the decretal epistles of the popes, before Syricius, are so filled with absurdities, contradictions, anachronisms, &c., that they are now given up, even by the most sanguine advocates for the papal supremacy. And yet these very decretals, absurd as they are, and inconsistent with themselves, as well as with all the genuine writings of those times, whether sacred or profane, were, for several ages, the main stays of the whole fabric of the papal power. By them that power was established; by them it was supported; for, in the days of ignorance, they were universally received as the genuine writings of the ancient Bishops of Rome, in whose names they were published. And, truly, were we to rank them, as they were ranked in the monkish and ignorant ages, with the decisions of the œcumenical councils, and the canonical books of the Scripture, no room would be left to question any branch of the unlimited power claimed by the popes. They were held in the greatest esteem and veneration from the beginning of the 9th century to the time of the Reformation, when, upon the first dawn of learning, the cheat was discovered, and the stays removed, which till then had supported the unwieldy edifice. But it was then in a condition to stand by itself, at least till new frauds were devised to prop it up; and this was accordingly done, without loss of time.

The decretals of the first popes are quoted by Bellarmine, to prove, that the supremacy of the Bishops of

Clement mentioned by St. Paul. Some confound him with Flavius Clemens. Chosen Bishop of Rome.

CLEMENT, THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[DOMITIAN, NERVA, TRAJAN.]

[Year of Christ 91.] CLEMENT, the successor of Anacletus, is, according to Origen,[1] Eusebius,[2] and all the ancients, the person whom St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Philippians,[3] names among those who had "laboured with him in the gospel, and whose names were in the book of life." Hence Chrysostom concludes, that, together with St. Luke and Timothy, he attended the Apostle of the Gentiles in all his journeys.[4] Irenæus assures us, that he had not only seen the apostles and conversed with them, but that, when he was appointed Bishop of Rome, he still heard their voices sounding in his ears, still had before his eyes the rules and good example they had given him.[5] Origen styles him *the disciple of the apostles*;[6] Ruffinus, *almost an apostle*;[7] and Clement of Alexandria, *an apostle*.[8] That he was well versed in every branch of learning, especially in polite literature, descended of a senatorian family, and nearly related to the Cæsars, is what we read in Eucherius[9] and Nilus,[10] who seem to have followed therein the Recognitions, a book of no authority. Eucherius perhaps confounded, as others have done, Pope Clement with Flavius Clemens, who was son to Flavius Sabinus, the only brother of Vespasian, and suffered death for the Christian religion in the persecution of Domitian;[11] for Pope Clement was, as himself seems to insinuate, rather of the race of Jacob than of the Cæsars.[12] Upon the death of Anacletus he was unanimously chosen by the people and clergy of Rome to succeed him. He had been named, say some, to that dignity by St. Peter himself, preferably to Linus and Anacletus;[13] but had declined it, finding that the faithful were not all equally disposed to submit to the judgment and authority of St. Peter. He therefore withdrew; and, as he was of a mild and pacific disposition, led a retired life to

Rome was universally acknowledged in the earliest times (Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2, c. 14:) but, at the same time, he owns, that *he dares not affirm them to be of undoubted authority*. And what can be more absurd than to quote a forgery, or what he himself owns may be a forgery, in vindication of so darling a point as *the supremacy?* But he did it for want of better evidences, and must therefore be excused. Baronius, ashamed to lay any stress on such gross and palpable forgeries, contents himself with only saying, that the popes had no hand in forging them; and that they never made use of their authority to support their own. That they were concerned in, or privy to, the forging of those letters, I dare not affirm: but that they countenanced them, as they did all other forgeries tending to the advancement of their see: that they received them as genuine, and endeavoured to impose them upon others; nay, that they made use of them soon after their first appearance in the world, to establish and promote the authority of their see; are undoubted matters of fact: witness the letter, which Nicolas I. wrote, in the year 865, to Hincmarus archbishop of Rheims, and to the other bishops of France, who, refusing to comply with some exorbitant demands of the pope, had rejected the decretals, on which those demands were founded, as writings that had been lately counterfeited. Nicolas, in his answer to them, maintains the authenticity of those letters, exhorts all, who profess the Catholic faith, to receive them *with due veneration*, and claims, in virtue of such sacred and authentic writings, an uncontrolled authority over all the churches of the world, as lodged from the beginning in his see. (Nic. I. ep. 42.) And was not this making use of the supposed authority of those decretals to promote his own? Nicolas seems to have believed the letters to be genuine; and, if he did, he was certainly mistaken, and erred in proposing, as he does, spurious pieces for a *firm and strong foundation* of our belief, as well as our practice. If he did not believe them to be genuine, and yet endeavoured to persuade the bishops of France that they were so; nay, and claimed, upon the authority of such pieces, a power over them, and their churches; a worse epithet would suit him better than that of *fallible*, which is common to all men.

The first who published these decretals was, according to Hincmarus, Riculphus bishop of Mentz, who was supposed to have brought them from Spain; because the name of Isidore was prefixed to the collection, and a famous writer of that name, namely, Isidore, Bishop of Seville, had flourished in Spain some centuries before. But such a mean and scandalous undertaking is altogether unworthy of so great a prelate; and besides, the author of the supposed decretals has copied, *verbatim*, some passages from the council of Toledo in 675, and from the sixth council in 681, whereas Isidore of Seville died in 626. The learned Ellies du Pin lays this forgery at the door of some German or Frenchman, the letters being all written in the style of the Germans and French, of the 9th century, and many of them addressed to persons of these two nations. Hincmarus was mistaken, in supposing the forged decretals to have been first published by Riculphus of Mentz; for in some of them are found fragments of the council held at Paris in 829, and he died in 814. They were first ushered into the world, and forged too, in all likelihood, by one Benedict, deacon of the church of Mentz, though, in his Preface to that collection, he would fain make us believe, that Autcarius, the successor of Riculphus, found them in the archives of that church, and that they had been placed there by Riculphus, who had brought them from Spain. Autcarius, in whose time Benedict published his collection, is thought to have been privy to the imposture. The name of Isadore, which was then very common in Spain, was prefixed to it, to persuade the world, that the decretals were brought from that country, and not forged at Mentz, where they first appeared. However, they were suspected by some, even in that dark age, and absolutely rejected by Hincmarus of Rheims, as writings of no authority. But the popes, whose pretensions they were calculated to favor, exerting all their authority to bring them into repute, they were in the end universally received, and inserted into all the collections of canons. At present they are so universally exploded, that there is not a single writer, no, not even in the Church of Rome, who is not ashamed to patronize or defend them. But the work is done, for which they were intended; and now that the edifice can stand by itself, no matter what becomes of the stays that supported it when it could not. These decretals may be justly looked upon as a standing monument of the ignorance, superstition, and credulity, that universally prevailed in the church, from the beginning of the ninth century to the time of the Reformation. I shall conclude with observing, that, from these decretals, Anastasius the Bibliothecarian, and after him Platina, have chiefly copied what they relate of the first popes, supposing them to have really done what, in those spurious pieces, they are said to have done.

1 Origen, in Jo. p. 143. 2 Euseb. l. 3, c. 15.
3 Philip. iv. 3. 4 Chrys. in Phil hom. 13.
5 Iren. l. 3, c. 3. 6 Orig. Pr. in l. 3, c. 3
7 Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195. 8 Clem strom 4.
9 Euch. ad Val. p. 19. 10 Nil. l. 2, ep. 49.
11 Dio, l. 65; Suet. in Dom. c. 15; Orig in Cels l. 1, p. 5.
12 Clem. ep. 1, c. 4. 13 Epiph. hær. 27, c. 6.

His famous Epistle to the Corinthians. Unjustly criticised by Photius. Thought lost, but appears again. Clement dies. His fabulous acts. The miracles he wrought unknown to Irenæus

the death of Anacletus, when he was forced to accept of the dignity which he had before declined. Thus Ruffinus, upon the authority of the Recognitions; which appears to me, I must own, a very improbable tale. During his pontificate happened an impious and detestable division, to use his own terms, among the Christians of Corinth, which obliged them to have recourse to other churches, especially to that of Rome; and on this occasion was written that famous Epistle to the Corinthians, so much magnified by the ancients, and publicly read, not only in the Church of Corinth, as Dionysius assures us, who was bishop of that city in 180, but in many other churches, to the time of Eusebius, and St. Jerome,[1] and perhaps long after. It was by some ranked among the canonical books of the Scripture, and by all reverenced next to them.[2] It was written in the name of the whole Church of Rome, and to the whole Church it is, in express terms, ascribed by Irenæus,[3] and Clement of Alexandria, who calls it the Epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians.[4] However, it was composed by Clement, in the name of the church; for, in the primitive times, bishops did nothing by themselves, but every thing jointly with their churches: "We advise," "We exhort," "We recommend," &c., was their usual style; which the popes still observe, though they mean only themselves; for they scorn to join either with the people or clergy. The style of this excellent letter is plain, clear, full of energy, without any useless ornaments; and the whole written with the simplicity, as Photius observes,[5] that the Church requires in ecclesiastical writers. There is so great an affinity, both as to the sense and the words, between this epistle, and the epistle to the Hebrews, that some have concluded Clement to have been the translator, nay, and the author of that epistle.[6] In Clement's epistle Photius discovers, as he thinks, three faults; viz., that he supposes other worlds beyond the ocean; that he speaks of the phœnix as a real bird; and that he uses words expressing the humanity of our Saviour, and not his divinity. But, as to the first of these objections, there can be no difficulty now, that we know for certain, what was but doubtfully advanced by the ancients; in speaking of the phœnix he complies with the opinion universally received in those days by the learned, both among the Christians and pagans. As to the third objection, Photius must not have observed, that he styles our Savior's sufferings, the sufferings of God, which was acknowledging his divinity. This epistle, the most precious and valuable treasure the church can boast, after the Holy Scriptures, was for many ages bewailed as lost; but, in 1633, it was again restored to the Christian world, by Patricius Junius, a north Briton, who published it from a manuscript, written by an Egyptian lady, named Thecla, about the time of the great Council of Nice, and afterwards brought over into England.[1] That this piece is genuine, appears from a great many passages quoted out of it by the ancients.

The most remarkable event that happened in the pontificate of Clement, was the persecution of Domitian; but what part he bore in it we can learn from no credible author. He died, according to Eusebius,[2] in the third year of Trajan's reign, that is, in the 100th of the Christian era. In the canon of the mass he has a place, with his two predecessors, among the martyrs; but Telesphorus, the seventh Bishop of Rome, is the first, as I have observed above, who was acknowledged as such by Irenæus, whose authority is of far greater weight than that of Ruffinus, or Pope Zosimus, who suppose him to have died for the confession of the faith.[3] In the Acts of Clement, to which Gregory of Tours gave an entire credit,[4] and after him many others, especially the two credulous annalists, Baronius,[5] and Alford,[6] in his Annals of the British Church, we read, that Clement was banished by Trajan into the Chersonesus, beyond the Euxine sea; that there he caused a fountain to spring up miraculously for the relief of the Christians confined to the same inhospitable region; that he converted the whole country to the faith, which provoked the emperor to such a degree, that he ordered him to be thrown into the sea, with an anchor fastened to his neck. It is added, that, on the anniversary of his death, the sea retired to the place where he had been drowned, though three long miles from the shore; that upon its retiring, there appeared a most magnificent temple, all of the finest marble; and in the temple a stately monument, in which was found the body of the saint; that the sea continued thus retiring every year on the same day, not daring, for the space of seven days, to return to its usual bounds, that the Christians might, at their leisure, and without apprehension of danger, perform their devotions in honour of the saint. To crown the whole, they add, that, one year, a mother having heedlessly left her young child in the temple, upon her return, next year, she found it not only alive, but in perfect health.[7] No mention is made of such stupendous miracles by Irenæus, who was brought up under Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna, in Asia, at the very time Clement is supposed to have suffered, and who speaks of him at length. His silence is a plain demonstration that they were unknown to him; and they must have been known, had they been true.

Besides, the letter to the Corinthians, of

[1] Euseb. l. 3, c. 16; Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.
[2] Vide Iren. l. 3, c. 3, Euseb. l. 3 c. 16, et 38; et l. 4, c. 23.
[3] Iren. ib.
[4] Clem. strom. 5.
[5] Phot. c. 126.
[6] Euseb. l. 3, c. 38; et l. 6, c. 25; Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.

[1] Not. Jun. p. 3; Not Cotel. p. 8.
[2] Eus. l. 3, c. 34.
[3] Ruf. Orig. t. 1, p. 778; Concil. per Lab. t. 2, p. 1558.
[4] Greg. Tur. de glor. martyr. c. 35.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 102.
[6] Alf. ad ann. eund.
[7] Greg. Tur. ib.

Other writings ascribed to Clement. A second letter to the Corinthians. Five other letters. His Itinerary. The Recognitions. St. Peter's Dialogues with Apion. The Apostolic Constitutions. The Canons of the Apostles.

which I have spoken above, several other pieces are ascribed to Clement; namely, a second letter to the Corinthians; which is, without all doubt, very ancient; but Eusebius doubts whether it was written by Clement;[1] and both St. Jerom,[2] and Photius,[3] absolutely reject it. Five other letters, placed among the decretals, whereof the first, more ancient than the rest, was translated by Ruffinus, and is quoted by the Council of Vaison, held in 442.[4] However, it is generally looked upon as a spurious piece; for the author of it, whoever he was, acquaints St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, who died long before St. Peter, with St. Peter's death.[5] Clement's Itinerary, which, in Photius's time, was prefixed, by way of Preface, to the Recognitions.[6] The Recognitions, relating, under the name of Clement, the actions of St. Peter, his Interview with Simon the Magician, how Clement himself knew again his father and his brothers, whom he had forgot; whence the whole work took the name of Recognitions, that is, *of knowing again*: it is likewise called the Itinerary of St. Peter, the Acts of St. Peter, the Acts of St. Clement.[7] The Recognitions are quoted by Origen,[8] Epiphanius,[9] and Ruffinus,[10] as the work of Clement; but these writers, at the same time, own them to have been altered in several places, and falsified by the heretics; nay, Epiphanius tells us, that the Ebionites scarce left any thing sound in them.[11] The author was well versed in philosophy, mathematics, astrology, and most other sciences, but not so well acquainted with the doctrine of the church; whence his work is absolutely rejected by Athanasius,[12] and now generally looked upon as a piece falsely ascribed to Clement. St. Peter's Dialogues with Apion were probably written in the third century, and, to gain credit, fathered upon Clement; for Eusebius writes, that there had lately appeared a long work, under the name of Clement, containing dialogues between St. Peter and Apion.[13] As to the Apostolic Constitutions, if that work is different from the doctrine of the apostles, mentioned by Athanasius and Eusebius, Epiphanius is the first who speaks of it: it appears, at least, from Dionysius of Alexandria, that, in the year 250, the Constitutions either had not yet appeared, or were of no repute in the church.[14] Epiphanius tells us, that many suspected them; but, as for himself, he received them, since he found nothing in them repugnant to the faith, or the discipline of the church.[15] But as he quotes several passages out of them, which are not to be found now, we may well conclude, that, since his time, they have been either altered or curtailed. The Greeks, indeed, in the second canon of the Council, that, in 692, was held at Constantinople, in a tower of the imperial palace, called Trullus, that is, the Cupola, declare, that they had been falsified, in several places, by the heretics. Photius thinks that, with respect to the style, they fall short of the Recognitions, but far excel them in the purity of the doctrine, adding, at the same time, that it is no easy task to clear them from the imputation of Arianism.[1] Dr. Pearson takes them to be a collection of several pieces, published in the earliest times, under the name of the apostles, and containing, as was pretended, the instructions they had given.[2] Albaspinæus, Bishop of Orange, thinks the matter they contain excellent, and the whole agreeable to the discipline observed by the Greek Church, during the four first centuries; but nevertheless he looks upon them only as a collection of the different customs that were established, by degrees, in the church, and some of which were disputed even in the fourth century;[3] so that they can by no means be ascribed either to the apostles, or to Clement. The Constitutions end with eighty-five canons, long known by the title of The Canons of the Apostles; but, as they contain several things that were not received in the apostles' time, nor in Clement's, the ablest critics are of opinion, that they likewise are but a collection of several decrees made in the first ages of the church, and that they were not collected into one body till the third century.[4] I don't find them quoted before the Council of Constantinople in 394. The Greeks, in the Council of the year 602, mentioned above, bound themselves to the observance of them; but they are all rejected by Pope Gelasius: however, Dionysius Exignus having, not long after, placed the first fifty at the head of his collection, they were received by degrees; but the other thirty-five have not been admitted to this day.

Upon the whole, of the many writings ascribed to Clement, the first letter to the Corinthians is the only one undoubtedly his: and what a wide difference appears, as to the spirit and style between that excellent piece and the briefs, bulls, mandates, &c., of his successors? He does not command, but exhorts; he does not threaten but entreats; he does not thunder anathemas and excommunications, but employs the most mild and gentle persuasives, even with the authors of the schism. Had he known himself to be the infallible and unerring judge of controversies, from whose tribunal lay no appeal: had the Corinthians believed themselves bound, on pain of damnation, to submit to his decisions, there had been no room

1 Euseb. l. 3, c. 38. 2 Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.
3 Phot. c. 113. 4 Concil. per Labb. t. 3, p. 1458.
5 Vide Blond. Decret. p. 25, 28.
6 Phot. c. 113.
7 Coteler. not. in script. Apost. p. 353.
8 Orig. Philocal. c. 23, p. 81, 82.
9 Epiph. hær. 30, c. 15.
10 Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195. 11 Epiph. hær. 30, p. 65.
12 Athan. sym. p. 154. 13 Euseb. l. 3, c. 38.
14 Ign. prol. c. 8, p. 54. 15 Epiph. hær. 76, p. 822.

1 Phot. c. 113. 2 Pears. in Ign. t. 1, p. 60, 61.
3 Alb. obser. l. 1, c. 3, p. 37, 38.
4 Idem ib. et Ign. prol. c. 15, p. 103.

Clement's Infallibility unknown to him, and to the Corinthians. Evaristus governs nine years. Alexander not a Martyr. The Institution of Holy Water falsely ascribed to him.

for reasons, arguments, and persuasives; he ought to have exerted the power with which he was vested, and put an end to all disputes, in the peremptory style of his successors, "We declare, and command all men to comply with this our declaration, on pain of incurring the indignation of the Almighty; and," as if that were not enough, "of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul." But it was not till some ages after, that the popes found out their infallibility, or rather their flattering divines found it out for them; so that this invaluable privilege lying dormant, men were obliged, for a long time, to make use of their reason, in deciding religious controversies.

EVARISTUS, FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[TRAJAN.]

[Year of Christ 100.] CLEMENT was succeeded by Evaristus, Evaristes, or Aristus, as he is called in the most ancient catalogue of the popes,[1] in the third year of Trajan's reign, that is, in the close of the first century of the Christian era. He governed about nine years, that is, to the twelfth year of Trajan, and the 109th of Christ.[2] Eusebius, in his Chronicle, supposes him to have died in the year 107;[3] and, in his history, says, that his death happened about the year 109;[4] but, in the series and succession of the popes, that writer is every where consistent with himself in his history, and quite otherwise in his Chronicle. Besides, the history ought to correct the Chronicle, as being posterior to it. To Evaristus are ascribed two decretals, the distribution of the titles or parishes of Rome, on which Baronius makes a long descant,[1] and an order, that bishops, when they preached, should be always attended by seven deacons.[2] But these and many other things of the same nature, we read only in Baronius, Platina, Anastasius, Ciaconius, &c., and my design is, as I have declared in the preface, to follow the ancients alone, in the history of the ancient popes; and therefore I shall take no notice of what the moderns advance, unless I find it supported by the authority of the original writers.

ALEXANDER, FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[TRAJAN, ADRIAN.]

[Year of Christ 109.] SIXTUS is placed, by Optatus Milevitanus,[5] immediately after Evaristus; but that is certainly a mistake, owing, in all likelihood, to those who transcribed him, since Irenæus,[6] Eusebius,[7] Epiphanius,[8] and even St. Augustin,[9] who follows Optatus in every thing else relating to the popes, place Alexander between Evaristus and Sixtus. Irenæus reckons Alexander the fifth Bishop of Rome; so that we agree with the most authentic and unexceptionable writer of antiquity in excluding St. Peter, and supposing Cletus and Anacletus to be one and the same person.[10] Alexander governed ten years and some months; and died in the third year of Adrian, and 119 of Christ.[11] We can learn nothing of the ancients concerning him: he is worshipped indeed by the Church of Rome as a martyr; but that title is not given him by Irenæus: and as for the Venerable Bede, who ranks him among the martyrs, he was led into that mistake by the Acts of St. Alexander, which, in the opinion of Dr. Pearson, were composed in the seventh century, but are now universally rejected as fabulous. Platina ascribes to Pope Alexander the institution of holy water,[3] which Baronius takes very much amiss of him, since he thereby robs the apostles of an honour due to them; for by the apostles, in his opinion, was first introduced the use of holy water.[4] But if we trace up this holy water to the fountain head, we shall find that it arises from an unhallowed spring, from the lustral water of the Pagans; for peace being restored to the church by Constantine, the Christians began, as a modern writer well observes,[5] to adopt the ceremonies of the Gentiles. Several cities in Italy, France, Germany, Spain, &c., pretend to have relics of this pope, insomuch that, were they all put together, they would form at least twenty entire bodies.[6]

1 Buch. p. 270.
2 Euseb. chron. l. 4, c. 1.
3 Opt. l. 2, p. 48.
4 Euseb. l. 4, c. 1.
5 Aug. ep. 165.
6 Euseb. l. 3, c. 34.
7 Idem, l. 3, c. 34.
8 Iren. l. 3, c. 6.
9 Epiph. hær. 27, c. 6.
10 Euseb. l. 5, c. 6.
11 Idem, l. 4, c. 5.

1 Bar. ann. 112.
2 Platin. in ej. vit.
3 Le Sueur, hist. de l'Egl. et de l'Emp. ad ann. 108.
4 Vid. Bolland. 3 Maii, p. 370, et Baillet vies de Saints, 3 de Mai.
5 Idem, ann. 121.
6 Bar. ad ann. 132, N. 3.

Decretals also ascribed to Sixtus. His Reliques. Telesphorus the first Bishop of Rome, Martyr. The two heretics, Valentine and Cerdo, come to Rome.

SIXTUS, SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ADRIAN.]

[Year of Christ 119.] THE successor of Alexander is named Sixtus by Optatus[1] and St. Augustin;[2] but by Irenæus,[3] Eusebius,[4] Epiphanius,[5] and Jerom,[6] Xystus: which word has some signification annexed to it in Greek; whereas Sixtus has none either in Greek or Latin. He presided ten years according to Eusebius,[7] but not complete; for he was raised to the see in the third year of Adrian, of Christ 119, and died in the twelfth year of the same prince, about the latter end of the year of Christ 128.[8] He is ranked among the martyrs in the Canon of the Mass, and in all the martyrologies: but his immediate successor is the first to whom that title is given by Irenæus. To Sixtus are ascribed two decretals, but both forged in latter ages, as plainly appears from De Marca, from Baluzius, and, above all, from the haughty title of Universal Bishop, which Sixtus is made to assume in one of them: a title, as F. Pagi is forced to confess, unknown to the bishops of the primitive and best times.[1] The title of Universal would be better adapted to the relics of this pope, than to his episcopacy; for they are dispersed all over the Roman Catholic world: but Baillet himself looks upon them as false, and unworthy of the worship that is paid to them, not excepting even those that were given by Clement X. to Cardinal de Retz, who caused them to be placed with great solemnity in the Abbey of St. Michael in Lorrain.[2]

TELESPHORUS, SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ADRIAN, ANTONINUS PIUS.]

[Year of Christ 128.] SIXTUS was succeeded by Telesphorus (or, as some style him, Thelesphorus,) the seventh Bishop of the see of Rome.[9] To him is ascribed, in some editions of the Chronicle of Eusebius, the institution of Lent;[10] but in none of the best editions mention is made of such an institution, and scarce in any manuscripts.[11] Baronius endeavours to prove, that this fast was instituted by the apostles, and that Telesphorus established it for ever by a decree; but his arguments are so weak that he deserves rather to be pitied than answered. He introduces too early the Bishops of Rome issuing decrees, and prescribing laws to the whole church. Telesphorus was the first Bishop of Rome who suffered death for the Christian religion, seeing Irenæus distinguishes him with the title of Martyr,[3] which this author gives to none of his predecessors; but, as to the particulars of his death, the ancients have left us quite in the dark. He suffered in the eleventh year of his pontificate, the first of Antoninus Pius, and 139 of Christ.[4]

HYGINUS, EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANTONINUS PIUS.]

[Year of Christ 139.] HYGINUS, the successor of Telesphorus, governed the church but four years, and those not complete; for, in 142, we find Pius already in that see.[12] In his time the two famous heretics, Valentine and Cerdo, came to Rome; the former from Egypt, and the latter from Syria, to display their new doctrine in that great metropolis. Hyginus no doubt opposed them with all the zeal of a primitive bishop; but, in spite of his zeal, they gained a great many proselytes to their heterodox opinions.[5] His infallibility, had it been then known and

[1] Opt. l. 2, p. 48.
[2] Aug. ep 53.
[3] Iren. l. 3, c. 3.
[4] Euseb. l. 4, c. 4.
[5] Epiph. hær. 97, c. 6.
[6] Hier. chron.
[7] Euseb. l. 3, c. 3
[8] Euseb. l. 4 c. 4, & 5.
[9] Iren. l. 3, c. 3; Euseb. l. 4, c. 5.
[10] Bar. ad ann. 154.
[11] Not. Scal. in chron. 216; Not. Pont. in chron. p. 612.
[12] Euseb. l. 4, c. 11

[1] Pagi in vit. Sixt.
[2] Baill. ib. 6 d'Avril.
[3] Iren. l. 3, c. 3.
[4] Euseb. l. 4, c. 10.
[5] Iren. l. 3, c. 4; Philas. c. 44; Epiph. hær. 41. c. 1.

Marcion comes to Rome. The power of receiving Appeals disowned by the Church of Rome. Pius no Martyr. Writings ascribed to him.

believed, would have soon put a stop to the growing evil. The church of Rome honours Hyginus among her martyrs; but none of the ancients give him that title. To him is ascribed the use of god-fathers and god-mothers in baptism, and the ceremony of consecrating churches; but upon no better grounds than the two decretals are fathered upon him, which are, by all the learned, rejected as spurious. Hyginus died in the year 142, the fourth or fifth of Antoninus Pius; and is supposed to have been buried near St. Peter.[1]

PIUS, NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[Antoninus Pius.]

[Year of Christ 142.] Anicetus is placed next to Hyginus by Optatus,[1] St. Augustin,[2] and Epiphanius.[3] But who would not, with Eusebius,[4] rather follow Irenæus,[5] and Hegesippus,[6] naming Pius[7] immediately after Hyginus, since the former wrote in the time of Eleutherius the second bishop after Anicetus; and the latter lived at Rome in the time of Anicetus, and continued there till the pontificate of Eleutherius.

In the time of Pius, Marcion, a native of Pontus, and the son of a bishop of the holy Catholic Church, says Epiphanius,[8] being excommunicated by his father for debauching a virgin, and finding he could by no means prevail upon the venerable prelate to receive him again into the church, abandoned his native city, supposed to be Sinope, and fled to Rome. Upon his arrival there, he applied to the elders of that church, entreating them to admit him to their communion. But those holy men, who had been taught by the disciples of the apostles, instead of complying with his request, returned him this answer: "We cannot admit you without leave from your holy father; nor can we, as we are all united in the same faith, and the same sentiments, undo what our holy colleague your father has done." Thus Epiphanius.[8] Had Bellarmine lived in those days, he had taught them another doctrine, a doctrine which, however necessary, the apostles had forgot to deliver to their disciples, viz., That the see of Rome was raised above all other sees; that the appeals of the whole catholic church were to be brought to it; that no appeals were to be made from it; that it was to judge of the whole church, but be judged by none. Marcion did not apply to Pius, as the reader must have observed, or at least did not apply to him alone, but to the elders, who disclaimed all power of reversing the sentence of a particular bishop or judge. And is not this an evident and incontestable proof that the power of receiving appeals was not known, or thought of, in those days? And yet, who would believe it? Bellarmine has the assurance to allege this very case as an argument to prove in the pope a power of receiving appeals.[2] But what would become of this prerogative, should the pope return the same answer to every appellant?

Pius governed the church for the space of fifteen years, and died in 157, the twentieth of Antoninus.[3] The Roman martyrology tells us, that he was martyred in the persecution of Antoninus Pius; but in that prince's reign there was no persecution; nor is the title of martyr given him by Irenæus. Baronius ascribes to this pope a decree, commanding the festival of Easter to be kept on Sunday, and quotes the Chronicle of Eusebius.[4] This decree is indeed mentioned in some editions of that writer; but Scaliger assures us, that no mention is made of it in any manuscript copy; and therefore he has left it out in his edition.[5] As to the celebration of Easter, it is manifest from Irenæus that though Pius, as well as his predecessors Sixtus, Telesphorus and Hyginus, differed from the bishops of Asia, yet they did not on that account separate themselves from their communion.[6] On this pope are fathered several spurious pieces, namely, some decrees, two letters ranked among the decretals, and two more written to Justus bishop of Vienne, in Dauphiné. The decrees, as well as the decretals, are universally rejected; and yet F. Pagi quotes one of them to prove the real presence in the sacrament.[7] The two letters to Justus are deemed genuine by Baronius,[8] by Cardinal Bona,[9] and by Blondel in his Treatise of the Sybils,[10] who nevertheless suspects them elsewhere.[11] On the other hand, they are absolutely rejected as false by Dr. Pearson,[12] by Cotelerius,[13] and Natalis Alexander,[14] who discover several expressions in them that were not in use till some ages after, and a great many incohe-

1 Opt. l. 2, p. 48.
2 Aug. ep 53.
3 Epiph. hær. 42.
4 Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.
5 Ien. l. 3, c. 3.
6 Apud. Euseb. l. 4, c. 22.
7 Epiph. hær. 42, c. 1.
8 Idem. ib.

1 Bolland. April. p. 22.
2 Bell. l. 2, c. 21.
3 Euseb. l. 4, c. 11.
4 Bar. ad ann. 159.
5 Euseb. chron. not. Scal. p. 119.
6 Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.
7 Pagi in Pio, n. 2.
8 Bar. ad ann. 166.
9 Bona rer. liturgic. l. 1, c. 3.
10 Blond. l. 2, c. 6.
11 Idem de la primauté.
12 Pears. in Ign. l. 2. p. 170.
13 Cotel. not. in script. Apost. p. 42, 43.
14 Nat. Alex. t. 1, p. 89.

St. Polycarp comes to Rome, and reclaims many from the errors of Marcion. Anicetus and he disagree about the celebration of Easter, but part without breach of charity. Hegesippus and St. Justin at Rome.

rencies. To say with Le Sueur, that they were written originally in Greek, and in latter times translated into Latin,[1] is but a poor evasion. As for the fable of Hermes, the brother of Pius, who, by the command of an angel appearing to him in the disguise of a shepherd, is said to have written a book showing that Easter ought to be kept on Sunday, I refer the reader to Platina, and such-like writers.

ANICETUS, TENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANTONINUS, M. AURELIUS.]

[Year of Christ 157.] PIUS was succeeded by Anicetus, in whose time Valentine the heretic, who came to Rome in the pontificate of Hyginus, and had gained many proselytes under Pius, continued sowing his pestilential errors among the members of that church: but many whom he had seduced were reclaimed by St. Polycarp, formerly the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and then Bishop of Smyrna. His declaring to them, that the doctrine taught by the church was the doctrine he had learnt of the apostles, made such an impression on their minds, that they abjured the errors of Valentine, and returned to the communion of the faithful.[2] They preferred the bare word of Polycarp, who claimed no infallibility, to the infallible authority of Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus. This is a plain proof that the popes had not yet begun to exert their infallibility; or, if they had, that it was not acknowledged. What brought St. Polycarp to Rome was the controversy about the celebration of Easter, which at this time began to grow very warm between the eastern and western churches.[3] All the churches of the east, and amongst the rest that of Smyrna, kept Easter on the 14th day of the moon of the first month, in conformity to the custom of the Jews: on the other hand, Anicetus would neither conform to that custom himself, nor suffer any under his jurisdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that solemnity on the Sunday next following the 14th of the moon. That this dispute might not occasion a schism in the church, Polycarp undertook a journey to Rome, in order to confer with the bishop of that city, who was the chief opposer of the Quartodecimans.[4] But it happened in this, as it does in most religious disputes, they parted each retaining his own way of thinking; but, at the same time, what happens but seldom, without the least breach of that charity which is the great and fundamental law of our holy religion. In token whereof they communicated together at the holy sacrament; nay, Anicetus, out of respect to St. Polycarp, yielded to him the eucharist;[5] that is, gave him leave to consecrate the eucharist in his own church: after which they parted in peace, though both determined to follow the ancient practice of their respective churches;[1] St. Polycarp, though well acquainted with the doctrine of the apostles, was a stranger, it seems, to that of Bellarmine, Baronius, &c., viz., that the whole Catholic Church is bound to conform to the rites, ceremonies, and customs of the Church of Rome.

In the time of Anicetus, Hegesippus and the celebrated martyr St. Justin came to Rome, upon what occasion is uncertain. The former, continuing there to the pontificate of Eleutherius, wrote a book on the doctrine which in that church had been conveyed down from the apostles to Anicetus, and was still observed, says he, in all its original purity.[2] The latter opposed with great zeal Marcion and his followers, publishing a book against his pernicious tenets, and against heresies in general.[3] It was at Rome that he had frequent conferences with Crescens, the Cynic, a man of some note at that time; but, according to the genius of his sect, proud, surly, conceited, and a declared enemy to all who professed the Christian religion, which he painted in the blackest colours.[4] The malice of this Cynic procured in the end for our zealous and learned apologist what he had long and most ardently wished, the glory of sealing with his blood the truth which he had so strenuously defended and promoted with his pen.[5] He suffered under Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus about the year 167, towards the end of the pontificate of Anicetus.

To this pope are ascribed by Anastasius, Platina, Ciaconius, and other modern writers, several ordinances and decrees; but as they are not mentioned by any of the ancients, we do not think them worthy of our notice. Anicetus governed the church, according to Eusebius,[6] eleven years, from the year 157 to the eighth year of M. Aurelius, that is, to 168 of the Christian era. Raban, Florus, and Anastasius, suppose him to have died for the pro-

[1] Sueur, hist. de l'Egl. &c. ad ann. 149.
[2] Iren. l. 3, c. 3, & l. 1, c. 24. [3] Euseb. l. 4, c. 13.
[4] Iren. apud Euseb. l. iv. c. 14.
[5] Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, 24.

[1] Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, 24. [2] Euseb. l. 4, c. 11.
[3] Just. Apol. 2, p. 70
[4] Tatian. orat. cont. Græc. p. 160.
[5] Euseb. l. 4, c. 16; Epiph. hær. 46, c. 1.
[6] Euseb. l. 4, c. 19.

Anicetus not a Martyr. His relics. Soter's charities to the distressed Christians. The heresy of Montanus broached in his time. He did not die a Martyr.

fession of the faith; which was, it seems, unknown to Irenæus. He was buried, according to some, near St. Peter, in the Vatican; according to others, in the burying-place of Calixtus;[1] out of which, though it is uncertain whether he was buried there or not, his head was taken in 1590, and given by Urban VII. to the Jesuits of Munich, in Bavaria, where it is yearly, with great solemnity, exposed to public adoration on the 17th of April, the anniversary, as is supposed, of his death: his body was taken out of the same place in 1604, and given by Clement VIII. to the Duke of Altaemps, who caused it to be conveyed to the chapel of his palace in Rome, and to be deposited there in a marble tomb, formerly the tomb of the Emperor Alexander; where it is worshipped to this day.

SOTER, ELEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[M. Aurelius.]

[Year of Christ 168.] Soter, the successor of Anicetus, is highly commended on account of his extensive charity towards the poor of other churches, but more especially towards those who were condemned for the confession of their faith to work in the mines.[2] These he is said not only to have relieved in their distress with generous gatherings made for that purpose at Rome, wherein he followed the example of his predecessors, but moreover to have sent letters to them in their afflicted condition. This we learn from a letter of Dionysius, then Bishop of Corinth, which was an answer to a letter from Soter, and the Church of Rome. Dionysius returns thanks to the Romans, and their bishop, for their generosity to the poor of Corinth; acquaints Soter that his letter had been publicly read; adds, that he shall cause it to be read for the future; and closes his epistle with great encomiums on the Romans, who had so generously contributed to the support of the indigent Corinthians.[3] This laudable custom did not end with the second century of the church; for Dionysius of Alexandria, writing about the year 254, to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, says, that all Syria and Arabia felt the good effects of the generosity of the Romans.[4] And some years after, that is, about the year 260, Pope Dionysius being informed, that the city of Cæsarea in Cappadocia had been ruined by the wars, and many Christians carried into captivity, he sent large sums to ransom them, with a letter to the Church of Cæsarea, which was still read in St. Basil's time.[1] Eusebius tells us, that this custom continued till the last persecution.[2] How differently the immense revenues of the see of Rome are employed now, those know who have seen the extravagant pomp, luxury, and parade of that court. In the year 171, the fourth of Soter, was broached the heresy of the Montanists, so called from their ringleader Montanus.[3] Against these, Soter is said, by an anonymous writer of some antiquity, to have composed a book, which was answered, according to the same writer, by Tertullian, become the defender of that sect:[4] but, according to the best chronologists, Tertullian did not turn Montanist till many years after the death of Soter; and, besides, both Soter's book, and Tertullian's answer to it, were quite unknown to Eusebius, and even to St. Jerom, who took great delight in reading Tertullian. Soter presided eight years, according to Eusebius;[5] that is, from the year 168, to 176, or to the beginning of 177, the 17th year of the reign of M. Aurelius. The title of martyr is given him by the modern writers, but not by Irenæus, or any of the ancients. To him are falsely ascribed two epistles, which have been placed among the Decretals. Where he was buried is uncertain; but his body is worshipped, at present, in the church of St. Sylvester at Rome, and in the cathedral of Toledo in Spain.[6]

[1] Vide Bolland. April 17 & 22. [2] Euseb. l. 4, c. 23.
[3] Idem ib. [4] Idem, l. 7, c. 5.

[1] Basil. ep. 220. [2] Euseb. l. 4, c. 23.
[3] Euseb. chron.
[4] Auct. anonym. de hæres. a Sirmund. edit. hær. 26, 86, p. 28, 79. [5] Euseb. l. 5, p. 153.
[6] Bar. in martyrol. 22 April. et Bolland. ad eund. diem.

The martyrs of Lyons write to Eleutherius. Eleutherius did not approve the prophecies of Montanus. Councils held without consulting the Bishop of Rome. Florinus and Blastus's new doctrine.

ELEUTHERIUS, TWELFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[M. AURELIUS, COMMODUS.]

[Year of Christ 176.] ELEUTHERIUS was deacon of the church of Rome in 168, when Hegesippus came to that city;[1] but Soter, the successor of Anicetus, being dead, he was chosen to govern the church in his room.[2] It is certain, that his election was known in Gaul before the death of the martyrs of Lyons, so famous in ecclesiastical history; for the controversy, which had been raised some years before in the churches of Asia, by Montanus and his followers, concerning the prophetic spirit to which they pretended, making at that time a great noise in the church, the martyrs of Lyons, desirous to contribute, so far as in them lay, to the public peace, wrote letters from their prisons, to the churches of Asia, and likewise to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, declaring their judgment and opinion in the case:[3] for great honor was paid, in those times, to the martyrs, and their opinion was always received with esteem and veneration. It were much to be wished, that Eusebius had set down their opinion at length; but he contents himself only with saying, that it was entirely agreeable to true piety, and to the orthodox faith;[4] which, in my opinion, is enough to make us reject the notion of Dr. Pearson, who takes it for granted, that they wrote in favor of those fanatics, and that for no other reason but because they are said, by Eusebius, to have written for the peace of the church.[5] Was the admitting of false prophets, and false prophecies, giving peace to the church? The same writer adds, that Eleutherius was induced, by the reverence and regard he had for the holy martyrs, to receive the prophecies of Montanus, and his two prophetesses.[6] But herein I must beg leave to disagree with that learned writer, and likewise with Dr. Cave;[7] for it was not, in my opinion, Eleutherius, but his successor Victor, who received the prophecies of Montanus. Tertullian, the only author who informs us that the dreams of that enthusiast were approved by the Bishop of Rome, does not distinguish that bishop by his name; so that he is to be found out only by reasoning and chronology. Now, on one hand, we read in Tertullian, that Montanus had been opposed by the predecessors of the bishop, who embraced his opinions;[8] and, on the other, in Eusebius,[9] that the heresy of Montanus was first broached in the year 171, the eleventh of the reign of M. Aurelius, and the fourth of the pontificate of Soter, the immediate predecessor of Eleutherius; these two therefore, and these alone, were the bishops who could oppose Montanus; and, since the first broaching of that heresy, the only predecessors of the bishop who embraced it. Victor, the successor of Eleutherius, was greatly provoked against the Asiatic bishops, on account of their refusing to comply with the custom of the church of Rome, in the celebration of Easter; and therefore might, out of spite to them, approve of the opinions which they had condemned: for Montanus, and his followers, had been already condemned, as Eusebius informs us,[1] by several synods held in Asia Minor. No opinion is now deemed heretical, unless condemned by the Bishop of Rome, who claims that prerogative as peculiar to himself; but the synods of Asia, the first mentioned in history, after that of the apostles at Jerusalem, condemned the opinions of Montanus, and cut him off from their communion, without consulting or even acquainting therewith the Bishop of Rome. But, to return to the martyrs; some are of opinion that they condemned, in their letters, the tenets of Montanus and his followers; but, at the same time, wrote in their favour, so far as to entreat the bishops of Asia, and Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, to treat them with indulgence, and admit them upon repentance, to their communion.[2] This is but a bare conjecture, not authorized by any of the ancients; and we do not find that the Montanists ever showed the least inclination to return to the communion of the church.

It was in the pontificate of Eleutherius, that Florinus and Blastus first broached their new doctrine; which was readily embraced by many at Rome; for they were both presbyters of that church.[3] Florinus was first one of the emperor's officers in Asia, afterwards the disciple of St. Polycarp, then famous all over that province; and, lastly, presbyter of the church of Rome; but both he and Blastus were degraded on account of their heretical opinions, and cut off from the communion of the faithful.[4] Against Florinus, Irenæus, then Bishop of Lyons, wrote a letter, entitled, *Of monarchy, or that God is not the author of evil*;[5] and another piece called, *De Ogdoede*, that is, of the eight; meaning, perhaps, the Eight Eons, or persons that composed the chimerical divinity of the Valentinians; for Florinus fell at last into that

[1] Euseb. l. 4, c. 22; Hier. vir. ill. c. 22.
[2] Iren. l. 3, c. 3.
[3] Euseb. i. 3, c. 3.
[4] Euseb. ib.
[5] Pears. post, p. 255.
[6] Idem, ib.
[7] Cave, Lives of the Fathers, p. 164.
[8] Tert. in Prax. c. 1.
[9] Euseb. in chron.

[1] Euseb. l. 5, c. 16; Con. per Labb. t. 1. p. 599.
[2] Vide Dupin. Biblioth. p. 287.
[3] Euseb. l. 5, c. 14.
[4] Idem ib. c. 15, 20.
[5] Idem ib.

The conversion of Lucius, a British king. The whole account fabulous. Several monkish fables concerning King Lucius

heresy.[1] Against Blastus, whom Pacian surnames *the Greek*,[2] Irenæus wrote a book, entitled, *Of schism*.[3] Ado[4] and Bede[5] tell us, that Eleutherius issued a decree, ordaining Easter to be kept on the Sunday after the 14th of the first moon; but as no mention is made of such a decree, by any writer of those times, their authority is of no weight.

Lucius, a British king, is said, by Bede, to have written to Pope Eleutherius, entreating him to send a proper person into Britain, to instruct him in the mysteries of the Christian religion; which the pope readily granted.[6] But as this is vouched only by Bede, who lived many ages after him, and by a Pontifical, supposed to have been written about the middle of the sixth century, what credit the whole history of Lucius may deserve, I leave the reader to judge. Such a remarkable event could not have escaped Eusebius, who, speaking of this very period of time, tells us, that, at Rome, many persons, eminent for their birth and wealth, embraced the Christian religion, with their whole families.[7] A solemn embassy from a British king, and his conversion, surely deserved a place in the history of the church. He informs us, that, in the reign of Commodus, and the Pontificate of Eleutherius, the Christian religion enjoyed a profound tranquillity all over the world; that it flourished, and attracted, to use his expression, the minds of many people.[8] Had he not here a favourable opportunity of mentioning our royal proselyte, who, in the reign of Commodus, is supposed to have written to Eleutherius, and by his means to have been converted to the Christian religion? To what can we ascribe the silence of such an exact and accurate writer, concerning an event which would have greatly recommended both his history, and the Christian religion? To an invincible antipathy, says the Jesuit Alford,[9] which he bore to the name of Britain, and which was so prevalent in him, that he chose rather to suppress the conversion of Lucius than mention it. But what could thus set Eusebius against Britain? Had he been ever injured by the Britons? Does he not elsewhere mention both them and their country? This jesuitical, absurd, and groundless speculation, which must expose the author of it to the ridicule of every reader, I should perhaps have let pass unobserved, had he not in this very place insulted, beyond the bounds common decency, the reformers of religion, for rejecting some idle ceremonies, which he supposes to have been practised at the conversion of Lucius. But, not to lay the whole stress on the silence of Eusebius, and other ancient writers, to whom King Lucius was utterly unknown, why should he have been at the trouble of sending to Rome for an instructer? Were there not many in his own kingdom as capable of instructing him as any Rome could send? The Christian religion had been planted in this island long before the reign of Lucius, in the time of the apostles, as Gildas seems to insinuate,[1] at least very early in the second century; for Origen, who flourished in the beginning of the third, tells us, that the virtue of the name of Jesus had passed the seas, to find out the Britons in another world.[2]

The short account, which Bede gives us of the embassy and conversion of King Lucius, has not only been greedily swallowed by the monkish writers, who came after him, but has served as a ground-plot to the innumerable fables with which they have filled this part of their histories. They even tell us the names of the ambassadors sent by Lucius to the pope, and of the legates *a Latere* sent by the pope to Lucius. The former were Elvanus and Medwinus, who, being ordained bishops by Eleutherius, returned to Britain, and greatly contributed to the conversion of this island. These fables gained credit, by degrees, in those ages of ignorance and superstition, insomuch that the two ambassadors were at last ranked among the saints; and their bodies, where or when found, nobody knows, exposed to public veneration, in the monastery of Glassenbury, on the 1st of January.[3] The pope's legates were Fugacius and Damianus, who, as we are told, went back to Rome, to obtain of Eleutherius a confirmation of what they had done; and, from Rome, returned into Britain, with a letter from the pope to King Lucius.[4] As for the king himself, he is said to have quitted his kingdom, and, turning missionary, to have preached the gospel in Germany, especially at Ausburgh; to have travelled from thence into the country of the Grisons; and, lastly, to have been ordained Bishop of Coire, their metropolis; and to have died there a martyr.[5] To these monkish fables, King Lucius owes a place among the saints; for on the 3d of December is kept, in the church of Rome, the festival of Lucius, king of the Britons, who died at Coire in Germany:[6] these are the words of the Roman martyrology; but Bede does not so much as mention him in his; a plain proof, that what is said of his preaching, of his martyrdom, &c., was invented after that writer's time. And yet Alford has not only filled his annals with these, and suchlike fabulous accounts, giving an entire credit to them, but inveighs, with great acrimony, against those who have not the gift of belief in the same degree with himself, especially against Dempster, telling him, that till his time the conversion of Lucius had never been

[1] Fleuri hist. Eccles. l. 3, c. 26, 27, p. 395, 397.
[2] Pacian. ep. 1.
[3] Euseb. l. 5, c. 20.
[4] Ado ad ann. 194.
[5] Bed. chron. t. 2, p. 111.
[6] Bed. hist. l. 1, c. 4, et chron. t. 2, p. 114.
[7] Euseb. l. 5, c. 21.
[8] Idem ib.
[9] Annal. ad ann. 182, p. 140.

[1] Gild. ex. c. 6, p. 116.
[2] Orig. in Luc. hom. 6.
[3] Vide Ush. Brit. eccles. antiq. c. 4, et Bolland. 1 Jan.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 183; Bolland. 26 Maii; Ush. ib. p. 54, 102.
[5] Vide Ush. ib. p. 137, 138.
[6] Martyr. Rom. 3 Decem.

The heresy of Theodotus. Victor approves the prophetic spirit of Montanus. His infallibility, how defended by Baronius and Bellarmine.

questioned by any man of sense or learning.[1] And truly, the story of King Lucius has been credited even by the greater part of Protestant writers, out of respect to our venerable historian; but as he wrote many ages after the pretended conversion of that prince, and none of the writers of those days, whom such a remarkable event could hardly have escaped, give us the least hint of it, we may be well allowed to question the whole, notwithstanding the authority of Bede, which can be of no weight with respect to transactions that are said to have happened in times so remote.

Eleutherius governed, according to the best chronologers, fifteen years; and died in 192, the last of the emperor Commodus.[2] To him are ascribed a Decretal, addressed to the bishops of Gaul, and a decree, declaring against Montanus, and his followers, that no food was forbidden to the Christians; but both are deemed spurious. He was buried, according to some, in the Salarian Way, according to others, in the Vatican; but, in what place soever he was buried, his body is now worshipped in the Vatican at Rome, in the cathedral of Troia in Apulia, and in several other places.[1] The title of Martyr is given him by the Church of Rome, but not by any of the ancient writers. Under him flourished Hegesippus, who wrote, in five books, an account of what had happened in the church since our Saviour's death, to his time.[2] He came to Rome in the pontificate of Anicetus, who was chosen in 157, and, remaining there to the time of Eleutherius, who succeeded Anicetus and Soter in 177, he wrote a book on the doctrine received by tradition in that church;[3] but neither of these works has reached our times.

VICTOR, THIRTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[COMMODUS, PERTINAX, SEVERUS.]

[Year of Christ 192.] VICTOR, the successor of Eleutherius, is counted by a writer, who at this very time lived in Rome, the thirteenth bishop of that city:[3] so that neither is St. Peter reckoned among them, nor is Cletus distinguished from Anacletus. In Victor's time a new heresy was broached at Rome by one Theodotus of Byzantium, denying the divinity of Christ.[4] The Theodotians gave out, that Victor favoured their doctrine;[5] which he did, perhaps, at that time;[6] though he cut them off afterwards from his communion. Be that as it will, he can by no means be cleared from another imputation, namely, that of owning and approving the prophetic spirit of Montanus, and his two prophetesses, Prisca and Maximilla: for Tertullian, his contemporary, tells us, in express terms, that he received their prophecies; that, upon receiving them, he gave letters of peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia; but that one Praxeas, just come from those parts, giving him a false account of those prophets, and their churches, and remonstrating, that by approving them, he condemned his predecessors, prevailed upon him to revoke the letters which he had already written in their behalf. Thus Tertullian, who was then himself become a follower of Montanus.[7] Here Baronius and Bellarmine, the two great advocates for the pope's infallibility, are put to a stand; they own, and cannot help owning, that the pope was deceived, and imposed upon; but, for all that, will not give up his infallibility. How great is the power of prejudice and prepossession! They find the pope actually erring, and yet maintain, that he cannot err. But this apostasy from common sense, if I may be allowed the expression, is not, perhaps, so much owing to prejudice, as to something worse; for no prejudice, however prevalent, can withstand the indisputable evidence of plain matters of fact. It is no new thing, says Baronius, nor what ought to cause in us the least surprise, that a pope should be overreached by impostors.[4] A pope overreached in matters of faith! What then becomes of infallibility? or what is the use of it? But the Montanists, says Bellarmine,[5] craftily concealed from the pope what was erroneous and heretical in their prophecies; so that he, discovering nothing in their doctrine repugnant to that of the church, believed they had been unjustly accused to, and condemned by, his predecessors. But, in the first place, Tertullian tells us, in express terms, that the prophecies of Montanus, and his followers, were approved by the pope; whereas the prophecies, which he is supposed by Bellarmine to have approved, were not the prophecies of Montanus, but others, quite different, and in every respect orthodox. In the second place, if Victor

[1] Alf. ad ann. 201, p. 201.
[2] Euseb chron. Florent. p. 811.
[3] Vide Euseb. l. 5, c. 28.
[4] Epiph. hær. 54, c. 1; Euseb. l. v. c. 28.
[5] Euseb. ib. [6] Idem. ib.
[7] Tert. in Prax. c. 1.

[1] Bolland. 26 Maii, p. 361. [2] Hier. vir. ill. c. 22.
[3] Idem ib. et Euseb. l. 4, c. 11, 22.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 173, n. 4.
[5] Bell. de sum. Pont. l. 4, c. 8.

The famous controversy about the celebration of Easter. Victor's haughty conduct. Is opposed by the Bishop of Ephesus, and by a council of all the bishops of Asia Minor. He cuts them off from his communion, &c.

believed that the Montanists had been unjustly condemned by his predecessors, he did not believe them infallible; so that, in every light, this fact oversets the pretended infallibility. We may add, that, if the pope's infallibility depends upon a right information, and neither he nor we can know whether he has been rightly informed, his infallibility is thereby rendered quite useless; since, in every particular case, we may doubt, and that doubt cannot be removed, whether the information, upon which he acts, was right, or not.

But what most of all distinguished the pontificate of Victor was, the famous controversy about the celebration of Easter, between the eastern and western bishops; the former keeping that solemnity on the 14th day of the first moon, on what day soever of the week it happened to fall; and the latter putting it off till the Sunday following. This, surely, could not be a point of any consequence, since the apostles had not thought fit to settle any thing concerning it; nay, by observing the paschal solemnity themselves, some on the one day, and some on the other, as it is manifest they did,[1] they plainly declared, that it was quite indifferent on what day it was observed. Accordingly, from the apostles' time to Victor's, each church had followed the custom and practice established by their respective founders, without giving the least disturbance to others, or being, on that account, disturbed by them.[2] Pope Anicetus even suffered such of the Asiatics as happened to be at Rome, to celebrate Easter after the manner of Asia:[3] Soter, indeed, and his successor Eleutherius, obliged those who lived at Rome to conform to the custom of that church; but that did not prevent their sending the eucharist, or sacrament, to the bishops who followed the opposite practice;[4] for a custom then obtained among bishops to send the eucharist to each other, especially at Easter, in token of communion and peace; but this custom was suppressed by the 14th canon of the council held in the fourth century at Laodicea.[5] Victor, not satisfied with what his two immediate predecessors had done, took upon him to impose the Roman custom on all the churches that followed the contrary practice. But, in this bold attempt, which we may call the first essay of papal usurpation, he met with a vigorous and truly Christian opposition from Polycrates, at that time Bishop of Ephesus, and one of the most eminent men in the church, both for piety and learning. He had studied, says Eusebius,[6] the Scriptures with great attention, had conferred with Christians from all parts of the world, and had ever conformed his life to the rules of the gospel. Jerom speaks of him as a man of excellent parts, and one universally respected.[1] In the present controversy, he peremptorily refused to relinquish the practice of his own church, which had been first introduced by the apostles St. John and St. Philip, and had been handed down to him by seven bishops of his own family.[2] Hereupon Victor, impatient of contradiction, wrote a letter, threatening to cut him off from his communion, unless he forthwith complied with the practice of the Church of Rome.[3] Polycrates, greatly surprised at the hasty proceedings of his fellow-bishop, assembled in Ephesus a council of all the bishops of Asia Minor, when it was unanimously resolved, that the practice, which they had received from their predecessors, ought not to be changed.[4] Agreeably to this resolution, Polycrates wrote to Victor, acquainting him therewith; and, at the same time, modestly insinuating, that, as to his menaces, he had better forbear them, since they had no manner of effect upon him, or his brethren.[5] Upon the receipt of this letter, Victor, giving the reins to an impotent and ungovernable passion, published bitter invectives against all the churches of Asia, declared them cut off from his communion, sent letters of excommunication to their respective bishops; and, at the same time, in order to have them cut off from the communion of the whole church, wrote to the other bishops, exhorting them to follow his example, and forbear communicating with their refractory brethren of Asia.[6] They all complied, to be sure, with the desire of the head of the church, who had power to command; but, out of his great moderation, chose to exhort and advise! No; not one followed his example, or advice; not one paid any sort of regard to his letters, or showed the least inclination to second him in such a rash and uncharitable attempt; but, on the contrary, they all joined, as Eusebius assures us,[7] in sharply censuring and rebuking him, as a disturber of the peace of the church. Among the rest Irenæus, then Bishop of Lyons, wrote him an excellent letter, putting him in mind of the moderation of his predecessors, and telling him, that though he agreed with him in the main of the controversy, yet he could not approve of his cutting off whole churches, for the observance of customs which they had received from their ancestors. He wrote, at the same time, to many other bishops,[8] no doubt, to dissuade them from joining the Bishop of Rome. However that be, it is certain, that, by this means, the storm was laid, a calm was restored to the church, and the Asiatics allowed to follow undisturbed their ancient

[1] Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, 25; Socrat. l. 5, c. 21; Epiph. hær. 70. c. 10. [2] Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.
[3] Idem ib. [4] Idem ib. c. 20.
[5] Concil. per Labb. t. 1, p. 150.
[6] Euseb. l. 5, c. 22, et 24.

[1] Hier. vir. ill. c. 45. [2] Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.
[3] Idem ib. [4] Idem ib.
[5] Idem ib Hier. vir ill. c. 45.
[6] Euseb. l. 5, c. 24; Socrat. l. 5, c. 22.
[7] Euseb. ib. [8] Euseb. ib. et Socrat. l. 5, c. 22.

Had no power over the Asiatics. Victor dies. His works He is sainted. A dreadful persecution against the Christians. Zephyrinus opposes the Theodotian heretics. The heresy of Praxeas. Origen at Rome.

practice.[1] But Pope Victor, says Baronius,[2] excommunicated the Asiatics, which he would never have ventured to do, had he not known that he had power and jurisdiction over them. The argument may be thus retorted against him: the Asiatics made no account of his excommunication; which they would not have ventured to do, had they not known that he had no power nor jurisdiction over them. Besides, Victor did not excommunicate them, as that word is now understood; that is, he did not cut them off from the communion of the catholic church; for all the other bishops continued to communicate with them, as they had done before; he only separated himself from their communion, which was no more than every bishop had power to do. Victor being thus baffled in his attempt, his successors took care not to revive the controversy; so that the Asiatics peaceably followed their ancient practice till the council of Nice, which, out of complaisance to Constantine the Great, ordered the solemnity of Easter to be kept everywhere on the same day, after the custom of Rome.[3]

This dispute happened, not in the reign of Commodus, as we read in the Synodicon,[1] but in the fourth year of the reign of Severus, as St. Jerom informs us,[2] of Christ 196. Victor, of whom we find nothing else in the ancients worthy of notice, died five years after,[3] that is, in the ninth of the Emperor Severus, and in the end of 201, or the beginning of 202 of Christ, having governed the church ten years. He is named by St. Jerom, the first among the ecclesiastical authors that wrote in Latin.[4] He published a piece on the controversy about the celebration of Easter, and some other books on religious subjects, which were still extant in St. Jerom's time.[5] As for the two Decretals that are ascribed to him, and the two letters to Desiderius and Parocoda, both bishops of Vienna, they are universally rejected.[6] The Church of Rome has placed Victor among her saints; and truly, his attempt, however unsuccessful, to promote the power and extend the jurisdiction of that see, deserved no less a reward.

[1] Euseb. ib. Hier. vir. ill. c. 35; Phot. c. 120; Cypr. ep. 75; Anast. p. 445. [2] Bar. ad ann. 198, n. 10.
[3] Euseb. vit. Const. l. 3, c. 18; Soz. l. 1, c. 16; Concil. l. 3, c. 18, 19, p. 492.
[4] Euseb. l. 5, c. 28. [5] Opt. l. 1, c. 37.
[6] Bar. ad ann. 196, n. 20.

ZEPHYRINUS, FOURTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[SEVERUS, CARACALLA, GETA, MACRINUS, DIADUMENUS, HELIOGABALUS.]

[Year of Christ 201.] IN the first year of the pontificate of Zephyrinus, who succeeded Victor, a dreadful persecution was raised against the Christians by the Emperor Severus, and carried on with great cruelty in all parts of the empire. Zephyrinus, however, had the good luck to escape it, and to see the church, by the death of that prince, happily delivered from the evils, which the rage of her foreign enemies had brought upon her. But her domestic enemies gave her no respite; the Theodotian heretics continued sowing, and not without success, their pestilential errors at Rome. Zephyrinus, it seems, opposed them with great vigor and zeal; for they reproached him, as we read in Eusebius,[4] as the first who had betrayed the truth, by maintaining against them the divinity of Christ: hence he is ranked by Optatus, with Tertullian, Victorinus, &c., among those who have successfully defended the Catholic Church.[5] Baronius, to extol Zephyrinus, ascribes to him the first condemnation of Praxeas,[6] which was followed by a solemn retractation under his own hand. But it was in Africa, and not at Rome, that Praxeas was condemned, as appeared plain to me, from the words of Tertullian,[7] before I had seen either Pamelius or Moreau, who understood them in that sense. Praxeas, as we have observed above, had done an eminent piece of service to the Church of Rome, by reclaiming Pope Victor from the heresy of Montanus: but the good he had done on that occasion was overbalanced by the mischief his new heresy occasioned both at Rome and in Africa; for in both places he gained many proselytes. He denied all distinction of persons in the Godhead, so that the Father being, according to his doctrine, the same person with the Son, it was he who took upon him human nature, and suffered on the cross; whence his followers were called Patropassians.[8]

In the pontificate of Zephyrinus, and, as Eusebius seems to insinuate, in the beginning of the reign of Caracalla, that is, towards the year 211 or 212, came to Rome the celebrated Origen, being desirous, as he himself declared, to see that church, so venerable for its antiquity and renown; but, after a very short stay there, he returned to Alexandria.[9] About the same time happened, at Rome, the famous dispute between Caius, a presbyter

[1] Concil. Labb. t. 1, p. 601.
[2] Hier vir. ill. c. 43, et chron.
[3] Euseb. l. 5, c. 28; Hier. chron.
[4] Hier. de vir. ill. c 34, 40. [5] Idem ib.
[6] Pears. posth. p. 91, 92; Bosquet. l. 3, c. 5.
[7] Tert. in Prax. c. 1, p. 631.
[8] Caten. Græc. Patr. c. 53. [9] Euseb. l. 6, c. 14.

Dispute at Rome between Caius and Proclus. Tertullian falls off from the church. The titles of High pontiff, &c. Zephyrinus not a Martyr. Alexander favourable to the Christians.

of that church, and Proclus, a leading man among the Montanists.[1] Caius committed to writing the reasons and arguments on both sides:[2] but that piece has not reached our times, though it was well known to Eusebius, who styles it a dialogue,[3] and likewise to Theodoret.[4]

It was during the pontificate of Zephyrinus, that Tertullian, the great defender of the Christian religion, fell off from the Catholic Church. His fall, which was lamented by all the faithful as a common loss, is ascribed, by St. Jerom, to the envy and ill usage he met with from the Roman clergy.[5] But how ill soever he was used by them in those days, he has perhaps met with worse treatment at their hands in latter times; for they call upon him as an evidence, to witness the pope's universal jurisdiction, and to confirm to him the haughty titles which he assumes; but with how little reason, will appear from the following relation: A Catholic bishop had, by a public declaration, admitted persons guilty of adultery and fornication to a place among the penitents. As Tertullian was a strict observer of rites and discipline, and a most zealous asserter of the greatest rigours of religion, he could not brook so much moderation and indulgence: and therefore, in his book *De Pudicitia*, which he wrote on that occasion, he extols the severity of the ancient discipline, aggravates the greatness of those offences, undertakes to confute the arguments for remission and indulgence; and, speaking of the above-mentioned declaration, he calls it "a peremptory decree," and styles the bishop who made it, "high pontiff, and bishop of bishops."[6] Hence the advocates for the see of Rome infer, that, even in those early times, such titles were given to the Bishop of Rome, and that his decrees were even then deemed peremptory.[1] But, in the first place, it is uncertain whether that declaration was published by the Bishop of Rome, or by some other great bishop, perhaps of Carthage, of Alexandria, or Antioch; for no bishop is named by Tertullian. In the second place, it is evident from the context, that, in the above-mentioned passage, Tertullian speaks ironically; and consequently all that can be inferred from thence is, that he gave those titles to the Catholic bishop, whoever he was, by way of derision; or if the bishop had assumed them in his Declaration, he took from thence occasion to expose his vanity and ambition. Baronius, and the flatterers of the bishops of Rome, triumph in this passage of Tertullian; from which however nothing can be inferred in favor of that see, unless they prove, which they can never do, that the above-mentioned declaration or decree was published by the Bishop of Rome; that those titles, which raise him above other bishops, were part of the decree; and lastly, that Tertullian mentioned them as due to him, and not by way of sarcasm, ironically reflecting on his pride and ambition.

As to the actions of Zephyrinus, the ancients have left us quite in the dark; and we cannot depend on what we read in the modern writers. He governed about seventeen years, and died in the first year of Heliogabalus, and 218 of the Christian era.[2] In the Roman martyrology he has a place among the martyrs, which puts Baronius himself to a stand,[3] since the church enjoyed a profound tranquillity from the death of Severus to the end of his pontificate.

[1] Euseb. l. 6, c. 34; Hier. vir. ill. c. 59.
[2] Idem ib. c. 20. [3] Idem, l. 3, c. 31.
[4] Theod. hæret. fab. l. 3, c. 2.
[5] Hier. vir. ill. c. 53. [6] Tert. de Pudic. c. 1.
[7] Opt. l. 2, p. 43. [8] Aug. ep. 53.
[9] Tert. de cor. mil.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 216, n. 5, 6, &c.
[2] Euseb. l. 6, c. 21 et chron.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 221, n. 1, 2.
[4] Lamprid. in vit.; Alex. p. 121. [5] Idem. ib. p. 131.

CALLISTUS, FIFTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HELIOGABALUS, ALEXANDER SEVERUS.]

[Year of Christ, 219.] ZEPHYRINUS was succeeded by Callistus, or Callixtus, as he is styled by Optatus,[7] and St. Austin.[8] In his time the church enjoyed a long, happy, and uninterrupted peace, as Tertullian calls it,[9] which lasted from the death of Severus in 211, to the reign of Maximinus in 235, as did also the state from the death of Macrinus in 218, to the year 233. Alexander, who succeeded Heliogabalus in 222, proved extremely favorable to the Christians, and even allowed them, if I mistake not the meaning of a profane writer, the free exercise of their religion:[4] it is at least certain, that he adjudged to them, against the tavern-keepers, a piece of ground, which it is pretended they had usurped upon the public, saying, when he gave sentence in their favour, that it was better God should be served on it in any manner, than that it should be occupied by tavern-keepers;[5] which was giving them leave to serve God on it after their own manner. On this spot of ground, Baronius supposes Callistus to have built a church in honor of the virgin Mary, known

Callistus's burying-place. The Acts of Callistus deserve no credit. Many saints ought to be expunged out of the catalogue. Callistus not a Martyr.

at present by the name of Santa Maria in Trastevere, that is, Saint Mary beyond the Tiber.[1] But the pontifical of Damasus, upon which alone he founds his opinion, deserves no credit, as I shall show in the life of that pope. Callistus is said by Anastasius[2] to have enclosed a large piece of ground on the Appian way, to serve as a burying-place for the Christians. This ground is frequently mentioned in the martyrologies, and described at length by Arringhus, who tells us, that one hundred and seventy-four thousand martyrs, and forty-six popes, were buried in it.[3] Though Alexander was of all the pagan emperors the most favorable and indulgent to the Christians, as is evident from all the ancient writers, both Christians and Pagans, yet he is represented in the martyrologies, and in the Acts of some martyrs, especially of Callistus, to which Bede gave an entire credit,[4] as the most barbarous and inhuman tyrant that ever shed Christian blood. If we reject these Acts, and we must either reject them, or the authority of the most unexceptionable writers among the ancients, we expunge at once above three hundred martyrs out of the catalogue of saints worshipped to this day by the Church of Rome, upon the bare authority of such Acts. Among these are the consul Palmatius, with his wife, his children, and forty-two of his domestics; the senator Simplicius, with his wife, and sixty-eight of his domestics: and, what will be an irreparable loss, the so much celebrated St. Cæcilia, in whose honor churches have been erected in every Christian kingdom. Baronius, not presuming on one side to question the Emperor Alexander's kindness to the Christians, which would be giving the lie to all the ancients, but, on the other, looking upon it as a sacrilege to rob the church of so many valuable relics, ascribes the cruel usage they are supposed to have met with in that prince's reign, not to him, but to Ulpian the celebrated civilian, who flourished under him.[5] But in those Acts, the martyrs are said to have suffered unheard-of torments, there minutely described, by the express command of the Emperor Alexander. Besides, could Alexander be said to have favored the Christians, could the Christians be said to have enjoyed a happy tranquillity under him, had one of his officers persecuted them with the utmost cruelty in his name, and by his authority? Baronius, not remembering, it seems, that in this place he had charged Ulpian with all the cruelties against the Christians, supposes elsewhere[1] several martyrs to have suffered in the reign of Alexander, after the death of Ulpian. Bede, 'tis true, has followed these Acts; but they are not on that account at all the more credible, since he often follows pieces which are now universally given up as supposititious. The very first words of these Acts are sufficient to make us suspect the truth of them; for they begin thus: In the time of Macrinus and Alexander — How come these two princes to be joined together? Macrinus reigned with his son Diadumenus, and Heliogabalus between them and Alexander. Soon after, the consul Palmatius is said to have been condemned without any form of judgment, without so much as being heard; whereas Herodian assures us, that Alexander was a strict observer of the laws; and that no criminal was condemned in his reign, but according to the usual course of law, and by judges of the greatest integrity.[2] Callistus, if we give credit to his Acts, was kept a long time prisoner in a private house, where he was every day cruelly beaten by the Emperor Alexander's orders, and at last thrown headlong out of the window into a well. The Acts are evidently fabulous, but Callistus nevertheless is worshipped among the martyrs; and the waters of the well, which is to be seen at Rome in the church that bears his name, are said to cure all sorts of diseases to this day. He governed the church five years, and died in the latter end of the year 223,[3] the third of the Emperor Alexander. His body is exposed to public adoration on the 10th of May, in the Church of St. Mary, beyond the Tiber, at Rome,[4] and in that of Our Lady at Rheims[5] Two decretals are ascribed to Callistus, and likewise the institution of the ember weeks, but without the least foundation.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 224, n. 4, 5.
[2] Arring. l. 3, c. 11.
[3] Bed. Martyr. 10 Maii, 14 Oct
[4] Bar. ad ann. 226, n. 4.
[5] Anast. in vit. Call.

[1] Idem. ad ann. 222, n. 11.
[2] Herod. l. vi. p. 575, 588.
[3] Euseb. l 6, c 21, et in chron.
[4] Bolland. 10 Maii, 493, 499.
[5] Arring. l. 2, c. 12; Theod. l. 4, c. 1, 2, 6, 8.

URBANUS, SIXTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXANDER.]

[Year of Christ 223.] ALL I can find in the ancients concerning Urban, the successor of Callistus, is, that during the whole time of his pontificate, both church and state enjoyed a profound peace under the Emperor Alexander; that he held the chair near seven years, and died about the middle of the year 230.[1] Great and wonderful things are related of him in his Acts, and in those of St. Cæcilia; but such Acts[2] are evidently fabulous, since, in opposition to all the ancients, they represent the Emperor Alexander as a most cruel persecutor of the Christian name. Urban himself is supposed to have suffered under him, and placed accordingly by the Church of Rome among her martyrs. His body is now worshipped in an abbey of his name in the diocese of Chalons on the Marne, and in the Church of St. Cæcilia at Rome.[1]

PONTIANUS, SEVENTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXANDER, MAXIMINUS.]

Year of Christ 230.] PONTIANUS succeeded Urban in 230, and governed, according to the pontifical of Bucherius,[3] five years, two months, and seven days; that is, from the 22d of July, 230, to the 28th of September, 235.[2] In the second year of his pontificate, the famous Origen was deposed and excommunicated by Demetrius bishop of

[1] Euseb. l. 6, c. 26.

[2] Bed. Martyr. & Boll. 25 Maii.

[3] This pontifical, well known to Cuspinian, F. Petau, and other chronologers, was published by Bucherius the Jesuit, in 1633, with the paschal cycle of Victorius. It is a catalogue of the bishops of Rome, from the foundation of that see to the time of Liberius, who was chosen in 352. As the election of Liberius is marked, and not his death, the catalogue is supposed by some to have been written in his time. His election is marked thus: *Liberius fuit temporibus Constantii ex die* xi. *Kalendas Junias in diem—a Consulibus Constantio* V. *et Constantio Cæsare*—By Constantius Cæsar is meant Gallus, the son of Julius Constantius, who, by his father Constantius Chlorus, was half-brother to Constantine the Great. Gallus was raised by the Emperor Constantius to the dignity of Cæsar in the year 351, on which occasion he gave him his own name. (Aurel. Vict. p. 518; Socr. l. 2, c. 28.) and the following year took him for his colleague in his fifth consulship, as appears from Idatius, from Prosper, and from the Alexandrian Chronicle. The above-mentioned pontifical is very faulty in the times preceding the pontificate of Pontianus, who was chosen in 230. nay, if we believe Bucherius, Anicetus, Eleutherius, and Zephyrinus, are omitted in it. I said, *if we believe* Bucherius; for Bollandus, another Jesuit, who perused the same manuscript, assures us, that he found there the names of those three bishops, which Bucherius assures us were not to be found there, (Bolland. Apr. t. 1, p. 22—24.) Which of the two Jesuits is the most honest is hard to determine in any case, but impossible in this, unless the original manuscript should be produced, which both perused. F. Pagi, the Franciscan, seems to favour Bucherius; for he complains of Bollandus for interpolating the manuscript, and not publishing it with all its faults and chasms, as Bucherius had done. But then he does not tell us that he had seen the original manuscript. Bollandus, on the other hand, complains of Bucherius for undervaluing such an invaluable piece; and settles by it his whole chronology of the popes, pretending it to have been sent by Pope Damasus to St. Jerom. (Bolland. ib. p. 3, n. 10.) But for this the only ground he has are some letters from Damasus to St. Jerom, and from Jerom to Damasus, which, by the best judges, are all thought supposititious. But even allowing it to have been sent by Damasus to St. Jerom, that ought not to recommend it more to our esteem than it did to his; and he seems to have paid very little regard to it: for in his Book of Illustrious men, which he wrote after the death of Damasus, he places Clement after Anacletus, though that pontifical puts Anacletus after Clement. (Hier. de vir. illustr. c. 15.)

What I have hitherto said is to be understood with respect to the times preceding the pontificate of Pontianus; for, from his time, the pontifical of Bucherius is almost quite exact to the end, that is, to the election of Liberius; and the more exact, the nearer it comes to his time. I said *almost*, for it is not even thenceforth free from all faults; but it has fewer than any other ancient record that has reached us; and it is on this consideration that, from the time of Pontianus, I have preferred it to all others. With respect to his predecessors, I have adopted the chronology of Eusebius, where it does not appear that he was mistaken; for that he was mistaken in some points is but too plain; and, for aught we know, he may have been so in many others. But as in those dark times we have no authentic records, no indisputable authorities, to depend on, I thought it more advisable to tread in the footsteps of so famous and ancient a writer, than, by attempting to open a new way, perplex and confound both myself and the reader, as Pearson, Dodwell, and Pagi, have done. And it was not, I must own, without some concern, that I found a man of Dr. Pearson's learning reduced, by undervaluing the authority of Eusebius, to take for his guide a writer of no authority at all, namely, Eutychius of Alexandria, who flourished so late as the tenth century, and is only famous for his blunders, even in what relates to his own church.

To the pontifical were annexed, in the same ancient manuscript, several other small pieces; viz., 1. A list of the consuls from the year 205 to 354, with the epacts, bissextile years, and the day of the week with which each year began. There are some mistakes in the epacts, but the rest is done with great exactness. 2. Another list of the consuls and governors of Rome, from the year 254 to 354. 3. A short necrology of the bishops of Rome, in which are marked, according to the order of the months, the day on which each of them died, and the place where he was buried. It begins with Lucius, and ends with Julius. In this list, Sixtus II. and Marcellus are omitted; the latter probably by a mistake of the transcriber, confounding him with his predecessor, Marcellinus; and the former, perhaps, because he is set down in the calendar of martyrs annexed to the necrology. These pieces, as well as the pontifical, all end at the year 354, whence Cardinal Noris (Fast. consular. p. 23) and others are of opinion, that they were written that year.

[1] Eric. l. 1, c. 12; Bolland. 25 Maii.

[2] Bolland. April. t. 1, p. 25.

The Persecution of Maximinus. Pontianus banished to Sardinia. Anterus probably dies a Martyr. Miraculous election of Fabianus. Not all popes thus chosen. Fabianus worthy of the dignity to which he was raised.

Alexandria, and the sentence approved of by most other bishops, especially by the Bishop of Rome, who assembled, it seems, his clergy on that occasion: for what else could St. Jerom mean, by telling us, that Rome assembled her senate against Origen?[1] The calm and quiet days which the church had for some years enjoyed, especially under Alexander, expired almost with the pontificate of Pontianus; for that excellent prince being assassinated in the month of May, 235, Maximinus, who succeeded him, out of hatred to him, began to persecute with great cruelty the Christians, whom he had so much favored, especially the bishops.[1] Pontianus, among the rest, was banished Rome, and confined to the unwholesome island of Sardinia,[2] where he died the same year, on the 28th of September, but of what kind of death is not well known.[3]

ANTERUS, EIGHTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAXIMINUS.]

[Year of Christ 235.] ANTERUS, the successor of Pontianus, presided only one month and ten days, and died on the 3d of January, 236.[2] Some modern writers place one Cyriacus between him and Pontianus; but their opinion, founded on the authority of the fabulous Acts of St. Ursula, is sufficiently confuted by Eusebius,[3] Optatus,[4] St. Augustin,[5] and Nicephorus,[4] who all name Anterus as the immediate successor of Pontianus. The shortness of his pontificate, and the cruel persecution carried on by Maximinus, give us room to believe that he died a martyr, which title is given him in the martyrologies of St. Jerom and Bede.[5]

FABIANUS, NINETEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAXIMINUS, GORDIAN, PHILIP, DECIUS.]

[Year of Christ 236.] FABIANUS, called by the Greeks Fabius, by Eutychius,[6] and in the Chronicle of Alexandria, Flavianus,[7] was, according to Eusebius, miraculously chosen for successor to Anterus; for he tells us, "That the people and clergy being assembled in order to proceed to a new election, a dove, unexpectedly appearing, settled, to the great surprise of all present, on the head of Fabianus, who was not so much as thought of, being but a layman, as appears from the account, and not an inhabitant of Rome, but just then come out of the country. At this prodigy the whole assembly cried out with one voice, 'Fabianus is our bishop;' and, crowding round him, placed him without further delay on the episcopal throne."—Thus Eusebius:[8] and to his account is owing the modern notion, that the pope is always chosen by the Holy Ghost. "What happened in the election of St. Fabianus," says Cardinal Cusani, "happens in the election of every pope. 'Tis true we do not see the Holy Ghost with our corporeal eyes; but we may and must see him, if we are not quite blind, with those of the mind. In vain, therefore, O eminent electors, are all your intrigues; the person, on whose head the heavenly dove is pleased to perch, will, in spite of them, be chosen."[9] In the sequel of this history, we shall see such monsters of iniquity elected, and by such scandalous practices, that to imagine the Holy Ghost anyways concerned in the election would be absolute blasphemy.

As for Fabianus, he seems to have been well worthy of the post to which he was raised; for the famous Bishop of Carthage, St. Cyprian, in answer to the letter, wherein the clergy of Rome gave him an account of the glorious death of their bishop, calls him "an excellent man;" and adds, that "the glory of his death had answered the purity, holiness, and integrity of his life."[7] From the pontifical of Bucherius we learn, that he appointed seven deacons over the fourteen regions or wards, into which Rome was then divided,[8] to take care of the poor, says Baronius.[9] We read in other more modern pontificals, that he named seven subdeacons to overlook the seven notaries, who are supposed

[1] Ruf. in Hier. l. 2, p. 225.
[2] Euseb. l. 6. c. 22.
[3] Aug. ep. 165.
[4] Chron. Al. p. 630.
[5] Boll. pont. p. 28—32.
[6] Opt. contr. Par. l. 2.
[7] Eutych. p. 384.
[8] Euseb. l. 6, c. 29.
[1] Oros. l. 7, c. 19.
[2] Vide Hallo. vit. Orig. p. 20.
[3] Vide Boll. Apr. t. I, p. 25.
[4] Niceph. chron.
[5] Vide Flor. p. 995—997.
[6] Card. Cus. de meth. consistorii. c. 7, p. 85.
[7] Cypr. ep. 4, et 31.
[8] Buch. cycl. 271.
[9] Bar. ad ann. 112, n. 9.

Fabianus said to have converted the Emperor Philip. Fabianus martyred in the persecution of Decius. The See vacant. The opinion of the Roman clergy concerning the lapsed. They disown the Pope's infallibility.

to have been first appointed by Pope Clement, and whose province it was to commit to writing the actions and speeches of the martyrs. It is manifest from St. Cyprian,[1] as Dr. Pearson well observes, that in the time of Cornelius, the successor of Fabianus, the Church of Rome had seven subdeacons, to whom St. Cyprian recommended the strictest exactness in marking the day of each martyr's death.[2] As for taking down their speeches, which some seem to object to, the art of writing in shorthand was well known in those times. Eusebius tells us, that by Tiro, Cicero's freedman, were first invented certain marks, which stood not only for whole words, but entire sentences.[3] But this invention is, by Dio, ascribed to Mæcenas, who ordered his freedman Aquila to make them known to all who cared to learn them.[4] Of their wonderful quickness in writing, with the help of these marks, Martial takes notice, in one of his distichs, saying, "how fast soever the tongue may run, the hand runs faster."[5]

Baronius[6] and Bollandus[7] ascribe to Fabianus the conversion of the Emperor Philip, and his son; adding, from the acts of Pontius the martyr, that he pulled down the great temple of the Romans, that he dashed to pieces their idols, and converted the whole city. What a pity that such wonderful feats should have been passed over in silence by Eusebius, and all the ancients! As for the conversion of Philip and his son, it is questioned by many, and very justly, the silence of Eusebius alone being an unanswerable evidence against it; but all agree, that if he was instructed and converted by Fabianus, he did no great honor either to his instructor or his religion. In the latter end of the year 249, the Emperor Philip being killed by the rebellious soldiery at Verona, Decius, who was raised to the empire in his room, began his reign with the most dreadful persecution that had ever yet afflicted the church. Fabianus was one of the first that fell a victim to the implacable hatred this emperor bore to the Christian name. He was put to death on the 20th of January, 250, while Decius was consul the second time, together with Gratus, after having governed the church fourteen years, one month, and ten days.[8]

[1] Cypr. ep. 37.
[2] Pears. posth. p. 19.
[3] Euseb. in chron.
[4] Dio Olymp. 193, ann. 4.
[5] Mart. l. 14.
[6] Bar. ad ann. 246, n. 9.
[7] Boll. 20 Jan. p. 253.
[8] Buch. cycl. p. 267.

[Year of Christ 250.] The death of Fabianus was followed by a vacancy, which lasted at least sixteen months, the Christians being either imprisoned, or so dispersed, that they could not assemble to choose a new bishop. During this interval, the clergy, that is, the presbyters and deacons, took upon themselves the care and administration of all ecclesiastical matters; and, being informed by Clementius, subdeacon of the church of Carthage, who came to Rome about Easter, in 250, that St. Cyprian had been obliged, by the fury of the persecution, to withdraw for a while from his see, they wrote to that clergy, exhorting them to follow their example.[1] Several excellent letters passed on this occasion between the clergy of Rome, and St. Cyprian and his clergy, especially concerning the method they were to hold with the lapsed; that is, with those who had either obtained of the pagan magistrates protections, or libels of safety, whence they were called Libellatici, or had actually sacrificed to idols, and were thence named Sacrificati. In one of these letters, the Roman clergy, after having maturely examined so material a point, and advised not only with the neighboring bishops, but with others, who, from the distant provinces, had fled for concealment to Rome, declare it was their opinion, "That such of the lapsed as were at the point of death, should, upon an unfeigned repentance, be admitted to the communion of the church, but that the cause of others should be put off till the election of a new bishop, when, together with him, with other bishops, with the priests, deacons, confessors, and laymen, who had stood firm, they should take their case into consideration;" adding, "that a crime committed by many ought not to be judged by one; and that a decree could not be binding without the consent and approbation of many."[2] Could they in more plain and express terms disown the infallibility of the pope their bishop? Could they upon mature deliberation write thus, and at the same time believe his judgment an infallible rule? Such a proposition would, in these days, be deemed heretical; and no wonder; the pope's infallibility must be maintained at all events; and to maintain it is impossible, without condemning, as heretical, the doctrine taught by the church in the first and purest ages.

[1] Cypr. ep. 3.
[2] Idem ep. 31.

The character of Cornelius by St. Cyprian. Novatian refuses to acknowledge him. St. Cyprian calls a council, which acknowledges Cornelius. Resolutions of the council of Africa concerning the lapsed.

CORNELIUS, TWENTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[DECIUS, GALLUS.]

[Year of Christ 251.] AFTER the see had been vacant for the space of sixteen months, Cornelius, a presbyter of the church of Rome, was at last elected,[1] on the 4th of June, 251, according to the most probable opinion.[2] He was, according to St. Cyprian,[3] a man of an unblemished character, and, on account of his peaceable temper, his great modesty, his integrity, and many other eminent virtues, well worthy of the dignity to which he was raised. He did not attain at once, says the same writer, to the height of the priesthood, but after he had passed through all the inferior degrees, agreeably to the discipline of the church. He was so far from using intrigues, from intruding himself by violence, as some have done, that violence was necessary to make him accept the dignity offered him. He was ordained bishop, continues St. Cyprian, by some of our colleagues, who, being then at Rome, conformed to the judgment of the whole people and clergy.[4] As Decius was still alive, who had declared, that he had rather bear with a competitor to his crown, than with a Bishop of Rome,[5] the Christians, in all likelihood, laid hold of the opportunity, which the revolt of Valens gave them, to choose a new bishop; for this very year Julius Valens revolting, caused himself to be proclaimed emperor in Rome;[6] and though he held the empire but a very short time, yet his revolt might divert Decius for a while from persecuting the Christians.

Though Cornelius was chosen by the unanimous voice of the people and clergy, yet Novatian, a presbyter of the church of Rome, who aspired to the same dignity, not only refused to acknowledge him; but having gained a considerable party among the people, five presbyters, and some confessors, he wrote in their name and his own to St. Cyprian, and no doubt to many other bishops, laying heinous crimes to the charge of Cornelius; namely, his having sued for a protection from the pagan magistrates, which was ranking him among the Libellatici, who were excluded from all dignities and employments in the church. St. Cyprian having received this letter, and at the same time one from Cornelius, acquainting him with his election, as was customary in those times among bishops, he caused the one to be read in a full assembly of the people and clergy, but suppressed the other, looking upon it as a scandalous libel.[1] However, to prevent the calumnies and false reports that might be spread abroad by Novatian and his partisans, he assembled a council of all the bishops of his province, who, hearing of the schism in the church of Rome, resolved to send thither two of their body, who should carefully inform themselves of what had passed in the late election, and on their return make a faithful report of all they had learnt. Pursuant to this resolution, Caldonius and Fortunatus, two African bishops, were despatched to Rome with letters from the council to the clergy of that city, and to the bishops who had been present at the ordination of Cornelius. The bishops no sooner received these letters than they answered them, assuring their brethren in Africa, that Cornelius had been lawfully chosen; and at the same time commending him as a person, on account of his extraordinary piety and exemplary life, most worthy of the dignity to which he had been raised. Their testimony was soon after confirmed by Caldonius and Fortunatus returning from Rome, and likewise by Stephanius and Pompeius, two African bishops, who had assisted at the ordination of Cornelius; so that he was universally acknowledged all over Africa.[2]

The African bishops no sooner acknowledged Cornelius than they acquainted him with the resolutions, which they had taken in their late council, with respect to the lapsed. The substance of these was, that such as had yielded to the fury of the persecution ought not to be abandoned, lest, giving themselves up to despair, they should fall into a total apostasy; but should be re-admitted to the union of the church upon a sincere repentance, and after a long penance: that the time of their penance should be shortened, or prolonged, according to the nature of their crimes; that is, the Libellatici should have a shorter time assigned them; and the Sacrificati, called also Thurificati, who had actually offered sacrifice, or frankincense, to idols, should not be admitted till they had expiated their offence by a very long penance; but that both the Libellatici and Sacrificati should be taken in, before the time of their penance was expired, if at the point of death, or even thought to be in danger.[3] As to fallen bishops, they were to be dealt with in the same manner; and, after due penance, or, as it is sometimes called, satisfaction, be admitted only in a lay capa-

[1] Euseb. chron. & l. 6, c. 33; Opt. l. 2; Aug. ep. 165, &c.
[2] Vide Pears. Cyp. an. p. 29, n. 6.
[3] Cypr. ep. 52.
[4] Idem ib.
[5] Idem ep. 52.
[6] Aur. Vict.

[1] Cypr. ep. 42.
[2] Idem ep. 41, 42, 45.
[3] Idem ep. 52, 54.

Novatian excommunicated. Wickedness of Novatus. He gains many to the party of Novatian. Novatian the first Anti-pope. He acquaints the other churches with his ordination.

city.[1] Cornelius did not, upon the receipt of these determinations or decrees, step into his oracular chair, and thence, as an infallible judge, condemn or approve them. Such arbitrary proceedings would not have been well relished by the bishops of Africa, nor even by his own clergy, who not long before had declared, that "a decree could not be binding without the consent and approbation of many." He therefore acted on this occasion as St. Cyprian had done, as other bishops did afterwards; that is, he assembled a council, which Eusebius calls "a great council;"[2] for it consisted of sixty bishops; and a great number of priests, deacons, and laymen, who, in those times, were admitted to all councils.[3] By this venerable assembly were the decrees of the council of Africa examined and approved, and then sent to be in like manner examined and approved by other bishops, till the whole church had agreed to them.[4]

At the council of Rome assisted, among other presbyters, Novatian: but as he maintained, in opposition to the whole assembly, that the lapsed were to be admitted upon no terms or satisfaction whatsoever, but should be left to the divine tribunal, he was himself cut off from that communion, which with an invincible obstinacy he denied to others.[5] Provoked at this sentence, he readily gave ear to the insinuations of Novatus, a presbyter of the church of Carthage, who had fled from thence to Rome, to avoid the sentence of excommunication, with which he was threatened by St. Cyprian, and the other bishops of Africa, for his scandalous doctrine, and irregular practices.[6] Pacianus paints him in the blackest colours: he stripped the orphans, says he, plundered the widows of the church of Carthage, and appropriated to himself the money belonging to the poor and the church:[7] he turned his father out of doors, and let him die of hunger in the streets, and would not even be at the trouble of burying him after his death. With a kick in the belly he made his wife miscarry, and bring forth a dead child: whence Pacianus calls him a traitor, an assassin, the murderer of his father and child.[8] As for his doctrine, he held, while at Carthage, tenets diametrically opposite to those he taught at Rome: for, at Carthage, he was for admitting to the communion of the church not only the lapsed, but all other sinners, let their crimes be ever so heinous, without any sort of penance; and, at Rome, for excluding them, let their penance be ever so long, let their repentance be ever so sincere.[9] At Carthage he found Felicissimus, of whom I shall speak hereafter, inclined to lenity; and Novatian, at Rome, to severity: and therefore, as he was a man of great vanity, and no principles, he suited himself to the different tempers of such as he judged the most capable of raising him. At Rome, by a pretence to an uncommon sanctity and severity, he gained a great many followers, and among them some confessors lately delivered out of prison, from whom he extorted letters directed to Novatian, wherein they consented to the ordination of the said Novatian. In virtue of these letters he was accordingly ordained, some say in Rome,[1] others in a neighbouring village,[2] by three bishops sent for by Novatus out of the country for that purpose, and quite unacquainted with his views. Being thus ordained bishop, he was set up by the party against Cornelius, whom they charged with relaxing the discipline of the church, and communicating with the lapsed, especially with one Trophimus. This St. Cyprian calls a false and groundless charge; for, as to Trophimus, though he was in the number of the Thurificati, that is, though he had offered frankincense to idols, and even persuaded his flock (for he was a presbyter, if not a bishop) to follow his example, yet he had sufficiently atoned for his crime, by a sincere repentance, by a long penance, and above all, by bringing back his people with him, who would not have returned without him.[3] As for the others, 'tis true, he communicated with some who had not fulfilled the time of penance assigned them, but such only as, being admitted at the point of death, had afterwards recovered; which cannot otherwise be avoided, says St. Cyprian,[4] but by killing those to whom we granted the peace of the church, when we apprehended them to be in danger. Novatian having thus, by a pretended zeal for the discipline of the church, and the artful insinuations of Novatus, seduced a great many at Rome, who styled themselves the Cathari, that is, the pure, undefiled party; he wrote in their and his own name to the other churches, acquainting them with his ordination, exhorting them not to communicate with the lapsed upon any terms, and bitterly complaining of the scandalous lenity and remissness of Cornelius.[5] At the same time Cornelius wrote to the other bishops, giving them a faithful account of all that had happened at Rome, especially of the uncanonical ordination of Novatian. However, the letters of Novatian, signed by several confessors, who were greatly respected in those days, made no small impression on Antonianus an African bishop, and Fabius bishop of Antioch,[6] but quite gained over to the party Marcianus bishop of Arles.[7] The other bishops declared all to a man for Cornelius, especially St. Cyprian, and those of his province, who,

[1] Cypr. ep. 68.
[2] Pacian. ep. 3.
[3] Theodoret. hær. fab. l. 3, c. 5.
[4] Pacian. ep. 3; Hier. vir. ill. c. 70; Cypr ep. 49.
[5] Pacian. ep. 3.
[6] Cypr. ep. 40, 49.
[7] Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.
[8] Euseb. l. 6, c. 24.
[9] Idem ib. & ep. 2.

[1] Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.
[2] Theod. l. 3, c. 5.
[3] Cypr. ep. 51.
[4] Idem ib.
[5] Euseb. l. 6, c. 45; Socrat. l. 4, c. 28; Hier. vir. ill c. 69
[6] Cypr. ep. 52; Euseb. l. 6, c. 44.
[7] Cypr. ep. 67.

Novatian's deputies rejected and excommunicated in Africa. He sends new deputies into Africa. The name of Pope anciently common to all bishops. The deputies are everywhere rejected in Africa.

being assembled in a council when the deputies of Novatian arrived, excommunicated without further examination both him and them;[1] and well they might, since they had taken so much pains to inform themselves of the lawfulness of Cornelius's election, as we have related above. The deputies, though thus rejected with scorn and disgrace by the council, did not abandon the enterprise, but proselyting from town to town, nay, from house to house, inveigled a great many, under color of communicating with the confessors.[2] St. Cyprian therefore, whose zeal was not confined within the bounds, however extensive, of Africa, Numidia, and the two Mauritanias, to withdraw this main support from the party, wrote a short but nervous letter to the confessors, deploring the fault they had committed, by consenting to the unlawful ordination of Novatian, and exhorting them to return with all speed to the catholic church.[3] Dionysius bishop of Alexandria wrote them a pathetic letter to the same purpose;[4] and these letters had at last the desired effect; but not before Novatus, who had drawn them into the schism, left Rome; which happened on the following occasion:

Novatian, being informed that the deputies he had sent into Africa were everywhere rejected and despised, resolved to send others, whom he judged, on account of their rank and authority, more capable of promoting his design.[5] The persons he pitched upon were Nicostratus, Novatus, Evaristus, Primus, and Dionysius. Of the two last I find no farther mention made in history; of Novatus I have spoken above; and as for Evaristus and Nicostratus, the former was a bishop, and is supposed to have been one of the three that ordained Novatian. Nicostratus was a deacon of the church of Rome,[6] and had been imprisoned with the two presbyters Moses and Maximus, for the confession of the faith,[7] which entitled him to a place among the confessors. To these three St. Cyprian ascribes the excellent letter, as he styles it, which the confessors of Rome wrote to those of Carthage.[8] He was likewise one of the confessors, who wrote to St. Cyprian himself, as appears from the title of that admirable letter, which runs thus: "The presbyters Moses and Maximus, the deacons Nicostratus and Ruffinus, and the other confessors, who are with them, to Pope Cyprian."[9] We may here observe, by the way, that the name of Pope, which signifies no more than *father*, was anciently common to all bishops; but was afterwards, by a special decree of Gregory VII. appropriated to the Bishop of Rome. To return to Nicostratus, the character given him by St. Cyprian and Cornelius bespeaks him quite unworthy of being joined with the others, who are named in that letter, and were all men of great piety: for he had squandered away the money belonging to the church, that was lodged in his hands, embezzled that of the widows and orphans, and defrauded a lady, who had trusted him with the management of her affairs.[1]

These new deputies met with no better a reception than the former had done: for St. Cyprian, being informed of their departure from Rome, by the confessor Augendus,[2] and soon after of their characters by the acolyte Nicephorus, both sent, for that purpose, by Cornelius,[3] he acquainted therewith the other catholic bishops, who, upon that intelligence, rejected them with the greatest indignation, as apostates and firebrands of sedition. Hereupon the deputies having, by the means and contrivance of Novatus, procured some of their party to be ordained bishops, and Nicostratus among the rest, they named them to the sees of the catholic bishops; which bred great confusion and disorder in the church, it being a difficult matter for the bishops in the distant provinces to distinguish between their lawful brethren and the intruders, and consequently to know whom they should admit to, and whom they should exclude from their communion. But against this evil a remedy was found by St. Cyprian, and the other African bishops, who, to arm him against the craft and arts of those subtle impostors, transmitted to him a list of all the catholic bishops of that province.[4]

The storm, which Novatus had raised in Rome, was laid by his departure; for he was no sooner gone, than the confessors whom he had seduced, viz., Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, and Macarius, signified to Cornelius their eager desire of quitting his party, and returning to the communion of the church. Cornelius questioned, at first, their sincerity; but, being convinced of it at last, he assembled his clergy, not caring to trust to his own judgment, in order to advise with them, in what manner he should proceed in the present case. At this council assisted, besides the Roman clergy, five bishops, who either happened to be then at Rome, or, on this occasion, had been invited thither by Cornelius. They were scarce met, when the confessors, attended by a great crowd, appeared before them, testifying, with a flood of tears, the sincerity of their repentance, and begging they would forget their past criminal conduct. The council did not think it advisable to come to any resolution, till they had acquainted the people with the request of the confessors; which they no sooner did, than the people flocked to the place, and not upbraiding, but embracing, with tears of joy, their retrieved brethren, and with the same tenderness as if they had been just then delivered out of prison, pointed out to the council the

[1] Cypr. ep. 67.
[2] Idem ep. 44.
[3] Cypr. ep. 48.
[4] Euseb. l. 6, c. 46.
[5] Idem ep. 49.
[6] Cypr. ep. 23.
[7] Idem ep. 47, 79.
[8] Idem ep. 26.
[9] Idem ep. 48, 49.
[2] Idem ep. 48.
[3] Idem ep. 49.
[4] Idem ep. 55.

The confessors return to the church. In what manner Novatian endeavoured to keep the rest steady. A schism in the church of Carthage. The persecution renewed by Gallus. Cornelius apprehended.

method they were to pursue. Accordingly Cornelius, having, with the approbation of the council, made them renounce the errors of Novatian, and acknowledge him for the only lawful Bishop of Rome, readmitted them, without further satisfaction, to the communion of the church.[1] From this account I should imagine, that those who accompanied the confessors at their first appearing before the council, were Novatians, whom they had brought back with them; but I dare not affirm it, since St. Cyprian, in his answer to Cornelius, speaks only of the four above-mentioned confessors. The confessors being thus returned, to the inexpressible joy of the whole people, Cornelius, impatient to impart the good news to St. Cyprian, wrote to him, as soon as the council broke up, to acquaint him with what had happened, and invite him to partake of the common joy, to which he had so much contributed.[2] With this letter, Nicephorus the acolyte embarked, without delay, for Africa; and thence returned soon after with an answer, wherein St. Cyprian assured Cornelius, that the return of the confessors had caused an universal joy in Africa, both for their sake, and because it might open the eyes of many, and prove in the end the ruin of the schismatic party.[3] The confessors themselves wrote to St. Cyprian, upon their return,[4] who immediately answered them;[5] and, in all likelihood, to the other chief bishops of the church; since Eusebius informs us, that Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote twice to them after their return.[6] In the mean time Novatian, seeing great numbers moved by the example of the confessors, daily fall off from his party, to keep the rest steady by the most sacred ties, used, in administering the eucharist, to hold the hands of those who received it, with the holy bread in them, between his, and oblige them to swear, "by the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," that they would never abandon him, nor return to Cornelius.[7]

As the church of Rome was rent by the schism of Novatian, so was the church of Carthage by that of Felicissimus; and as the former, upon his being excommunicated by Cornelius and the council of Rome, had recourse to St. Cyprian, in like manner the latter, being cut off from the communion of the church by St. Cyprian and the council of Carthage, had recourse to Cornelius. But as the doctrine of Felicissimus, though diametrically opposite to that of Novatian, was equally repugnant to the catholic truth, and to the discipline established in the church, as I have observed above, he was at first rejected by Cornelius, with great steadiness and resolution. But the Bishop of Rome had, at last, been frightened into a compliance, had he not been animated and encouraged by St. Cyprian; for the followers of Felicissimus having, in imitation of the Novatians, appointed one of their own faction, named Fortunatus, Bishop of Carthage, Felicissimus took upon himself to carry to Cornelius the letters of the new and third bishop of that city. Accordingly he set out for Rome, attended by a troop of seditious, desperate, and abandoned men, says St. Cyprian.[1] Cornelius rejected them at first with great firmness, and immediately acquainted St. Cyprian with what had passed; but Felicissimus threatening to read publicly the letters he had brought, if Cornelius did not receive them, and to discover many scandalous things, he was not a little intimidated. He therefore wrote a second letter to St. Cyprian, but betrayed in it a great deal of fear and weakness: however, the excellent letter which St. Cyprian wrote in answer to his, inspired him with new vigour, and kept him steady.[2]

In the mean time, Decius being killed, the persecution was carried on, or rather renewed with more fury than ever, by Gallus, his successor. As the Roman empire was, at this time, afflicted with a dreadful plague, Gallus, who, it seems, had not molested the Christians during the first months of his reign,[3] issued an order, enjoining men of all ranks and professions to offer sacrifice to the gods, hoping, by that means, to appease their wrath, and put a stop to the raging evil. It was on occasion of this plague that St. Cyprian wrote his excellent discourse on Mortality, wherein he so eloquently teaches a Christian to triumph over the fears of death, and shows with how little reason we mourn for those friends and relations who are snatched from us. Such of the Christians as refused to comply with the emperor's edict were either banished or executed. Cornelius, among the rest, was apprehended at the first breaking out of the persecution, and made a glorious confession of his faith, as appears from St. Cyprian, who, on that occasion, wrote him a letter of congratulation.[4] What happened to him afterwards is uncertain; for his Acts are evidently fabulous, though they have been received by Bede, by Ado, by Anastasius, and many others, far more considerable for their number than their authority. We read in the pontifical of Bucherius, that he was banished to Centumcellæ, now Civita Vecchia, and died of a natural death, according to the expression used there,[5] ("dormitionem accepit.") As to the title of martyr, with which he is distinguished by St. Jerom,[6] it was anciently given to all those who, for the confession of faith, died in prison, which in all likelihood happened to Cornelius.[7]

[1] Cypr. ep. 46. Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.
[2] Cypr. ep. 46.
[3] Idem ep. 47.
[4] Idem ep. 50.
[5] Idem ep. 51.
[6] Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.
[7] Idem ib.

[1] Cypr. ep. 55.
[2] Idem ib.
[3] Idem ep. 54.
[4] Idem ep. 57.
[5] Buch. p. 271.
[6] Hier. vit. Paul. p. 237.
[7] Cornelius is reckoned by St. Jerom among the ecclesiastical writers, on account of the four letters which he wrote to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, who seemed not to dislike the tenets of Novatian. (Hier. vir. ill c 66, p. 293.) He wrote several other letters, whereof two

Cornelius died on the same day of the month and the week on which St. Cyprian was martyred six years after;[1] that is, on the 14th of September, 252, according to the most probable opinion, having held the pontificate one year, three months, and ten days. His body is supposed to have been translated from Civita Vecchia to the cemetery of Callistus; for near that place Pope Leo I. is said to have built, in honour of Cornelius, a basilic or magnificent church.[2] His body was believed to be still at Rome in the end of the eighth century; for Anastasius tells us, that Pope Adrian placed it in a church, which he had built in Capracoro;[3] but it was soon after removed from thence and brought into France, by Charlemagne, as Pamelius assures us, upon the authority of a small life of St. Cyprian, written, as he supposes, by Paulus Diaconus.[1]

Eusebius observes, that, in the time of Cornelius, the church of Rome was in a most flourishing condition; for, not to mention the people, who were almost without number, it consisted of forty-six presbyters, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, lectors, and janitors or doorkeepers, and fifteen hundred widows and other poor, who were all maintained by the alms and offerings of the faithful.[2]

LUCIUS, TWENTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[Gallus, Volusianus.]

[Year of Christ 252.] Lucius was no sooner named to succeed Cornelius, than he was apprehended and sent, with many others, into banishment; for St. Cyprian wrote him a letter, in the name of his colleagues and his own, congratulating him, at the same time, on his promotion and his exile, as appears from St. Cyprian's second letter to him;[4] for his first has not reached our times. Lucius had been but a very short time in banishment, when he was recalled, to the inexpressible joy of his flock, who, it seems, crowded out to meet him.[5] On this occasion St. Cyprian wrote him a second letter, still extant,[6] wherein he testifies the joy with which the news of his return had been received by him and his brethren in Africa. He returned to Rome during the heat of the persecution; but what occasioned his return, we are nowhere told. St. Cyprian says, in his second letter to him, that he was perhaps recalled to be immolated in the sight of his flock, that they might be animated and encouraged by the example of his Christian constancy and resolution;[3] which happened accordingly; for he had not governed eight whole months, says Eusebius,[4] no, nor six, according to the most probable opinion, but only five and a few days, when he died a martyr; for that title is given him by St. Cyprian.[5] He was beheaded, say the martyrologies; but on this point the ancients are silent; and his dying in prison had given him a just claim to that title. His body is supposed to have been discovered entire, in the church of St. Cæcilia at Rome, in 1599, though the church of Roskild, in the isle of Zealand, had long before pretended to his head.[6]

are still extant among those of St. Cyprian, (Cypr. ep. 46, 48;) and some fragments of his fourth letter to Fabius have been transmitted to us by Eusebius. As for the letter to Lupicinus, Bishop of Vienna, which was found in the archives of that church, and published by Father Du Bosc, the Cardinals Baronius (Bar. ad ann. 255, n. 47) and Bona (Bona lit. l, c. 3, p. 13) think it genuine; but it is, without all doubt, supposititious: for, according to Ado and Baronius himself, (Bar. ad ann. 262, n. 58,) Florentius, whom Lupicinus is supposed to have succeeded, was raised to that see in the reign of Maximus or Gordian, about the year 240, and held it till the reign of Valerian, and about the year 258, so that in 252, when Cornelius died, Lupicinus was not yet bishop. Besides, in the title of the letter, which Baronius has suppressed, Lupicinus is styled "archbishop;" which title was not known then, nor long after. The letter is therefore rejected by Launoy, (Laun. Ger. l. 4, c. 6,) and Dr. Pearson, (Pears. Cyp. ann. p. 37,) as a forged and spurious piece. Erasmus ascribes to Cornelius the Treatise on Charity, (Eras. Cyp. p. 417;) and Du Pin both that, and the other on the public shows, with the discourse against Novatian, (Du Pin, t. 1, p. 469,) which are all to be found among St. Cyprian's works.

[1] Hier. vir ill. c. 67. [2] Flor. p. 828, 830.
[3] Anast. c. 46, p. 27. [4] Cypr. ep. 58.
[5] Idem ib. [6] Idem ep. 58.

[1] Pamel. prolog. in S. Cypr. p. 19.
There is a famous abbey, bearing his name, at Compeigne, in the Isle of France, where his relics and those of St. Cyprian are supposed to be kept in the same shrine. But how can we reconcile this with what we read in the council of Rheims, held in 1049, under Leo IX., viz., that the body of St. Cornelius was removed by the clergy of Compeigne, from that city to Rheims; and received there by the pope? (Conc. t. 9, p. 1023, 1012.) But, on the other hand, the council is contradicted by Aubertus de Mira, who assures us, that, in 860, the relics of Pope Cornelius were translated from the Abbey of Inde, standing about four miles south of Aix-la-Chapelle, to that of Rosnay, which is, at present, a collegiate church in Flanders, between Ondenarde and Tournay. In this church is still to be seen a shrine, supposed to contain, as appears from the inscription, the bones of St. Cornelius and St. Cyprian. (Vide Bolland. 12 Feb. p. 607. et Pamel. p. 23.)
[2] Euseb. l. 6, c. 43. [3] Cypr. ep. 58.
[4] Euseb. l. 7, c. 2. [5] Cypr. ep. 67.
[6] Bolland. 4 Mart. p. 301, 302.

The bishops of Gaul write to Stephen. Stephen's rash conduct. He suffers himself to be imposed upon.

STEPHEN, TWENTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[Year of Christ 253.] STEPHEN, who succeeded Lucius, in 253, soon after his election, received a letter from Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, written in the name of all his colleagues in Gaul, informing him that Marcian, Bishop of Arles, having embraced the doctrine of Novatian, had denied the communion of the church to the lapsed, even at the point of death. At the same time they wrote to St. Cyprian, and on the same subject,[1] not caring to come to any vigorous resolution against their colleague, without the advice and approbation of other bishops, especially of Rome and Carthage; the former being eminent for the dignity of his see, and the latter for his known zeal, piety, and learning. But Faustinus did not find in the Bishop of Rome the zeal he expected; and therefore he wrote a second letter to St. Cyprian, exhorting him to animate the others by his example;[2] which that zealous prelate did accordingly; for he wrote immediately to Stephen, pressing him to despatch, without delay, full and ample letters to the bishops of Gaul; that, finding themselves thus backed and supported, they might thereby be encouraged to depose Marcian, and name another in his room. It is not to be doubted but the Bishop of Carthage, who had the welfare of the church, at least, as much at heart as the Bishop of Rome, did himself what he encouraged the others to do; but I cannot positively affirm it, since his answer to Faustinus is lost. As to the issue of this affair, the ancients have left us quite in the dark.[3]

St. Cyprian did not doubt in the least but that Marcian would be deposed; for, in his letter to Stephen, he desires him to let him know the name of the person who should be chosen in his room, that he may not be at a loss to whom he should direct his letters and his brethren.[4]

Faustinus, and the other bishops of Gaul, did not apply, on this occasion, to Stephen alone, but to him, and to St. Cyprian. Why then should their applying to the Bishop of Rome be construed, as it is, by all the Roman Catholic writers, into a tacit acknowledgment of his universal jurisdiction, and not the like construction be put on their applying to the Bishop of Carthage? But, in truth, neither can bear such a construction, since the bishops of Gaul did not refer the cause of Marcian either to Stephen, or to St. Cyprian: they wrote to both only for their advice and approbation. Stephen was backward, for reasons unknown to us, in giving his; and therefore St. Cyprian, in a letter, which he wrote on this occasion, pressed him to encourage with his letters the people of Arles, and the bishops of Gaul, to depose Marcian, and appoint another in his room.[1] Was not this plainly acknowledging, not in the Bishop of Rome, but in the people and clergy, the power of deposing one bishop, and appointing another in his room?

But to return to Stephen: his rash conduct had involved the churches of Spain in endless calamities, had not St. Cyprian, and the other bishops of Africa, zealously interposed. The bishops of Spain, having judged two of their colleagues unworthy of the episcopacy, namely, Basilides of Leon and Astorga, and Martial of Merida, had disposed of their sees to others, appointing Sabinus in the room of the former, and Felix in that of the latter. They were both Libellatici, and guilty of many other crimes, for which Martial had been deposed; but Basilides, returning to himself, and conscious of his own guilt, had voluntarily resigned, declaring he should think it a great happiness to be readmitted, after due satisfaction, to the communion of the church, even in the capacity of a layman. But, ambition getting the better of all his good resolutions, he soon began to pant after his former condition; and, thinking the favour and interest of the Bishop of Rome might greatly contribute to his re-establishment, he undertook a journey to that city; and there, as St. Cyprian expresses himself, "imposed upon our colleague Stephen, who lived at a great distance, and was ignorant of the truth, seeking unjustly to be restored to his bishopric, from which he had been justly deposed."[2] Being thus admitted to the communion of the Bishop of Rome, he returned well satisfied to Spain, and there exercised all episcopal functions, as he had formerly done. St. Cyprian does not tell us, in express terms, that Martial too had recourse to Rome; but that he had, may, perhaps, be gathered from his words; for he writes, that, notwithstanding the craft and deceit Martial had used, probably in imposing upon Stephen, he had not been able to preserve his episcopacy.[3] Besides, he acted as a bishop after he had been deposed by a synod; which he would have hardly attempted, had he not been countenanced by some bishop of rank and dignity. Be that as it will, the churches of Leon, Astorga, and Merida, applied, in this their distress, to the

[1] Cypr. ep. 67. [2] Idem ib.

[3] Marcian's name is not in the list of the bishops of Arles, published by F. Mabillon: whence some modern writers have concluded, that he was actually deposed; but that list is very imperfect, the names of many bishops being wanting there, whom we certainly know to have governed that church.

[4] Cypr. ep. 67.

[1] Cypr. ep. 70. [2] Cypr. ep. 68.

[3] Idem ib.

Martial of Merida excommunicated. Appeals to Rome, no proof of the Pope's supremacy. Dispute about the baptism of heretics. Both opinions erroneous. The custom of baptizing heretics.

bishops of Africa, imploring, both by letters and deputies, their advice and assistance. The deputies were the two new bishops Felix and Sabinus; and their deputation was backed by a pressing letter from Felix, Bishop of Saragosa, whom St. Cyprian styles a propagator of the faith, and a defender of the truth.[1] These letters being read at Carthage, in a council of twenty-eight bishops, with St. Cyprian at their head, it was concluded, that Basilides and Martial ought not to be acknowledged as bishops; that it was not lawful to communicate with them; that such bishops as did, ought to be excommunicated themselves; and, finally, that their imposing upon Stephen, instead of giving them any kind of right to the sees they had forfeited by their wickedness, added to their guilt. By the same council, the election of Sabinus and Felix was confirmed, and they acknowledged by all the African bishops as their colleagues.[2]

It is surprising, that Bellarmine, Baronius, Davidius, and other advocates for the pope's supremacy, should lay so much stress as they do on the recourse to Rome of the two deposed bishops. If their recurring, or appealing, as they are pleased to style it, to the Bishop of Rome, is any proof of his being acknowledged by them for the head of the church, the appeal of the other bishops of Spain from him to St. Cyprian, and their acquiescing to his, and not to the judgment of Stephen, will be a stronger proof of St. Cyprian's being acknowledged by them for the head of the church. Had Basilides and Martial recurred not to Rome, but to Carthage; had the bishops of Spain appealed from St. Cyprian to Stephen, as they did from Stephen to St. Cyprian, and acquiesced to his judgment, no notice had been taken of the appeal of the two apostates; that only of the catholic bishops had been set forth with great pomp and flourish of words. But, as the case stands, they must be satisfied with the evidence of the apostates, and leave the catholic bishops to bear testimony for us, which we shall not misuse; we shall not build upon it the supremacy of the church of Carthage; we shall not set up St. Cyprian for a judge, to whose tribunal all appeals must be brought; in short, we shall not make him an universal judge, an universal pastor, a pope; though, to the testimony of the Spanish bishops, that of Gregory Nazianzene should be added, and I defy the champions for the see of Rome to allege one in their favor more plain and expressive: St. Cyprian, says he, "presided not only over the church of Carthage, or that of Africa, on which he reflected an extraordinary lustre, but over all the west, nay, and over all the nations of the east, of the north, and the south."[3] Had Gregory said as much of the Bishop of Rome, the passage had been employed as a corner-stone to support the pope's universal jurisdiction.

Not long after the affair of the Spanish bishops, that is, about the year 256, according to the most probable opinion, happened the famous contest about the baptism of heretics, which rent the whole church into two parties, the one headed by St. Cyprian, and the other by Stephen. St. Cyprian maintained, that baptism administered by heretics was null and invalid; and, consequently, that such as came over from them, from what sect soever they came, ought to be baptized by a catholic minister: he owned there was but one baptism, and therefore avoided the word rebaptization; but thought that heretics had not the power of conferring it. On the other hand, Stephen, and those who adhered to him, pretended, that baptism conferred by heretics, of whatever sect or persuasion, was valid; so that by avoiding one error, they fell into another; for some heretics of those times, namely, the Montanists and Marcionites, did not baptize, as is commanded by the gospel, in the name of the Three Persons; whence their baptism was declared null by two oecumenical councils, as I shall relate hereafter. I know great pains have been taken to excuse Stephen; but his own words, quoted by St. Cyprian, from his own letter to him, can, in my opinion, admit of no dispute; for he there forbids, in express terms, the baptizing of heretics, "from what heresy soever they should come.[1] And here we may observe, by the way, that the whole church erred, either at this time, or afterwards; for afterwards both opinions were condemned, and both were held at this time, by the one or the other of the two parties, into which the whole church was divided. The point in dispute had been canvassed long before, and differently settled in different provinces. The churches of Africa and Numidia had formerly admitted heretics, without baptizing or rebaptizing them; but the contrary practice was established in a council of the bishops of these two provinces, summoned about the close of the second century, by Agrippinus bishop of Carthage.[2] The same practice of baptizing heretics was followed by the churches of Cappadocia, and the other provinces of Asia, as a tradition handed down to them from the apostles' times; whence it was confirmed in a council, which was held at Iconium in Phrygia, about the year 230, and consisted of all the bishops of Cappadocia, Galatia, Cilicia, and the neighbouring provinces.[3] The same practice was approved of by another council, assembled, much about the same time, at Synnades in Phrygia.[4] The bishops of Pontus and Egypt agreed, it seems, with those of Cappadocia and Galatia; but all the other bishops, especially those of Italy, Gaul, and Spain, held the contrary opinion, and

[1] Cypr. ep. 68. [2] Idem ib.
[3] Greg. Naz. orat. 18, p. 281.

[1] Cypr. ep. 70, 73.
[2] Cypr. ep. 70, 73; Aug. bapt. l. 2, c. 7 & 8.
[3] Cypr. ep. 75. [4] Euseb. l. 7, c. 7.

St. Cyprian's famous letter to Jubaianus. His desire to live in peace and unity with those who held the opposite opinion. Stephen's pride and arrogance.

followed the opposite practice.[1] This disagreement, both in opinion and practice, had hitherto created no disturbance in the church, each bishop conforming to the custom of his particular church, as received by tradition, or settled by synods, without censuring those who disagreed with him, or being censured by them. But the question was now revived by eighteen bishops of Numidia, who wrote to a council, held at this time by St. Cyprian, to know whether they had done well in rebaptizing heretics, agreeably to the ancient practice of their respective churches. What raised this doubt now, we know not; but it is certain, the council answered, that they ought to follow the practice which they had hitherto observed.[2] The same answer was returned by St. Cyprian, to Quintus bishop of Mauritania, who had asked the same question.[3] Soon after, another council was held at Carthage, composed of seventy-one bishops, wherein the decrees of the former council, concerning the baptism of heretics, were confirmed; and besides, it was ordained, that such presbyters and deacons as had received ordination at the hands of heretics, or who, after receiving orders in the church, had fallen into heresy, should be admitted to communion only as laymen.[4] The council, by a synodal letter, acquainted Stephen with these resolutions, hoping he would approve and embrace them; but at the same time declaring, that if any bishop should think fit to reject them, and follow different opinions, agreeably to the liberty they all claimed, no breach of peace and unity should thence follow on their side.[5] With this letter St. Cyprian sent those he had written to Quintus, and to the bishops of Numidia.[6]

It was after this council, and before Stephen's answer, that St. Cyprian wrote the famous letter to Jubaianus, who was a bishop, but in what province, or of what city, we know not. Jubaianus had, by a letter, asked St. Cyprian's opinion about the baptizing of heretics; and, at the same time, sent him the copy of a letter, which he had received, wherein many reasons were alleged to prove that baptism, by whomsoever administered, not even the Marcionites excepted, ought to be deemed valid. The author of this letter inveighs bitterly against St. Cyprian, and those of his party, styling them "betrayers of the truth, and enemies to the peace and unity of the church."[7] Baronius, and likewise Pamelius, ascribe that piece to Stephen, not apprised that they must consequently own the doctrine held by Stephen to have been no less erroneous than that which was held by St. Cyprian, if the doctrine of the church be true, as I have observed above. But we have not sufficient grounds to suppose Stephen the author of it, since many besides him wrote in favor of that opinion. St. Cyprian, in answer to Jubaianus, sent him his letter to Quintus, that of the first council to the bishops of Numidia; and, moreover, wrote him a long letter with a great many arguments in favour of his opinion, and the answers to what was objected against it; especially in the letter, whereof Jubaianus had transmitted him a copy.[1] He ends his letter by a most solemn protestation of unity and charity with those who should differ from him; which is related at length by St. Jerom,[2] and likewise by St. Austin, who tells us, that he was never tired with reading over and over again those words of peace and charity, breathing nothing but the sweetest odour of that union in which the holy prelate anxiously sought to live with his brethren.[3] To this letter Jubaianus returned answer, that he had fully convinced him, and that he willingly embraced his opinion.[4] In that letter St. Cyprian seems to have mustered all the arguments that could be alleged in favor of his opinion; and therefore St. Austin has employed his third, fourth, and fifth books on baptism, in confuting them.

We have hitherto seen with how much temper, moderation, and candor, the dispute was managed on St. Cyprian's side: he determined nothing without the advice and approbation of his colleagues assembled in council; the determinations of the council he imparted to other bishops, leaving them at full liberty to embrace or reject them, and declaring, that no disagreement in opinion should occasion in him the least breach of charity. How different was the conduct of the Bishop of Rome! He condescended, indeed, to answer the synodal letter of the African bishops; but did it with that pride and arrogance that in after ages became the characteristic of his successors. He begins with the dignity of his see, and his pretended succession to St. Peter, which he takes care to put them in mind of: in the next place, he rejects their decrees with the utmost indignation, and attempts to confute the arguments alleged to support them: he then proceeds to commands and menaces, ordering St. Cyprian to quit his opinion, and threatening to cut off, from the communion of the church, all those who should presume to differ from him, and rebaptize heretics: he concludes his letter with a bitter invective against St. Cyprian, branding that great luminary of the church with the reproachful names of "false Christ, false apostle, deceitful workman."[5] Such was Pope Stephen's answer to a most respectful letter from a council of seventy-one bishops. Pompeius, Bishop of Sabrata, in the Tripolitana, hearing of this letter, and being desirous to peruse it, as he had done all the rest on the same subject, St. Cyprian, in compliance with his desire, sent him a copy of it; and a

[1] Basil. ep. 75. [2] Cypr. ep. 70. [3] Idem ep. 71. [4] Idem ep. 73. [5] Idem ep. 72. [6] Idem ib. [7] Idem ep. 73.

[1] Cypr. ep. 73. [2] Hier. in Luc. c. 9. [3] Aug. bapt. l. 4, c. 8. [4] Concil. p. 397. [5] Cypr. ep. 74; Euseb. l. 7, c. 3; Aug. bapt. l. 2, c. 7.

Stephen censured by St. Cyprian. St. Cyprian assembles a great council at Carthage. Deputies sent to Stephen. He excommunicates all who held the opposite opinion. His conduct disapproved by Dionysius.

the same time wrote him a letter, wherein he treats Stephen, upon the just provocation he had given him, with more than ordinary sharpness and acrimony, charging him with "pride and impertinence," with "self-contradiction and ignorance," with "indiscretion, obstinacy, childishness;" nay, he styles him a "favorer and abetter of heretics against the church of God."[1] St. Cyprian was more provoked at Stephen's abusive language than moved either by his authority or menaces. St. Austin supposes the opinion he held to have been false and erroneous; and yet owns that he was not obliged to yield to the authority of Stephen, nor give up the point till he was convinced by dint of reason, or by the decision of an oecumenical council.[2] However, as St. Cyprian sought nothing but truth, upon the receipt of Stephen's letter, he summoned a great council, in order to have the question canvassed anew, and examined with more care and attention. The council met accordingly, on the 1st of September, 256, consisting of eighty-five bishops, a great number of presbyters and deacons, and a considerable part of the people.[3] To this assembly were read the letter of Jubaianus to St. Cyprian, his answer to it, and Jubaianus's reply; with the letter of the former council to Stephen, and Stephen's answer to the council. These pieces being read, St. Cyprian made a short discourse, exhorting his colleagues to speak their mind freely: the words he used on this occasion alluded, without doubt, to the pride and arrogance of the Bishop of Rome; "Let none of us," says he, "set up for the bishop of bishops; let none of us presume to reduce our colleagues by a tyrannical fear to the necessity of obeying:" he concluded with protesting anew, in the most solemn manner, that he left every one the full liberty of following what opinion he liked best; and that no man should, on that score, be judged by him, or separated from his communion.[4] The discourse being finished, each bishop delivered his opinion, and St. Cyprian the last, all approving, with one consent, the baptizing of heretics. Pamelius and others count eighty-seven bishops present at the council, because Natalis of Oea spoke for the two other bishops of Libya Tripolitana, namely, Pompeius of Sabrata, and Dioga of Leptis the Great,[5] who were absent.

The third council of Carthage having thus confirmed the decrees of the two former, notwithstanding the threats and menaces of the Bishop of Rome, it was thought advisable for the peace of the church to acquaint him therewith; and at the same time to inform him more particularly of the reasons on which their opinion was grounded. Deputies were accordingly despatched to Rome for that purpose; but Stephen not only refused to see or hear them, but would not allow any of his flock to correspond with them, to supply them with the necessaries of life, or even to admit them under the same roof; excluding them not only from his communion, but from common hospitality, says Firmilian, who wrote this very year.[1] He did not stop here; but, transported with rage, or zeal, as Baronius is pleased to style it, he cut off from his communion all the bishops who had assisted at the council, and all those who held the same opinion, that is, the bishops of Africa, Numidia, Mauritania, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, and Egypt.[2] But Stephen's anathemas proved, as those of Victor had done before, *bruta fulmina*; no regard was had to them, no, not even by those of his own party; who, by continuing in communion with those whom he had cut off from his, sufficiently declared their thoughts touching his rash and unchristian conduct. This dispute, says St. Austin, occasioned no schism in the church, the bishops continuing united in charity, notwithstanding their disagreement in opinion.[3] No thanks to Stephen, who did all that lay in his power to set the bishops at variance, and involve the whole church in confusion and disorder: "The peace of Christ," continues St. Austin, "triumphed in their hearts, and put a stop to the growing schism;" not in the heart of Stephen, where rage, ambition, and envy lodged; guests incompatible with peace and charity; but in the hearts of the other bishops, who were thereby restrained from following his example. How many schisms had been prevented, had bishops in after ages trod in the footsteps of those great prelates!

Dionysius, afterwards pope, and Philemon, both then presbyters of the church of Rome, acquainted, no doubt by Stephen's direction, the great Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, with what had passed, hoping to gain him over to their party, and extort from him an approbation of Stephen's conduct: but that illustrious prelate, foreseeing and well weighing the evil consequences that might attend it, declared his sentiments with all the freedom and zeal that became a man of his rank in the church. He told them plainly, that the condemning a practice which had been established by so many councils was what he could by no means approve of; that an affair of such consequence required long and mature deliberation; and that the deciding it over hastily might raise eternal disputes, and end at last in a schism: he therefore begged Stephen, in a letter which he wrote to him on this occasion, that he would, upon reflection, alter his conduct; and in an affair upon which so much depended, take different measures from those which he had hitherto pursued.[4] As Stephen wrote to Dionysius, so did St. Cyprian to Firmilian, giving him a particular

[1] Cypr. ep. 74.
[2] Aug. de bapt. l. 1, c. 7, 18, et l. 2, c. 8, 15.
[3] Cypr. con. p. 397.
[4] Idem ib. Aug. de bapt. l. 3, c. 3.
[5] Cypr. con. p. 403.

[1] Cypr. ep. 75.
[2] Euseb. l. 7, c. 5.
[3] Aug. bapt. l. 5, c. 25.
[4] Euseb. l. 7, c. 5.

Stephen severely censured by Firmilian. He dies, but not a Martyr. His Acts fabulous. His relics. Dionysius of Alexandria interposes in the famous dispute. Peace restored to the church by his means.

and candid account both of Stephen's conduct and his own. Firmilian was Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and one of the most eminent prelates at that time in the church both for piety and learning: he had a singular veneration for St. Cyprian, maintained with great zeal the same cause, and consequently had been equally ill-used and excommunicated by Stephen. He therefore received with extraordinary joy the letter, which St. Cyprian sent him by Rogatian, one of his deacons, often read it with great satisfaction,[1] and answered it with a long letter,[2] which is still extant, though St. Cyprian's to him has been lost long since. In this letter Firmilian, amazed and provoked at Stephen's unaccountable conduct, expresses his detestation of it in sharper terms than the laws of charity can well allow; for, not content to charge him with sacrificing the peace of the church to a petulent humour, he compares him to Judas, and stigmatizes him with the epithets of inhuman, audacious, insolent, wicked, impious schismatic; for "he is a true schismatic," says Firmilian, "who departs from the unity of the church, which thou hast done, O Stephen; for, by attempting to separate others from thee, thou hast separated thyself from all other churches. How much sin hast thou heaped upon thyself by cutting thyself off from so many flocks!"[3] Firmilian's letter was translated into Latin by St. Cyprian himself, as is manifest from the style. It was unknown, it seems, to St. Austin; for he never quotes it, nor, in confuting the opinion of St. Cyprian, takes any notice of some reasons alleged in that letter to support it.

There was no hope of seeing an end put to this dispute, so long as Stephen lived; but he dying, his successor, who was a man of a quite different temper, laid the storm, which his furious and ungovernable passion had raised. He died on the 2d of August, 257, according to the most probable opinion.[4] The Church of Rome, upon the authority of his Acts, ranks him among the martyrs; but that honor is not paid him either by St. Austin, or by Vincentius Lirinensis, who, naming him together with St. Cyprian, as they often do, give constantly the title of Martyr to the latter, and never to the former. As for his Acts, they flatly contradict, in several points, the most unexceptionable writers among the ancients,[1] and therefore by no means deserve the credit which Baronius would have us give them.[2] Even Anastasius seems to have made no account of them, if in his time they were yet composed, which may be questioned; for the account he gives us of Stephen's death differs widely from that which we read in those Acts.[3] But he had made a bold attempt towards extending the power and authority of the see of Rome, and therefore was to be placed among the saints for the encouragement of others. To say he had merited that honour by his virtues, either as a Christian or a bishop, had been carrying the imposture too far: the only means therefore left of making him a saint, was to make him a martyr, that, by his glorious death, he might be thought to have deserved what it was manifest from the records of those times he had not deserved by his Christian life. Hence Acts were forged, setting forth his heroic confession of the faith before the emperor, his sufferings on that account, the stupendous miracles he wrought, &c., which, however incredible, might, in process of time, by their antiquity alone, gain credit with the greater part of mankind. Stephen was buried in the cemetery of Callistus;[4] whence his body was translated about the year 762, by Paul I., to a monastery of Greek monks, which that pope had built in Rome, as we read in Anastasius.[5] How it got from thence to Trani in Apulia, nobody knows; but from that city it was conveyed with great pomp in 1782, to Pisa in Tuscany, where it is still worshipped in a church bearing the pretended saint's name.[6] According to the most probable opinion, Stephen governed four years, and about six months.

[1] Cypr. ep. 75.
[2] Idem ib.
[3] Idem ib.
[4] Buch. cycl. p. 297.

SIXTUS II., TWENTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[Valerian, Gallienus.]

Year of Christ 257.] Stephen being dead, Sixtus or Xystus II., a deacon of the church of Rome, was chosen to succeed him. As the late dispute was not yet ended, Dionysius bishop of Alexandria no sooner heard of his promotion, than he began to press him with great earnestness to relinquish the wild pretensions of his predecessor, and concur with the other bishops in restoring peace and tranquillity to the church.[7] He wrote three letters to him on the same subject, whereof the last was from Dionysius and the whole church of Alexandria, to Sixtus and the whole church of Rome.[8] He wrote likewise to Dionysius and Philemon, two presbyters of the church of Rome, whom we have men-

[1] Pears. annal. Cypr. p. 57, 58.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 259.
[3] Anast. in vit. Vict.
[4] Buch. cycl. p. 267.
[5] Anast. c. 95.
[6] Roll. Pont. p. 36.
[7] Euseb. l. 7, c. 5, 9.
[8] Idem c. 9.

Valerian persecutes the church. Sixtus martyred. The see vacant almost a whole year. Dionysius's charity to the distressed Christians of Cæsarea.

tioned above, and who upon Stephen's death seem to have abandoned his party; for Dionysius of Alexandria, in his first letter to Sixtus, writes, that these two presbyters had been formerly of Stephen's opinion[1]—a plain indication that they were not then. The Bishop of Alexandria had at last the satisfaction to see his pious endeavours crowned with success; for we find no farther mention made of this dispute till it was revived by the Donatists. In what manner it ended, we are nowhere told; but it is manifest, from the writers of those times, that the African and Asiatic bishops continued the same practice of baptizing heretics, till it was condemned by the two great councils, of Arles in 314, and of Nice in 325.[2] Whence we may well conclude, that the terms proposed at the beginning of the dispute by Dionysius and St. Cyprian were agreed to by Sixtus, namely, that no restraint should be laid on the bishops of either side, but that every one should be allowed to follow undisturbed which of the two opinions he thought most agreeable to the Scriptures and to reason. This was allowing the bishops to consult the Scriptures, and make use of their own reason, in a point already judged and decided by the Bishop of Rome. But the successors of Sixtus have not been so complaisant; for they pretend, that a blind faith ought to be yielded to all their decisions as infallibly true, a blind obedience to all their decrees as unquestionably holy.

But now the persecution, which had begun some months before the decease of Stephen, raged with more violence than ever: for Valerian having, at the instigation of an Egyptian magician, changed the kindness he once had for the Christians into an implacable hatred, he ordered, by a rescript to the senate, all bishops, priests, and deacons, to be carefully sought for, and executed without mercy.[1] Pursuant to this order, Sixtus, who among the first fell into the hands of the persecutors, was immediately either beheaded, as we read in the pontifical of Bucherius;[2] or crucified, as we are told by Prudentius;[3] having held the chair only eleven months and some days. Pontius, a deacon of the church of Carthage, styles him a good and pacific prelate,[4] no doubt on account of his conduct quite opposite to that of his ambitious and quarrelsome predecessor.[5]

[1] Euseb. l. 7, c. 5.
[2] Cypr. ep. 77; Basil. can. 47, et ep. 9, conc. Arel. can. 8.
[3] Basil. ep. 220, et de Sp. Sanct. c. 29; Euseb. l. 7, c. 7; Athan. de syn. ep. 918.

DIONYSIUS, TWENTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[GALLIENUS, CLAUDIUS II.]

[Year of Christ 258.] SIXTUS being dead, and the Christians prevented by the persecution from assembling to choose another in his room, the see remained vacant almost a whole year, that is, from the 6th of August, 258, to the 22d of July, 259, when Dionysius, a presbyter of the church of Rome, whom we have mentioned above, was elected, to the great satisfaction of the faithful; for he was one of the most eminent men of his time both for piety and learning.[3] During his pontificate, the Goths broke into the empire, overran all Asia Minor, and, having almost utterly destroyed the city of Cæsarea, they carried with them into captivity most of its Christian inhabitants. Firmilian was then bishop of the place, who had censured the conduct of Stephen with so much sharpness and acrimony; but the remembrance of what had passed on that unhappy occasion had not that effect on Dionysius, which far less provocations have had on many of his successors; for he no sooner heard of the distress that church was in, than, laying hold of so favorable an opportunity to exert his charity, he wrote a letter to comfort them in their calamity, and at the same time despatched proper persons with large collections to ransom the Christians who had fallen into the hands of the barbarians.[6] The letter, which Dionysius wrote on this occasion, was carefully kept in the archives of the church of Cæsarea, as an authentic monument of his goodness and charity.[7] The great Dionysius bishop of Alexandria having, at this time, composed a learned treatise to prove against Sabellius the distinction of the divine persons, some over-zealous Catholics, misconstruing several passages in that work, and concluding that he had run into the opposite error, accused him

[1] Cypr. ep. 82.
[2] Buch. p. 268.
[3] Prud. de coron. martyr. p. 71.
[4] Pont. in vit. S. Cypr. p. 8.
[5] Ruffinus published, under the name of Sixtus bishop of Rome, the book of a Pythagorean philosopher, named Sixtus. St. Jerom reproaches him in two places with that imposture, as he styles it, supposing him to have known the work, which he ascribed to Pope Sixtus, not to be his. (Ep. ad Ctesiph. contr. Pelag. c. 22, et in cap. 18, Ezech.) St. Austin was imposed upon among the rest; for, in his treatise of Nature and Grace, he quotes that book as the work of Pope Sixtus; but he afterwards owned and corrected his mistake. (Aug. l. 2, retract. c. 42.) It was ranked by Pope Gelasius among the books of heretics; so that he supposed it to have been written by a Christian, which was more than he could know, there not being a single word in it whence we can argue the author to have believed in, or to have had any knowledge of Christ: and it is on this consideration that it has been thought unworthy of a bishop of those times.
[6] Basil. ep. 220.
[7] Idem ib.

Dionysius of Alexandria accused at Rome. That argues no jurisdiction in the Bishop of Rome. Paul, Bishop of Antioch, deposed without the knowledge of the Bishop of Rome. Keeps possession of the bishop's habitation.

to the Bishop of Rome, as if he denied the Son to be consubstantial with the Father.[1] Hereupon the Bishop of Rome, having assembled a council, acquainted Dionysius with the sentiments of the other bishops, and his own, expressing his concern, that the divinity of the Word should have been questioned by him, and at the same time desiring him to answer the accusation.[2] This Dionysius readily did in four books, which he styled Confutation and Apology; showing therein that his opinion was very different from what it had been represented at Rome, and explaining those passages which had given ground for the accusation. This work he addressed to the Bishop of Rome.[3] Here Baronius exults. Behold, says he, one of the most eminent prelates of the church, upon suspicion of heresy, arraigned at Rome, judged at Rome. Who does not see a supreme tribunal erected there, to which all causes must be brought; a sovereign judge residing there, by whom all persons must be absolved or condemned; is either blind and cannot see, or shuts his eyes and will not see.[4] And does not the sharp-sighted annalist himself see what every one the least conversant in ecclesiastical history must see, if he is not either blind and cannot, or shuts his eyes and will not see, namely, bishops, when guilty, or only suspected of heresy, accused to some of their colleagues, who neither had nor claimed any jurisdiction over them? Thus was the famous Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, at this very time, accused by his whole church, first to Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, and soon after to Firmilian bishop of Cæsarea.[5] That such an accusation argued any jurisdiction in those bishops over the Bishop of Antioch, is what Baronius himself dares not affirm; and yet a like accusation brought to Rome is enough for him to transform that see into a supreme tribunal; that bishop, though far from such ambitious thoughts, into a sovereign judge. But the Bishop of Rome, says Baronius, required of Dionysius a confession or declaration of his faith: and does not that argue superiority and jurisdiction? Baronius himself knew it does not: for it is impossible he should not know, that when a bishop was suspected of heresy, all his colleagues had a right to require of him a confession of his faith, and not to communicate with him till they had received it.

In the time of Dionysius was held the famous council of Antioch, which condemned and deposed Paul bishop of that city, who denied the distinction of the Divine Persons, and the divinity of Christ. Of the deposition of Paul, and the election of Damnus, who was placed in his room, notice was immediately given to the whole church, by a synodal letter addressed to Dionysius bishop of Rome, and to Maximus, who had succeeded the great Dionysius in the see of Alexandria.[1] And here it will not be foreign to my purpose to observe, that the Bishop of Antioch was summoned to appear before the council, and not at the supreme tribunal erected by Baronius at Rome; that he was condemned and deposed without the consent or concurrence, nay, and without the knowledge of the sovereign judge residing at Rome; that he did not appeal to him, which he certainly would have done, as he was a man of unparalleled impudence and ambition, had such a custom obtained in those days; and lastly, that the fathers of the council wrote to the Bishop of Rome in the same manner as they did to other bishops, letting him know, that for the future he was to communicate with Damnus, and not with Paul. All this is manifest from the account which St. Basil gives us of that council.[2] And yet Baronius brings in that father, even on this occasion, as an evidence for the papal supremacy.[3]

From St. Basil, Baronius runs to the Emperor Aurelian, begging of a Pagan prince what he could not extort from a catholic bishop, a declaration and acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy. The reader must know, that Paul having kept, by force, possession of the bishop's habitation in defiance of the council, the catholic bishops had recourse to the emperor, who, after hearing both parties with great attention, adjudged the house to him, who should be acknowledged by the Bishop of Rome and the other bishops of Italy.[4] This Baronius interprets as an open acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy; and that his readers may not overlook it, as most of them would be apt to do,

[1] Athan. pro sent. Dion. Alex. p. 558.
[2] Idem. ib. et de syn. 918, 919.
[3] Athan. ib. p. 558, 559.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 263, n. 50.
[5] Euseb. l. 7 c. 27.

[1] Euseb. l. 7, c. 30.
[2] Basil. de synod.
[3] For by wrong pointing a passage in the Latin translation of that author, he makes him contradict himself, and ascribe the deposing of Paul to Dionysius bishop of Rome, and the great Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, though the latter was dead before Paul was deposed, as is evident from the letter which was written by the council on that occasion, and is addressed to Maximus the successor of Dionysius in the see of Alexandria, (Euseb. l. 7, c. 30.) The passage runs thus: *Duo enim Dionysii diu ante eos septuaginta fuere, qui Samosatensem sustulere, quorum alter Romæ, alter Alexandriæ Præsul erat.* (Basil. de syn. p. 918.) The meaning of St. Basil is, that the two Dionysius's flourished before the council of Antioch, which consisted of seventy bishops, and deposed Paul of Zamosata; that is, before the second council that was assembled against him; for another had been convened in the same city about eight years before to depose him; but upon his pretending to renounce his errors, the sentence had been suspended. The above-quoted passage Baronius stops thus: *Duo enim Dionysii diu ante eos septuaginta fuere; qui Samosatensem deposuere, &c.*, so that the relative *qui* refers, according to this method of pointing, to the two Dionysius's, and not to the seventy bishops: as if St. Basil had said, "The two Dionysius's, who deposed Paul of Samosata, flourished before the council of Antioch, which was composed of seventy bishops." (Bar. ad ann. 265, n. 10.) So that Paul must be twice deposed, St. Basil must contradict himself, all the writers of those times must be arraigned as guilty of an unpardonable omission, lest the Bishop of Rome should appear to have been, what he really was, an idle spectator of a transaction so famous in the history of the church. A writer of any honor or honesty had rather give up a cause, than expose himself thus by attempting to defend it.
[4] Euseb. l. 7, c. 24.

The emperor's sentence whether favourable to the pretensions of the see of Rome. Dionysius dies not a Martyr. Felix dies a Martyr in the persecution of Aurelian. Eutychianus not martyred.

he takes care to bespeak their attention, by marking it in the margin with the following words in capitals, "The Emperor Aurelian acknowledges the supremacy of the Church of Rome."[1] From this one would expect to find Aurelian not only turned Christian, but prostrate at his Holiness's feet, and bowing down to kiss them: but our annalist, to the great disappointment of his readers, after having thus raised their attention, only repeats out of Eusebius the sentence pronounced by the emperor, which he would have us suppose with him to have been owing to the knowledge that prince had of the pope's supremacy. And why must the pope's supremacy be brought in here rather than the supremacy of the bishops of Ravenna, of Milan, of Aquileia, &c., and, above all, the supremacy of the collective body of the Italian bishops? for to them, and not to any particular bishop, the cause was referred by the emperor. As for the emperor's conduct on this occasion, it may be thus accounted for: that just and wise prince observed the bishops in the east greatly animated against Paul; and therefore apprehending them more swayed by passion and prejudice than by justice and equity, he referred the cause to the bishops of Italy, who, he thought, would judge more impartially, as being placed at a distance, and not engaged, at least not so warmly, in the dispute.[1] But this happened two years after the death of Dionysius; for he died on the 26th of December, 269. Claudius and Paternus being consuls, after having governed the church of Rome for the space of ten years, five months, and four days, according to the most probable opinion.[2] As he died in the reign of Claudius II., surnamed the Gothic, who is represented in the Acts of some pretended martyrs as an implacable enemy to the Christian name, he is in some martyrologies honored with the title of Martyr; but as neither Eusebius, nor any other ancient writer, takes notice of that prince's having ever persecuted or molested the Christians, those Acts ought to be looked upon as fabulous, and Dionysius, with three hundred and seventy-five more, expunged out of the catalogue of martyrs; though some of them, namely, Marcus, Priscus, Valentine, and Quirinus, are honored by the Church of Rome as saints of the first class, and have filled with their relics most of the provinces of Europe.

FELIX, TWENTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CLAUDIUS II., AURELIAN.]

[Year of Christ 269.] DIONYSIUS was succeeded by Felix, in whose times a furious persecution being raised by Aurelian, he may be supposed to have suffered among the rest, since he is distinguished by the council of Ephesus,[2] by St. Cyril,[3] and by Vincentius Lirinensis,[4] with the title of Martyr. He presided, according to Eusebius,[5] Syncellus,[6] and Eutychius,[7] five years, to which Baronius adds eleven months and twenty-five days.[8] He wrote a letter addressed to Maximus bishop of Alexandria, which is quoted by Cyril, and the council of Ephesus.[3] The Acts of the Martyrs, who are supposed to have suffered under Aurelian, are without all doubt suppositious; for in them frequent mention is made of the emperor's son, whereas the writers of those times tell us in express terms, that he had a daughter, but no male issue.[4]

EUTYCHIANUS, TWENTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[AURELIAN, TACITUS, PROBUS, CARUS.]

[Year of Christ 275.] FELIX being dead, Eutychianus was chosen in his room in the very beginning of the year 275.[9] Several things are said of him by Anastasius and other writers of no authority; but all I can learn of the ancients concerning him is, that he governed eight years and eleven months;[5] and consequently died in the close of the year 283. He is honored by the Church of Rome as a martyr, and is said in the Roman mar-

[1] Bar. ad ann. 272, n. 18.
[2] Conc. t. 3, p. 511.
[3] Cyr. ib.
[4] Vin. Lirin. c. 42.
[5] Euseb. l. 7, c. 32.
[6] Sync. p. 385.
[7] Eutych. p. 400.
[8] Buch. 272.
[9] Euseb. l. 7, c. 32; Buch. p. 272.

[1] Vide Du Pin de antiq. ecc. discip. dissert. 2, p. 156.
[2] Buch. p. 272.
[3] Conc. t. 3, p. 511, 851.
[4] Aur. vit. p. 223.
[5] Buch. p. 272.

Caius not a Martyr, though honoured as a Martyr. The Church of Rome, why so fond of Martyrs. Marcellinus unjustly aspersed by the Church of Rome.

tyrology to have suffered under Numerian; but it is certain that in 283, when Eutychianus died, Numerian was not emperor, but only Cæsar, and at that very time engaged with his father, Carus, in a war with the Persians in the east, where he was assassinated by Aper, his father-in-law. As for his brother, Carinus, who remained in the west, neither he, nor the two preceding emperors, Tacitus and Probus, ever gave the least disturbance to the Christians; so that the Church of Rome must be at the trouble of finding out a distinct place in heaven from that of the martyrs for Eutychianus, Trophimus, Sabbacius, and the illustrious senator Dorymedon, who are supposed to have suffered under those princes.

CAIUS, TWENTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CARUS, CARINUS, NUMERIAN, DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN.]

[Year of Christ 283.] As little is said by the ancients of Caius as is said of his predecessor. A few days after the death of Eutychianus, Caius was chosen to succeed him, Carus and Carinus being consuls.[1] He presided twelve years, four months, and seven days; that is, from the 17th of December, 283, to the 22d of April, 296. Caius too is counted by the Church of Rome among her martyrs, upon the authority of Bede, and of the Acts of St. Susanna, by which that writer seems to have been misled. In those Acts, Caius is said to have suffered with Susanna, his niece, and many others, under Numerian: but that prince in his father's lifetime had no great power, being only Cæsar, and very young, and was killed on his march out of Persia soon after his father's death; so that he never reigned in the west, and but a very short time in the east. Caius therefore could not suffer under him at Rome, where his elder brother Carinus governed. But the vulgar have a particular veneration for martyrs, and, what turns to a very good account, are glad to purchase their relics at any rate. The Church of Rome, therefore, to provide herself with great store of them, has multiplied beyond belief the number of her martyrs; which she could not well do without multiplying at the same time the number of the persecutors of the Christian religion. And hence it is that several princes, who never molested, nay, who greatly favored the Christians, have been by the Church of Rome transformed in her martyrologies and legends into persecutors. As for the Acts of the supposed St. Susanna, they are full of mistakes and absurdities, and contradict the best historians of those times.

MARCELLINUS, TWENTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, GALERIUS.]

[Year of Christ 296.] MARCELLINUS succeeded Caius on the 30th of June, 296, and governed eight years, three months, and twenty-five days, according to the most ancient records:[2] so that he must have died on the 24th of October, 304. The love of truth, which an historian ought never to swerve from, obliges me to undertake the defence of this pope against the Church of Rome herself, and most of her divines, who, joining the Donatists of Africa, have endeavoured to blacken his memory with aspersions equally wicked and groundless. For the Church of Rome tells us, both in her Breviary and Martyrology, and her divines must chime in with her, that Marcellinus being apprehended during the persecution of Diocesian, he was persuaded by that prince to deliver up the Holy Scripture to be burnt by the pagans, agreeably to a late edict, and at the same time to offer incense to the gods. This they found on the Acts of the council of Sinuessa, which is supposed to have been summoned on that occasion, and before which Marcellinus is said to have been convicted by seventy-two witnesses of the above-mentioned crimes. That such a scandalous story, invented by the Donatists of Africa, as St. Austin affirms,[1] should not only have been credited, but industriously propagated, by the successors of Marcellinus, must seem very strange and surprising to those who recollect with how much zeal they have strove on other occasions to conceal or excuse the least imperfections in their predecessors. If, therefore, they not only readily own the apostasy of Marcellinus, but are the first to divulge it, and take care to make it known in the Breviary to those who

[1] Buch. p. 272. [2] Buch. cycl. p. 272.

[1] Aug. de bapt. c. 10.

Their view therein. Marcellinus commended by the ancients. The Acts of the council of Sinuessa fabulous. No such council ever held. The many absurdities contained in the Acts of that council.

scarce know any thing else, we may be well assured there is a snake hid in the grass; the more as it is certain almost beyond doubt, that no such council was ever held; and consequently that the Acts upon which alone that apostasy is founded, are supposititious. To unravel the whole, the reader must know, that the fall of Marcellinus made such a noise in the church, as we read in those Acts, that immediately a grand council met, composed of no fewer than three hundred bishops. Before this council Marcellinus appeared; but, at his first appearance, the bishops, struck with horror at the very thought of judging the head of the church, the judge of all, cried out with one voice, "The first see is to be judged by nobody: accuse yourself, judge yourself, condemn yourself." To this testimony, so favourable to the ambitious views of the bishops of Rome, is entirely owing the sanction which they have given to such fables, highly injurious to the memory of one of their best predecessors. Without this lenitive, the Acts of the pretended council of Sinuessa, supposing the apostasy of a pope, had been condemned; the absurdities and contradictions, which it is wholly made up of, had been set forth in a proper light; and the testimonies of Theodoret and St. Austin had been alleged to vindicate the character of Marcellinus: for of these two writers the former tells us, that he acquired great glory by his conduct during the persecution;[1] and the latter, in writing against Petilian, the Donatist, has the following words: "Why should I answer the calumnies with which he loads the bishops of Rome? Why should I clear them from the crimes which he lays to their charge? Marcellinus, and his presbyters Melchiades, Marcellus, and Sylvester, are accused by him as if they had delivered up the sacred books, and offered incense to the gods: are they therefore to be thought guilty? Does he prove what he advances against them? He brands them with the epithet of wicked and sacrilegious; but I say they are innocent: And why should I produce reasons to support my defence, since he brings none to make good his charge?"[2] But a solemn declaration that the see of Rome "is to be judged by nobody," made in those early times, by three hundred bishops, carries with it such marks of truth, as quite invalidate the testimonies of Theodoret and St. Austin, and render the apostasy of Marcellinus, which gave room to that declaration, undeniable! St. Austin looks upon the apostasy of Marcellinus, and his presbyters Melchiades, Marcellus, and Sylvester, who were all afterwards bishops of Rome, as a mere calumny, as an invention of the Donatists; but their successors, trampling upon all authority that stands in the way of their ambition, choose rather to have four of their predecessors thought apostates and idolaters, than part with the decree of that pretended council, exalting them so high above all other bishops.

If Marcellinus acquired great glory during the persecution, as Theodoret assures us; if his apostasy was a mere calumny, broached by the Donatists, as we read in St. Austin; the pretended council of Sinuessa must be given up, since it is supposed to have been assembled on occasion of Marcellinus's fall: but, abstracting from the fall of Marcellinus, the circumstances attending that council are in themselves so absurd and incredible, that there needs no other argument to convince a man, who has any understanding, and dares to use it, that no such council ever was, or could be held. For who can conceive it possible, that, during the most cruel persecution the church ever suffered, three hundred bishops should assemble, not in Rome, where they might more easily have met unobserved, but in a small country town, where a much less numerous assembly must immediately have been observed and suspected? But, after the death of Fabianus, says Baronius,[1] the clergy of Rome, and the bishops, met to choose him a successor, notwithstanding the persecution that raged then. He ought to have said *some* bishops, as St. Cyprian does,[2] whom he quotes; but I shall say so for him, that his argument may appear in its full strength, and save me the trouble of answering it; for it will then run thus: Some bishops, perhaps fifteen or twenty, met unobserved in the great and populous city of Rome: *ergo*, three hundred might meet unobserved in a small country town; for such was Sinuessa.

This council is supposed to have been held in a grotto, or cave, where there was no room but for fifty at a time; and yet they are all said to have been present when Marcellinus owned his crime, and divested himself of his dignity. And what a despicable figure does he make on that occasion! At first he denies the charge; but, being convicted by seventy-two eye-witnesses, he owns it at last, but in terms more becoming a school-boy, trembling at the sight of a rod, than a penitent bishop, before so grave an assembly. But the most remarkable passage in that piece is the dispute between Urbanus high-pontiff of Jupiter, and Marcellinus high-pontiff of the Christians. Urbanus, to convince his fellow-pontiff that he ought not to scruple offering incense to Jupiter, alleges the example of the magi offering incense to Christ. Marcellinus answers, that the offering of incense on that occasion was mysterious; and unravels the mystery. Hereupon Urbanus, unacquainted with mysteries, appeals to the judgment of the emperors Diocletian and Maximian; to this appeal Marcellinus agrees; and the controversy is referred by both pontiffs to be decided by the two emperors. They, no doubt,

[1] Theod. l. 1, c. 2, p. 524.
[2] Aug. in Pet. c. 16, t. 7, p. 87.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 303, n. 102, 105.
[2] Cypr. ep. 31.

Marcellinus falsely supposed to have died a Martyr. Vacancy of three years. Marcellinus and Marcellus confounded by some writers; but distinguished by others.

gave sentence in favour of Jupiter and Urbanus; and then Dioclesian, taking Marcellinus with him into the temple of Vesta, persuaded him there to offer incense to Jupiter, Hercules, and Saturn. How these three deities came to have a place in the temple of Vesta, the compiler of these Acts alone knows. Such are the absurdities and contradictions, of which that piece is wholly made up. But it flatters the ambition of the successors of Marcellinus; on occasion of his fall it exalts the see of Rome above all other sees: its authority therefore must not be called in question: all the absurdities and contradictions it contains must be blindly believed; the memory of Marcellinus most unjustly slandered; the testimonies of Theodoret, and St. Austin, clearing him from all guilt, disregarded and rejected. And may not this be interpreted as a tacit declaration, that they had rather he had been guilty than innocent, provided his guilt could anyways contribute to the aggrandizing of their see? What can we think their ambition will spare, since they have thus sacrificed to it the character of one of their predecessors, whose memory is revered by all antiquity? The Church of Rome honours Marcellinus as a saint; and, notwithstanding his pretended apostasy, allows him a place amongst her martyrs; probably by way of reparation for the injustice done him. But his martyrdom may be justly questioned; at least it seems to have been utterly unknown to St. Austin, who flourished not long after his time, since he never mentions it, though it would have afforded him the strongest argument he could possibly use to silence the Donatists. His martyrdom, it is true, is vouched by Bede, who tells us, that he was beheaded at Rome, by Dioclesian's order; but that historian is often led into gross mistakes by a pontifical, supposed to have been written in the sixth century, which he frequently copies, with all its anachronisms and other faults.

That, upon the death of Marcellinus, there happened a vacancy of some years, seems undeniable, since it is marked in the pontificals, even in that of Bucherius,[1] and mentioned by all those who, till Baronius's time, have written the history of the popes: but what at this time should occasion a vacancy at least of three years, is what I will not take upon me to account for: the persecution lasted but two years in Italy, according to Eusebius,[2] which expired soon after the death of Marcellinus: some pretend that it raged there so long as Galerius was master of that country. Be that as it will, it is certain, that Maxentius usurped the empire in 306, and that he not only favoured the Christians, but pretended to be of the same religion himself; and yet the see remained vacant, according to the pontifical of Bucherius,[3] till the tenth consulate of Maximian Hercules, and the seventh of Maximian Galerius, that is, till the year 308. Baronius indeed admits of no vacancy; but, in opposition to all those who have written before him, places the election of Marcellus immediately after the decease of his predecessor Marcellinus.[4] This I should readily agree to, but for the authority of the above-mentioned pontifical, which had not yet appeared in Baronius's time, and is thought to have been written about the year 354. As for the Chronicle of Eusebius, it can be here of no weight on the one side or the other, since Marcellus is there quite left out; and his successor Melchiades is said to have died before Constantine made himself master of Rome; whereas it is certain, that, under Melchiades, a council was held at Rome, by that prince's order, as we shall see hereafter.

MARCELLUS, TWENTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, GALERIUS, CONSTANTINE.]

[Year of Christ 308.] UPON the death of Marcellinus, the see remained vacant somewhat above three years and a half; that is, from the 24th of October, 304, to the 19th of May, 308, when Marcellus was chosen in his room. Thus, says the pontifical of Bucherius, where, instead of seven years, which is a mistake of the transcribers, as is manifest from the consulships marked there, we must read three.[1] The similitude of the two names has misled some writers to confound Marcellinus with Marcellus; for Eusebius as well as St. Jerom only mention the former; and Theodoret, omitting both Marcellus and Eusebius, who succeeded him, names Melchiades as the immediate successor of Marcellinus;[5] which has made Dr. Pearson doubt, whether Marcellus was ever Bishop of Rome.[6] But Marcellinus and Marcellus are evidently distinguished in the pontifical of Bucherius, by the different times in which they governed, and the different consuls under whom their government began and ended.[7] They are, besides, distinguished both by Optatus

[1] Buch. p. 272.

[1] Buch. p. 272.
[2] Euseb. l. 8, c. 14.
[3] Buch. ib.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 304, n. 26, 27.
[5] Theod. l. 1, c. 2.
[6] Pears. post, 109.
[7] Buch. p. 272.

Marcellus is banished. His Acts are fabulous. His relics. Eusebius defends the discipline of the church, and is banished. Constantine converted to the Christian religion. His edicts in favour of the Christians.

Milevitanus,[1] and St. Austin,[2] who speaks of Marcellus, not only as a presbyter of the Church of Rome, but as bishop of that see. To these testimonies I may add the epitaph of Marcellus by Pope Damasus, supposing him to have been Bishop of Rome.[3] Damasus flourished about the year 366. Many things are said of Marcellus; but they are all founded either on his Acts, or the modern pontificals, and consequently have no foundation at all. Pope Damasus, in his epitaph, tells us, that his steadiness in keeping up the discipline of the church, and obliging such as had fallen, during the persecution, to give due satisfaction, stirred up against him a general hatred, which, not confined to private disputes and invectives, ended in tumults, bloodshed, and murders.[4] Damasus adds, that "the crime of one, who had renounced the faith, while the church enjoyed a profound peace, induced the tyrant Maxentius to send Marcellus into banishment." But of these transactions the ancients either have not thought fit to give us a more particular account, or, if they did, their writings have not reached our times. Marcellus died on the 16th of January, 310, having held the pontificate one year, seven months, and twenty days;[1] but whether he died in banishment, or was recalled to Rome, is uncertain. The Church of Rome, upon the authority of his fabulous Acts, has added him, with many others, to the number of her martyrs: but Maxentius, who reigned at Rome during his pontificate, and under whom he is said to have suffered, had no sooner made himself master of that city, than he put an end to the persecution, as we are told, in express terms, by Eusebius.[2] He is said to have been buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, on the Salarian way:[3] but his body, like the bodies of most other saints, is now worshipped in several places; viz., in a church, bearing his name, at Rome; in the Abbey of Omont in Hainault, not far from Maubeuge; at Cluni, in a parish church of the diocese of Elne in Roussillon,[4] &c.

EUSEBIUS, THIRTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LICINIUS.]

[Year of Christ 310.] MARCELLUS was succeeded by Eusebius, who governed seven months, according to Eusebius,[5] but only four months and sixteen days, according to the pontifical of Bucherius.[6] From an ancient epitaph on this pope we learn, that he opposed, with great vigour and zeal, one Heraclius, pretending that those who had fallen during the persecution ought to be readmitted to the communion of the church, without giving such satisfaction as was then required; and that hereupon great divisions happening among the people, Maxentius, to put an end to those disturbances, banished Eusebius into Sicily.[5] Many other things are said of him by Anastasius, Platina, Ciacconius, and such-like writers; but what we read in them has no better foundation than what is advanced by Baronius, viz., that he instructed Eusebius the celebrated Bishop of Vercelli, and gave him his own name;[6] which is founded on the Acts of that bishop, now universally rejected as supposititious.

MELCHIADES, THIRTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LICINIUS.]

[Year of Christ 311.] MELCHIADES, or Miltiades, as he is called in the ancient manuscripts, was chosen to succeed Eusebius, on the 2d of July, 311, after a vacancy of nine months and upwards;[7] which historians do not account for. In his time happened the ever memorable conversion of Constantine to the Christian religion. That prince, having overcome and utterly defeated the usurper Maxentius, on the 28th of October, 312, soon after issued an edict, jointly with Licinius, who was upon the point of marrying his sister, allowing the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and likewise the liberty of building churches.[7] By the same edict, he ordered the places where they had held their

[1] Opt. l. 2, p. 48.
[2] Aug. ep. 165, et in Petil. c. 16, p. 87.
[3] Vide Bolland. 16 Jan. p. 5.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 309.
[5] Euseb. chron.
[6] Buch. p. 272.
[5] Buch. p. 272.

[1] Buch. p. 272.
[2] Euseb. l. 8, c. 14.
[3] Boll. Jan. 16, p. 5.
[4] Idem, et Flor. in Martyr. Hier. p. 256, 257.
[6] Bar. ad ann. 311.
[6] Idem ib. n. 42.
[7] Euseb. l. 9, c. 9.

The schism of the Donatists, in Africa. Traditores, who. The chief authors of the schism against Cæcilianus. The bishops of Numidia summoned to depose him.

assemblies before the persecution, and which had been taken from them, to be restored.[1] He left Rome in the beginning of the year 313, and, arriving at Milan, he there issued a second edict, to correct some mistakes that had given offence in the former.[2] What these mistakes were, we know not; for the decree itself has not reached our times; but Valesius conjectures, that the high commendations bestowed on the Christian religion alarmed the pagans, imagining that the intention of the two princes was to suppress theirs; and likewise, that some Christians had taken offence at the odious name of heretics, given in that decree to the various sects sprung from them.[3] Be that as it will, it is certain, that, by the second decree, an entire liberty of conscience was granted to all sorts of persons, every one being allowed to honor and worship what deity he pleased, and in what manner soever he thought best. The second edict strictly enjoins all those who had purchased of the exchequer, or held by grant, any place formerly destined for the assemblies of the Christians, to restore them forthwith, and apply to the exchequer, where they should be indemnified.[4] The same year, 313, Licinius, having gained a complete victory over Maximinus, a sworn enemy to the Christians, made himself master of Nicomedia, and there caused the edict of Milan to be proclaimed and set up in the market-place, on the 13th of June.[5] Thus peace was restored to the church in the east as well as in the west, after a most cruel and bloody persecution of ten years and almost four months; for the first edict against the Christians had been published in that very city on the 24th of February, 303.[6]

Another remarkable incident of this pontificate was the famous schism, formed in Africa against Cæcilianus, the catholic bishop of Carthage; whereof a succinct account will not be foreign to my subject, as Melchiades was chiefly concerned in most of the transactions relating to it. The first decree against the Christians, published by Diocletian, which I have just now mentioned, ordered the churches to be everywhere laid level with the ground, the books of the Scripture to be carefully sought for, and publicly burnt; and that such persons of quality as should persist in the profession of the Christian faith, should be deemed infamous, and excluded from all honors and employments. This edict was executed with such rigor in Africa, that it was a capital crime in the magistrates of the cities, and punishable with death, to show any mercy or compassion to a Christian, who, owning he had the sacred books, should refuse to deliver them into the hands of the proper officers. Those who, in compliance with this edict, delivered them up, which great numbers did, were styled Traditores, a name which afterwards became famous in the history of the church, by affording the Donatists a plausible pretence to separate themselves from the communion of the catholic bishops.[1] Of this crime Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, was falsely accused; but, though the charge could not be proved against him, yet some of his flock, encouraged by Donatus, Bishop of Casænigræ, in Numidia, separated from his communion.[2] Mensurius dying some years after, Cæcilianus, deacon of the church of Carthage, was chosen in his room, in spite of the cabals and intrigues of Botrus and Cælesius, two chief presbyters, who aspired to that dignity. Cæcilianus, soon after his election, summoned some persons, in whose custody his predecessor had left the money of the church, to deliver it up to him: but they not only refused to comply with his demand, but began to stir up the people, and form a party against him. Botrus and Cælesius were not idle on this occasion; but, animated with jealousy and envy, left no art unpractised to blacken his character, and discredit him with those who had preferred him to them. But the chief support of this faction was Lucilla, a woman of great quality, wealth, and interest, and an avowed enemy to Cæcilianus, who, while he was yet deacon, had publicly reprimanded her for kissing the relic of a martyr, as she was upon the point of receiving the eucharist. An undeniable proof, that the worship of relics was at this time disapproved by the church. Such liberty taken with a person of her rank, was what she could not brook; and therefore she laid hold of the first opportunity that offered, and no better could offer, to revenge the affront.[3] It is not to be doubted but those who had separated from Mensurius joined this faction; since the second schism owed its origin to the first, as St. Austin says, speak- of the two schisms under Mensurius and Cæcilianus.[4]

The schismatics, to give an appearance of justice and authority to their proceedings, summoned Secundus, Bishop of Tigisis, and the other bishops of Numidia, to depose Cæcilianus, and choose another in his room; for the bishops of Numidia claimed the privilege of assisting at the election of the Bishop of Carthage, and ordaining him after he was elected.[5] They readily complied with the summons: but upon their arrival they found, to their great surprise, that the whole city, except a small number of schismatics, the avowed enemies of Cæcilianus, communicated with him as their lawful bishop.[6] They were seventy in number; but as many of them

[1] Euseb. l. 10, c. 5. [2] Idem ib.
[3] Val. in not. ad Euseb. hist. p. 195.
[4] Euseb. ib. [5] Lact. pers. c. 47, 48.
[6] Idem ib.

[1] Aug. l. 7, c. 2; Opt. l. 1, p. 39.
[2] Aug. collat. Carth. die 3, c. 12; Vales. in not. ad Euseb. hist. p. 191.
[3] Opt. l. 1, p. 41; Aug. Psal. Abced. p. 3, in Petil. c. 18, et contr. epist. Parmen. p. 7.
[4] Aug. coll. Carth. die 3, c. 12.
[5] Aug. in Par. l. 1, c. 3, et Psal. Abced. p. 3; Opt. p. 41.
[6] Opt. ib.

Cæcilianus's election declared null. From whom called Donatists. Edicts enacted by Constantine. The Donatists petition Constantine that the dispute be referred to the bishops of Gaul. He names the bishops.

were Traditors, and some guilty of other enormous crimes, as appears from the Acts of the council of Cirtha,[1] they were easily prevailed upon by Lucilla, who is said to have spent an immense sum on this occasion,[2] to declare the election of Cæcilianus void, and the see of Carthage vacant. The only thing they could lay to his charge was, that he had been ordained by Felix, Bishop of Aptungus, whom they falsely accused as a Traditor. Cæcilianus refused to appear before them; and, truly, to trust himself to such an assembly had been acting a very imprudent part; for Purpurius, Bishop of Limata, had said, "If he comes among us, instead of laying our hands upon him by way of ordination, we ought to knock out his brains by way of penance."[3]

The party having thus declared Cæcilianus illegally elected and ordained, they separated themselves from his communion, and from the communion of all who communicated with him;[4] that is, from the communion of the catholic church; for Cæcilianus was acknowledged by the other bishops of Africa, by the Bishop of Rome, and by all the bishops of the world, says St. Austin.[5] Such was the rise of the famous schism, which, for the space of three hundred years and upwards, occasioned great disturbances in the churches of Africa. Donatus, Bishop of Casænigræ, in Numidia, was the first author of it, according to St. Austin;[6] but it was not from him, but from Donatus, the schismatic Bishop of Carthage, that they took the name of Donatists; for, till his time, they styled themselves the party of Majorinus,[7] whom they chose and ordained Bishop of Carthage, in the room of Cæcilianus; though he was then only lector of that church, and had been formerly one of Lucilla's menial servants.[8] To justify their conduct, and their electing a new bishop, they wrote letters to all the churches of Africa, filled with calumnies against Cæcilianus, and those who had ordained him. By these letters great numbers were imposed upon, and misled; insomuch that the people being everywhere divided, most churches had two bishops, the one ordained by Majorinus and the other by Cæcilianus.[9]

About this time, that is, about the year 313, Constantine, out of his zeal for the Christian religion, issued two decrees, addressed to Anulinus, Proconsul of Africa, the one commanding all the places in that province to be restored, which had once belonged to the catholic church, and might have been usurped during the persecution;[10] and the other, exempting the ecclesiastics from all civil functions.[1] This privilege was granted only to the ecclesiastics of the catholic church, whereof Cæcilianus was the head, as was expressly declared in the edict; and therefore to him alone the proconsul imparted it. It was a great mortification to the Donatists to see themselves thus disregarded by the emperor: they therefore assembled a few days after, and, drawing up a petition to Constantine, they delivered it, unsealed, to Anulinus, together with a bundle of papers, sealed up in a leather bag, with this title: "The Petition of the catholic church, containing the crimes of Cæcilianus; by the party of Majorinus." The substance of the petition was, that the controversy between them and the other bishops of Africa might be referred to the bishops of Gaul, who were free from the imputation of having delivered up the sacred books to the pagans.[2] Anulinus immediately despatched a messenger to the emperor, both with the request and the papers, giving him, at the same time, by a letter still extant,[3] an insight into the dispute, that made so great a noise in Africa. Constantine, who was then in Gaul, having received and read all those pieces, expressed great concern to find the Christians thus divided among themselves, and the bishops at variance with one another.[4] However, he readily granted to the Donatists the judges they demanded, naming, for that purpose, Maternus bishop of Cologne, Rheticius bishop of Autun, and Marinus bishop of Arles;[5] all men of known integrity, great learning, and unblemished characters. To these, by a letter under his own hand, he gave notice of their new commission; and, at the same time, for their better information, he caused copies to be transmitted to them of all the papers he had received from Anulinus.[6] The three bishops were ordered to repair, with all speed, to Rome, and there jointly with Melchiades, bishop of that city, to sit as judges of the controversy. Cæcilianus likewise was ordered to Rome, and allowed to take with him ten bishops of his party, such as he should judge the most capable of defending his cause; and the same liberty was granted to the adverse party.[7] Constantine, in the letter he wrote on this occasion to Melchiades, after appealing to him as a witness of the respect and veneration he had for the catholic church, declares, he had nothing so much at heart as to see her members happily united: he therefore earnestly entreats him to examine the affair with the utmost attention, and, jointly with the bishops of Gaul, to judge it according to the strictest laws of justice and equity.[8] In this letter Constantine names no other judges but the three bishops of Gaul, Mel-

[1] Aug. in Cresc. l. 3, c. 26, 27, 29, et coll. die 3, c. 17, die 2, c. 14, &c.
[2] Aug. in Gaud. l. 1, c. 37, ep. 162, et in Psal. 36, p. 119.
[3] Opt. p. 41.
[4] Aug. coll. die 3, c. 14.
[5] Idem ep. 162.
[6] In Joan. evang. tract. 69, p. 12.
[7] Hier. vir. ill. c. 93.
[8] Opt. l. 1, p. 42.
[9] Aug. ep. 162.
[10] Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.

[1] Euseb. l. 10, c. 7, et Cod. Theod. 16, t. 2, l. 1, p. 20.
[2] Aug. ep. 68; Vales. in not. ad hist. Euseb. p. 197.
[3] Coll. Carth. in concil. per Steph. Baluz. c. 3, n. 216, 220, p. 578.
[4] Opt. l. 1, p. 44.
[5] Opt. ib. Aug. ep. 166.
[6] Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.
[7] Coll. Carth. p. 149.
[8] Euseb. ib.

The council of Rome. Cæcilianus absolved, and Donatus condemned. Melchiades dies. Whether the Lateran palace was given by Constantine to Melchiades.

chiades, and one Mark, supposed to have been Bishop of Milan, whom he joins with Melchiades; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that they were at last nineteen in all.[1] They met, for the first time, on Friday the 2d of October, 313, Constantine and Licinius being the third time consuls.[2] The place they met in was the apartment of Fausta, in the Lateran palace,[3] she being then, in all likelihood, absent in Gaul with the emperor, her husband. Before this assembly Cæcilianus appeared as the person accused, and Donatus, of Casænigræ, as the accuser. They had but three meetings: in the first the characters of the accusers and witnesses were strictly inquired into, and their depositions heard; in the second, the acts of the council of Carthage, which had condemned Cæcilianus, as I have related above, were examined; and in the last, Cæcilianus, against whom nothing had been proved, was absolved, and Donatus condemned as a slanderer, and the chief author of the schism.[4] An account of the whole, together with the acts of the council, was immediately transmitted to Constantine, who began to flatter himself, that he had put an end to the dispute; for he could not imagine that the Donatists would appeal from the judgment of such unexceptionable judges, of judges whom they themselves had demanded. But the good prince was yet a stranger to the nature of religious disputes, to the heat, animosity, and enthusiastic rancor with which they are commonly carried on. Notwithstanding the pains he took, and his successors after him, and no pains they spared, to heal these unhappy divisions, they continued, to the great scandal of the pagans, rending the church into most furious parties and factions, for the space of near three hundred years. The council of Rome was held in the month of October, 313, and Melchiades died on the 10th of January ensuing, Volusianus and Anienus being consuls, having presided for the space of two years, six months, and eight days.[5] About an hundred years after, the Donatists charged him with having delivered up the sacred books, and offered incense to the pagan gods; but this St. Austin calls a groundless charge, a mere calumny, a malicious invention of the Donatists of his time to justify the conduct of their predecessors, in appealing, as they did, from the council of Rome, at which Melchiades assisted, and probably presided, as bishop of the imperial city.[6]

Baronius, impatient to see the pope raised to the rank of a prince, endeavours to prove, that Melchiades was placed in that station by Constantine, and argues thus: the council of Rome was held in the Lateran palace; therefore that palace had been given by Constantine to Melchiades, and belonged to him; for that an assembly of nineteen bishops only should meet in so spacious a place, can not otherwise be accounted for, but by supposing the pope to have resided there. This he calls a demonstration.[1] Having thus got him a palace, and, no doubt, magnificently furnished, he finds no difficulty in equipping him in every other respect as a prince: for who can imagine, says he, that Constantine, so pious, so generous a prince, would have given to the head of the church a royal palace to live in, and not allow him at the same time a suitable retinue, with suitable appointments? To act otherwise, had not been honoring, but disgracing the Christian religion, since its high pontiff, stalking about all alone in a huge palace, could be but an object of ridicule to the pontiffs of the pagan superstition, who lived in magnificent houses, with answerable grandeur.[2] Thus is the bishop metamorphosed at once into a sovereign. But the metamorphosis is somewhat premature. If Constantine, yet a neophyte, was not well acquainted with the true spirit of the Christian religion, Melchiades was; and therefore, had that prince offered to distinguish him by any such marks of worldly grandeur, I do not question but, as he was a very good man, he would have taken from thence an opportunity of instructing him better in the principles of his new profession, and showing him in what contempt the Christian prelates had, and he himself ought to have, all worldly grandeur. But no such offer was ever made or dreamt of: for what at length is all this founded on? On the meeting of the council in the Lateran palace. The French academy meet in the Louvre: are they therefore princes? And does not Optatus, of whom we have the whole account, call it in express terms the house of Fausta?[3] Fausta perhaps lived there, says Baronius, during the long and flourishing reign of her father Maximian, and thence it might be called the house of Fausta. Thus in the end is his demonstration dwindled away to a mere conjecture, and a very groundless one too: but, waiving that, why might not Fausta continue in the same palace after her father's death, with her husband Constantine, when he was at Rome, or alone, when she did not attend him in the wars? The annalist seems to have forgot that Fausta was Constantine's wife. But after all, the empress, as it appears to me, had only an apartment in the Lateran; for in this sense I understand Optatus saying, "The council was held in the house, or habitation, of Fausta in the Lateran." But her being anyways there excludes Melchiades. Their sitting in the imperial palace gave a kind of

[1] Opt. l. 1, p. 44.
[2] Aug. coll Carth. die 3, c. 17; Opt. ib.
[3] Opt. l. 1, p. 44.
[4] Coll. Carth. p. 149 et ep. 162. Opt. ib.
[5] Buch. p. 272.
[6] Aug. in Pet. p. 87, et in Par. c. 5, p. 8.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 312, n. 82. [2] Idem ib. n. 85.
[3] Opt. l. 1, p. 44.

The Donatists complain of the council of Rome. The council of Arles. Cæcilianus declared innocent.

authority and sanction to their decisions; and besides, there might not be room in the house of Melchiades, if he had a house, for the council, and those who were to attend it, they being in all forty bishops; so that we need not put Melchiades in possession of that palace to account for the council's meeting in it, as Baronius has done.

SYLVESTER, THIRTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE.]

[Year of Christ 314.] SYLVESTER was chosen in the room of Melchiades on the last of January, 314.[1] In his time were held the two great councils of Arles and Nice. The former was convened by Constantine's order at the request of the Donatists, who, instead of acquiescing to the judgment of the council of Rome, loudly complained to the emperor of the bishops who composed it, as partial, prejudiced, and over-hasty in deciding a controversy of the greatest importance.[2] Constantine heard them with great patience; and that he might leave them no color or pretence whatsoever to continue in their schism, he summoned a second council to meet at Arles, inviting several bishops to it with most pathetic letters under his own hand, and ordering the proconsuls and governors of provinces to acquaint the rest with his desire and intention. Chrestus, or Crescentius, Bishop of Syracuse, was allowed, and so, without all doubt, were the rest, to bring two presbyters with him, and three attendants, as we learn from the emperor's letter to him, which is still extant.[3] They were all to be supplied with conveniences for travelling, and every thing else, at the public expense. The time appointed for their meeting was the first of August, 314, and on that day they met accordingly,[4] not from all parts of the world, as we read in the Acts of the second council of Arles,[5] but from Africa, and most other provinces of the west. Sylvester bishop of Rome was invited to it; but he excused himself on account of his age, and sent in his room the two presbyters, Claudianus and Vitus, with Eugenius and Cyriacus, deacons: the Bishop of Ostia sent likewise two presbyters in his room.[6] By this assembly Cæcilianus was again declared innocent, and those who should falsely accuse their brethren cut off from the communion of the church, without hopes of being ever re-admitted, except at the point of death.[7] As to the schismatic bishops, it was agreed, that such of them as abandoned the schism should not forfeit their dignity, but sit alternately with the catholic bishop till one of them died.[8] The council, before they broke up, acquainted the Bishop of Rome with their proceedings, and at the same time sent him the decrees they had made concerning the discipline of the church, not to be confirmed by him, as Baronius would make us believe,[1] but that, *by his means, as he held larger dioceses, they might be the sooner known.* These are the very words of the council.[2, 3]

1 Buch. p. 272. 2 Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.
3 Euseb. ib. et concil. t. 1, p. 157.
4 Euseb. et concil. ib.
5 Conc. Gen. t. 1, p. 106. 6 Concil. p. 1425.
7 Concil. ib. 8 Concil. ib.

1 Bar. ad ann. 314, n. 68. 2 Concil. p. 1425.

3 Several canons were made by this council relating to the discipline of the church. 1. It was ordained, that Easter should be kept on the same day, and on a Sunday, by all the churches in the world; and that the Bishop of Rome should acquaint the other churches with the day. But it was afterwards ordained, that the Bishop of Alexandria should fix the day, and give timely notice of it to the Bishop of Rome, that by his means it might be notified to the whole church. This ordinance St. Cyril seems to ascribe to the council of Nice; for he says, that it was "so enacted by a synod composed of all the saints of the earth;" which, at the time he wrote, that is, about the year 360, could be said of no other synod but that of Nice. Pope Leo the Great, speaking of this custom in a letter to the Emperor Marcian, only says, that it was "established by the holy fathers." (Leo, ep. 94, c. 1.) He meant, perhaps, the fathers of Nice. But as they took no notice of such a custom in their letter to the church of Egypt, I cannot suppose it to have been introduced by them. The care of fixing the day, and acquainting the Bishop of Rome with it, was probably committed to the Bishop of Alexandria, because the Egyptians were thought to be better acquainted with the motions of the heavenly bodies than any other nation. In other provinces the bishops seem to have been utter strangers to astronomy, and to that ignorance was chiefly owing their disagreement with respect to the celebration of Easter. This custom still obtained in the fifth century, as appears from a letter of Leo the Great, dated the 28th of July, 454. For by that letter he acquaints the bishops of Gaul and Spain, that the following year, 455, Easter would fall on the 24th of April, "as it had been settled in the east." (Leo, ep. 109.) Before his time, Innocent I., being at a loss to know on what day Easter should be kept in 414, had recourse to Aurelius bishop of Carthage, entreating him to examine that point in a council, and let him know what they determined, that he might notify it, as was customary, to other churches. Innocent had quarrelled, on Chrysostom's account, with the eastern bishops; and therefore chose rather to be informed and directed by the African bishops than by them. 2. It was decreed, that such as had been baptized by heretics in the name of the Trinity, should not be rebaptized, but admitted into the church only by the imposition of hands. But to this decree of the council no greater regard was paid, than had been paid in St. Cyprian's time to the decisions of Pope Stephen. For in the year 370, the same practice of rebaptizing heretics still obtained in several churches of Africa, as appears from Optatus, who wrote about that time. In the east some held, and some denied the validity of baptism administered by a heretic. Of the latter opinion was the great Athanasius, who flourished from the year 326 to 373; and St. Basil, who wrote about the year 369, after examining, in his letter to Amphilochus, the two opposite practices, seems inclined to think the baptism of heretics null. According to the present doctrine of the Church of Rome, baptism, by whomsoever administered, whether Jew, gentile, heretic, Mahommedan, &c., whether man or woman, or even a child, is valid, provided it be only administered with an intention of administering it, without which

Osius did not assist at the council of Nice as the pope's legate. Nor did he preside. Eusebius of Cæsarea did not harangue the emperor at the opening of the council, but on another occasion.

The other grand council that was held during the pontificate of Sylvester was that of Nice, so famous in the history of the church; but the bishop of the reigning city, says Eusebius,[1] being prevented by his great age from undertaking so long a journey, he sent Vitus and Vincentius, two Roman presbyters, to supply his room,[2] with orders to agree in his name to the decisions of the council.[3] In process of time such orders grew out of date, and the modest name of Roman presbyters, given to those who were sent by the bishops of Rome, either to councils or princes, was changed into the lofty title of *Legates a latere*. Baronius,[4] and after him most writers of the Church of Rome, maintain Osius, the celebrated Bishop of Cordoua, to have assisted, nay, and presided at the council of Nice as the pope's legate. Vitus and Vincentius, say they, represented the person of the pope; but Osius held his place, and the place of all the bishops of the west. That Osius assisted at the council with the character of the pope's legate, is affirmed, I own, by Gelasius of Cyzicus, who flourished about the end of the fifth century:[5] but Eusebius, who was present, mentions only Vitus and Vincentius as sent thither by Sylvester. In like manner all the historians, who have written of that council after Eusebius till the time of Gelasius, in naming those two presbyters and Osius, which they all do, constantly distinguish the former by the title of the Deputies, the Representatives, &c. of the Bishop of Rome, and never the latter. Besides, Vitus and Vincentius, in subscribing to the canons of the council, declare, that they do it *in the name of the venerable pope*, or father, *Sylvester their bishop*;[1] whereas Osius subscribes, like the other bishops, in his own name. As to his presiding at that great assembly, his name, 'tis true, is marked the first by Socrates,[2] among those who subscribed to the definitions and canons of the council; but yet I am inclined to believe that that honour not to have been conferred upon him, but upon Eustathius bishop of Antioch; for John, bishop of the same city, writing to Proculus about the year 435, styles him the first of the fathers assembled at Nice,[3] and Facundus calls him the first of the council.[4] In the Chronicle of Nicephorus he is styled the head of the fathers of Nice:[5] and from Theodoret we learn, that he sat the first on the right hand in the assembly, and haraugued the emperor,[6] which it was the president's province to do.[7]

The honor of presiding belonged of right to Alexander bishop of Alexandria; but he, it seems, declined it, perhaps to obviate the complaints of the Arians, who looked upon him as a party concerned, and one highly prejudiced against them. I know that the haranguing of Constantine is ascribed to Eusebius the historian, in the title of the chapter in which he mentions it,[8] that Sozomen positively affirms it, and that the learned Valesius thinks there is no room to doubt of it, since Eusebius was the most eloquent bishop of those times; and besides, he himself tells us, that he pronounced a speech in praise of Constantine, on occasion of his entering into the twentieth year of his reign, while he was sitting in the midst of the ministers of God;[9] meaning thereby, no doubt, the bishops assembled at Nice. That Eusebius harangued the emperor before that venerable assembly, is not at all to be questioned; but that the bishops, who composed it, should have pitched upon one who was suspected, or rather convicted, of Arianism, to address the emperor in their name, at the opening of the council, seems to me highly improbable. The orator, whoever he was, sat in the first place, or at least in the second, (that I may not quarrel with Baronius, who will have the place on the left hand to have been the most honourable:[10]) and what right had the Bishop of Cæsarea to that honor? I may add, that a short compliment, such as is that which the presbyter

every sacrament, say they, is null. This doctrine, with respect to the intention, proves daily to timorous consciences the source of endless doubts and perplexities, which can never be removed: for though they may know, for certain, that the ceremony was performed, yet they can never know whether or not it was performed with the due intention. In confessions, for instance, they may hear the words of the absolution pronounced by the priest; but they know nothing of his intention, of the intention of the minister who baptized him, of the bishop who ordained him, of the priest who baptized, or the bishops who ordained that bishop, and so up to the apostles, by whom the first bishops were ordained. Should the right intention have been wanting in any of these—should the priest, while he pronounces the words of absolution, have his thoughts employed on some other object, as it may easily happen; the penitent sinner would depart from his tribunal with the whole load of his sins, and be damned, notwithstanding his repentance, for, or, more properly speaking, through want of attention in the priest. A most unchristian and impious doctrine, placing our eternal salvation in the hands of others, and not in our own. 3. The council decreed, that excommunicated persons should be nowhere absolved from the excommunication but in the places where they had been excommunicated. The bishops of Rome did not yet know, it seems, that they were vested with an unlimited power of binding and loosening, of excommunicating and absolving, with respect to all persons and places; for had Sylvester but dreamt of such a power, we may well suppose he would never have suffered it to be thus controlled. Several other canons were made by this council, in all twenty-two; but it is foreign to my purpose to take notice of them. I shall only observe, that the council consisted of thirty-three bishops, and not of two hundred, as Baronius supposes, upon the authority of St. Austin, whom he misunderstood; and that Marinus bishop of Arles presided, his name being placed at the head of the subscriptions, and the names of Sylvester's legates after his.

[1] Euseb. l. 3, c. 7.
[2] Soz. p. 430.
[3] Theodoret. l. 1, c. 6.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 326, n. 20.
[5] Gal. Cyz. de Nic. concil. l. 2, c. 5, p. 68.

[1] Con. t. 2, p. 50.
[2] Socr. l. 1, c. 23.
[3] Facund. l. 8, c. 1.
[4] Idem, l. 2, c. 1.
[5] Niceph. cron.
[6] Theod. l. 1, c. 6.
[7] The title of President is given him in a letter, which is commonly ascribed to Pope Felix III. (Concil. t. 1, p. 1072.) But I am well apprised, that no great stress should be laid on that piece, since some surmise it to have been composed in the eighth century.
[8] Euseb. in vit. Const. l. 3, c. 11.
[9] Euseb. l. 1, c. 1; Vales. in not. p. 223.
[10] Bar. ad ann. 325, n. 56—59.

The council of Nice not convened by the pope. The council commands all causes to be finally determined by provincial synods. The hierarchy first formed. The office and duty of Bishops. How ordained.

Gregory ascribes to Eustathius of Antioch,[1] had been far more proper on that occasion than Eusebius's long and tedious panegyric, which therefore some suppose to have been pronounced on occasion of the magnificent entertainment which Constantine gave the bishops, as they were preparing to return to their respective sees; for he then entered into the twentieth year of his reign, which began on the 25th of July, 325, and it was on that occasion that Eusebius wrote, and delivered his panegyric before the emperor, and the fathers of the council, as he himself declares.[2] To conclude, had Eusebius been appointed by that great assembly to address the emperor in their name, his modesty had not prevented him from describing the spokesman so as to leave no room to doubt on whom that honor had been conferred.

Before I dismiss this subject, it may not be improper, nor foreign to my purpose, to observe, that the council of Nice, the first general or œcumenical council held in the church, was convened by the emperor, and not by the Bishop of Rome; that the Bishop of Rome did not preside in it either in person, or by his legates, as they are pleased to style them; and consequently that the privilege which they assumed in after ages of assembling general councils, and presiding in them, ought to be deemed a most insolent and unwarrantable usurpation. The second thing worthy of notice with respect to this council is its fifth canon, commanding all ecclesiastical causes to be finally decided in each province by a provincial synod. The words of the canon are clear in themselves, and besides have been understood in this sense by all the councils that were held, by all the authors that wrote, for several ages after;[3] nay, it was understood in this sense by some of the popes themselves, namely, by Innocent I., who, in one of his letters to Victricius bishop of Roan, writes thus: "If any controversy should arise among the clerks, whether they be of an inferior or superior rank, let it be decided, agreeably to the council of Nice, in an assembly of the bishops of the same province."[4] 'Tis true, he adds, "without prejudicing the rights of the Roman see." But that restriction is his own, and not the council's. Hence this canon, directing all causes to be thus tried, all disputes to be thus ended, was often quoted on occasion of appeals made to Rome, and employed as a bulwark to restrain the encroaching power of the popes within due bounds; but in process of time their ambition, supported by the favor of princes, and the great temporalities they acquired, bore all down before them.

It was in the pontificate of Sylvester, and under the benign auspices of Constantine, that the ecclesiastical hierarchy was first formed and settled in the manner it continues to this day; the new form of government introduced by that prince into the state serving as a model for the government of the church. In the three first centuries no other hierarchy was known, no other degrees thought of, but those of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Of these alone was composed the whole body of the clergy; but with this difference, that the bishop or supervisor was the general disposer and manager of all things within the bounds of his jurisdiction, nothing being done there without his consent and approbation, and the presbyters and deacons his assistants, or his counsellors and senate, as St. Jerom,[1] and before him St. Ignatius,[2] styled them. This order was probably introduced, according to Grotius,[3] in imitation of the Jewish synagogues; for each synagogue had its ruler, who presided over the rest, its pastors and its eleemosynaries; to the ruler succeeded the bishop, to the pastors the presbyters, and to the eleemosynaries the deacons. It was the bishop's office and duty to preach the word,[4] to pray with his people,[5] to administer the sacraments,[6] to ordain ministers,[7] to excommunicate offenders,[8] to absolve penitents,[9] and to regulate and settle every thing relating to his particular church,[10] with the consent and concurrence of the presbytery; for the presbyters were his counsellors or senate, and, together with him, presided in the consistories of those times, as we learn from Tertullian telling us, that in those courts "approved elders presided."[11] Hence Petrus de Marca concludes the original government of the church to have been mixt of monarchy and aristocracy; or, to use his own words, the monarchical government of the church to have been tempered with the aristocratical. As the bishop could not discharge, as he ought, the above-mentioned functions, without residing among those who were committed to his care, his residence was deemed absolutely necessary, and non-residence a most heinous transgression; insomuch that St. Cyprian, enumerating the sins that brought the wrath of God upon the church in the bloody persecution of Decius, mentions non-residence in the bishops as one.[12] Upon the vacancy of a see a new bishop was chosen in the room of the deceased, in some places by the clergy and people of that church alone, in others by the neighboring bishops, the people and the clergy only expressing their desire, and giving testimony of the life and manners of the person proposed, and in some by the joint suffrages of the clergy, of the people, and of the neighboring bishops. These three different methods of electing we find practised

1 Surius, 10 Jul. p. 159.
2 Euseb. vit. Const. l. 3, c. 14.
3 Vide Elli. Du Pin de antiq. eccles. discip. p. 98. et seq.
4 Inn. in epist. ad Vict. c. 3.

1 Hier. in c. 2, Isai.
2 Vide Basil. ep. 319.
3 Grot. de imp. summ. potest. c. 11, n. 8.
4 Orig. in Ezek. hom. 3.
5 Justin. apol. 2, p. 98.
6 Tert. de bapt. p. 602.
7 Idem ib. p. 99
8 Cypr. ep. 38, p. 90.
9 Idem. ep. 10. p. 30.
10 Tert. ib. p. 39.
11 Idem ib. p. 709.
12 Cypr. de laps. n. 4, p. 278.

The office and duty of Presbyters. Qualifications requisite in a Presbyter. The institution and office of Deacons. Their number.

at different times with respect to the same church; but on no occasion was the choice of the neighboring bishops sufficient without the consent of the clergy and people, nor the election of the clergy and people without the approbation of the neighboring bishops. The bishop being thus elected and confirmed, he was in the next place ordained; and this ceremony was performed by the neighboring bishops, in his own church, and in the presence of his flock, by the imposition of hands. The new bishop, agreeably to a custom which obtained then, immediately gave notice of his promotion to other bishops, especially to those of the greater sees, who, by receiving and answering his letters, were said to communicate with him, and to acknowledge him lawfully chosen.

In the second degree were the presbyters or priests, whose office or province it was to assist the bishop in the discharge of his pastoral commission, whence they are often styled the bishop's assistants: with his consent and approbation they preached the word, they prayed with the people, they administered the sacraments, they absolved penitents, and, in short, discharged every office which the bishop did, except those of ordaining, confirming, and excommunicating; I say, with the bishop's consent and approbation, for no spiritual function could they perform without his leave, as is manifest from Tertullian,[1] Origen,[2] St. Cyprian,[3] and above all from St. Ignatius, in his famous letter to the church of Smyrna.[4] The church, in those happy days, admitted none to the sacred functions, but such as were known by a long trial to be well qualified for so great a charge. The qualifications requisite in a presbyter, so far as I can learn from the ancients, may be reduced to these four heads: his condition in the world, his conversation, his learning, and his age. He was not to be entangled with any worldly affairs, with any secular employments, but at perfect liberty to apply himself wholly to the functions of his office.[5] He was to be of an unspotted and exemplary life;[6] and therefore, before ordination, he was proposed to the presbytery and people for their testimony and approbation. He was to be well versed in the Scripture, and capable of teaching others, and instructing them in the mysteries of the Christian religion. As for human learning, it was not required in a presbyter; nay, by some it was condemned, particularly logic and philosophy, as in a manner inconsistent with Christianity,[7] but at the same time highly commended and applauded by others as conducive to the right understanding of the Scripture, and necessary for confuting the sophisms of heretics;[1] whence logic especially is recommended by Clemens Alexandrinus to all ecclesiastics, as "a hedge to defend the truth from being trod down by sophists."[2] As for the age of a presbyter, he was to be stricken in years, as the very name of a presbyter or elder sufficiently declares. However, if a young man was endowed with extraordinary gifts and talents, his age was dispensed with in respect both to the sacerdotal and episcopal dignity. Thus was Aurelius, though young in years, raised, in regard of his great merit, to the rank of a presbyter, as we read in St. Cyprian;[3] and the Bishop of Magnesia, in St. Ignatius's time, was, it seems, but a young man, since Ignatius, in his letter to the Magnesians, exhorts them "not to despise their bishop's age, but to yield him all due respect and reverence."[4] These were the qualifications requisite in a candidate for the ministry: if he was recommended by them, (for no other recommendation could avail him,) he was admitted to holy orders; if not, he was rejected as unfit for the sacred function. The person ordained was at liberty to serve the church where he had received his orders, or any other where his assistance might be wanted; for he was not ordained minister of any particular church, but of the church universal.

In the third and last degree were the deacons, whose original institution was to "serve tables," as we read in the Acts;[5] that is, to inspect the poor, and relieve them by a proper distribution of the offerings made by the faithful, which were committed to their charge, though they could not dispose of them without the bishop's knowledge.[6] They were ordained by the imposition of hands,[7] and therefore deemed ministers of the altar, as well as dispensers of alms; and with a great deal of reason, for they assisted the bishops or presbyters in administering the eucharist, by delivering the elements to the communicants;[8] they carried the eucharist to such as had not been able to assist with the rest at divine service;[9] they preached, and, in the absence of the bishop and presbyters, conferred the sacrament of baptism.[10] The presbyters of a church were not confined to a set number; but the deacons were, no church having more than seven in the primitive times, that being the original number instituted by the apostles. Thus the church of Rome had but seven in the times of Pope Cornelius[11] and Pope Sixtus II.,[12] the church of Saragosa the same number in the time of Vincentius, who flourished under Dioclesian.[13] The fourteenth canon of the council of Neo-

[1] Tertull. de bapt. p. 602.
[2] Orig. hom. de Engast. vol. i. p. 28.
[3] Cypr. ep. 10, p. 29, ep. 11, p. 32, ep. 12, p. 37.
[4] Ign. ad. Smyrn. p. 6.
[5] Cypr. ep. 66, p. 195; Tert. de præscript. p. 89.
[6] Idem ep. 68, p. 201.
[7] Tert. advers. Hermog. p. 266, et de præscript. p. 70, 71.

[1] Orig. contra Cels. l. 6, p. 279; Clem. Alex. strom. l. 1, p. 207, l. 6, p. 472, &c.
[2] Clem. Alex. strom. l. 6, p. 472.
[3] Cypr. ep. 33, p. 76. [4] Ign. ep. ad Magnes. p. 31.
[5] Acts vi. 1, 2, 3, 4.
[6] Const. Apost. l. 2, p. 31, 32.
[7] Acts vi. 6. [8] Just. apol. 2. p. 97.
[9] Idem ib. p. 93. [10] Tert. de bapt. p. 602.
[11] Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.
[12] Prud. de coron. mar. p. 71.
[13] Idem ib. p. 91.

Subdeacons, Acolytes, Readers, &c. Each church independent. The ecclesiastical polity adapted to the civil. The new form of government introduced by Constantine. The civil and ecclesiastical polity compared.

cæsarea, or the fifteenth, according to the Greek, forbids this number to be enlarged, even in the greatest and most populous cities;[1] whence St. Jerom writes, that great respect was paid to the deacons, because they were few in number.[2]

As for the subdeacons, acolytes, lectors, janitors, and exorcists, they were not considered as anyways belonging to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, being employed only in the meaner offices of the church, by the due discharge of which they were to give proof of their integrity and attention, in order to be raised to a higher degree; for in those days very few, and none but upon some very extraordinary occasion, arrived at once, or, as they call it, *per saltum*, at the episcopal dignity.

During the three first centuries each church was in a manner independent, that is, could make such regulations relating to its discipline and government as were judged proper and expedient, without the concurrence and authority of other churches.[3] However, in all matters of moment, the bishops used to advise with one another, especially with those of the same province, who frequently met to settle all ecclesiastical affairs within their respective limits. Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, writes, that in his province they met every year;[4] and from the frequent synods mentioned by St. Cyprian, we may conclude them to have been held in that province at least once a year. These synods or assemblies were composed of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and laymen, representing the people of their several churches.[5] They met by their own appointment and authority, there being no Christian magistrates in those days to convene synods. Being thus assembled, they chose in the first place one, and sometimes two bishops, to preside.[6] It was their office and duty to see the point in question calmly and fairly debated, to sum up in each debate what had been urged on both sides, to take the votes and suffrages of the members of the synod, and last of all to give their own.[7] In these assemblies all ecclesiastical affairs were settled by the majority of votes, and their decrees and decisions were binding with respect to those churches whose representatives were present;[8] but were not so with respect to other churches.

Such was the hierarchy, such the government of the church, during the three first centuries. But in the fourth and following ages great alterations were made in both, the church adapting her government to that of the state, namely, to the new form of government introduced by Constantine, who had settled her in peace, and taken the priesthood into his immediate protection. For it was in his reign that the titles of Patriarchs, Exarchs, Metropolitans, were first heard of, or at least had any power, authority, or privileges, annexed to them. That this conformity between the civil and ecclesiastical polity may appear more plainly, I shall premise a succinct account of the former, as established by Constantine throughout the empire. That prince divided the whole Roman world into four prefectures, namely, the east, Illyricum, Gaul, and Italy, which were governed by four prefects, called *Præfecti Prætorio*. Till his time the whole empire was governed under the emperors by two prefects only, as Zosimus informs us;[1] and this division is supposed to have been made by Constantine, jealous of the too great power of those magistrates. Each prefecture was subdivided into several dioceses, and each diocese into several provinces. Thus the prefecture of the east contained five dioceses; namely, the east divided into ten provinces, Egypt into six, Pontus into eleven, Asia into ten, and Thrace into six. Under the prefecture of Illyricum were two dioceses; Macedon, consisting of eight provinces; and Dacia, consisting of four. The prefecture of Gaul comprised three dioceses, Gaul made up of seventeen provinces, Spain of seven, and Britain of five. The prefecture of Italy was divided into two vicarages or lieutenancies; the one of Rome, comprehending ten provinces, under the vicar of Rome, whence they were called suburbicarian provinces; the other of Italy, containing seven provinces, governed by the vicar of Italy, who resided at Milan, whence they were simply called provinces of Italy. Under the prefect of Italy was likewise West Africa, and after Constantine's death West Illyricum. The prefects had other officers under them, by whom the provinces were more immediately governed. These were, to name them according to their rank and dignity, proconsuls, vicars, consulars, correctors, and presidents. Each diocese had its metropolis, and likewise each province contained in the diocese.

Now, if we compare the civil polity thus described, with the ecclesiastical, we shall find them in most places answering each other, in every respect, and one bishop raised above the rest, according to the rank that was given by this new division to the city in which he presided. Thus, for instance, the chief cities of the five dioceses of the oriental prefecture were—Antioch, the metropolis of the oriental diocese; Alexandria, of the Egyptian; Ephesus, of the Asiatic; Cæsarea, of the Pontic; and Heraclea, of the Thracian. Now the bishops of these cities, in regard of the eminence of their sees, were exalted above all other bishops, and distinguished with the title of exarchs; nay, and by degrees they acquired, not to say usurped, a kind of authority and jurisdiction over the bishops of the inferior sees, which was afterwards confirmed

[1] Conc. t. 1, p. 1448.
[2] Hier. ep. 85.
[3] Cypr. ep. 55, 72, 52.
[4] Apud Cypr. ep. 75.
[5] Cypr. ep. 14, 26, 31; Euseb. l. 5, c. 16, et l. 7, c. 30; Act. concil. Carth. apud Cypr. p. 443.
[6] Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, et 24.
[7] Act. concil. Carth. p. 443.
[8] Cypr. ep. 59.

[1] Zos. l. 2, p. 623.

The prefectures of Illyricum, Gaul, Spain, and Italy. The ecclesiastical polity of Italy agreeable to the civil. The ecclesiastical polity in Africa. Exarchs, Metropolitans, &c., not of divine institution.

to them by several councils. In like manner, the bishop of the metropolis of each province was, on account of the dignity of his see, honored with the title of metropolitan, to which were annexed several privileges, of which I shall speak hereafter. When one province was divided into two, which often happened, the ecclesiastical polity was likewise altered, and the bishop of the new metropolis raised to the dignity of a metropolitan. Several instances might be alleged of ambitious bishops applying to the emperors for a division of the province, that their city might acquire the title of metropolis, and they, of course, that of metropolitans. When the city of Byzantium was declared the metropolis of another empire, the Exarchate of Heraclea, the metropolis of the Thracian diocese, was, by that change, transferred from Heraclea to the new metropolis; so that the Bishop of Heraclea became suffragan to the Bishop of Byzantium, or, as it was then called, Constantinople, who, till that time, had been suffragan to him. Upon the division of a province, the churches were likewise divided, and the bishop of the new metropolis acquired all the privileges and power of a metropolitan over the churches taken by the change in the civil government from the ancient metropolis. But it was afterwards decreed, by the council of Chalcedon, that if any city should be raised to the dignity of a metropolis, the bishop of that city should enjoy the title, but not the privileges of a metropolitan. Thus the bishops of Nice and Berytus were honored with the title of metropolitans, and took place of all the other bishops of those provinces; but nevertheless continued to be suffragans to their ancient metropolitans, the bishops of Nicomedia and Tyre. For the same reason several bishops in the kingdom of Naples enjoy, to this day, the title of metropolitans; but neither have, nor ever had, any province or suffragans. The abovementioned decree was enacted by the council of Chalcedon, to prevent the bishops from recurring, as they often did, to the emperors, and to obviate the frequent changes that were thereby introduced into the church.

The prefecture of Illyricum had but one exarch, the Bishop of Thessalonica, the metropolis of the Macedonian diocese. In the prefecture of Gaul there was no exarch, but in the two dioceses of Gaul and Spain as many metropolitans as provinces. Some there were, without all doubt, in the diocese of Britain, which was divided into five provinces, namely, Maxima Cæsariensis, Britannia Prima, Britannia Secunda, Valentia, and Flavia Cæsariensis. But in this island an entire change was made, by the Saxons, both in the ecclesiastical and civil polity.

Under the prefect of Italy were three dioceses, namely, Italy, West Illyricum, and West Africa. The diocese of Italy was divided into two vicarages, as I have observed above, and governed by two vicars; the one called the vicar of Rome, and residing in that city, the other styled the vicar of Italy, and residing at Milan. Under the former were ten provinces, namely, Campania, Apulia, Lucania, Hetruria, Umbria, Picenum Suburbicarium, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Valeria; and seven under the latter, namely, Liguria, Æmilia, Flaminia or Picenum Annonarium, Venetia, Istria, Alpes Cottiæ, and the two Rhætiæ. Such was the civil government of Italy, and entirely agreeable to the civil was the ecclesiastical. Thus the Bishop of Rome enjoyed all the privileges of a metropolitan, with respect to the bishops of the provinces subject to the vicar of that city, or the suburbicarian provinces, as they are styled by Ruffinus. In like manner the Bishop of Milan exercised the power and authority of a metropolitan over all the bishops under the vicar of Italy. But the power of both was confined within the limits of their respective vicarages. As neither had the charge of a whole diocese, they were not, like several bishops in the east, distinguished with the title of exarch, which they had no right to, but with that only of metropolitan. However, the power of the Bishop of Rome far exceeded, within the bounds of his jurisdiction, that of other metropolitans, as I shall show hereafter.

In Africa the ecclesiastical polity varied greatly from the civil. Carthage, indeed, in the proconsular province of Africa, properly so called, was the metropolis of all West Africa, and the bishop of that city the primate and exarch. But in the other five provinces of that diocese, namely, Numidia, the two Mauritanias, Cæsariensis and Sitifensis, Tingitana, Bizacena, and Tripolitana, the senior bishop, in what city soever he presided, enjoyed the title and privileges of metropolitan, regard being had to his seniority, or the time of his ordination, and none to the dignity of his see. And hence it is that, at different times, we find bishops of different cities, within the same province, acting as metropolitans. Of West Illyricum, the third diocese under the prefect of Italy, I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Some writers, namely, Petrus de Marca, Archbishop of Paris,[1] Christianus Lupus,[2] Emmanuel Schelstrat,[3] two eminent divines, the one of Louvain, the other of Antwerp, and Leo Allatius,[4] have taken a great deal of pains to prove, that these ecclesiastical dignities owe their origin to Christ, or the apostles. But their arguments are unanswerably confuted by the learned Ellies du Pin;[5] and besides, it is evident, from the entire conformity which the ecclesiastical government had, in most places, with the political state of the

[1] Pet. de Mar. l. 6, de conc. c. 1.
[2] Lup. can. 4; Nic. par. 1.
[3] Schel. antiq illust. part. 1, disser. 1, c. 3, art. 1.
[4] Leo All. de eccl. occid. et orient. conses. l. 1, c. 2.
[5] Du Pin de antiq. eccles. discip. diss. 1, n. 6.

The new dignities added to the ancient hierarchy of the church. The rights and privileges of metropolitans. The rights and privileges of patriarchs, or exarchs. The Bishop of Rome not a patriarch.

empire, as established by Constantine, that the church, in forming the hierarchy I have described, adopted his plan; and consequently, that such dignities are not of divine, but of human institution. I might add, that it cannot be proved from Scripture, that the apostles, in appointing bishops, gave more power to one than to another, or any power at all to one over the others.

The new dignities or degrees, added to the ancient hierarchy of the church, in the fourth and following centuries, were those of Metropolitan, Primate, Archbishop, Exarch, and Patriarch. The title of Metropolitan was given to the bishop of the chief city of a province, and likewise that of Primate, he being *primus*, or the first of the province; for such was the original signification of that word in an ecclesiastical sense; but, in process of time, the title of Primate was restrained to the bishops of some great cities. On the contrary the title of Archbishop was originally bestowed on metropolitans only of great eminence and distinction; but, in the eighth century, it began to be given indifferently to all metropolitans, and even to some bishops, distinguished by no other title. As the bishop of the metropolis, or chief city, of a province, was dignified with the title of Metropolitan, so was the bishop of the metropolis, or chief city of a diocese, with that of Exarch; which, however, we find sometimes given to metropolitans. As for the title of Patriarch, it was first common to all bishops, but afterwards confined to the exarchs; and lastly, to the bishops of the five following cities, namely, Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. It was first bestowed on the Bishop of Rome, by the council of Chalcedon,[1] after it had been long common to all the exarchs of the east, as the learned Du Pin well observes.[2]

The titles of Metropolitans, Primates, Exarchs, and Patriarchs, were not bare names of honor, but had several rights and prerogatives attending them. Thus the metropolitans and primates had, by their prerogative, a right to ordain the bishops of their respective provinces, to convene provincial synods, and to have a general superintendency or inspection over the whole province. The ordaining of bishops was a privilege common to the metropolitan, with the other bishops of the same province; but with this difference, that the presence, or at least the consent and approbation of the metropolitan was absolutely necessary; for, according to the fourth and sixth canons of the council of Nice, "He who was not ordained, or approved, by the metropolitan, was not to be a bishop." This privilege, was confirmed to the metropolitans by many subsequent councils, namely, by those of Arles, Laodicea, Carthage, Chalcedon, Ephesus,[1] and many others. However, in the fifth century, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople began, in the east, to usurp this prerogative, pretending, that no bishops ought to be ordained in their respective dioceses, without their knowledge, consent, and approbation; and the patriarch of Rome, still more ambitious and encroaching, claimed a right to ordain the bishops throughout all the provinces of the west, which occasioned endless disputes, as we shall see in the sequel of this history. As to the second privilege peculiar to the metropolitans, they had a right to summon the bishops of their respective provinces to meet when they thought proper; to appoint the time and place of their meeting; to punish such as did not, without just cause, comply with their summons; and to preside in the assembly. The general care and inspection, which they were charged with over the whole province, imported, first, That all complaints against, all contests with or between the bishops of the province, were to be brought to their tribunal; and there heard, judged, and determined, not by the metropolitan alone, but by him and the other bishops of the province, in a provincial synod. Innumerable instances might be alleged of bishops thus deposed by their metropolitans. Secondly, The metropolitans had a right to receive appeals from the sentence of inferior bishops, and, with the other bishops, to confirm or reverse their decrees. And, lastly, each metropolitan was to keep a watchful eye over the bishops of his province, and take care that they discharged, as they ought, the functions of their office. These privileges were, in express terms, granted to the metropolitans, by almost innumerable councils, which it is needless and would be too tedious to name.

As for the patriarchs, or exarchs; by their prerogative, they were empowered to ordain the metropolitans, to convene diocesan synods, and to have a general superintendency over their respective dioceses, such as the metropolitans had over their respective provinces. The Bishop of Rome had not the charge of a whole diocese, and therefore was not, properly speaking, exarch or patriarch: his jurisdiction did not extend beyond the limits of the vicarage of Rome, or the suburbicarian provinces; and no instance can be produced of metropolitans or bishops ordained by him, out of those provinces, till the time of Valentinian III. Even in the vicarage of Italy the metropolitans of each province ordained all the bishops, and were themselves ordained by the bishops of the province. But over the suburbicarian provinces the Bishop of Rome exercised greater power and authority than the exarchs of the east did over the provinces of their dioceses; for the latter left the ordi-

[1] Concil. t. 4, col. 58; Evagr. l. 2, c. 18.
[2] Du Pin, c. 6, n. 5.

[1] Conc. Arel. can. 50; Laod. can. 12; Carth. can. 12; Eph. act. 4, &c.

The bishops of Rome have no right to ordain the metropolitans. The title of Archbishop a bare name of honour. The donation of all Italy to the pope, a forgery. Constantine baptized at Nicomedia, and not at Rome.

nation of the bishops to their metropolitans, whereas the former ordained not only the bishops of the metropolitan cities, but all those of the forementioned provinces: and the reason of this was, because these provinces had no metropolitans, to whom the ordination of bishops would of right have belonged; so that the prerogatives of the metropolitans were all vested in the Bishop of Rome alone. As there were no exarchs or patriarchs in the west, the bishops of each province were, by several councils, vested with the power of ordaining their own metropolitans; and that they were thus ordained in Gaul, Spain, and West Africa, is so manifest as to admit of no dispute.[1] And yet the sticklers for the see of Rome pretend the bishops of that city to have a divine and inherent right of ordaining all the metropolitans throughout the Christian world, by themselves, their vicars, or delegates. To maintain this chimerical right against the incontestable evidence of facts, they tell us, that the popes, for some ages, neglected to exert the power they had.[2] But from this charge all mankind will clear them, it being but too well known, that they never neglected the least opportunity of exerting to the utmost the power they had, and usurping the power they had not. But, cavils aside, it is evident beyond dispute, that the popes never knew, nor dreamt of, any such right or prerogative, till they were told of it by their flattering divines; at least Pope Leo, surnamed the Great, did not; for in one of his letters to the bishops of Gaul he disclaims, in express terms, the right of ordaining the bishops of that diocese.[3] To conclude, the Bishop of Rome was the only metropolitan in that vicarage; and, as such, had a right to ordain all the bishops of the suburbicarian provinces, or the provinces subject to the vicar of Rome; but, for a considerable tract of time, there is no instance of their ordaining either bishops or metropolitans out of that district.

As for the title of Archbishop, it is in itself a bare name of honor; whence, in some countries, especially in Italy, several are distinguished with that title, who indeed take place of, but have no power or authority over other bishops. And thus far of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as settled in the fourth and following centuries, of the different degrees that compose it, and the prerogatives peculiar to each degree, the knowledge whereof is absolutely necessary for the right understanding of the many contests and disputes in point of jurisdiction, which I shall have occasion to touch upon in the sequel of this history; for it was not at once, but by degrees, and not without great opposition, that the bishops of Rome, extending their authority beyond the limits of that vicarage, which was at that time the boundary of their jurisdiction, acquired the unlimited power they now enjoy, with the arrogant title of Universal Bishop.

But to return to Sylvester, in whose pontificate this great change began; I need not employ many words to show the forgery of the so much boasted donation of all Italy, supposed to have been made by Constantine to Sylvester, in the spring of the year 324, four days after he had been baptized by that pontiff, since the instrument of that donation is now looked upon as supposititious, by all who have the least tincture of learning. The arguments they allege against it are: 1. That more than twelve copies of that instrument are still extant, all differing from one another. 2. That it evidently appears, from two constitutions of Constantine, still to be seen in the Theodosian Code,[1] that he was not at Rome, but at Thessalonica, in the spring of the year 324. 3. That neither Eusebius, who has given us a very minute and particular account of the actions of that prince, nor any other contemporary writer, has so much as hinted at so memorable a fact. 4. That all the ancient writers, both Greek and Latin, agree, that Constantine was not baptized at Rome, but at Nicomedia, when he lay at the point of death.[2] Let those who stand up in defence of that donation, give satisfactory answers to these reasons, and I shall conclude with them, that Italy being, by such a donation, disjoined from the empire, the emperors who succeeded Constantine had no claim or title to that country; that none of their constitutions were binding there; and consequently that, by the inhabitants of Italy, recourse ought to be had, in all cases, not to the civil, but to the canon law: for such pernicious doctrines have been broached, published, and maintained, as natural deductions from Constantine's great generosity to Sylvester.[3] In Rome is still to be seen, in a most sumptuous chapel, close to the Lateran, the baptistery or font in which Constantine is said to have been baptized. The chapel is adorned with noble paintings, representing that august ceremony, as performed by Sylvester, in the magnificent drapery and stately apparel of the present popes. Four days after this ceremony, Constantine, sensible of his obligations to Sylvester, rewarded him for his trouble with a fee, as Luchesini, the Scolopian, expresses it, answering in some degree to the greatness of the favour he had received at his hands; a fee worthy of so great a prince, of so great a pope.[4] The fee, which that writer, otherwise a man of learning, makes a long and tedious descant upon, was no less than the city of Rome, and all Italy. That

[1] Vide Du Pin. dissert. 1, n. 13. [2] Idem ib.
[3] Leo, ep. 89.

[1] Cod. Theod. l. 4, de navicul. et l. un. de his qui veniam ætat.
[2] Vide Petr. de Marca, l. 3, c. 12, l. 6, c. 6; Schelstrat. antiq. illustr. par. 2, dissert. 3, c. 8; Got. in chron. cod. Theod. ann. 324; Euseb. vit. Const. l. 4, c. 61.
[3] Affict. in constit. in prælud. quæst. 2. n. 2, et q. 20, n. 1; Tappia de jur. regni, l. 1, et de leg. l. 1, n. 6; Ponte de potest. Prorog. tit. 11, n. 26.
[4] Luch. de imp. potest. in Ital.

What gave countenance to the custom of deferring baptism to the point of death. Spurious pieces ascribed to Sylvester.

Constantine was baptized at Nicomedia, and not at Rome, is affirmed, in express terms, by Theodoret,[1] Sozomen,[2] Socrates,[3] and Photius,[4] among the Greeks; and, among the Latins, by St. Ambrose,[5] St. Jerom,[6] and the council of Rimini.[7] Emmanuel Schelstrat, on one side, ashamed to reject, or even to question such authorities, but, on the other, unwilling to rob Sylvester of that glory, will have Constantine to have been baptized in both places. It is well known, says he, that Constantine, in the latter end of his life, was greatly biassed in favor of the Arians, and their tenets. Now a practice obtained among them of rebaptizing such as came over to their sect from the catholic church; and, to conform to this custom, Constantine was, in all likelihood, prevailed upon by Eusebius, the Arian bishop of Nicomedia, who assisted him on his death-bed.[8] Thus Schelstrat. But it is certain, that in Constantine's time, the Arians allowed the validity of baptism administered by the catholics; for, long after, we find St. Austin upbraiding them with the practice of rebaptizing, as a novelty lately introduced among them.[9] Besides, who is so little versed in the history of the church, as not to know that in those early times a very bad custom universally prevailed, at least among persons of distinction, who embraced the Christian religion, namely, that of putting off their baptism to their death-bed, or till they were upon the point of exposing themselves to some great danger? Thus Theodosius the Great, though he had not only openly professed the Christian religion, but given many instances of an extraordinary piety, yet did not choose to be baptized till he fell dangerously ill at Thessalonica.[10] In like manner Valentinian II. delayed his baptism till the approach of a battle with the barbarians, when he sent, in great haste, for St. Ambrose to administer that sacrament to him. But while the good bishop was crossing the Alps, on his way to Vienna, where the emperor then was, he received the melancholy news of his having been inhumanly murdered by some of his own officers, at the instigation of Arbogastus. His death was greatly lamented by St. Ambrose, who, in the elegant oration which he pronounced on occasion of his obsequies, maintained, that the fervent desire of baptism had the same effect as the sacrament itself; and consequently, that the sins of the deceased prince being thereby cancelled, it was not to be doubted, but from this life he had passed to eternal bliss.[11] Innumerable instances of the same nature occur in history, which were, it seems, utterly unknown to the author of the Acts of Pope Sylvester, upon whose sole authority the fable has been credited of Constantine's receiving baptism at the hands of Sylvester, soon after his conversion. That impostor, whoever he was, is supposed to have lived in the eighth century, long after the custom of deferring baptism to the point of death had been utterly abolished. What gave countenance to such a custom was an opinion then generally received, and still held by the Church of Rome; namely, That by the waters of the sacred font men were washed clean, not only from the original, but from all other sins. This proved a great encouragement to vice, when piety began (and it began but too early) to decay among Christians; and therefore the fathers of the church, especially Basil, his brother Gregory, of Nyssa, and St. Ambrose,[1] employed all the oratory they were masters of, in crying down such a pernicious and wicked custom, as they style it; so that it was at last quite laid aside. Whether confession ought not, on the same account, to be put down, I shall leave the reader to judge; and only observe here, by the way, that had the virtue and efficacy ascribed now to confession, been known in those times, sinners needed not have delayed baptism to the point of death, since their sins had been no less effectually cancelled by confession than by baptism.

As for the letter from the council of Nice to Sylvester; his answer; the Acts of a council of two hundred and seventy-five bishops, supposed to have been held by him at the request of the fathers of Nice, to confirm their canons and decrees;[2] his letter to the bishops

[1] Theod. l. 1, c. 32.
[2] Soz. l. 2, c. 34.
[3] Socr. l. 1, c. 39.
[4] Phot. cod. 127.
[5] Ambros. serm. de obitu Theodos.
[6] Hier. in chron.
[7] Soz. l. 4, c. 18.
[8] Schelst. antiq. illust. part 2, dissert. 3, c. 6.
[9] Aug. de hæres. c. 48.
[10] Socr. l. 5, c. 6; Sozom. l. 7, c. 4.
[11] Amb. orat. in fun. Val.

[1] Greg. in orat. de bapt. Amb. in ser. de sanct. et alibi.

[2] The style of the letter from the council to Sylvester is quite barbarous and unintelligible. It begins thus: *Gloriam corroborata de Divinis mysteriis. Ecclesiasticæ utilitatis quæ ad robur pertinent ecclesiæ catholicæ et apostolicæ ad sedem tuam Romanam explanata et de Græco redacta scribere confitemur—nunc itaque ad vestræ sedis argumentum accurrimus roborari.* The rest is written in the same style; the consuls are called *sovereigns*, and the letter is dated five or six days after the opening of the council. The design of the impostor was to make the fathers of Nice recur to Sylvester for a confirmation of their decrees. Sylvester's answer is of a piece with the letter of the council; it supposes him to have added something to the council; mentions the cycle of Victorinus, who was not born in Sylvester's time, nor many years after; and bears a false date. As for the council said, and by some still maintained, to have been held at Rome, to confirm the canons of Nice, it was utterly unknown to all the ancients. And who can believe that none of the ancients should ever have heard of a council held in the metropolis of the empire, and consisting, as we are told, of two hundred and seventy-five bishops, or, if they had heard of it, that they would never have mentioned it? Besides, it is said to have been held at Rome, in the presence of Constantine; and it is certain that the emperor was not in Rome at the time the council is supposed to have been held. The canons, which are supposed to have been made on this occasion, contain regulations repugnant to the practice of those times, and which it was then impossible to observe. The first canon relates to the time when Easter was to be kept; but what is there determined no man can know. The second is no less unintelligible than the first: *Ut unusquisque episcopus rediens ad parochiam suam compaginem salutationis plebi tuæ innotescat.* These are the words of this canon. The third forbids the ecclesiastics to appear before secular judges, let the action be what it will; which is repugnant to the discipline of those times.

The Bishop of Rome ordained by the Bishop of Ostia. Julius is falsely said to have held a great council at Rome. The Arians write to Julius against Athanasius.

of Gaul, in favor of the church of Vienne; the Acts of two other councils, said to have been held by him at Rome; they are all pieces universally rejected by men of learning, and deemed no less fabulous than the instrument of Constantine's donation, and that prince's journey with Sylvester to the council of Nice, as it is related in the Acts of the latter, even in those which F. Combesis published in 1660. They are in Greek, and that writer undertakes to defend them as genuine;[1] but we need no other proof than the account they give of that journey, to conclude them incapable of being defended. Sylvester died on the 31st of December, 335, after having governed the church of Rome for the space of twenty-one years and eleven months.[2]

MARK, THIRTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE.]

[Year of Christ 336.] SYLVESTER was succeeded by Mark, on the 18th of January, 336. He is passed over by Theodoret,[1] but named by Optatus,[2] Ruffinus,[3] St. Austin,[4] St. Jerom,[5] and Sozomen.[6] We know nothing certain either of his life or administration. Anastasius indeed tells us, that by him the Bishop of Ostia was first appointed to ordain the Bishop of Rome, and to carry the pallium or pall; where Baronius observes, that the pall is here mentioned for the first time.[7] But Anastasius is not a writer we can depend upon. It is certain, however, that the bishops of Ostia have long enjoyed this privilege; for it is mentioned by St. Austin,[8] and likewise in a memorial presented by the clergy of Rome, in 418, to the Emperor Honorius, on occasion of the election of Pope Zosimus.[3] The letter which the bishops of Egypt are said to have written to this pope, and his answer to them, are rejected even by Baronius,[4] and very justly; for the pope's answer is dated eighteen days after his death. He died on the 7th of October, the same year he had been chosen,[5] and was buried in the cemetery of Balbina, which was thenceforth called after his name.[6] His body is now worshipped in the church of St. Lawrence, at Florence, though no mention is made by any writer of its having ever been translated thither.[7]

JULIUS, THIRTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, and his three sons, CONSTANTINE, CONSTANTIUS, and CONSTANS.]

[Year of Christ 337.] UPON the death of Mark the see was vacant for the space of four months, that is, to the 6th of February, 337, when Julius was chosen.[9] He is said to have held a council of a hundred and sixteen bishops in the December of the same year.[10] But the date of this council puts Baronius to a stand; for in the date are marked the consuls, the year of the emperors, and the indiction. Now, according to the consuls, it must have been held in 337; according to the year of the emperors, in 340; and, according to the indiction, in 347. The annalist spares neither his words nor his labor to solve, or rather to patch up, this difficulty; but, being sensible, after a long, tedious, and puzzling descant, that he labours in vain, he concludes, that the text has been altered.[8] He might have saved himself a great deal of trouble, by owning at once what has been plainly proved since by Blondel,[9] namely, that no such council was ever held.

When Julius was raised to the pontificate, the celebrated Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, lived in banishment at Treves; but the year following he was allowed to return to his church by the three emperors, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, who had suc-

The fourth will have those who enter themselves among the clergy, to pass through all the degrees, and fixes the time which they are to continue in each degree. They are to be janitors or door-keepers one year, lectors or readers twenty, exorcists ten, acolytes five, subdeacons five, deacons five, and priests six; so that none under threescore could attain to the episcopal dignity; which is highly absurd in itself, and contrary to the practice of those times.

[1] Theod. l. 2, c. 12.
[2] Opt. l. 2, p. 48.
[3] Ruffin. l. 10, c. 22.
[4] Aug. ep. 165.
[5] Hier. chron.
[6] Soz. l. 2, c. 20.
[7] Bar. ad ann. 336, n. 64.
[8] Aug. coll. die 3, c. 16.
[9] Buch. p. 273.
[10] Concil. tom. 2, p. 527.

[1] Comb. act., &c., p. 258.
[2] Buch. cycl. p. 267, 273.
[3] Vide Du Pin, dissert. 1, n. 13.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 336, n. 60, 61.
[5] Soz. l. 2, c. 20; Hier. chron. Buch. p. 267, 273.
[6] Front. cal. p. 141.
[7] Holland. Pont. p. 50.
[8] Bar. ad ann. 337, n. 67.
[9] Blond. decret. p. 451

The Arians desire Julius to assemble a council. They decline appearing at the council of Rome; assemble one at Antioch; and there depose Athanasius. Neither Athanasius nor any other bishop restored by Julius.

ceeded their father in 337. The Eusebians, that is, the Arian faction headed by Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, at whose instigation he had been banished by Constantine, alarmed at his return, wrote bitter letters against him to the three princes, and likewise to the Bishop of Rome. To the latter they despatched with their letters Macarius a presbyter, and the two deacons, Martyrius and Hesychius. Athanasius no sooner heard of this embassy than he, in his turn, despatched some presbyters to oppose the attempts of his enemies, and defend his innocence against the calumnies which he well knew they were sent to spread against him, not only at Rome, but all over the west.[1] Upon their arrival, Macarius privately withdrew from Rome, and the other two were so confounded by the deputies of Athanasius, at a private conference held before the pope, that, to gain time, they had no other resource but to appeal to a council, which they begged the pope to assemble, and to give timely notice thereof both to Athanasius and the Eusebians. They bragged that, before the council, they would make good the charge they had brought against Athanasius, and offered to take Julius himself for their judge.[2] This offer, we may be sure, was readily accepted by the Bishop of Rome, who immediately wrote to Athanasius inviting him to the council, and at the same time desired the deputies of the Eusebians to acquaint their party, that, agreeably to their request, a council should be soon convened. Athanasius, upon the receipt of the pope's letter, set out, without delay, for Rome, where he arrived in the latter end of the year 339. After his arrival, the Bishop of Rome despatched Elpidius and Philoxenes, two of his presbyters, with letters to the Eusebians, summoning them to the council, which their deputies had demanded, and acquainting them with the time and place in which it was to be held.[3] The place was Rome, and the time the month of June, 341, according to the most probable opinion. The other bishops assembled at the time appointed; but the Eusebians, instead of appearing at the council of Rome, which had been convened at their request, assembled one at Antioch, and there, without waiting for the determination of Julius, whom they had chosen for their judge, they deposed Athanasius, and appointed Gregory bishop of Alexandria in his room; nay, they even detained the deputies sent by the pope till the time appointed for the meeting of the council was expired, that they might afterwards plead, as they did, the shortness of the term prescribed for them to meet in.[4] In the council of Rome the cause of Athanasius was examined, and he, after the strictest scrutiny, declared innocent with one voice by the fifty bishops who composed it;[1] so that Julius and the rest continued to communicate with him as a bishop,[2] which was declaring him unlawfully deposed. Several other bishops, who had been deposed by the Arians, came to lay their complaints before the council, and, among the rest, Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, and Paul bishop of Constantinople. The former had been condemned as a heretic by a council held at Constantinople in 336, and consisting entirely of Arian bishops. As nobody appeared against him during the fifteen months he continued at Rome, and the declaration of his faith, which, at the request of Julius, he gave under his own hand, was judged quite orthodox by the pope and the council, he was readmitted to the communion of the catholic church.[3] But whether they did not judge too favorably of his belief, may be very much questioned: Epiphanius at least was noways satisfied with it.[4] And truly it would be no easy task to clear him from the heresy of Sabellius and Samosatenus, denying the trinity of the Divine Persons:[5] but to examine so perplexed and intricate a point would be foreign to my purpose. Socrates[6] and Sozomen[7] write, that Julius, by the authority of his see, reinstated all the bishops who had been displaced by the Arians; that he supported and defended their innocence with letters full of vigor and liberty; severely reprimanded those who had deposed them; summoned some of them to appear at Rome, in a limited time, to justify their conduct; and, lastly, that he threatened to treat them as they deserved, if they did not forbear raising disturbances in the church. In virtue of these letters, says Socrates, the bishops were restored to their sees. But Sozomen names only Athanasius, and Paul bishop of Constantinople. It is surprising, that the advocates for the see of Rome should allege the testimony of these two writers, to prove that the authority of the Bishop of Rome was acknowledged by the orientals; that his jurisdiction was universal; when they themselves must know (for I cannot suppose them so ignorant as not to know) that the historians whom they quote were grossly mistaken. For it is manifest from Athanasius,[8] that Julius wrote only two letters to the Eusebians; one before the council met, inviting them to it; and the other, while the council was still sitting, which I shall speak of hereafter; and in neither of these does Julius take upon him either to threaten or command. The abovementioned historians seem to have jumbled these two letters together, and to have made a third out of them, with some improvements of their own. As to his restoring the deposed

[1] Athan. apol. 2, p. 741—745. [2] Idem ib.
[3] Idem ib. Socr. l. 2, c. 15; Soz. l. 3, c. 8.
[4] Athan. ib. p. 744, et ad Solit. p. 816.

[1] Athan. apol. 2, p. 748.
[2] Idem ib. Hil. frag. p. 26. [3] Idem ib. p. 750.
[4] Epiph. 72, c. 4.
[5] Vide Petav. dog. t. 2, l. 1, c. 13; Hilar. de Trin. l. 7, p. 46.
[6] Socr. l. 2, c. 15. [7] Soz. l. 3, c. 8.
[8] Athan. apol. 2, p. 739.

The Eusebians write to Julius; and threaten to separate themselves from his communion. Julius's answer to their letter. The council of Sardica.

bishops to their sees, it is certain he did not, since Athanasius continued in the west till the year 349, when he was restored by the council of Sardica. Paul indeed was reinstated sooner, but not till the see of Constantinople became vacant by the death of Eusebius, who had been translated from Nicomedia to that city. I appeal to the Roman Catholics themselves, and leave them to judge whether it is at all probable, that the Emperor Constantius, and the oriental bishops, incensed as they were against Paul and Athanasius, whom they had condemned and deposed in two synods, should, out of respect to the pope, suffer them thus tamely to return to their sees, and drive out those whom they had placed in their room. This had been owning themselves guilty, and reversing the sentence they had but lately pronounced, which, as will appear, they were noways in a humor to do.

While the council of Rome was yet sitting, the pope's two deputies, Elpidius and Philoxenes, returning from the east, delivered to Julius a letter from the Eusebians, which may pass for a masterpiece of the kind; for, without departing from, or intrenching upon, the respect that was due to the bishop of the imperial city, they, at the same time, commend, censure, menace, and rally him in a most cruel manner. They begin with alleging several frivolous excuses for not appearing at the council, such as the Persian war, which, by the way, did not prevent their assembling at Antioch; the shortness of the term prescribed for their meeting; the pope's writing only to some of them, and not to all, as he ought to have done; and finally, his writing to them in his own name alone, which was tacitly taxing him with taking too much upon him. They then launch out ironically, it seems, into the highest encomiums on the Church of Rome, styling her the first of all churches, the school of the apostles, the metropolis of true piety. However, the first preachers of the gospel, add they, came out of the east; and, after all, we ought to be looked upon as inferiors to none, though perhaps we may not have such numerous and flourishing churches as some have, since the want of numbers may be abundantly supplied by the piety of a few. As to rank, we are all equal, the greatness of the cities, in which we preside, adding nothing to the dignity we all enjoy. In the next place, they express great concern at the little regard shown by some to the decisions of councils, which ought to be revered by all, and deemed immutable. This was modestly censuring the pope for not acquiescing to the decrees of the councils of Tyre and Constantinople condemning Athanasius. In the end they allege several things both against Athanasius, and Marcellus bishop of Ancyra; and conclude with telling Julius, that if he renounced all correspondence and intercourse with the bishops they had deposed, and acknowledged those they had placed in their room, they would continue to communicate with him; but if he refused to comply with their decisions and decrees, they should think themselves obliged to act in a very different manner.[1] Julius was so mortified with this letter, that he suppressed it for some time, hoping the Eusebians would send deputies, who, he presumed, would express their sentiments by word of mouth, and in a different style. But, none appearing, he was obliged to lay the letter he had received before the fathers of the council, who, after expressing the greatest indignation against the Eusebians, advised the pope to answer it; which he did accordingly, by that excellent letter, which has been preserved entire among the works of Athanasius. He begins with complaining, in very modest terms, of the animosity they betrayed in their letter, to which he thought he had given no occasion; unless they had taken it amiss, that he had summoned them to the council; which he could not persuade himself they did, since, at the request of their deputies, he had appointed the council to meet, and, at their request, invited them to it. As for the regard due to the decrees and decisions of councils, he told them, that they had trespassed the first against the decrees of the œcumenical council of Nice, by admitting the Arians to their communion, which he conceived to be more criminal in them, than it was in him to receive Athanasius and Marcellus. He reproaches them with another transgression of the canons of the church, namely, with that of passing from one bishopric to another, which Eusebius had done. He then justifies his conduct with regard to Athanasius and Marcellus; exhorts the Eusebians, with great zeal and earnestness, to find out some remedy against the evils and disorders that reigned in the east, which he describes at length; and concludes with complaining of the orientals for condemning and deposing bishops, those especially of the apostolic sees, without the concurrence or knowledge of their brethren in the west.[2]

Julius, finding his letter made no impression on the Eusebians, applied with several other bishops to the Emperor Constans, who, at their request, proposed to his brother Constantius the assembling of an œcumenical council, in order to put an end to those unhappy divisions. To this proposal Constantius agreed; and accordingly, by the command of the two princes, a numerous council met in 347, at Sardica, the metropolis of Dacia in Illyricum.[3] Julius, apprehending it dangerous to abandon his flock at that juncture, did not assist in person, but by his deputies Archidamus and Philoxenes, who signed in

[1] Athan. apol. 2, p. 740—749, et ad Solit. p. 816; Soz. l. 3, c. 8; Euseb. l. 6, c. 43; Hil. frag. p. 25.
[2] Athan. ib. p. 730—753.
[3] Athan. ib. p. 761; Socr. l. 1, c. 20; Hil. frag. 2, p. 7; Soz. l. 3, c. 12, &c.

Canons of the council of Sardica relating to the Bishop of Rome. The practice of appealing to the pope first introduced. The popes claim as their original right, what was granted them as a favor.

his name.[1] The orientals came, but withdrew soon after, upon the council's refusing to exclude Athanasius, and some others, whom they had condemned.[2] But by the orthodox bishops, who remained, the acts of the council of Rome were confirmed, Athanasius and three other bishops declared innocent; and those who had been placed in their room, not only deposed, but anathematized, and entirely cut off from the communion of the Catholic church.[3] The council, before they broke up, wrote several letters; and, among the rest, one to the emperors; one to the Bishop of Rome; and a circular letter to all the bishops of the Catholic church, acquainting them with what had passed, and exhorting them to join the council, and declare to the world, that they accepted their decrees by subscribing to them.[4] The circular letter was subscribed first by the great Osius bishop of Cordoua, and in the second place by the pope's legates.[5] In their letter to Julius they beg him to notify their decrees to the bishops of Sardinia, Sicily, and Italy, lest any of them should receive letters of peace and communion from the bishops they had condemned.[6] In this letter the council says, or rather is made to say, that "it is very meet or reasonable, that all bishops should acquaint their head, that is, the see of St. Peter, with what passes in their respective provinces."[7] I agree with Blondel,[8] that this passage is foisted in; but cannot acquiesce to the only reason he alleges to support his opinion, namely, the barbarity of the Latin expression, (*valde congruentissimum est;*) for such a slip might easily escape men wholly bent on defending the truth, and speaking it; and besides, we are not certain, that this letter was originally written in Latin. The want of connection between that sentence and what is said both before and after it, is, I think, a more convincing proof of forgery.

By the council of Sardica several canons were made; but I shall only take notice of those that regard the Bishop of Rome. By the third canon in the Greek, or the fourth in the Latin translation by Isidorus, it is ordered, that if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, his judges shall acquaint the Bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order his cause to be re-examined by such of the neighboring bishops as he shall think fit to name.[9] Osius, who was greatly addicted to the see of Rome, begged the council to grant this honor to the memory of St. Peter. The fourth canon, according to the Greek, adds, that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant till his cause shall be judged by the Bishop of Rome. By the fifth canon, which by some mistake is the seventh in Dionysius Exiguus, it is ordered, that if a bishop, condemned in his own province, shall choose to be judged by the Bishop of Rome, and desires him to appoint some of his presbyters to judge him in his name, together with the bishops, the Bishop of Rome may grant him his request. Thus was the pernicious practice of appealing to the pope first introduced and authorized. It must be observed, that the oriental bishops had all left the council: those who remained were all zealous opposers of Arianism. At the head of their party was the Bishop of Rome. In the heat of their zeal they thought they could not confer too much power upon him; and so made a concession entirely repugnant to the discipline of the primitive church, and which he could never have obtained, had not those dispositions worked strongly in his favour. This will not be surprising to those, who have attended to history, and seen how much the ambition of princes and heads of factions is often advanced beyond its due bounds by the indiscreet fervor of party zeal. To the council of Sardica, acting under this influence, the see of Rome is indebted for the so much boasted privilege of receiving appeals; and Julius was very thankful for it. But his successors, looking upon such an obligation as a diminution of their pretended sovereignty, have had the assurance to claim it as their original right: but that such a right was unknown to their great friend Osius, to the fathers of the council, nay, and to the pope himself, and his legates, is manifest, since what they now claim as their original and inherent right, was by Osius begged of the council as a favor, and, as such, granted by the council, and accepted by the pope and his legates. This power of receiving appeals, only with respect to the judging and deposing of bishops, has been extended by the popes to all causes; and great encouragement has been given to such as recurred to their tribunal on the slightest occasions. "Concerning appeals in the smallest causes, we would have you to know, that the same regard is to be had to them, for how slight a matter soever they be made, as if they were for a greater," says Pope Alexander III. in his letter to the Bishop of Worcester.[1] The scandalous and intolerable abuse of this power in the popes has obliged several princes, even when superstition most prevailed, to restrain their subjects by severe laws from recurring to Rome. Nay, other councils of far greater authority than that of Sardica, finding no other means to put a stop to the daily encroachments of the see of Rome, have thought it necessary to revoke the privilege, which that council had too rashly granted, as we shall see in the sequel of the present history.

It had been decreed but six years before,

[1] Athan. ap. 2, p. 767.
[2] Athan. ad Solit. p. 819; Hil. frag. 2, p. 22.
[3] Athan. ib. p. 766, et ad Sol. p. 820; Theod. l. 2, c. 6; Hil. frag. 1, p. 18.
[4] Athan. ib.
[5] Idem ib. p. 767.
[6] Hil. frag. 1, p. 15, 16.
[7] Idem ib.
[8] Blond. prim. p. 106.
[9] Concil. t. 2, p. 652.

[1] In decret. Greg. l. 2, tit. 28, c. 11.

Decrees of the council of Antioch revoked by the council of Sardica. Osius did not preside as the pope's legate. Athanasius retires to Naissus. Is recalled by Constantius. Ursacius and Valens retract. Julius dies.

by the council of Antioch, that, if the bishops of the same province disagreed in judging one of their brethren, the metropolitan might call in those of the neighboring province to judge with them; but if they agreed, and were unanimous either in condemning or absolving, their judgment should be irreversible. Both these decrees were revoked by the present council, though entirely agreeable to the ancient practice and discipline of the church. But yet this council, however favorable to the pope, did not grant him the power of summoning bishops to Rome, in order to be judged there by him. He was only empowered to examine the judgment given in the province; and, in case he found it to be wrong, to order another in the same province, to invite to this new synod the bishops of the next province, and to send his legates to it as he thought fit.

At this council the pope's legates assisted; but Osius presided, as we are told in express terms by Theodoret,[1] by Sozomen,[2] and by the fathers of the council of Chalcedon.[3] Besides, his name is the first in the subscriptions, as they have been transmitted to us by Athanasius, who assures us, that Osius was the chief, and presided in all the councils at which he assisted. He signed the first, and in his own name: after him signed the legates, not in their own, but in the pope's name; *Julius Romæ per Archidamum et Philoxenum, Presbyteros;* which is a sufficient confutation of De Marca, and the other popish writers, pretending, without the least foundation, that Osius presided in the name of Julius.

It is to be observed, that the canons of this council were never received in the east, nor even in the west, by the bishops of Africa; and that they were not inserted by the council of Chalcedon into the code of canons approved by them, as rules to be universally observed: so that, after all, the so much boasted council of Sardica is a council of no great authority. Of this the popes themselves were well apprized; and therefore, recurring to fraud, attempted, as we shall see hereafter, to impose upon the world the canons of Sardica as the canons of Nice.

Athanasius, though declared innocent by the council, did not think it advisable to return to his see, being informed that the Eusebians had prevailed upon the Emperor Constantius to issue an order empowering and commanding the magistrates of Alexandria to put him to death, without further trial, in what place soever he should be found within the precincts of that jurisdiction.[4] He therefore retired to Naissus, in Upper Dacia, and there continued from the year 347 to 349, when Constantius chose rather to recall him, and the other exiled bishops, than engage in a civil war, with which he was threatened by his brother, if he did not.[1] Before his departure for the east he went to Rome, to take his leave of that church, and his great protector Julius, who, on that occasion, wrote an excellent letter of congratulation to the presbyters, deacons, and people of Alexandria. Of this letter we have two copies, the one in Socrates,[2] and the other in Athanasius.[3] The former contains great commendations of that prelate, which, out of modesty, were, as I conjecture, omitted by him.

Julius had, soon after, the satisfaction of receiving a solemn retractation made by Ursacius, bishop of Singidunum, and Valens, bishop of Mursus, two of Athanasius's most inveterate enemies, publicly owning, that whatever they had said or written against him was utterly false, groundless, and invented out of pure malice: at the same time they embraced his communion, and anathematized the heresy of Arius, and all who held or defended his tenets. This act Valens wrote with his own hand, and Ursacius signed it; whereupon they were both admitted by Julius to the communion of the church.[4] This retractation, though not at all sincere, but merely owing to policy, greatly contributed to the justification of Athanasius. I find nothing else in the ancients concerning Julius worthy of notice. He died on the 12th of April, 352, having governed the Church of Rome fifteen

1 Theodoret, l. 2, c. 15. 2 Soz. l. 3, c. 11.
3 Concil. l. 4, p. 825.
4 Ath. apol. 2, p. 271, et ad Sol. p 820.

1 Ath. ad Sol. p. 822; Ruf. l. 1, c. 19; Theod. l. 2, c. 6.
2 Socr. l. 2, c. 23. 3 Athan. apol. 2, p. 770.
4 Ath. ad Solit. p. 826, et Apol. 2, p. 776; Hil. frag. 1, p. 24—26.

Ursacius and Valens first abjured, or rather pretended to abjure, their errors at Milan, before the council, that at this time was sitting there. From Milan they repaired to Rome, and there abjured anew their errors, in the presence of Julius, and the whole Roman church. Here Baronius observes, "that as this was a matter of too great moment to be finally decided by the council of Milan, though the Roman presbyters were present, they sent them to Julius, that they might abjure their errors in his presence, agreeably to the ancient custom of the Catholic church; namely, that eminent heretics should abjure their heresies only at Rome." (Bar. ad ann. 350, n. 23.) But, in the first place, they were not sent by the council; but went to Rome of their own accord, as Osius assures us, in express terms, *Illi ultro Romam venerunt.* (Apud Ath. ad Solitar.) In the second place, the matter was finally determined by the council of Milan; for the council received their recantations, and restored them to the communion of the church. And what else was to be done? what else could Julius do? But if the matter was finally determined by the council, what could induce them, says Baronius, to travel to Rome, and abjure anew their heresy there? The answer is obvious: They had imposed upon the council by a pretended abjuration, and went to Rome to impose, in like manner, on Julius, and obtain by that means his communion; which they did accordingly, notwithstanding his *infallibility.* Besides, as both Athanasius and his enemies had referred their cause to the arbitration of Julius, he was the fittest person to receive the retractation of the false evidence which they had formerly given. As to the custom mentioned by Baronius, "that eminent heretics should abjure their heresies only at Rome," no man can be so little versed in ecclesiastical history as not to know that no such custom ever obtained in the Catholic church. Not to recur to more ancient times, the Arian bishops, that is, bishops guilty of the same heresy as Ursacius and Valens, abjured their errors before the council that was held at Jerusalem, in 335. There they renounced their heresy; there they were all restored to the communion of the church, without going, or offering to go to Rome. And many of those bishops were surely more eminent heretics than either Ursacius or Valens.

Julius not banished by Constantius. Liberius his own panegyrist. The Eusebians write a second letter to Julius against Athanasius: which is answered by Liberius: who summons Athanasius to Rome.

years, two months, and six days.[1] He is said to have been buried in the cemetery of Callistus, on the Aurelian Way, where he had built a church,[2] and to have been removed from thence, in 817, by Pope Paschal I., to the church of St. Praxedes; and again from that, by Innocent II., in 1140, to St. Mary's beyond the Tiber.[3] Bede, whom the authors of the modern pontificals have followed, tells us, in his Martyrology,[4] that Julius was sent into banishment, where he suffered much for the space of ten months, till the death of Constantius, a zealous promoter of Arianism. But that historian was certainly mistaken, since Constantius was never master of Rome in Julius's time, and his brother Constans was a great friend to Julius, and all the orthodox bishops. Of the many writings ascribed to Julius, none, except his two letters, are authentic, the one to the Eusebians, and the other to the Church of Alexandria, of which we have spoken above. Leontius, of Byzantium, mentions seven epistles, which, in the latter end of the sixth century, were ascribed to Julius;[1] but, at the same time, he assures us, that they were not written by him, but by Apollinaris the heresiarch; and the monks of Palestine, in the account they gave of the Eutychians, in the time of the Emperor Anastasius, assure us, that they seduced great numbers of people, by ascribing the works of Apollinaris to the fathers, namely, to Athanasius, to Gregory Nazienzen, and to Julius.[2] Gennadius ascribes to Julius a letter to Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, greatly savoring of the heresy of Eutyches and Timotheus;[3] but Leontius, of Byzantium, evidently proves that letter to have been written by Apollinaris; and as his it is quoted by his two disciples, Valentine and Timotheus.[4] The orientals have a liturgy which they suppose to have been composed by Julius: this supposition, however groundless, shows him to have been in great repute in those parts.[5]

LIBERIUS, THIRTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTIUS, JULIAN, JOVIAN, VALERIAN.]

[Year of Christ 352.] LIBERIUS was chosen on the 22d of May, 352, in the room of Julius.[5] He had trampled under foot, (to use his own terms,) all worldly things, to observe the gospel, and obey the dictates of his faith. He had been employed, before his election, in several ecclesiastical ministries, and discharged them with reputation, though he was not conscious to himself of having ever done the least thing for the sake of praise and glory. He was at last raised to the episcopal dignity, but much against his will, as he calls God and the church to witness. He protests, that it was his ardent and only wish, that he might keep himself pure and undefiled in the administration of his new dignity, that he might inviolably maintain and defend the faith, which he had received from his illustrious predecessors, among whom were many martyrs.[6] Were we to judge of his conduct from his words, we should equal him to the best of his predecessors; but there appears, throughout his whole administration, such an odd mixture of opposite qualities, that it is no easy matter to form a true idea of his character; at one time we shall find him bold, intrepid, and inflexible; at another timorous, faint-hearted, and compliant; insomuch that one can hardly conceive him to be the same man. The latter qualities he betrayed in the very beginning of his pontificate, by separating himself from the communion of Athanasius. Constans, the great support of the orthodox party, being murdered, and Constantius upon the point of becoming master of Rome, by a complete victory he had gained over the two brothers Magnentius and Decentius, the Eusebians thought this a proper juncture to try whether the fear of that prince had not rendered Julius somewhat more tractable. For Constantius was more incensed than ever against Athanasius, being assured by the Eusebians, to whom he gave an entire credit, that he had influenced his brother to threaten him with a civil war.[6] They wrote therefore to Julius a second letter, filled with new complaints and calumnies against Athanasius; but Julius dying in the mean time, their letter, together with another to the same purpose from the Arians of Alexandria, was delivered to Liberius, who caused them both to be publicly read in a full assembly of the people, and in the council, which was then sitting at Rome.[7] His answer to these letters has not reached our times; but a copy of the letter, which he wrote on that occasion to Athanasius, has, to his eternal disgrace, been transmitted to us, among the fragments of Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers. In that letter he summons him to appear forthwith at Rome, to clear himself there of the heavy accusations brought against him; and threatens to cut

[1] Buch. cycl. 267, 273.
[2] Bolland. 12 Apr. p. 86, n. 14.
[3] Buch. cycl. p. 273.
[4] Idem ib.
[4] Bed. martyr. p. 83.
[6] Hil. frag. 2, p. 41.

[1] Leont. sect 8, p. 526.
[2] Gen. c. 2.
[3] Bona lit. 1, c. 9, p. 61.
[4] Evagr l. 3, c. 31.
[4] Leont. ib.
[6] Ath. ad Solit. p. 823, et Apol. 2, p. 674; Theod. l. 2, c. 10.
[7] Hil. frag. 1, p. 36, 40.

Liberius communicates with the Arians, and excommunicates Athanasius. His letter to them not supposititious. The Council of Arles. The Emperor's edict. The Pope's legates sign the condemnation of Athanasius.

him off from the communion of that church, if he refused to comply with the summons.[1] With this letter he despatched three of his presbyters, Lucius, Paulus, and Ælianus; strictly enjoining them, by all means, to prevail upon Athanasius to repair, without delay, to Rome.[2] This conduct, so very different from that of his predecessor, was, no doubt, owing to the dread he was in of the Emperor Constantius, by this time probably master of Rome and all Italy; for what else could tempt or induce him to act so preposterously? Be that as it will, Athanasius was greatly surprised and concerned to find himself so unworthily treated and threatened by the Bishop of Rome; but did not think himself, on that account, obliged to abandon his flock. He remained therefore in Alexandria; but begged his colleagues in Egypt to write in his favor to the pope, which they did accordingly. But Liberius wanted to ingratiate himself with the Arians, and, by their means, with the emperor; and therefore, without any regard to the testimony of the orthodox bishops, or the known innocence of the oppressed Athanasius, he wrote to the Eusebians, acquainting them that he communicated with them; but, as to Athanasius, he had cut him off from his communion, and from that of his church.[3] Baronius,[4] and after him the Benedictines, in their last edition of the works of Hilarius and Athanasius,[5] maintain this letter of Liberius to have been forged by the Arians, and inserted into the works of Hilarius. But they allege no convincing reason why the other pieces, among which it has been conveyed to us, should be admitted as genuine, and this alone rejected as supposititious. Athanasius, indeed, never reproached the Bishop of Rome with his scandalous conduct, as they observe; but may not that be ascribed to his moderation? The more, as he was sensible that Liberius acted thus not out of ill will, but fear. As to the want of connection between that letter and the pieces preceding and following it, I should not have expected such an objection from any who had ever perused the fragments of that writer, which every one knows to have been patched together without any regard to time or order.[6]

In the mean time Constantius, now in quiet possession of the whole empire by the death of Magnentius, who, after his defeat, had laid violent hands on himself, summoned a council to meet at Arles. At this council Liberius did not assist in person, but by his legates, Vincentius bishop of Capua, and Marcellus bishop of Campania, who, together with some others, had been sent by Liberius some time before to meet the emperor at Arles, and beg him in the pope's name to assemble a council at Aquileia.[1] As the Bishop of Capua was a man of great parts, and long experience, Liberius reposed an entire confidence in him, not doubting but he would maintain the dignity of his legation, and support the innocency of Athanasius with that firmness which he had shown on several other occasions.[2]

As the council consisted chiefly of Arians, their great point in view was, to extort from the Italian bishops a solemn condemnation of Athanasius. This, therefore, was in the first place proposed in the council; and, because the orthodox bishops would not consent to it, an edict was issued by the emperor, sentencing all those to exile who should refuse to sign the condemnation of Athanasius.[3] The boasted firmness and constancy of Vincentius were not proof against such a trial. He did all that lay in his power to divert the emperor from the execution of a decree utterly inconsistent with the liberty of a council; but finding him deaf to all remonstrances, he began to capitulate, offering to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, on condition the Eusebians signed that of Arius, and publicly abjured his doctrine. This he thought would be some alleviation of his guilt, and therefore the proposal which he had made by word of mouth he gave in writing to the heads of the Arian faction, signed by himself and his fellow-legates. But the Arians, too well acquainted with their weakness to grant them any terms, peremptorily insisted upon their condemning Athanasius, and referring the cause and doctrine of Arius to a more proper juncture. Vincentius and his colleagues, finding the enemies of Athanasius thus inflexible, and, on the other hand, determined at all events to keep their bishopries, and avoid the hardships of a painful exile, complied at last, and "yielded to the troublesome times," to use their softening expression.[4]

[1] Hil. frag. 1, p. 36, 40. [2] Idem ib.
[3] Idem ib.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 352, n. 12—20
[5] Hil. p. 1327, et Athan. vit. p. 51.
[6] Thus the very letter of Liberius is put in the place where the letter of the council of Sardica to the Emperor Constantius ought to have been, as is manifest from what is said immediately before it. A few lines after, instead of the letter from the council of Egypt to Liberius, which Hilarius promises, we find one from Liberius to the bishops of Italy, written after the death of Constantius upon a quite different subject. What comes immediately after the letter of Liberius to the Eusebians, ought, in all likelihood, to have been placed after the above-mentioned letter of the council of Sardica to Constantius: for to me it appears no less improbable than it does or can do to Baronius, (Bar. ad ann. 352, n. 13,) that Hilarius, a most zealous stickler for the orthodox faith, should approve of the pope's scandalous letter, tending utterly to subvert it, and express his approbation in these terms: "What is there in this letter that is not holy? What is there that does not proceed from the fear of God?" However, I cannot conclude, and much less demonstratively, with the annalist, that the letter has been forged by the Arians. All I think can be inferred from thence is, that the letters, like most other pieces there, have been misplaced; and that the abovementioned words of Hilarius ought to be put after the letter of the council to Constantius, and not after that of Liberius to the Arians.

[1] Ath. ad Solit. p 829; Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 159; Hil. frag. 2, p. 41, 47.
[2] For Liberius, ashamed of what he had done against Athanasius, not only readmitted him soon after to his own communion, but with great zeal undertook his defence.
[3] Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 159.
[4] Hil. frag. 2, p. 42; Ath. ap. 1, p. 691; Theod. l. 2, c. 17.

The glorious behavior of Paulinus. Liberius writes to the emperor for another council; which is granted, and assembles at Milan. Some bishops banished.

They were the more inexcusable, as they had before their eyes the example of a great prelate, whose constancy was proof against all the threats and menaces of a provoked prince. This was the celebrated Paulinus bishop of Treves, who, after perusing the formulary drawn up by the Eusebians, to be signed by him and the other bishops, rejected it with the utmost indignation, declaring that nothing they could do should ever induce him to betray the truth, and his own conscience, by setting his hand to such a scandalous piece. The Eusebians left no art unattempted to gain him, as they had done the pope's legates; but finding he was a man of a quite different disposition, and despairing of being ever able to prevail upon him either by hopes or fear, they at last had recourse to the emperor, who, putting his decree in execution, sent him into exile; and in order to tire out his patience, ordered him to be constantly conveyed from one inhospitable place to another. But in every place Paulinus was the same, the conscience of his suffering for the sake of justice enabling him to bear, not only with patience, but cheerfulness, the inexpressible hardships he underwent.[1] He died in Phrygia in the fifth year of his exile,[2] that is, in 358. But his body is supposed to have been discovered in a church of his name at Treves, in the year 1071.[3] How and when it was conveyed thither, let those inquire who adore it.

To return to Liberius, he was so sensibly affected with the fall of Vincentius and his colleagues, that he wished for an opportunity of losing his life in so good a cause, and washing out with his blood the stain which the scandalous conduct of his legates had brought upon his character.[4] Thus he expresses himself in the letter which he wrote on that occasion to the great friend of his see, Osius.[5] However, in the height of his affliction, he found great relief in the courage and steadiness of Cæcilianus bishop of Spoleto, of Eusebius bishop of Vercelli, and of Lucifer bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia. The latter advised the pope to demand of the emperor another council, and generously took upon himself to go to Arles, where Constantius then was, and make that demand. Liberius readily accepted his offer, and named Pancratius and Hilarius for his colleagues, the one a presbyter, the other a deacon of the Church of Rome. By these he wrote an excellent letter to the emperor, wherein, with the liberty that became a Catholic bishop, but at the same time with all the respect that is due from a subject to his sovereign, he justifies his conduct in the defence of Athanasius, lays open the arts and views of the adverse party, and begs that a new council might be assembled, there being no other means to put a stop to so many evils, and restore peace and tranquillity to the Catholic church.[1] At the same time Liberius wrote to Eusebius bishop of Vercelli, and Fortunatianus bishop of Aquileia, entreating them to assist his legates with their advice, and even with their presence, should it be thought necessary. The three legates, on their arrival at Vercelli, in their way to Arles, were not only kindly received, but joined by Eusebius, who repaired with them to the emperor. As the Arians were noways averse to the proposal, nay, had even solicited the emperor to convene a new council, the request of the legates met with no difficulty; so that a council was appointed to meet at Milan, where it met accordingly in the beginning of the year 355.[2] We are told, that it consisted of three hundred western bishops, and that from the east there came but very few.[3] But Constantius and his army may be said to have supplied their room. For the council no sooner met, than the emperor absolutely insisted upon their signing the condemnation of Athanasius, and an edict, containing the chief tenets of Arius, which had been published in his name. But in this attempt he met with a vigorous opposition from Dionysius bishop of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and the two other legates, Pancratius and Hilarius; which provoked him to such a degree, that he was upon the point of commanding them to be executed upon the spot as rebels. But, upon second thoughts, he contented himself with sending them into exile, Dionysius into Cappadocia, or Armenia, where he died a few years after, Eusebius to Scythopolis in Palæstine, and Lucifer to Germanicia in Syria. To what place Pancratius and Hilarius were confined, we know not; but the latter was most cruelly whipped before he was banished.[4] As for the other bishops, I shall only say, with Ruffinus,[5] that, out of three hundred, Dionysius, Lucifer, and Eusebius, alone showed a firmness and intrepidity becoming men of their rank and dignity. Among the rest Fortunatianus bishop of Aquileia signed the condemnation of Athanasius; which greatly added to the grief and concern of Liberius, who, till that time, had entertained the highest opinion of him.

And now Constantius had the satisfaction of seeing Athanasius condemned by the far greater part of the western bishops. But the Bishop of Rome still declared openly in his favor, and did all that lay in his power to gain others to his party. To deprive him therefore of so powerful a protector, the emperor resolved to spare no cost nor labor. With this view he despatched to Rome the

[1] Hil. frag. 1, p. 6; et in Cons. l. 2, p. 119; Sulp. Sever. p. 157; Ath. in Ar. or. 1, p. 291, ad Solit. p. 831, de fug. 703.
[2] Sulp. Sever. p. 469; Hier. chron.
[3] Bar. in martyr. 31 Aug.
[4] Hil. frag. 47.
[5] Idem ib.

[1] Hil. frag. p. 39, 43.
[2] Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 159; Hil. frag. 2, p. 43; Athan. ad Solit. p. 846.
[3] Soz. p. 546, 547; Socr. l. 2, c. 36.
[4] Athan. ad Sol. p. 838.
[5] Ruff. l. 1, c. 20.

Constantius endeavors in vain to gain Liberius; who is sent prisoner to Milan. His interview with the emperor. His steadiness. He is banished to Berœa in Thrace. Felix is chosen in his room.

eunuch Eusebius, his great chamberlain, with rich presents in one hand, and a threatening letter in the other: but with an invincible firmness Liberius withstood both; so that the eunuch, who was himself a sworn enemy to Athanasius, returned to court baffled and disappointed; and there, by the account he gave of his unsuccessful embassy, added new fuel to the fire, which burnt already with great violence. The emperor, who pretended to govern the church no less despotically than he did the state, transported with rage at the stout opposition he met with from the Bishop of Rome, immediately despatched an order to Leoncius, prefect of that city, enjoining him to apprehend Liberius, and send him under a strong guard to court. Pursuant to this order, Liberius was seized in the night-time, lest the people, by whom he was greatly beloved, should attempt his rescue, and conveyed to Milan, where the court then resided.[1] Soon after his arrival he was brought before the emperor, when, undaunted and unawed by the presence of so great a prince, he spoke with all the liberty of an apostle, and with all the eloquence of a great orator.[2] At this interview were present Eusebius the eunuch, and Epictetus bishop of Centumcellæ, now Civita Vecchia, who, for his ready compliance with the emperor's will, had been raised by him to great preferments.[3] The latter told Liberius, when he had ended the excellent speech he made before the emperor, that he had indeed expressed great zeal for the purity of the faith, and the liberty of councils; but the whole was mere mummery; and that he only wanted to be looked upon by his party as a person of some significancy, and to brag among the senators, on his return to Rome, that he had had the honor to dispute with the emperor.[4] The eunuch too thought he must speak, but it was only to betray his ignorance; for he reproached Liberius with defending Athanasius, who had been condemned, he said, as an heretic, by the council of Nice.[5] As for Constantius, the only reply he made to the reasons alleged by Liberius in favor of Athanasius, and the faith of Nice, was, that the wicked and impious Athanasius, as he styled him, had been condemned by the whole world; that, by his arrogant conduct, he had provoked all mankind, and himself in particular, by constantly stirring up his brother against him; that therefore he looked upon the defeat of Magnentius and Sylvanus, who had attempted to bereave him of his crown, as less important to him than the deposing and condemning of a man, by whom he had been so highly injured.[6] In answer to this, Liberius begged, that, of all men, he would not choose bishops for the instruments of his private revenge. Constantius made no reply, but only told him, that he must either sign the condemnation of Athanasius, or be sent into exile; and that he allowed him three days to deliberate which of the two he would choose. Liberius answered, with great intrepidity, that he had already chosen, and was resolved; that in three days he should not change his resolution; and therefore the emperor might send him that minute to what place soever he pleased.[1] The three days were not yet expired when the emperor sent for him anew to court, hoping the fear of banishment had softened him, as it had done most others, into a compliance. But he found him unalterably fixed in the same resolution; and, therefore, despairing of being ever able to succeed in his attempts, he ordered him to be conveyed forthwith to Berœa in Thrace.[2] Liberius had not yet left the palace, when the emperor sent him a present of five hundred pieces of gold to defray his charges; which he sent back by the same person who brought them, saying, that the emperor might want money to pay his troops. The like sum was sent him by the Empress Eusebia; which, with the same answer, he desired might be conveyed to the emperor, adding, that if he knew not how to employ that sum better, he might bestow it on Epictetus, or Auxentius the Arian bishop of Milan, who would be very thankful for it.[3] He left Milan three days after, and set out for the place of his exile. His fate was no sooner known at Rome, than the clergy, assembling the people, bound themselves by a solemn oath, in their presence, not to acknowledge any other for their bishop so long as Liberius lived.[4]

Liberius being thus driven from his see, another was placed on it in his room; and the person, whom the emperor and the Arian faction pitched upon, was one Felix, then only deacon of the Church of Rome.[5] But the clergy could not proceed to a new election, without an open violation of the oath they had taken; the people began to mutiny, and, assembling in crowds, would suffer none of the Arian faction to enter their churches. The imperial palace therefore served instead of a church; three of the emperor's eunuchs represented the people; and three bishops, slaves of the court, namely, Epictetus of Centumcellæ, Acacius of Cæsarea, and Basilius of Ancyra, ordained the new elected bishop.[6] Thus was Felix chosen, and thus ordained. As Liberius was greatly beloved by the people, chiefly on account of his vigorous opposition to Constantius, the intrusion of Felix occasioned a great sedition, in which many lost their lives.[7] The clergy

[1] Athan. ad Solit. p. 834, 835; Ammian. l. 15, p. 47; Theod. l. 2, c. 13. et l. 15, p. 38, 41, 47.
[2] Athan. et Theod. ib.
[3] Athan. in Ar. or. 1, p. 290; Marcell. et Faustin. lib. prec. ad Theod. p. 30.
[4] Theod. l. 2, c. 13.
[5] Idem ib.
[6] Theod. l. 1, c. 13.
[1] Theod. l. 1, c. 13.
[2] Idem ib. et Athan. ad Solit. p. 835.
[3] Theod. l. 2, c. 13; Soz. l. 4, c. 11.
[4] Marc. et Faust. &c. p. 3; Hier. chron.
[5] Athan ad Solit p 861; Ruff. l. 1, c. 22.
[6] Athan. ib. Hier. ep. 98; Soz. l. 4, c. 21; Socr. l. 2, c. 37.
[7] Soz. l. 4, c. 15.

Constantius goes to Rome. The Roman ladies intercede for Liberius. The emperor promises to recall him. The edict, recalling him to govern jointly with Felix, rallied by the Roman people.

were not so zealous in the cause as the people; for great numbers of them, unmindful of the oath they had taken, were by degrees reconciled to Felix, and communicated with him;[1] whereas the people continued to abhor and avoid him at least till the year 357, when Constantius came to Rome.[2] For that prince, being desirous to see the metropolis of his empire, undertook a journey to Rome in the above-mentioned year, and entered it in triumph on the 28th of April.[3] During his short stay in that city, the Roman ladies gave a signal instance of the zeal and affection they still retained for their exiled bishop. They thought a more favorable opportunity could never offer to solicit the emperor for his return; and therefore, by a private agreement among themselves, they pressed their husbands, with great earnestness, to lay hold of it, threatening to abandon them if they did not, and repairing to their bishop to share with him the hardships of his exile. The husbands, unmoved by such menaces, which they well knew would never take place, answered, that by such an application they might incur the displeasure of the prince, which would prove fatal to them, as well as to the person in whose behalf they interposed; whereas, should they themselves take such a pious and commendable office upon them, the respect due to their sex would, in all likelihood, extort from the prince the desired favor, at least it would restrain his resentment, and stifle all thoughts of revenge. The proposal was universally applauded by the ladies, unwilling to expose their husbands to the dire effects of the emperor's indignation. On an appointed day, therefore, attiring themselves in an apparel suitable to their rank, that the emperor in seeing them might know who they were, and treat them accordingly, they repaired to court; and being immediately admitted to the prince's presence, they conjured him, with tears in their eyes, to take pity of that great city, of that numerous flock, bereft of its pastor, and, in his absence, devoured by ravenous wolves. This was not at all a courtly language: however, Constantius, without betraying the least emotion, said, "I thought you had a pastor. Is not Felix as capable of discharging the pastoral office as any other?" "Felix," replied they, "is detested, and avoided by all." At these words the emperor first looked grave; but, immediately changing his gravity into a smile, "If so," said he, with great complaisance, "you must have Liberius again: I shall, without delay, despatch the proper orders for his return." An edict was accordingly issued the very next day, recalling Liberius to govern the church jointly with Felix; for Constantius thought it inconsistent with his honor, and the imperial dignity, to drive Felix from the see, on which he himself had placed him.

When this edict was read, in the presence of the emperor, to the people assembled in the Circus, they applauded it at first, by way of raillery, saying, "That since the spectators, at the public sports, were divided into two parties, it was just and reasonable there should be two bishops to head them." The multitude, not satisfied with thus pleasantly expressing their dissatisfaction, cried out, immediately after, with one voice, "There is but one God, one Christ, one Bishop."[1] And yet the emperor was rather delighted than displeased with the humor of the people, and the liberty they took; for to what happened on this occasion Ammianus Marcellinus probably alludes, where he writes, that Constantius, in exhibiting public sports at Rome, was pleased with the liberty they took to rally him, knowing it did not proceed from pride or ill-nature.[2] Theodoret tells us, that to acclamations so worthy of the Roman piety, the emperor granted the return of Liberius;[3] and with him agree Sulpitius Severus,[4] and Ruffinus.[5] But Sozomen,[6] and all the writers of those times, assure us, that his return did not happen this, but the following year, 358, when he bought it dear, by signing the condemnation of Athanasius, and the symbol or creed, composed by the Semi-Arians at Sirmium, now Sirmish in Sclavonia. Constantius, at the request of the Roman ladies and people, promised to recall him, as I have related; but it was on condition, says Sozomen,[7] that he should agree with the bishops of the court, that is, with the Semi-Arians. The firmness which Liberius had hitherto shown, left no room to doubt of his rejecting such a proposal with the greatest indignation. But he now felt what before he had only beheld at a distance: he began to compare the ease and plenty in which he had lived at Rome, with the inconveniences and hardships of his present exile. Besides, from the menaces thrown out against him by the emperor's officers, he apprehended his life to be in danger.[8] 'Tis true, he had wished for an opportunity of shedding his blood in so good a cause, as I have related above. But who is not brave at a distance from danger? The jealousy he had of Felix, who, sitting in his chair, acted the high-pontiff at Rome, was the Delila, says Baronius,[9] speaking of his signing the condemnation of Athanasius, who bereft this Samson of all his strength and courage. However that be, it is certain that the strength and courage, which he had with great glory exerted on other occasions, vanished at once. For he not only signed the condemnation of Athanasius, but moreover

1 Hier. chron. Marc. et Faust. p. 3.
2 Athan. ad Solit. p. 861; Theod. l. 2, c. 14; Ammian. l. 16, p. 72.
3 Ammian. l. 16, p. 69, 72; Idat. chron. Alex.

1 Theod. l. 2, c. 14; Soz. l. 4, c. 15.
2 Amm. l. 16.
3 Theod. ib.
4 Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 160.
5 Ruff. l. 1, c. 27.
6 Soz. l. 4, c. 11.
7 Idem ib.
8 Athan. ad Solit. p. 837.
9 Bar. ad ann. 357, n. 41.

Liberius signs the condemnation of Athanasius, and embraces the doctrine of Sirmium. His letter to the eastern bishops. He is anathematized by Hilarius. His letter to the bishops. He is recalled from his banishment.

approved and received, as catholic, the confession or symbol of Sirmium.[1] Thus, to ingratiate himself with the emperor, and return to Rome, did Liberius abandon, at last, his persecuted friend, renounce the Catholic faith, and solemnly promise to maintain inviolable the doctrine of Sirmium.[2] As he was impatient to be reinstated in his see, he took care immediately to acquaint the emperor with the steps he had taken. With this letter he despatched Fortunatianus bishop of Aquileia, charging him to solicit Constantius for his return, since he had done all he had required of him.[3] Constantius took no notice of, nor returned any answer to, this letter. On the other hand, Liberius was heartily sick of his exile, heartily sick of suffering for the sake of justice. In hopes therefore of putting a speedy end to his exile, and the hardships attending it, he wrote in a most submissive and cringing style to the eastern bishops, assuring them, that it was merely out of respect to his predecessor Julius, and to maintain his judgment, that he had undertaken the defence of Athanasius; that as soon as it had pleased God to open his eyes, and discover to him how justly he had been condemned, he had separated himself from his communion, and joined them; that all their decrees concerning him should be inviolably observed by the apostolic see, as indeed they ought to be; that he sincerely and willingly received the true catholic and orthodox faith, as it had been expounded and defined by several of his brethren and colleagues at Sirmium, and had been proposed to him by his colleague Demophilus; that he received every article of that symbol, and had nothing to object against any. This remarkable letter he concludes thus: "And now that I agree with you in every point, let me earnestly entreat your holinesses to employ your joint interest in my behalf, that I may be recalled from banishment, and suffered to return to the see which God has been pleased to commit to my care."[4] This letter has been conveyed to us by the great Hilarius, Bishop of Poitiers, who, in relating it, not able to restrain the just indignation it kindled in his breast, interrupts the recital three times, to anathematize the author of it, the *prevaricating* Liberius, as he styles him.[5] He wrote likewise to Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, who bore great sway at court, and were at the head of the Arian faction in the west, to acquaint them that he communicated with them, and also with Auxentius and Epictetus, two of the most inveterate enemies the orthodox had; and that whoever did not communicate with them, that is, every catholic bishop, was cut off from his communion. These words Hilarius cannot repeat without anathematizing anew Liberius, and all the Arians with him. In the same letter he lets them know, that he has separated himself from the communion of Athanasius, late bishop of Alexandria, acknowledging him, by that expression, lawfully deposed. He declares, in the beginning of his letter, and calls God to witness, that it is not by compulsion, but merely for the sake of peace and charity, far preferable to martyrdom itself, that he writes to them. He conjures them, by the omnipotent God, by his Son Jesus, by the Holy Ghost, to intercede for him with the emperor, that, by his return, peace and tranquillity may be restored to the church committed to his care; assuring them, that the zeal they exert in so pious, so just a cause, will meet with a proportionable reward in heaven.[1]

As the emperor had not yet taken the least notice of his letter; as the eastern bishops, as well as the bishops at court, did not act, as he thought, with all the zeal and expedition he expected, and his ready compliance well deserved; he wrote a third letter, directed to Vincentius, Bishop of Capua, acquainting him that he had abandoned the defence of Athanasius, and desiring him to give notice thereof to all the bishops of Campania; and, at the same time, to use his utmost endeavors to persuade them to despatch some of their body with a letter, in their common name, to the emperor, begging Constantius to deliver him, without further delay, from his present most melancholy and deplorable situation. To this letter he adds the following paragraph, in his own hand: "We live in peace with all the bishops of the east, and with you. As for me, I have discharged my conscience before God. Will you suffer me to perish in my present exile? The same God will judge us both."[2] The Bishop of Capua had been formerly sent by Liberius to the council of Arles, with the character of his legate, as I have observed above, and had there signed the condemnation of Athanasius; on which occasion Liberius wished for an opportunity of washing out, with his own blood, the stain which the conduct of his legate had brought upon his character. But his only wish now was to see himself delivered from his painful exile, and restored to his former state, upon any terms. Vincentius, touched with his complaints, prevailed upon the bishops of Campania to send a solemn deputation to the emperor in his behalf; which Constantius complied with, so far as to recall him from the place of his exile to Sirmium, where the court then was.[3] Upon his arrival there, Constantius, who had lately embraced the doctrine of the Semi-Arians, taking advantage of his weakness, and of the eager desire he had betrayed of returning to his see, obliged him, as well as the bishops of the court, and four African bishops, who happened to be then at Sirmium, to sign the same doctrine.[4]

[1] Hil. frag. I. p. 48; Hier. vir. il. c. 97.
[2] Hil. frag. I, p. 48.
[3] Idem ib. p. 49.
[4] Idem ib. p. 47, 48.
[5] Idem ib.

[1] Hil. frag. I, p. 49.
[2] Idem ib. p. 51.
[3] Soz. l. 4, c. 15.
[4] Idem ib.

Liberius signs the doctrine of the Semi-Arians. What alleged by Baronius in his defence; and by Bellarmine. Liberius returns to Rome.

Thus did the infallible Liberius sign, and embrace, at least in appearance, both the Arian and Semi-Arian heresy; the Arian at Berœa, the place of his exile, and the Semi-Arian at Sirmium. That the confession he signed at Berœa was Arian, cannot be doubted; for it was the second of Sirmium, which all agree to have been Arian.[1] Besides, it was proposed to him by Demophilus bishop of Berœa, who was a most zealous stickler for Arianism, and greatly attached to Ursacius and Valens, the two leading men among the Arians in the west; and it is not at all probable, that he would have required Liberius to sign a doctrine different from that which he himself held.

The advocates for the pope's infallibility are here quite at a loss what to say in defence of that prerogative. That Liberius signed the condemnation of Athanasius, that he communicated with the Arians, and, what above all galls them, that he received the Sirmian confession of faith as catholic and orthodox, are undeniable matters of fact. To reconcile them with infallibility, is what they have been long drudging at: and to what pitiful shifts, what eluding and unmeaning distinctions, have they not been obliged to recur! Like a man struggling for life in deep water, and catching at every twig to save it, they flounce from quibble to quibble, from one subterfuge to another, but all in vain; sink they must, and their infallibility with them. To show their distress, I shall briefly transcribe what I find offered on this occasion, by the most learned among them, in defence of the cause they have undertaken. Baronius,[2] after relating and owning the above-mentioned facts, addresses his readers thus: "We have hitherto sailed among dangerous rocks, among treacherous shoals; but fear not, I shall at last pilot you safe into the port of truth." Then, dropping his allegory, he makes a long descant to prove, that the Sirmian Confession of Faith, signed by Liberius, was, in every article, catholic and orthodox. A rare pilot indeed! If this (to pursue his allegory) is "the port of truth," who can help pitying Jerom, Hilarius, Athanasius, and in short all the ancients? for they certainly missed it, and, falling in among those "dangerous rocks, those treacherous shoals," which Baronius had the skill and good luck to avoid, were there unfortunately shipwrecked. For Jerom says, in express terms, and in two places,[1] that Liberius signed an heresy; Hilarius, that he approved of the Arian perfidy;[2] Athanasius, that he joined the Arians;[3] and all the ancients, that he apostatized from the faith: nay, Liberius himself, in his letter to the orientals, which is still to be seen, under his own hand, in the Vatican library, gives them notice, that "in all things" he agrees with Demophilus, a most zealous Arian, and with them; which words Hilarius could not repeat without anathematizing him. It is therefore manifest, beyond all dispute, that the confession of faith, signed by Liberius, was not catholic, but Arian. Of this Baronius himself was, without doubt, well apprized, and into this port he had piloted his reader, had truth alone been his land-mark. Bellarmine, the other great stickler for infallibility, pursues a different method, but with worse success, in my opinion, than his fellow-champion, Baronius; for, by striving to support that chimerical prerogative, he evidently oversets it. The pope, according to him, may sign and receive heretical opinions, as Liberius did, without prejudicing in the least his infallibility, provided he does not internally assent to them;[4] so that the so much boasted infallibility is by him reduced at last to this: that the pope cannot internally assent to an error; which is confining his infallibility to himself, and consequently disqualifying him for the office of a teacher. Infallibility, even thus curtailed, is, no doubt, a most valuable treasure to the owner, but of no more use to the rest of mankind than a treasure concealed under ground; and, on that very account, it ought in common sense to be exploded. But it is scarce worth the while to quarrel with Bellarmine about it, since he cannot be so unreasonable as to require us, in virtue of such a prerogative, to pay any regard to the decisions of the pope, till such time, at least, as we know them to be agreeable to his private opinion: and this is what we can never know, since every pope may, like Liberius, externally admit an opinion as true; and, at the same time, internally reject it as false.

But, to return to Liberius; he was at last, in regard of his ready compliance with the

[1] Three councils were held at Sirmium, one in 349, another in 352, and the third in 357. In the first, Photinus, bishop of that city, was condemned, for reviving the heresy of Paul of Samosata. This council was entirely composed of the western bishops, who attempted to depose Photinus, but were vigorously opposed by the people. The second council of Sirmium was convened by the Emperor Constantius, and consisted of the eastern bishops only, who condemned anew, and deposed Photinus. By this council a symbol or creed was composed, which has been transmitted to us in Greek by St. Athanasius, and in Latin by St. Hilarius; and is entirely orthodox. In the third council of Sirmium a new creed was composed by Potamius bishop of Lisbone, and signed by Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and the other bishops there present. This creed was altogether Arian; for not only the word "consubstantial" was rejected by it, but the Son was declared to be unlike the Father in essence, to be less than the Father, and to have had a beginning. And it was this second symbol of Sirmium that Liberius signed at Berœa. Upon his arrival at Sirmium he found there Basilius of Ancyra, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and the other Semi-Arian bishops, who were lately come from the council of Ancyra, where they had condemned the doctrine of the pure Arians, and established that of the Semi-Arians, holding the Son to be like the Father in nature and essence, but not "consubstantial," or of the same substance. And this doctrine Liberius signed out of complaisance to the emperor, that nothing might obstruct his return to Rome. He signed it in a kind of council, consisting of the Semi-Arian bishops whom I have mentioned above.

[2] Bar. ad. ann. 357, n. 46.

[1] Hier. vir. ill. c. 97, et in chron.

[2] Hil. frag. 2, p. 43.

[3] Athan. ad Solit.

[4] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4, c. 9.

Felix is driven out. The judgment of the ancients concerning Felix. He is honored by the Church of Rome as a saint and a Martyr. His fabulous Acts. How he came to be honored as a saint.

will of the emperor, allowed to return to Rome; but on condition that he should govern jointly with Felix.[1] Letters were accordingly despatched both to Felix and the Roman clergy, to acquaint them therewith. Sozomen seems to insinuate that they both governed thus for some time.[2] But, according to St. Jerom, and the two presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, who lived then at Rome, and were eye-witnesses of what they relate, Felix was driven not only from the see, but out of the city, as soon as Liberius entered it; which he did on the 2d of August, 358, in in a kind of triumph, being met and received by the whole people with loud acclamations of joy.[3] Felix returned soon after, at the instigation of a few of the ecclesiastics, who had, contrary to their oath, adhered to him; and even attempted to perform divine service in the basilic of Julius, beyond the Tiber; but the enraged multitude drove him out a second time, and, with him, all the ecclesiastics who had acknowledged him.[4] Socrates writes, that the emperor himself was in the end obliged to give him up, and consent to his expulsion.[5] Mention is made in the pontificals of a bloody persecution, raised in Rome by Liberius and his party against the partisans of Felix, who, it is said, were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the baths, in all public places, and even in the churches.[6] But as none of the ancients take the least notice of such cruelties, I will not charge Liberius with them, upon the bare authority of such records. Felix, being driven from Rome, withdrew to a small estate he had on the road to Porto, and there spent the remaining part of his life in retirement.[7] Sozomen supposes him to have died soon after.[8] But the two presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, who must have been better informed, assure us, that he lived seven years after the return of Liberius, and died on the 22d of November, 365.[9]

Concerning Felix, all the ancients agree that he was unlawfully elected and ordained; that he communicated with the Arians; that, to ingratiate himself with them and the emperor, he signed the condemnation of Athanasius; that he was guilty of perjury in accepting the episcopal dignity, having bound himself, with the rest of the clergy, by a solemn oath, to acknowledge no other bishop while Liberius lived; and, lastly, that he strove to keep possession of the Roman see, after the return of the lawful bishop, and to sit in it, together with him, in open defiance of the canons of the church. Socrates adds, that he not only communicated with the Arians, but was infected with the Arian heresy.[10] Athanasius styles him "a monster raised to the see of Rome by the malice of antichrist, one worthy of those who raised him, and in every respect well qualified for the execution of their wicked designs."[1] And yet this heretic, this monster, this intruder, or anti-pope, is honored (the reader will be surprised to hear it, is honored) by the church of Rome as a saint; nay, as a martyr; and his festival is kept to this day, on the 29th of July. This honor was conferred on him in the ages of darkness and ignorance, upon the authority of his fabulous Acts, and a more fabulous pontifical, from which his Acts seem to have been copied. In the pontifical it is said, that Felix declared Constantius, who had been twice baptized, an heretic; and was therefore, by an order from the incensed emperor, apprehended, and privately beheaded, with many ecclesiastics and laymen, under the walls of Rome, on the 11th of November. It is added, that the presbyter Damasus privately conveyed his body to a church, which Felix had built, and there interred it; and that, upon his death, the see remained vacant for the space of thirty-eight days.[2] In the Acts of Felix we read, that Constantius was rebaptized by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia; that Felix having, on that account, declared him an heretic, he was driven from the see of Rome, and Liberius replaced on it; that Felix thereupon retired into the country, but was brought back by the emperor's orders, and beheaded on the 10th of November; that his body was interred on the 20th of the same month in a church, which he had built while he was a presbyter: And we keep his festival, adds the author, on the 29th of July.[3] Anastasius has copied the pontifical, word for word, except that he pretends Felix to have been beheaded at Cora, in the Campagna of Rome;[4] though he has told us, in the foregoing page, that he "died in peace," a phrase never used in speaking of martyrs, on the 29th of July, at his estate on the road to Porto.[5] The city of Cere, now Cerventera, in Tuscany, honors Felix to this day, as their chief patron or protector. In those dark times legends alone were in request, and all other books, even the Scripture itself, quite out of date and neglected. No wonder therefore that such absurdities, however inconsistent with history, were swallowed without straining; and Felix, for his pretended zeal and constancy, ranked among the holy martyrs. For I may venture to affirm, that the most learned men, at that time, in the church, knew nothing of Felix but what they had learned from his fabulous Acts, and from the above-mentioned pontifical. That I may not be thought to exaggerate, I shall allege one instance of the ignorance of past times: Gulielmus a Sancto Amore, one of the most learned men of the 13th century, knew that, in the time of Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers, a

[1] Soz. l. 4, c. 15. [2] Idem ib.
[3] Hier. chron. Mar. et Faust. p. 4.
[4] Idem ib. [5] Socr. l. 2, c. 37.
[6] Anast. c. 37; Boll. Apr. t. 1, p. 31.
[7] Theod. l. 2, c. 13; Philg. l. 4, c. 3.
[8] Soz. l. 4, c. 15. [9] Marc. et Faust. p. 4.
[10] Socrat. l. 2, c. 37.

[1] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861.
[2] Vide Bolland. Apr. t. 1, p. 31. [3] MS. p. 219.
[4] Anast. c. 37, p. 22. [5] Idem ib. p. 21.

Felix's sanctity called in question; and his cause re-examined. His sanctity and martyrdom confirmed by the discovery of his body. His legend proved to be fabulous.

pope, with most of the bishops, had fallen into heresy. He did not even pretend to be so well versed in history as to know for certain who the pope was; but, indulging a conjecture, which he thought probable enough, he named Anastasius II., who died in 498, about one hundred and fifty years after the time of Hilarius; so that he was an utter stranger to the history of Pope Liberius, and consequently to that of the antipope Felix. Had it not been for the like ignorance in more early times, the apotheosis of our pretended martyr had never taken place. Be that as it will, during the ages of darkness he held undisturbed the rank to which he had been thus raised: but when the dawn of knowledge began to appear, and it was discovered at last from contemporary and unexceptionable writers, who Felix was, the church of Rome was ashamed to own him among her saints. On the other hand, to degrade him had been giving a fatal blow to the pope's authority, and rendering it for ever precarious, in so material a point as that of canonization. Felix therefore was, at all events, to keep his place in heaven; his sanctity was to be confirmed, and the world imposed upon by some contrivance or other, capable of utterly defeating the testimony of the ancients.

This point being settled, to prevent all suspicion of deceit, or underhand dealings, Pope Gregory XIII. declared, in 1582, his intention of having the cause of Felix impartially examined. In order to this, he appointed Baronius, employed at that time in reforming the Roman martyrology, to put in writing whatever could be objected against Felix, and Cardinal Santorio to answer his objections, and collect likewise in writing all that could be said in favor of his new client, that the pope might be thoroughly acquainted with the merits of the cause before he came to a final decision. This conduct in Gregory has been censured by some over-zealous divines of the Church of Rome, as if he had thereby given the world occasion to think that he questioned the infallibility of his predecessors, who had honored Felix as a saint.[1] But Gregory well knew what he was doing, and how the whole would end. In compliance with his orders, Baronius wrote a dissertation, which he himself calls a volume, and not a short one,[2] to prove that Felix was neither a saint nor a martyr. As he had truth on his side, Cardinal Santorio, though a man of learning, could neither answer his arguments, nor offer any thing in so desperate a cause worthy of himself. He often addressed himself in his prayers to his client, entreating him to undertake his own cause, by suggesting to him what might be alleged in his defence. But the client was no less at a stand than the advocate. Some other person, therefore, must interpose: and whom did the carrying or losing such a cause more nearly concern than the pope, since his authority in a most essential point was at stake? This was a nice affair, and to be managed with great art and dexterity. Gregory, therefore, having often heard both sides, in a full congregation of cardinals, without betraying the least partiality for Felix, appointed them to meet for the last time on the 28th of July, the eve of the pretended saint's festival, judging that the most proper time to play off with good success the trick, which he had kept the whole time *in petto*. The cardinals met on the day appointed; Baronius quite silenced his adversary; the whole assembly was fully convinced that Felix was no saint, no martyr; the pope himself seemed to fall in with the rest, and accordingly rose up to declare, as was thought, the unhappy Felix fallen from heaven; when a great noise was all on a sudden heard at the door, and immediately a messenger entered, who, after uttering these words, "holy Felix, pray for us," acquainted the pope and the cardinals that the body of Felix was just discovered. Hereupon they all repaired in great haste to the church of Cosmas and Damianus, where the miraculous discovery had been made; and there saw, in a marble coffin of an extraordinary size, on one side the bodies of Mark, Marcellianus, and Tranquillinus; and on the other that of Felix, with this inscription on a stone that lay by it, "The body of Saint Felix, who condemned Constantius."[1] Hereupon the Te Deum was sung with great solemnity for the triumph of truth: Felix was declared worthy of the veneration and worship that had till then been paid him, and a place was allowed him among the other saints in the Roman martyrology, where it is said, that "he was driven from his see for defending the Catholic faith, by Constantius, an Arian emperor, and privately put to death at Cere, now Cervetera, in Tuscany." Baronius, transported with joy, as he himself declares,[2] at so miraculous and seasonable a discovery, immediately yielded, not to his antagonist Santorio, but to Felix, who had evidently interposed; and, taking that interposition for a satisfactory answer to all his arguments, he immediately retracted whatever he had said, and consigned to the flames whatever he had written in opposition to Felix.[3] Thus, to maintain a chimerical prerogative, they sport with truth; betray into error those who confide in them; and, turning the worst of men into saints, honor vice with the greatest reward they can bestow on virtue.

That this pretended discovery was nothing but a contrivance to confirm the martyrdom of Felix, and impose upon the world, is manifest; and that the pontifical, and his acts, on

[1] Leuchesini de infall. sed. Rom. p 97; Rossi vicario di Cristo, p. 72. [2] Bar. ad ann. 557, n. 63.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 557, n. 63. [2] Idem ib. n. 64. [3] Idem. ib.

which his martyrdom was originally founded, were a no less palpable and gross imposition, may be easily demonstrated. For, in the first place, Marcellinus and Faustinus, who lived in the time of Felix and Liberius at Rome, tell us, in express terms, that Felix, "who had been substituted to Liberius, died on the 22d of November, 365,"[1] that is, four years after the death of Constantius, by whom he is said, in his Acts, and in the pontifical, to have been martyred. Athanasius assures us,[2] and with him agree Philostorgius,[3] and the Chronicle of Alexandria,[4] that Constantius was not baptized till at the point of death, when he received that sacrament at the hands of Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch. And yet both the Acts of Felix and the pontifical will have him to have been twice baptized before his death; for it was on this account that Felix is said to have declared him a heretic. This declaration Baronius improves into a solemn excommunication; and, being become, after the above-mentioned discovery, a most zealous advocate for Felix, tells us, that the holy martyr was no sooner placed on the throne of St. Peter, than, changing his conduct, he separated himself from the communion of those by whom he had been raised, and boldly thundered an anathema against the emperor himself.[5] What a pity that Athanasius was not better acquainted with the conduct of Felix! for if he had, he would never have styled him "a monster placed on the see of Rome by the malice of antichrist." Such an attempt, unheard of till that time, must have made a great noise; and yet I find it was heard by none but Baronius, who lived at so great a distance. I may add, that there was no room for an excommunication against Constantius, who was still a catechumen, and consequently did not partake of the sacred mysteries.

The Roman Catholic writers, to save the credit of Felix, maintained him to have been, at least for some time, lawful pope. But, to confute whatever has been or can be said by them in his favor, without entering into a detail of the many sophistical and unconclusive arguments, false assertions, and groundless suppositions, with which they endeavor to disguise the truth, and confound their readers, I argue thus: that Liberius was lawfully chosen, and Felix unlawfully, is past all dispute. Now, upon the fall of Liberius, either there was, or there was not, a new election: if there was not, Liberius continued to be lawful bishop; or if by his fall he forfeited his dignity, as some think he did, the see became vacant; for nothing subsequent to the unlawful election of Felix could render it lawful. If there was a new election, and Felix was lawfully chosen, Liberius from that minute either ceased to be pope, or there were two lawful popes at a time. The latter they will not admit, lest they should turn the church into a monster with two heads. They must therefore allow Felix to have been lawful pope, and Liberius an antipope, till the see became vacant by the death of the former. But, on the other hand, this new election is quite groundless, highly improbable, and absolutely repugnant to what we read in the ancient and contemporary writers. It is quite groundless; for though Bellarmine speaks of a new election with as much confidence as if he had been one of the electors,[1] yet we find not the least hint of it in any of the writers of those times, who would not have passed over in silence so remarkable an event, had it come to their knowledge. It is highly improbable; for Liberius was greatly beloved by the whole people, and the far greater part of the clergy; and Felix hated to such a degree, that of all the inhabitants of Rome, not one ever appeared in the church while he was in it;[2] nay, he was by all avoided, even in the streets and other public places, as if he had carried about with him a contagion.[3] Is it not therefore altogether improbable, that the people and clergy should depose the man, whom in a manner they adored, for communicating with the Arians, and appoint one in his room, who likewise communicated with them, and was universally detested, avoided, and abhorred? And yet all this is gravely supposed by Bellarmine.[4] Lastly, the election of Felix is repugnant to what we read in the ancient writers, who all speak of him as an antipope, and an intruder. Optatus, who lived at that very time, and St. Austin, who flourished soon after, have not allowed him a place in their catalogues of the bishops of Rome. Theodoret takes no notice of him in his catalogues of the bishops of the chief cities. St. Jerom and Prosper count Liberius the thirty-fourth bishop of Rome, and Damasus, who succeeded him, the thirty-fifth; a plain indication that they did not look upon Felix as lawful bishop. Among the moderns, Onuphrius Panvinius, in his Lives of the Popes, printed in 1557, some years before the discovery of Felix's body, calls Novatian the first antipope, and Felix the second. But his book was prohibited in 1583, the year after the second canonization of Felix. The writers, who came after, took warning; and such of them as thought it base to concur in deceiving mankind, since it was not safe to undeceive them, chose to waive this subject, but not without giving some broad hints of what they believed in their hearts. Thus F. Labbé,[5] and Cardinal Bona,[6] take no notice of this Felix, but call Pope Felix, who was raised to the see of Rome in 485, the second

[1] Marcell. et Faust. p. 4.
[2] Athan. de syn. p. 907.
[3] Philost. l. 6, c. 6.
[4] Chron. Alex. p. 681.
[5] Bar. ad ann 357, n. 65.

[1] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4, c. 9.
[2] Theodoret. p. 610.
[3] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861.
[4] Bell. ibid.
[5] Lab. chron.
[6] Bona, lit. l. 2, c. 11, p. 423.

Felix acknowledged as a Saint by some Roman Catholic writers. The emperor undertakes the establishing of Arianism. An account of the life of Osius. He is imprisoned under Maximian. He instructs Constantine.

pope of that name. Felix I. was martyred under Aurelian in 274, as we have related elsewhere.[1] F. Labbé, at the death of Felix II., which happened in 492, adds, that he was the third of that name, according to Baronius.[2] Had Felix never been canonized, no man would have been so regardless of his own reputation as to undertake his defence; but Gregory having declared him a saint, and, by such a declaration, linked his cause with infallibility in a most essential point, the hired champions of that see found themselves under an indispensable obligation of entering the lists; which I need not say they have done to no purpose.

The fall of the Bishop of Rome, who was at the head of the orthodox party, inspired the emperor with great hopes of succeeding in the design he had formed of utterly abolishing the orthodox faith: he found there were but few bishops whose virtue was proof against the frowns and resentment of the court. In the council held at Arles in 353, they had all to a man chosen rather to communicate with the Arians, than be driven from their sees: in that which was convened two years after, at Milan, only three bishops were found, namely, Dionysius bishop of that city, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Eusebius of Vercelli, who, equally unmoved by threats and promises, had maintained the truth with the loss of their dignity. The example of the Bishop of Rome had been followed by the far greater part of the bishops of Italy. But what above all encouraged the emperor to pursue the scheme he had so much at heart, was the fall of the celebrated Osius bishop of Cordoua, in the hundredth year of his age, and sixty-second of his episcopacy. As the name of Osius is one of the most famous in the ecclesiastical history of those times, and his fall is alleged by the ancients as a memorable instance of the weakness of human nature, however strengthened and improved by a long practice of the most eminent virtues, a succinct account of so remarkable an event will not, I hope, be unacceptable to the reader, or thought foreign to the subject in hand.

Osius was a native of Spain,[3] born, according to some, in Cordoua, about the year 256, and raised, in regard of his extraordinary merit, to the see of that city in 295.[4] He was even then conspicuous for the firmness of his faith, and the purity of his life, says Sozomen.[5] Athanasius, who was well acquainted with him, speaks of him with the greatest respect and esteem, calling him a man truly holy, according to the Greek signification of his name; one in whose conduct even his most inveterate enemies could discover nothing that was not commendable, his life being irreprehensible, and his reputation unspotted.[1] Theodoret,[2] and Eusebius,[3] extol him on account of his extraordinary prudence, wisdom, and learning, which gave great weight to his opinion in the many councils at which he assisted, and often presided. In the year 300, he was present at the council of Eliberis, or Illeberis, in Spain, famous for the severity of its canons; and, in all likelihood, made even then a considerable figure; since, in the Acts of that council, he is named in the second place after Felix of Acci, now Guadix, in Andalusia, who probably presided.[4] Three years after broke out the persecution of Maximian Hercules, in which Osius distinguished himself by his zeal, his constancy, and his sufferings; for, having with great intrepidity confessed his faith before the pagan magistrates, he was by them imprisoned, and kept under a very close and painful confinement for the space of two years, that is, from the year 303 to 305, when, upon the abdication of Maximian and Dioclesian, he was set at liberty by Constantius Chlorus, the father of Constantine the Great.[5] He is honored by Athanasius,[6] by the council of Sardica, and by most of the ancients, with the title of confessor, which was given to such as had suffered imprisonment, torments, or exile, but had not died, for the confession of the faith. He was highly esteemed and revered by Constantine, not only as a confessor, but as a person of extraordinary wisdom and probity;[7] whence he is thought to have been one of the prelates whom that prince consulted in 311,[8] and kept with him to instruct him in the mysteries of the Christian religion. Some think that Osius was meant by the Egyptian priest come from Spain, to whom Zosimus ascribes the change made by Constantine in point of religion.[9] The church of Cordoua was, out of regard to him, enriched by Constantine with many valuable presents, whence he is said to have been very rich.[10] But what use he made of his wealth we may learn from Athanasius, who assures us, that no one in want ever applied to him without being relieved, and receiving the supply he demanded.[11] In the famous dispute, which I have taken notice of in its proper place, between Cæcilianus and the Donatists of Africa, Osius undertook, with great zeal, the defence of the former, and prevailed in the end upon Constantine to espouse his cause, and declare against the Donatists,[12] whom he thenceforth punished with great severity, taking their churches from them, and sending the most obstinate among them into exile. Constantine being become master of

[1] Vide p. 37.
[2] Lab. chron.
[3] Athan. ad Sol. p. 838.
[4] Soz. l. 1. c. 16.
[5] Idem ib.

[1] Athan. ad Sol. p. 841.
[2] Theod. l. 1, c. 6.
[3] Euseb. vit Const. l. 2, c. 63.
[4] Concil. tom. 1, p. 969.
[5] Athan. ad Sol. p. 838; Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2, c. 63.
[6] Athan. ib. apol. 2, p. 760, et alibi.
[7] Euseb. ib. Socr. l. 1, c. 7.
[8] Euseb. ib. l. 1, c. 7.
[9] Zos. l. 2, p. 435.
[10] Marc. et Faust p. 34.
[11] Athan. de fug. p. 704.
[12] Aug. in Parm. l. 1, c. 8.

Osius sent to compose some disputes in the east. He assists at the council of Nice, and draws up the Nicene creed. Constantius attempts to gain him over to the Arian party. He is sent to Sirmium. Confined and racked.

the east in the year 323, his first care was to put an end to the unhappy divisions that reigned in those churches about the celebration of Easter, and some other controverted points. With this view he despatched Osius into the east, who, upon his arrival there, summoned a council to meet at Alexandria, which, under his influence, condemned the heresy of Sabellius, put a stop to the schism of one Colluthus, and greatly allayed the animosity of the contending parties about the day on which Easter was to be kept.[1] On his return to court, the account he gave of the Arians, whose heresy he had endeavored in vain to suppress, made so deep an impression in the mind of the emperor, that, for a long time, he continued highly prejudiced against them.[2] It was at the suggestion of Osius that Constantine assembled the council of Nice in 325, at which he assisted, and distinguished himself above the rest;[3] for of all the councils he was the head and leader, as Athanasius styles him.[4] By him was worded and drawn up the famous Nicene symbol or creed, as we are told in express terms by Athanasius.[5] He presided at the council of Sardica, which, at his request, was assembled by the Emperor Constans in 347.[6] From that council he retired to his bishopric, and continued there undisturbed till the year 355, when Constantius seeing himself master of the west, as well as of the east, undertook to oblige all the bishops to condemn Athanasius, whose cause was looked upon as inseparable from that of the orthodox faith. As Osius had on all occasions declared highly in his favor, and the example of a prelate so venerable for his age, for the glorious title of Confessor, and the figure he had made for many years in the church, greatly prejudiced the world against the enemies of the persecuted bishop, the emperor resolved to deprive, if possible, the orthodox party of so powerful a support. With this view he ordered Osius to repair to Milan, where the court then was, well knowing that he was not, like most other bishops, to be terrified with threatening letters. Osius, in compliance with the emperor's orders, set out without delay from Cordoua, notwithstanding his great age; and, arriving at Milan, was there received by the emperor with all the respect that was due to the "father of bishops," as he was styled. Constantius entertained him for some days with the utmost civility, hoping by that means to bring him into his views; but he no sooner named Athanasius to him, than the zealous prelate, well knowing the drift of his discourse, and armed against all temptations, interrupted him with declaring, that he was ready to sacrifice not one, but a thousand lives, in so just a cause; nay, he even reprimanded the emperor with great freedom, who, out of an awful reverence for a prelate of his years, authority, and figure, heard him with great patience, and not only forbore offering him any violence, but gave him leave to return unmolested to his see.[1]

The mild treatment Osius met with gave great uneasiness to the Arian party, especially to the two bishops, Ursacius and Valens, who thereupon never ceased soliciting the emperor to proceed with vigor against the only man who, they said, was capable of obstructing his great and pious designs. They were powerfully seconded by the eunuchs, who prevailed in the end upon the emperor, as they bore a great sway at court, to try anew the firmness and constancy of so celebrated a champion. Constantius therefore wrote several letters to him, treating him in some with great respect, and styling him his father, but menacing him in others, and naming to him the bishops whom he had banished for refusing to condemn a man whom most bishops, and several councils, had already condemned.[2] Osius, inflexible and unmoved, answered the emperor by a letter worthy of himself, and the great reputation he had acquired. It has been conveyed to us by Athanasius, and nothing can be said stronger in that bishop's defence; for he there shows unanswerably, that, whatever crimes might be alleged against him, his only guilt was a steady adherence to the faith of Nice.[3] But Constantius, without hearkening to the reasons he urged in justification of his own and Athanasius's conduct, without paying the least regard to the earnest prayers and entreaties, to the paternal exhortations and admonitions, of so venerable a prelate, ordered him to quit his see forthwith, and repair to Sirmium, where he was kept a whole year in a kind of exile. But, unaffected with the many hardships he suffered there, with the loss of his dignity, with the inhuman treatment of his relations, who were all persecuted, stripped of their estates, and reduced to beggary on his account, Osius still stood up in defence of Athanasius, still rejected with indignation the proposals of his enemies,[4] striving to induce him at least to communicate with them. They therefore resolved to proceed to open force, and either to gain over to their party a man of his figure and rank, or, by removing him out of the way, to deprive the orthodox of their main support.[5] Accordingly, with the emperor's consent and approbation, they caused him first to be closely confined, and afterwards to be cruelly beaten; and lastly to be put to the rack, and most inhumanly tortured, as if he had been the worst of criminals.[6] Even against such exquisite torments the firmness of his mind

[1] Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2, c. 73. [2] Socr. l. 1, c. 8.
[3] Sulp. l. 2, c. 55; Theod. l. 2, c. 12.
[4] Athan. fug. p. 703.
[5] Athan. ad Sol. p. 837. [6] Hil. frag. 2, p. 16.

[1] Athan. ad Sol. p. 837—841.
[2] Idem ib. p. 838. [3] Idem ib. p. 838—840.
[4] Athan. ib. p. 841; Sulp. l. 2, p. 162; Socr. l. 2, c. 31.
[5] Athan. de fug. p. 701; Apol. 2, p. 807.
[6] Idem ib. Socr. p. 127.

Osius yields at last. He signs the Sirmian Confession of Faith. The Arians triumph. Hilarius not well informed as to the circumstances of his fall. He is restored to his see.

was proof for some time; but the weakness of his body obliged him in a manner to yield at last, and communicate with Ursacius and Valens.[1] Athanasius seems to insinuate, in some places, that he signed his condemnation;[2] but in another he expressly denies it.[3] Sulpitius Severus thinks he was guilty of no other crime but that of communicating with the Arians.[4] Athanasius only says, that he consented to communicate with Ursacius and Valens.[5] However, that he did not stop there, but signed the Arian confession of Sirmium, is but too manifest from several unexceptionable and contemporary writers. Phœbadius bishop of Agen, in France, in his answer written at this very time to the Arians, bragging that their doctrine had been approved and embraced by the great Osius, allows the fact; but adds, that he was induced thereunto by force, and not conviction.[6] Marcellinus and Faustinus, who wrote at the same time, say, that Osius set his hand, but never yielded his heart, to the Arian impiety.[7] Nay, Hilarius bishop of Poitiers supposes the Sirmian Confession of Faith to have been drawn up by Osius and Potamus; for he often calls it, "The heresy, the blasphemies, the wild and mad conceits of Osius and Potamus."[8] Vigilius Tapsensis ranks Osius with Ursacius, "and the other wicked men, who composed the sacrilegious confession of Sirmium."[9] Socrates writes, that he signed the Sirmian symbol;[10] Sozomen, that he consented to the suppression of the words Omoousion, and Omoiousion;[11] and Eusebius of Vercelli bestows high encomiums on Gregory bishop of Elvira, for opposing the great "transgressor Osius."[12] Potamus, whom I have mentioned above, was Bishop of Lisbone, and a most sanguine stickler for the orthodox party; but upon the emperor's yielding to him some lands of the imperial demesne, that lay very convenient for him, he changed sides, and became a most zealous champion of the Arian doctrine;[13] insomuch that he is ranked by Phœbadius with Ursacius and Valens, the two great apostles of the Arians.[14]

The fall of the great Osius, whom the orthodox party looked upon as their invincible hero, surprised the whole world.[15] Some could not believe it; others ascribed it to his great age, which might have weakened his judgment.[16] It was immediately published all over the east, and great rejoicings were made on the occasion, by the bishops in those parts, who looked upon such a conquest as a signal victory over the orthodox.[1] Phœbadius tells us, that the chief argument alleged by the Arians, in favor of their doctrine, against the bishops of Gaul, was "the conversion of Osius," as they styled it.[2] Here Davidius pleases himself with ridiculing, and indeed very justly, this and several other conversions, greatly boasted by the Arians; but he must give me leave to put him in mind, that he ridicules, at the same time, the many conversions which his church is constantly boasting, since most of them, especially those thus made in the new world, have been owing to arguments of the same nature as that of Osius, and other Arian proselytes, and were not perhaps at all more sincere. Hilarius, Bishop of Poitiers, who lived at this time in exile, amidst the Arians in Phrygia, seems not to be well informed as to the circumstances of the fall of Osius; else he had made some allowance for the barbarous and inhuman treatment the unhappy prelate met with, and not reflected on him with so much bitterness and severity, saying, that it had pleased God to prolong his life till he fell, that the world might know what he had been before he fell.[3] That a man in the hundredth year of his age should yield to most exquisite and repeated torments, is not at all to be wondered at: and therefore had Hilarius been better informed, he had rather pitied than reproached him. But the Arians, among whom he lived, took care to conceal whatever could anyways depreciate their boasted victory: at least that Hilarius was a stranger to what Osius had suffered, is manifest, from his ascribing the fall of that great prelate, not to the cruelty of his enemies, but to the too great love he had for his sepulchre,[4] meaning, I suppose, the desire he had of dying in his native country, and not in exile.

Osius having thus gratified the emperor, by communicating with the Arians, and signing the Sirmian Confession of Faith, he was immediately reinstated in his see, and suffered to return to his native country, where he gave some trouble, it seems, to the orthodox bishops; for Gregory bishop of Elvira is highly commended by Eusebius of Vercelli, who lived then in exile, "for opposing the transgressor Osius, as I have observed above. The unfortunate prelate did not live long after his fall, but died in the latter end of the same year 357, according to the most probable opinion. He did not forget the crime he had committed, says Athanasius;[5] but grievously complained, at the point of death, of the violence that had been offered him, anathematized the heresy of Arius, and exhorted, as by his last will, all mankind to reject it.[6] To his repentance Athanasius, no doubt, alludes, where he writes, that Osius yielded only for

[1] Athan. ad Sol. p. 841.
[2] Athan. de fug. p. 704, et apol. 2, p. 807.
[3] Idem ad Sol. p. 841
[4] Sulp. l. 2, p. 161, 162.
[5] Athan. ad Sol. p. 811.
[6] Phœbad. contr. Arian. p. 180.
[7] Marcell. et Faust. p. 34.
[8] Hil. de syn. p. 124, 125, 133.
[9] Vigil. in Eutychian. l. 5, n. 3.
[10] Socr. l. 2, c. 31.
[11] Soz. l. 4, c. 12.
[12] Hil frag. 2, p. 4.
[13] Marcell. et Faust. p. 34.
[14] Phœbad. p. 169.
[15] Idem, p. 180; Soz. l. 4, c. 12.
[16] Sulp. l. 2, p. 161, 162.

[1] Soz. l. 4, c. 12.
[2] Phœbad. p. 180.
[3] Hil. syn. p. 133.
[4] Idem ib. p. 137
[5] Athan. ad Sol. p. 141, et 842.
[6] Idem ib.

Constantius appoints a council to meet at Nicomedia; which city is destroyed by an earthquake. The council appointed to meet at Nice. Two councils appointed to meet instead of one. The occasion of this change.

a time;[1] which he says of no other, not even of Liberius. As for the account, which some writers give of his tragical end,[2] it is not worthy of notice. The Greek church honors him as a saint, and his festival is kept on the 27th of August;[3] but they are certainly mistaken in supposing him to have died in banishment. The case of Osius deserves, without all doubt, to be greatly pitied. But it would be still more worthy of our pity and compassion, had he been himself an enemy to all persecution. But it must be observed, that he was the author and promoter of the first Christian persecution. For it was he who first stirred up Constantine against the Donatists; many of whom were sent into exile, and some even sentenced to death, nay, and led to the place of execution. I dare not interpret the very severe treatment he met with, or his fall and apostasy, as a judgment; but cannot help thinking him, on that consideration, less worthy of our compassion and concern than a man of his years and merit would otherwise have been.

Constantius, having thus gained over to the heterodox party the celebrated Bishop of Cordoua, and sent those into exile whom he apprehended most capable of traversing his design, resolved to assemble a council, not doubting but he should be able, by some means or other, to prevail upon the members that composed it to approve and embrace the doctrine, which he was laboring with indefatigable pains to establish. Accordingly he wrote to the chief bishops of each province, enjoining them to meet in the name of the rest, at an appointed time, in the city of Nicomedia.[4] In compliance with his orders the bishops immediately set out; but, while they were on the road, they were stopped by the news that was brought them of the utter destruction of the city of Nicomedia by a sudden and most dreadful earthquake. This public calamity happened on the 24th of August, 358,[5] and the Arians, in the account which they transmitted of it to court, assured the emperor, that several bishops, who were for consubstantiality, had been buried under the ruins of the great church.[6] It was probably, by this account, that Philostorgius was deceived and misled, when he wrote, that fifteen bishops, who were all defenders of consubstantiality, were crushed to pieces by the fall of the church, together with Cecrops, bishop of the city.[7] But Sozomen assures us, that, when the church fell, there was not a single person in it; and that two bishops only perished in the earthquake, namely, Cecrops, who was an Arian, and a bishop of Bosporus.[8] This misfortune obliged the emperor to change the place of the council; and accordingly letters were immediately despatched to all the bishops, ordering them to repair to Nice, which city was suggested to him by Basilius, the Semi-Arian bishop of Ancyra, with a design, says Theodoret,[1] to eclipse the glory and authority of the first council by the confusion of two. Be that as it will, the bishops were ordered to meet there early in the summer of the year 359. Such as were not in a condition to undertake such a journey, on account of their age or infirmities, were to send priests or deacons, as their deputies, to vote and act in their name; and the council was strictly enjoined to transmit to the emperor such decrees as they should enact, that he might examine them, and see whether they were agreeable to Scripture: for this purpose ten deputies were to be appointed by the bishops of the east, and the like number by those of the west.[2] But while the world was expecting to see a second œcumenical council assembled at Nice, the emperor all on a sudden changed his mind, and instead of one, resolved to convene two, the one in the east, and the other in the west.[3] This change was owing to the intrigues of the Anomeans, or Pure Arians, who, finding the far greater part of the bishops either for the orthodox faith of Nice, or the Semi-Arian, as established in a council at Antioch, concluded, that there would be no means to divert them, when assembled together, from condemning their doctrine; whereas if they were divided, they did not despair of being able to manage both assemblies, or at least one of the two.[4] This design of dividing the council they privately imparted to the eunuch Eusebius, their great friend, and the emperor's chief favorite, who, highly applauding the scheme, took upon him to get it approved by Constantius. And this he easily effected, by representing, that a general council would put the bishops to greater trouble and inconveniences than most of them could well bear, and, at the same time, the treasury to an immense charge; for on such occasions their expenses were defrayed by the emperor.[5] He therefore advised him to assemble two councils at the same time, one in the east, and the other in the west, which, he said, would be less troublesome to the bishops, and less expensive to the exchequer. To these reasons Constantius acquiesced; but, as he was a zealous Semi-Arian, Eusebius kept him in the dark as to the true motive of such a change. Thus was Constantius, and thus have many princes been, since his time, led, as it were, hoodwinked, by some in whom they reposed an entire confidence, into measures tending to promote designs quite opposite to their own.

This point being settled, to the great satisfaction of the Anomeans, Ariminum, now

1 Idem de frag. p. 704, et apol. 2, p. 807.
2 Vide Isidor. de vir. ill. in Osio, c. 1.
3 Menæa, p. 203.
4 Soz. l. 4, c. 16, et l. 3, c. 19; Athan. de syn. p. 873.
5 Greg. Nyss. de facto, p. 75. 6 Soz. ib.
7 Philost. l. 4, c. 20. 8 Soz. ib.

1 Theodor. l. 1, c. 22.
2 Soz. l. 4, c. 16; Athan. de syn. p. 869.
3 Athan. ib. p. 870.
4 Athan. ib. p. 873, 874; Soz. l. 4, c. 16.
5 Idem ib. et c. 17.

Rimini chosen for the western bishops; and Seleucia in Isauria for those of the east. The emperor's letter to the western bishops. The Arians propose a new confession drawn up at Sirmium.

Rimini, on the Adriatic sea, was thought the most proper place for the western bishops to meet at. But the city of Nice, where the general council was to assemble, having suffered much by the late earthquake, the emperor desired the eastern bishops might not meet there, but in whatever other place they should agree among themselves to be the most proper and convenient.[1] This Theodoret ascribes to a particular providence, that would not suffer the great council of Nice to be ever confounded with a conventicle of heretics.[2] As the bishops could not agree about the place, and it was not at all probable they should, the emperor, by the advice of a few, who were then with him at Sirmium, named the city of Seleucia in Isauria.[3] And now that the place was settled for both councils, Constantius issued an order, enjoining not only the chief bishops of each province, as he had done the year before, but all, without exception, to repair to one of the two;[4] nay, he despatched officers into the provinces, with a strict charge to see his order punctually obeyed, and put in execution.[5] The bishops therefore set out from all parts; the public carriages, roads, and houses, were everywhere crowded with them; which gave great offence to the catechumens, and no small diversion to the pagans, who thought it equally strange and ridiculous, that men, who had been brought up from their infancy in the Christian religion, and whose business it was to instruct others in that belief, should be constantly hurrying, in their old age, from one place to another, to know what they themselves should believe.[6] Ammianus Marcellinus complains, that the necessary funds for the maintenance of the public carriages were quite drained and exhausted, by the roaming about of the Christian bishops.[7] Their charges were defrayed by the emperor, as I have observed above; but the bishops of Gaul and Britain, that they might be the more independent, insisted upon travelling at their own expense; only three of the latter, not having wherewithal to support themselves, chose rather to be obliged to the emperor than burdensome to their colleagues, who generously offered to contribute to their maintenance, every one according to his ability.[8]

The western bishops, that is, those of Illyricum, Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain, being assembled at Rimini, in all four hundred and upwards,[9] the emperor wrote to Taurus, the Præfectus Prætorio of Italy, charging him to be present at all the debates, and not to suffer the bishops to separate, till, in points of faith, they had all agreed: if he succeeded therein, he was to be rewarded with the consular dignity.[10] At the same time he wrote to the bishops, enjoining them to treat only of such matters as related to the faith, unity, and order of the church, and forbidding them to meddle, on any pretence whatsoever, with what concerned the eastern bishops, who, he said, would take care to settle their own affairs, since they were met for that purpose.[1] This was to prevent their entering upon the cause of Athanasius, whom he well knew the western bishops would have declared innocent. The emperor's letter is dated the 27th of May, 359.[2] At this council Restitutus bishop of Carthage is supposed to have presided, as he was, both for piety and learning, the most conspicuous in the assembly. At their first meeting, the two Arian bishops, Ursacius and Valens, appeared with a paper in their hands, containing a new confession of faith, composed lately at Sirmium by the emperor, by a small number of Arian and Semi-Arian bishops, and several presbyters and deacons, who, after a debate, which lasted the whole day, had at length agreed to suppress the word *consubstantial*, and introduce the word *like* in its room; so that the Son was no more to be said *consubstantial*, but *like to the Father in all things*; the three last words Constantius added, and, by obliging all who were present to sign them, defeated, say the Semi-Arians, the wicked designs of the heretics, meaning the pure Arians.[3] However, excepting those words, the whole confession was thought to favor their doctrine;[4] whence the Semi-Arians held out till night, when the emperor, well satisfied with the words *like in all things*, obliged them to sign it. This confession of faith was drawn up, and signed,[5] on the eve of Pentecost,[6] that is, on the 22d or

1 Soz. l. 4, c. 24. 2 Theod. l. 2, c. 21.
3 Socr. l. 2, c. 39; Soz. l. 4, c. 16.
4 Hil. de syn. p. 24. 5 Sulp. l. 2, p. 164.
6 Athan. de syn. p. 870. 7 Amnian. l. 21, p. 203.
8 Sulp. l. 4, c. 17.
9 Athan. de syn. p. 874; Sulp l. 2, p. 162; Soz. p. 563.
10 Hier. p. 143; Sulp. p. 162.

1 Hil. frag. 2, p. 43, 44. 2 Idem. ib. p. 46.
3 Athan. de syn. p. 876; Hil. frag. 1, p. 44; Epiph. hæres. 73, c. 22.
4 Hil. and Epiph. ib.
5 It was signed by the few bishops who were present, and by a good number of presbyters and deacons. The bishops were Marcus of Arethusa, George, who had been intruded into the see of Alexandria, Basilius of Ancyra, Germinius of Sirmium, Hypatianus of Heraclea, Valens, Ursacius, and Pancratius of Pelusium, (Athan. de syn. p. 873; Epi. 73, c. 22; Socr. l. 2, c. 29.) Valens, in signing it, added to his name these words: *I believe the Son to be like to the Father.* He was unwilling to acknowledge the Son like to the Father *in all things*, agreeably to the confession, which he was to sign, and therefore suppressed these words. But the emperor, insisting upon his adding them, he took his will for the rule of his faith, and added them accordingly. Basilius of Ancyra, suspecting some meaning contrary to the doctrine which he held, to lie concealed and disguised under those words, declared, that he understood by them a likeness in *substance*, in *existence*, and in *essence*; and that he signed in this, and no other sense, the present symbol. Not satisfied with this declaration, he wrote, some time after, an exposition of the faith that was professed by him, and the other Semi-Arian bishops. This exposition is, by Epiphanius, styled a letter, and was placed by him after the circular letter of the council of Ancyra. The present confession of Sirmium is commonly styled the third, but was, properly speaking, the fourth: for before this, three different Symbols had been composed at Sirmium; namely, one entirely orthodox, in 351, another altogether Arian, in 357, a third Semi-Arian, in 358, and the present in 359. The second Liberius signed at Berœa, and the third at Sirmium, upon his arrival in that city.
6 Hil. frag. 1, p. 44; Epiph. hæres. 73, c. 22.

The new confession of the Arians rejected; and they condemned and deposed. Deputies sent to the emperor, who leaves Constantinople without seeing them. The Arians get deputies ordered to Nice, in Thrace.

23d of May, 359:[1] Easter having fallen that year on the 4th of April.[2] Ursacius and Valens read it to the council, adding, when they had done, that it had been approved of by the emperor, and therefore that they ought all to be satisfied with it, without recurring to any other councils or creeds, without demanding any other confession of the heretics, or inquiring too narrowly into their doctrine and opinions, which would be attended with much trouble, endless disputes and eternal divisions; that the catholic truths, which all men were bound to believe, ought not to be darkened with metaphysical terms, but expressed by words, which all men understood; and, lastly, that it was quite idle to quarrel and make so much noise about a word (meaning the word *consubstantial*) which none of the inspired writers had thought fit to make use of in explaining the mysteries of our holy religion.[3] What answer the council returned, I can find nowhere recorded. But a motion being made soon after to condemn and anathematize the Arian and all other heresies, Ursacius and his party opposed it; which alarmed the orthodox bishops, concluding from thence, that whatever expressions they made use of, their belief was different from that of the catholic church. They therefore resolved to hearken to them no longer; and accordingly, without the least regard to their remonstrances and protestations, they condemned, with one consent, all heretics in general, and that of Arius in particular; declared heretical the confession of faith presented by Ursacius and Valens; confirmed that of Nice, and ordered the word *consubstantial* to be retained, since the true meaning of it might be sufficiently gathered from several passages in Scripture.[4] They did not stop here; but, transported with zeal on the Arians attempting to impose upon them by a second confession of faith, they declared them all, and their leaders Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Caius, by name, ignorant and deceitful men, impostors, heretics, deposed them in the council, and signed all to a man this declaration on the 21st of July of the present year 359.[5]

With this act they put an end to the sessions, and immediately despatched ten deputies to acquaint the emperor with what had passed, pursuant to his express command. The like number was sent by the Arians, who had assisted at the council. These, travelling with great expedition, arrived at Constantinople, where the court then was, some time before the others; and, being immediately admitted to the emperor, they prejudiced him to such a degree against the orthodox party, that he would not so much as see their deputies, pretending to be wholly taken up with the affairs of the state. They were therefore obliged to deliver the letter, which the council had written on this occasion, to one of his ministers.[1] They expected every day to be admitted to an audience, or, at least, to receive an answer, and be dismissed. But, after they had been thus kept for some time in expectation, the emperor all on a sudden left Constantinople, in order to head his army against the barbarians, who had broken into the empire. He was no sooner gone than one of the ministers came to acquaint them, that it was the emperor's pleasure they should repair forthwith to Adrianople, and there wait his return.[2] However, before he set out, he wrote to the council, giving them notice of his sudden departure from Constantinople; and alleging, by way of excuse for not having seen or heard their deputies, the present situation of public affairs, which had engrossed his whole attention, whereas, the discussing and settling of spiritual affairs required a mind quite free and disengaged from all worldly cares. He concluded his short letter with entreating them not to think of separating till he was at leisure to settle, in conjunction with them, matters of so great importance to the church, and the whole Christian world.[3] The design of the most wicked Constantius, as Athanasius styles him,[4] was to tire out the bishops with such delays, hoping they would, in the end, choose rather to sign the last Sirmian confession, which he was bent upon establishing in the room of the Nicene, than to be long kept, as it were, in exile, at a distance from their sees.[5] But this he could not compass for the present, the bishops declaring, in their answer to his letter, that they could not, and hoped they never should, upon any consideration whatsoever, depart from what they had so unanimously settled and decreed.[6] Socrates writes, that the bishops, after having waited some time in vain for the emperor's answer to their letter, left Rimini, and retired to their respective sees.[7] And here he ends his account of that council. It were greatly to be wished, that nothing else could be said of it; but several contemporary and unexceptionable writers, and Hilarius among the rest,[8] assure us, that Constantius *changed at last the faith of the western bishops into impiety*. Of this deplorable change they give us the following account.

The Arians, taking occasion from the last letter of the bishops at Rimini to incense Constantius against them, prevailed upon him to order their deputies to a city in Thrace, known at that time by the name of Nice, but formerly called Ostudizus, and placed by Sanson a few leagues to the east of Adrianople. This place they chose, that the symbol, which they designed to impose upon them.

[1] Athan. de syn. p. 875. [2] Buch. cycl.
[3] Athan. Soz. ib. Theod. l. 1, c. 15.
[4] Athan. ib. p. 876; Soz. ib. Hil. frag. 2, p. 47, 48.
[5] Athan. ib. Socr. l. 1, c. 37; Hil. frag. 2, p. 46.

[1] Sulp. l. 2, p. 163; Athan. ad Afr. p. 934; Hil. frag. 2, p. 36.
[2] Socr. ib. Athan. de syn. p. 930.
[3] Athan. de syn p. 929, 930. [4] Id. ib.
[5] Theod. l. 2, c. 15, 16. [6] Id. ib.
[7] Socr. l. 2, c. 37. [8] Hil. in cons. l. 1, p. 113.

The deputies of the Arians sign the Sirmian confession. Constantius orders the bishops at Rimini to suppress the words *substance* and *consubstantial*. The greater part yield. The others imposed upon by the Arians.

might be confounded by the ignorant people with that of the great council of Nice in Bithynia.[1] The deputies no sooner arrived there, than a confession of faith was proposed to them entirely agreeable to the last made at Sirmium, except that in this new creed the Son was declared *like to the Father*, without the addition of the words *in all things*. This they rejected at first with great resolution and intrepidity; but the Arians were no less resolute, and therefore left nothing unattempted they could think of to carry their point.[2] But finding hope and fear, threats and promises, equally ineffectual, they proceeded at last to open force and violence.[3] What kind of violence was employed against them, the author does not tell us; but Marcellinus and Faustinus ascribe their retracting what they had declared to be holy, and approving what they had condemned as impious, to the love of their sees, and the dread they were in of being driven from them.[4] Be that as it will, it is certain, that they yielded at last; that they accepted and signed, without the least limitation or restriction, the above-mentioned confession of faith; consented to the suppression of the word *consubstantial;* declared void and null all the acts and proceedings of the council of Rimini; anathematized, as heretical, all opinions contrary to the doctrine contained in the said confession; and, finally, admitted to their communion Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Caius, whom they had not long before deposed as heretics.[5] Restitutus, Bishop of Carthage, and one of the most eminent prelates at that time in the church, signed the first, and the other deputies after him, according to the dignity of their sees. The emperor, transported with joy at the news of their compliance, which he looked upon as a signal victory, gave them immediately leave to return to Rimini. At the same time he wrote to Taurus, charging him anew not to suffer the bishops to depart till they had all signed the same confession of faith, and empowering him to send into exile such as by their obstinancy should distinguish themselves above the rest, provided they were not above fifteen in number.[6] He likewise wrote to the bishops, commanding them, on pain of incurring his indignation, to suppress for ever the words *substance* and *consubstantial*, severely reprimanding them for presuming to depose Ursacius and his colleagues, and assuring them, that they should not be allowed to return to their sees, till they had entitled themselves to his favor by an entire and unreserved compliance with his will.[7] To this letter the Arians, who had assisted at the council, to the number of eighty, returned a most submissive answer, and even thanked the emperor for the great pains he took to establish the true doctrine.[1] However, Taurus declared that he could by no means suffer them to depart till the rest had agreed with them, and the whole assembly was of one mind. The orthodox bishops showed at first some resolution, and even refused to communicate with their own deputies. But this resolution soon vanished; they were eager to return to their sees; the emperor was inflexible; Taurus took care to render the place both inconvenient and disagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their example, the rest began to waver, and, being so far got the better of, yielded soon after, and went over to the Arian party in such crowds, that in a very short time the number of the orthodox bishops, who continued steady, was reduced to twenty.[2] At the head of these was Phœbadius, the celebrated bishop of Agen, who seemed invincible; but nevertheless was overcome in the end, not by the menaces of the emperor, or his prefect, but by the craft and subtilty of Ursacius and Valens, who, finding they could by no other means prevail upon him to accept the Sirmian confession, declared, that to put an end to the unhappy divisions that had so long rent the church, they had at last resolved to agree to such alterations and additions as should be judged proper and necessary by him and his colleagues. This declaration was received by all with great joy: Phœbadius triumphed, thinking he had carried his point, and saved the reputation of the council. To the symbol were immediately added several anathemas against the Arian heresy, and an article declaring *the Son equal to the Father, without beginning, and before all time.* When this article was read, Valens desired, that, in order to leave no room for new disputes or chicanery, they would add, that *the Son was not a creature like other creatures.*[3] This was evidently supposing the Son to be a creature only exalted above all other creatures; so that by admitting such an article they condemned the doctrine which they designed to establish, and established that which they designed to condemn. And yet of this neither was Phœbadius aware, nor any of his party, as they afterwards solemnly declared.[4] A most unaccountable oversight, and hardly credible! But Theodoret,[5] Ambrose,[6] Sulpitius Severus,[7] and Fulgentius,[8] took it upon their word, and so must we. Neither party could brag of the victory; for the Arians had anathematized the heresy of Arius; and on the other hand the orthodox bishops had deliberately agreed to the suppressing of the words *substance* and *consubstantial*, and inadvertently acknowledged the Son to be a creature; which was all the Arians aimed at, or could desire. The council being thus ended, new deputies were sent

1 Theod. l. 2, c. 16; Hil. in ann. p. 122.
2 Id. ib. 3 Hil. frag. 2, p. 23.
4 Marc. et Faust. p. 25.
5 Hil. frag. 2. p. 36, 37; Theod. ib.; Sulp. l. 2, p. 165.
6 Athan. ad Afr. p. 941; Sulp. p. 165; Marc. et Faust. p. 26; Hil. frag. p. 37.
7 Athan. ib. p. 934.

1 Hil. frag. 2, p. 37, 38. 2 Sulp. p. 166.
3 Sulp. ib. 4 Theod. l. 1, c. 17.
5 Id. ib. 6 Ambros. de fid. l. 3, c. 7.
7 Sulp. l. 2, p. 166. 8 Fulg. in Pint. c. 3, p. 536.

They discover their mistake. Are judged guilty by the exiled bishops. Great disagreement in the council of Seleucia. The semi-Arians condemn and depose the Arians. They sign the last confession of Sirmium. The Arians, in their turn, condemn and depose the semi-Arians, and also sign the last confession of Sirmium.

to acquaint the emperor with what had passed, who being highly pleased with the report made by Urfacius and Valens (for they were at the head of the deputation) immediately granted the bishops leave to return to their respective sees, after they had been about four months at Rimini.

The council no sooner broke up than the Arians began to proclaim aloud the victory they had gained, bragging, that it had not been defined in the council of Rimini, that the Son was not a creature, but only that he was not like other creatures; and declaring it was, and had always been their opinion, that the Son was no more like the Father, than a piece of glass was like an emerald.[1] Phœbadius, and the other bishops who had adhered to him, were returned to their sees with great joy, flattering themselves that they had sufficiently established the catholic doctrine, and prevented all future disputes: but, finding that the Arians pretended their tenets had been confirmed by this very council, and seriously reflecting on the articles, which they themselves had agreed to, they discovered at last how grossly they had been imposed upon, and publicly retracted all they had said, done, or signed, repugnant to the truths of the catholic church.[2] However, Gregory bishop of Elvira refused to communicate with any of the bishops who had assisted at the council of Rimini, and was on that account commended by Eusebius of Vercelli.[3] The exiled bishops, and those who lay concealed, agreed among themselves by letters, to declare them for ever incapable of performing any episcopal or sacerdotal functions, and to admit them to the communion of the church only in the capacity of laymen.[4] When peace was restored to the church by the death of Constantius in 361, most of the orthodox bishops were for deposing all those of the council of Rimini, and placing others in their room. But this sentence the people would not suffer to be put in execution, rising every where in defence of their pastors, and in some places insulting, beating, and even killing, those who came to depose them.[5]

As for the council of Seleucia, it met on the 27th of September 359, and consisted only of one hundred and sixty bishops, all Arians, or semi-Arians, except twelve or thirteen orthodox bishops from Egypt.[6] This assembly Gregory Nazianzen calls the Tower of Calane, or Babel, the council of Caiaphas.[7] And indeed with a great deal of reason; for nothing was there seen but tumult, confusion, and disorder. The Anomeans and semi-Arians appeared so irreconcilably incensed against each other, and carried on their debates with so much animosity and bitterness, that the Quæstor Leonas, whom the emperor had appointed to assist at the council, thinking it impossible they should ever agree in any one point, rose up at their fourth meeting, while they were in the heat of dispute, and, withdrawing abruptly, put an end to that session, nay, and to the council; for, being invited the next day, the first of October, to the assembly, he refused to go, saying, that he did not conceive his presence to be at all necessary, since they might quarrel and scold as much as they pleased without him.[1] This he did, says Sozomen, to favour the Anomeans, who thence took occasion to absent themselves from the council, which, as it was chiefly composed of semi-Arians, seemed determined to condemn their doctrine.[2] However, the semi-Arians met by themselves; and, finding they could by no means prevail upon the Anomeans to return to the council, they condemned their doctrine as heretical and blasphemous, excommunicated and deposed the leading men of their party, appointed others in their room, and gave notice thereof to their respective churches.[3] Before they broke up, they despatched ten deputies to acquaint the emperor with the transactions of the council. But the bishops whom they had deposed, arriving at court before them, and being by their friends there immediately introduced to Constantius, they prejudiced him against the council of Seleucia to such a degree, that it was some time before he could prevail upon himself to hear the deputies. However, he heard them at last, and, by threatening them with exile if they did not comply, obliged them to sign the last confession of Sirmium, which had been rejected by the council as Arian.[4] In this he spent the whole day, and great part of the night, preceding the first of January, though he was obliged to make the necessary preparations for entering on that day his tenth consulate with the usual pomp and solemnity.[5]

In the beginning of the year 360 the Anomeans assembling by themselves at Constantinople, as the semi-Arians had done at Seleucia, in order to ingratiate themselves with the emperor, not only received the last Sirmian confession, but condemned all other confessions or symbols that had been made till then, or should be made for the future. They then declared all the acts of the council of Seleucia void and null; and, to be even with the semi-Arians, deposed, under various pretences, such of their party as had most contributed to the deposing of them, and even prevailed upon the emperor to send them into exile.[6]

They did not stop here, but obtained of

[1] Hil. frag. 1, p. 53, 54.
[2] Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.
[3] Hil. frag. 2, p. 4, 5.
[4] Mar. & Faust. p. 47.
[5] Hier. ib.
[6] Ath. de syn. p. 881; Hil. in cons. l. 1. p. 114.
[7] Greg. Naz. or. 21. p. 386.

[1] Socr. l. 2. c. 40.
[2] Soz. l. 4. c. 22.
[3] Id. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 40. Ath. de syn. p. 881. Basil. in Eunom. l. 1. p. 697. Sulp. l. 1. p. 165.
[4] Hil. in cons. l. 1. p. 115. Soz. l. 4. c. 23. Basil. ep. 74.
[5] Soz. l. 4. c. 24.
[6] Socr. l. 2, c. 12. Soz. l. 4. c. 24. Philost. l. 5. c. 1.

An order from the emperor injoining all bishops to sign the Sirmian confession. It was probably signed by Liberius. Arianism universally obtains. Constantius designs to establish the doctrine of the pure Arians; but is prevented by death.

Constantius an order, which was published throughout the empire, commanding all Bishops to sign the Sirmian confession, on pain of forfeiting their dignity, and being sent into exile.[1] (*) This order was executed with the utmost rigor in all the provinces of the empire, and very few were found, who did not sign with their hands what they condemned in their hearts.[2] Many, who till then had been thought invincible, were overcome, and complied with the times; and such as did not, were driven, without distinction, from their sees, into exile, and others appointed in their room, the signing of that confession being a qualification indispensibly requisite both for obtaining and keeping the episcopal dignity.[3] Thus were all the sees throughout the empire filled with Arians, insomuch that in the whole east not one orthodox bishop was left, and in the west, but one, namely, Gregory bishop of Elvira in Andalusia, and he, in all likelihood, obliged to absent himself from his flock, and lie concealed, as were probably pope Liberius, and Vincentius of Capua, if what Theodoret relates of them be true, namely, that they never consented to the decrees of Rimini,[4] and thereby retrieved the reputation they had lost, the former by signing the Sirmian confession of the year 357, and the other by communicating with the Arians in 353, as I have related above. But what Theodoret writes may be justly called in question; for it is not at all probable, that the emperor, and the Arian party, so warmly bent on establishing that confession throughout the empire, would have suffered the bishop of the imperial city, of the first see, to reject it, without deposing him, as they had done the bishops of all the other great sees, and appointing another more compliant in his room. This could not be prevented by his concealing himself in the caverns and cemeteries abcut Rome, as he is said to have done in his acts quoted by Baronius,[5] though he might by that means have escaped being sent into exile. Besides, had he, instead of complying with the emperor's express command, withdrawn and absconded, I cannot think that his antagonist Felix, who was still alive, and had done nothing we know of to disoblige the emperor, and the Arian party, by whom he had been formerly raised to that see, would have neglected so favorable an opportunity of recovering his ancient dignity. If what Theodoret says be true, Gregory Nazianzen is highly to blame for not excepting Liberius, when he writ, that the bishops either all complied, or were driven into exile, excepting a few, who were too insignificant to be taken notice of by the emperor, or his ministers.[1] Be that as it will, it is certain, that at this time the Arian doctrine universally obtained; that the face of the church appeared quite deformed and disfigured;[2] that the whole world saw itself, with astonishment, all on a sudden become Arian;[3] that the boat of St. Peter, to use St. Jerom's expression, tossed by furious winds, by violent storms, was upon the point of sinking, and no hopes of safety seemed to be left.[4]

The following year 361, the Anomeans, not fully satisfied with the confession of faith, which, at their suggestion, the emperor had taken so much pains to establish throughout the empire, assembled, with his leave, at Antioch, and there drew up a new symbol, or creed, wherein it was expressly said, that "the Son was in every thing unlike to the Father," and that "He was made out of nothing." Constantius had formerly expressed the greatest abhorrence to this doctrine, and had even banished those who held, and refused to anathematize, such "impious blasphemies," as he then styled them.[5] But, having lately changed his opinion, which was chiefly owing to the great influence the eunuch Eusebius had over him, he was now no less sanguine for the unlikeness of the Son to the Father, than he had been hitherto for the likeness.[6] In order therefore to abolish the ancient, and establish this new creed in its room, he appointed a council to meet at Nice in Bithynia,[7] which, without all doubt, he would have treated in the same manner as he had done that of Rimini. But, as the bishops were preparing to set out for the appointed place, they were stopped by the sudden and unexpected news of the emperor's death, which put an end to all his councils, and was heard with equal joy by those of the orthodox and semi-Arian party. He was succeeded by Julian, surnamed the Apostate, who immediately recalled all those who had been banished by Constantius on account of their religion.[8] Whatever was his

[1] Sox. l. 4. c. 26.

(*) This confession is called sometime the confession of Nice in Thrace, and sometimes the confession of Rimini; but it differed from both. By the confession of Nice, the Son was acknowledged to be like to the Father, without the addition of the words "in all Things," which were an essential part of the last confession of Sirmium. In that of Rimini the Son was said "not to be a creature like other creatures," and there were no such words in the confession of Sirmium. But by all three the word consubstantial was rejected, and no other would satisfy the orthodox, acknowledging the Son to be "of the same substance with the Father." Both the Arians and semi-Arians allowed the Son to be like to the Father: but that likeness was by them very differently understood and interpreted. The Arians held him to be like rather by grace than by nature, and as like as a creature could be to the Creator. (a) The semi-Arians confessed him to be like in nature, in existence, in essence, in substance, and in every thing else. But the orthodox maintained him to be of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same existence, essence, &c. and, to express this sameness of identity, they chose the word consubstantial.

[2] Greg. Naz. orat. 21. p. 387. [3] Id. ib.
[4] Theod. l. 2. c. 17. [5] Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 48.
(a) Ruff. l. 1. c. 25.

[1] Greg. Naz. orat. 1. p. 387. [2] Ruff. l. 1. c. 21.
[3] Hier. in Lucifer. p. 143. & in chron.
[4] Idem ib. [5] Theod. l. 2. c. 23.
[6] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Ath. de syn. p. 906.
[7] Philost. l. 6. c. 5. [8] Socr. l. 3. c. 1.

The exiled bishops recalled by Julian. The council of Alexandria. A schism formed by Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari. He never returned to the communion of the church.

motive, the church reaped great advantages from the return of so many eminent prelates, who, in the worst of times, had, with an invincible firmness and constancy, stood up in her defence. Among the rest returned, on this occasion, the famous Meletius bishop of Antioch, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, who had been all three confined to the most distant parts of Thebais in Egypt, Cyril of Jerusalem, Pelagius of Laodicea in Phœnicia, and, to the inexpressible joy of the orthodox party, their great champion Athanasius bishop of Alexandria,[1] who immediately resumed, undisturbed, his episcopal function; George, the usurper of his see, having been assassinated a little while before by the pagans of Alexandria, on account of his avarice and cruelty.[2] In other places the orthodox bishops, finding the Arians in possession of their sees, contented themselves with being acknowledged by those of their communion, without attempting to drive out their antagonists, which would have created great confusion, and endless disturbances in the church. Julian refused to interpose his authority in favor of either party, saying, that as he was not so well acquainted with the nature of their disputes as a just and impartial judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuse him, lest he should be guilty of some injustice, and settle matters of such importance among themselves. Athanasius entered Alexandria in a kind of triumph, which is described in a lively manner by Gregory Nazianzen, who seems to have pleased himself with displaying, in that description, all the eloquence he was master of.[3]

The bishop of Alexandria being thus reinstated, and again at full liberty to exert his zeal for the catholic cause, his first care was to retrieve his fallen brethren, and reunite them to the church. With this view he assembled, in 362, a council at Alexandria, composed only of confessors, that is, of such bishops as had chosen rather to forfeit their dignities and sees, than receive or sign the Arian confession of Rimini or Sirmium. This was one of the most respectable councils that was ever held in the church, not so much in regard of the numbers (for I find not above twenty named) as of the merit, virtue, and sanctity of the members that composed it. The chief subject of their debates, or rather inquiries, was to find out the most proper means of restoring tranquillity to the church, after so dreadful a storm. Some, and among the rest Lucifer bishop of Cagliari, who did not assist in person, but by his deputies, the two deacons Herennius and Agapetus, were for deposing all those who had signed the confession of Rimini, and cutting them off from the communion of the church. But this unseasonable severity was condemned by the far greater part, as tending to raise a new storm, and involve the church in greater troubles than ever, which the emperor Julian would take care to improve, to the total ruin of the Christian religion. Athanasius therefore was for using severity only with the authors, and chief promoters, of the late general defection: and his opinion prevailed; for a decree was enacted, importing, that the authors of the late general prevarication should, even upon their repentance, be received to the communion of the church only in the capacity of laymen, but that the rest should be all kept in, or restored to, their sees, upon their publicly renouncing the Arian communion, and embracing the faith of Nice.[1] This decree was every where received with the greatest joy, the bishop Cagliari being the only man, either in the east or west, who opposed it, and that with so much obstinacy, that, rather than yield, he chose to separate himself from the communion of the rest, and to form a new schism, which bore his name, and soon gained a considerable footing, especially in the west; several persons no less distinguished for piety than learning, and among the rest Gregory, the famous bishop of Elvira, having adopted the sentiments of a man, who had suffered so much for the purity of the faith. As Lucifer is honored by the church of Rome as a saint, and his festival is kept on the 20th of May,[2] Baronius pretends, that he abandoned his schism, and returned to the communion of the church, before his death.[3] But his contemporary Ruffinus, who probably knew him, assures us, that he died in the schism, which he had formed.[4] Jerom often speaks of his schism, but no where gives us the least hint of his having ever quitted it; which would have afforded him a strong argument against the Luciferians, and he would not have failed to urge it, in the book which he wrote to convince them of their error. That writer speaks of Lucifer, on all occasions, with the greatest respect, even in the book which he writ against his followers: he owns, that his intention was pure and upright; that it was not pride, thirst after glory, or a desire of transmitting his name to posterity, but a mistaken zeal, that led him astray, and made him disapprove what the others approved; he even distinguishes him with the title of the Blessed Lucifer.[5] And hence Baronius concludes, that he returned to the communion of the church; for otherwise, says the annalist,[6] St. Jerom had never given him the title of blessed or saint. But that he did not return, is manifest, from the silence of St. Jerom on that head, and from the authority of a contemporary writer quoted above: and hence I may draw a conclusion far better grounded than that of Baronius; namely, that

[1] Theod. l. 3. c. 2. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.
[2] Ammian. l. 22. p. 223. Soz. l. 4. c. 30. Philost. l. 7. c. 2. Epiph. p. 912.
[3] Greg. Naz. 21.

[1] Ruf. l. 1. c. 28. Ath. ad Ruf. t. 2. p. 41. Amb. de salv. p. 316. Aug. ep. 50. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.
[2] Bolland, Maii 20. p. 207.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132.
[4] Ruf. l. 1. c. 30.
[5] Hier. in Lucif. p. 144.
[6] Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132.

The council of Alexandria saves the church from ruin. The faith of Nice every where established. A council convened by the semi-Arians.

St. Jerom excused him on account of his good intention; and, consequently, that he did not hold the uncharitable doctrine of the church of Rome, excluding from salvation all who die out of her communion, let their intention be never so good. It is to be observed, that the Luciferians not only excluded from their communion those who had received the Arian confession, but all who communicated with them, even after they had anathematized that confession, and publicly embraced the faith of Nice.

The resolution taken by the confessors in the council of Alexandria, is said to have saved the church from utter ruin. For had that prevailed, which was urged with so much warmth by Lucifer, the bishops, who had chosen rather to sign the Arian confession than forfeit their sees, would have kept them in defiance of a decree made by a small number of their colleagues, and in all likelihood excommunicated and deposed, in their turn, those who had excommunicated and deposed them: and, in that case, the Arian party, comprehending almost all the bishops of the church, must have prevailed. But as nothing was required of them, to keep their sees, besides their renouncing the confession of Rimini, which they had embraced, and embracing that of Nice, which they had renounced, they readily complied with the decree of the Council; insomuch that the following year, 363, Athanasius, in a letter, which he wrote to the emperor Jovian, immediately after the death of Julian, could assure that prince, that the faith of Nice had been received, and was professed, in all the provinces of the empire, which he enumerates; but omits those of Thrace, Bithynia, and the Hellespont,[1] the bishops there still continuing obstinately to maintain the doctrine of Arius, and to reject the faith of Nice, as we learn from Sozomen,[2] Socrates,[3] and Basil;[4] nay, at Constantinople, the orthodox had but a small chapel to assemble in, all the churches being in possession of the Arians, under Eudoxius, a leading man among the pure Arians, who had usurped that see.[5] For the better establishment of the orthodox faith, after the violent shock it had lately received, councils were held in several provinces of the empire,* and by all was received the faith of Nice, the confession of Rimini condemned, and the words *substance* and *consubstantial.* re-established.[1] A very strong proof that the assent given before to the Arian doctrines had been solely the effect of force, or of interest, which being now removed, and all left at liberty to act as their consciences only directed, the orthodox faith prevailed as much as the other had done under Constantius.

As every one was allowed by Julian to believe what he pleased, and to own his belief, whatever it was, the semi-Arians convened a council, soon after the death of Constantius, who, in the latter end of his life, had begun to persecute them as much as he had favored them before. This council was composed of those chiefly who had assisted at that of Seleucia, of which I have spoken above; and they all agreed to condemn and anathematize the doctrine of the pure Arians, with the confession of Rimini, and to sign anew the confession of Antioch, establishing a likeness in substance between the Son and the Father. Thus they pretended to keep a due mean between the two opposite extremes,

[1] Atha. ad Jov. t. I. p. 246. [2] Soz. l. 6. c. 10.
[3] Socr. l. 4. c. I. [4] Bas. ep. 75. [5] Socr. ib.

* The bishops of Gaul assembled at Paris in 362, and, having first owned their crime, in approving and signing the confession of Rimini, they acknowledged the three persons of the Trinity to be of the same nature and substance, and condemned Ursacius, Valens, and Auxentius the Arian bishop of Milan. This council was convened by St. Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers; and a letter, which the council wrote on this occasion, has been transmitted to us, among the fragments of his works. He is said to have assembled several other councils in Gaul, for the re-establishment of the faith of Nice, which is all we know of them. The same year, 362, the bishops of Italy assembling, declared void and null the acts of the council of Rimini, embraced the faith of Nice, and, with one accord, anathematized Ursacius and Valens, as the leading men of the Arian party. There is, among the fragments of St. Hilarius, a letter on this subject, from the Italian to the Illyrian bishops. Where this council was held I find no where recorded. In the year 363, the emperor Jovian desiring to be instructed in the faith of the catholic church, by Athanasius and the Egyptian bishops, who were come to wait on him, they assembled in council, and agreed to propose no other creed to him but that of Nice. At the same time they condemned the heresy of Macedonius, denying the divinity of the Holy Ghost. This council is generally thought to have been held at Alexandria. But, from the letter, which they presented to the emperor, it appears to have consisted of some Egyptian bishops, who, as it is there said, were appointed to represent all the others of the province. (*a*) Had the council been held in Alexandria, they had, I should think, been all present. It must therefore have assembled in some place out of Egypt; and where more likely than at Antioch? For there the emperor was this very year, and there Athanasius waited on him. The same year another council was held at Antioch, under Melecius bishop of that city. In that council, Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had been at the head of the Arian party, in the latter end of the reign of Constantius, and his followers, commonly styled Acacians, embraced the faith of Nice, and admitted the term consubstantial. Acacius had no other faith but that of the party which prevailed. Hence, in the time of Jovian, who favored the orthodox party, he professed the Faith of Nice; but two years after he had signed it, he joined the Arians anew, seeing them in great favor with the emperor Valens. Several other councils were held, from the year 363 to 368, of which we have no particular account. For Athanasius tells us, in general terms, that many councils assembled in France, in Spain, at Rome, in Dalmatia, in Dardania, in Macedonia, in Epirus, in Greece, in Candia, and the other islands, in Sicily, in Cyprus, in Lycia, in Isauria, in Egypt, and in Arabia; and that they all met to maintain the orthodox faith, the faith of the council of Nice. (*b*) In his letter to the emperor Jovian he assures him, that the symbol of Nice was received in the above-mentioned provinces, and besides, in Britain, in Africa, in Pamphylia, in Lybia, in Pontus, in Cappadocia, and in the east, that is, in the patriarchate of Antioch. (*c*) But in the provinces of Thrace, of Bithynia, and the Hellespont, the semi-Arians prevailed, till they were overpowered by the Arians, strongly supported by the emperor Valens, a most zealous defender of Arianism.

(*a*) Theod. l. 4. c. 3. (*b*) Athan. de Afr. and ad Epict.
(*c*) Id. ad Jov.
[1] Athan. ad Afr. p. 931. and ad Epict. p. 582.

The sect of the Macedonians. They are persecuted by the emperor Valens. Deliver to Liberius their confession of faith; who admits them to his communion. Liberius dies.

of the western bishops, whose consubstantiality, they said, left no room for the distinction of persons; and of the pure Arians, who denied all likeness.[1] It was after this council that the semi-Arians, separating themselves from the communion of the pure Arians, began to form a distinct sect, and to be called Macedonians; which name was given them from Macedonius, late bishop of Constantinople, but deposed by the pure Arians, in the council they held in that city in 360, to make room for their great champion Eudoxius, translated formerly from Germanicia to Antioch, and now from Antioch to Constantinople. They were also named Marathonians, from Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia, who, together with Macedonius, was at the head of the party; and Pneumatomachi, that is, enemies to the Holy Ghost, whose divinity they denied, which was their chief, if not their only error; for some are of opinion, that though they rejected the word consubstantial, yet they agreed with the orthodox in the meaning of it. They led very regular, austere, and edifying lives; and are, on that score, highly commended and extolled by Gregory Nazianzen.[2] No wonder, therefore, that they soon spread all over the east, and gained every where great numbers of followers. At Constantinople, and in the neighbouring cities and provinces, they were followed not only by the greater part of the people, but by some persons of distinction, by such as were most remarkable for their piety, by entire monasteries, both of men and women.[3] The inhabitants of Cyzicus in the Propontis were almost all of this sect, and we are told of some miracles wrought by a Macedonian of that place,[4] which Baronius will not allow, though as well attested as any he relates.

The emperor Valens, who reigned in the east, which had been yielded to him by his brother Valentinian, when he took him for his colleague in the empire, spared no pains to reconcile this sect with that of the Arians, which he greatly favored. But, finding them no less averse to the Arians than the orthodox themselves, he began, in the year 366, to persecute them with great cruelty. To avoid this persecution they resolved to recur to the emperor Valentinian, and, embracing the faith professed by him and the western bishops, to put themselves under his protection. Accordingly he despatched three of their body, namely, Eustathius bishop of Sebaste, Sylvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala, to acquaint the emperor, in the name of the rest, with the resolution they had taken, and implore his protection.[5] These, being informed, on their arrival in Italy, that Valentinian was waging war with the barbarians on the borders of Gaul, instead of repairing to him, which they apprehended might be attended with no small danger, went straight to Rome, and there delivered to Liberius letters from their brethren, directed to him, and to the other bishops of the west, whom they earnestly entreated to use their interest with the emperor, in their behalf, assuring them, that they sincerely renounced the errors they had hitherto held, and embraced the catholic faith, as explained and defined by the council of Nice.[1] But Liberius, notwithstanding these assurances, suspected their sincerity; and therefore could not, by any means, be prevailed upon to communicate with them, or even to hear them, till they had delivered to him a confession of faith, under their hand, and in the name of the whole party, wherein they anathematized those of Rimini, and Nice in Bithynia; condemned the heresy of Arius, with all other heresies; and received the definitions of the council of Nice, those particularly that related to consubstantiality. To this confession they added a solemn protestation, declaring themselves ready to submit to the sentence of such judges as the pope should think fit to appoint, should they, or those by whom they had been sent, be ever for the future accused or suspected of swerving in the least from the faith they now embraced and professed.[2] In virtue of this confession, whereof the original was carefully lodged in the archives of the church of Rome, Liberius admitted the deputies to his communion; and upon their departure, wrote, in the name of all the bishops of Italy, and the west, to the Macedonian bishops, of whom he names fifty-nine, signifying the great joy, which their letters, and the confession of faith, signed by their deputies, had occasioned at Rome, and in all the western churches, since by such a confession they were all again happily united in one faith. In this letter Liberius assures them, that all the bishops, who had assisted at the council of Rimini, had retracted the doctrine, which they had been forced to sign there; and were more than ever incensed against the Arians, on account of the violence, which, at their instigation, had been offered them.[3] The Macedonians admitted the divinity of the Son, but denied that of the Holy Ghost; nay, this was their favorite doctrine, and, as it were, the characteristic of their sect; but Liberius, and the other western bishops, not suspecting them of such an error, which in all likelihood they had not yet publicly owned, admitted them to their communion, without examining them on that head.

Liberius died soon after, that is, on the 23d or 24th of September, of the present year, 366, as we are told by Marcellinus and Faustinus, whose authority is preferable to that of any other, since, at this very time, they lived at Rome.[4] He had been chosen on the 22d of

[1] Soz. l. 5. c. 14. [2] Greg. Naz. orat. 44.
[3] Ruf. l. 1. c. 25. [4] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. l. 4. c. 4. l. 5. c. 8.
[5] Id. l. 4. c. 12. Soz. l. 6. c. 10.

[1] Soz. Socr. ib. Basil. ep. 82. [2] Socr. ib. [3] Socr. l. 4. c. 12.
[4] Marcell. and Faust. p. 4. 5.

The deplorable condition of the church in his time. By whom Arianism was banished out of the west. Neither Vincentius of Capua, nor Liberius, assisted at the council of Rimini. Liberius is honored as a saint. The founding of the church of St. Mary the Greater.

May, 352, so that he governed the church of Rome, fourteen years, four months, and a day or two. Liberius lived in troublesome times, the worst the church had ever yet seen. She had two dangerous enemies to contend with at the same time, the power of the prince then on the imperial throne, and the craft of a most subtle and deceitful party. The prince employed all his power to overcome, with oppression, those whom the party could not overreach with their craft; and the party to overreach with their craft such as the prince could not overcome with oppression. On the other hand, the prelates, even some who were reputed the pillars of the church, seemed to have lost that zeal, firmness, and intrepidity, which they had so gloriously exerted under the pagan princes, and few were found among them, whose virtue was proof against the loss of their dignity, or exile. Hence the defection became general, and the orthodox party was brought so low, that it must have been utterly quashed, had Constantius lived a few years longer. But Providence interposed; Constantius died while he was pursuing his scheme with the greatest success; and Julian, his successor, by betraying an equal hatred and aversion to Christians of all denominations, obliged them to forget their quarrels among themselves, to lay aside their animosity against each other, and to unite in their mutual defence against him, as a common enemy. Jovian, who succeeded him, proved no less favorable to the orthodox, than Constantius had been to the Arians. Many therefore of the latter, and among the rest Acacius, who was at the head of the pure Arians, to gain the favor of the emperor, publicly renounced the doctrine of Arius, and embraced that of Nice. Jovian, after a short reign of seven months and twenty days, was succeeded by Valentinian, who continued to countenance the orthodox, as his predecessor had done, though he did not use the Arians with that rigor which some zealots expected from a confessor, which title he had deserved under Julian. However, as he professed the orthodox faith, that party universally prevailed; insomuch that, in a very short time, no traces of Arianism were left in the west, except at Milan, under the Arian bishop, Auxentius, and in a few cities of Illyricum, where it was kept up by Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and their disciples, till the following century, when it was every where re-established there by the Goths.

Baronius ascribes to Liberius the banishing of Arianism out of the west, and the establishing of the orthodox faith in its room; but that glory was owing, according to Ruffinus, to Hilarius of Poitiers, and Eusebius of Vercelli, who, like the two great luminaries of the universe, to use his words, enlightened with their rays Illyricum, Gaul, and Italy, dispelling every where the darkness of heresy.[1] He minutely describes the great success that attended them, with the difficulties and obstructions they met with in so pious and commendable an undertaking.[2] But, as for Liberius, he does not so much as mention him. And truly, from the year 357, in which he fell, to his admitting the Macedonians to his communion in 366, which was the last of his life, the only thing I find recorded of him in the ancients, is his writing a letter to the catholic bishops of Italy, wherein he exhorts them to atone for their past conduct by renouncing the errors of the Arians, and receiving anew the symbol of Nice. He adds, that as this is the only atonement, which it has been thought proper to require of them, they ought to exert their zeal against the authors of the fault they committed, in proportion to the grief they must feel for committing it.[3] This letter has been transmitted to us among the fragments of Hilarius. It is hard to guess what could induce Baronius to write so confidently as he does, that Vincentius of Capua assisted at the council of Rimini with the character of the pope's legate.[4] In what ancient author did he find the least intimation or distant hint of such a legation? Vincentius of Capua, though a person of great eminency, is not even mentioned by any of the contemporary writers, who relate the transactions of that council, and named the chief prelates who composed it. 'Tis true we read of him, in one author, that he never consented to the confession of Rimini:[5] but that is said of Liberius too,[6] whom Baronius owns not to have been present at that assembly.

Liberius, notwithstanding his fall, is honored both by the Latin and Greek churches as a saint. By the former his festival is kept on the 23d of September, and by the latter on the 27th of August.[7] He erected a church on the Esquiline mount at Rome, which bore his name, and was called the Basilic of Liberius, till it was consecrated to the Virgin Mary by Sixtus III. when it took the name of Sancta Maria Major, or Saint Mary the Greater. It owes its foundation, as is universally believed in the church of Rome, to the following miracle. A Roman of the patrician order, and of wealth equal to his rank, named John, having no children, resolved to make a free gift of his whole estate to the Virgin Mary. This resolution he imparted to his wife, who consenting to it with great alacrity, the estate was immediately made over to the holy Virgin, whom they thenceforth jointly intreated, in their daily prayers, to let them know by some token in what manner she chose to dispose of it. Their prayers were heard, and on the night preceding the 5th of August, when the heat is most violent at

[1] Ruf. l. 3. c. 30, 31. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Hil. frag. l. p. 37, 38. [4] Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 3.
[5] Theoph. l. 2. c. 13. [6] Id. ib. [7] Menæa, p. 293.

Rome, a miraculous snow fell from heaven, which covered part of the Esquiline mount. The same night the patrician and his wife were admonished in a dream to build a church on the spot of ground which they should find covered with snow. Early next morning they went to acquaint Pope Liberius with what had happened, whom they found to have had the same dream; so that no room being now left to doubt of the revelation, the pope appointed a grand procession of the whole clergy, in which he walked himself, attended by crowds of people, to the above-mentioned mount; and there, having caused the snow, which still lay unmelted, to be removed, on the spot, which it had covered, he laid the foundation of that magnificent basilic, which was reared at the expense of the patrician, and is now known by the name of Saint Mary the Greater, and Saint Mary in the Snow.[1] I should not have thought such an idle tale worthy of a place in a grave history, were it not recorded in the most authentic book the church of Rome has after the scripture, the Roman Breviary, a book approved and commended by the council of Trent, and by the special bulls of three popes, Pius V. Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. of whom the latter declares every thing it contains to be extracted from ancient and approved authors, and to be agreeable to truth.[2] So that it would be less dangerous, at least in Italy, to deny any truth revealed in the scripture, than to question any fable related in the Breviary. The feast of the Snow, or St. Mary in the Snow, is kept annually at Rome, on the 5th of August, with the greatest solemnity. The college of cardinals assists that day at divine service in the church of Saint Mary the Greater; and the pope, if not indisposed, or otherwise prevented, officiates in person: the primicerio, or dean of that church, reads the account, which I have delivered above; and, that nothing may be wanting to complete the farce, numbers of children are employed, during the service, to drop jessamines from the gallery on the congregation, in remembrance and imitation of the miraculous snow. And truly by children alone such fables are proper to be acted and believed.

Several pieces have reached our times, which were either written by, or have been falsely ascribed to, Liberius. Among the former are, his letter in answer to the Macedonian bishops; another to the catholic bishops of Italy; which have been both mentioned above; and a discourse which he pronounced on Christmas-day in the church of St. Peter, on occasion of his giving the sacred veil to Marcellina the sister of St. Ambrose when she embraced the state of virginity. This discourse St. Ambrose has inserted in his third book on virgins, but in his own style, which is very different from that of Liberius, who had not the gift of eloquence.[1] Among the pieces falsely ascribed to Liberius, most men of learning reckon the confession of faith, written in Greek, which he is supposed to have sent to Athanasius. This piece Baronius will, by all means, have to be genuine; and the use he makes of it is somewhat extraordinary. The council of Alexandria, to which the church owed her safety, was convened by Athanasius, upon his return from exile, as I have related above. By that small assembly, consisting only of confessors, was enacted the famous decree with respect to those, who had communicated with the Arians, and signed the confession of Rimini. To that decree the whole church readily conformed; so that the honor of saving the church was chiefly owing to Athanasius, and wholly to him and the other confessors. Of Liberius not the least mention is made; so that he had no share in that glory. The annalist therefore, not being able to bring in his sovereign pontiff upon the authority of any records now extant, has recourse to those that probably never were; or, if they ever were, are now no more. He supposes part of the abovementioned confession of faith, sent by Liberius to Athanasius, to be wanting; and Liberius, in the part that is wanting, to have empowered Athanasius to convene a council, and to have appointed Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari, to assist at that council with the character of his legates. Such wild and extravagant suppositions require a very strong proof to support them, some plausible conjectures at least to give them an appearance of truth. But that we must not expect of Baronius. The only argument, if it may be so called, which he pretends to offer on this occasion, is, that he cannot conceive Athanasius, and the other holy confessors, would have taken upon them to act as they did, and enact a decree extending to the whole church, had they not received such a power from him, to whom all power was given,[2] meaning the pope. The other pieces, falsely ascribed to Liberius, are another letter to Athanasius, and one to all the catholic bishops; which are both reputed supposititious, being dated by consuls who never existed.

[1] Breviar. Rom. 5 Aug. [2] Vide Bull. Urb. VIII. Breviario præfix.

[1] Amb. de virg. l. 3. p. 437. [2] Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 306

Damasus, a native of Rome, and deacon of that church. Whether he abandoned Liberius, and sided with Felix. He is chosen bishop of Rome, and likewise Ursinus.

DAMASUS, THIRTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[VALENTINIAN, VALENS, GRATIAN, THEODOSIUS.]

[Year of Christ 366.] LIBERIUS was succeeded by Damasus, whom the Spanish writers, upon the authority of Anastasius, suppose to have been a native of Spain;[1] though there is no room to doubt of his being born in Rome, since it appears from an inscription quoted by Baronius,[2] that his father had been lector, deacon, and presbyter, of the church of St. Laurence in that city, and consequently must have lived there from his youth. Damasus had a sister named Irene, who embraced the state of virginity, and died before she was twenty, as we read in her epitaph.[3] It is not therefore probable, that her death happened in the twelfth year of her brother's pontificate, as the Spanish author of her life tells us, he being then seventy. Damasus served, as his father had done, the church of St. Laurence, till he was stricken in years; for he was upwards of sixty when raised to the episcopal dignity. He was deacon of Rome in 355, when Liberius was sent into exile; on which occasion he not only bound himself, with the rest of the clergy, by a solemn oath not to acknowledge any other bishop so long as Liberius lived, but attended him on his journey to the place of his banishment.[4] Marcellinus and Faustinus seem to insinuate, that soon afterwards, giving way to his ambition, he forgot the oath he had taken, abandoned Liberius, for whom he had professed the greatest friendship, and sided with Felix, his antagonist.[5] But these two presbyters were zealous partisans of the antipope Ursinus, of whom hereafter; and therefore we ought to be very cautious of what they write to the prejudice of Damasus. Jerom, who lived then at Rome, and in great intimacy with Damasus, reproaches such of the ecclesiastics as forsook Liberius, and joined Felix, with the breach of a most solemn oath; styles them perjurers, deserters, time-servers, &c., which I cannot think he would have done so freely, had Damasus been one of the number. I am therefore not a little surprised, that Baronius should blindly acquiesce to the accounts of the above-mentioned writers, and, without further inquiry, condemn Damasus as guilty of perjury, by ranking him among the followers of Felix.[6] And yet the annalist supposes him to have been appointed great vicar of Rome by Liberius, upon his withdrawing from the city to avoid the persecution raised by Constantius after the council of Rimini:[1] so that, according to him, he must have changed sides anew, and, abandoning Felix, returned to Liberius, which is representing him as a man swayed by no other principles but those of interest and ambition, and therefore always siding with those who were uppermost. This is all we know of Damasus before his election.

Liberius dying on the 23d or 24th of September, 366, as I have related above, great disturbances were raised in Rome by the election of two bishops to succeed him, namely, Damasus and Ursinus, whom the later writers style Ursicinus, a deacon of that church. This double election gave rise to a dangerous schism, and a kind of civil war, within the walls of the city, which did not end without a great deal of bloodshed. I shall impartially relate what I find concerning this important transaction in the contemporary writers of either side, leaving the reader to judge which of the two pretenders was the cause of so much mischief, and which legally chosen. I shall begin with the account which Marcellinus and Faustinus, who were then at Rome, give us of these elections. They were both presbyters of that church, but, being strict followers of Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, of whom I have spoken above, they and their whole party were deemed schismatics, and consequently cruelly persecuted by the catholic bishops, especially Damasus. Finding themselves thus oppressed, the two presbyters, between 383, and 388, drew up a petition in behalf of themselves and their afflicted brethren, addressed to Valentinian II. Theodosius, and Arcadius, intreating those princes to protect their innocence, and put a stop to the unbridled rage of their enemies. With this request the two presbyters repaired to Constantinople, being driven from Rome by Damasus, and there presented it to Theodosius, who, pitying their condition, in his rescript directed to Cynegius the Præfectus Prætorio, treated them as catholics, granted them the free exercise of their religion, and declared all those wicked men, nay, and heretics, who had presumed, or should for the future presume, to persecute or molest them.[2] In the preface, prefixed to this petition, I find the following account of both the above-mentioned elections. Ursinus, say they, was chosen in the basilic of Julius by the deacons Amantius and Lupus, and the people, who had

[1] Anast. c. 38.
[2] Bar. 384. 16. in appar.
[3] Boll. 21 Feb. p. 244. ad annal.
[4] Marcell. & Faust. p. 3.
[5] Id. p. 3—5.
[6] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 60. & ad ann. 367. n. 8

[1] Id. ad ann. 359. n. 48. 100. 103. Gennad. c. 16.
[2] Marc. & Faust. p. 18.

Different accounts of these elections. Great disturbances in Rome, occasioned by this double election. Several persons massacred. The sedition becomes general.

continued in the communion of Liberius; but Damasus, by those who had adhered to Felix, assembled for that purpose in the church of St. Laurence, called in Lucinus. Ursinus was ordained the first, by Paul, bishop of Tivoli; which Damasus, who had always panted after the episcopal dignity, no sooner knew, than he hired a great number of chariot drivers, and other such despicable wretches, who, violently breaking into the basilic of Julius, massacred a great many people there. Seven days afterwards they made themselves masters of the Lateran basilic, and there was Damasus ordained bishop.[1] This account charges Damasus alone with the schism, and the evils attending it. On the other hand, the council of Rome, held about twelve years after, lays the whole blame on Ursinus, who, say they, boldly attempted to usurp a dignity, which on no score was due to him;[2] and that which met at Aquileia in 381, and consisted of all the most eminent bishops of the west, ascribes to Ursinus, and his temerity, the many calamities the church had suffered; paints him as a man of no credit, character, or reputation; and adds, that he seized by force what he had no hopes of attaining by lawful means.[3] Ambrose writes, that the suffrage of heaven concurred in the election of Damasus.[4] According to these authorities Damasus was lawfully elected, and Ursinus unlawfully. As to the particulars of his election, Jerom, who perhaps was then at Rome, tells us, that Damasus was first chosen, and then Ursinus, who, after his election, seized by force on the basilic of Sicinus,[5] that is, according to the most probable opinion, the basilic of Liberius, now St. Mary the Greater. Socrates says, that Ursinus having near as many votes as Damasus, he was thereby encouraged to hold separate assemblies, and to get himself ordained in a dark and retired corner of the basilic of Sicinus.[6] Ruffinus assures us, that Damasus was already ordained, when Ursinus, transported with rage, at his being preferred to him, assembled a great number of seditious people, and, supported by them, caused himself, in defiance of the canons of the church, to be ordained, in the basilic of Sicinus, by Paul, bishop of Tivoli; whereas the bishops of Rome were always ordained and consecrated by those of Ostia. After his consecration, continues this author, he ordained several persons; which was adding a sacrilege to his unlawful election.[7] Both Ruffinus, and Socrates, who follows him, were certainly mistaken as to the place of this ordination, since we are told by Marcellinus and Faustinus, that Ursinus was ordained, not in the basilic of Sicinus, but in that of Julius.[8] These two writers, who were in Rome at the time of the elections, tell us, in express terms, that Ursinus was chosen before Damasus; and Jerom, who was probably in Rome at the same time, assures us in terms no less express, that Damasus was chosen before Ursinus. The former was greatly addicted to Ursinus, and the latter no less attached to Damasus. As for the two councils, which I have quoted above, they were held some years after, when the party of Damasus had universally prevailed, and it was a crime to acknowledge Ursinus. Jerom has been followed by most of the writers who came after, and the authority of the other two quite disregarded, for no other reason but because they were schismatics; for they joined Lucifer, as I have observed above, and refused to communicate with the bishops who had signed the confession of Rimini, nay, and with those who communicated with them.

By this double election the citizens of Rome saw themselves, before they were aware, involved in a civil war. The whole people were divided, some siding with Damasus, and some with Ursinus; and neither of the competitors showed the least inclination to yield to the other. No day passed without skirmishes and bloodshed; insomuch that Juventius, governor of the city, and Julian, the præfectus annonæ, to put a stop to the present, and prevent greater disturbances, agreed to banish Ursinus, whose party seemed less powerful, together with his two deacons, Amantius and Lupus. The two authors I have often quoted write, that both Juventius and Julian were bribed by Damasus, who taking advantage of the absence of his competitor, armed his followers with clubs and swords, hoping thus to intimidate the friends of the exiled bishop, and bring them in the end to acknowledge him. Seven presbyters of the party of Ursinus were seized, at the request of Damasus, in order to be sent into exile, but rescued by the people of the same party, and carried in triumph to the basilic of Liberius; which Damasus no sooner heard, than, arming all his followers, both clergy and laymen, with clubs, swords, axes, &c. he marched at the head of the seditious and enraged multitude to the basilic, which he and his partisans immediately invested, and attacked with the utmost fury. It was set on fire in several places; the doors were forced, the roof uncovered, and thence showers of tiles discharged on the people assembled there: great was the massacre; one hundred and sixty persons, men and women, were inhumanly murdered on the side of Ursinus, and a great many more wounded, some of whom died of their wounds. On the side of Damasus not one single person was killed. This riot began on the 25th of October, 366, at eight in the morning.

Thus the above mentioned writer.[1] Ruffinus writes in general terms, that the illegal

[1] Id. p. 6, 7.

[1] Marc. & Faust. p. 5, 6.
[2] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 8.
[3] Ibid. p. 68, 69. 71.
[4] Amb. ep. 11. tom. 5.
[5] Hier. chron.
[6] Socr. l. 4. c. 24.
[7] Ruff. l. 2. c. 10.
[8] Marc. & Faust. p. 5 6.

election of Ursinus, in opposition to Damasus, occasioned such a tumult, or rather civil war, among the people, some siding with the one, and some with the other, that the places destined for prayer streamed with human blood.[1] The heathen Ammianus Marcellinus assures us, that the partisans of Damasus and Ursinus were so implacably incensed against each other, that several persons were wounded in the quarrel, and some killed: nay, it is certain, adds he, that in the basilic of Sicinus one hundred and thirty-seven persons were found dead, all killed the same day: but Damasus in the end, by the efforts of his party, got the better of his antagonist.[2] Jerom, however partial, owns, that Ursinus having got possession of the basilic of Sicinus, the partisans of Damasus repaired thither in crowds, and that several persons were thereupon inhumanly massacred.[3] The sedition became general, and the seditious on either side so numerous and powerful, that Juventius, not thinking it advisable to punish, nor being able to appease, the enraged populace, abandoned the city and retired to the country.[4] He was perhaps for Ursinus, whose party being overmatched by that of Damasus, he might not think it safe to continue in Rome. Three days after the massacre in the basilic of Liberius, that is, on the 28th of October, the partisans of Ursinus, say Marcellinus and Faustinus, assembling, cried out aloud against Damasus, complaining of his conduct, and begging that a sufficient number of bishops might be convened, and the controversy referred to their judgment and decision.[5] Damasus was greatly favored, and chiefly supported, by the Roman ladies, which probably gave occasion to the charge of adultery that was brought against him. But Jerom, either to clear him of this charge, or to obviate the like suspicions, naturally arising from his familiar conversation with the female sex, styles him a "virgin doctor of the virgin church."[6]

Baronius, finding he can neither disguise nor extenuate the cruelty committed by those who adhered to Damasus, is at a great deal of trouble to disculpate him, and lay the whole blame on Maximinus, who, as appears from history, discharged the office of præfectus annonæ from the latter end of the year 367, to the beginning of 370, and was noted for his cruelty. Baronius is supported herein by the authority of Jerom and Ruffinus, of whom the former writes, that Damasus remained conqueror, without hurting the conquered;[7] and the latter, that the cruelties practised by the prefect Maximinus, who had espoused the cause of Damasus, upon those of the adverse party, rendered the name of that virtuous prelate odious, though he had no share in them.[8] But who is to be charged with the massacre in the basilic of Sicinus or Liberius? On whom are the murders to be laid, committed there? Maximinus was not then in power, and perhaps not at Rome. I cannot help thinking but Damasus might at least have restrained his followers from such excesses; and consequently, as he did not, I cannot, with Ruffinus, conclude him to have had no share in them; I say, at least restrained; for I will not charge him with heading and encouraging the riotous multitude in that wicked attempt, upon the bare authority of Marcellinus and Faustinus, both zealous partisans of Ursinus. But neither ought Baronius, Bellarmine, Davidius, &c. upon the bare testimony of two writers, no less sanguine in the cause of Damasus, suppose him to have been no ways concerned in those disorders. The famous Ammianus Marcellinus, who lived at this very time in Rome, and, as a pagan, was no ways concerned in the quarrel, nor more inclined to one side than the other, assures us, that both were equally ambitious of the episcopal dignity, and both equally guilty.[1] The authority of a writer, thus unbiassed, and in every other respect unexceptionable, ought to be preferred, without the least hesitation, to that of any other, whom we have just reason to suspect of partiality. Jerom indeed speaks with more modesty and reserve than Ruffinus, and those who have copied after him; for he only says, that Damasus did not hurt his enemies after he had conquered them. But, in relating the above-mentioned massacre, and the skirmishes that happened before the party of Damasus prevailed, he always describes his partisans as the aggressors, without ever pretending to excuse him, as having no share in those riots; which he would not have failed to do, had he not paid a greater regard to truth than Ruffinus seems to have done.

The heathen Marcellinus, after telling us, that Damasus and Ursinus aspired with equal ambition to the episcopal chair, adds this famous remark, which I shall set down in his own words: "I must own," says he, "that when I reflect on the pomp attending that dignity, I do not at all wonder, that those, who are fond of show and parade, should scold, quarrel, fight, and strain every nerve to attain it; since they are sure, if they succeed, to be enriched with the offerings of the ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in stately chariots, and gorgeously attired; to keep costly and sumptuous tables; nay, and to surpass the emperors themselves in the splendor and magnificence of their entertainments. But how happy would they be, if, despising the grandeur of the city, which they allege to excuse their luxury, they followed the example of some bishops in the provinces, who, by the temperance and frugality of their diet, the poverty and plainness of their dress, the modesty of their looks fixed on the ground, the

[1] Ruff. l. 2. c. 10.
[2] Ammian. Mar. l. 27. p. 337.
[3] Hier. chron.
[4] Ammian. ib.
[5] Marc. & Faust. p. 9.
[6] Hier. ep. 5. t. 2.
[7] Hier. ep. 49.
[8] Ruff. l. 2. c. 20.

[1] Ammian. l. 27. p. 337.

How the oblations of the faithful disposed of. Ursinus recalled by Valentinian; but banished anew. The bishop of Rome empowered by the emperor to judge other bishops.

purity of their lives, and the regularity of their whole conduct, approve themselves to the eternal God, and all his true worshippers!"[1] Thus Ammianus. And that Damasus was fond of all that pomp, grandeur, and parade, that he led such a voluptuous life, as Ammianus here so justly censures and condemns in the bishops of Rome, is not to be doubted, since Prætextatus, a man of the first quality, honored with the greatest employments of the empire, and zealously attached to paganism, in conversing familiarly with him, used pleasantly to say, "make me bishop of Rome, and I'll immediately turn Christian."[2] But, as I shall have occasion to speak of this subject hereafter, I shall only observe here, that the offerings of those devout women, and other pious Christians, were no better employed in the days of Damasus, than the immense wealth, which the church of Rome acquired in after-ages, by the voluntary contributions of all the Christian nations, is disposed of in ours. With these offerings the bishops of Rome used in more early times, to maintain the poor of their own church, and send the overplus to other churches, where the poor were numerous, and the offerings small. Of this generous practice I have mentioned some instances, that well deserve to be recorded. But when ambition began to take place of charity, the poor were forgotten, and nothing thought of but splendid equipages, numerous retinues, princely apparel, sumptuous tables, and whatever else could feed the vanity of these upstart princes, and put them upon the level with the greatest monarchs. To such purposes were the oblations of the faithful perverted. Baronius takes it very much amiss of Ammianus, that he should find fault with the costly tables and entertainments of the popes, since it is manifest from St. Austin, that the Christians at Rome, and, no doubt, the pope with the rest, kept a righteous fast three days in the week;[3] so that, in his opinion, they ought not to be blamed for rioting four days in the week, provided they fasted three. But to this doctrine Ammianus was a stranger, and therefore, notwithstanding the fasts they might keep, he justly censured their expensive tables and banquets as no ways suited to their profession and character.

But to return to Ursinus; he had been banished Rome by the prefect Juventius, before the 26th of October, 366, as I have related above; but the emperor Valentinian, who was at this time in Gaul, having, at the request of his friends, granted him leave to return, he entered the city on the 15th of September, 367, in a kind of triumph, being met and received with loud acclamations by those of his party.[4] At the same time the emperor directed a rescript to Prætextatus, who had succeeded Juventius in the prefecture of Rome, enjoining him to recall all those, who had been banished for the late riots, and reinstate them in their former condition, after warning them, that if for the future, they disturbed the peace of the public, they should be punished without mercy.[1] But notwithstanding this warning, new disturbances must have happened, since Ursinus was, by an order from the emporor, banished again on the 16th of November of the same year, 367, together with seven of his followers, who were all confined to different places in Gaul, where they continued till the year 371.[2] The two presbyters tell us, that Damasus, having, with large sums, gained the ministers and favorites at court, by their means extorted from the emperor the abovementioned order. They add, that the friends of Ursinus were resolved to stand by him; but that he, to prevent bloodshed, delivered himself up into the hands of the officers of justice.[3] However that be, by the banishment of Ursinus, and some of the leading men of his party, tranquillity was restored for a while, and the disturbances composed, says Ammianus, which the Christians had raised by quarreling among themselves.[4]

About this time the emperor Valentinian enacted a law, empowering the bishop of Rome to examine and judge other bishops, that religious and ecclesiastical disputes might not be decided by profane or secular judges, but by a pontiff of the same religion, and his collegues.[5] A very imprudent law, considering the nature and consequences of such a concession. The bishops assembled in council at Rome, in 378, after declaring, in the strongest terms, their approbation of this law, agreed to present an address to the emperor Gratian, wherein they earnestly recommended to him the execution of it, because it greatly redounded, say they, to the honor of the sacred ministry; because the judgment of bishops was more sure and certain than that of any civil magistrate; and, lastly, because it delivered the prelates of the church from the just concern they were under, to find that they could not make their innocence appear without racks and tortures, which innocent persons were put to by the secular judges.[6] This exemption seems to have been understood by the council as extending to all cases, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Be that as it will, whatever exemption was by the above-mentioned law granted to the bishops, whatever power was by that law vested in the bishop of Rome, and his colleagues, the council, with a true sense of gratitude, acknowledged such power and immunity to be entirely owing to the indulgence of the emperor: a plain proof that the absurd and chimerical notion of a divine right was not yet broached. The bishops chose rather

[1] Idem ib. p. 337. 338. [2] Hier. ep. 61. t. 2.
[3] Aug. ep. 86. Bar. ann. 367. n. 10.
[4] Marc. & Faust. p. 6—9.

[1] Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 4.
[2] Marc. & Faust. p. 9, 10. [3] Idem ib.
[4] Ammian. l. 27. p. 349.
[5] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80. [6] Id. p. 81.

The followers of Ursinus driven out of Rome. Damasus assembles a council at Rome. Ursacius and Valens condemned. Auxentius, why spared.

to be judged by the pope and his collegues, that is, by their own brethren, than by lay judges, for the reasons they allege in their address to Gratian. Hence they cheerfully submitted to his judgment, and applauded every new power that was granted him, as redounding to the honor of the episcopal order. But, alas! they were not aware, that every new power, yielded to the bishop of Rome, was a new link added to the chain they were forging, if not for themselves, for those, at least, who were to succeed them. They little apprehended, that the bishop of Rome would, in process of time, claim all the power vested in him, and his collegues, as due to him alone, and that too by divine right; that, in virtue of such a claim, he would set up for universal and sole monarch of the church, exercise an unbounded authority and jurisdiction, and degrade all other bishops from his colleagues to his vassals and slaves. Blondel is of opinion, that the bishop of Rome was, by that law, only empowered to judge the bishops within the limits of his jurisdiction, that is, those of the suburbicarian provinces.[1] Others think that such a power was only for a time, and extended to those bishops alone who were concerned in the present schism; which seems most probable, since Valentinian declares, that he enacted the above-mentioned law to settle the church, shaken by the fury of the schism.[2]

Ursinus, and the leading men of his party, being driven out of the city, the inhabitants began to enjoy their former peace and tranquillity. But yet his followers continued to assemble in the cemeteries of the martyrs, and even kept possession of a church, supposed to be that of St. Agnes, without the walls.[3] Of this Damasus took care to transmit an account to the emperor, in a memorial; who, fearing that, from such a spark, the fire might break out again, which he had been striving to extinguish, enjoined Prætextatus to put Damasus forthwith in possession of that church; and, in the execution of this order, probably happened what we find related, perhaps with some exaggeration, by the two writers I have often quoted; for they tell us, that one day, while the followers of Ursinus were assembled, in great numbers, in the church of St. Agnes, Damasus, falling unexpectedly upon them with satellites, made a dreadful havock of the innocent and defenceless multitude.[4] After this second massacre Prætextatus, to secure the tranquillity of the city, sent several more of the party of Ursinus into exile. Valentinian, however, would not consent to their being confined to any particular place; but gave them full liberty to live where they pleased, provided they kept out of Rome.[5] The two writers add, that the cruelties exercised in the church of St. Agnes gave great offence to the bishops of Italy; and that Damasus having invited some of them to Rome, to solemnize with him the anniversary of his consecration, he laid hold of that opportunity to solicit them with intreaties, nay, and to tempt them with money, to condemn Ursinus; but all in vain; the bishops equally unmoved by his prayers and offers, refusing, with great firmness and resolution, to condemn a man whom they had not heard. Marcellinus and Faustinus close their preface with a short account of themselves, telling us, that the presbyters of Ursinus' party were imprisoned, racked, banished, dispersed, and sent into different countries; and that they themselves, who were of that number, presented a petition to the emperors, begging them to put a stop to so cruel a persecution.[1]

Damasus having thus, in the end, by the favor of the emperors, entirely got the better of the adverse party, and secured his dignity, he turned his thoughts to ecclesiastical matters. In the west there were now but three bishops, who still maintained the doctrine of Arius; namely, Arsacius, bishop of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, and Auxentius of Milan. Damasus, however, convened a numerous council at Rome; and there examined anew, and anew condemned the tenets of Arius, and all who held them, namely Ursacius and Valens.[2] Auxentius was a pure, and no less zealous, Arian, than either of these two; but as he was in favor with Valentinian, whom he had deceived by an equivocal confession of faith, Damasus, and his council, thought it advisable not to name him. The council wrote a synodal letter to the other bishops, acquainting them with what had passed; which was answered by Athanasius, and the bishops of Egypt, then assembled at Alexandria. In their answer they thanked Damasus for condemning Ursacius and Valens; but, at the same time, express no small surprise to find, that Auxentius was not yet deposed, though guilty not only of Arianism, but of many other crimes, which they enumerate.[3] Damasus and his colleagues paid, no doubt, great regard to the remonstrances of Athanasius; but, as Auxentius was supported by the emperor, and they were better courtiers than Athanasius, they never attempted to depose him; nay, they carried their complaisance so far as to condemn Ursacius and Valens, as if they had been the only Arian bishops in the west, without even naming Auxentius. He therefore kept, for many years, quiet possession of the see he had usurped, and was at last deprived of it by death alone.

The many abuses and disorders, that reigned at this time among the ecclesiastics

[1] Blond. Prim. p. 165. [2] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80.
[3] Marc. & Faust. p. 10. [4] Id. p. 10, 11. Bar. ad ann. 368. [5] Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 3.

[1] Marc. & Faust. p. 11, 13. [2] Ath. ad Afr. p. 931.
[3] Id. ib. p. 931—941.

The avarice of the Roman clergy restrained by Valentinian. Law enacted by him. The sentiments of St. Jerom and Ambrose concerning this law.

of Rome, offered a larger field to the zeal of Damascus, than the heresy of Arius, now confined in the west to a corner of Illyricum. But he was by no means a fit person to set up for a reformer of manners, and the evil required a more powerful remedy than he could apply. The prelates of the church, even the bishops of Rome, could yet only preach against vice, admonish the vicious, and inflict ecclesiastical censures on such as gave no ear to their admonitions: all other power was still lodged in lay hands, and only imparted to the ecclesiastics in some extraordinary cases. The insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, the mean and scandalous arts they were daily practising to circumvent the orphans, plunder the widows, and rob the lawful heirs of their just inheritance, cried loudly for a reform; but were evils too strong for the curb of exhortation, admonition, or censures merely ecclesiastical; and Damasus himself was not quite free from imputations of this nature. It was therefore necessary, that the secular power should interpose in defence of the deluded laity, against the craft and rapines of the ravenous clergy. A law was accordingly enacted by the emperor Valentinian, in the year 370, addressed to Damasus bishop of Rome, and read, on the 29th of July, in all the churches of that city, strictly forbidding the ecclesiastics, and such as professed celibacy, meaning the monks, to frequent the houses of orphans or widows, or to accept from those, whom they attended under the veil of religion, any thing whatsoever by way of donation, legacy, or feoffment in trust. Whatever was thus given or accepted, is declared forfeited to the public treasury.[1]

This law, taken in a literal sense, only forbids the ecclesiastics to accept such donations as were made by the women whom they attended in spiritual matters as their guides or directors; but it was either understood and interpreted as extending to all donations from pious persons, or a new law was made at this time excluding the ecclesiastics from all such donations, as plainly appears from Jerom and Ambrose, of whom the former, in one of his letters, writes thus: "I am ashamed to say it, the priests of the idols, the stage-players, charioteers, whores, are capable of inheriting estates, and receiving legacies; from this common privilege, clerks alone, and monks, are debarred by law; debarred, not under persecuting tyrants, but Christian princes."[2] And Ambrose; "We are excluded by laws, lately enacted, from all inheritances, donations and legacies: yet we do not complain: and why should we? By such laws we only lose wealth; and the loss of wealth is no loss to us. Estates are lawfully bequeathed to the ministers of the heathen temples; no layman is excluded, let his condition be ever so low, let his life be ever so scandalous: clerks alone are debarred of a right common to the rest of mankind. Let a Christian widow bequeath her whole estate to a Pagan priest, her will is good in law; let her bequeath the least share of it to a minister of God, her will is null. I do not mention these things by way of complaint, but only to let the world know that I do not complain; for I had rather we should want money, than virtue or grace."[1] From these testimonies it is manifest, that either by the above-mentioned law, or by some other published at this time, the ecclesiastics were restrained from receiving any donations or legacies whatever, by whomsoever bequeathed: and that such a law was absolutely necessary, is no less manifest from the unquestionable authority of Jerom, who lived at this very time in Rome, and describes, as an eye-witness, the arts that were practised with great success, by the Roman clergy, to circumvent rich widows, and old men. "The clerks," says he, "who ought to instruct and awe the women with a grave and composed behavior, first kiss their heads, and then, stretching out their hand, as it were to bestow a blessing, slily receive a fee for their salutation. The women in the mean time, elated with pride in seeing themselves thus courted by the clergy, prefer the freedom of widowhood to the subjection attending the state of matrimony. Some of the clergy make it the whole business and employment of their lives to learn the names of the ladies, to find out their habitations, to study their humor. One of these (perhaps Antimus or Sophronius, two monkish harpies, of whom he speaks elsewhere,) an adept in the art, rises with the sun, settles the order of his visits, acquaints himself with the shortest ways, and almost breaks into the rooms of the women before they are awake. If he sees any curious pieces of household furniture, he extols, admires, and handles it; and, sighing that he too should stand in need of such trifles, in the end, rather extorts it by force, than obtains it by good-will, the ladies being afraid to disoblige the prating old fellow, that is always running about from house to house."[2] The same writer, speaking elsewhere of the monks, displays the arts which they practised to deceive, captivate, and plunder, the rich widows, and old men; and adds, that, by professing poverty, they were become rich, and that the church grieved to see many acquire great wealth by serving her, who had been beggars, while they lived in the world.[3] So that the monastic profession was in those early times what it is now, a gainful trade, under the mask of religion. As for the mean, nay, and nauseous offices, to which they were prompted by their avarice, and the greedy expectation of legacies, to submit, about the childless old men and women in their sickness, it would be forgetting

[1] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 2. l. 20. p. 48. [2] Hier. ep. 2. p. 13.

[1] Amb. ep. 12. t. 5. p. 200. [2] Hier. ep. 22. [3] Id. ep. 3.

That law probably not procured by Damasus. It is extended to sacred virgins, and to bishops. The primitive rigor and discipline utterly neglected at Rome. The orthodox persecuted in the east.

the dignity of an historian to mention them. The reader will find them described by Jerom, and perhaps too minutely, in the letter he writ to his friend Nepotian.[1] In the same letter he informs us, how the wealth thus acquired was disposed of. "I," says he, applying to himself, what he levelled at others, to render the truth he spoke less disagreeable; "I, who was born in a poor country cottage, who had scarce millet enough, and coarse bread, to satiate my craving stomach, now despise the finest flour, the choicest honey, am well acquainted with the different kinds and names of fishes, and can tell by the taste from what coast each shell-fish was brought, from what province each bird."[2] A law was therefore necessary to restrain the insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, and obviate the unhallowed use they made of the wealth, which by such scandalous means they had acquired. This law Jerom calls a caustic; and adds, that he does not complain of it, but of the sore that required it.[3] However, that he complains, and Ambrose too, not only of the sore, but the caustic, is manifest from their words, and manner of writing. To exaggerate the pretended hardship, they both observe, that the pagan priests lay under no such restraints; an unseasonable observation! since it shows the difference between the pagan and Christian priesthood in a mortifying light. The former gave no occassion to such a law, their avarice wanted no such restraints: if it had, we may be sure they had met with no quarter from a Christian, nay, from an orthodox prince; and if he had spared them, such partiality had not been tamely put up, and passed over in silence, by the ecclesiastical writers of those times, namely, by the two I have mentioned.

Baronius is of opinion, that the above mentioned law was procured by Damasus, who, finding his clergy no longer awed by the spiritual sword, had recourse to the temporal; for the temporal, adds he, though in the emperor's hands, was given by our saviour to St. Peter and his successors, as well as the spiritual.[4] Thus he puts at once both swords into the pope's hands, though he has not yet been able to allege one single instance of their having either. They got both, it is true, in after ages; and we shall see, in the sequel of this history, how they came by them. But that law, says Baronius, was read in all the churches of Rome. And so have others been, when they concerned the clergy, and were addressed to, though not procured by, the bishop of that city.[5] Besides, as Damasus loved pomp and grandeur, it is not at all probable, that he was instrumental in the enacting of a law, which deprived him of the main fund to support them, the generosity of the Roman ladies.

[1] Hier. ep. 2. [2] Id. ib.
[3] Id. ib. [4] Bar. ad. ann. 370. n. 118.
[5] Vide Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 50.

Two years after, that is, in 372, the law I have mentioned above was extended by the same prince, namely, Valentinian, to the sacred virgins and bishops, so as to exclude the former from the right of giving, and the latter from that of receiving, any thing whatsoever by way of donation, legacy, &c.[1] But this law, with another still more severe, published twenty years afterwards by the empeperor Theodosius, was abrogated by the emperor Marcian in the year 455, as I shall have occasion to relate hereafter. In the mean time I cannot help observing with astonishment, how early the primitive rigor of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome; how early the most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivalled, in riotous living, the greatest epicures of pagan Rome, when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerom, who was an eyewitness of what he wrote, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses, which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility, under the reign of Domitian. And how much more worthy were the former of the severest censure, not only in regard of their calling, and the religion they professed, teaching them to curb and subdue all irregular passions and appetites, but from this aggravating circumstance, that the estates they so squandered and wasted were not their own, but the patrimony of the poor, the substance of the orphans, widows, and unhappy persons, whom, under the cloak of religion, they robbed of their just inheritance! And herein they conformed to the example of their chief, who, finding an inexhaustible fund in the generosity of the Roman ladies to support his extravagance, lived in that pomp and grandeur which Ammianus has described above.

But he was roused from the easy and indolent life he led at Rome, by letters from the famous Basil, lately raised to the see of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the metropolis of Pontus, imploring his assistance, and that of the other western bishops, in the present unhappy condition of the churches in the east. Arianism was almost universally extirpated in the west under the orthodox emperor Valentinian, as I have observed above; but in the east it triumphed under his brother Valens, a most zealous favorer of the Arians, a most implacable enemy to the orthodox, who were by him every where driven from their sees, and sent into exile: nay, he gave full power to the Arian bishops and magistrates to imprison, fine, beat, rack, and banish, at pleasure, such of the orthodox clergy as they could not win over by more gentle methods. This power

[1] Cod. Theod. nov. 16. t. 2. l. 22. p. 50.

The orthodox inhumanly treated by the emperor Valens. They are divided among themselves. What occasioned this division. Meletius the new bishop of Antioch declares in favor of the orthodox. He is banished.

they used so tyrannically, especially at Constantinople, that the clergy of that city resolved to apply to Valens himself for relief, not doubting, but the miseries they groaned under might, if duly represented, even move him to compassion. Accordingly they appointed eighty of their body, all men of unblemished characters, and known piety, to repair to Nicomedia, where that prince then was, and lay their grievances before him. Upon their arrival at court, they were introduced to the emperor, who heard them with great attention, without showing the least emotion either of resentment or compassion. However, as, upon his dismissing them, he immediately sent for Modestus, the præfectus prætorio, they concluded that he had given ear to their just complaints, and began to expect a speedy redress of their grievances. But the charge he gave him, very different from what they expected, was to despatch them all without mercy or delay. The prefect, apprehending the death of so many eminent ecclesiastics might occasion a tumult in the city, gave out that the emperor had ordered them into exile; and accordingly caused them to be put on board a vessel, in order to be conveyed, as he pretended, to the place of their banishment. But the vessel was no sooner out of sight, than the mariners, pursuant to their private instructions, set fire to it, and betaking themselves to their boat, left those they had on board to the mercy of the flames and waves.[1]

But Athanasias, Basil, and the other champions of the orthodox party, were not so much alarmed at the cruel persecution raised against them by their enemies, as at the unhappy divisions that reigned at this very time among themselves. It was to procure a remedy for these divisions, to heal a dangerous schism, that rent the orthodox party into two opposite factions, that Basil, by the advice of Athanasius, writ the above-mentioned letter to Damasus, and that the orthodox bishops of the east writ in common a letter to all their brethren in the west. As this schism did more hurt to the orthodox cause than it was in the power of their enemies to have done, I shall not think it foreign to my purpose to insert a succinct account of its rise and progress. Eustathius, the orthodox bishop of Antioch, being deposed by the Arians in 331, and one of their own party put in his room, the greater part of the clergy and people of that city, acknowledging the new chosen bishop, and his Arian successors, assisted at their assemblies, mixed with the Arians, and received the sacraments at their hands, though they disagreed with them in belief. But some more zealous than the rest, refusing to own any other bishop so long as Eustathius lived, held their assemblies apart, under the direction of presbyters animated with the like zeal. These, from their steady attachment to Eustathius, were called Eustathians, and with them alone Athanasius communicated while he was at Antioch.[1] This schism or separation continued even after the death of Eustathius, those of his party declining not only the communion of the Arians and their bishops, but of the orthodox, who communicated with them. In the year 360, the see of Antioch being vacant, by the translation of Eudoxius the Arian to that of Constantinople, the Arians, and the orthodox, who communicated with them, chose with one consent the famous Meletius to succeed him. Both parties joyfully concurred in this election; the orthodox, because they knew his doctrine to be no less pure than his manners; and the Arians, because they hoped, by such a distinguishing mark of their friendship and esteem, to win him, and by his means to gain over to their party the whole city of Antioch, nay, and the Eustathians themselves.[2] But they soon found, to their great mortification, that the orthodox were better acquainted with Meletius than they, that he was most zealously attached to the orthodox party, and was not to be swayed by friendship or enmity, by hopes or terrors. He was no sooner installed, which ceremony was performed with the greatest solemnity, than he loudly declared in favor of consubstantiality, and boldly cut off from his communion, as rotten and incurable members, all who held the opposite doctrine. The Arians of Antioch were thunderstruck with the boldness of the attempt; the whole party took the alarm; Eudoxius bishop of Constantinople, and the neighboring bishops, forgetful of every thing else, hastened to Antioch; hopes, fears, prayers, menaces, were successively employed, and nothing left unattempted to divert, at least to allay, the impending storm. But all in vain; the zeal of Meletius was incapable of control: he openly declared, that nothing should, nothing could, make him desist from, or relent in, the work he had undertaken, till he had utterly extirpated the Arian heresy, without leaving the least shoot of so poisonous a weed in the field, which by divine appointment he was to guard and cultivate.[3] The Arians finding him immovably fixed in his resolution, and, what doubled their concern, the whole party in imminent danger from one of their own choosing, they applied with better success to the emperor Constantius; and, charging the new bishop of Antioch with Sabellianism, which charge the credulous and unwary prince believed upon their word, they extorted from him a rescript banishing Meletius from Antioch about thirty days after his instalment, and confining him to Melitene in Armenia, his native city.[4] Euzoius was preferred in his room, formerly the chief favorite of Arius, and the most ancient

[1] Socr. l. 4. c. 15. Soz. l. 6. c. 13. Theod. l. 4. c. 21. Naz. or. 20.

[1] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Theod. l. 2. c. 27. ep. 73. c. 28. Hier. chron. [2] Soz. l. 4. c. 28. [3] Chrys. or. 45. [4] Chrys. ib. Epiph. c. 38. Soz. l. 4. c. 28. Theod. l. 2. c. 27. Philost. l. 5. c. 5.

Great divisions in that church. The council of Alexandria strive to heal these divisions. All means of an accommodation cut off by the imprudent conduct of the bishop of Cagliari.

of all his disciples; for together with him he was condemned by the great council of Nice.

The orthodox, who had hitherto communicated with the Arians, were so disobliged and scandalized at these proceedings, that, in the end they renounced the Arian communion; and, assembling by themselves, proposed a union with the Eustathians. But their proposal was rejected by the leading men of that party, alleging, that they could not admit them to their communion, because they had for so many years communicated with the Arians, received the sacraments at their hands, and still seemed to acknowledge Meletius as lawful bishop, though he had been chosen by the Arian faction: for the Eustathians, notwithstanding the heroic firmness of Meletius in defending and promoting the common cause, refused to own him, for no other reason but because the Arians had had a chief share in his election.[1] As this disagreement greatly weakened the orthodox cause in Antioch, and might, in time, be attended with fatal consequences, no pains were spared by the apostolic men of those times, to induce the Eustathians to abate somewhat of their zeal and severity. As for the other party, notwithstanding their attachment to Meletius, whence they had the name of Meletians, they were greatly inclined to an accommodation, and seemed to court the communion of the Eustathians, almost upon any terms. Lucifer, the famous bishop of Cagliari, on his return from Thebais in Egypt, to which place he had been confined by Constantius, was prompted by his zeal to take Antioch in his way, with a design to mediate an accommodation between the dissenting parties. Being arrived in that city, he had several conferences with the leading men of the one and the other party; and, finding neither averse to an accommodation, he conceived great hopes of succeeding in his design; and therefore begged the fathers of the council of Alexandria, which was already sitting, and to which he had been invited by Athanasius, to dispense with his assisting at that assembly, since his presence seemed more necessary at Antioch. However, he appointed two of his deacons to be present as his deputies, enjoining them to agree, in his name, to the decisions of the council.[2] Baronius owns here, which I cannot help observing by the way, that Lucifer never appeared in the council of Alexandria;[3] forgetting, no doubt, what he elsewhere so strenuously maintains;[4] namely, that Lucifer assisted at that assembly, in the name of pope Liberius, and as his legate.

The fathers of the council not only approved of the bishop of Cagliari's resolution, but appointed Eusebius of Vercelli, and Asterius of Petra in Arabia, to assist him in so pious an undertaking. What seemed chiefly to obstruct the so much wished for union, was a great attachment on one side to Meletius, and an equal obstinacy on the other, in refusing to acknowledge one preferred by the Arians. The confessors therefore assembled in Alexandria (for of confessors alone that assembly was composed) were of opinion, that, if every other remedy proved ineffectual, their deputies should apply to Meletius; and, having persuaded him to resign his dignity, choose another in his room, equally acceptable to both parties. They did not in the least doubt but Meletius would readily, nay, with great joy, sacrifice his dignity, and every other private view, to the public tranquillity;[1] so great was the opinion they entertained of his virtue. Had this wise resolution taken place, it had, in all likelihood, been attended with the desired effect. But before the deputies could reach Antioch, Lucifer, more commendable for zeal than prudence, had cut off all means of an accommodation, by conferring, of his own authority, the episcopal dignity on the presbyter Paulinus, who was at the head of the Eustathians, and had with more warmth than any other opposed Meletius, and those who adhered to him. He was assisted in that irregular ordination by two other confessors;[2] namely, Gorgonius of Germanicia, and Cymatius of Gabala, or rather of Paltos.[3] This step he took to oblige the Eustathians, when he found they could by no means be induced to acknowledge Meletius. But, instead of closing, he thereby widened, the breach, the Meletians declaring, that they would never abandon a bishop of their own party, to acknowledge one of another, chosen without their consent, or even their knowledge.[4] This unhappy division, thus settled and confirmed between the two orthodox parties in Antioch, did not continue long confined to that particular church, but soon extended to the church universal; some owning Meletius for lawful bishop of Antioch, and others Paulinus. Athanasius communicated with Paulinus, and not with Meletius; and his example was followed by the bishops of Egypt, of Cyprus, and all the bishops in the west.[5] On the other hand, all the orthodox bishops in the east, except Athanasius, and those I have mentioned, espoused, with great warmth, the cause of Meletius.[6] They all continued, however, notwithstanding this disagreement, to communicate with each other, though with some indifference and coldness. The ordination of Paulinus gave rise to another schism; for Eusebius of Vercelli, finding, on his arrival at Antioch, all hopes of an accommodation cut off, and no room left for the measures concerted and agreed to by the council, immediately quitted the city, without communicating with either party. This was

[1] Socr. l. 2. c. 44. Theod. l. 3. c. 12.
[2] Ruf. l. 1. c. 20. Soc.. l. 3. c. 6.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 180. [4] Id. ib. n. 206.

[1] Athan. de Ant. p. 574—577. [2] Hier. chron.
[3] Ath. ep. ad Solit. & de Antioch. Eccl. p. 589.
[4] Ruf. l. 1. c. 27. Theod. l. 3. c. 2.
[5] Id. ib. c. 30. [6] Id. ib.

St. Basil, bishop of Cæsarea applies to Damasus. The haughty conduct of Damasus resented by St. Basil. St. Basil complains of Damasus, and the western bishops. Damasus takes on him the office of judge, being only chosen mediator.

condemning the conduct of Lucifer; which he could not brook; and therefore, full of resentment, he renounced the communion of Eusebius, with whom he had hitherto lived in the greatest intimacy, and suffered together with him a most painful exile for the common cause.[1]

Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, one of the great lights of the church, left nothing unattempted, which he apprehended could any ways contribute to the reuniting of the orthodox among themselves, and putting an end to the present schism. But, despairing at last of success, and finding the prelates in the east all warmly engaged in the dispute, some in favor of Meletius, and some of Paulinus, he resolved to apply to the bishop of Rome, who had not yet declared for either of the competitors, his thoughts being wholly employed in securing his dignity against a competitor at home. He wrote therefore to Damasus, entreating him to despatch deputies into the east, who, in concert with the prelates there, inclined to an accommodation, might settle the proper means of accomplishing so desirable a work, and uniting in charity those, who were already united in faith. He added, that it was from his zeal alone they expected relief, from that zeal which he had made so eminently appear on other occasions; that Dionysius, one of his predecessors, had afforded them a seasonable assistance, when their wants were less pressing, and their condition not so deplorable; and therefore that there was no room left to doubt of his readily conforming to so glorious an example.[2] With this letter, and another from the bishops in the east, soliciting the advice, assistance, and mediation of their colleagues in the west, Dorotheus, deacon of the church of Antioch, was despatched into Italy: whence he returned in the beginning of the following year, 372, with an answer from the bishops of Illyricum, Italy, and Gaul.[3] But Damasus did not condescend to return an answer to Basil, or take the least notice of his letter; which haughty conduct he justly resented, and in pretty sharp terms, taxing Damasus, in one of his letters,[4] with a spirit of pride and vanity, which made him overlook other bishops as below his attention, and expect to be accosted by them with the meanest flattery. But his thus disregarding the request and entreaties of the bishop of Cæsarea, was not owing to his pride alone. He was so little acquainted with the state of the churches in the east, and what passed there, that he looked upon Eusebius, bishop of Samosata, and Meletius, with whom Basil lived in great intimacy, as rank Arians, though they both lived at that very time in exile, having been driven from their sees by the Arians, on account of the zeal, which they had, with an invincible firmness, exerted in defence of the orthodox faith.[1] The bishop of Rome might, with very little trouble, have been better informed; but his mind, it seems, was so deeply engaged in worldly affairs, and his thoughts so taken up with state, pomp, and grandeur, that he was never at leisure to mind those matters, which justly claimed, and ought to have engrossed, his whole attention. By him the western bishops were led into the same mistake concerning Eusebius and Meletius; and hence the backwardness they showed to correspond with Basil, as if he designed to impose upon them, or was himself imposed upon by others. Of this Basil justly complained in a letter he writ to Eusebius of Samosata. "If the wrath of God," says he, "is in the end appeased, if mercy takes place, what other help do we stand in need of? But, if his anger continues, what relief will the pride of the west afford us? They neither know the truth, nor can they patiently bear it. They are ever prepossessed with idle jealousies, ever swayed by groundless surmises; and therefore act now the same part they lately acted in the case of Marcellinus; that is, they quarrel with those, who inform them of the truth, and, being left to themselves, they introduce and establish heresies. As for my own part, I had once some thoughts of writing a private letter to their chief (that is, to Damasus), and, waving all mention of church affairs, only tell him, that they neither know what passes here, nor take the right method to be informed; and that they ought not to oppress those who are already humbled by affliction, nor mistake pride for dignity, since that sin alone is capable of setting a man at enmity with God."[2] From these words it is pretty plain that the notion of the pope's infallibility was not yet broached, or at least was not yet known to Basil. The bishop of the metropolis of the empire was deservedly looked upon, in regard of the dignity of his see, as the chief and head of all the western bishops; and to him as such, not as an infallible and unerring judge, the eastern bishops frequently applied in the disputes, that happened to rise among them; so that all we can infer from their applying to him is, that his authority bore a great sway; which was owing to the pre-eminence of his see, and not to any power or prerogative peculiar to him, and superior to others.

It was long ere Damasus could be brought to give any attention to the affairs of the east; and when he did, it was only to add fuel to the fire, which had lately begun to rage with great violence. For, looking upon the office of a bare mediator, which alone had been offered him, as no ways suitable to his dignity, he arrogantly assumed that of a judge, and not only acknowledged Paulinus for lawful bishop of Antioch, but, misled by

[1] Id. ib. Theod. l. 3. c. 2.
[2] Basil. ep. 320.
[3] Id. ep. 2. 73.
[4] Id. ep. 250.

[1] Id. ep. 321.
[2] Id. ep. 8.

His conduct condemned by St. Basil. New disturbances raised in Rome, by the partisans of Ursinus; who are banished. The Luciferians persecuted by Damasus. Apollinaris the heresiarch. An account of him.

false and groundless reports, declared Meletius a transgressor of the canons, an intruder, a schismatic, and even a heretic;[1] that Meletius, who had suffered exile, and innumerable hardships, in defence of the orthodox faith, who was then revered all over the east, as a man of extraordinary sanctity, and is now honored by the church of Rome as a saint of the first class. But his thus openly declaring in favor of Paulinus, his treating in such a base and unworthy manner one of the most eminent prelates of the east, served only to engage the followers of Meletius more warmly in his cause; and the great Basil, among the rest, who could not help censuring the conduct of Damasus as rash, partial, and injudicious: he even repented his having ever applied to him; for, in one of his letters to Eusebius of Samosata, he expresses himself thus: "The saying of Diomedes occurs to my mind; entreaties are not to be used with Achilles, he is too haughty;[2] and truly the more you flatter haughty and insolent men, the more haughty and insolent they become."[3] As no regard was had to the authority of Damasus, and the western bishops, who, following his example, acknowledged Paulinus, and not Meletius, the orthodox bishops in the east not only continued divided among themselves, but a new division arose between the western bishops, and those of the party of Meletius, at the head of which was Basil, bishop of Cæsarea. But, of these unhappy divisions, so far as the bishops of Rome were concerned in them, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Damasus was far more successful in suppressing the schism of Ursinus, which about this time was revived at Rome. The empeperor Valentinian, some time before, by a rescript addressed to Ampelius, governor, and Maximinus, vicar of Rome, had allowed Ursinus, and the leading men of his party, who had been confined with him to Gaul, liberty to live where they pleased, provided they kept out of Rome, and the suburbicarian provinces.[4] This indulgence shown by the emperor to Ursinus, encouraged his followers in Rome to declare openly in his favor, and even to assemble apart from those who communicated with Damasus. But, being therein opposed by the party of Damasus with their usual violence, new disturbances arose, and the city was upon the point of becoming again the scene of a civil war. Simplicius, then vicar of Rome, at the request of Damasus, gave the emperor immediate notice of the approaching danger; and the emperor, in answer to his letter, sent him a rescript, commanding "all those who, in contempt of religion, held or frequented unlawful assemblies, to be banished one hundred miles from Rome, that their obstinacy might hurt none but themselves."[5] Thus for the present a stop was put to the disorders that began to reign in the city.

The two presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, pretend, that this law was levelled at the Ursinians alone, but was interpreted by Damasus, as comprehending the Luciferians, as the followers of Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, who, refusing to communicate with the bishops who signed the confession of Rimini, and with all who communicated with them, had separate assemblies at Rome, and even a bishop of their own, named Aurelius. But Damasus, say they, using them, in virtue of the abovementioned law, with no less cruelty than he did the Ursinians, they thenceforth assembled only in the night, under a presbyter, named Macarius, of whose sanctity and austerities they relate wonderful things. But night and darkness could not protect them against the persecuting spirit of Damasus, whose clerks, breaking one night in upon them, while they were performing divine service in a private house, dispersed the congregation, seized Macarius, and dragging him along with them over the sharp flints, by which he was cruelly bruised, and dangerously wounded in the thigh, they kept him the remaining part of the night closely confined. Next morning he was carried before the judge, who, finding him inflexible in rejecting the communion of Damasus, condemned him to exile; but the holy presbyter, being arrived at Ostia, died there of his wounds.[1] The same authors add, that Damasus caused several catholic presbyters to be sent into exile, and some laymen; but that Aurelius, the Luciferian bishop, in spite of all his efforts, continued in Rome to the hour of his death.[2]

About this time, that is, in the year 377, a great council was held at Rome, in which the famous Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, was condemned and deposed with his two disciples, Vitalis and Timotheus. Apollinaris was a man of uncommon parts, great penetration, universal knowledge; and had at first been so zealous a defender of the orthodox faith, that he was looked upon by all, particularly by Epiphanius and Athanasius, as one of the great champions of that cause,[3] and ranked by Philostorgius with Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen.[4] He contracted a strict friendship with Athanasius, when that prelate passed through Laodicea in 349, on his return to Egypt, and ever after maintained a close correspondence with him, on which account he was excommunicated by Gregory, the Arian bishop of that city.[5] When the Arians began to prevail in the east, Apollinaris was cruelly persecuted by the men in power of that party, and at last driven into exile.[6] Basil writ several letters to him, and

[1] Id. ep. 10. [2] Hom. II. 9. ver. 694.
[3] Basil. ep. 10. [4] Cod. Theod. 9. t. 29. l. 1. p. 221.
[5] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 91.

[1] Marc. & Faust. p. 65—67. [2] Id. ib.
[3] Basil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 21. Hier. vir. ill. c. 104.
[4] Suidas, p. 273. [5] Soz. l. 6. c. 35.
[6] Nil. l. 1. ep. 257.

The doctrine held by Apollinaris, and his disciples. Apollinaris not known nor suspected to be the author of the heresy he broached.

in those he wrote to others, often mentions him as a person for whom he had the greatest esteem.[1] He is said to have excelled in the knowledge of the scriptures, which he publicly interpreted at Antioch, where he had Jerom among the many disciples, who flocked from all parts to hear him.[2] But he was equally versed in human learning, especially in poetry; and his knowledge in that branch of literature proved very useful in the time of the emperor Julian. For that prince having by a law debarred the Christians from perusing or studying the pagan authors, Apollinaris, to supply the want of those writers, composed several pieces in imitation of them, and, among the rest, a poem comprising the history of the Jews to the time of Saul, and divided into twenty-four books, which he distinguished by so many letters of the Greek alphabet, as Homer had done.[3] He likewise wrote comedies, tragedies, lyric verses, &c. imitating Pindar in the latter, and Menander and Euripedes in the two former.[4] Sozomen thinks his compositions fell in no respect short of the works of the ancients; who, upon the whole, says he, were far inferior to him, since they excelled, each in one kind only, but he equally in all.[5] The tragedy entitled, "Christ Suffering," which is to be found among the works of Gregory Nazianzen, is by some ascribed to Apollinaris; but that piece does not at all answer the great opinion Sozomen seems to have entertained of him. His paraphrase in hexameter verse on the Psalms, the only entire work of his that has reached our times, is an elegant, exact, and sublime translation of them, greatly commended and admired by the best judges.[6] His poetry proved very serviceable to him, when he began to broach his heresy; for great numbers of people, especially women, embraced his doctrine, being taken, and in a manner enchanted, with the sweetness of his verses; for he composed a great many songs and odes equally pious and elegant, adapted to all occasions, and on all occasions sung with suitable airs by his followers.[7] To these Gregory Nazianzen no doubt alludes, where he speaks of the Psalms of the Apollinarists, to which the Psalms of David had given place; of those sweet and so much admired verses, which were looked upon by them as a third testament.[8] It was chiefly to oppose the progress Apollinaris made, by the insinuating means of his poetry, that Gregory Nazianzen applied himself to the same study. About the year 362, Apollinaris was raised, in consideration of his great piety and learning, to the see of Laodicea in Syria, in which city he was born, according to the most probable opinion, and had spent the greater part of his life.

[1] Basil. ep. 82. [2] Hier. ep. 65. [3] Soz. l. 5. c. 18. [4] Id. ib. [5] Id. ib. [6] Voss. poet. Græc. c. 9. p. 76. Baillet, t. 6. p. 453. 455. [7] Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [8] Naz. or. 52. p. 745.

As for the doctrine held by Apollinaris, and his followers, called from him Apollinarists; they maintained at first, that Christ had human flesh, but not a human soul, the want of which was supplied, according to them, by the divinity. But being afterwards convinced, that such a doctrine was repugnant to several plain and express passages of scripture, they abandoned it in part, and, distinguishing, with some philosophers, the soul, by which we live, from the intelligence, by which we reason, they allowed the former in our Saviour, but denied the latter; the operations of which, said they, were performed by the divinity.[1] Thus they allowed him, says St. Austin, the soul of a beast, but denied him that of a man.[2] By means of this doctrine they avoided the absurdity with which they reproached the catholics, admitting in Christ, as they falsely imagined, two opposite and distinct natures, without any union or subordination between them.[3] The catholics indeed acknowledged two distinct and complete natures in Christ; but at the same time maintained a union between them, such a union as was admitted by the Apollinarists between the flesh and the Divinity. The latter upbraided the catholics with adoring a man, styling them Anthropolaters; and the catholics reproached in their turn the Apollinarists with adoring the flesh, calling them Sarcolaters.[4] The Apollinarists distinguished themselves from the catholics, by causing the following words to be fixed on the front of their houses; "We must not adore a man that bears a God, but a God that bears flesh." The errors of the Apollinarists were not only concerning the soul, but likewise the body of our Saviour; for they maintained, that his body, like other bodies only in appearance, was coeval with the Divinity, and of the same substance with the eternal wisdom.[5] Hence it followed, by a natural consequence, that the body of our Saviour was impassible and immortal; that it was not taken of the Virgin Mary; that he was not born of her; that his birth, passion, death, and resurrection, were mere illusions; or else that the Divine nature was passible: both which absurdities were admitted by some of the sects into which the Apollinarists were afterwards divided.[6]

This doctrine was first heard of in 362, and condemned the same year in the council of Alexandria. In 373, it began to make a great noise in the church; but it was not known even then by whom it had been broached: for Apollinaris was so far from owning himself the author of those tenets, that, in one of his letters to Serapion bishop of Thmuis in

[1] Epiph. 77. c. 23. Theod. hær. 4. c. 8. Ath. de incar. p. 615. Nem. l. 1. p. 710. Naz. orat. 46. p. 722. [2] Aug. in. Jo. hom. 47. [3] Naz. or. 52. p. 749. [4] Nys. in Apol. l. 2. p. 47. Naz. car. 146. [5] Athan. ad Epiph. 582. Aug. pers. c. 24. & hær. 55. Theod. l. 5, c. 3. Naz. or. 51. [6] Ath. ib. p. 583. Naz. or. 46. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. Theod. l. 5. c. 3.

His errors condemned in a council at Rome. Damasus imposed upon by Vitalis, one of his disciples. Apollinaris openly declares against the church.

Egypt, which is still extant,[1] he expresses, in the strongest terms, his approbation of a letter from Athanasius to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, confuting the very errors he held; and at the same time condemns the folly of those, who maintained the flesh to be consubstantial to the divine nature. In another letter to the same Serapion, he owns the body of our Saviour to have been taken of the Virgin Mary, to have been formed in her womb, and his flesh to have been of the same substance with ours; adding, "And these are truths not to be called in question."[2] In a third letter he assures Serapion, that he has ever denied in his writings the flesh of our Saviour to have descended from heaven, or to be of the same substance with the Divinity.[3] Apollinaris, by thus publicly declaring against the doctrine, which at the same time he was privately propagating, eluded the vigilance of Athanasius himself, who, in confuting his errors, never mentions his name, nor seems to have entertained the least suspicion of him; nay, he recommended Timotheus, a favorite disciple of his, to Damasus, as a person whose orthodoxy was not to be questioned; and as such he was received, not only by the bishop of Rome, but by all the western bishops, of whom he obtained letters, on his return, directed to Apollinaris, as to a bishop of the catholic communion.[4]

In the year 374 or 375, Damasus convened a great council at Rome, in which the errors of Apollinaris were condemned; but neither was he nor any other named as the broacher or author of that doctrine. The very year that Damasus condemned the doctrine of Apollinaris, he was deceived and overreached by one of the disciples of that heresiarch, named Vitalis. He was a presbyter of the church of Antioch, and of the communion of Meletius, by whom he had been ordained; but afterwards, renouncing his communion, he joined Apollinaris, and, being in high esteem with the people, drew great numbers over with him to that side. Of these, called from him Vitalians, Apollinaris some years after appointed him bishop, adding thereby a fourth party to the three that already divided the church of Antioch, namely, the Arians, Paulinians, and Meletians.[5] Before he threw off the mask, and publicly maintained the tenets of Apollinaris, he strove to be admitted with his followers to the communion of Paulinus of Antioch, and of Damasus; and with this view he undertook a journey to Rome in the year 375. As he had been suspected, and even accused of holding the doctrines of Apollinaris, Damasus required of him, before he admitted him to his communion, a confession of his faith, which he gave under his hand, but in such terms as bore a double meaning. Damasus, however, well satisfied with it, gave him a letter for Paulinus of Antioch, and sent him back to be admitted by that bishop to the communion of the church.[1] But Damasus soon after, either upon his own reflection, or at the suggestion of others, apprehending himself imposed upon, wrote another letter to Paulinus, by the presbyter Patronius, and afterwards a third, which Holstenius has inserted at length in his "Roman Collection."[2] Together with this letter Damasus sent to Paulinus a confession of faith, drawn up by a council summoned for that purpose, desiring him to admit none to his communion, but such as should sign that confession, and the confession of Nice.[3] To this piece the fathers of the council of Chalcedon no doubt allude, in commending Damasus for pointing out, in his letters to Paulinus, the rules all catholics ought to be guided by in reasoning of the mystery of the incarnation.[4] What Baronius observes here is true, namely, that Vitalis, by the same ambiguous confession of faith, imposed upon Gregory Nazianzen, who received the Apollinarists as brethren, and not as enemies.[5] He adds, "And no wonder that Vitalis imposed upon Damasus, since by the same confession he imposed upon Gregory Nazianzen:" he ought rather to have said, "No wonder that he imposed upon Gregory, who did not pretend to infallibility, since he imposed upon Damasus, who was infallible." As Vitalis refused to sign the confession sent by Damasus, Paulinus would not admit him to his communion; upon which he pulled off the mask, publicly renounced the communion both of Damasus and Paulinus, and, bidding defiance to the canons, accepted the title and dignity of bishop of Antioch, offered him by Apollinaris. At the same time that heresiarch, finding he could conceal himself no longer, openly declared, that he would communicate with none who held that our Saviour had taken a human soul, and human understanding: which was separating himself from the communion of the catholic church.[6] It was long before it was believed in the church that those tenets had been broached, or were held by Apollinaris: no credit was given, at first, even to his disciples, most people being inclined to think, that they were mistaken, and did not comprehend the sublime thoughts of that great man.[7] But when no room was left for any further doubt, the surprise and concern of the whole catholic party were equal to the high opinion they had entertained of him till that time.[8] When Epiphanius wrote against the Apollinarists, he well knew Apollinaris to be the author of that sect; for he reproaches him with this unwarrantable separation from the church;

[1] Leont. p. 1031. [2] Id. p. 1032. [3] Id. p. 1035. [4] Id. p. 1042. [5] Ep. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. Chron. Alex. p. 688.

[1] Epiph. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Naz. or. 52. [2] Vet. Rom. eccles. mon. collect. p. 181. [3] Ib. p. 180. & Theod. l. 5. c. 10. [4] Conc. t. 4. p. 826. [5] Naz. or. 51. [6] Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Facund. l. 4. c. 2. [7] Nil. ep. 257. [8] Basil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 34.

A great schism in the church. Basil recurs to the western bishops; who condemn the doctrine of Apollinaris, and depose him with Vitalis and Timotheus. A mistake of Baronius. Another mistake of the same writer. The doctrine of the Millenarians held by the greatest men in the church. How little tradition to be depended upon.

and yet he speaks of him with the greatest respect; seems to think, that many things had been unjustly fathered upon him; and takes a great deal of pains to assure his reader, that what he writes is truth, and not calumny proceeding from any private pique, malice, or grudge.[1]

The schism, which the establishing of a new bishop occasioned in the church of Antioch, was not confined to that alone, but extended to most other churches, over which Apollinaris appointed bishops of his own sect, who held separate assemblies, practised different rites, and, instead of the sacred hymns commonly sung at divine service by the rest of the church, introduced canticles composed by their leader, and containing the substance of his doctrine.[2] The many perplexed questions and difficulties, which he and his emissaries were daily starting about the incarnation, bred such confusion in the minds of men, that many began to question the truth of that mystery.[3] The objections they moved against our Saviour's taking flesh, and being born of the Virgin Mary, seemed calculated merely to raise improper ideas, and sully the thoughts of chaste minds; for they themselves held his body to be coeval with the Divinity, and to have only been conveyed into the world by means of the Virgin Mary.[4] Their doctrine was applauded and received by many, and few who read their books were content with, or kept to the plain and ancient doctrine of the church.[5] Basil, therefore, and the other orthodox bishops in the east, to put a stop the more effectually to the growing evil, not only declaimed against it in all their writings, but despatched the two presbyters, Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, with letters to Damasus, and the other western bishops, entreating them to condemn without delay the doctrine of Apollinaris, and Apollinaris himself, since he had at last openly declared against the church, and owned himself the author of the new sect.[6] In compliance with this request, a great council was convened at Rome the following year, 378, in which Apollinaris was not only condemned with great solemnity, but deposed, with his two favourite disciples, Vitalis and Timotheus; the former bishop of the Apollinarists at Antioch, and the latter at Berytus in Phœnicia.[7] By the same council it was defined, that Jesus was true man, and true God; and whoever maintained or affected any thing to be wanting either to his humanity or divinity, was declared an enemy to the church.[8] Vitalis had deceived Damasus, as I have observed above, by a confession of faith, in which, under equivocal terms, he had artfully concealed his heresy. The bishop of Rome, therefore, now undeceived, caused the confession he had formerly approved of to be anathematized by the council, together with its author, exerting himself, says Gregory Nazianzen, with so much the more vigor against them, as they had formerly taken advantage of his candor and sincerity to impose upon him.[1] Gregory Nazianzen therefore supposes, that the pope could be imposed upon in a matter concerning the faith. Indeed the sticklers for infallibility must either give up that prerogative, or allow all the fathers to have talked nonsense.

Baronius is certainly mistaken, and so was Ruffinus,[2] whom he follows, in asserting the heresy of Apollinaris to have been first condemned by the council of Rome, since it is manifest, that the doctrine of that heresiarch had been condemned long before by Athanasius, Basil, and Epiphanius, in their writings, and by the council held at Alexandria in 362. But Ruffinus probably meant no more, than that those errors were first condemned by the council of Rome, under the name, and together with the person, of Apollinaris; which is undeniable. I cannot help observing here another mistake of Baronius, pretending that Damasus (for whatever was done by the council is by him ascribed to Damasus alone) in condemning Apollinaris, condemned all the errors he held; and consequently the opinion of the Millenarians, holding that Christ was to return upon the earth, and reign over the faithful a thousand years before the end of the world. This opinion was first broached about the year 118, by Papias bishop of Hierapolis, a man of great piety, and honored by the church of Rome as a saint.[3] He declares, in the few fragments of his works, which have been conveyed to us by Eusebius,[4] that, as he lived near the times of the apostles, he made it his chief business to learn of their disciples whatever they could recollect to have been done or said by them, on different occasions, that was not recorded in holy writ. Thus he learned the above-mentioned doctrine,[5] which, upon the authority of such a tradition, countenanced by some passages in the Revelations,[6] and one text in St. Paul, was embraced and held by the most eminent men for piety and learning, at that time, in the church; and, among the rest, by Irenæus, and Justin the Martyr. And yet such a doctrine is now rank heresy in the church of Rome. But, by declaring it such, have they not overset their own system, which places tradition upon a level with the canonical books of the scripture? Can they allege a more ancient tradition, one more universally received, or equally

[1] Epiph. 66. c. 20. 77. c. 2. [2] Basil. ep. 293. Soz. l. 6. c. 25.
[3] Basil. ib.
[4] Naz. or. 46, & 5. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. [5] Basil. ep. 74. [6] Id. ep. 74.
[7] Ruff. l. 2. c. 20. Soz. l. 6. c. 25.
[8] Ruff. ib. Theod. p. 719. Concil. t. 5. p. 741. Leon. Sulp. p. 1042. Phot. p. 231.

[1] Greg. Naz. or. 52. [2] Ruff. ib.
[3] Martyrol. Rom. 22 Feb. [4] Eusch. l. 3. c. 33.
[5] Id ib. [6] Rev. c. xx.

The Apollinarists condemned by several councils. Penal laws enacted against them. New disturbances raised by Ursinus. Damasus falsely accused, but cleared by the emperor. Some bishops, deposed by Damasus, keep their sees.

countenanced by scripture, in favor of the many traditional articles of faith, which they have obtruded upon the world? Papias declares, he received the above-mentioned doctrine of those who had learned it immediately of the apostles. If such a tradition be rejected as false, what other has a right to be admitted as true? If we deny or question St. Peter's having been at Rome, tradition, and the authority of Irenæus (for all the others have copied from him), are immediately produced against us. But what weight either ought to bear, the case before us sufficiently demonstrates.

To return to Apollinaris: It is very certain, that he held and taught the doctrine of the Millenarians; but it is no less certain, that such a doctrine was not condemned, as Baronius pretends,[1] by the council of Rome in 378, since many eminent men in the church held it, and Sulpitius Severus among the rest, after that council, without being deemed heretics on that score. The sentence pronounced against Apollinaris, and his disciples, by the council of Rome, was confirmed by a council held the same year at Alexandria,[2] by an oecumenical council assembled at Constantinople in 381, and by the council at Antioch in 379.[3] However, the Apollinarists, though thus condemned and deposed by all the councils of the east and west, as we read in Gregory Nazianzen,[4] still kept their ground, till recourse was had to the secular power. For the emperor Theodosius, at the request of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, enacted a law, dated the tenth of March, 388, forbidding the Apollinarists to hold assemblies, to have any ecclesiastics or bishops, or to dwell in the cities.[5] As this law was executed with the utmost rigor, at least against the leading men of the party, who were banished the cities, and confined to the deserts,[6] the Apollinarists were in a few years reduced to a very small number, when they begged to be admitted to the communion of the catholic church, which was in the end granted them by Theodotus,[7] who governed the church of Antioch, from the year 416 to 428. But as their conversion was owing not to conviction, but persecution, they still held in their hearts the same sentiments, which ever must happen in the like case; nay, and privately instilled their errors into the minds of many, whose faith had been, till that time, untainted.[8] It was to these pretended catholics, or disguised Apollinarists, that the Eutychian heresy, and that of the Monothelites, of whom I shall speak hereafter, owed their birth.[9] Hence the emperor Marcian, by an edict in 455, declared the Eutychians to be Apollinarists, and consequently liable to the same penalties.[1] As for Apollinaris himself, he died about the year 392, having maintained, to the hour of his death, the same sentiments, in which he had lived; and, with them, the same outward appearance, at least, of a most holy and exemplary life;[2] which is all the authors of those times will allow him.

While Damasus, and the other western bishops, were wholly intent upon suppressing the heresy of Apollinaris, and restoring the eastern churches to their former tranquillity, the antipope Ursinus, laying hold of that opportunity, arrived privately at Milan, and there joined the Arians, upon their promising to support him with the whole power of their party.[3] But Ambrose, who then governed that church, and kept a watchful eye over the flock committed to his care, gave immediate notice of their clandestine meetings, and pernicious designs, to the emperor Gratian, who soon after ordered Ursinus to quit Italy, and confined him to Cologne.[4] During his exile his partisans were not idle; they found the emperor Gratian, who, in 375, had succeeded his father Valentinian I. warmly engaged in favor of Damasus: they well knew that so long as he continued in that disposition, it would be in vain to solicit the return of Ursinus, or to put up any petition in his behalf. In order therefore to estrange the mind of the emperor from Damasus, they suborned a Jew, named Isaac, who had embraced the Christian religion, but was then returned to Judaism, to accuse him before the civil magistrate of a heinous crime, which I find not specified by any of the ancients. But the emperor, taking upon himself the judging of that cause, soon discovered the innocence of the accused, and the malice of the accuser; and therefore, honorably acquitting the former, and punishing the latter according to his deserts, confined him to a corner of Spain.[5]

This attempt on the reputation of Damasus was not the only thing that gave him great uneasiness at this time. The emperor Valentinian had transferred, as I have related above, the power of judging bishops, such at least as were concerned in the schism of Ursinus, from the civil magistrate to the bishop of Rome. But several bishops, though deposed by him, still maintained themselves in their sees, with open force, in defiance of his sentence, and the imperial law. Among these were the bishop of Parma, and Florentius bishop of Puzzuolo, who, for their attachment to Ursinus, had been both deposed by Damasus, and other bishops assembled at Rome.[6] The Donatists too, notwithstanding the severe laws enacted against them by several emperors, had got footing in Italy, and in Rome

[1] Bar. ad ann. 118. n. 2. & 373. n. 14.
[2] Ruf. l. 2. c. 20.
[3] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99.
[4] Naz. ep. 77.
[5] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 14. p. 130.
[6] Soz. l. 6. c. 26.
[7] Theod. l. 5. c. 3.
[8] Id. ib.
[9] Leo, ep. 134. c. 2. Pet. dog. t. 4. p. 24.
Prædestinat. de hæres. c. 55.

[1] Conc. t. 4. p. 886, 887.
[2] Hier. vir. ill. c. 104. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. Greg. Nys. in Eph. t. 3. p. 609.
[3] Amb. ep. 4.
[4] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 82. 92.
[5] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 84—92.
[6] Ib. p. 82—93.

The Italian bishops recur to the emperor. Their letter to him. What they demand in particular for the bishop of Rome. The emperor's answer. In what sense the pope above other bishops.

itself, where they were known by the names of Montenenses, and Rupenses, on account of their assembling in a church or oratory, which they had among the neighboring rocks and mountains.[1] They had a bishop of their own, either sent from Africa, or ordained by bishops sent from thence for that purpose. Claudian, who governed them at this time, was their fifth bishop of Rome.[2] The emperor ordered him to be sent back to Africa, whence he came. But though he had been several times imprisoned, in order to oblige him by that means to return, he could not even so be prevailed upon to abandon his flock; but continued at Rome, perverting many there, and rebaptizing all he could pervert.[3] To put a stop to these evils, the bishops of Italy, assembling at Rome, had recourse to the emperor Gratian, acquainting him with the conduct of the contumacious bishops, and earnestly entreating him to cause the law, commanding the bishops to be judged by the bishop of Rome, and not by the civil magistrate, which he himself had enacted with his father, to be put in execution. By that law, the emperor, in all likelihood, only intended to confirm, with respect to the bishop of Rome, the canons of the church, appointing the metropolitan, with his council, judge of the bishops of his province in ecclesiastical causes. But the bishops, assembled on this occasion at Rome, attempted to extend the authority of the bishop of Rome, far beyond the bounds to which the emperors and canons had confined it. For, in their letter to Gratian, they suggested the following regulations as necessary for the tranquillity of the church, and entreated him to establish them by law: 1. That if any, who had been condemned by the bishop of Rome, or other catholic bishops, should, after such condemnation, presume to keep their churches, they should be banished from the territories of the cities, where they had been bishops. 2. That such as should refuse, when lawfully summoned, to appear before the bishops, should be obliged, by the prefect of Italy, or his vicar, to repair to Rome, to be judged there. 3. That, if the accused bishop resided in a distant province, he should be obliged, by the judges of the place, to appear before his metropolitan; and, if his metropolitan was suspected as partial, or prejudiced against him, he might be allowed to appeal to the bishop of Rome, or to a council of fifteen neighboring bishops; but, if the accused was himself a metropolitan, he should either repair to Rome, or appear before such judges as the bishop of Rome should appoint; and, when thus condemned, submit to the sentence.[4] In behalf of the bishop of Rome in particular they begged, in the same letter, that, as he "was above other bishops by the prerogative of the apostolic see, though upon a level with them as to the ministry," he might not be obliged to appear before the civil magistrate, since other bishops had been exempted from their jurisdiction, but before a council, or that the emperor would reserve to himself the cognisance of what concerned him, leaving to the ordinary judges the power of examining facts and witnesses, but not the authority of pronouncing sentence.[1] What answer the emperor returned to the council, we know not; but, in a rescript, addressed to the vicar Aquilinus, after summing up the heads of the letter from the council, and severely reprimanding his officers for their neglect, in not causing the imperial law to be put in execution, he confirms the rescript addressed to Simplicius, which I have mentioned above; commands the bishop of Parma, Florentius of Puzzuolo, and Claudian the Donatist, with all those who shall be condemned by the councils, as disturbers of the quiet of the church, to be driven from their dioceses, and banished a hundred miles from Rome: he grants all the council had desired, with respect to the judging of bishops; but requires the bishop of Rome to act with the advice of five or seven other bishops; and, lastly, he forbids persons of infamous characters, or known slanderers, to be admitted as informers or witnesses against bishops.[2] In this rescript he takes no notice of what the council had asked for the bishop of Rome in particular.

From these pieces, which are still extant, it is manifest beyond all dispute, as the reader must have observed, that, in the year 378, when this council was held, no prerogative was yet discovered in the pope, peculiar to him, and not common to all bishops, besides that of rank, which arose from the dignity of his see, that is, from his being bishop of the metropolis of the empire; for, in that respect alone, the bishops, who composed the council, acknowledged him "to be above them;" nay, by declaring themselves, in express terms, "equal to him as to the ministry," they seem to have taken particular care, that no room or pretence should be left for his claiming a superiority in any other respect. And how great would their surprise have been, had Damasus, in hearing that part of their address to the emperor, started up, and, protesting against it, as derogatory to his prerogative, declared, that, "to him all power was given in Heaven and on earth;" that, "so far from being equal to him, they, and all other bishops, were but his deputies and delegates;" that "the power, authority, and jurisdiction, which they enjoyed, were derived to them from the plenitude of his!" Had he talked in this strain, the whole council would have concluded him delirious. And yet these are the sentiments of his successors; these the very words, with which they and their divines have expressed

[1] Opt. l. 2. p. 49. Aug. de Unit. c. 3. t. 7. & ep. Hier. 165. chron. [2] Opt. l. 2. p. 49.
[3] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 83, 84. [4] Ibid. p. 85—87.

[1] Ibid. p. 87—89. [2] Ibid. p. 90, 91.

The power he now claims unknown in the time of Damasus. A new accusation brought against Damasus. The council of Aquileia writes to the emperor in his behalf. A great council assembled at Constantinople, by the emperor Theodosius.

them;[1] so that it is now reckoned heresy not to believe what in the fourth century it had been deemed madness to have gravely uttered. It would perhaps have seemed still more strange and surprising to the fathers of the council, however prejudiced in his favor, if Damasus, instead of gratefully acknowledging their regard for him in petitioning the emperor, that he might not be judged by the civil magistrate, but either by a council, or the emperor himself, had severely rebuked them as strangers to, or betrayers of, his inherent right, acquainting them, that, in virtue thereof, "all men were to be judged by him, but himself by no man;[2]" that "the greatest monarchs were his slaves and vassals, and he king of kings, monarch of the world, sole lord and governor both in spirituals and temporals;"[3] that "he was appointed prince over all nations and kingdoms;"[4] that "his power excelled all powers;"[5] that "it was necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to him."[6] And yet these are the notions, that have been uttered by his successors, and the very terms in which they were uttered. In the age I am now writing of they have been looked upon no otherwise than the ravings of a distempered brain; but they are now held by the church of Rome, and her divines, as oracles, and inserted as such into her canons. Bellarmine owns, that in the fourth century, the pope was still subject to the emperors, nay, and to the civil magistrate, without the least distinction between him and other vassals. "But this subjection," says he, in his apology against king James,[7] "the emperors exacted by force, because the power of the pope was not known to them." Nor to any body else, he might have added, since the writers of those times seem to have been no better acquainted with the power of the pope than the emperors; at least, they take no notice of it, even in describing, as some of them have done, the state of the church at the time they wrote, and relating the customs, laws, and practices, that then obtained. Besides, how could the power of the pope be unknown to the Christian emperors, if it was one of the chief tenets of the Christian doctrine? Neither Damasus, nor any of his predecessors, can be justly charged with bashfulness, in acquainting the world with the power they had or claimed. We may further observe here, that the emperor requires the bishop of Rome, in judging according to the power granted him, to act with the advice of five or seven other bishops: a plain proof, that he was as little acquainted with the pope's infallibility, as with his power.

The council of the Italian bishops, assembled at Rome, no sooner broke up, than the emissaries and partisans of Ursinus began to raise new disturbances in that city, by stirring up the pagans against Damasus, and, at the same time, charging him with things, to use the expression of the council of Aquileia, "not fit to be uttered by a bishop, nor heard by such an emperor as Gratian.[1] Anastasius writes, that he was accused of adultery by the two deacons, Concordus and Callistus.[2] And truly, that some crime of that nature was laid to his charge, is pretty plain, from the terms in which it was expressed by the council. Valerian, then governor of Rome, immediately acquainted the emperor with the accusation;[3] but what part Gratian acted on this occasion, we are not told by any ancient writer. We read in the pontificals, and most of the modern writers, that the cause was referred by the emperor to the council then sitting at Aquileia; and that Damasus was declared innocent by all the bishops who composed it. But, as neither is related by any credible author, I am inclined to believe, that Gratian took no notice of the charge, in compliance with the request of the bishops assembled at Aquileia; for, by a letter, they earnestly entreated him not to hearken to Ursinus, because his giving ear to him would occasion endless disturbances in Rome; and besides, they could by no means communicate with a man who thus wickedly aspired to a dignity, to which he had no claim or title; who, by his scandalous behavior, had incurred the hatred of all good Christians; who had impiously joined the Arians, and, together with them, attempted to disturb the quiet of the catholic church of Milan.[4]

Towards the latter end of the pontificate of Damasus, two great councils were held, the one at Constantinople, in 381, and the other at Rome, in 382. The former was assembled by the emperor Theodosius, who, after having put the orthodox in possession of the churches, which till his time had been held by the Arians in the east, where he reigned, summoned all the bishops within his dominions to meet at Constantinople, in order to deliberate about the most proper means of restoring an entire tranquillity to the church, rent and disturbed not only by several sects of heretics, but by the divisions that reigned among the orthodox themselves, by that especially of Antioch, the most ancient of all, which from that church had spread all over the empire, and occasioned rather an entire separation, than a misunderstanding between the east and the west, the former communicating with Meletius, and the latter with Paulinus, as I have related above. In this council many

[1] Bellar. de summ. Pont. l. 4. c. 24. Aug. Triumph. de potest. Eccles. in præf. ad Joh. XXII. Concil. Later. sub Leone X.
[2] Grat. dist. 40. c. 6.
[3] Bonif. VIII. in ap. ad Mart. Polon. & Conc. Vienn. p. 909.
[4] Pius V. in Bull. apud Cam. ad ann. 1570.
[5] Sixt. V. in Bull. contr. Hen. Navar.
[6] Bonif. VIII. extrav. com. l. I. tit. 8. c. 1.
[7] Bellar. ap. p. 202.

[1] Amb. ep. 4.
[2] Anast. c. 38.
[3] Cod. Theod. ch. p. 104.
[4] Amb. ib.

Which revokes the privilege granted to the see of Rome by the council of Sardica. The council writes to the western bishops. The authority of this council among the Greeks, and the Latins. The popes at variance among and with themselves about it. This council was assembled by the emperor, and not by Damasus.

weighty matters were transacted, and several canons established, some of which, namely, the second and third, deserve to be taken notice of here. For by the second, the council renewed and confirmed the ancient law of the church, authorized by the fourth, fifth, and sixth canons of the council of Nice, commanding the bishops of each province to be ordained by those of the same province, and such of the neighboring provinces as they should think fit to call in; directing all ecclesiastical matters to be settled, all disputes to be finally decided by a council composed of the bishops of the province, or at least of the diocess, that is, of all the provinces under the same vicar; and strictly forbidding the bishops of one diocess to concern themselves, under any color or pretence whatsoever, with what happens in another.[1] By this cannon the privilege, formerly granted to the see of Rome by the council of Sardica, was revoked, and all appeals from the council of the diocess forbidden. By the third canon the see of Constantinople is declared first in rank and dignity after that of Rome.[2] Some Greek writers have pretended, that, by this canon, the two sees were declared in every respect equal; but that Zonaras himself owns to be false and groundless.[3] It is to be observed, that the council of Constantinople gave rank and honor to that see, but no jurisdiction. It was to the council of Chalcedon that the bishops of Constantinople owed their authority and jurisdiction; for by that council they were empowered to ordain the metropolitans of the diocesses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace.[4] The reasons alleged by Baronius to prove the third canon of the council of Constantinople supposititious,[5] are quite frivolous; and it is certain beyond all dispute, that the bishops of that city maintained ever after the rank, which the above-mentioned canon had given them. In a short time the bishop of Constantinople, taking advantage of that canon, and of the deference that is naturally paid to the bishop of the imperial city, extended his jurisdiction over all the neighboring provinces, nay, and over the whole eastern empire, as we shall observe in the sequel of this history.

The canons of this council were, without all doubt, sent, according to custom, to the western bishops for their approbation, probably with the letter which the council wrote to them concerning the heresy of Apollinaris.[6] And yet pope Leo the Great writes, that the third canon was never notified to the church of Rome;[7] but Gregory the Great, that the canon condemning the Eudoxians, which was the first, had never been received at Rome:[8] but Gregory perhaps meant nothing else, than that the canon he mentions was of no authority at Rome. As for Leo, it is hard to conceive what he meant by saying, that the third canon was not known to the church of Rome; for he could not but know, that the bishop of Constantinople held the second rank in the church, and the first in the east, since his own legates, whose conduct he entirely approved of, owned him to have an indisputable right to that rank; nay, Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum, in Phrygia, maintained that it was with the consent and approbation of Leo himself that the see of Constantinople enjoyed that honor.

The authority of this council has ever been great among the Greeks, who style it an oecumenical council, and had often recourse to it as such in the council of Chalcedon.[1] The bishops of the Hellespont speak of it with the greatest respect and reverence, in a letter they wrote to the emperor Leo.[2] As for the Latins, I find a great disagreement among the popes themselves concerning the authority of this council; nay, the greatest of them all disagrees even with himself about it. The legates of pope Leo rejected its canons, alleging that they had never been inserted in the book of the canons.[3] In like manner the popes Simplicius and Felix II. speaking of the councils which they received, name those only of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.[4] Gregory the Great writes, that the church of Rome had neither the acts nor the canons of the council of Constantinople; that the condemnation of the Macedonians was the only thing done by that council which they admitted; and that as to other heresies condemned there, they rejected them as having been condemned before by other councils.[5] But he declares elsewhere, and often repeats it, that he received the four oecumenical councils, as he did the four gospels,[6] naming the council of Constantinople in the second place. In the same manner, and with the same words, were the four oecumenical councils received by Gelasius, and several popes before him, as well as by Martin I. and several others after him: so that the council of Constantinople is, according to some popes, of equal authority with the gospel; according to others, of no authority at all: nay, it is thus by the same pope at one time extolled, at another undervalued. Let Baronius and Bellarmine reconcile these contradictions, if they can.

That this council was assembled by the emperor Theodosius, is affirmed by all the writers who speak of it,[7] nay, and by the bishops who composed it.[8] And yet Baronius has the assurance to assert, as a thing not to be questioned, that it was convened by Dama-

[1] Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 9. Concil. t. 2. p. 947.
[2] Concil. ib.
[3] Zon. in can. p. 70. 72.
[4] Concil. t. 4. p. 795—798.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 37, 38.
[6] Concil. t. 4. p. 826.
[7] Leo, ep. 53. c. 5.
[8] Greg. 5. ep. 31.

[1] Theod. l. 5. c. 9.
[2] Conc. t. 4. p. 945.
[3] Conc. t. 4. p. 809. Marca de concord. sacerd. & imp. l. 3. c. 3.
[4] Lup. ep. 53. c. 5.
[5] Greg. l. 6. ep. 31.
[6] Id. l. 1. ep. 24.
[7] Theod. l. 5. c. 6. Naz. or. 14. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7.
[8] Ep. syn. conc. t. 1. p. 872.

The disturbances in the church of Antioch increased. Flavianus ordained bishop of Antioch.

sus,[1] which none of the ancients have so much as once named: and this assertion he founds upon the authority of the universally exploded acts of Damasus; of certain manuscripts, which he knows very little of, and nobody else any thing; and of a passage in the acts of the sixth oecumenical council, where it is said, that Theodosius and Damasus opposed with great firmness the Macedonian heresy; whence the annalist concludes, by what rules of logic I leave the reader to find out, that the council, which condemned the heresy of Macedonius, was convened by the authority of Damasus, backed by that of the emperor.[2] Christianus Lupus, more honest than Baronius, though no less attached to the see of Rome, ingenuously owns, that the council was assembled by the emperor alone; but adds, that Damasus confirmed it;[3] which is true, if he means no more than that Damasus accepted the decrees made by the council; for it was not his, but the emperor's approbation, that gave them a sanction; and accordingly they wrote, not to him, but to the emperor, acquainting him, by whose command they had been called together, with the decrees they had made, and requesting him to confirm them with his seal and sentence.[4] This council consisted of an hundred and fifty bishops, among whom were thirty-six Macedonians, whom Theodosius had particularly summoned, hoping to reunite them with the catholics.[5] No mention is made of letters or deputies sent either by Damasus, or by any of the western bishops; and Theodoret assures us in two different places,[6] that Theodosius only assembled the eastern bishops. Meletius of Antioch presided; for Gregory of Nyssa styled him in full council, our father and head.[7] Upon his death (for he died while the council was sitting) that honor was conferred on Gregory Nazianzen, appointed by the emperor and the council bishop of Constantinople;[8] but he resigning, soon after, his new dignity, his successor Nectarius was named to preside in his room.[9]

One of the chief motives that induced Theodosius to assemble so numerous a council at Constantinople, was, to hear what remedy they could suggest against the schism of the church of Antioch, which caused such jealousies between the east and the west as seemed to forebode an imminent rupture.[10] But before the fathers of the council entered upon that important subject, Meletius died; and his death, which ought to have put an end to the present disturbances, served only to increase them, and engage the contending parties more warmly in the dispute. It had been agreed by Meletius and Paulinus, that the survivor should be sole bishop of all the orthodox at Antioch.[1] Socrates and Sozomen add,[2] that six presbyters, who it was most likely might be one day raised to that see, bound themselves by a solemn oath not to vote for any other, nor to accept themselves the episcopal dignity, so long as either of the two lived. However, Meletius was no sooner dead, than some of the prelates present at the council moved for choosing him a successor, which occasioned many long and warm debates. Gregory Nazianzen, elected bishop of Constantinople a few days before, exerted all his eloquence to divert the council from a resolution, which, he said, would prove fatal to the church, and kindle a flame, which perhaps it might never be in their power to extinguish.[3] Several other prelates, enemies to strife and contention, falling in with Gregory, spoke to the same purpose, exhorting their colleagues, with great zeal and eloquence, to put an end at last to the unhappy divisions that had so long rent the church, by allowing Paulinus, already striken in years, to govern peaceably the remaining part of his life.[4] But the far greater part were for a new election, offering no other reason to recommend such a step, but that the east, where our Savior had appeared, ought not to yield to the west.[5] So that the resolution of giving a successor to Meletius was taken merely out of pique to the western bishops, who, having the bishop of Rome at their head, had begun to treat their brethren in the east with great haughtiness, and assume an air of authority that did not become them; but that had been better resented on any other occasion than on this.

The resolution being taken, Flavianus, a presbyter of the church of Antioch, was named by the council, and, with the approbation of the emperor, and of all the Meletians at Antioch, ordained in that city. He is commended by the writers who lived in or near those times, as a man of an exemplary life, and extraordinary piety, as a zealous defender of the orthodox faith, and opposer of the Arian heresy, as a mirror of every sacerdotal virtue; and barring the right of Paulinus, the most worthy and deserving person the council could name to succeed the great Meletius.[6] These, and other like encomiums, bestowed upon Flavianus by the writers of those times, leave no room to doubt but Socrates and Sozomen were misinformed in naming him among the six presbyters who took the oath I have mentioned above; the rather as no notice is taken of such an oath by his most inveterate enemies, in the many disputes that arose about his ordination. Gregory Nazianzen, who had been lately preferred to the see of Constantinople, and had accepted that dignity with no other view, but to re-

[1] Bar. ad ann. 281. n. 20.
[2] Id. ib. n. 19.
[3] Lup. notæ in can. 1, 2. p. 74.
[4] Vide Bar. ad ann. 281. n. 37.
[5] Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7.
[6] Theod. l. 5. c. 2. 6, & 7.
[7] Nyss. de Mel. p. 587.
[8] Id. ib. p. 589. & Naz. car. 1. p. 27.
[9] Vide Lup. t. 1. p. 275.
[10] Theod. l. 5. c. 6.

[1] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 76, 77.
[2] Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3.
[3] Naz. car. 1. p. 24—26. [4] Id. ib. [5] Id. ib. p. 27.
[6] Vide Theod. l. 5. c. 9. & Cod. Theod. ap. p. 164.

Gregory Nazianzen resigns the bishopric of Constantinople. Nectarius is chosen in his room. The council of Aquileia writes to Theodosius in favor of Paulinus. And the bishops of Italy in favor of Maximus. Who Maximus was, and how chosen bishop of Constantinople.

move all jealousies, and restore a good understanding between the east and the west, being sensible that the electing of a new bishop in the room of Meletius would widen the breach, and obstruct all possible means of an accommodation, resigned his dignity, and, to the inexpressible grief of his flock, retired both from the council and city.[1] In one of his orations,[2] he ascribes this resolution to the divisions that reigned among the bishops, declaring that he was quite tired with their constant quarreling and bickering among themselves, and comparing them to children at play; whom to join in their childish diversions, would be degrading a serious character. Upon the resignation of Gregory, Nectarius was chosen to succeed him; but, as to the particulars of his election, they are variously related by authors, and foreign to my purpose. He was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, descended of an illustrious and senatorial family, but at the time of his election still a layman, and prætor of Constantinople; nay, he had not been baptized.[3]

The same year that the eastern bishops met at Constantinople, by the command of Theodosius, the western bishops met at Aquileia, by the command of Gratian. While the latter were yet sitting, news was brought of the death of Meletius, and at the same time they received certain intelligence of the resolution which the council of Constantinople had taken of appointing him a successor. Hereupon having despatched the business for which they had met, and condemned Palladius and Secundianus, the only two Arian bishops now in the west, they despatched some presbyters into the east, with a letter to the emperor Theodosius, wherein, after expressing the joy it had given them to hear that the orthodox in those parts were at last happily delivered from the oppression of the Arians, they complained of the hardships Paulinus had met with, whom they had always acknowledged as lawful bishop of Antioch, put the emperor in mind of the agreement between Paulinus and Meletius, and concluded with entreating him to assemble an oecumenical council at Alexandria, as the only means of restoring tranquillity to the church, and settling a perfect harmony amongst her members.[4] Before this letter reached the emperor, the council of Constantinople was concluded, and the bishops returned to their respective sees. However, Theodosius recalled some of them, in order to govern himself by their advice in granting or denying the western bishops their request.[5] But the election of Flavianus being in the mean time known in the west, the bishops of the vicariate of Italy, then assembled in council with Ambrose, bishop of Milan, at their head, wrote a long letter to Theodosius, complaining of that election, openly espousing at the same time the cause of Maximus against Nectarius, the new bishop of Constantinople, and threatening to separate themselves entirely from the communion of the eastern bishops, unless Maximus was acknowledged lawful bishop of that city, or at least an oecumenical council was assembled to examine the claims of the two competitors, and to confirm with their joint suffrages the disputed dignity to him, who had the best.[1] They also desired, in the same letter, to have the contest between Paulinus and Flavianus decided.

Maximus, surnamed the Cynic, because he had from his youth professed the philosophy, and wore the habit of that sect, was a man of a most infamous character, and had been publicly whipped in Egypt, his native country, and confined to the city of Oasis, for crimes not fit to be mentioned.[2] Being released from his banishment, he wandered all over the east, and was every where equally abhorred and detested on account of his matchless impudence and scandalous manners.[3] At last he repaired to Constantinople, where he had not been long, when, by one of the boldest attempts mentioned in history, he caused himself to be installed and ordained bishop of that city: for the doors of the church being broken open in the dead of the night, by a band of Egyptian mariners, he was placed on the episcopal chair in the profane dress of a cynic, by some bishops whom his friends had sent out of Egypt for that purpose. But the people, and some of the clergy, in the adjoining houses, being alarmed at the noise, and crowding to see what occasioned it, Maximus and his unhallowed crew thought fit to withdraw, and complete the ceremony in a place better adapted to such a scene of profaneness, the house of a player on the flute.[4] Maximus, thus ordained, in equal defiance of the imperial laws and canons of the church, had the assurance to claim the see of Constantinople as his right, and to protest against the election of Gregory Nazianzen, and likewise of Nectarius, who was chosen upon the resignation of Gregory, though they had both been named to that dignity by the council of Constantinople, that is, by all the eastern bishops. But no regard being had to his protest, nay, his ordination being declared null by the council, and he driven out of the city by the populace, and rejected with indignation by the emperor, he had recourse to the bishops of the vicariate of Italy, then assembled in council with Ambrose, bishop of Milan, at their head, as I have observed above. These giving an entire credit to the accounts of the lying and deceitful cynic, as

[1] Naz. ep. 15.
[2] Id. or. 32.
[3] Theod. l. 5. c. 8. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Ruff. l. 2. c. 21. Soz. l. 7. c. 8, & 10.
[4] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 75—78. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.
[5] Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.

[1] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 103—107.
[2] Naz. or. 23. & car. 148.
[3] Id. ib.
[4] Id. car. l. p. 14, 15. & or. 28.

He is acknowledged by Ambrose, and the Italian bishops. The emperor's answer to their letter. A council of all the western bishops assembled at Rome. The misunderstanding between the east and the west increased.

they were quite unacquainted with what had passed in the east, not only admitted him to their communion, but, without farther inquiry or examination, acknowledged him for lawful bishop of Constantinople, and wrote the above mentioned letter to Theodosius in his behalf.[1] We must not confound this council with that of Aquileia, as I find most writers have done: for the latter was composed of almost all the western bishops under Valerian bishop of that place; whereas the council I am now speaking of, consisted only of the bishops of the vicariate of Italy, under the bishop of Milan, their metropolitan. It is surprising that Ambrose, and the other bishops of that council, should not have been better informed with respect to the ordination of Maximus, since Acholius bishop of Thessalonica, with five other bishops of Macedon, had, at least a year before, transmitted to Damasus a minute account of it, agreeing in every particular with that which I have given above from Gregory Nazianzen.[2] The letter from the council caused no small surprise in Theodosius: he was sensible they had suffered themselves to be grossly imposed upon; but, not judging it necessary to undeceive them, he only told them, in his answer to their letter, that the reasons they alleged did not seem sufficient to him for assembling an oecumenical council, and giving so much trouble to the prelates of the church; that they were not to concern themselves with what happened in the east, nor remove the bounds, that had been wisely placed by their forefathers between the east and the west; and that, as to the affair of Maximus, by espousing his cause they had betrayed either an unwarrantable animosity against the orientals, or an inexcusable credulity in giving credit to false and groundless reports.[3]

Upon the receipt of this letter, the Italian bishops, finding Theodosius no ways disposed to assemble an oecumenical council, applied to Gratian, who not only granted them leave to meet at Rome, the place they chose, but despatched letters to all the bishops both in the east and west, giving them notice of the time and place, in which the council was to be held, and inviting them to it.[4] But of all the eastern bishops, two only complied with this invitation; namely, Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in the island of Cyprus, and Paulinus, whom all the west acknowledged for lawful bishop of Antioch. The western bishops were all present, either in person, or by their deputies; and Damasus presided.[5] But, as to the transactions of this great assembly, we are almost entirely in the dark; for all we know of them is, that they unanimously agreed not to communicate with Flavianus, the new bishop of Antioch, nor with Diodorus of Tarsus, or Acacius of Beræa, who had been chiefly instrumental in his promotion; that they condemned the heresy of Apollinaris; and that, at the request of Damasus, a confession of faith was drawn up by Jerom, and approved by the council, which the Apollinarists were to sign, upon their being readmitted to the communion of the church.[1] As for Maximus, they seemed to have abandoned his cause, being, in all likelihood undeceived, with respect to his ordination, by Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, and St. Jerom, who assisted at the council, and could not be strangers to the character of Maximus, nor unacquainted with the scandalous methods by which he had attained the episcopal dignity.

The resolution they took not to communicate with Flavianus, whose election, though imprudently made, was undoubtedly canonical, and had been approved and confirmed by the oecumenical council of Constantinople, not only increased the jealousies and misunderstanding between the east and west, but occasioned a great disagreement, and endless quarrels, among the eastern bishops themselves. For those who acknowledged Paulinus, namely, the bishops of Egypt, of the island of Cyprus, of Arabia, insisted upon the deposition of Flavianus.[2] Nestorius mentions some letters, written by the bishops of Egypt against Flavianus, with great virulency, and a "tyrannical spirit," to use his expression.[3] On the other hand, the bishops of Syria, of Palæstine, of Phœnicia, Armenia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, not only maintained, with equal warmth, the election of Flavianus, but began to treat their brethren in the east, who had joined the western bishops against them, as schismatics, as betrayers of their trust, as transgressors of the canons of Nice, commanding the elections and ordinations of each province to be made and performed by the bishops of the same province, and all disputes concerning them to be finally decided in the place where they had begun.[4] This schism occasioned great confusion in the church, which continued till the year 398, when Chrysostom, after having, with indefatigable pains, long labored in vain to bring about an accommodation between the east and the west, had at last, soon after his promotion to the see of Constantinople, the satisfaction of seeing his pious endeavors crowned with success, as I shall relate in a more proper place.

From this whole account it is manifest, as the reader must have observed, that the ori-

[1] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104—107.
[2] Vide Holsten. coll. vet. Rom. eccles. monument. p. 37—40.
[3] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99—101.
[4] Hier. ep. 27. Theod. l. 5. c. 9.
[5] Hier. ep. 16. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. Ambr. ep. 22.

[1] Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Holst. coll. t. 2. p. 37. Ruf. de orig. lib. adulter. p. 197.
[2] Theodor. l. 5. c. 23. Socr. l. 5. c. 10.
[3] Mercat. opera, t. 2. p. 86. n. 5.
[4] Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Theodor. l. 5. c. 23.

No regard paid by the eastern bishops to the judgment of the pope. The custom of appointing vicars introduced by Damasus, and on what occasion. The institution of vicars improved by the succeeding popes. Legates vested with greater power than vicars.

entals paid no manner of regard either to the judgment of the bishop of Rome, or to that of the whole body of the western bishops, assembled in council under him. For though they well knew the bishop of Rome, and his colleagues in the west to be warmly engaged in favor of Paulinus, yet they refused to acknowledge him, even after the death of Meletius; and therefore raised Flavianus to the see of Antioch, in the room of Meletius; and confirmed that election in an oecumenical council. The western bishops exclaimed against it, desiring it might be referred to the decision of a general council. But not even to that demand would the orientals agree, thinking, as they declared in their answer, that there was no occasion for a council, since Flavianus had been chosen and ordained by the bishops of the diocess, which was all the canons of Nice required. They therefore exhorted them to divest themselves of all prejudices, to sacrifice all private affections to the peace and unity of the church, and to put an end to the present, and prevent all future disputes, by approving, with their joint suffrages, an election which had been approved and confirmed by an oecumenical council.[1]

To return to Damasus: he was the first who introduced the custom, which his successors took care to improve, of conferring on certain bishops the title of their vicars, pretending thereby to impart to them an extraordinary power, enabling them to perform several things, which they could not perform in virtue of their own. Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, was the first who enjoyed this title, being, by Damasus, appointed his vicar in East Illyricum, on the following occasion: Illyricum, comprising all ancient Greece, and many provinces on the Danube, whereof Sirmium was the capital, had, ever since the time of Constantine, belonged to the western empire. But, in the year 379, Dacia and Greece were, by Gratian, disjoined from the more westerly provinces, and added, in favor of Theodosius, to the eastern empire, being known by the name of East Illyricum, whereof Thessalonica, the metropolis of Macedon, was the chief city. The bishops of Rome, as presiding in the metropolis of the empire, had begun to claim a kind of jurisdiction, or rather inspection in ecclesiastical matters, over all the provinces of the western empire; which was the first great step by which they ascended to the supremacy they afterwards claimed and established. This Damasus was unwilling to resign with respect to Illyricum, even after that country was dismembered from the western, and added to the eastern empire. In order therefore to maintain his claim, he apppointed Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, to act in his stead, vesting in him the power which he pretended to have over those provinces. Upon the death of Acholius he conferred the same dignity on his successor, Anysius, as did the following popes on the succeeding bishops of Thessalonica, who, by thus supporting the pretensions of Rome, became the first bishops, and, in a manner, the patriarchs, of East Illyricum; for they are sometimes distinguished with that title. This, however, was not done without opposition, the other metropolitans not readily acknowledging for their superior one who, till that time, had been their equal.[1] Syricius, who succeeded Damasus, enlarging the power claimed by his predecessor, decreed, that no bishop should be ordained in East Illyricum without the consent and approbation of the bishop of Thessalonica.[2] But it was some time before this decree took place. Pope Innocent I. writes, that his predecessors committed to the care of Acholius, Achaia, Thessaly, the two Epiruses, Candia, the two Dacias, Mœsia, Dardania, and Prævalitana, now part of Albania, empowering him to judge and decide the controversies that might arise there, and appointing him to be "the first among the primates, without prejudicing the primacy of those churches."[3] Thus were the bishops of Thessalonica first appointed vicars or vicegerents of the bishops of Rome, probably in the year 382, for in that year Acholius assisted at the council of Rome, and it was, in all likelihood, on that occasion that Damasus vested him with this new dignity. The contrivance of Damasus was notably improved by his successors, who, in order to extend and enlarge their authority, conferred the title of their vicars, and the pretended power annexed to it, on the most eminent prelates of other provinces and kingdoms, engaging them thereby to depend upon them, and to promote the authority of their see, to the utter suppression of the ancient rights and liberties both of bishops and synods. This dignity was for the most part annexed to certain secs, but sometimes conferred on particular persons. Thus was Austin appointed the pope's vicar in England, Boniface in Germany; and both, in virtue of the power which they pretended to have been imparted to them with that title, usurped and exercised an authority above that of metropolitans. The institution of vicars was, by the succeeding popes, improved into that of legates, or, to use De Marca's expression, the latter institution was grafted on the former.[4] The legates were vested with a far greater power than the vicars, or, as pope Leo expresses it, "were admitted to a far greater share of his care, though not to the plenitude of his power."[5] They were sent on proper occasions into all countries, and never failed exerting, to the utmost stretch, their boasted power, oppressing, in virtue of their paramount authority, the clergy

[1] Theodor. l. 5. c. 8.

[1] Vide Christ. Lup. de Rom. Apell. p. 627, 628.
[2] Coll. Rom. Holsten. p. 43. [3] Ibid. p. 48, 49.
[4] De Marc. concord. sacerd. & imp. l. 6. c. 5.
[5] Leo. ep. 48.

The sending legates no proof of the pope's universal jurisdiction. The disingenuity of Bellarmine. Damasus dies. The decrees ascribed to him suppositious. His writings in prose and verse.

as well as the people, and extorting from both large sums, to support the pomp and luxury in which they lived.

The custom of appointing vicars and legates may well be alleged as a remarkable instance of the craft and policy of the popes, since, of all the methods they ever devised (and many they have devised) to extend and establish their power, none has better answered their ambitious views. But how Bellarmine could lay so much stress upon it as he does,[1] to prove, that the pope has, by divine right, a sovereign authority and jurisdiction over all the churches of the earth, is inconceivable. For it is certain, beyond all dispute, that such a custom had never been heard of till the time of Damasus, that is, till the latter end of the fourth century, when it was first introduced, upon the dismembering of East Illyricum, by Gratian, from the western empire. Damasus did not even then claim that sovereign and unlimited power, with which Bellarmine is pleased to vest him, but only a kind of inspection over the provinces of the western empire, as bishop of the first see. And here I cannot help observing the disingenuity of Bellarmine, who, in speaking of this institution, expresses himself thus: "Leo appointed Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica, his vicar in the east, in the same manner as the predecessors of Anastasius had been vicars to the predecessors of Leo."[2] From these words every reader would naturally conclude, and Bellarmine designs they should, that the bishops of Thessalonica had been the pope's vicars from the beginning, or time out of mind; whereas it is certain, that this institution had taken place but a few years before. Pope Leo I. in conferring on Anastasius the vicariate dignity of his see, as he styles it, declared, that he followed therein the example of his predecessor, Syricius,[3] who first appointed Anysius to act in his stead. But he was doubly mistaken; for these vicars were first instituted, as is notorious, by Damasus, and not by Syricius; and it was not by Syricius, but by Damasus, that Anysius was vested with that dignity.[4] The bishop of Thessalonica is styled, by the ancient writers, the pope's vicar in East Illyricum, which is manifestly confining his vicariate jurisdiction to that district; but Bellarmine extends it at once all over the east, by distinguishing him with the title of the pope's vicar for the east.[5] But how little regard was paid to the pope's authority in the east, I have sufficiently shown above.

I find nothing else in the ancient writers concerning Damasus worthy of notice, besides his generously undertaking the defence of Symmachus, who, being prefect of Rome in 384, the last year of Damasus' life, and a sworn enemy to the Christians, was falsely accused to the emperor, as if he had with great cruelty persecuted and oppressed them. But Damasus had the generosity to take his part, and clear him, by a letter he wrote to the emperor, from that charge.[1] This was one of the last acts of Damasus' life; for he died this year, on the 10th or 11th of December, being then in the eightieth year of his age, after he had governed the church of Rome for the space of eighteen years and about two months.[2] He was buried, according to Anastasius,[3] near his mother and sister, in a church which he had built at the catacombs, on the way to Ardea; whence that place, though part of the cemetery of Calixtus, is by some called the cemetery of Damasus.[4] He proposed at first being buried near the remains of St. Sixtus, and his companions; but afterwards changed his mind, lest he should disturb the ashes of the saints.[5] He caused the church of St. Laurence, near the theatre of Pompey, probably that which his father and he himself had formerly served, to be rebuilt, enlarged and embellished; whence it is still known by the joint titles of St. Laurence and Damasus.[6] In that church his body is worshipped to this day. But, how or when it was removed thither, nobody knows.[7] Several decrees are ascribed to Damasus by Gratian, Ivo of Chartres, Anastasius, and others, but all evidently forged by some impostor blindly addicted to the see of Rome, and quite unacquainted with the discipline of the church in the fourth century. In one of them a canon is quoted from the council of Nice, forbidding the laity to eat or drink of any thing that was offered to the holy priests, because none but the Jewish priests were allowed to eat of the bread that was offered on the altar. We know of no such canon; and besides, it is not at all probable, that the council of Nice would have restrained the clergy from sharing, at least with the poor, what was offered them. In another of these decrees the paying of tithes is commanded, on pain of excommunication; whereas, it might be easily made appear, that, in the fourth century, the offerings destined for the maintenance of the clergy were still voluntary. Another decree supposes, that, by an ancient custom, all metropolitans swore fealty to the apostolic see, and could ordain no bishops till they had received the pall from Rome. For the sake of this, Baronius admits all the rest: but of such a custom not the least mention, or distant hint, is to be met with in any ancient writer.

Damasus is ranked by Jerom[8] among the ecclesiastical writers, on account of the many small pieces he wrote, chiefly in verse; for he had a particular genius for poetry, and was

[1] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 20. [2] Id. ib.
[3] Coll. Rom. Holsten. p. 145. [4] Ibid. p. 46—49.
[5] Bell. ib.

[1] Sym. l. 10. ep. 34. [2] Hier. vir. ill. c. 103.
[3] Anast. c. 38. [4] Aring. l. 3. c. 12. n. 16.
[5] Vide Bar. in app. ann. 384. n. 25.
[6] Front. cal. p. 50. Bar. ad. ann. 384. n. 16.
[7] Aring. l. 3. c. 12. [8] Hier. vir. ill. c. 103.

no despicable poet, if some compositions ascribed to him were truly his. He wrote several books, both in prose and verse, in commendation of virginity; but neither that, nor any of his other works, has reached our times, besides some letters, and a few epitaphs, inscriptions, and epigrams, which have been carefully collected by Baronius,[1] though it may be justly questioned whether the several pieces ascribed to him by that writer were written by him. A short history of the first popes, styled the Pontifical of Damasus, and published together with the councils, has long passed for the work of Damasus; but now even Baronius owns it not to be his; and most critics are of opinion, that it was written after the time of Gregory the Great; nay, some ascribe it to Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who flourished in the ninth century.[2] As for his letters, those to Aurelius of Carthage, to Stephen, styled archbishop of the council of Mauritania, to Prosper, primate of Numidia, to the bishops of Italy, are all spurious, as well as the letters to which some of them are answers, and supposed to have been forged by that notorious impostor Isidorus Mercator.[3] His genuine letters are, the two that are to be found among the works of Jerom, to whom they were written; two to Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, published by Holstenius in his collection of the ancient monuments of the church of Rome;[4] a letter of great length to Paulinus of Antioch, whereof the chief heads are set down by Theodoret, in his history, as are likewise those of his letter to the Orientals concerning Timotheus, the favorite disciple of Apollinaris. Several letters from the councils, that were held in Rome in his time, and at which he presided, are still extant, and may well be ascribed to him. The two letters to Jerom are well worth perusing, being written in a pure, easy, and elegant style, and with a great deal of spirit, vivacity, and even gaiety, though Damasus was then much advanced in years, and overburdened with cares and business.[5] In one of them he declares, that his only delight was to read the scriptures; and that all other books, however well written, gave him rather disgust than pleasure. Jerom returned to Rome from the east in 382, with Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, and Paulinus, of Antioch, to assist at the council held there. The other two returned to their sees; but Jerom continued at Rome, being kept there by Damasus, who employed him in answering the letters he received from the councils of several churches applying to him for his advice.[6] Damasus, taken with his learning and erudition, and chiefly with the knowledge he had of the scripture, had long before lived in great intimacy with him, and upon his leaving Rome wrote frequent letters to him, not thinking it beneath the rank he held in the church to consult him as his master about the true meaning of some difficult passages in holy writ.[1] Thus in one of his letters he desires him to explain the parable of the prodigal son,[2] and in another to interpret the word hosanna, which he says was differently interpreted by different writers, who seemed to contradict each other.[3] In compliance with this request, Jerom wrote the piece on that subject, which is still extant. It was likewise at the desire of Damasus that he corrected the Latin version of the New Testament, and revised at Rome the Latin version of the Psalms, comparing it with the Greek text of the Septuagint. But as to the letter, with which Damasus is supposed to have encouraged him to undertake that work, it is evidently supposititious, and altogether unworthy of him.

Anastasius ascribes to Damasus the custom of singing, instead of reading, the psalms at Divine service.[4] But it is manifest from Austin, that this practice was brought from the east, and first complied with by the church of Milan,[5] in the year 386, that is, two years after the death of Damasus. So long as Damasus lived, Jerom continued at Rome; but as, by his learning and exemplary life, he was an eye-sore to the lewd, ignorant, and haughty clergy of Rome, or as he styles them, "the senate of pharisees,"[6] he thought it advisable to abandon the city upon the death of his great friend and protector, and retire to Jerusalem, hoping to find there that quiet and tranquillity which he despaired of being able to enjoy while he dwelt with "the scarlet whore,"[7] that is, while he lived at Rome. As for the character of Damasus; Jerom styles him, "a virgin doctor of the virgin church;" and, in his letter to Eustochium, "a man of great excellence." Theodoret commends him as a man of a holy life, as one who declined no fatigue or labor to support and maintain the doctrine of the apostles, and who struck the Arians with terror, though he attacked them at a distance.[8] Elsewhere he calls him the famous Damasus,[9] and places him at the head of the most celebrated teachers of truth, who, till his time, had appeared in the west.[10] That Greek writer could not be biassed in his favor, though Jerom perhaps was. The orientals declared, in 431, that they followed the example of Damasus, and other persons eminent for learning;[11] and the council of Chalcedon, speaking of his letter to Paulinus of Antioch, styles him the honor and glory of Rome for piety and justice.[12] The church of Rome honors him as a saint, and his festival is kept in some places on the 10th, in others on

1 Bar. ad ann. 384. n. 21. 2 Bolland. propyl. p. 59.
3 Id. ib. & Du Pin. Biblioth. p. 459.
4 Holsten. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 37, & 180.
5 Hier. ep. 124, & 144.
6 Id. ep. 11. Ruff. de Orig. p. 197.

1 Hier. ep. 141. 2 Id. ep. 146. 3 Id. ep. 144.
4 Anast. c. 38. 5 Aug. confess. l. 9. c. 7.
6 Hier. in præf. version. Did. de Spir. Sanct.
7 Id. ib. 8 Theod. l. 5. c. 2. & l. 4. c. 27.
9 Id. ep. 144. 10 Id. ep. 145.
11 Concil. t. 3. p. 740. 12 Concil. t. 4. p. 82.

the 11th of December. But, after all, that he got the pontificate by the most horrible violence and bloodshed; that he lived in great state; that he had frequent and grand entertainments; that he kept a table, which, in sumptuousness, vied with the tables of the emperors themselves; and all this at the expense of the Roman ladies, whose generous contributions might have been applied to better uses; is affirmed by contemporary and unexceptionable writers. It is likewise manifest from the letters of Jerom, that in his time the discipline of the church was greatly relaxed; that the observance of the primitive canons was almost utterly neglected; and that luxury, ignorance, and debauchery, universally prevailed among the ecclesiastics at Rome. And this charge against his clergy in some degree recoils upon him, since he appears to have carried the papal authority farther than any of his predecessors, and therefore might have restrained and corrected them. Whether his sanctity may not from all this be justly questioned, notwithstanding the favorable testimony of some ancient writers, I leave the reader to judge.

SYRICIUS, THIRTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[VALENTINIAN, THEODOSIUS, ARCADIUS, HONORIUS.]

[Year of Christ 384.] SYRICIUS, the successor of Damasus, according to the pontificals, and some ancient monuments quoted and received by Baronius,[1] was a native of Rome, the son of one Tiburtius, had been first reader, and afterwards deacon, under Liberius, and, upon his death, had zealously espoused the cause of Damasus against Ursinus and his party. Damasus being dead, he was chosen in his room by the unanimous acclamations of the whole Roman people, being at that time presbyter of the church known by the title of the Pastor, perhaps the most ancient church in Rome.[2] Ursinus, who was still alive, did not fail, upon the vacancy of the see, to revive his former claim; but he was rejected with scorn and indignation. Valentinian the younger, who then reigned in Italy under the direction of his mother Justina, received the news of this election with great joy; and, concluding from the unanimity of the electors, the worth and merit of the person elected, confirmed Syricius in his new dignity, by a rescript dated the 23d of February, and directed to Pinianus, at that time either prefect or vicar of Rome.[3] *

The first thing I read of Syricius is his answering a letter or relation which Himerius, bishop of Tarragon in Spain, had sent to Damasus by Bassianus, a presbyter of that church, requiring the advice of the church of Rome concerning some points of discipline, and certain abuses that prevailed in Spain. Damasus being dead before the arrival of Bassianus, Syricius, who had succeeded him, caused this relation or letter to be read, and carefully examined, in an assembly of his brethren, that is, perhaps, of the bishops who had assisted at his ordination; and, having maturely weighed and considered every article, he first acquainted Himerius with his promotion, and then returned to each the following answers.[1] The first was concerning the sacrament of baptism, which was by some bishops of Spain rejected as null and invalid, when conferred by an Arian minister. In opposition to them, Syricius alleges the authority of Liberius, and of the council of Nice, the practice of the church of Rome, and that of all other churches both in the east and west.[2] Isidorus of Seville takes particular notice of this point of discipline, which he says was established by the letter of Syricius.[3] By the second article he forbids the sacrament of baptism to be administered at Christmas, or the Epiphany, on the feasts of the apostle or martyrs, or at any other time but Easter, and during the Penticost of that festival, meaning, in all likelihood, at Easter time, or the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, or Whitsuntide; for such, adds he, is the practice of the church of Rome, and of all other churches. From this rule, however, he excepts children, and all persons, who are any ways in danger.[4] By the third article, he forbids granting the grace of reconciliation to apostates, that is, forgiving and readmitting them to the communion of the church, except at the point of death.[5] By the fourth, a woman, who, being betrothed to one man, has received the priest's blessing to marry him, is debarred from marrying another. The fifth article commands all persons, who, being guilty of a crime, have performed penance for it, to be treated as the apostates, if they relapse into the same crime; and the sixth, all religious persons,

[1] Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. Anast. 6. 29. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. [2] Vide Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. [3] Id. ib. n. 6.
* Damasus died on the 10th or 11th of December 384, as I have related before; and Syricius was chosen the same year, as we read in the Chronicle of Prosper. Anastasius therefore, and the author of the Pontifical published by Bollandus, as well as Baronius, were certainly mistaken in affirming, upon what grounds I know not, that, upon the death of Damasus, the see remained vacant for the space of 31 or 36 days. (a)
(a) Anast. p. 21. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. Bar. ib. n. 5.

[1] Concil. t. 1. p. 69. 689—691. [2] Ib. p. 689.
[3] Isid. ser. c. 3. [4] Con. ib. [5] Ib. p. 690.

Priests and deacons obliged to observe celibacy. The celibacy of the clergy first proposed in the council of Elvira.

whether men or women, guilty of fornication, to be dealt with in the same manner, and, moreover, to be excluded from partaking of the sacred mysteries, that is, of the eucharist, except at the point of death.[1] How different is the present practice of the church of Rome from that of the same church in the fourth century! which was perhaps even too severe.

Syricius, by the seventh article of his letter, obliges all priests and deacons to observe celibacy: and as some had not paid due obedience to that command of the church, he allows those who should acknowledge their fault, and plead ignorance, to continue in their rank, though without hopes of rising: but as for those who should presume to defend this abuse as lawful, he declares them deposed and degraded from the rank they held in the church:[2] Pope Innocent I. writing to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, quotes and transcribes great part of this article.[3] The eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh articles describe at length the life which those ought to have led, who are raised by the clergy and people to the episcopal dignity, and the steps or degrees by which they should ascend to it. They ought first to have been readers; at the age of thirty, acolytes, subdeacons, and deacons; five years after, presbyters; and in that degree they were to continue ten years before they could be chosen bishops. Those who had been married to two wives, or to a widow, are absolutely excluded from ever sitting in the episcopal see. Even the lectors are forbidden, on pain of deposition, to marry twice, or to marry a widow.[4] These, and several other less important regulations, Syricius delivers as general rules to be inviolably observed by all churches, often declaring, that those who do not readily comply with them shall be separated from his communion by the sentence of a synod, and strictly enjoining the chief prelates of each province to take care they be punctually observed within the bounds of their respective jurisdictions, on pain of being deposed, and treated as they deserve. He therefore desires Himerius to notify his letter, not only to all the bishops of his diocess or province, but likewise to those of Carthagena, Bœtica, Lusitania, Galicia, and to all the neighbouring bishops, meaning perhaps those of Gaul; for Innocent I. supposes the decrees of his predecessor Syricius to be known to Exuperius of Toulouse;[5] and in all likelihood they were so to others in that country.

This letter is the first of all the decretals acknowledged, by the learned, to be genuine, and likewise the first in all the ancient collections of the canons of the Latin church. It is quoted by Innocent I. and Isidore of Seville, and is the only letter of the many ascribed to Syricius, that Dionysius Exiguus has inserted in his collection. It is to be found in Father Quesnel's Roman code;[1] and Cresconius quotes no other decrees of Syricius but what are taken from this letter. It is dated the third of the ides of February, that is, the eleventh of that month, 385. Arcadius and Bauto being consuls.*

As priests and deacons are commanded, by the seventh article of this letter, to abstain from marriage, and this is the first opportunity that has offered of mentioning the celibacy of the clergy, a short digression on such a material point of discipline in the church may not, perhaps, be unacceptable to the reader. The laying of this heavy burden on the shoulders of the clergy, a burden too heavy for most of them to bear, as experience has shown, was first moved in the council of Elvira, held about the year 300, according to the most probable opinion; and, being warmly promoted by the celebrated Osius of Cordoua, and Felix of Acci, now Guadix in Andalusia, who presided at that assembly, it passed into a law; and all bishops, presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, were commanded on pain of deposition, "to abstain from wives, and the begetting of children." These are the very words of the 33d canon of that council.[2] That, till this time, the clergy were allowed to marry, even in Spain, is manifest from the 65th canon of the same council, excluding from the communion of the church, even at the point of death, such ecclesiastics, as, knowing their wives to be guilty of adultery, should not, upon the first notice of their crime, immediately turn them out of doors.[3] How long the 33d canon continued in vigor, is uncertain; nay, it may be questioned whether it ever took place: if ever it did, it was out of date, or at least not generally observed by the Spanish clergy, in the time of Syricius, as evidently appears from the words of his letter, or answer to Himerius of Tarragon: I said, by the Spanish clergy; for no such injunction had yet been laid on the ecclesiastics of any other country or nation. About

[1] Con. ib. p. 160.
[2] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.
[3] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.
[4] Ib. p. 689, 690.
[5] Ib. & p. 691.

[1] Cod. Rom. a Ques. cum Leone edit. c. 29.

* The Jesuit Papebrok highly extols this letter, (*a*) but, at the same time, does not think it quite pure and genuine, because the date, says he, has been added to it; for the other letters of Syricius, and likewise those of his predecessors, bear no date. But can we conclude from thence, that they never had any? Some of the letters of Innocent I. are dated, and some without a date, and he admits both. The transcribers contented themselves, for the most part, with copying the body of the letter, and neglected the rest. Papebrok adds, that the date ought to have been expressed thus: "Arcadio Aug. et Bautone viro clar. Conss.," and not "Arcadio et Bautone viris clarissimis," as it is in that letter. But might not this mistake be owing to the ignorance of the transcribers, who, finding, in the original, only the two letters, V. C. which are to be met with in many ancient writings, set down "viris clarissimis," instead of "viro clarissimo?" Papebrok must have observed the same mistake in the letter, which Pope Innocent I. wrote to the council of Milevum, (*b*) and which he allows to be altogether genuine. For slips or oversights of this nature, hardly avoidable, no piece ought to be condemned, or even suspected.

(*a*) Bolland. prop. p. 56. (*b*) Concil. t. 2. p. 1289.

[2] Conc. t. 1. p. 1210.
[3] Ib. p. 1329.

The present practice of the church of Rome, with respect to this point.

fifteen years after, was held the council of Ancyra, in which it was decreed, that "if any deacon did not declare at his ordination, that he designed to marry, he ought not to be allowed to marry after; but might, if he made such a declaration, because, in that case, the bishop tacitly consented to it." The council of Neocæsarea, which assembled soon after that of Ancyra, and consisted, in great part, of the same bishops, commanded "such presbyters as married after their ordination to be degraded." In the year 325, was held the council of Nice; and, in that great assembly, it was moved, perhaps by Osius, who acted a chief part there, that bishops, presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, should be debarred from all commerce with the wives they had married before their ordination. But this motion was warmly opposed by Paphnutius, who had himself ever led a chaste and single life, and was one of the most eminent and illustrious prelates, at that time, in the church. He represented, that the burden they proposed laying on the clergy, was too heavy; that few had sufficient strength to bear it; that the women, thus abandoned by their husbands, would be exposed to great dangers; that marriage was no pollution, but, according to St. Paul, commendable; that those, therefore, who were not married, when first admitted to the sacerdotal functions, should continue in that state; and such as were, should continue to live with their wives. Thus Sozomen,[1] Socrates,[2] and Suidas.[3](*)

The advice of Paphnutius was applauded by the whole assembly, and the above-mentioned historians, and the point in dispute was left undecided. In the year 340, it was decreed, in the council of Arles, that no man, encumbered with a wife, should be admitted to holy orders, unless he promised, with his wife's approbation and consent, to abstain for ever from the conjugal duty.

This is all I can find in the ancient records concerning the continence or celibacy of the clergy, before the time of Syricius. And hence it is manifest, that both Crichtonæus and Melancthon were greatly mistaken; the former in affirming, which many have done after him, that celibacy was first imposed upon the clergy by Syricius;[1] and the latter by confidently asserting, that celibacy was not required of the ministers of the gospel by any council, but by the popes, in opposition to all councils and synods.[2] It must be owned, however, that this law was not so generally observed before the time of Syricius, as it was after. For it was not long after his time before it became an established point of discipline in most of the western churches, not in virtue of his letter, or of those which his successor wrote to the same purpose, but because it was enjoined by the synods of each particular nation. Thus it was established in Africa by the council of Carthage in 390, in Gaul by one held at Orleans, by two at Tours, and one at Agde; in Spain, by three held at Toledo; in Germany, by the councils of Aquisgranum, or Aix la Chapelle, of Worms, and of Mentz. We know of none in Britain: and that it did not even begin to take place here till the arrival of Austin, in the sixth century, may be sufficiently proved from the letters of that monk to Gregory, and Gregory's answer to him; but of that more hereafter. (*)

As to the present practice and doctrine of the church of Rome, with respect to this, in their opinion, most essential point of ecclesiastical discipline, no man is allowed, after his ordination, to marry, or to cohabit with the wife he had married before: nay, in order to prevent all possible means even of any clandestine commerce between them, the woman must, by a solemn vow of chastity, renounce all claims on her husband, and retiring into a monastery, bind herself by a second vow to continue there, without ever once going out, on any pretence whatsoever, so long as her husband lives, who cannot be admitted so much as to the rank of a subdeacon, till she is secured by these two vows.* Such is the present practice of the church of Rome,

[1] Soz. l. 1. c. 23. [2] Socr. l. 1. c. 11.
[3] Suid. in vit. Paph.

(*) I am not unapprised, that this account is rejected by Baronius, (a) and Bellarmine, (b) as fabulous; but, notwithstanding the pains they have both taken to make it appear incredible, F. Lupus allows it to be true, (c) though a no less zealous stickler for the discipline of the church of Rome than either of them. Ruffinus, I own, takes no notice of this transaction, as Valesius well observes. But has no true transaction been, either wilfully or ignorantly, omitted by that writer? Valesius well knows, that many have; and had he perused that author with a little more attention, he would not have so positively affirmed, that no one ever named Paphnutius among the bishops of Egypt, who assisted at the Council of Nice, since he is named among them by Ruffinus, and with great commendations. (d)

(a) Bar. ad ann. 58. n. 21.
(b) Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20. (c) Lup. in can. p. 114.
(d) Ruf. l. 1. c. 4.

[1] Cricht. de contin. sacerd. [2] Melanc. in Apol. c. 4. p. 13.

(*) I cannot forbear taking notice here of an inexcusable mistake in the ecclesiastical history of England, by Nicolas Harpsfield, archdeacon of Canterbury, a work in great request abroad. That writer tells us, that Restitutus, bishop of London, assisted at the council of Arles, and signed the above-mentioned canon, forbidding a man encumbered with a wife to be admitted to orders, unless he promised, with her consent, to refrain from all commerce with her after his ordination. He leaves us to infer from thence, that this canon was received in Britain. (a) But surely Harpsfield must never have seen either the subscriptions, or the acts of that council. Had he seen the subscriptions, he had hardly omitted two British bishops out of three. For, besides the name of Restitutus, I find among the subscriptions, the names of Adelphus de colonia Londinensium, that is, as is commonly believed of Colchester, and of Hibernus of Eboracum, or York. Had he seen the acts, he had never been guilty of such a gross mistake as to ascribe the above mentioned canon to the council of Arles, at which Restitutus assisted; since that council was held against the Donatists of Africa, in the year 314, and not the least mention was made there of the celibacy of the clergy. (b) The second council of Arles was held about twenty-six years after, and of that council the said canon is the second.

(a) Harp. Hist. Eccles. (b) Concil. t. 1. p. 1426—1429. Anglican. p. 26.

In the primitive church, married and unmarried men raised indiscriminately to ecclesiastical dignities. Celibacy recommended by the fathers: never enjoined by the apostles.

though subdeacons were allowed to marry long after the time of Syricius, who, in his letter, mentions only deacons and presbyters, and does not even oblige them to part with their wives, but only excludes them from rising to a higher degree in the church. Pope Leo the Great, chosen in 440, was the first who extended the law of celibacy to the subdeacons, commanding them, in a letter, which he wrote about the year 442, to Rusticus bishop of Narbonne, to abstain, as well as the deacons, presbyters, and bishops, from all commerce with their wives. But this law was observed by very few churches. In the time of pope Gregory the Great, that is in the latter end of the sixth century, it had not yet taken place, even in Sicily, though reckoned among the suburbicarian provinces: it was first introduced into that island by him; but he allowed those to cohabit with their wives, who had been ordained without a previous promise to live continent, though he would not suffer them to be raised to a higher degree without such a promise. Bellarmine,[1] and the other divines of the church of Rome, to soften the odium, which the hard, and commonly impracticable command she lays on her clergy, must reflect on her, represent continency as a virtue to be easily acquired. Their ascetics seem better acquinted with the difficulties and struggles attending the practice of that virtue, than their divines; for they prescribe, as the sole means of attaining it, constant prayer, frequent fasting, macerating the rebelling flesh with all kinds of austerities, and principally the avoiding of all female company. And, if these be the sole means of attaining it, I leave the reader to judge how few of their clergy do attain it.

No one is so little versed in the history of the church, as not to know, that in the first three centuries of the Christian religion, married and unmarried men were indiscriminately raised to the episcopal, and every other ecclesiastical dignity; nay, Jerom writes, that in his time, that is, in the fourth century, the former were, for the most part, preferred to the latter, not in regard of their greater merit, but because, in such elections, the unmarried men were outnumbered by the married, who chose to be governed by one in their own station of life.[2] It is hence manifest, that marriage was not thought, in Jerom's time, inconsistent with, or any bar to, the episcopal dignity. And why should it? since, excepting St. John, the apostles themselves were all married, as we are told, in express terms, by Ignatius the Martyr,[3] who was their cotemporary and disciple, and whose authority ought, on that consideration, to be of greater weight than that of all the other fathers together. "But such of the primitive clergy," says Bellarmine,[1] "as were married before their ordination, abstained ever after from the use of matrimony: let our adversaries produce, if they can, but a single evidence of a presbyter or bishop's having any commerce with their wives." It lies upon him to show they had not. We know nothing to the contrary, and therefore may well suppose, that pursuant to the advice given by the apostle to all husbands and wives, "they came together," after ordination as they did before, "lest Satan should tempt them for their incontinency."

The fathers, it is true, out of a mistaken notion of an extraordinary merit attending celibacy in this life, and an extraordinary reward reserved for it in the other, began very early to recommend it to persons of all ranks and stations, but more especially to the clergy, as the principal excellence and perfection of a Christian. By their exhortations, and the praises they were constantly bestowing on virginity, celibacy, and continence, many among the clergy, and even some of the laity, were wrought up to such a pitch of enthusiasm, as to mutilate themselves, thinking they could by no other means be sufficiently qualified for the unnatural, but meritorious, state of celibacy. And, what is very surprising, this practice became so common in the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth century, that the fathers of Nice were obliged to restrain it by a particular canon. They enacted one accordingly, excluding for ever from the priesthood, such "as should make themselves eunuchs, the preservation of their life or health not requiring such a mutilation." By the same canon they deposed and degraded all, who should thus maim themselves after their ordination.[2] But though the fathers warmly recommended celibacy to the unmarried clergy, and continence to the married, neither was looked upon us an obligation, till late in the fourth century, and not even then in all places; for Epiphanius, who lived till the beginning of the fifth, writes, that though "men still begetting children" were excluded by the ecclesiastical canons from every dignity and degree in the church, yet they were in some places admitted as subdeacons, deacons, and presbyters, because those canons were not yet universally observed;[3] so that, according to Epiphanius, it was not by the apostles (as the divines of the church of Rome pretend), but by the ecclesiastical canons, that this obligation was laid on the clergy; and, in his time, those canons were not yet universally complied with, nor indeed many ages after: nay, in the Greek church, the clergy are to this day allowed to cohabit with the wives they married before their ordination; and, in this kingdom, celibacy was not uni-

[1] Bellar. de cler. l. 1. c. 21. [2] Hier. in Jovin. l. 1.
[3] Ign. ep. ad Philadelp.

[1] Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20.
[2] Theod. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. l. 2. p. 28, 29. Ambr. ep. 25.
[3] Epiph. hæres. 59.

Celibacy deemed by the pagans the highest degree of sanctity. The celibacy of the clergy a bad institution. Another letter of Syricius.

versally established till after the conquest, as I shall have occasion to show in the sequel of the present history.

The abstaining from lawful, as well as unlawful pleasures, was deemed, by the ancient pagans, especially in the east, the highest degree of sanctity and perfection. Hence some of their priests, in compliance with this notion, and to recommend themselves to the esteem of the people, did not only profess, promise, and vow an eternal abstinence from all pleasures of that nature, as those of the church of Rome do, but put it out of their power ever to enjoy them. Thus the priests of "Cybele, by becoming priests ceased to be men," to borrow the expression of Jerom; and the Hierophantes, who were the first ministers of religion among the Athenians, rendered themselves equally incapable of transgressing the vows they had made, by constantly drinking the cold juice of hemlock.[1] A stoic, called Cheremon, introduced by Jerom to describe the lives of the Egyptian priests, tells us, among other things, that, from the time they addicted themselves to the service of the gods, they renounced all intercourse and commerce with women; and, the better to conquer their natural inclinations, abstained altogether from meat and wine. Several other instances might be alleged to show that celibacy was embraced and practised by the pagan priests, long before the birth of the Christian religion; and, consequently, that it was not religion, but superstition, that first laid the priesthood under such an obligation. The church of Rome has borrowed, as is notorious, several ceremonies, customs, and practices of the pagans, and perhaps the celibacy of the priesthood among the rest: I say, perhaps, because it might have been suggested to her by the same spirit of superstition that suggested it to them: for wherever the same spirit prevails, it will ever operate in the same manner, and be attended with the same, or the like effects. Thus we find the same austerities practised by the pagans in the East Indies, and other idolatrous nations, that are practised and recommended by the church of Rome; and yet no man can imagine those austerities to have been by either borrowed of the other. There is almost an entire conformity between the laws, discipline, and hierarchy of the ancient druids, and the present Roman catholic clergy; nay, the latter claim the very same privileges, prerogatives, and exemptions, as were claimed and enjoyed by the former:[2] and yet we cannot well suppose them to have been guided therein by their example. Celibacy was discountenanced by the Romans, who nevertheless had their vestals, instituted by their second king at a time when, the new city being yet then thinly inhabited, marriage ought in both sexes to have been most encouraged: and the same spirit, which suggested to that superstitious prince the institution of the vestals, suggested the like institutions to other pagan nations, and to the church at Rome that of so many different orders of nuns.

How much better had the church of Rome consulted her own reputation, had she either, in opposition to the pagan priesthood, allowed her clergy the use of matrimony, or, by a more perfect imitation of their discipline, with the law of celibacy, prescribed the like methods of observing it! How many enormities had been prevented by either of these means, the world knows. But none of her clergy have the observance of their vows so much at heart as to imitate either the Athenian or the Egyptian priests: and as for those of Cybele, they are so far from conforming to their practice, that a law subjecting them to it has kept them out of protestant kingdoms, when the fear of death could not.

If every law or institution is to be judged good or evil, according to the good and evil attending them, it is by daily experience but too manifest, that the forced celibacy of the clergy ought to be deemed of all institutions the very worst. Indeed all sensible men of that church know and lament the innumerable evils which the celibacy of her clergy occasions, and must always occasion, in spite of all remedies that can be applied to it. But she finds one advantage in it, which, in her eyes, makes more than sufficient amends for all those evils, namely, her engrossing by that means to herself all the thoughts and attention of her clergy, which, were they allowed to marry, would be divided between her and their families, and each of them would have a separate interest from that of the church. Several customs and practices, once warmly espoused by that church, have, in process of time, been abrogated, and quite laid aside, on account of the inconveniences attending them; and this, which long experience has shown to be attended with more pernicious consequences than any other, had, but for that political view, been likewise abolished.

Another letter, universally ascribed to Syricius, has reached our times. It is written in a very perplexed and obscure style; bears no date; is not to be found either in Dionysius Exiguus, or any ancient code; and is addressed to "all the orthodox dwelling in different provinces:"[1] which is manifestly a mistake, since Syricius desires those, to whom it is addressed, to confirm it with their subscriptions, which cannot be understood but of bishops. However, as it is received by all as genuine, I shall not take it upon me to reject it as spurious. The subject of this letter is the ordination of the ministers of the church; and the first article is against those who pre-

[1] Hier. l. 2. in Jov.
[2] Vide Cæs. comm. de bell. Gall. l. 6. Cic. div. l. 1.

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1028.

tend to pass from the vanities of the world to the episcopal dignity. Syricius writes, that they came often to him, attended with numerous retinues, begging him to ordain them; but that they had never been able to prevail upon him to grant them their request. In the second article he complains of the monks, who were constantly wandering about the country, and on whom the bishops chose rather to confer holy orders, and the episcopal dignity itself, than to relieve them with alms. The third and last article forbids a layman or neophyte to be ordained either deacon or presbyter. If this letter be genuine, Syricius was the first bishop of Rome who styled himself pope, as Papebrok well observes;[1] for the title of his letter, as transmitted to us, runs thus; "Pope Syricius to the orthodox," &c. The word imports no more than father, and it was anciently given, out of respect, to all bishops, as I have observed elsewhere; but I have found none before Syricius who distinguished themselves with that title.

Jerom continued at Rome some months after the death of his great patron Damasus. But, finding himself obnoxious to the Roman clergy, for the liberty he had taken in some of his writings to censure their effeminate and licentious lives, and, on the other hand, not being countenanced and supported by Syricius, as he had been by his predecessor, he thought it advisable to abandon that city, and return to Palæstine. Some pretend, but without sufficient authority, that Syricius joined the rest in reviling and persecuting him.

Baronius has inserted, in his Annals,[2] a letter from the usurper Maximus, who reigned in Gaul; from which we learn that Syricius had written first to him, exhorting him to continue steady in the catholic faith, being, perhaps, apprehensive lest he should suffer himself to be imposed upon by the Priscillianists, who were very numerous in Gaul; and complaining to him of the undue ordination of a presbyter named Agricius. Maximus, in his answer, pretends great zeal for the true faith, and promises to assemble the bishops of Gaul, and of the five provinces, meaning Gallia Narbonensis, to examine the affair of Agricius. He assures Syricius, that he has nothing so much at heart as to maintain the catholic faith pure and uncorrupted, to see a perfect harmony established among the prelates of the church, and to suppress the many disorders which had prevailed at the time of his accession to the empire, and would have soon proved incurable, had they been neglected. He adds, that many shocking abominations of the Manichees, meaning no doubt the Priscillianists, had been discovered, not by groundless conjectures and surmises, but by their own confession before the magistrates, as Syricius might learn from the acts. For Maximus caused the ringleaders of that sect to be put to death this very year, convicted before the magistrates of the grossest immoralities.* These were Priscillian himself, Felicissimus, and Armenus, two ecclesiastics, who had but very lately embraced his doctrine; Asarinus and Aurelius, two deacons; Latronianus, or, as Jerom calls him, Matronianus, a layman; and Euchrocia, the widow of the orator Delphidius, who had professed eloquence in the city of Bourdeaux a few years before. These were, by the order of Maximus, all beheaded this year at Treves. The rest of Priscillian's followers, whom they could discover and apprehend, were either banished or confined.

But these severities served only to increase

[1] Bolland. prop. p. 213.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 387. n. 65, 66. ex. t. 1. ep. Rom. Pont. p. 48.

* The first author of this sect was one Mark, a native of Memphis in Egypt, a famous magician, and once a follower of the doctrine of the Manichees. (*a*) From Egypt he travelled into Spain, where he had for his disciples a woman of quality named Agapa, Elpidius the rhetorician, and Agagius. (*b*) Priscillian, of whom I shall speak hereafter, was the disciple and successor of the two latter. Jerom tells us, upon the authority of Irenæus, whom he quotes, that Mark passed from the banks of the Rhone into Aquitaine, and from thence into Spain; (*c*) which made Baronius write, that he first infected Gaul. (*d*) But no such thing was ever affirmed by Irenæus; and besides, Jerom confounds the sect of the Marcosians with that of the Priscillianists, and the author of the former, who was contemporary with Irenæus, with the author of the latter, who lived in the fourth century.

The Priscillianists broached no new doctrine, but formed a new sect, by adopting every impious opinion that had been broached by others; whence their sect is styled by Austin, the common sink of all other heresies. (*e*) By their external behavior, which was extremely modest and composed, they gained many followers, whom, by degrees, they let into the abominations of their sect; for there was no lewdness which they did not encourage and practice, rejecting matrimony for no other reason, but because it confined a man to one woman, and a woman to one man. (*f*) They held it no crime to speak contrary to what they thought and believed, and to confirm with an oath what they said when they were talking to people of a different persuasion. This was one of their favorite maxims, which above all others they took care to inculcate to their proselytes, often repeating to them, and among themselves, the famous verse;

Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli.

Swear, foreswear, but never betray a secret. (*g*)

Hence it was no easy matter to discover them; for they mixed with the orthodox at Divine service, received the sacraments of the church, and disowned, with the most solemn oaths, the doctrines which they had been heard by many to utter and teach. (*h*) To this sect Priscillian, who gave name to it, was gained by the above-mentioned Elpidius and Agagius. He was a man of birth and fortune, being descended of an ancient and illustrious family of Spain, and is said to have been endowed with extraordinary parts, and well versed in every branch of learning; so that many were induced by his example to embrace the new sect, and more by his eloquence; for he had a particular gift of speaking well, and gaining the affections of all who heard him. (*i*) Among his followers were several persons of the first rank, both men and women, and even some bishops, namely, Vegetinus, Symphosius, Instantius, and Salvianus, of whom the two latter entered into an indissoluble league and alliance with him. (*k*)

(*a*) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Isid. Hisp. de Scrip. eccles. c. 2. (*b*) Id. ib. (*c*) Hier. ep. 29.
(*d*) Bar. ad. ann. 381. n. 113, 114.
(*e*) Aug. hær. 70. p. 13. (*f*) Id. ib. & Leo, ep. 93.
(*g*) Aug. ib. ep. 253. & ad Con. c. 2. (*h*) Id. ib.
(*i*) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Hier. in Isai. 64. p. 240.
(*k*) Sulp. ib. p. 171. Concil. t. 1. p. 741.

They are honored by their followers as saints and martyrs. Many embrace their doctrine. Two of their leading men renounce their errors; and are admitted to the communion of the church by the council of Toledo. The acts of that council confirmed by St. Ambrose and Syricius. Dictinius honored as a saint. Priscillian honored as a saint and a martyr.

the evil which they were employed to cure. The bodies of Priscillian, and of those who had suffered with him, were conveyed by their friends and adherents into Spain, and there interred with great pomp and solemnity; their names were added to those of other saints and martyrs, their firmness and constancy extolled, and their doctrine embraced by such numbers of proselytes, that it spread in a short time over all the provinces between the Pyrenees and the ocean.[1] Symphosius, metropolitan of Galicia, whom, after the death of Priscillian, they looked upon as the chief man and head of their sect, took care to fill all the vacant sees in that province with bishops of his own communion. Dictinius, whom he raised among the rest to that dignity, is supposed by St. Austin[2] to have been the author of a book, famous in those times, styled Libra, or, the Pound.* However, both he and Symphosius were afterwards convinced of their errors; and, desiring thereupon to be reconciled with the church, they undertook a journey to Milan, in order to engage St. Ambrose, bishop of that city, in their favor. He received them with the greatest marks of kindness and affection; and being satisfied with the terms of reconciliation, which they themselves proposed, and promised to observe, he wrote in their behalf to the bishops of Spain, who, at his request, admitted them to their communion.[3] †

In the year 438, of the Spanish, and 400, of the common era, a council was held at Toledo; and, in the presence of that assembly, Symphosius, Dictinius, and Comasus, one of Symphosius' presbyters, solemnly abjured the errors of Priscillian, anathematized the doctrine, sect, and books of that heretic, and readily signed the confession of faith which the council had drawn up. Their example was followed by three other bishops, namely, Paternus, Isonius, and Vegetinus, who were all admitted to the communion of the church, and even allowed to keep their sees, though unduly preferred, "on condition the bishops of Rome and Milan should consent thereto, and restore them to the peace of the church."[1] From these words, which are the very words of the council, it is manifest, first, that the fathers, who composed that assembly, were strangers to the bishop of Rome's universal jurisdiction; and, secondly, that the bishop of Milan did not act, as Baronius pretends, on that occasion as the pope's legate. Their requiring the approbation of the bishop of Milan, besides that of the bishop of Rome, sufficiently proves the one; and their requiring the approbation of the bishop of Rome, besides that of the bishop of Milan, the other.

Four other bishops, namely, Herenius, Donatus, Acurius, and Æmilius, could by no means be induced to follow the example of Symphosius and Dictinius; and were thereupon deposed by the council, and cut off from the communion of the catholic church. The bishops of Rome and Milan not only confirmed the acts of the council with respect to Symphosius and Dictinius, but separated themselves from the communion of the bishops of Bœtica and the Carthagenese, who, thinking the council had dealt too favorably with them, refused to admit them to their communion.[2] Dictinius died in 420, and is now honored in Spain as a saint, though it may be justly questioned whether he deserves that honor. Idatius the chronologist, who was a native of Spain, and raised there to the episcopal dignity about the year 428, mentions him without saying any thing in his praise, or taking the least notice of his being honored then as a saint. St. Austin speaks doubtfully even of his conversion,[3] and at the same time tells us, that his book was highly esteemed by the Priscillianists, and his memory no less revered; which, notwithstanding the eminent sanctity ascribed to him by Baronius,[4] gives us room to suspect, that the honor now paid him is owing to a tradition handed down by the Priscillianists. For thus was Priscillian himself once revered both as a saint and a martyr. Nay, the author of the notes on Sulpitius Severus assures us, that he has seen his name in some, not very ancient, martyrologies; and Petrus de Natalibus has allowed, both to him, and to Latronianus, who suffered with him, a place among the martyrs of the church, pretending to be countenanced therein by the authority of Jerom.[5] And truly it must be owned, that

[1] Hier. ep. 29. [2] Aug. ad Con. c. 3.

* It was so called because it contained twelve questions, as the Roman pound did twelve ounces. In that piece the author endeavored to prove, from the practice of the patriarchs, of the prophets, apostles, angels, and of Christ himself, that a lie could be no crime, when uttered to conceal our religion. (a)

[3] Concil. t. 1. p. 742. ed. Binian.

† That these two bishops should have applied to St. Ambrose, and not to Syricius, is what Baronius cannot brook; and therefore to bring in, right or wrong, the bishop of Rome, he quotes a passage of the council of Toledo, where the fathers of that assembly, speaking of the letter which St. Ambrose had written in favor of Symphosius and Dictinius, adds the following words in a parenthesis; "Which things were likewise suggested by pope Syricius of holy memory. (b) But as these words have no manner of connexion with the rest, it is manifest they have been foisted in on purpose to bring Syricius upon the stage; and were we to admit them as genuine, we could only conclude from thence, that Syricius too had written to the bishops of Spain in behalf of Symphosius and Dictinius. Baronius indeed goes a great way farther; for he infers from the above-mentioned words, that St. Ambrose acted by the advice and direction of Syricius; and from thence by a second inference, which could occur to none but himself, that both Ambrose, and Simplicius, who succeeded him in the see of Milan, were the pope's legates. (c) It is by such far-fetched inferences and deductions that he endeavors, throughout his voluminous performance, to mislead his unwary readers into a belief of the pope's supremacy.

(a) Id. ib. c. 2, & 18. (b) Concil. t. 2. p. 1230.
(c) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 54.

[1] Concil. t. 1. p. 742. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1279.
[3] Aug. ad Conc. c. 3. [4] Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 56.
[5] Pet. de Natal. l. 11. c. 89.

Jerom, in the year 392, writ very favorably of Priscillian. "He was executed," says he, "by the faction of Ithacius, being accused by some as if he had embraced the heresy of the gnostics; but others maintained, that he held not the doctrine and tenets with which he was charged."[1] But being afterwards better informed, he styles him an execrable man,[2] and condemns his doctrine as an infamous heresy, as a plague and contagion, that cruelly ravaged most of the Spanish provinces.[3] It is not therefore without reason that the church of Rome now anathematizes, as a heretic, the man she once revered as a saint. Such has been the fate of many others, judged by Baronius himself unworthy of the worship that was paid them, and therefore set aside, when, by the command of Gregory XIII. he revised and corrected the Roman Martyrology. As for Dictinius, he has not yet been driven out of heaven, though nobody can well tell how he came in. 'Tis true, both he and Symphosius are styled bishops of holy memory, in the abstract of the council of Toledo, which is supposed to have been done about the year 447. This is all Baronius can plead in favor of his eminent sanctity. A poor charter indeed to hold a place in heaven by, and claim the worship and honors attending it! For the author of that abstract is utterly unknown; and, besides, he canonizes alike Symphosius and Dictinius, styling them both bishops of holy memory. Why then should his authority have so much weight with respect to the one, and none at all in regard of the other? If we bar prescription, which surely can have no room here, Dictinius can have no more right to keep the place he has, than Symphosius to claim the place he has not. Nay, the latter would have a far better right, were it true, that Dictinius relapsed into the errors he had abjured, and was on that account deposed with several other bishops of his sect. This I read in an author of great note;[4] but as he advances it upon the authority of another, namely, of Idatius the chronologist, and the passage he quotes is not to be found in that writer, at least in the editions I have perused, it would be both unjust and ungenerous to deprive Dictinius of, or disturb him in, the possession of his saintship upon such an evidence.

Syricuis and Ambrose, in conjunction with the catholic bishops of Spain, alarmed at the wonderful progress the doctrine of Priscillian had made in so short a time, left nothing unattempted they could think of to put a stop to the growing evil. But all to no purpose; in spite of their utmost efforts, in defiance of the most severe laws, that were enacted against them, especially by the emperors Honorius, and Theodosius the younger, their numbers increased daily, and their doctrine grew daily more popular; the severities that were practised against them, serving only to recommend those to the esteem and veneration of the multitude, who suffered them, as many did, with patience and constancy. As they held it lawful to conceal their real sentiments from the catholics, by disowning them with the most solemn oaths; the catholics suffered themselves to be led by a mistaken zeal into the same error, disowning, in like manner, their sentiments, the better to discover those of their adversaries. But this pernicious practice of defending truth by destroying it, and opposing lies by lying, was fully and unanswerably confuted by Austin, in his answer to Consentius, who had written to him at length on that subject.[1](*)

The indefatigable pains Syricius took, together with the other catholic bishops, in suppressing the heresy of the Priscillianists, proved quite unsuccessful, though seconded by the secular power, and the severest laws that had yet been enacted against heretics. Their doctrine rather gained, than lost ground; and we shall find them in the sixth century, that is, two hundred years hence, still a numerous sect, and councils assembling, to very little purpose, against them. Syricius was not so intent, as we are told, upon maintaining the doctrine of the church, as to neglect the discipline. In order to correct several abuses, that had begun to prevail, and revive some ancient constitutions, that were grown out of use, he convened a council at Rome, which is said to have consisted of eighty bishops; and, with their consent and approbation, established the following canons: 1. That no one should presume to ordain a bishop, without the knowledge of the apostolic see. 2. That no man should be admitted to the ecclesiastical order, who, after the remission of his sins, that is, perhaps, after his baptism, had worn the sword of worldly warfare. 3. That no clerk should marry a widow. 4. That the Novatians and Montanists, that is, Donatists, should be received into the church by the imposition of hands; but that

[1] Hier. vir. iii. c. 121.
[2] Ad Cte. t. 2. p. 152.
[3] Id. ep. 82. 29. in Isai. c. 60.
[4] Leo, t. p. 831.

[1] Aug. ad Con. contra mendac. per totum.

* The doctrine of the church of Rome, concerning equivocations, mental reservations, and the lawfulness, or rather obligation, of concealing, with the most solemn oaths, what has been revealed under the seal of confession, has perhaps some affinity with the doctrine of the Priscillianists. What is only known under the seal of confession, say their divines, is not known to man, but to God alone, since it was not discovered to a man, but to God represented by a man, that is, to the priest or confessor; and therefore, the priest may, with a safe conscience, affirm, even upon oath, that he knows not what he thus knew. It is by recurring to this doctrine, that F. Daniel Bartoli, in his history of England, or rather of the Jesuits in England, endeavors to justify the conduct of the Jesuit Garnet, in not discovering the gunpowder plot, to which he supposes him to have been privy: but as it was disclosed to him in confession, or at least under the seal of confession, he had sinned grievously by discovering it, though by such a discovery he might have saved a whole nation from destruction. (a) So that the violating such a seal is a far greater evil than the loss of so many lives, than the utter ruin of an entire nation. A doctrine evidently repugnant to the dictates both of reason and humanity.

(a) Bar. hist. d'Inghilterra.

such as, abandoning the catholic faith, had been rebaptized by them, should not be re-admitted without performing a long penance. 5. That the priests and deacons should live continent, being, by their office, daily employed in the divine ministry.[1] These canons or decrees, say the Roman catholic divines, are contained in a letter, which Syricius wrote to the bishop of Africa, and which was read, and received as a law, by a council held some years after at Tela, in the province of Byzacene, as appears from the acts of that council.[2] Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage, in his abridgment of the canons, done in the sixth century, often quotes the letter of Syricius, and takes particular notice of the canons that were copied from it by the council of Tela. The same letter, together with the acts of that council, are to be found, word for word, in the ancient code of the church of Rome. So that, upon the whole, we cannot question, says Baronius, the authenticity of that piece, without rendering the authority of every other monument of antiquity quite precarious, and leaving men to their own wild and groundless conjectures. But men of learning have, of late years, been too much upon their guard to admit, without the strictest examination, any piece, however authentic in appearance, that seemed to countenance the extraordinary power and authority claimed by the bishop of Rome. And not without reason, since they well knew what pains had been taken to banish truth, by suppressing or adulterating the most authentic records, and to establish falsehood, by substituting in their room fabulous legends, spurious letters, and acts of councils that never were held. As for the letter ascribed to Syricius, it has been suspected ever since criticism took place,[3] and lately rejected as unquestionably supposititious, by F. Quesnel, who, in a learned dissertation on that subject, proves, in my opinion, unanswerably, not only the letter, but the acts of the pretended council of Tela, to have been forged, and inserted, in latter times, into the collection of Ferrandus, and the Roman code.[4](*)

I find no farther mention made of Syricius, in the ancient writers, till the year 390, when

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1028—1030. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1578.
[3] Vide Blond. censur. in decretal. epist. 550.
[4] Quesn. dissert. 5. sur S. Leon.

(*) To convince the reader of this double forgery, I need not refer him to that judicious writer. The many groundless, perplexed, and contradictory arguments, or rather conjectures, alleged by those who have taken most pains to prove both the above-mentioned pieces genuine, namely, by Chifflerus, Papebrok, and cardinal Noris, are, perhaps, a more convincing proof of their being forged, than any that can be alleged against them. There is so palpable a difference, in point of style, between this letter, and that which Syricius wrote to Himerius, and which is on all hands allowed to be genuine, that no one can possibly suppose both to have been penned by one and the same person. Besides, in the former letter Syricius absolutely commands, and in this only advises, exhorts, and entreats the priests and deacons to live continent. Of these two difficulties none of the writers I have just quoted have thought fit to take the least notice, though they could hardly escape their observation. The very first canon or article of this letter, for the sake of which both the letter itself, and the acts of the council, were most probably forged, sufficiently betrays the forgery. For it is absolutely unintelligible, and therefore pointed, construed, altered, &c. in twenty different manners, by those who maintain it to be genuine. Some read it thus: "Ut sine conscientia sedis apostolicæ primatis nemo audeat ordinare;" "That no one should presume to ordain without the knowledge of the primate of the apostolic see." I do not find the bishops of Rome to have ever styled themselves, in their letters, primates of the apostolic see; nay, the humble title of primate of the apostolic see (humble with respect to the bishop of Rome, primate, prince, and monarch of the whole church,) so soured Labbé, that he fairly owned the truth, choosing rather to give up the letter, than to admit a title that seemed to detract from the supremacy. Besides, it is very certain, that, in the time of Syricius the bishops of Rome were not yet so lost to all modesty as to pretend, in open defiance of the canons, that no bishop should be ordained without their knowledge. Others read that article thus: "Ut extra conscientiam sedis apostolicæ, hoc est, primatis, &c." "That none should presume to ordain without the knowledge of the apostolic see, that is, of their primate." Now, it is probable, that the bishop of Rome would have given the title of apostolic see to all the metropolitan churches; a title which pope Leo the Great would not allow even to the bishop of Constantinople? (*a*) I might add, that the author of this letter writes, and I think very ridiculously, that the African bishops would have come to Rome to assist at the council, had they not been prevented by their infirmities, or old age; which is supposing them all to have been old or infirm; that the subscription of this letter is very singular, "Data Romæ in concilio episcoporum octoginta," which in all other synodal letters is placed at the beginning; that neither this letter, nor the council of Tela, by which it is supposed to have been quoted, are ever mentioned or taken notice of by any of the councils, that were afterwards held in Africa, to establish the celibacy of the clergy. Some will have this letter to have been written only for the bishops of the vicariate of Rome, of which Syricius was primate, and to have been sent by him to the bishops of Africa, and perhaps to those of the other provinces, with a design to try whether they might not be prompted to receive the canons it contained, as general rules, though made for the vicariate only. This had been attempting to establish at once, and to a manner by surprise, a universal jurisdiction. But I can hardly believe, that, in the days of Syricius, when the ambition of the bishops of Rome was yet in its infancy, they should have aspired to, or entertained any notion of such a jurisdiction. As to the council, I shall only observe here, that it is said in all the printed copies of the councils, all the ancient manuscripts, but one, to have been held at Tela, in the province of Byzacene, whereas Tela is allowed, even by those who defend this council as genuine, to have belonged to the proconsularis. They have therefore nothing else to recur to but the ignorance of the transcribers, the usual refuge in such cases, whom they all agree to have been mistaken, though all equally at a loss, and at variance among themselves, how to correct the supposed mistake. For, instead of Tela, some read Zela or Zella, others Tena, Teneptis, Teleptus, &c. In short, there is not a single town in the whole province of Byzacene, bearing the least resemblance in name with Tela, that has not been substituted in its room; nay, some have bestowed that honor on the smallest villages, as if it were probable, that, in a province, filled, as Byzacene was, with considerable cities, and episcopal sees, bishops should choose to assemble in a village. To read Proconsularis instead of Byzacene, as some have done, is contradicting, and consequently giving up, the acts of that council; for the thirty-three bishops named there as composing it, were all of the latter province, and Vincentius and Fortunatianus are said to have assisted as deputies from the former. (*b*) It would be needless to dwell any longer on this subject, and point out the many absurdities and contradictions that occur in the supposed acts of that council, since the very title must convince every impartial reader, that no such council was ever held. I cannot, however, help taking notice of a very extraordinary canon, quoted by Ferrandus, from the letter of Syricius, and approved, as is said there, by

(*a*) Leo. ep. 78. (*b*) Concil. t. 1. p. 1577.

he condemned the doctrine of Jovinian, and cast him and his followers out of the church. Jovinian was by profession a monk, by birth a Latin, as Jerom observes, and the first who infected that language with heresy; all, or rather almost all, the heresies that, for the first four hundred years, had disturbed the peace of the church, having been broached by Greeks, Chaldæans, or Syrians.[1] He had formerly practised great austerities, going bare-footed, living upon bread and water, covered with a tattered black garment, and earning his livelihood by the sweat of his brow, his hands being callous with long and hard labor.[2] The doctrine he taught is, by Jerom, reduced to the four following heads. 1. That those, who, with a lively faith, have been regenerated by baptism, cannot afterwards be overcome by the devil. 2. That for all those, who shall preserve their baptism, an equal reward is reserved in heaven. 3. That there is no difference of merit between abstaining from some meats, and using them with thanksgiving. 4, and lastly, That virgins, widows, and married women, are in a state of equal merit; and, consequently, that all difference in merit can only arise from their different actions. That the two last were then counted heresies, shows that the church began, in this century, to be tainted with doctrines that border on popery, and no ways consist with the liberty of the gospel.[3] Besides these tenets, Jovinian taught, as Ambrose and Austin inform us, that the Virgin Mary preserved her virginity in conceiving our Savior, but lost it in bringing him forth, pretending to prove by arguments, "false, but ingenious enough," say they, that we should otherwise be obliged to own, with the Manichees, the body of Christ not to have been real, but aereal.[4] He, besides, charged the catholics with Manicheism, on account of their preferring the state of virginity to that of matrimony.[5] Both Jerom and Ambrose tell us, that, together with his doctrine, he changed his manners, renouncing his former austerities, and giving himself up to all manner of debauchery, to redeem, as it were, the time he had lost.[6] But perhaps this charge was not well founded, but rather supposed as a consequence of his undervaluing celibacy, and the merit ascribed to it, there being too many instances in ecclesiastical history of such inferences, drawn from opinions which were not approved by the fathers of the church, as could no way be justified. They often painted those, whom they styled heretics, in the blackest colors, to prejudice the people more effectually against their doctrine. In this art Jerom excelled all the rest, and none ever disagreed with him, who did not at once forfeit those very virtues, which he himself had admired and extolled in them before. He abstained, however, from matrimony; but merely, say Austin and Jerom, to avoid the trouble and anxiety attending it, and not because he apprehended there could be in this life any merit in continency, or any reward allotted for it in the next.[1] This doctrine he broached in Rome, and soon found there a great number of followers, among the rest several of both sexes, who had embraced, and professed for many years, the state of virginity, being seduced and misled, says Austin, by the cavils of that impious wretch, asking them whether they pretended to be more holy than Abraham and Sarah, than many other men and women, who, though married, are commended in the Old Testament, for their eminent sanctity.[2] The first, who took offence at this doctrine, were two laymen, namely, Pammachius and Victorinus. All we know of the latter is, that he was illustrious for his birth, and, if we believe Ambrose, venerable for his piety.[3] As for Pammachius, he is well known in the history of the church, and often mentioned by Jerom with the greatest commendations. He was descended, says that writer, from the ancient family of the Camilli, and yet less distinguished by the nobility of his descent than his piety.[4] Having heard, by chance, some of the propositions advanced by Jovinian, he made it his business to inquire more narrowly into his doctrine, being assisted therein by Victorinus, who had taken the alarm upon hearing, in Rome, this "shocking doctrine," says Jerom,[5] that "a virgin was no better than a married woman." These two having, by a diligent inquiry, discovered at length the whole doctrine of Jovinian, as well as the author and promoters of it, they presented a request to Syricius, acquainting him therewith, and desiring, that the doctrine of Jovinian might be condemned by the episcopal authority, and the sentence of the Holy Ghost, as contrary to the law of God.[6] These are Ambrose's words, as the text now is; but it is generally thought to have been altered and corrupted. Be that as it will, Syricius did not take upon him to act on this occasion by his private authority; but, assembling the priests, deacons, and other ecclesiastics of Rome, he read to them the request of Pammachius and Victorinus, and, having, together with them, maturely examined the doctrine of Jovinian, he declared it, with the unanimous consent of the whole assembly, contrary to scripture; and at the same time cut off, for ever, from the communion of the church, not only Jovinian, who

the council of Tela; namely, "That no bishop should be ordained by a single bishop, the church of Rome excepted." This exception is not to be found in the letter ascribed to Syricius, from which they make Ferrandus quote it; and, besides, the bishops of Rome were never ordained by a single bishop, nor did they ever take upon them to ordain bishops alone.

[1] Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. t. 2. p. 94.
[2] Id. ib. l. 1. c. 25. Aug. hæres. 82. Amb. ep. 7.
[3] Hier. ib. c. 1.
[4] Aug. op. imp. l. 4. c. 121. & hær. 82. Amb. ep. 7.
[5] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 2. & ad Bon. l. 2. c. 2.
[6] Hier. ib. c. 25. Amb. ep. 7.

[1] Amb. ibid.
[2] Aug. hæres. 82. Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. c. 23.
[3] Amb. ep. 6. [4] Hier. ep. 26.
[5] Id. ep. 50. [6] Amb. ep. 6.

had first broached such a doctrine, but those among his followers, who were found to have been the most sanguine in promoting it; namely, Auxentius, Genialis, Germinator, Felix, Frontinus, Martianus, Januarius, and Ingenius.[1] Jovinian, instead of submitting to the judgment of Syricius, and his clergy, immediately left Rome, and repaired with all speed to Milan, not despairing of being able to engage Ambrose in his favor, and likewise the emperor Theodosius, who was then in that city, before Syricius could prejudice them against him. Of this Syricius was aware, and therefore without loss of time, despatched three of his presbyters to Milan, Crescentius, Leopardus, and Alexander, with a letter to that church, which has been transmitted to us among Ambrose's works,[2] acquainting them with what had passed at Rome. In virtue of this letter he was rejected by Ambrose; and, at the request of the three Roman presbyters, driven out of the town by the emperor.(*)

The letter of Syricius was answered by Ambrose, and signed by him, and several other bishops, who were still at Milan, where they had met to condemn Ithacius, and his adherents, for having been accessary to the death of Priscillian. In their answer they commend the pastoral vigilance of Syricius, and, having briefly declared their opinion against the other tenets of Jovinian, dwell on what he had advanced against the virginity of the Virgin Mary. But they seem to have mistaken his meaning, in charging him with Manicheism, and supposing him to have held, that our Savior did not assume a real body: for he held no such doctrine, but only charged the catholics with it, as Austin tells us in express terms.[3] It is surprising, that such a question should have thus employed the thoughts and attention of so many venerable prelates, and created such feuds and animosities in the church. Both parties agreed, that the virgin Mary had brought forth her son without the co-operation or intercourse of man; and in that sense alone she is styled a virgin.

From Milan Jovinian returned to the neighborhood of Rome, where his followers continued to assemble, under his direction, till the year 398, when the emperor Honorius, giving ear to the complaints of the neighboring bishops, enacted a law, commanding him and his accomplices to be beaten with whips armed with lead, and transported into different islands.[4] Jovinian himself was confined to the isle of Boas, on the coast of Dalmatia,[5] where he gave up the ghost, about the year 406, in the midst of the mirth and jollity of a banquet, says Jerom, adding that he was revived in Vigilantius, as Euphorbus was formerly in Pythagoras.[1] Some of Jerom's friends in Rome sent him the book, which Jovinian had composed to explain and defend his doctrine, begging him to confute it. He readily complied with their request, and ended his work in the year 392. It consisted of two books, but met with a very indifferent reception at Rome. For though he declared from the beginning, that it was not his intention to condemn marriage, and that he had an utter abhorrence to the errors of Marcion, of Tatian, and the Manichees, holding marriage to be sinful; yet the disparaging terms he made use of in speaking of marriage, gave great offence, even to those who professed continency.(*)

Notwithstanding the severity of the law I have mentioned above, some still continued to hold, and privately to propagate, the doctrine of Jovinian, which induced Austin to compose his treatise on the advantages of marriage and virginity; a performance far more judicious than that of Jerom, who has taken great pains to disparage and cry down marriage, the better to extol virginity, as if he could not commend the one without condemning the other. Austin, on the contrary, begins his work with great encomiums on matrimony, to which, however commendable, in the end he prefers virginity. But after all, the reasons alleged by the one as well as the other, are, if duly weighed, but empty and inconclusive speculations.

The following year, 391, a great council was convened at Capua, chiefly with a view to restore peace to the church of Antioch, and put an end to the schism, which had long prevailed there, and had occasioned almost an entire separation between the east and the west, as I have related elsewhere.[2] Paulinus, who was acknowledged for lawful bishop of that city by part of the catholics there, by the bishops of Egypt, Arabia, Cyprus, by the bishop of Rome, and all the western bishops, died about the year 388.[3] But the unhappy division, which had reigned during his life, continued to reign even after his death. For Paulinus by a most unaccountable conduct, and a most notorious and open violation of the canons, took upon him not only to appoint himself a successor before he died, but to or-

[1] Id. ib. [2] Id. ep. 7.

(*) Baronius pretends it was on this occasion that Theodosius enacted the law, dated from Verona the 3d of September of the present year, 390, commanding all, who professed a monastic life, to quit the cities, and retire, pursuant to their profession, into the deserts.(*a*) But that it was made on a very different occasion, it will fall in my way to show hereafter.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 390. n. 47, 48.

[3] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 2. [4] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 53.

[5] Hier. in vigil. c. 1.

[1] Hier. in Vigil. c. 1.

(*) This induced Pammachius to purchase all the copies of it he could get, and send them back to the author, acquainting him in a friendly manner with what had chiefly given offence.(*a*) This Jerom took as a token of the most sincere friendship; and therefore, not satisfied with acknowledging the obligations he had laid on him, and commending his conduct as worthy of his great prudence, and answerable to the affection which it was owing to, he immediately set about the apology which Pammachius had advised him to write, and inscribed it to him.(*b*)

(*a*) Ex Ruff. p. 231. & ep. 52. (*b*) Hier. ep. 51, 52.

[2] Vide p. 220.

[3] Soz. l. 5. c. 15. & l. 7. c. 15. Hier. vir. ill. c. 125.

The council of Capua. The difference between the two competitors to the see of Antioch referred, by the council, to the bishops of Egypt.

dain him alone. The person whom he thus both named and ordained, was one Evagrius, a presbyter, with whom he had always lived in close friendship;[1] and who on that account was, notwithstanding his illegal election and ordination, acknowledged by Paulinus' party for bishop of Antioch. Theodoret writes, that the bishop of Rome, with the other western bishops, and those of Egypt, embraced his communion.[2] But Ambrose assures us, that the bishops of Egypt stood neuter, suspending all communication both with Evagrius, and his competitor Flavianus; and speaks in such manner of both, as gives us room to suppose that he himself communicated with neither. "Both rely more on the invalidity of their competitor's ordination," says he, "than on the validity of their own. It is therefore with reason that Flavianus declines a fair trial, and not without reason that Evagrius does not demand one."[3] The example of Ambrose was, in all likelihood, followed by the bishop of Rome, and the other western bishops; or, Ambrose, perhaps, conformed to theirs.(*)

All the bishops of Illyricum, upon the death of Paulinus, admitted Flavianus, and not Evagrius, to their communion, if we may depend upon Theodoret.[4] As this new election occasioned unheard-of disturbances in the church of Antioch, as the division still continued between the east and the west, the western bishops had frequent recourse to the emperor Theodosius, during the three years he passed in the west, pressing him to oblige, by his imperial authority, both Flavianus and Evagrius to submit their cause to the judgment of a council, that should be held in Italy. Theodosius consented at last to their request, named Capua for the place where the council should meet, and took upon him to oblige Flavianus to repair thither at the time appointed. Soon after, that is, about the 14th of July, 391, he left Italy, where he had continued ever since the year 388, settling young Valentinian on the throne, and set out for Constantinople, into which city he made his entry on the 10th of November. Before his departure from Italy he had written to Flavianus, commanding him to repair to Constantinople, and wait his arrival there. Flavianus readily complied with the emperor's orders, and appeared at court the day after his arrival. But when the prince acquainted him with the promise he had made to the western bishops, and desired him to prepare for the journey, which he did in a very obliging manner, Flavianus represented to him the inconveniences attending so long a journey at that season of the year, and begged he would give him leave to put it off to the spring, when he would not fail to obey his orders. The emperor, seeing him stricken in years, thought the excuse just and reasonable; and therefore, out of compassion and good nature, allowed him for the present to return to his see.[1] Thus did Flavianus, by the indulgence of the emperor, avoid the judgment of the western bishops, who wisely forbore meddling with so nice a subject in his absence, though his competitor was present.

The council of Capua met in the latter end of the year 391, and was, it seems, a very numerous assembly, since it is styled, in the canons of the church of Africa, "a full council."[2] But whether it was composed of all the western bishops, or only of the bishops of Italy, is uncertain, and cannot be determined from the words of Ambrose, "We all met,"[3] which may be equally understood of both. As the acts of this council have not reached our times, we do not even know who presided at it, some conferring that honor on Ambrose,[4] some on Syricius,[5] and some on both.[6] That Syricius presided, or even assisted, in person, is not at all probable; for in the times I am now writing of, the bishops of Rome had begun to affect grandeur; and, under pretence that their presence was necessary in the great metropolis of the empire, to assist or preside in councils held elsewhere by their deputies or legates, as they are now styled. That Syricius assisted, by his deputies, at the council of Capua, I do not doubt, since the council was composed, at least, of all the bishops of Italy, and Syricius owned himself bound by their decrees.[7] But that Ambrose presided, seems undeniable, since by him, and him alone, the whole was conducted and managed.(*)

The council avoided deciding, and even taking into consideration, the affair of Flavianus and Evagrius, in the absence of the former, though they had chiefly met for that purpose. However, to re-establish the tranquillity of the church, they agreed to renew their correspondence with, and grant their communion to, all the Catholic bishops of the east. As for the difference between the two competitors for the see of Antioch, they committed the discussing and deciding it to Theophylus, bishop of Alexandria, and the

[1] Theodor. l. 5. c. 25. [2] Theod. ib.
[3] Amb. ep. 9.
(*) A modern writer will have it by all means, that Syricius communicated with Evagrius (a), because he had always opposed Flavianus, as his predecessors had done. But surely from his espousing the cause of Paulinus, who was legally chosen, against Flavianus, whose election was contested, we cannot well conclude, that, in opposition to him, he likewise took the part of one whose election was indisputably illegal. It is far more probable, that he communicated with neither.
(a) M. Launoy, ep. 7. p. 10.
[4] Theod. ib.

[1] Id. ib. & Amb. 9. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1072.
[3] Amb. ep. 9. [4] Laun. ep. 7. p. 10.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 391. [6] Blond. Prim. p. 237.
[7] Amb. ep. 9.
(*) Baronius, without the least foundation in history, supposes Ambrose to have acted as the pope's legate. But it is the custom of that writer to vest every eminent and distinguished prelate with the legatine dignity on such occasions, and then pass upon his readers the deference and regard shown to their merit for a tribute paid to the bishops of Rome.

Flavianus refuses to comply with the decree of the council. Ambrose's moderation and impartiality. Syricius writes to the emperor. Flavianus ready to resign his dignity, rather than to submit to the judgment of the Egyptian or western bishops. Flavianus did not acknowledge in Syricius the power claimed by his successors.

other bishops of Egypt, as the most proper judges, since they communicated with neither, and therefore, could not be suspected to favor the one more than the other.[1] The bishop of Alexandria immediately acquainted Flavianus with the resolution of the council, summoning him, at the same time, to appear, in compliance therewith, before the bishops of Egypt, who were soon to assemble, in order to put the decree of that venerable assembly in execution. But Flavianus, instead of obeying the summons, and paying the regard that was thought due to the decree of so numerous a council, refused to stir from Antioch, pleading a rescript, which he had extorted from Theodosius, commanding the western bishops to repair into the east, and there examine the affair in a new council. This Theophylus did not expect, and therefore being at a loss how to conduct himself on such an emergency, he gave Ambrose immediate notice of the summons he had sent, and the answer he had received. Ambrose had nothing so much at heart as to restore peace and tranquillity to the church of Antioch; and from the regard which the council had shown to Flavianus, as well as the impartiality with which they had acted with respect to both, he had promised himself success in so pious an undertaking. It was therefore with the utmost concern that he saw his endeavors thus unexpectedly defeated, and all hopes of accomplishing what he had undertaken, vanish at once. He had but too much reason to resent such an affronting conduct, which did not so much affect the council in general, as him in particular, since it was at his motion, that the council took the above-mentioned resolution. That, however, did not tempt him to depart from the neutrality he had embraced, and declare for Evagrius: he still maintained the same impartiality, and refused to communicate with either. In his answer to Theophylus, he desires him, without betraying the least emotion of anger or resentment, to summon Flavianus once more, directing him, at the same time, to communicate with all the catholic bishops of the east, pursuant to the decree of the council, whether he complied with this second summons or not; and to acquaint the bishop of Rome with what he had done, that, the whole being approved by that church, as he did not question but it would, the whole church might be happily of one mind, and reap the fruit of his labor.[2]

Syricius, and in all likelihood Ambrose too, wrote to Theodosius, pressing him to send Flavianus to Rome,(*) if he did not approve of his being judged by the bishop of Alexandria. Syricius, in his letter, tells the emperor, that he well knew how to deal with tyrants, who revolted from him, and how to chastise them; but suffered those to go unpunished, who despised the laws of Christ.[1](*)

Theodosius, in compliance with the request of Syricius, made in the name of all the western bishops, sent anew for Flavianus, and told him, that he must, by all means, either repair to Rome, or submit his cause to the judgment of the bishops of Egypt. But he was determined, says Theodoret, to relinquish his dignity rather than to suffer the western bishops, or those of Egypt, to examine and decide whether he had a right to it or not; and, by that means to hold it to them. He therefore answered the emperor with great calmness and respect, in the following terms: "Sir, if my faith is not thought orthodox, or my conduct not worthy of a catholic bishop, I am willing to be judged by those who accuse me, and ready to submit to the sentence they shall pronounce. But, if all this noise is made merely for the sake of my dignity, from this moment I resign every preferment I enjoy in the church, to those whom nothing but preferment can silence. You may therefore dispose of the see of Antioch, now vacant, to whom you please." Theodosius, pleased with this answer, and thinking Flavianus, the more ready he was to give up his dignity, the more worthy to hold it, ordered him to return to Antioch, and resume the government of his church; nor did he ever afterwards give the least attention to the pressing and repeated instances of Syricius, and his colleagues in the west.[2]

From the whole conduct of Flavianus it is manifest, that he did not acknowledge any extraordinary power in Syricius, much less that power, which has been claimed by his successors, of disposing, by divine right, of all bishoprics, of placing and displacing bishops, at pleasure throughout the Christian world. This power, though evidently usurped, and utterly unknown even in the end of the fourth century, bishops are now obliged to own in their very titles, styling themselves bishops of such a place, by the grace of God, and of the apostolic see. Flavianus was content with the grace of God; and, as for the grace of the apostolic see, he gave himself no trouble about it. And yet Flavianus is honored by the church of Rome as a saint; and his festival kept on the 26th of September. And truly, if we may depend upon the testimony of the most authentic and unexceptionable writers of those times, we shall hardly find one in the Roman calendar more worthy of that honor. The famous John Chrysostom, who was one of his presbyters before his pro-

[1] Id ib. [2] Id. ib.

(*) That is, into the west; for thus Theodoret constantly expresses the west.

[1] Theod. l. 5. c. 23.

(*) Theodoret tells us, that Damasus, Syricius, and Anastasius the successor of Syricius, wrote to the emperor Theodosius about the dispute between Flavianus and Evagrius. A gross mistake! since Damasus was dead long before the election of Evagrius, and Theodosius before that of Anastasius.

[2] Id. ib.

The communion between the east and the west renewed. Bonosus accused before the council. His errors. The judging of his cause committed by the council to the neighboring bishops, who condemn him.

motion to the see of Constantinople, has filled his homilies with the praises of "the great Flavianus," as he styles him. His distinguished merit, eminent virtues, and extraordinary piety, seem to have been Chrysostom's favorite topic; and these encomiums he bestowed upon him, while he was still alive. After his death he was distinguished by the council of Chalcedon, with the title of "the blessed Flavianus;"[1] and by that of the east, held under John of Antioch, ranked among the brightest luminaries, the most illustrious prelates, and the greatest saints of the church.[2] Theodoret never names him without adding to his name some epithet, denoting his extraordinary merit, such as "the great, the holy, the admirable" Flavianus. As therefore no room is left to doubt of his extraordinary piety and merit, we may well conclude, from his absolutely refusing to submit his cause to the judgment of Syricius, and the other bishops of the west, that he did not acknowledge either in him or them a power to judge him. This refusal did not, in the eyes of Chrysostom, and other great men, detract in the least from his merit, nor lessen the high opinion they entertained of his sanctity. A plain indication that they did not think his conduct reprehensible, and consequently did not acknowledge, more than he, that power which is now one main article of the Roman catholic creed.

As Flavianus declined the judgment of the western as well as the Egyptian bishops, and the emperor gave no farther ear to their remonstrances and complaints, the resolution taken by the council of Capua was put in execution; which was, to renew the communion and good understanding between the east and the west, and abandon the church of Antioch to its schism, which, after so many promising remedies applied in vain, began now to be deemed an incurable evil.[3]

The council of Capua, after the abovementioned resolution concerning the difference between Flavianus and Evagrius, heard a charge brought by some bishops against Bonosus, bishop of Naissus in Dacia, according to some, or, as others will have it, of Sardica, the metropolis of that province. He was accused of a crime against the canons of the church, and the law of God,[4] and likewise of heresy. The crime is not specified; but as for the heresy, I gather from Austin that he held the Son to be inferior to the Father;[5] and from Ambrose, that he taught, the Virgin Mary had had other children after the birth of Christ.[6] He had, it seems, been condemned by Damasus, who died in 384,[7] but still held his see, and was not driven from it, even by the council of Capua. For the fathers of that assembly committed the hearing and judging of his cause to the bishops in his neighborhood, chiefly to those of Macedon, under their metropolitan Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica.[1] The neighboring bishops assembled, pursuant to the order of the council; and Bonosus, as well as his accusers, appearing before them, they found the charge so well supported, that they immediately forbade him to enter his church; which was suspending him from all episcopal functions. Bonosus complained loudly of this sentence, and even advised with the bishop of Milan, whether he might not, in defiance of a judgment so rash and immature, still exercise the functions of his office, and, in case of opposition, repel force with force. Ambrose exhorted him, in the strongest terms, to acquiesce to the sentence, to conduct himself with the prudence, temper, and moderation, that became a bishop; and, above all, not to undertake any thing that might be interpreted as a contempt of the authority of his judges, since he could not contemn their authority, without contemning at the same time that of the council, which had appointed them.[2] In the mean time the bishops of Macedon, having more leisurely examined the cause of Bonosus, wrote to Syricius, referring the decision to him, and declaring their abhorrence of the detestable error, that the Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ. If this was an error, which may well be doubted, it was one that did no way affect the Christian faith, and therefore did not deserve such a severe condemnation: but as it thwarted the favorable opinions then entertained in the church concerning virginity, it is no wonder that it should meet with so rough a treatment.(*)

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 830.
[2] Facund. Hermian. l. 8. c. 1.
[3] Ruff. l. II. c. 22.
[4] Mercat. t. 2. p. 128.
[5] Aug. ep. 150.
[6] Amb. ep. 5. & Instit. Virg. p. 5.
[7] Merc. ib.

[1] Amb. ib.
[2] Id. ib.

(*) That the Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ, was not a new opinion. It was taught by Helvidius in 383, and long before him by Tertullian, as Jerom himself is forced to own in the treatise which he wrote against Helvidius: nay, in the time of Epiphanius, who flourished from the year 366 to 403, that opinion universally prevailed in Arabia, as appears from the letter which he wrote in confutation of it, and addressed to all the Christians dwelling in Arabia, from the presbyters down to the catechumens. In that letter he styles those who denied the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary, Antidicomarianites; and ranks them, though their opinion had not yet been condemned by the church, sometimes among the heretics, and sometimes among the schismatics. But in the same letter he censures, with no less severity, those who adored her, styling the worship that was paid her an idolatrous heresy; which was taxing those who paid it both with heresy and idolatry; and from neither will the unmeaning terms of *latria, dulia, hyperdulia*, &c. invented and used by the schoolmen to express different degrees of worship, excuse the present practice of the church of Rome. Epiphanius was unacquainted with such terms, as well as with the different degrees of worship answering them; and therefore called the meeting of certain women, on a stated day, to offer a cake to the Virgin Mary, and eat it together in her honor, (whence they had the name of Collyridians,) "a folly repugnant to religion, an illusion of the devil, a robbing God of the honor that was due to him, an idolatrous heresy." (*a*) These women came from the northern provinces of Scythia into Thrace, probably about the year 372, when Athanaric, king of the Goths, drove all the Christians out of his dominions. From Thrace they wandered into Arabia; and there, in opposition to the Antidicomari-

(*a*) Epiph. hær. 78, 79.

Bonosus exercises the episcopal functions after his condemnation. He ordains some by force. An end to the schism of Antioch.

Syricius, in his answer to the bishops of Macedon, approves their sentiments; and employs almost his whole letter to show, that the Virgin Mary was always a virgin: but as for the cause of Bonosus, he tells them, that "it was not lawful for him to judge it, since that province had been committed to them by the council of Capua."[1] And was not this disclaiming, in the most plain and explicit terms he possibly could, that power which his successors challenge, and have almost overturned the Christian religion to maintain.(*)

As Syricius declined the judging of Bonosus, his cause was in the end decided, and he condemned by Anysius and the other bishops, to whom that judgment had been committed by the council of Capua. It was at the same time decreed, that those who had been ordained by him after the first sentence, that is, after his suspension, should retain the degrees to which he had raised them. This indulgence was shown, as is declared in the decree, contrary to the common rule, on account of the present necessity; that is, lest they should adhere to Bonosus, and form a schism.[1] Bonosus, though thus condemned, continued to exercise the episcopal functions, and, holding separate assemblies, to ordain, without examination or distinction, all who presented themselves to him: nay, he is even charged with dragging some by open force to his conventicle, and ordaining them there against their will:[2] a kind of rape never heard of before. What advantage he could propose to himself or others in so doing, we are not told, and it is not easy to guess. The bishops of Macedon allowed even those, who were thus ordained, to keep their respective degrees in the catholic church, upon their only receiving the benediction of a lawful bishop. Hence those, who found themselves excluded by the church from holy orders, on account of their scandalous lives, applied to Bonosus, pretending to espouse his party, but left him as soon as they had obtained the degree they wanted.[3] Bonosus died about the year 410, but his doctrine did not die with him, being maintained by some two hundred years after his death.(*)

Syricius had, in the last year of his life, the satisfaction of seeing an end put at length to the schism of Antioch, which I have had so frequent occasion to speak of; and the east and west, after so long a misunderstanding, or rather separation, happily reunited. This great work was accomplished in the following manner: Evagrius, the successor to Paulinus, dying not long after his promotion, Flavianus employed all the credit and interest he had at court, and with the clergy of Antioch, to prevent the election of a new bishop in the room of the deceased: and so far his endeavors proved successful. But he could by no means gain the Eustathians, who continued to assemble apart, or prevail either upon the bishops of Egypt, or Syricius, and

anites, introduced the above-mentioned idolatrous practice. This is the first instance of any worship paid to the Virgin Mary; and to those women the extravagant worship that is still paid her by the church of Rome owes its rise. Some of these women took upon them to act, at their meetings as priestesses. This Epiphanius styles an abominable abuse, women being so utterly incapable, says he, of performing any ecclesiastical functions, that our Savior did not grant even to his mother the power of baptizing. (*a*)

(*) Such a letter, we may be sure, has not been tamely received by the partisans of Rome. Some of them have rejected it as forged and surreptitious, for no other reason, but because Syricius is there made to disclaim a power which he undoubtedly had. But this is evidently begging the question. (*b*) Others finding it conveyed to us amongst Ambrose's letters, have ascribed it to him, by prefixing his name to it. But Ambrose is unluckily named, and spoken of, in the body of the letter: whence Baronius himself allows it not to be his. (*c*) The style afforded great matter of dispute, some thinking it like, and others unlike, to the style of Syricius: but more than the style, the title; "To Theophilus and Anysius." The former was bishop of Alexandria: and how came he to be any-ways concerned in the cause of Bonosus? If that name was common to him with some bishops of Macedon, how came that bishop to be named before Anysius his metripolitan? (*d*) In the height of these disputes, Holstenius published the above-mentioned letter at Rome, under the name of Syricius, from a very ancient and authentic manuscript, with the following title, "To Anysius and the other bishops of Illyricum." (*e*) This turned the controversy into another channel; for the dispute was no more concerning the authenticity, but the sense, of the letter, which the sticklers of the see of Rome began to think very different from the sense that the words of Syricius had conveyed to them before; nay, those who had rejected the letter as spurious, for no other reason but because Syricius was there made to disown a power which he undoubtedly had, were not ashamed now to maintain, that he disowned no such power. Some of them have a particular faculty or talent at making authors say what they never thought or dreamt of; nay, at making them affirm what they flatly deny, and deny what they possitively affirm. But they have not been so successful on this as on several other occasions. The words of Syricius are too plain and precise to admit of any plausible, or even probable, misinterpretation. To avoid therefore the tiresome and unnecessary task of confuting the forced interpretations they have put on the words of Syricius, I refer the reader to his letter, which is the fifth amongst Ambrose's letters; and leave him to judge, whether it was possible for him to disclaim, in terms less liable to misinterpretations, the power of judging a cause committed by a council to the judgment of others, which was disclaiming, in other words, that universal jurisdiction, which his successors have usurped, and pretended to exercise by Divine right.

(*a*) Idem Ibid.
(*b*) David. p. 562, 563.
(*c*) Bar. ad ann. 389. n. 76.
(*d*) Vid. Blond. primau. p. 236.
(*e*) Holst. coll. Rom. t. I. p. 189.

[1] Amb. ibid.

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1274. [2] Ib. p. 1275. [3] Ib.

(*) His followers were known by the name of Bonosiacs or Bonosians; and mention is made of them by Pope Gregory, towards the latter end of the sixth century. (*a*) That pope writes, as does likewise Gennadius, (*b*) that the church rejected their baptism, because they did not baptize in the name of the three Divine persons. But the council of Arles, held in 452, by the seventeenth canon, commands the Bonosians to be received into the church by the holy unction, the imposition of hands, and a confession of faith, it being certain, that they baptize in the name of the trinity. (*c*) It is to be observed, that several writers have confounded the Bonosians with the Photinians, who did not baptize in the name of the three persons; and by them both Gregory and Gennadius were misled. (*d*)

(*a*) Greg. l. 9. ep. 61.
(*b*) Id. ib. Genn. dog. c. 52.
(*c*) Avit. frag. p. 188.
(*d*) Vide Concil. t. 2. p. 1270. & t. 3. p. 663. & t. 4. p. 1013.

Chrysostom studies to reconcile the eastern and western bishops. Flavianus and Theophilus reconciled. Chrysostom attempts a reconciliation between Flavianus and Syricius. His prudent conduct. Syricius and Flavianus reconciled.

the other western bishops, to admit him to their communion, though he had no competitor, whose cause they could espouse against him. Thus, through the inflexible obstinacy of the Egyptian and western bishops, was discord kept alive, and a kind of schism fomented among the prelates and members of the catholic church, says Sozomen.[1] In this situation affairs continued from the year 392, in which Evagrius died, to the year 398, when the famous John Chrysostom, presbyter of the church of Antioch, was, in regard of his extraordinary merit, preferred to the see of Constantinople. No sooner was he placed in that high station, than his generous disposition, above all little piques and jealousies, his zeal for the welfare of the church in general, and the tender regard he had for that of Antioch in particular, prompted him to employ all the credit and authority, which his new dignity gave him, in bringing about an entire reconciliation between the east and the west, and restoring the church of Antioch to the communion of those churches, from which it had been so long separated.[2] Chrysostom had been consecrated by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, whom the council of Capua had appointed to decide, with the other bishops of Egypt, the difference between Flavianus and Evagrius, as I have related above, to him therefore, before he left Constantinople to return to Egypt, the new bishop of that city, impatient to see so great a work brought to a happy issue, imparted his intention of attempting a reconciliation between Flavianus and Syricius, bishop of Rome, earnestly entreating him to second and promote with his endeavors an undertaking truly worthy of the two bishops of the east.

There had subsisted a misunderstanding between Theophilus and Flavianus ever since the year 391, when the council of Capua was held. Flavianus had refused to submit his cause to the judgment of Theophilus pursuant to the resolution of that council; which he had highly resented; and, in the height of his resentment, as he was a man of a fiery and choleric temper, he had written to Flavianus in a very haughty and imperious style. To these letters Nestorius, no doubt, alludes, where he tells us, that Egypt could not, by her menacing letters, though written in the style, and with all the haughtiness, of an imperious tyrant, move or terrify the blessed Flavianus.[3] It was necessary, in the first place, to remove the misunderstanding which had so long subsisted between these two prelates; and in this Chrysostom met with no difficulty or obstruction, Theophilus readily agreeing to the terms he proposed in the name of Flavianus, and Flavianus ratifying them, upon the first notice, without the least exception or limitation. What these terms were, we are no where told; but it is certain, that, all disputes being thereby composed, the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch were entirely reconciled, and the communion between them renewed, to the great satisfaction of both.[1] The next thing to be attempted, and, as was apprehended, the most difficult to be accomplished, was the reconciling of Syricius with the bishop of Antioch, who had now held that see seventeen years, but had not been able, notwithstanding the great character he bore, to obtain the communion of Syricius, or any of his predecessors, on account of their strong prejudice against him, as well as his predecessor Meletius, and their obstinate attachment to the contrary party, in opposition to the far greater part of the eastern bishops. But the zeal of Chrysostom was proof against all difficulties. Not despairing therefore of success, he took the most effectual means a consummate prudence could dictate, to obtain it, advising the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria to acquaint the bishop of Rome, by a solemn embassy, with their reconciliation, and at the same time to beg, in the name of Flavianus, the communion of that see. This he knew would flatter the vanity of Syricius, and be of more weight than any remonstrances they could make. They readily fell in with the proposal, and deputies were immediately chosen to put it in execution. These were Acacius, bishop of Berœa, Demetrius of Pessinus, and several other bishops, with Isodorus, presbyter and hospitaler of the church of Alexandria, and a great number of presbyters and deacons of the church of Antioch. Acacius, who was at the head of this deputation, was charged by Chrysostom to present to Syricius the decree of his election to the see of Constantinople.[2] That so great an honor might not be conferred in vain on the see of Rome, it was thought advisable to acquaint Syricius with their design, before they set out, and to be well assured of a kind reception on their arrival in the west. They gave him accordingly early notice of their intention, and he, taken with the bait, readily promised to settle every thing to their satisfaction;[3] which he did accordingly, receiving them, on their arrival at Rome, with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, and admitting Flavianus to his communion. From Rome the deputies repaired into Egypt, where all the bishops, following the example of Theophilus and Syricius, acknowledged Flavianus for lawful bishop of Antioch, and, assembling in council, with great solemnity, embraced his communion. From Egypt the deputies set out for Antioch, and there, by delivering to Flavianus letters of communion from the western and Egyptian bishops, completed the

[1] Soz. l. 8. c. 3.
[2] Theod. l. 5. c. 23. Soz. l. 8. c. 3.
[3] Marc. t. 2. p. 86.

[1] Socr. l. 5. c. 15.
[2] Soz. l. 8. c. 3. Socr. l. 6. c. 9. Pallad. dial. c. 4.
[3] Theod. l. 5. c. 23.

The misunderstanding between the east and the west entirely removed. Flavianus endeavors in vain to gain over the Eustathians. Flavianus honored by the church of Rome as a saint, though ill used in his life-time by the popes.

great work, and with it their deputation.[1] Thus was an end put, at last, to the schism of Antioch; and, after so many years of strife and contention, a perfect harmony and good understanding were settled anew between the east and the west.(*)

Flavianus, being thus at last, in the seventeenth year of his episcopacy, acknowledged by, and united in communion with, all the bishops of the catholic church, spared no pains to gain over the Eustathians, that, by reuniting them to the rest of his flock, he might have the merit and glory of establishing an entire and lasting tranquillity in the church committed to his care. But his zeal was not therein attended with the wished-for success. The glory of completing so great and desirable a work was, by Providence, reserved for Alexander, one of his successors, who had the satisfaction of seeing all party-names laid aside, and the whole people of Antioch united in one flock, under one and the same shepherd. This union was made with great solemnity, in the year 415; eleven years after the death of Flavianus, and eighty-five after the beginning of the schism. Thus Theodoret, in his ecclesiastical history.[1] But Theodorus the lector assures us, that there still remained some seeds of that unhappy division till the year 482, when the body of Eustathius being brought back to Antioch, the few Eustathians who still continued to assemble apart, joined the rest of the catholics, and the name of Eustathius was never more heard of.[2] Flavianus died in the year 404, the ninety-fifth of his age, and twenty-third of his episcopacy, and is now honored as a saint; a distinction which none of his competitors have deserved, though as much caressed and favored by the two bishops of Rome, Damasus and Syricius, as he was opposed and ill used. How fallible have the bishops of that see showed themselves, from the earliest times, in their judgment of things! How rash in taking parties, and fomenting discords! How obstinate and inflexible in maintaining the cause, which they had once undertaken, let it be ever so bad! The only thing that can be alleged against the character of Flavianus, is his having accepted the bishopric of Antioch, contrary to the oath he had taken, on occasion of the agreement between Meletius and Paulinus, as I have related above.[3] That he took such an oath, is vouched both by Socrates and Sozomen.[4] But as he was looked upon by all the east, and extolled by Chrysostom, even in his lifetime, as a prelate of an unblemished character, and never reproached, even by his greatest enemies, with such an oath, in the many disputes that arose about his election, I had rather charge those two writers with one mistake more, (for they are guilty of many others), than a man of Flavi-

[1] Soz. l. 5. c. 15. Theod. ib. Pallad. dial. p. 10.

(*) If Syricius is to blame (and who, but Baronius, can excuse him?) for not acknowledging Flavianus, at least after the death of Paulinus, the election of his successor Evagrius being unquestionably uncanonical and illegal; how much more is he to blame for not acknowledging him even after the death of Evagrius, when he had no pretence whatsoever for denying him his communion, and by granting it he might have put an end to the schism? Baronius, to conceal the truth, and mislead his readers, takes a great deal of pains, in his account of this schism, to place in a false light all the transactions relating to it. But, in spite of all the art he has been able to use, to varnish over the conduct of Syricius, and impose on the public, it must appear undeniable to every impartial, I may say, to every rational, man, that the schism, and the many evils attending it, which are pathetically described by Chrysostom, who was then at Antioch, (*a*) were entirely owing to the pride and obstinacy of the bishop of Rome, at least during the last six years, that is, from the year 382, when Evagrius died, to 388, when he yielded, at last, upon his being courted to it by a solemn embassy. He had nothing then to object against the election, and much less against the conduct of Flavianus; and, if he had nothing then, he could have nothing before; so that it was merely from a haughty and obstinate spirit that he refused to communicate with him, and, by such a refusal, kept up and fomented a division so pernicious to the church. Baronius represents him as laboring with indefatigable pains to restore the tranquillity of the church, and leaving nothing unattempted that could any ways contribute to the promoting of so pious an undertaking, an undertaking which he had so much at heart. But that he had nothing at heart besides the glory of his see, is but too manifest from his conduct; for the minute that was saved, as it was by the above-mentioned deputation, all the difficulties vanished at once, which till then had obstructed the work. As for the conduct of Flavianus, in refusing to submit his cause to the judgment of the council of Capua, or of the Egyptian bishops, appointed to judge it by that council, it must appear, if impartially considered, more worthy of commendation than blame, though condemned, in very unbecoming terms by the sticklers for the see of Rome. He had been chosen in the oecumenical council of Constantinople, in the year 381, by the unanimous voice of all the bishops of the diocess of the east, or the patriarchate of Antioch, and soon after ordained in their presence, at Antioch, with the approbation of Nestorius, then bishop of Constantinople, and the loud acclamations of the far greater part of the people of Antioch, promising themselves, in him, a second Meletius, in whose room he was chosen.(*b*) Being thus chosen and ordained, he was acknowledged by all the bishops of the east except those of Egypt, of the island of Cyprus, and Arabia. Could he therefore, without shamefully betraying the undoubted right, which the bishops of each diocess had of choosing their metropolitan, suffer his election to be questioned and canvassed by the western bishops, who had no concern in it; and, besides had openly espoused the cause of his competitor Paulinus, and supported him, so long as he lived, with the most open and avowed partiality? Could he, without foregoing, in a manner still more shameful, both his own right, and that of his electors, out of compliance to the bishops assembled at Capua, put himself upon the level with Evagrius, whose election and ordination were undoubtedly illegal? Besides, Flavianus was sensible, that the eastern bishops would have paid no manner of regard to the sentence of the council; that, had the council adjudged the see of Antioch to Evagrius, such a judgment, instead of closing, would have widened the breach between the east and the west; and consequently, that his complying with their summons, far from answering the end they proposed to themselves, would more probably have had a quite contrary effect, since he had but too much room to suppose, that the strong prejudice, which they had on all occasions betrayed against him, would incline them to favor his competitor, notwithstanding the known illegality both of his election and ordination. It was therefore, upon the whole, very prudent in him to decline putting the affair upon that issue.

(*a*) Chrys. in Eph. hom. 11.

(*b*) Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104.

[1] Theod. l. 5. c. 35. [2] Theodor. Lect. l. 2.
[3] Vid. p. 101. [4] Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3.

Syricius dies. Was once honored as a saint. Why expunged by Baronius out of the calendar of saints. Jerom and Ruffinus quarrel.

anus' probity with such a scandalous prevarication.

Syricius did not long enjoy the satisfaction he had, to see the schism of Antioch ended in his days, and a good understanding settled anew between the east and the west. He died the same year, 398, according to the most probable opinion, on the 26th of November.[1] He is said, in his epitaph, quoted by Baronius,[2] to have been a man of a tender, compassionate, and generous temper; to have studied the happiness of the people committed to his care; to have spared no pains in procuring them the blessings that flow from peace and tranquillity; and to have screened several persons from the wrath of the emperor, to maintain the rights of the church.[3] He is commended by Ambrose, and the whole council of Milan, as a vigilant pastor,[4] by Isidore of Seville, as an illustrious pontiff;[5] and he has even a place among the other saints, in most of the ancient martyrologies.[6] However, Baronius has not thought him worthy of a place in the Roman martyrology. It is well known, that the charge of revising and correcting the Roman martyrology was committed, by pope Gregory XIII. to Baronius, with full power to reject such as he should judge unworthy, and admit others in their room, whom he should declare worthy of the public worship, and a place there.(*) "The keys of heaven," says a modern writer, speaking of that charge, "were taken from Peter, and given to Baronius; for it was not by Peter, but by Baronius, that some were excluded from, and others admitted into, heaven."[7] He then shows, that by this second Minos, as he styles him, several were driven from the seats they had long held in heaven, and to which they had a just claim, to make room for others, who had no claim. Among the former he names Syricius, whom he thinks Baronius ought to have treated in a more friendly manner, upon the recommendation of Ambrose, of the council of Milan, and of Isidore. What thus prejudiced Baronius against him, and out-weighed, in his scales, all the recommendations that could be produced in his favor, was his indifference for Jerom and Paulinus, and the kindness he showed to Ruffinus, Jerom's antagonist. Syricius, instead of protecting Jerom, as his predecessor Damasus had done, against the Roman clergy, whom he had provoked with his writings, gave him, in a manner, up to their resentment; which obliged him to abandon Rome, and return into the east, as I have related above. The name of Paulinus, afterwards bishop of Nola, is famous in the history of the church, and celebrated by Jerom, Ambrose, Austin, and all the writers of those times. He had abandoned the world, and the immense wealth he possessed, to lead a retired life; and, in the year 395, he passed through Rome, on his way to Nola, which he had chosen for the place of his retirement. The treatment he met with at Rome, from that clergy, and Syricius himself, must have been very unworthy of a man of his character, since it obliged him, as he himself writes,[1] to quit the city in great haste, and pursue his journey to Nola. Two years afterwards Ruffinus came to Rome, and there met with a very different reception. For Syricius received him, though violently suspected of Origenism, with the greatest marks of esteem and affection; and, after having entertained him a whole year, gave him letters of communion at his departure. Of this Jerom complains, as if advantage had been taken of the bishop of Rome's simplicity, to impose upon him.[2] I will not pretend, as some have done, to justify Ruffinus; but cannot help observing, that such a charge ought not to be admitted against him, upon the bare authority of Jerom, or of those who have only copied what he wrote.

Jerom and Ruffinus had lived several years in close friendship, and great intimacy; but, falling out in the year 393, their former friendship was turned at once into an open and avowed enmity. What gave occasion to this breach I shall relate hereafter, and only observe here, that Jerom not only quarreled with Ruffinus, but with all the friends of Ruffinus; nay, and with those too, who, professing an equal friendship for both, would not break with either, or any ways interfere in the quarrel. Among these was the celebrated Roman matron Melania, so frequently spoken of, and so highly commended, by Austin, by Paulinus, and, above all, by Je-

[1] Vid. Bolland. 22 Feb. p. 282.
[2] Bar. ad an. 398. in app. [3] Id. ib.
[4] Amb. ep. 7. [5] Isid. vir. ill. c. 3.
[6] Florent. p. 999. Bolland. Feb. 22. p. 282.

(*) The Roman martyrology contains the names of such saints as may be publicly worshipped, and of the places where they died, with a succinct account of the most remarkable feats which they are supposed to have performed. I said, who are publicly worshipped; for in private every one is allowed to honor, worship, and invoke whom they please, provided they have sufficient grounds to believe them in a state of happiness, or in the way to it, that is, in heaven, or in purgatory; for the souls in purgatory may be privately worshipped and invoked; nay, most of the popish divines are now of opinion, that even a canonized saint may be still in purgatory. When learning began to revive, many gross mistakes were discovered in the Roman, as well as in the other martyrologies, some being placed among the saints, and consequently worshipped as saints, who had been notorious sinners; and others daily invoked, who had never existed. That the church therefore might be no longer misled in her worship, Gregory XIII. thought it necessary to interpose his infallible authority; and, having, accordingly, ordered Baronius to revise and correct the Roman martyrology, he confirmed, by a special bull, dated the 14th of January, 1581, all the emendations, additions, corrections, &c. which Baronius had been pleased to make, threatening with the indignation of the Almighty God, and of his apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, all who should presume to make any further alterations. And yet many alterations have been made since Gregory's time; and that many more might and ought to be made, has been sufficiently shown by many protestant, and some Roman catholic, divines.

[7] Aguilera santi di Palermo.

[1] Paul. ep. 1.
[2] Hier. ep. 16. & in Ruff. l. 3. c. 6, & 7

Jerom quarrels with all the friends of Ruffinus, especially with Melania. His conduct towards her. Syricius not to be condemned on the bare authority of Jerom.

rom himself, who has filled his letters with her praises, proposing her as a true pattern of every virtue becoming her sex.

Melania had retired with Ruffinus to Jerusalem, twenty-seven years before, and continued there practising, under his direction, those works of charity, which Jerom so often admires and extols. It could not therefore be expected, that she should discard the partner of her holy life, and all her good works, as Paulinus styles him,[1] the minute the other was pleased to dislike him, or, indeed, that she should take any part at all in the quarrel. And yet, because she prudently declined taking part, but continued to show the same affection and esteem for Ruffinus, which she had done before; Jerom, forgetful of the regard that was due to a matron of her birth and piety, and of the high encomiums which he had himself bestowed on her, began to inveigh with no less bitterness against her, than against Ruffinus himself. In one of his letters, still extant,[2] after finding fault with one of Ruffinus' friends, thought to be John, bishop of Jerusalem, he adds; "But, after all, he is not so much to blame as his instructors Ruffinus and Melania, who, with a great deal of trouble and pains, have taught him to know nothing." Ruffinus tells us, that Jerom, finding that Melania, who was a matron of great judgment and penetration, did not approve of his actions and conduct, thereupon spitefully erased out of his chronicle, what he had there written in her praise.[3] But he did not, nor was it, perhaps, in his power to make such an alteration in all the copies; for what he is said to have cancelled, is still remaining in all the printed, as well as manuscript copies of that work, which have reached our times. Melania lived eighteen years after, steadily pursuing the same course of life, for which Jerom had once proposed her as a pattern to her whole sex.[4] She died at Jerusalem in the year 411, and died poor, having spent an immense estate in relieving the needy and indigent, not only of the countries where she lived, and through which she passed, but those too of the most distant provinces of the empire. For persons in poverty and distress, whether in Persia or Britain, says the author of her life,[5] were alike the objects of her charity, and felt alike the effects of her generosity and good nature. She died, but with her did not die the rancor and spleen which Jerom had for so many years harbored in his breast against her. For, carrying his resentment even beyond the grave, while the poor were every where bemoaning, with tears, the loss of so generous a benefactress, while the writers were paying the deserved tribute of praise to the virtues of so pious a matron, Jerom, instead of joining the rest in the common grief, strove to dry up their tears, to drown their praises, by throwing out several peevish and ill-natured reflections on the memory of the deceased. As the famous Pelagius had inscribed a book to her before he broached his opinions, Jerom, in the letter which he wrote to Ctesiphon against the Pelagians, could not forbear bringing her in, and observing on that occasion, with a malignant quibble, that the very name of Melania bespoke (in the Greek tongue), and sufficiently declared, the blackness of her treachery and perfidiousness.[1]

Such was the conduct of Jerom towards that illustrious matron, in her life time, and after her death. From this conduct I leave the reader to judge, whether the authority of so prejudiced a writer ought to have been of such weight with Baronius, as to make him exclude her, as well as Syricius, from the Roman martyrology, or the calendar of saints. Should we grant Ruffinus to have really held the errors which Jerom charged him with, it must still be owned, that Melania acted, as became a person of her wisdom, piety, and experience, in suspending her judgment, and not breaking with Ruffinus, till she was otherwise convinced, than by the invectives of his antagonist, equally levelled against herself, that he was no longer worthy of her friendship and regard. As for Syricius, Jerom rather commends than blames him, even where he complains of his kindness to Ruffinus. For he only says, that Ruffinus abused the simplicity of Syricius, who judged of the spirit of others from his own;[2] which was saying, in other words, that he was a good man, but mistaken in his judgment, or not infallible: so that his only crime, according to Jerom, was want of infallibility. However, upon the authority of that father, Baronius not only condemns the conduct of Syricius, but, rashly prying into the inscrutable secrets of Providence, pretends his days to have been shortened for the countenance he gave to Ruffinus, and the remissness he showed in suppressing the errors, with which he was charged. It is certain, that Ruffinus was well received, and entertained, in a very hospitable manner, by Syricius, during his stay at Rome; and that, upon his leaving that city, he received from him letters of communion. Now, if Syricius did not know, or did not believe, that Ruffinus held those errors, how unjust is it to blame him for the kindness he showed to a man of Ruffinus' character! If he did know, and yet gave him letters of communion, how will Baronius be able to clear Syricius from the imputation of holding the same errors?(*)

[1] Paul. ep. 9. [2] Hier. ep. 101. [3] Ex. Ruf. l. 2. [4] Vid. Hier. ep. 99. [5] Pallad. hist. Lausiac. in Bibl. Patr. c. 118.

[1] Hier. ad Ctes. l. 2. [2] Hier. in Ruf. l. 3. c. 6. 7.

(*) A modern writer, (Florentinus, in vet. Mart. Hieron. p. 1001—1010.) taking the part of Syricius against Baronius, has composed a whole dissertation, and not a short one, to show "how undeservedly Syricius has been cashiered in this review of the church

The misunderstanding between Syricius and Paulinus, no charge against Syricius. Anastasius writes to Paulinus. What occasioned the quarrel between Jerom and Ruffinus. Ruffinus translates Origen's Periarchon.

As for the treatment Paulinus of Nola met with from Syricius, there was, no doubt, a misunderstanding between them; but, as I am quite in the dark as to the cause of it, I will not take upon me to condemn the one rather than the other. Perhaps they were both to blame; perhaps they both meant well, and neither was to blame. However that be, the misunderstanding between them was soon removed; for, during the remaining part of Syricius' life, Paulinus went constantly to Rome once a year, as he himself declares, in one of his letters.[1] Syricius, it is true, did not take Jerom into his protection, as his predecessor had done, nor show him the same kindness; which is the third charge brought by Baronius against him, but of no more weight than the other two, that is, of none at all. Jerom, prompted by his zeal, and censorious temper, could not help inveighing, with great bitterness, in all his writings, against the looseness and debauchery, which universally prevailed, in his time, among the Roman clergy, and the pious frauds they made use of to extort legacies and presents from old men, from widows, and from orphans. Syricius might have been as much offended at the vices of his libertine clergy, as Jerom was, and even studied to reform them; but, at the same time, be glad, without deserving the least reproach on that score, to get rid of so troublesome a censor, who thus exposed their irregularities to the eyes, and them to the contempt, of the world. (*)

Syricius was interred in the cemetery of Priscilla, but his body was translated, about the latter-end of the eighth century, to the church of St. Praxedes,[2] where his remains (for Baronius will not allow us to call them relics) still lie unregarded.

ANASTASIUS, THIRTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ARCADIUS, HONORIUS.]

[Year of Christ, 398.] SYRICIUS was succeeded by Anastasius,[3] after a vacancy of twenty days, according to some; and, according to others, of near two months. He was no sooner chosen, than he wrote a kind and obliging letter to Paulinus, then at Nola in Campania, and another in his commendation to the bishops of that province.[4] This he is supposed to have done, in order to efface the bad impression, which the treatment Paulinus had met with in the time of Syricius, might have given him against that see, and the Roman clergy.

It was in the time of Anastasius, and soon after his election, that the famous dispute arose between Jerom and Ruffinus, which was afterwards carried on with warmth on both sides quite unbecoming men of their profession. Of this quarrel, and the part Anastasius acted on that occasion, the writers of those times give us the following account. Ruffinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, and a great admirer of Origen, having accompanied Melania, whom he had attended twenty-five years at Jerusalem, on her return to Rome in the time of Syricius, was received there with extraordinary marks of esteem by the Roman clergy, and Syricius himself, as I have observed elsewhere.[5] Encouraged by the reception he met with, he continued a whole year at Rome; and during that time published, but without putting his name to it, a Latin translation of Origen's Periarchon, or Treatise of Principles, having first removed the prejudice which some might entertain against that writer, by the translation of an apology, which the martyr Pamphylus had composed in his vindication, while he was in prison. To this apology he added a piece of his own, showing that most of the errors ascribed to Origen had been maliciously inserted into his works by his enemies after his death.[6] In the preface to the Periarchon itself he also declared, that, in imitation of a learned brother, meaning Jerom, who had translated above seventy of Origen's books, he had either corrected or suppressed such errors as had appeared to him repugnant to the articles of the catholic faith.[7] The work, thus recommended, was

triumphant, while many others passed muster for great saints, whose virtues," he might have said, whose very existence, "may be justly disputed." I shall not enter into the tedious detail of his arguments and reasons, but only observe, that the name of Syricius should not have been struck out of the calendar, while the names of the Arian pope Liberius, and the anti-pope Felix, his antagonist, were kept in; though, upon other accounts, I think him myself very unworthy of the name of a saint.

[1] Paul. ep. 16. [3] Theod. l. 5. c. 24. Soz. l. 7. c. 31. Aug. de civ. Dei.
[4] Paul. ep. 16.

(*) The festival of Syricius was never kept, it seems, by public authority; but is marked in some ancient martyrologies, on the 22d of February, and in others on the 26th of November. The last was more probably the day of his death, since he is said, both by Prosper and Isidore, to have governed fourteen years, to complete which one month only will be wanting, if we place his death on that day; and several, if with Baronius we suppose him to have died on the 22d of February; (a) for, as to the year of his death there is no disagreement among authors. Baronius mentions an ancient picture, part whereof, says he, is still to be seen in the title of pope Syricius. (b) But that picture is no more to be seen, and he explains himself no farther.

(a) Vid. Boll. 22 Feb. p. 282.
(b) Bar. ad ann. 395. n. 6.

[2] Vide. Boll. prop. p. 59. [5] Page 124.
[6] Hier. Apol. l. 2. ep. 75, & dial. advers. Pelag. [7] Id. ap. l. advers. Ruff.

Many at Rome embrace the errors of Origen. Errors left in the work, notwithstanding the corrections made by the translator. Jerom's charge against Ruffinus. Ruffinus' answer. Jerom condemns Origen, and inveighs against Ruffinus. Origen condemned by Anastasius and several other bishops.

received with uncommon applause at Rome, and the sentiments of Origen greedily embraced, and warmly maintained, by great numbers of the clergy as well as the laity, to whom Origen had till then been, it seems, utterly unknown. This happened in the time of Syricius, who, either not suspecting Ruffinus, as he had not put his name to the translation, or perhaps not judging him worthy of censure for barely relating the sentiments of another, or supposing that, agreeably to his preface, he had suppressed whatever was wrong in the original work, gave him letters of communion at his departure from Rome: for he had no sooner published his translation than he left that city and returned to Aquileia. Syricius died soon after, and Anastasius who was no sooner chosen in his room, than the famous Roman matron Marcella, offended at the new doctrines that began to prevail in Rome, applied to him, pressing him to put a stop to the growing evil, and at the same time accusing Ruffinus as the author of the translation, to which alone it was owing.[1] To make good this charge, she produced some copies corrected with Ruffinus' own hand; and several persons appeared, who, having by her means been reclaimed from the errors of Origen, owned they had been led into them by the disciples of Ruffinus.[2] This Jerom cannot relate without launching into the praises of his heroine Marcella, crying up her zeal, extolling her courage and resolution, in thus making head against so numerous a band, meaning the Origenists in Rome, while the clergy declined that trouble, or rather promoted the doctrines they ought to have opposed. But elsewhere he will not allow women, under any pretence whatsoever, to concern themselves in religious controversies. "To meddle in disputes concerning faith or religion, is not at all the province (says he, with the words of St. Paul) of silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."[3] But he speaks here of Melania, who was no less attached to Ruffinus than Marcella was to him.

In the Periarchon were contained, without all doubt, many unsound and unwarrantable notions, and Ruffinus corrected those only that related to the Trinity. "He corrected," says Jerom, "what Origen had impiously written concerning the Trinity, being well apprised it would have given great offence at Rome. But as to his other errors, those especially concerning the fall of the angels, and the first man, the resurrection, the world or worlds of Epicurus, the restoration of all things, &c., he either left them, as he found them in the original, or confirmed them with reasons borrowed from the comment of Didymus, an avowed defender of Origen. Thus he declared himself a catholic with respect to the Trinity, that in other points the reader might not be aware of him as a heretic."[1]

In answer to this charge, Ruffinus declared, that it was never his intention to correct all the errors that were ascribed to Origen; that the declaration he had made, in his preface to the Periarchon, ought to be restrained to those errors only that related to the Trinity; and that it was very uncharitable to judge of his faith, from the faith of the author he translated, and not from his own words. He then declares his sentiments touching some particular points, in which Origen was thought to differ from the church; adding, that where Origen differed from the catholic church, he differed from Origen.

Anastasius, notwithstanding the solicitations of Marcella, declined either proceeding against Ruffinus, or censuring his translation, till two years after, when Jerom, in a new version which he published of the same work, undertook to prove, that several opinions of Origen were truly heretical, and as such ought to be condemned by the church. As to Ruffinus, he inveighed bitterly against him, as if he had translated that work with no other view but to propagate the errors it contained. Thus began the famous quarrel between these two writers, which occasioned no small disturbance in the church, some siding with Jerom against Ruffinus, and others with Ruffinus against Jerom. Among the former, the most sanguine were Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia, in the island of Cyprus, and Anastasius, bishop of Rome. Theophilus not only condemned in a council, which he summoned for that purpose, the errors of Origen, but Origen himself, declaring him a heretic, and forbidding all under his jurisdiction to read, or even keep his works by them; which is the first instance we have of such prohibitions. His example was followed by Epiphanius, Anastasius, Venerius, bishop of Milan, Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, and several others. But some, and among the rest John, bishop of Jerusalem, and Chrysostom, then bishop of Constantinople, disapproving the rash conduct of their colleagues, could by no means be induced to confirm the sentence they had pronounced; which Epiphanius resented to such a degree, that he immediately separated himself from their communion. Sozomen adds, that he even refused to pray for young Theodosius, while he was dangerously ill, because his mother Eudoxia would not banish from Constantinople some monks who had warmly espoused the cause of Origen.[2] Ruffinus ranks Epiphanius among those plagiaries, who, borrowing from Origen all they said or wrote, cried down his works,

[1] Id. ib.
[2] Id. ib.
[3] Id. & Ctesiphont. advers. Peleg. Tim. 2. c. iii. v. 6, 7.

[1] Id. apol. 1. advers. Ruff.
[2] Soz. l. 8. c. 15.

in order to deter others from reading them, and consequently from discovering, that what was admired in them was not their own.[1]

Origen being thus condemned as a heretic, near one hundred and fifty years after his death, Anastasius, at the instigation of Marcella, Pammachius, Oceanus, and some other of Jerom's friends in Rome, wrote to Ruffinus complaining of his translation, and summoning him to appear, and give an account of his faith. In answer to this letter, Ruffinus sent him a confession of faith entirely agreeable to that of the catholic church, adding, that he held no other; that his faith had been sufficiently tried in the persecution of Valens; and that, as to the translation of Origen's work, he had there neither approved nor disapproved, but barely related, the sentiments of that writer. He modestly declined complying with the summons calling him to Rome; and concluded with declaring, that the faith of the Roman church and his were one and the same.[2] (*)

But this confession, however orthodox, did not satisfy Anastasius, or rather Jerom and his friends in Rome. They continued, says Ruffinus, the persecution which they had so successfully begun, and with their malicious suggestions prevailed in the end on Anastasius to comply with their unjust demands;[1] that is, I suppose, to separate himself from his communion: for Anastasius, in his answer to a letter which John, bishop of Jerusalem, had wrote in favor of Ruffinus, acquaints that prelate, that he had cut him off from his communion, and left him to be judged by God and his own conscience. "As to Origen," says he in the same letter, "I knew not before who he was, nor what he had wrote. Ruffinus has translated him into our language; and, in doing so, what else could he have in view but to infect this church with his pernicious doctrines? He has expressed his own sentiments in translating those of his author; and is therefore no less guilty than Origen himself, whom we have all condemned."[2](*)

[1] Hier. in Ruff. l. 2. c. 6. l. 3. c. 7. & Ruff. ad Orig.
[2] Hier. in Ruff. c. 6, 7. ep. 16. 78.

(*) The chief errors of Origen were concerning the Trinity, the resurrection of the body, the eternity of hell torments, and the origin of souls. If his works were not interpolated by the heretics, as Ruffinus pretended they were, it is no easy matter to determine what was his real opinion with respect to the Trinity; for in some passages he seems to acknowledge an equality, and in others to establish an inequality, between the Father and the Son. As to the resurrection, he was accused of not believing, that the body, at least the same body, was to rise from the dead. He denied the eternity of hell torments, and held, that even the devils would repent in the end, and be saved. He maintained the souls to have been created before the world; to have been confined to the bodies, which they animated, as so many prisons, to expiate there the sins which they had committed; to be in perpetual motion passing from one body to another, and at last to become angels. With the three last errors chiefly Ruffinus was charged by St. Jerom; and it was to clear himself from such an imputation, that, in his answer to Anastasius summoning him to Rome, he declared his belief with respect to those articles, styling his answer on that account an apology. As to the Trinity, those whom they called Origenists, were allowed, even by their enemies, to be quite orthodox in their belief of that mystery. Touching the resurrection, Ruffinus declared and explained his faith in such clear terms as ought to have left no room, even for St. Jerom, to arraign him on that head. He expressed himself in a manner no less orthodox with respect to the eternity of the pains of hell. But, as to the origin of souls, he owns himself to be quite at a loss what to think, and what to determine, on that subject, since no particular opinion had been yet settled by the church, and the ecclesiastical writers disagreed in that point among themselves; some believing, with Tertullian and Lactantius, the souls to have been formed with the bodies; and others maintaining, with Origen, that they were all created before the world: as to himself, he declared, that he held nothing for certain but what he was taught by the church, namely, that the souls as well as the bodies proceeded from God. (a) This Jerom called a false, artful, and imposing confession, as if Ruffinus did not believe what he professed in the most solemn manner to believe; and Anastasius, judging of his faith not from his own words, but from those of Jerom, separated himself from his communion.

I cannot help observing here, that Jerom, whom nothing now will satisfy but the condemnation of Origen, used a few years before to inveigh with the same gall and bitterness against the enemies of that writer as he does now against his friends, condemning with as much acrimony those who accused him, as he now does those who excuse him. Origen had been condemned in his lifetime by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, and by several other bishops: and Jerom, after telling us, in speaking of the judgment that was given against him, that he had written more books than others had time to read; and that in the number of his volumes he had surpassed Varro, and the other most eloquent writers both Greek and Latin; adds, "But what reward did he receive for so much toil and labor? He was condemned by the bishop Demetrius; and, if we except the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Phœnicia, and Achaia, he was condemned by all the rest. Even Rome assembled her senate against him, not because he taught any new doctrines, or held any heretical opinions, which those who snarl at him, like so many mad dogs, would fain make us believe; but because they could not bear the bright rays of his eloquence and knowledge, and were forced to be dumb when he spoke." This passage is quoted by Ruffinus, and Jerom himself owns it to have been copied from his letter to Paula. (a)

By the senate that Rome assembled against Origen, Jerom meant, no doubt, the bishop and clergy of that city: and that he made no account of their judgment, sufficiently appears from the contemptuous and ironical manner he speaks of it. However, that father is brought in by Baronius as an evidence for infallibility, on account of the regard which he afterwards paid to the judgment of Anastasius, styling it a decisive sentence. But Jerom had then changed his opinion; and Anastasius only condemned what he had condemned before; so that from the great regard which Jerom showed on that occasion for the judgment of Anastasius, Baronius can at most conclude, that he thought the popes infallible when they agreed with him; for that he thought them fallible when they disagreed with him, is manifest from his not acquiescing in the judgment of another pope condemning Origen, when he himself had not yet condemned him.

(a) Ruff. ad Anast. p. 202. (a) Hier. vir. illustr. c. 54. Ruff. l. 2. p. 225.
[1] Idem ibid. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1194.

(*) The same charge lies against Jerom; nay, he was the more guilty of the two. For he had not only translated many of Origen's works, containing errors no less repugnant to the catholic truths than any in the Periarchon, but had besides filled his comments on the Scripture, especially on the epistle to the Ephesians, with the worst of Origen's errors, namely, with those relating to the resurrection of the body, to the pre-existence of the souls, and to the duration of hell-torments, as is manifest from the many passages quoted by Ruffinus out of the comments of that father. Jerom found great fault with Ruffinus, for not confuting the errors which he translated; concluding from thence, that he held the same doctrines: and yet he was himself so far from confuting in his comments any of Origen's erroneous opinions, that on the contrary he often delivered them in such manner as made many,

The condemnation of Origen owing chiefly to the bishop of Alexandria. The bishop of Aquileia communicates with Ruffinus, though excommunicated by Anastasius. Ruffinus unjustly condemned.

In the same letter Anastasius mentions with great joy a decree of the emperor, that is, of Arcadius and Honorius, forbidding the works of Origen, and imposing severe penalties on such as should for the future read or peruse them.(*)

Such is the account the contemporary writers, and Jerom himself, give us of the condemnation of Origen, and his interpreter, Ruffinus, very different from that which we read in Baronius, introducing his high pontiff Anastasius as acting the first part on that occasion; though Jerom tells us, in express terms, that Anastasius followed the example of Theophilus; that he condemned in the west, what had before been condemned in the east;[1] and that Rome and all Italy owed their deliverance to the letters of Theophilus;[2] meaning the circular letter, which Theophilus wrote to all the catholic bishops, acquainting them that he had condemned Origen, and prohibited his books, and exhorting them to follow his example.[3] It was by this letter that Anastasius was induced to condemn Origen: for what else could Jerom mean by saying, that Rome and Italy were, by the letters of Theophilus, delivered from the errors of Origen? Baronius could not but know, that the letter of Theophilus was addressed to all the catholic bishops, since it is styled by Theophilus himself, in a letter he wrote to Epiphanius,[4] and by Epiphanius, in one of his letters to Jerom,[5] "a general letter to all catholics:" and yet the annalist speaks of it as directed to Anastasius alone, in order to impose by that means on his readers, and persuade them, "that the bishop of Alexandria submitted the sentence he had pronounced to the judgment of Anastasius, being well apprised, that it could be of no weight unless confirmed by the first see." Had he been well apprised of this, I cannot think he would have pronounced such a sentence, as it is very certain he did, without the authority, the advice, or even the knowledge, of the "first see."

As to Ruffinus, Anastasius, it is true, separated himself from his communion; but did not excommunicate him, that is, as the word is now understood, did not cut him off from the communion of the catholic church, as Baronius insinuates. The power of excommunicating him in this sense was by the canons vested in his own bishop; and it is manifest from Jerom, that Chromatius, then bishop of Aquileia, continued to communicate with him after Anastasius had renounced his communion; nay, after Chromatius himself had condemned Origen, and the Origenists,[1] that is, those who held the errors of Origen. A plain proof, that the bishop Aquileia did not acquiesce in the judgment of Anastasius in ranking Ruffinus among them. And truly the only charge brought against him by Anastasius, in his letter to John of Jerusalem, was his having translated Origen into the Latin tongue, without pointing out his errors, or offering any arguments to confute them. Thence he was by Jerom induced to conclude, that Ruffinus held the same errors. "What could Ruffinus propose," says he in his letter, "by translating Origen into the Roman language? Had he exposed the execrable errors his work contains, and raised in his readers that indignation which the author deserves, I should rather have praised than blamed him. But he has in his mind consented to those errors, and in translating the sentiments of Origen expressed his own."[2] This Ruffinus denied, declaring, with the words of Origen, in his preface to the Periarchon,[3] that he embraced nothing as truth, that any ways differed from the received doctrines of the catholic church: nay, he was so far from defending any of Origen's errors, which seemed to him repugnant to the catholic truths, that in the apology he composed in defence of that writer, as well as in the preface which he prefixed to his translation, he undertook to prove, that those errors were not his, but had been maliciously inserted into his works, either by his enemies to eclipse his reputation, or by heretics, who had fathered upon him their own doctrines, with a view of recommending them to the world by the authority of so great and so venerable a name.[4] He followed therein the example of the most eminent writers, and the greatest lights of the church, namely, of the martyr Pamphylus,[5] of Athanasius,[6] Ba-

and St. Austin among the rest, believe them to be his own.(a) Nay, in one place he seems to own, that he held some of Origen's errors:(b) but ends what he there writes of him thus: "If you believe me, I never was an Origenist; but if you absolutely insist upon my having been one, I now tell you, that I am so no more; and it is to convince you of this, that I am become the accuser of Origen."

(*) Ruffinus pretended this letter to be suppositious, and to have been forged by St. Jerom, alleging, that he could not believe the bishop of Rome capable of such a crying piece of injustice as to condemn an innocent man, and condemn him in his absence. He added, that if Anastasius had ever written such a letter to John of Jerusalem, John, with whom he lived in great intimacy, would have acquainted him with it, which he had not done. In answer to this charge, Jerom refers him to the archives of the Roman church;(c) and to Jerom I refer the Jesuit Halloix, supposing the letter to have been feigned, though not by St. Jerom, on account of the following words, that seem to wound the pretended supremacy. "I have entirely separated myself from him," meaning Ruffinus: "I will not even know where he is, or what he is doing: let him try, if he pleases, to be absolved elsewhere." So that Anastasius thought he might be absolved elsewhere, though condemned at Rome. This Halloix, more jealous of the papal supremacy than the pope himself, will not allow, and therefore pretends the letter to be suppositious. But, since the time of Ruffinus, none besides he ever questioned its authenticity.

(a) Hier. ep. 89. (b) Hier. ep. 65.
(c) Hier. in Ruff. l. 3. c. 5, & 6.
[1] Hier. ep. 78. [2] Id. ep. 71.
[3] Id. ep. 6. 69, 70. [4] Id. ep. 6.
[5] Id. ep. 73.

[1] Apol. l. 3. c. 1. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1194.
[3] Præf. ad Periarch. p. 665.
[4] Apol. pro Orig. apud Hier. t. 4. p. 194, 195. & præf. ad Periarch. [5] Phot. c. 118.
[6] Athan. de Nicæn. decret. p. 277. Concil. t. 5. p. 652. Phot. c. 232.

Origen excused by some of the fathers, and once by Jerom himself. The bishops of Africa apply to Anastasius and Venerius of Milan. Anastasius advises the bishops of Africa not to dissemble the cruelties of the Donatists. Who refuse to comply with his advice.

zil,[1] his brother Gregory of Nyssa,[2] Gregory Nazianzen,[3] and many others, who out of the great regard they had for a man of Origen's piety and learning, either ascribed to others the errors they found in his works, or excused them, by putting on his words the most charitable construction they could bear. Jerom himself had been formerly one of Origen's greatest admirers, had translated above seventy of his books, and thought he could not employ his time better than in enriching the Latin tongue with the works of "the best writer and first doctor of the church after the apostles,"[4] as he then styled him. As Ruffinus, in his translation of the Periarchon, endeavored to excuse the errors of Origen, so had Jerom done before him in translating his other works, choosing rather to "veil and excuse," than expose the faults of one whom in other respects he so much admired.[5] But this admiration being afterwards changed into an open and avowed enmity, "the first doctor of the church after the apostles" became at once not only an "heterodox, but an impious writer;" all who stood up in his defence were arraigned of the same "pestilential doctrines;" and what was found amiss in his works was no longer "veiled or excused," but set out in the worst light.(*)

[1] Concil. t. 5. p. 653.
[2] Phot. c. 232. & Nyss. in Cant. t. 1. p. 473.
[3] Naz. or. 31. [4] Hier. de nom. Heb. p. 299.
[5] Hier. ep. 65.

(*) Some of the fathers would not allow even his doctrine concerning the Trinity to be heterodox. For some passages being quoted out of his works by the Arians to confirm their opinions, Basil and Nazianzen undertook to prove, from other passages, that his sentiments with respect to the Trinity were quite orthodox; and that the Arians had either out of malice misinterpreted, or out of ignorance misunderstood his meaning, not being capable of fathoming the depth of his thoughts.(a) It must be owned, that Origen, in several places, speaks of the Trinity agreeably to the sentiments of the church, acknowledging "the Son to have been from the beginning in the Father; to be the image of the Father; to have been begotten by him from all eternity; to be the wisdom of God; to be God, though not the source and origin of the Divinity, as the Father, whom on that account he styles Autotheos; to be above all creatures; to have the same power as the Father, and to deserve the same honor and worship." But elsewhere he uses expressions that can no way bear an orthodox sense, namely, that "the word is an hypostasis different from the Father;" meaning by the word "hypostasis" nature and substance; "that the Father and Son are one by concord and union; that the Son is not properly God, but called God, because he is the image of the Divinity; that the Word and the Holy Ghost were made by the Father; that the Father is greater than the Son; that the Son is inferior to the Father, though far above all creatures, as the ray of the sun is inferior to the sun;" and lastly "that the Son is the minister of the Father." In these passages is contained a very different doctrine from that which is laid down in those I have quoted above: and hence some of the friends of Origen, and among the rest Ruffinus, concluded the latter passages to have been foisted in by the Arians, denying the Divinity of the Word; while others, allowing them to be Origen's, undertook to explain them in a catholic sense, in opposition to the Arians confirming their doctrine with the authority of so eminent a writer. But his enemies, attending only to the passages where he seemed to establish an inequality in the Trinity, not only condemned him as a heretic, but all who stood up in his defence, or attempted to interpret his words in a catholic sense.

(a) Socr. l. 4. c. 26.

But what seems most of all surprising, and quite unaccountable, in the conduct of that father, is, that though he had with so much noise procured Origen to be condemned as a heretic, and his books to be prohibited, particularly his Periarchon, or, as some will have it, the Periarchon alone, as containing most of his heretical tenets; yet, in a private letter to Paulinus, he refers him to that very piece for the decision of some questions of the greatest importance.[1] But to return to Anastasius.

The same year, 401, in which Origen was condemned, the churches of Africa being greatly distressed for want of ecclesiastics, the bishops of the province of Carthage, assembling under Aurelius, bishop of that city, resolved to despatch one of their body into Italy, to acquaint Anastasius, and Venerius, bishop of Milan, with the condition of the African churches, and implore their assistance.[2] Which of the bishops was charged with this legation, or what success attended it, we are no where told. But as Paulinus, who afterwards wrote the life of St. Ambrose, and belonged to the church of Milan, was at this time sent into Africa, and continued there, some have not improbably conjectured, that Venerius at least assisted his colleagues in Africa with a supply of as many ecclesiastics as he could spare. Baronius supposes Anastasius to have relieved those churches with the like supply; but this supposition he builds upon the paternal care which Anastasius had, as universal pastor, of all the catholic churches,[3] which is building on a false foundation.

The same year another council was held at Carthage, consisting of all the bishops of Africa; and Aurelius, who presided in this, as he had done in the former, opened it with reading a letter from Anastasius, exhorting the bishops of Africa no longer to dissemble the cruelties of the Donatists, who continued to use with great barbarity the catholic bishops and clergy.[4] The fathers of the council returned Anastasius thanks for his advice; but, not thinking it quite agreeable to the true spirit of Christianity, they declined complying with it. They knew that their persecutors, had they complained of their cruelties to the civil magistrate, would have been punished with death, pursuant to a law enacted against them, three years before, by the emperors Arcadius and Honorius.[5] They therefore chose, notwithstanding the advice of Anastasius, rather to suffer with patience a most cruel persecution, than redeem themselves from it at so dear a rate.[6] In the same council, it was decreed, among other things, that such of the Donatist clergy, as should return to the church, might be admitted, if

[1] Hier. ep. 153. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1642.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 401, n. 7.
[4] Concil. t. 1. inter Concil. Afr. c. 33.
[5] Cod. Theod. l. 3. de episc. & cler. & Greg. l. 1. ep. 52. [6] Aug. ep. 127.

Anastasius dies. Is greatly commended by Jerom. Is honored as a saint. An ill-timed observation of Baronius. The election of Innocent commended by the ancients. He writes to Anysius of Thessalonica.

the bishop, who received them, thought it expedient, to the same rank which they had enjoyed before their conversion. As a decree had been lately enacted by Anastasius, and the other Italian bishops, excluding converted heretics from the catholic clergy;[1] it was to acquaint them with the motives which had prompted the fathers assembled at Carthage to admit the Donatists, that Aurelius and his colleagues wrote to Anastasius, and not to beg of him a dispensation in favor of the converted Donatists, as is ridiculously supposed by Baronius.[2]

This is all I find recorded of Anastasius, by the ancient writers. He died on the 27th of April, 402, after having held the see of Rome four years, one month, and thirteen days. Jerom, with whom he sided against Ruffinus, and the other friends of Origen, distinguishes him with the title of an eminent man; and adds, "that Rome did not deserve to enjoy him long, lest the head of the world should be cut off under such a bishop; nay, he was snatched away," says he, "lest he should strive to ward off, with his prayers, the execution of the sentence that was already pronounced; the Lord saying to Jeremiah, pray not for this people for their good: when they fast, I will not hear their cry," &c.[3] Jerom speaks there of the calamities that befel Rome seven years after, when it was taken by the Goths, under Alaric. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, not only an avowed enemy to Origen, but a cruel persecutor of all who stood up in his defence, extols Anastasius for his pastoral care, and indefatigable pains, in preserving and maintaining the purity of the catholic faith;[4] alluding, no doubt, to his acting in concert with him, against Origen, and the pretended Origenists. Be that as it will, Anastasius is now honored as a saint by the church of Rome; and the honors paid him are chiefly owing to the commendations of Jerom and Theophilus, whose party he so warmly espoused. As to the writings of Anastasius, mention is made by Jerom, of several letters written by him on different occasions; but that alone has reached our times, which he wrote to John, bishop of Jerusalem, and some fragments of another to one Ursinus, on the Incarnation.(*)

Baronius observes, at the death of Syricius,[5] that such popes as did not, through sloth and indolence, exert the due zeal in extirpating the heterodox opinions that sprung up in the church, that is, such popes as did not exterminate all who differed in opinion from them, have been quickly cut off, to make room for other more zealous asserters of the purity of the faith. An ill-timed observation! which I might retort here, were I inclined to indulge such a humor, since the indolent Syricius enjoyed his dignity thirteen years (and not very many have enjoyed it longer) and the very zealous Anastasius only four.

INNOCENT, THIRTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ARCADIUS, HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS THE YOUNGER.]

[Year of Christ 402.] On the demise of Anastasius, Innocent was immediately, and with one consent, chosen by the clergy and the people.[6] He was, according to Anastasius,[7] a native of Albano, and the son of another Innocent; but, according to Jerom, both the son and successor of Anastasius.[8] Theodoret styles him a man of great address, and a lively genius;[9] Prosper, a worthy successor of St. Peter;[10] and Austin distinguishes him, after his death, with the title of the Blessed Innocent.[11] Orosius says, that God withdrew that holy bishop from Rome, when the city was taken, as he did Lot from Sodom;[12] and Jerom, in writing to Demetrias, exhorts her to adhere steadily to the faith of Innocent.[13] Austin, in the letter he wrote to him in the name of the council of Milevum, ascribes his election to a particular Providence; and adds, that the fathers of the Council thought it a duty incumbent upon them to suggest to him what might be done for the good of the church, since they could not think him capable of hearing any thing of that nature with contempt or indifference.[14]

Innocent was no sooner chosen and ordained, than he wrote to Anysius of Thessalonica, acquainting him with his election, and charging him, as his three immediate predecessors had done, with the care of the churches of

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1642.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 14.
[3] Hier. ep. 16. Jerem. c. xiv. ver. 11, 12.
[4] Justin. in ep. ad Menan.
[5] Ad ann. 397, num. 21.
[6] Collect. Rem. ab Holsten. p. 45.
[7] Anast. c. 41.
[8] Hier. ep. 8.
[9] Theod. l. 5. c. 35.
[10] Prosp. in Col. c. 10.
[11] Pec. orig. c. 9.
[12] Oros. l. 7. c. 39.
[13] Hier. ubi supra.
[14] Aug. ep. 92.

* The two decretals that have been transmitted to us under his name are evidently supposititious, the one being dated fourteen years before his election, and the other fourteen years after his death. One of these pretended decretals is addressed to the German and Burgundian bishops, though nothing is more certain, than that the Burgundians were not converted to the Christian religion till many years after his death, till the year 436, if Socrates is to be credited. (a) They are both made up of several passages taken from the letters of Innocent, Leo, Gregory, and others; and were, in all likelihood, forged, as many others have been, by Isidorus Mercator.

(a) Socr. l. 7. c. 30.

Innocent's letter to Victricius. The articles it contains. Innocent thinks the marriage of a woman with another man valid, while her husband is still alive. The unchristian severity of one of these articles ill excused by Baronius.

East Illyricum.[1] In the end of the following year, 403, the emperor Honorius visited the city of Rome; and, during his stay there, Innocent went frequently to wait on him, in order to obtain, in behalf of some bishops, and other ecclesiastics, an exemption from executing certain civil offices hereditary in their families. He succeeded in his suit; but it cost him a great deal of trouble and uneasiness.[2] Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, who happened to be then at Rome, having applied to him for information, with respect to the practice and discipline of the Roman church, Innocent, to gratify him, and "that he might not seem to approve, by his silence, the abuses that prevailed in some churches," sent him a Book of Rules, as he styled it, containing several regulations, which had been originally established, says he, by the authority of the apostles and fathers, but were now, in many places, either quite unknown, or utterly neglected. He therefore entreats Victricius to communicate them to the neighboring churches and bishops, that they might be acquainted with the discipline of the Roman church, and conform to it in instructing the new converted Christians.[3]

This Book of Rules contains thirteen regulations relating to different points of discipline, whereof the first forbids, and declares uncanonical, the ordination of bishops without the knowledge and approbation of their metropolitans. The second excludes from the clerical order such as have served, or shall continue to serve, in war after baptism. The third orders all differences and disputes, arising among the ecclesiastics, to be decided by the bishops of the provinces, saving the rights of the Roman church;* and commands those to be deposed who shall recur to other tribunals, except in causes of the greatest importance, when, after the bishops have given sentence, recourse may be had to the apostolical see, pursuant to the order of the council, meaning, no doubt, the council of Sardica.[4] The three next relate to those who shall have married a widow, a woman that has been divorced, or a second wife, either before or after baptism; and they are all alike declared incapable of being ever admitted among the clergy. The seventh forbids bishops to ordain clerks of another church, without the permission of their own bishops, or to admit those to serve one church who have been deposed in another. The eighth allows the Novatians and Donatists, who return to the church, to be re-admitted by the bare imposition of hands; but subjects those to a long penance, who had quitted the church to be rebaptized by them. The ninth relates to the celibacy of the priests and deacons, who are debarred by it from all commerce with their wives, after ordination. The inferior clergy were allowed to marry; but Innocent, by the tenth article of the present letter, excepts those who, before they were admitted among the clergy, had lived in monasteries, and professed continence there; it being fit, says he, they should observe in a higher rank what they had observed when only monks. In the same article he observes, that those who had lost their virginity before marriage, did not receive the blessing of the church when they afterwards married; and that it was the ancient practice of the church, that such as had lost it before baptism, should promise, before they were admitted to the clerical order, never to marry. The eleventh forbids those to be ordained who were not exempted from all civil offices and employments, such offices diverting them from the functions of the priesthood, and sometimes obliging them to exhibit shows and public sports, of which the devil was, without all doubt, the author and promoter. The twelfth forbids women, who have married a second husband, their first being still alive, to be admitted to repentance, or allowed to do penance, till one of the two dies. The same discipline is to be observed, according to this article, with respect to the virgins, who, after consecrating their virginity to Jesus Christ, shall, either by a public marriage, or by private fornication, violate the faith they had pledged to their immortal Spouse.

Baronius,[1] to answer the objections which some innovators, as he is pleased to style them, have offered against the unchristian severity of this article, tells us, that the repentance of such a virgin can by no means be sincere, so long as she continues with the man she married; which is quite foreign to the purpose, since Innocent excludes her from repentance, not only so long as she lives with him, but so long as he lives. Innocent knew what Baronius seems not to have known; namely, that the marriage of virgins, however solemnly consecrated, held good, even according to the practice of the Roman church;[2] and, consequently, that they could not abandon their husbands; and hence he would not admit them to repentance, or the participation of the sacred mysteries, till the death of their husbands; which was keeping them, as it were, in a state of excommunication, without any possible means of redeeming themselves from it. And it is this uncharitable severity, which some divines of the reformed churches have deservedly blamed. Baronius stigmatizes such marriages with the name of adultery; but he confounds the time of Innocent with his own; for in his time, the vow of chastity was declared a true marriage, and, consequently, every subsequent marriage void and null; but, in Innocent's time, the mar-

[1] Coll. Rom. p. 46, 47. [2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1252.
[3] Ibid. p. 1249. [4] See above, p. 120, 121.
* In some editions this clause is wanting.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 404. num. 130.
[2] See Natal. Alex. hist. eccles. t. 10. p. 14.

riage of a sacred virgin was held valid, though commonly deemed sinful. Whether it be sinful or no, or whether a vow of that kind can be lawfully made, I shall not take upon me to determine here; but I am very confident, that of most persons, who debar themselves by a solemn vow from ever marrying, we may say, with the fathers of the eighth council of Toledo, "That they had better break a vow, which they had rashly made, than fill up, by observing it, the measure of their sins."

But to return to the letter: the thirteenth and last article will have those virgins to do penance for some time, who shall marry after having promised to live virgins, though they had not yet received the sacred veil.[1] This letter has been inserted by Dionysius Exiguus, in his code of the Roman church, and is quoted by the second council of Tours, held in 567,[2] and by several other councils.[3] (*)

In the year 404, Austin wrote to Innocent, in the name of the bishops assembled in council at Carthage, entreating him to apply to Honorius for new laws against the Donatists; whose cruelties towards the orthodox, if not magnified by Austin,[4] are scarce to be matched in history. The emperor hearkened to Innocent's remonstrances, and severe laws being issued against them, they began by that means to be convinced of their errors, and to return daily in great numbers to the unity of the church. This is what we read in one of Austin's letters;[1] for the Donatists, as he would make us believe, finding themselves persecuted, began to inquire, which they had never done before, into the grounds of the religion, for which they suffered. This inquiry had the desired effect; their eyes were opened; they discovered the errors of their sect; and, being sensible of their folly in foregoing any temporal advantage, or exposing themselves to the least inconvenience, for the sake of such a religion, they sincerely abjured it, and zealously embraced the catholic faith. An ingenious term, I must own, to excuse, nay, and to authorize and sanctify the greatest barbarities! But daily experience teaches us, that persecution has a contrary effect, and that the more men are persecuted, the more obstinately they adhere to the opinions, however absurd, for which they suffer; witness the great number of martyrs which almost every church, as well as the catholic, can boast of. And, where it has not that effect, the most it can do is to make men become hypocrites, and profess a religion they do not believe; but scarce ever changes their hearts, or brings any to a sincere and efficacious assent to a faith which is thus violently forced on their minds.

About the same time, or not long after, Innocent wrote to the bishops of Spain; and the chief articles of his letter were: 1. That they ought to cut off from their communion such of their brethren as refused to communicate with Symphosius, Dictinius, and other bishops, who, having renounced the errors of Priscillian, had been re-admitted to the communion of the church by the council held at Toledo, in the year 400.[2] 2. That those bishops should be deposed who had been ordained without the knowledge or consent of their mertropolitan. 3. That such as presumed to ordain against the canons should be likewise deposed, and all who had been thus ordained by them.

Chrysostom, the celebrated bishop of Constantinople, having been unjustly deposed in 403, and driven from his see by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, and the council ad Quercum, or at the Oak, near Chalcedon, had, upon his return to Constantinople, insisted upon a council being summoned, to make his innocence the more plainly appear to the world. This Theophilus, and the bishops of his party, not only strenuously opposed, but, by the great interest they had at court, prevailed upon the emperor Arcadius to drive him from Constantinople a second time, and banish him to Cucusus, an inhospitable place in Cilicia. The news of these last proceedings had not yet reached Rome, when Theophilus sent one of his lectors with a letter to

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1249—1252. [2] Concil. t. 5. p. 858, & 866.
[3] See Blond. Decr. p. 55.

(*) And yet some have been induced, by the date it bears, to question its authenticity. For it is dated the 15th of February, 404. Now, it is manifest, say they, from the letter itself, that Victricius was at Rome while the emperor Honorius was there; and it is no less certain, that Honorius did not arrive at Rome till the month of December, 403. If therefore Victricius was at Rome in December, 403, it is not at all probable, that Innocent should have written to him on the 15th of February, 404. To solve this difficulty, some suppose Victricius to have applied to Innocent, while he was still at Rome; and Innocent, instead of informing him, as he might, by word of mouth, to have given him in writing the desired instructions, that, having thus more weight, they might the more readily be complied with by other bishops. But it is manifest, from Innocent's words, that his letter was an answer to one from Victricius; and we cannot well suppose Victricius, who was at Rome in December, to have returned to Rouen, to have written from thence to Innocent, and Innocent to have returned him so full an answer by the 15th of the following Jaunary. We may conclude the year to have been, by some mistake, altered, and 404, inserted in the date instead of 405, since the letter could not be written earlier, as I have just observed, than the month of January (if January was the true month) of the latter year; and we have no reason to think it was written later. The mistake as to the year might have been occasioned by the transcriber's omitting P. C. "Post Consulatum Honorii," and thereby confounding the year of the emperor's sixth consulship, 404, with the year after it, 405. Such omissions frequently occur, and have led writers, not aware of them, into great mistakes, in point of chronology, or made them suspect, nay, and condemn, as spurious, the most authentic pieces of history. This letter, in some editions, bears no date; and F. Labbé assures us, that he has seen a manuscript copy of it, in which the date was wanting. Some therefore suppose the date to have been afterwards added, nay, and the whole conclusion of the letter. For Innocent closes it by saying, that the observance of the rules it contains will banish all ambition among the bishops, compose all differences, prevent all schisms, and leave no room for the devil to insult the flock of Christ. A conclusion taken probably from some other piece, and not at all adapted or applicable, with truth, to this.

[4] Aug. ep. 50.

[1] Idem. ibid. [2] See above, p. 114.

Innocent's answer to Chrysostom's letter. Theophilus writes to Innocent. Innocent's answer to Theophilus. Letters from the bishops of Chrysostom's party to Innocent. Who sends letters of communion to them. Letters from Acacius to Innocent.

Innocent, acquainting him, that he had deposed Chrysostom. As, in this letter, Theophilus observed an entire silence with respect to the motives that had prompted him to take such a step, Innocent prudently forbore returning him an answer. There happened to be then at Rome a deacon of the church of Constantinople, who, hearing what Theophilus had written, went immediately, and warned Innocent to be upon his guard, entreating him, at the same time, not to proceed but with the utmost caution, in so nice and important an affair, and assuring him, that the truth could not remain long undiscovered. Accordingly, in three days, Pansovius, and three other bishops, arrived at Rome, with three letters for Innocent: namely, one from Chrysostom himself, another from the bishops of his communion, and the third from the whole clergy of Constantinople. Chrysostom, in his letter, which is still to be seen in his works, and in those of Palladius, who wrote the history of his persecution, after giving Innocent an account of the storm his enemies had raised against him, entreats him to declare such wicked proceedings void and null, to pronounce all who had any share in them punishable, according to the ecclesiastical laws, and to continue to him the marks of his charity and communion. In the title and close of the letter, he addresses himself to one, but every where else to more persons, the letter having been written, as appears from the copy in Palladius,[1] not to Innocent alone, but to him, to Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia, bishops of the three chief sees in the west.

Innocent, acting with his usual prudence and circumspection, in his answers to the above-mentioned letters, declared, that he admitted the bishops of both parties to his communion, from which he could exclude no man till he was lawfully judged and condemned; and that therefore, to compose all differences, and leave no room for complaints on either side, it was fit a council should be assembled, consisting of the western as well as the eastern bishops. The other bishops of Italy, to whom Chrysostom had written, returned much the same answer,[2] following therein the advice, which Chrysostom himself had given to the bishops of his party: namely, that they should communicate with his enemies, to prevent divisions in the church, but not sign his condemnation, because he did not think himself guilty.[3] Innocent's answer to Theophilus was in words to the same effect. His letter to Chrysostom was carried into the east by Demetrius, bishop of Pessinus, who took care to show it every where, to the end it might be every where known, that the Roman church still communicated with that holy bishop.[4]

A few days after Innocent had answered Chrysostom's letter, Petrus, one of Theophilus' presbyters, and Martyrius, deacon of the church of Constantinople, arrived at Rome, with letters from Theophilus, and the acts of Chrysostom's deposition by the council ad Quercum. From these it appeared, that the council had consisted of thirty-six bishops, whereof twenty-nine were Egyptians, and over these Theophilus had, as their metropolitan, too great an influence; that Chrysostom had been condemned without being heard, and that nothing had been laid to his charge deserving so severe and exemplary a punishment. Innocent, therefore, having read them, with the utmost indignation, answered Theophilus in a few words; that he was determined, as he had notified to him by his former letter, to communicate both with him and his brother John; that he could by no means depart from the communion of the latter, till he was lawfully judged and condemned; that a council was to be soon held, before which it was incumbent upon Theophilus to make good his charge, and the steps he had hitherto taken, by the canons and decrees of the council of Nice, since the Roman church admitted no others.[1] With this letter, Petrus and Martyrius returned to Constantinople, whence arrived at Rome, soon after their departure from that city, Theoctecnus, a presbyter of the church of Constantinople, and one of Chrysostom's friends, with letters from twenty-five bishops, informing Innocent that Chrysostom had been driven a second time from his see; that he had been conducted by a band of soldiers to Cucusus, and confined to that place; and that the great church had been consumed by fire, the very day he was carried out of Constantinople. Innocent was greatly affected with this account, and shed many tears in reading it. But as these troubles and disorders were fomented by some great men at the court either of Arcadius or Honorius, and a misunderstanding was then subsisting between the two brothers, or their ministers, he concluded that his endeavors towards the restoring of peace and unity would prove unsuccessful, and might even blow the fire, which already burned with so much violence, into a greater flame. On these considerations he wisely forbore making any application for the present to Honorius, and only sent letters of communion to Chrysostom, and the bishops, who had espoused his cause.[2] These letters were delivered to Theoctecnus, who was scarce gone, when one Paternus, who styled himself a presbyter of the church of Constantinople, arrived at Rome, with letters from Acacius, who had been intruded into the see of Constantinople, and from some other bishops of his party, charging Chrysostom with setting fire to the Basilic, or Great Church. So barefaced a calumny provoked

[1] Pall. Dial. c. 2.
[2] Idem. ib. c. 8.
[3] Idem. ib.
[4] Idem. ib. c. 3.

[1] Idem. ib.
[2] Pallad. ibid. c. 2.

Chrysostom's friends cruelly persecuted. Two edicts enacted against them. Several bishops, and the whole clergy of Constantinople, write to Innocent. His answer to the clergy. Innocent applies to Honorius; who writes to Arcadius.

Innocent to such a degree, that he would neither hear Paternus, nor return an answer to the letters he had brought.

In the meantime, a most cruel persecution was raised at Constantinople, against Chrysostom's friends, refusing to communicate with Acacius, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, who had intruded himself into the vacant see of Antioch, and, in defiance of the canons, maintained, by force of arms, the dignity he had usurped. This persecution was carried on under a Christian emperor, with as much cruelty as any had ever been under the most inveterate enemies of the Christian name. The pretence they made use of was to discover the authors of the late fire; and as the imperial officers chiefly suspected, or pretended to suspect, Chrysostom's friends, Optatus, who was then prefect or governor of Constantinople, and a pagan, laid hold of that opportunity to vent upon them the implacable hatred he bore to the religion they professed. Many, therefore, without distinction of sex or condition, were, by his orders, dragged to the public gaols, and confined there to dungeons; others tormented with such barbarity as to expire on the rack; and great numbers, after having undergone repeated tortures, stripped of all their effects, and banished to the most remote and desolate places of the empire.

At the same time the emperor Arcadius, strangely prepossessed against Chrysostom, and those of his communion, caused two edicts to be published; the one directed to the governors of the provinces, whom he strictly enjoined not to suffer, in their respective jurisdictions, any private assemblies or meetings of persons, who, despising the churches, worshipped elsewhere, lest they should seem to communicate with the most reverend prelates of the holy law, Arsacius, Theophilus, and Porphyrius. The other commanded such bishops as refused to communicate with them, to be driven from their sees, and their effects to be seized. The persecution, which still raged, though it was soon after stopped at the remonstrances of Studius, the præfectus prætorio, and the severity, with which the two imperial edicts were put in execution, drove great numbers, both of the clergy and laity, from Constantinople, and the provinces subject to Arcadius. Among the former were Cyriacus, bishop of Synnada, Eulysius of Apamea, in Bithynia, Palladius of Helenopolis, Germanus, a presbyter, and Cassianus, a deacon, who afterwards embraced the monastic life, and became famous for his ascetic writings. Eulysius brought letters to Innocent from fifteen bishops of Chrysostom's communion, acquainting him with the deplorable state of the Constantinopolitan church, and one from Anysius of Thessalonica, declaring, that in the present unhappy divisions he had resolved to conform entirely to the sentiments of the Roman church. Germanus and Cassianus likewise delivered letters to Innocent, written in the name of the whole clergy of Constantinople, and giving him an account of the persecution that still raged, and of the cruel treatment their bishop had met with.[1] Innocent, in his answer to this letter, expresses, in the most pathetic terms, his concern for the unhappy state of that church, and their sufferings; he encourages them to bear, with patience, their present tribulation and afflictions, nay, and with joy, since it is for the sake of justice they suffer, and are thus persecuted: he complains of the undue deposition of his colleague, and installation of another in his lifetime, which he shows to be against the canons of the council of Nice, the only canons admitted and obeyed by the Roman church: he concludes with informing them, that as he had always thought it necessary, that an oecumenical council should assemble, he had long considered, and was still considering, by what means it might be assembled, since a council, and nothing else, could appease so violent a storm, and restore to the church the so much wished for tranquillity.[2]

Two presbyters in the mean time came to Rome from the east, Domitianus of Constantinople, and Vallagus, of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, and brought with them the original acts, which they had purchased with a large sum of the imperial officers, containing an authentic detail of the cruelties which some women of quality had been made to endure for not communicating with Arsacius, and the bishops of his faction. With these the good bishop was so deeply affected, that he could no longer forbear applying to Honorius, who, at his request, wrote immediately to Arcadius a very pressing and friendly letter in favor of Chrysostom, and those of his communion. At the same time he issued an order for convening a council of the western bishops, who, meeting soon after at Rome, drew up an address, which they sent to Ravenna, where the emperor then was, earnestly entreating him to interpose anew his good offices with his brother Arcadius, that an oecumenical council might be allowed to assemble at Thessalonica, in order to compose the present differences, which had already produced a misunderstanding between the eastern and western churches, and might in the end bring on an entire separation. Honorius, in compliance with their request, wrote a third letter to Arcadius (for he had, it seems, written already a second), and at the same time one to Innocent, desiring him to appoint five bishops, two presbyters of the Roman church, and one deacon, to carry his letter into the east, think-

[1] Pall. ubi supra. Soz. l. 8. c. 26. Hist. Lausiac. c. 121.
[2] Soz. ubi supra, & ep. Rom. Pont. Inn. 15.

Honorius' letter. The pope's legates not allowed to touch at Thessalonica. The hard usage they met with on their journey, and at Constantinople. The letters taken from them by force. They are put on board a leaky vessel, but arrive safe in Italy.

ing that such a legation would add no small weight to his mediation. The letter to Arcadius was in the following terms:

"This is the third time I write to your meekness (ad mansuetudinem tuam) entreating you to correct and rectify the iniquitous proceedings that have been carried on against John, bishop of Constantinople. But nothing, I find, has been hitherto done in his behalf. Having therefore much at heart the peace of the church, which will be attended with that of our empire, I write to you anew by these holy bishops and presbyters, earnestly desiring you to command the eastern bishops to assemble at Thessalonica. The western bishops have sent five of their body, two presbyters of the Roman church, and one deacon, all men of the strictest equity, and quite free from the bias of favor and hatred. These I beg you would receive with that regard which is due to their rank and merit: if they find John to have been justly deposed, they may separate me from his communion; and you from the communion of the orientals, if it appears that he has been unjustly deposed. The western bishops have very plainly expressed their sentiments, in the many letters they have written to me on the subject of the present dispute. Of these I send you two, the one from the bishop of Rome, the other from the bishop of Aquileia; and with them the rest agree. One thing I must above all beg of your meekness; that you oblige Theophilus of Alexandria to assist at the council, how averse soever he may be to it; for he is said to be the first and chief author of the present calamities. Thus the synod, meeting with no delays or obstructions, will restore peace and tranquillity in our days."[1]

With these letters the legates set out from Rome, attended by the above-mentioned prelates, Demetrius, Cyriacus, Eulysius, and Palladius; and, sailing for Greece, put in at Athens, with a design to pursue their voyage to Thessalonica, having letters from Innocent to Anysius, bishop of that city. But at Athens they were, to their great surprise, stopped and detained by a military tribune, who let them know that they must not touch at Thessalonica; and at the same time appointed a centurion as a guard over them, strictly enjoining him not to suffer them, under any pretence whatsoever, to approach that city. Soon after, the tribune parted them, and putting them on board two vessels, ordered the mariners to convey them straight to Constantinople. Anysius communicated with Chrysostom, as I have observed above; and it was, without all doubt, on this consideration that the legates were not allowed to set foot in his diocess. They arrived at Constantinople the third day after they had left Athens, but starved with hunger; for the tribune had neither supplied them with provisions when they embarked, nor allowed them time to supply themselves; so that they had tasted no kind of victuals during the three days they were at sea. On their arrival at Constantinople, they were not suffered to come ashore, but ordered to a castle on the Thracian coast called Athyra, where they were all closely confined, the legates in one common room, and the other bishops in so many separate cells. As the people of Constantinople were most zealously attached to Chrysostom, the emperor apprehended, and with a great deal of reason, that their entering the city, and conversing publicly there, might be attended with uncommon disturbances and commotions; and therefore thought it advisable to keep them at a distance, and under confinement. They had not been long thus confined, when they were ordered, they knew not by whom, to deliver the letters they had brought. But neither by this person, whoever he was, nor by several others, who were successively sent on the same errand, could they be prevailed upon to part with them, alleging, that letters from an emperor ought to be delivered to none but an emperor.

As they continued firm and unshaken in this resolution, one Valerian, a military tribune, was at last called in, and ordered to employ the rhetoric peculiar to his profession, since no other could prevail. Valerian accordingly, after a short preamble, proceeded to violence; and, seizing them, took the letters by force, having in the struggle wounded one of the bishops in the hand. The next day they were visited by a person, who, without acquainting them who he was, or by whom sent, offered them a very considerable sum, on condition they would communicate with Atticus, who, upon the death of Arsacius, had, by the bishops of his faction, been intruded in his room. Upon their rejecting, as they did, with the utmost indignation, this offer, Valerian, who was present, conducted them under a strong guard to the seaside, and there put them on board an old leaky vessel, having first, with a large bribe, prevailed upon the commander, as they were informed, to engage his word, that they should not outlive that voyage. They outlived it, however, and, having reached Lampsacus, they embarked on board another vessel, which landed them safe at Otranto. As for the eastern bishops who had attended them from Rome, namely, Cyriacus, Eulysius, Palladius, and Demetrius, after having been some time kept under close confinement at Athyra, they were banished to the most remote and abandoned places of the empire. The other bishops, who refused to communicate with Atticus, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, fared no better, being in like manner either driven into banishment, or obliged to abscond, and, under the

[1] Pall. ibid.

Honorius resolves to revenge the affront offered to his ambassadors, but is diverted from it. Arcadius and Eudoxia not excommunicated by Innocent. Chrysostom did not appeal to the see of Rome.

disguise of mechanics, earned their livelihood by the meanest professions. Many perished in the places of their exile for want of necessaries; and others were so cruelly harassed, nay, and barbarously beaten by the merciless soldiery, appointed to conduct them, that they died on the road.[1] Such were the wretched effects of that unchristian principle of persecution being lawful to punish error in religious disputes, which all sects of Christians then held, and all suffered by in their turns, as the different parties among them got the civil magistrate and force on their side.

Honorius, being informed of the base treatment the legates had met with, though vested with the sacred character of ambassadors, was so provoked at such a notorious violation of the right of nations, that he resolved to make war on his brother, and revenge it by force of arms. But from this resolution he was diverted by a threatened invasion of the barbarians, and the seasonable discovery of the famous Stilicho's treachery, which obliged him to keep all his troops in Italy, or the adjoining provinces. As for Innocent, finding the mediation of Honorius, which he had procured, prove unsuccessful, and no other means left of affording the least relief to Chrysostom and the other persecuted bishops, he resolved to make known to the world his abhorrence of the evils, which it was not in his power to redress; and accordingly separated himself from the communion of Atticus, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, as the chief authors of the present calamities.[2]

Baronius, thinking it inconsistent with the dignity of his high pontiff thus tamely to bear with the insulting conduct of Arcadius, would fain persuade us, that, after he had tried in vain all other methods of bringing the emperor, and the empress Eudoxia, to a sense of their duty, he at last thought himself obliged to thunder against both the tremendous sentence of excommunication, cutting them off as rotten members from the body of the faithful committed to his care and direction. To prove this, he produces several letters from Innocent to Arcadius, and from Arcadius to Innocent, transcribed partly from Gennadius, Glycas, and Nicephorus, and partly from the Vatican manuscripts.[3] To enter into a critical examination of those pieces, would be wasting time, and tiring the reader to no purpose. I shall therefore content myself with three observations, each of them sufficient, in my opinion, to make the world reject them all as mere forgeries. In the first place, the silence of the historians, who wrote at that time, touching so remarkable and unprecedented an event as the excommunication of an emperor and an empress, is an unanswerable confutation of every proof that can be alleged to support the authenticity of the pretended letters. For who can imagine, that the writers, who flourished then, and have transmitted to us most minute accounts of far less important transactions both civil and ecclesiastical, would have passed this over in silence? In the second place, Eudoxia is supposed, in all those letters, to have outlived Chrysostom; whereas it is certain, that she died in 404, four years before him. Lastly, in the abovementioned letter, Arcadius is all along supposed to have repented, and changed his conduct towards Chrysostom, to have persecuted his enemies as he had formerly done his friends, and to have chiefly vented his resentment on the first author of all the disturbances, the empress, who thereupon, out of grief, rage, and despair, fell into a dangerous malady.[1] But of all this not the least hint is to be met with in Palladius, who wrote in the last days of the life and reign of Arcadius; nay, that historian speaks of the friends of Chrysostom as men still under the emperor's displeasure, and feeling the dreadful effects of it in the inhospitable places, to which they had been formerly confined.

From the conduct of Chrysostom on this occasion, the Roman catholic divines have taken a great deal of pains to prove, that the custom of appealing to the see of Rome obtained in his time; that he actually appealed to that see; and consequently, that the prerogative of receiving appeals from all parts, and finally deciding all controversies, claimed by the bishops of Rome, was then acknowledged even in the east. Nothing surely but the utmost distress for want of other instances to prove their assertion, could have tempted them to make use of this; since, from the conduct of Chrysostom on this very occasion, nay, and from that of Innocent too, if set in their true light, it may be undeniably made out, that this pretended prerogative was utterly unknown to both. The fact stands thus, and thus it is related by the historians, who have transmitted it to us: Chrysostom is unjustly accused; the bishop of Alexandria takes upon him to inquire into his conduct; assembles a council, consisting chiefly of Egyptian bishops, and summons Chrysostom to appear before them: Chrysostom pays no regard to the summons, protests against it, and will not allow the bishops assembled to have any power or authority over him, "since it had been ordained by the canons of the church, that the affairs of the provinces should be regulated by the bishops of the provinces; and it was consequently very incongruous, that the bishops of Thrace should be judged by those of Egypt."[2] No regard is had to his protest, none to the canons upon which it was grounded: he is summoned anew; and, not appearing within the limited time, is

[1] Pall. in dial. ubi supra. [2] Idem ibidem.
[3] Bar. ann. 407. n. 19—22.

[1] Vid. Bar. ubi sup. Niceph. l. 13. c. 34. & Glyc. l. 4. p. 259. 260.
[2] Chrysos. ep. 122.

Chrysostom an utter stranger to the power of receiving appeals in the bishops of Rome. Chrysostom never acknowledged such a power. The disingenuity of Bellarmine. Innocent's letter to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse.

judged, condemned, and deposed. From this sentence he appeals to a lawful council; but, being, notwithstanding his appeal, driven from his see, he recurs at last to the western bishops, namely, to Innocent of Rome, Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia, entreating them not to abandon him in his distress, nor exclude him from their communion,[1] but to procure by all means the assembling of a general council, in order to restore the church to her former tranquillity.

Such was the conduct of Chrysostom: and, from this conduct, does it not manifestly appear, that Chrysostom was an utter stranger to the pretended power in the bishops of Rome of receiving appeals from all other tribunals, and finally determining all controversies? Who can think, that, had he been acquainted with such a prerogative, he would, when so unjustly oppressed, have appealed to a council, which, he was well apprised, would meet with great obstructions, when he had, ready at hand, a more certain and easy method of finding relief? Had he been satisfied, that Innocent had such a privilege, is it likely he would have written to him on so urgent an occasion, without taking the least notice of it; that he would have contented himself with only entreating him to procure the assembling of a general council? Should a bishop now, apprehending himself injured by a national or provincial synod, appeal, not to the pope, but, as Chrysostom did, to a general council, he would, by such an appeal, draw upon himself the indignation of the Roman see; for it would be thence concluded, and no conclusion can be more natural, that he did not acknowledge the power of receiving appeals claimed by that see.

But Chrysostom, say they, did acknowledge such a power; for, in his letter to Innocent, he entreats him "to declare such wicked proceedings void and null, and to prononnce all, who had any share in them, punishable, according to the ecclesiastical laws." But Chrysostom addresses himself here, not to Innocent alone, as I have already observed, but to him, in conjunction with Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia;[2] nay, he addresses himself, throughout the whole letter, to more persons than one; and yet Baronius has the assurance to style the letter an "Appeal to Innocent."[3] And why to him, and not to the other two, since he wrote nothing to him but what he wrote to them? Bellarmine, finding some expressions in the above mentioned letter, which he thought might be so interpreted as to favor and countenance the pretensions of the see of Rome, had Chrysostom addressed himself to Innocent alone, makes him accordingly, by altering the number in the passage he quotes, address himself to Innocent alone;(*) and then concludes, that even the Greeks acknowledge the bishop of Rome for their supreme judge.[1] What must every impartial man think of a cause, that wants to be thus defended? What of those, who thus defend it?

About this time, that is, in the year 405, Innocent, being consulted by Exuperius,(*) bishop of Toulouse, concerning some points of discipline, answered him by a decretal, containing the following decisions: 1. That the priests and deacons, who were daily employed in sacrificing or baptizing, were not to be allowed the use of matrimony; that those, who were ignorant of the decretal issued by Syricius, might be forgiven, upon their promising thenceforth to live continent; but, as to the rest, they should, as unworthy of indulgence, be deposed. The second article relates to those, who, after baptism, had led a wicked or sinful life, and at the point of death desired the communion. Innocent declares, that to such, according to the ancient discipline of the church, which was more severe, repentance was granted, and not the communion; but, according to the present practice, both were granted. By repentance is here meant, according to the most probable opinion, a reconciliation with the church; and, by the communion, the eucharist, which the thirteenth canon of the council of Nice commands to be given to all dying persons who desire it. Some doubted whether it was lawful for a Christian to discharge the office of a judge, in criminal cases. Innocent therefore declares, in the third article, that no penance ought to be imposed upon those who had condemned criminals to the rack, or even to death, the civil power having been established by God for the punishment of criminals. As women were, it seems, more frequently punished for adultery than men, some imagined that crime not to be alike punishable in both. This notion Innocent confutes in the fourth article; adding, that women were more frequently punished, merely because the husbands were more forward in accusing their wives, than wives in accusing their husbands. The fifth

[1] Pall. dial. 2. [2] Idem ibid. [3] Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 20.
(*) He changes "obsecro ut scribatis" into "obsecro ut scribas."

[1] Bell. Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 15.
(*) Exuperius was, as we gather from Ausonius, a native of Bourdeaux, one of the greatest orators of his time, and had governed Spain in quality of prefect. He afterwards withdrew from the world; embraced the ecclesiastical state in the place of his nativity; (a) and was, for his eminent virtues, raised to the see of Toulouse. He was chiefly commendable for his charity to the poor; though he bestowed the greater part of it on objects, perhaps, of all, the least worthy of his compassion: for, by the monk Sisennius, he sent considerable sums into the east, to be distributed there among the monks of Egypt and Palestine; (b) which might have been better employed at home, Gaul being then threatened with an invasion of the Vandals, Alans, and other barbarous nations; who, accordingly, broke into that province on the last day of the year 406, and made themselves masters of Toulouse itself. It was, however, this kindness of Exuperius to the monks, that chiefly recommended him to Jerom, (c) who often mentions him with the greatest commendations, (d) and even inscribed to him his comment on Zechariah
(a) Paulin. ep. 20. (b) Hier. præf. in lib. 1, 2, & 3. Zech. & ep. 152.
(c) Idem ibid.
(d) Idem ep. 410, 411.

article is a confirmation of the third; for it only absolves from all sins such as are obliged, by their office, to prosecute or condemn criminals. The sixth article excludes from the communion of the church all men, who, after they have been parted from their wives, marry other women; and all women, who, after they have been parted from their husbands, marry other men.(*) The same punishment is, by this article, inflicted on those who marry them, but not on their parents or relations, provided they have been no way accessory to that unlawful contract. The last article contains a catalogue of the canonical books of scripture, the same as are still acknowledged by the church of Rome as canonical. In the same article, some books are pointed out, that ought to be absolutely condemned and rejected.[1] (†) These directions, or instructions, Innocent pretends to have drawn partly from scripture, and partly from tradition; and thanks Exuperius, because he had, by applying to him for a solution to his difficulties, engaged him to examine them with attention, and thereby given him an opportunity of learning what he had not known before. It is surprising he should have mentioned the scripture, since the very first article, debarring for ever married men from the use of matrimony, is an open contradiction to the directions given by St. Paul to all married persons, without restraint or distinction; "Defraud you not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, &c. and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency."[1]

As the bishops of Rome had, ever since the time of Damasus, taken upon them to appoint the bishop of Thessalonica their vicar for East Illyricum, Innocent no sooner heard, that Rufus had been promoted to that see, vacant by the death of Anysius, than he let all the bishops of those parts know, by a circular letter, probably directed to Rufus himself, that he conferred on him the same dignity which his predecessors had conferred on the other bishops of Thessalonica. He wrote, at the same time, a private letter to Rufus, containing some instructions relating to the exercise of his vicarious power, and, with them, the names of the provinces which he was to govern, as his vicar and first primate; but without intrenching, adds Innocent, upon the rights and privileges of the primate or metropolitan of each province. In this letter he takes great care, that Rufus should not forget he is indebted for such a power to the see of Rome; for that he frequently repeats, as if he entertained some jealousy of Rufus, or apprehended that he might claim such a power, as bishop of Thessalonica, that city being, according to the civil division of the empire, on which the ecclesiastical was ingrafted, the metropolis of East Illyricum.[2]

The same year, 407, the emperor Honorius visited the city of Rome, and continued there till the month of May, of the year 408. On the 23d of the following August, Stilicho was killed; and Alaric, the Goth, entering Italy soon after his death, appeared before Rome, and laid close siege to that city in the latter end of the same year. As no provisions could be conveyed into the place, all the avenues being shut up, and well guarded, a famine soon ensued, and upon the famine a plague, which daily swept off great numbers of the inhabitants. In this extremity, such of the senators as still adhered to the pagan superstitions, promising themselves relief from the gods of their ancestors, resolved to implore

(*) The matrimonial bond is held, by the church of Rome, indissoluble, and a separation only allowed as to bed and board, even in cases of adultery; whence it follows, that so long as they both live, neither can marry, without being guilty of adultery. There are, however, some "annulling impediments," as the canonists style them, that is, circumstances rendering the marriage contract null; and if any of these intervene, and is made to appear, the parties are then declared not to have been married; and, consequently, free to marry whom they please. Until Innocent's time, men who had been parted from their wives convicted of adultery, were allowed to marry again. This Epiphanius tells us in express terms; adding, that, agreeably to scripture, (no doubt to Matt. v. 32.) it could be no crime to marry again; that those who married again were not excluded, on that score, from life everlasting; and consequently ought not to be excluded from the communion of the church. (*a*) The scope and design of Epiphanius, throughout his work, was to acquaint us with the several heresies that sprang up in the church, and to explain, in opposition to them, the catholic doctrines. It must therefore have been deemed a heresy in his time, that is, towards the latter end of the fourth century, to think the matrimonial bond indissoluble, even in cases of adultery, or to hold it unlawful for a man to marry again, who had put away his wife for the cause of fornication. But the heresy became afterwards a catholic truth, and the catholic truth a heresy. This change, however, was not so much owing to Innocent's decretal, as to the two books which St. Austin wrote about the year 419, to prove that it is unlawful for a husband, who has put away his wife, even for adultery, or for a wife who has been thus put away, to marry again, while both are living. He founds his opinion on that of St. Paul, "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth." (*b*) But, instead of understanding that passage with the exception made by our Savior himself, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication," &c. he endeavors, by many logical distinctions, and unnatural interpretations, to remove that exception, though expressed by the Evangelist in the plainest terms. He was therein, no doubt, misled by the groundless, but then reigning, notion, of an extraordinary merit annexed to celibacy; and therefore ends his work with exhorting the husbands, who have put away their wives, to observe continency, in imitation of the ecclesiastics, who observe it, says he, with the greatest exactness, though it was not by their own choice that some of them went into orders. It may be questioned whether, even then, the continence of the unmarried clergy was such as he represents it.

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1254—1256.

(†) These were several books, styled "The acts of the apostles," forged by Leucius, Nezocharis, and Leonides, and ascribed by them to some of the apostles. Leucius was, by sect, a Manichee, as appears from Austin, who confuted his books. (*c*) Nezocharis and Leonides are, by Innocent, styled philosophers. The books of Leucius, in the latter end of the present century, were anew declared apocryphal by pope Gelasius: "The books," says he in one of his decretals, "composed by Leucius, a disciple of the devil, are all apocryphal." (*a*)

(*a*) Epiph. hæres. 59. (*b*) 1 Corinth. vii. 39. (*c*) Aug. de fide contra Manich.

(*a*) Gelas. in decretal. de lib. Apocryph.

[1] 1 Corinth. vii. 5.

[2] Holsten. Coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 49—51.

The pagan superstitions connived at by Innocent. Innocent leaves Rome, and repairs to the emperor at Ravenna. Innocent's letter to Marcianus, bishop of Naissus. His letter to Aurelius of Carthage. The letter of the bishops of Macedon to Innocent. Innocent's answer.

their protection, by solemn sacrifices offered up to them in the capitol, and other public places of the city. This resolution, says Zosimus,[1] they imparted to Innocent, then bishop of Rome, who, sacrificing his private opinion to the public welfare, agreed to it, on condition that the ceremony should be privately performed. Of these sacrifices, Sozomen, too, takes particular notice;[2] but makes no mention of Innocent, which has induced some to suspect the veracity of Zosimus, who was, as is well known, a sworn enemy to the Christian religion. But that those sacrifices were performed, is affirmed both by him and Sozomen; and it is not at all probable, that Pompeianus, who was then governor of Rome, and a Christian, would have suffered them, without the consent and approbation of Innocent. However that be, I see not why Baronius should be so provoked against Zosimus, for making Innocent thus connive at the superstitious worship of the gentiles, since his successors have always allowed, and do still allow, even in Rome itself, the free exercise of the Jewish worship.

Rome being reduced to the last extremity, deputies were, in the end, sent out to treat with Alaric, who, hearkening to their proposals, raised the siege, upon their paying to him five thousand pounds weight of gold, thirty thousand of silver, four thousand silk garments, three thousand skins of purple dye, and as many pounds of pepper. At the same time the Romans engaged to mediate a peace between him and Honorius: but the emperor refusing to comply with the terms that were proposed, though no ways unreasonable, the Roman senate sent two solemn deputations to Ravenna, where Honorius then resided, to lay before him the danger to which he exposed the empire, and persuade him to accept the conditions offered him both by them and by Alaric. As the first deputation proved unsuccessful, Innocent, thinking his presence might give some weight to the negotiations, left Rome, and, together with the deputies, repaired to Ravenna. Thus he escaped the mortification of seeing the city of Rome taken and plundered by the barbarians.[3] For, Honorius still rejecting the terms of peace, Alaric returned with his army before Rome; and, having made himself master of it on the 24th of August, of the year 410, treated the great metropolis of the empire no better, if Jerom may be credited, than the Greeks are said to have treated ancient Troy.[4]

While Innocent continued at Ravenna, he wrote to Marcianus, bishop of Naissus; a city in Mœsia, concerning the ecclesiastics of his diocess, who had been ordained by Bonosus, of whom we have spoken above.[5] In that letter, Innocent declares that Marcianus ought to admit to his communion, and even restore to their churches, those ecclesiastics, who, having adhered to Bonosus during his condemnation, were willing to return, provided they had been ordained by him before his condemnation. One of these, by name Rusticus, to remove all doubt concerning the validity of his ordination, had caused himself to be reordained by a catholic bishop; and this reordination Innocent condemns, in the same letter, as highly criminal.[1]

In the year 412, Innocent wrote to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, whom he seems to have greatly honored and esteemed, concerning the day on which Easter was to be kept in the year 414. He acquaints Aurelius, that the 16th day of the moon of March would fall that year on the 22d of the month, and the 23d of the moon on the 29th of the month; and consequently that, in his opinion, Easter ought to be kept on the 22d of March. However, he desires Aurelius to discuss that point in the council of the African bishops, that was in a short time to be held at Carthage; and to let him know, whether they approved of such a regulation, or what they objected against it, that he might solemnly notify by his letters, according to custom, the day, on which Easter was to be celebrated.[2] Their thus notifying to the other bishops the day on which Easter was to be kept, was no argument of power; but it gave them an air of pre-eminence, which they dexterously improved into power.

In the year 414, Vitalis, archdeacon probably of Thessalonica, arrived at Rome, with letters for Innocent, from the bishops of Macedon, touching certain points of discipline, which, it seems, they had referred to him, and he had decided before. In this letter they represent to him, in the first place, that, according to the custom and practice of their churches, the marrying a widow was no bar or impediment to orders, or even to the episcopal dignity; and that to marry one wife before, and a second after, baptism, was not, with them, deemed bigamy. Then passing to those, who had been ordained by Bonosus, they declare it as their opinion, that nothing more could be required than the blessing of a lawful bishop to readmit them to the functions of their office. They conclude with begging leave to raise to the episcopal dignity one Photinus, who had been condemned by the predecessors of Innocent, and to depose a deacon, by name, Eustatius.[3]

This letter Innocent answered, almost in the style and language of a modern pope. He begins with expressing his surpise at the affront they offered to the apostolic see, by calling in doubt what he had already decided. He then answers, one by one, the heads of their letter, with all the authority of an un-

[1] Zos. l. 5. c. 40. [2] Soz. l. 9. c. 6.
[3] Zos. l. 5. p. 819, 820. Soz. l. 9. c. 7.
[4] Hier. ep. 16. [5] Vid. sup. p. 263—266.

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1271. [2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1269.
[3] Conc. t. 2. p. 1272—1276.

Innocent declares orders conferred by heretics to be null. Which opinion has been since declared heretical. Innocent owns the holy see to have been imposed upon. The misunderstanding between the eastern and western churches continues after the death of Chrysostom.

erring judge, though neither he, nor any of his predecessors, had ever yet claimed, or thought of claiming, such a prerogative. He absolutely condemns the practice of admitting to orders such as had married widows, because that was forbidden, says he, by Moses to the high priest of the Jews; which was tacitly declaring the Levitical laws to be still, in some degree, binding with respect to the Christian clergy. He adds, that if any such had been ordained, it was the general practice of all the churches, both in the east and west, to depose them.(*) As for those who had married but one of their two wives after baptism, Innocent declares them equally incapable of being ordained as if they had married both.(†) As to the ecclesiastics ordained by Bonosus, Innocent not only excludes them from the ministry, but endeavors to prove in general, that orders, when conferred by heretics, are null, borrowing, for that purpose, of St. Cyprian, all the arguments which that father had made use of to prove a no less erroneous opinion; namely, the nullity of baptism, when conferred by heretics.(‡)

The opinion, which he endeavors to establish here, has been since condemned as heretical, by several of his successors, and is now held as such by the whole church; which has cut out a great deal of work for the champions of infallibility. They plainly see, (and who can read Innocent's letter without seeing?) that the reasons which he made use of were all calculated to prove the nullity of ordination by the hands of a heretic; but nevertheless pretend, that whatever their seeming purport may be, Innocent employed them only to prove, that an heretical bishop had not the power of conferring grace, and with it the right of exercising lawfully the functions of his office.[1] But who can believe any man, endowed with the least share of common sense, capable of arguing so absurdly? If his meaning may be thus wrested, in spite of his words, to a catholic sense, whose meaning may not?

With respect to Photinus, Innocent declares himself very unwilling to blame, or give occasion to the world to think that he blamed, the conduct of his predecessors, who had condemned Photinus; but nevertheless, since so many prelates had made it appear by their joint testimonies, that the holy see had been imposed upon by false and groundless reports, he agrees to his promotion. As to the deacon Eustatius, he lets them know, that, whatever reports may have been spread to his prejudice, he is well assured both of his probity, and the purity of his faith, and therefore cannot consent to his deposition. In the end of his letter, he complains of the bishops of Macedon for not paying due regard to the testimony of the Roman church, in behalf of the two subdeacons Dizonianus and Cyriacus.

We have observed above, that Chrysostom being driven from the see of Constantinople into exile, Innocent, and with him most of the western bishops, had espoused his cause with great warmth; but, finding that all their endeavors in his behalf proved unsuccessful, they at last separted themselves from the communion of Atticus of Constantinople, Porphyrius of Antioch, and Theophilus of Alexandria. In the year 407, Chrysostom died at Cumana in Pontus; but with him did not die the animosities, which his deposition had occasioned between the churches of the east and the west. Atticus indeed thought nothing could now obstruct the wished for union; and therefore, as soon as Chrysostom's death was known, he applied to Rome, desiring the communion of that church. But he was greatly surprised, when he understood, that Innocent, instead of readily granting him his request, insisted upon his first acknowledging Chrysostom to have been, and to have died, lawful bishop of Constantinople, by enrolling his name in the diptychs,(*) with the names of other bishops of that city. This demand seemed to Atticus highly unreasonable; for it was obliging him to acknowledge his own election to have been null. He therefore peremptorily refused to comply with it; but nevertheless continued soliciting, by means of his friends at Rome, a reconciliation with that church.[1] But Innocent was inflexible; he was determined at all events to carry his point, and therefore would hearken to no other terms till that was complied with. The eastern bishops followed the example of Atticus; the western that of Innocent. And thus were the separation, and the animosities attending it, continued seven years longer, each party bitterly inveighing, in the mean time, against the

(*) Such a practice, however general, could have no other foundation but the same unwarrantable notion: I say unwarrantable; for what can be more so than to exclude, as Innocent does, even from the lowest degrees in the church, a man who had married a widow, because the high priest of the Jews was not allowed to marry one, though all other priests were, under that law, free from such a restraint?

(†) Jerom held the contrary opinion, and maintained it in one of his letters,(*a*) with reasons, that appeared to Baronius "almost unanswerable," (*b*) that is, no otherwise answerable than by the "ipse dixit" of Innocent, which, with him, stood in the room of reason.

(‡) He was, it seems, no logician; else, to prove his opinion, he had never made use of arguments, that equally proved, and had been calculated to prove, an erroneous opinion, an opinion long before condemned by all the bishops of the catholic church, and very lately by himself, in a letter to Alexander, bishop of Antioch, where he maintains the validity of baptism conferred by an Arian.(*c*)

(*a*) Hier. ep. 83. (*b*) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 60.
(*c*) Inn. ep. 18.

[1] Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 10.

(*) The dyptichs were tables, in which were enrolled the names of all those who died in the communion of the church. The bishops were placed there by themselves; and of all commemoration was made by the deacon in time of the service.

[1] Theodoret. l. 5. c. 34.

The churches of Antioch and Rome reconciled. The bishop of Antioch strives to reconcile the churches of Rome and Constantinople. His imprudent conduct. The name of Chrysostom enrolled in the diptychs by the bishop of Constantinople. The two churches reunited at last. Innocent's letter to Alexander of Antioch. The prerogatives of the see of Rome owing to the city, and not to St. Peter.

authors of the divisions, and each expressing a most earnest desire of a reconciliation.

At length Porphyrius of Antioch, one of Chrysostom's most inveterate enemies, dying in the year 413, or 414, Alexander, who until then had led a monastic life, was chosen in his room by the unanimous consent of the people and clergy. As he was fully convinced of Chrysostom's innocence, and the malice of his enemies, he no sooner found himself vested with that dignity, than he caused the deceased prelate's name to be inserted in the diptychs of his church, and the two bishops Helpidius and Pappus to be restored to their sees, from which they had been driven for refusing to renounce his communion, and to communicate with his enemies. After this Alexander sent a solemn deputation to Rome, at the head of which was, it seems, the famous Cassian, to acquaint Innocent with his promotion, to inform him of what he had done, and thereupon to renew the union between the two churches. Alexander, who entertained a sincere desire of seeing peace and concord restored between the east and the west, did not doubt but the example of his church would be followed by many others, and a way, by that means, be paved to a general pacification. Innocent received the deputation with the greatest marks of joy, admitted Alexander to his communion, and, with the consent and approbation of twenty-four other bishops, declared the church of Antioch again united to that of Rome.

Several other bishops, moved partly by the example, and partly by the letters and exhortations of the bishop of Antioch, yielded to Innocent, and submitted to the terms he required. But Atticus still adhered to his former resolution, and, to gain him, Alexander, who spared no pains to complete the work he had begun, repaired in person to Constantinople. But he acted there with such indiscretion as rendered that haughty prelate more averse, than he had ever yet been, to an accommodation on the terms proposed by Innocent. For all other means he could think of, to compass his design, proving unsuccessful, he resolved in the end to apply to the populace, who, as he well knew, had been most zealously attached to Chrysostom during his life, and revered him as a saint after his death. Suffering therefore his zeal to get the better of his prudence, and of every consideration prudence could suggest, he began to harangue the multitude, and inflame them with seditious speeches against Atticus, as carrying, even beyond the grave, his hatred and malice against their holy bishop. The populace heard him with attention, applauded his zeal, and, full of rage against Atticus, demanded, in a tumultuous manner, that the name of so holy, so great and deserving a prelate, might be enrolled, without further delay, in the diptychs. But their clamors and threats made no more impression on the mind of Atticus than the reasons of Alexander; he withstood both, and the bishop of Antioch, finding all his attempts thus shamefully baffled, returned to his see, with the mortification of having only widened the breach, which he intended to close, between the churches of Rome and Constantinople.[1] Baronius supposes Alexander to have acted on this occasion as Innocent's legate.[2] But I find nothing in the ancients to countenance such a supposition, besides his haughty behavior, and his pursuing, by the most unwarrantable methods, what he had in view.

Atticus, however, allowed in the end Chrysostom's name to be inserted in the diptychs; but whether he did it by choice or compulsion, is uncertain; for, in one of his letters, he writes, that he could no longer withstand the threats and violence of the enraged multitude;[3] and in another, that he had done it to comply with the will of the emperors, and to conform to the sentiments of his brethren, both in the east and west.[4] However that be, it is certain, that he never changed his sentiments with respect to Chrysostom, as is manifest from his declaring, after he had placed his name in the diptychs, that he thereby meant no more than to own, that he had been once bishop of Constantinople; but that he still adhered to the judgment that was given against him. With this, however, Innocent was satisfied; and so is Baronius.

Alexander maintained ever after a close correspondence with Innocent, courting his favor with the most servile submissions, recurring to him in every momentous affair relating to his church, and suffering himself to be blindly guided by his counsels. In one of his letters he consulted him, it seems, concerning the prerogatives of his see, and the extent of his jurisdiction; and nothing can be more subtle than Innocent's answer. For after a long preamble on the dignity of the see of Antioch, he craftily insinuates all the privileges and prerogatives annexed to it to be owing not to the dignity of the city, but to the dignity of the see, as having been once the see of St. Peter. He adds, that on this consideration it had been distinguished with an extensive jurisdiction, and that it yielded to that of Rome itself only because St. Peter had accomplished there what he had begun at Antioch.[5] What Innocent proposed to himself by thus exalting the see of Antioch, by deriving the privileges, prerogatives, and jurisdiction, of that see from St. Peter, is obvious. If they were owing not to the city, but to St. Peter, as Innocent affirms, those enjoyed by the see

[1] Niceph. l. 14. c. 27.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 48. n. 32.
[3] Niceph. c. 26.
[4] Idem, c. 27.
[5] Conc. t. 2. p. 1269.

The division of the church founded on the division of the empire. Innocent encourages the bishop of Antioch to invade the rights of the metropolitans. Innocent's letter occasions great disputes between the bishops of Antioch and those of Cyprus.

of Rome were, in like manner, owing to St. Peter, and not to the city. This notion, now first started by Innocent, was not suffered to drop; but, being greedily embraced by his successors, it was, in process of time, improved by them into a general plea for all their exorbitant claims. And thus Innocent may be justly said to have pointed out the ground on which the unwieldy fabric of the papal power was afterwards built. But if it be true, as Innocent pretends, that the see of Antioch owed its dignity to St. Peter, and not to the city, how will he account for its being ranked under that of Alexandria, which was neither founded, nor had ever been honored, by that apostle? But not to waste time in combating such a groundless notion, nothing is more certain, than that the disposition and division of the church was founded upon, and entirely agreeable to, the disposition and division of the empire;[1] and consequently that as no regard was had to St. Peter, or any other apostle, in the civil, none could be had in the ecclesiastical, polity. And hence it naturally follows, that as Rome was the first city of the empire, Alexandria the second, and Antioch the third, the sees should be ranked in the same order; and in the same order they were ranked accordingly, though the see of Alexandria was founded only by a disciple of St. Peter, and that of Antioch was supposed to have been founded by St. Peter himself.

This division of the church took place soon after the division of the empire made by Constantine the Great, on which it was founded. It was first introduced by custom, but afterwards confirmed by several councils; and in none of them is there a word of St. Peter. As therefore the bishop of Alexandria preceded in rank the bishop of Antioch, for no other reason but because the city of Alexandria preceded in dignity the city of Antioch, according to the secular constitutions of the empire; so the bishop of Rome preceded in rank all other bishops, for no other reason but because the city of Rome, as the seat of the empire, preceded in dignity all other cities.

But to return to Innocent: In the same letter to Alexander he observes, that the bishop of Antioch did not preside over a single province, but a whole diocess; and therefore advises him not only to maintain the right he had of ordaining the metropolitans, but not to suffer other bishops in the provinces under his jurisdiction, however distant, to be ordained without his consent and approbation. He adds, that, with respect to the bishops of the less remote provinces, he might reserve to himself the right of ordaining them.[2] This was encouraging the bishop of Antioch to invade and usurp the undoubted rights of the metropolitans, in open defiance of the fourth and sixth canons of the council of Nice, which were afterwards confirmed by almost innumerable other councils, all granting to the metropolitans the power of ordaining the bishops of their respective provinces jointly with the bishops of the same province, without ever once mentioning the patriarch or head of the diocess.[1] But of this right the bishops of Rome had deprived the metropolitans under their jurisdiction as early at least as the time of Syricius; for that pope, in the letter which he wrote to Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, appointing him his vicar for East Illyricum, charges him not to suffer any bishops to be ordained in those provinces without his consent and approbation. Innocent maintained what his predecessors had usurped; and, to countenance their usurpation and his own, he encourages, by this letter, the bishop of Antioch to pursue the same conduct with respect to the metropolitans of his diocess. The example of the bishops of Rome was, in process of time, followed by those of Constantinople, who, rivalling them in pride and ambition, not only usurped the power of ordaining all the bishops of their diocess, but, by the interest they had at court, obtained an imperial rescript, confirming to them the power which they had usurped. But they were soon obliged to part with it, though thus guarantied, by the fathers of the council of Chalcedon empowering, by their twenty-eighth canon, the bishops of Constantinople to ordain the metropolitans in the diocesses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace; but at the same time ascertaining to the metropolitans the right of ordaining the bishops of their respective provinces. But the bishops of Rome, ever determined to part with no power, however acquired, found means not only to elude the decrees of this and several other councils, ascertaining the rights of the metropolitans in the plainest terms, but to improve, by daily encroachments, their usurped jurisdiction, as I shall have frequent occasion to observe in the sequel of this history.

Innocent complains, in the next article of his letter, of a custom that obtained in the island of Cyprus. It was one of the chief privileges of the patriarch, or bishop, who presided over a whole diocess, to ordain the metropolitans of the provinces comprised under his diocess. But the metropolitan of Cyprus was ordained by the bishops of that island without the consent, or even the privity, of the bishop of Antioch, though Cyprus belonged to his province, according to the civil division of the empire. This custom Innocent condemns, as repugnant to the canons of the council of Nice; adding, that it was first introduced in the unhappy times when Arianism prevailed all over Syria, the bishops of Cyprus refusing then to acknowledge those of Antioch, who were infected with that heresy. This ar-

[1] See above, p. 105. & seq. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1269.

[1] Vid. Ell. Du Pin de antiq. eccles. disciplin. dissert. prim. n. 12.

Which are in the end decided in favor of the latter. Alterations in the state generally attended with the like alterations in the church. Ecclesiastics ordained by heretics to be admitted into the church only as laymen. Innocent's letter to the bishop of Eugubium. All churches ought, according to him, to conform to the customs of the Roman church.

ticle proved the source of endless disputes between the bishops of Antioch and those of Cyprus; the former pretending, that the power of ordaining the metropolitan of Cyprus was lodged in them, and the latter opposing with great warmth such a pretension. The controversy was at length referred to the council of Ephesus; and the fathers of that numerous assembly, having heard and examined with great attention the pleas of both parties, condemned in the strongest terms the pretension of the bishops of Antioch, as repugnant to the ancient canons, that is, to those very canons, on which, at the suggestion of Innocent, they had founded it. And here I cannot help observing, by the way, that the bishops of Antioch never thought of alleging, in support of their claim, the authority of Innocent, which they would certainly have done, had they not been well apprised, that no regard would have been paid to it by the fathers of the council. As for what Innocent adds concerning the time and manner in which the custom he complains of was introduced, he must certainly have been no less mistaken in those particulars, than he was in the sense and meaning of the canons of Nice. For who can imagine, that the Arian bishops at the time Arianism prevailed, that is, when they had the greatest interest at court, and the orthodox had none, would have suffered the bishops of Cyprus to withdraw themselves, contrary to the established laws of the church, from their jurisdiction, for no other reason, but because the bishops of Antioch professed the doctrine of Arius?

Alexander, in his letter to Innocent, had asked him, whether two metropolitan sees should be erected in one province, which had been divided by the emperors into two? Innocent replies, that the concerns of the church being different from those of the state, the church ought to adhere to the ancient rule. However, it is plain from history, that such alterations in the state were, generally speaking, attended with the like alterations in the church; insomuch that when the bishop of any considerable city wanted to be raised to the dignity of a metropolitan, the most expeditious way of gratifying his ambition was, to apply to the emperor for a division of the province; that his city being advanced by such a division, to the rank of a metropolis, he might, by the same means, be preferred to that of a metropolitan. Of mere bishops, thus raised to the dignity of metropolitans, without any regard to Innocent's letter, or, as it is styled, decretal, several instances occur in history.

Innocent, in the end of his letter, declares it as his opinion, that such ecclesiastics as had renounced Arianism, or any other heresy, with a desire of being received into the church, ought not to be admitted as ecclesiastics, but only as laymen. This doctrine is entirely agreeable to the erroneous doctrine concerning the invalidity of ordination by the hands of a heretic, which we have heard him labor to establish in his letter to the bishops of Macedon.[1] He concludes this letter with entreating the bishop of Antioch to cause it to be read in a council, or to see that copies of it be transmitted to all the bishops of his diocess, that all may agree in observing the instructions which it contains.[2]

But of all Innocent's letters, that which he wrote to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, (a city still known by the same name in the duchy of Urbino), is by far the most worthy of notice, whether we consider the doctrine which he there lays down, or the principles on which he founds it. As to the doctrine, it may be reduced to the two following heads: namely, That all the churches in the west are bound to adopt, and strictly to observe, every practice and custom observed by the Roman church; and that the customs of all other churches differing from those of the Roman church, are but corruptions of the ancient tradition, deviations from the practice of the primitive times, and insufferable abuses. As for the principles on which he founds this doctrine, they are, to say no more, of a piece with the doctrine itself. For he pretends, 1. That no apostle, besides St. Peter, ever preached in the west. He ought, with St. Peter, to have at least excepted St. Paul; and, no doubt, would, had not his memory failed him, as well as his infallibility. He supposes, in the second place, that all the churches in the west were founded by St. Peter, or by some of his successors; and consequently, that they ought to conform to the customs of the Roman church, since to that church they owe their origin. But that the church of Lyons, not to mention others, was founded by preachers sent thither out of Asia by St. Polycarp, and not by St. Peter, or any of his successors, is affirmed by all the ancients, and allowed by the most learned among the moderns; though some of them pretend, without the least foundation, the whole to have been done by the authority of the bishop of Rome.[3] Innocent pretends, in the third place, every point of discipline and ecclesiastical polity to have been settled by the apostles, and whatever was settled at Rome by St. Peter to have been there strictly observed ever since his time, without the least addition or diminution. He concludes this part of his letter with laying it down as a general maxim, that it is unlawful for any bishop to make the least alterations in the discipline of his church, or even to introduce into one church a custom or practice observed by another.[4] This nevertheless is what all

[1] Vide supra, p. 141. [2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1265—1269.
[3] Vide Petr. de Marc. dissert. de primat. p. 227.
[4] Concil. t. 1. p. 1245. Ugh. t. 1. p. 676.

Some customs of the Roman church borrowed of other churches. The ceremony of anointing those who are confirmed. Confirmation not a sacrament. Why deemed formerly unlawful to fast on Sunday or Saturday.

bishops have done, and even those of Rome, both before and after Innocent's time, and consequently what they thought it lawful to do. The psalmody, for instance, (and innumerable other instances might be alleged), or the singing of psalms in the churches, was not instituted by any of the apostles, but first introduced by St. Ignatius into the church of Antioch,[1] whence it spread in a very short time to all the churches in the east, those bishops no more scrupling to adopt, than Ignatius had scrupled to introduce, so laudable a practice. Of the eastern churches it was borrowed by the church of Milan, and of the church of Milan by that of Rome, long before Innocent's time; which plainly shows, that his predecessors held not that doctrine, no more than one of the best of his successors, St. Gregory the Great, who openly approves of some customs, that were first unknown to, but afterwards adopted by his church.[2] Upon the whole, it is evident, that Innocent was grossly mistaken, not only with respect to this point, but likewise in asserting, that whatever had been settled at Rome by St. Peter, was still observed there without the least addition or diminution.

The remaining part of Innocent's letter relates to some particular ceremonies and customs, especially to the ceremony of confirming those who were baptized, and the custom of fasting on Saturdays. With respect to the former, he informs Decentius, that according to the customs of the church, founded on the practice of the apostles, the bishop alone can anoint on the forehead those who have been baptized, and give them the Holy Ghost; and that the priests can only anoint other parts, the episcopal power not having been granted to them, though they partake of the priesthood.(*)

The Roman catholics, finding this ceremony, now known by the name of confirmation, styled a sacrament by St. Cyprian,[1] and St. Austin,[2] have thereupon raised it to that rank, not reflecting that the ancient writers frequently make use of that word to express no more than a sacred ceremony, or mystery. And truly were they to reckon among their sacraments all the ceremonies which the fathers and other Christian writers have distinguished with that title, their number would amount to seventy rather than to seven.

With respect to the other point, those who are ever so little versed in the writings of the fathers, must know, that from the earliest times it was deemed unlawful, nay, and highly criminal, for a Christian to fast on Sunday or Saturday; on Sunday, because those heretics, who denied the resurrection of our Savior, fasted on that day, in opposition to the orthodox, who, believing it, solemnized the Sunday, the day on which it happened, with feasting and rejoicings; on Saturday, because other heretics holding the god of the Jews, and the author of their law, to be an evil spirit, whom Christ came to destroy, fasted on the seventh day, thinking that by fasting they vilified the god of the Jews as much as the Jews honored him by feasting.[3] Among the ancient canons, known by the name of the "Apostolic Constitutions," we read the following ordinance: "If a clerk shall be found to have fasted on a Sunday or a Saturday, let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be cut off from the communion of the faithful."[4] But that canon must be understood only with respect to the east; for there was broached, and there chiefly prevailed, the heresy that first introduced such a practice. But in the west,

[1] Socrat. l. 6. c. 8. [2] Greg. l. 7. ep. 64.

(*) The ceremony of anointing with oil the forehead, and likewise the organs of the five senses, in those who had been baptized, is undoubtedly very ancient. Tertullian, who lived in the latter end of the second century, speaks of it as a ceremony universally practised and established.(a) St. Cyprian,(b) who flourished fifty years after St. Ambrose,(c) St. Austin,(d) St. Jerom,(e) and the other fathers, describe it as a ceremony by which the Holy Ghost was given to those who had been baptized, and consequently which none but bishops could administer, they being the successors of the apostles, to whom alone that power was granted. For the fathers, generally speaking, and other ancient writers, suppose this, and the imposition of hands, by which the Holy Ghost was given by the apostles to those who were baptized,(f) to be one and the same ceremony. The oil employed on this occasion was, as early as the third century, solemnly consecrated, kept in the churches or places where the faithful met, and held by them in great veneration.(g) This gave rise, in the following century, to many superstitious practices, and miracles were said to have been wrought by the "holy oil," to warrant such practices, and confound those who thought it unlawful to comply with them. A very remarkable miracle of this nature is gravely related by Optatus Milevitanus,(a) who wrote about the middle of the fourth century. But, in the time of the apostles, the whole of the ceremony consisted in the imposition of hands: "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Not a word of oil, of chrism, of unction, of signing with oil on the forehead in the form of a cross, and much less of a blow given by the bishop on the cheek to the person that is confirmed, though these are now all deemed, in the church of Rome, material parts of this ceremony. As such rites were unknown to, and unpractised by, the apostles, it matters little how early they were introduced after their time. And here I cannot help observing, that the Roman catholics themselves have not thought fit to adopt all the ceremonies used on this occasion, and recommended by the fathers. For, in Innocent's time, the person confirmed was not only anointed on the forehead, but on other parts; on the forehead by the bishop, on other parts by the priests. The other parts were, as we gather from Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem,(b) the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and feet. The anointing of these parts was, in the opinion of that father, no less fraught with mysteries than the anointing of the forehead; and yet the former unction, notwithstanding its antiquity, and all the mysteries it symbolized, has been long since omitted, as altogether unnecessary. They might in like manner have omitted all the rest, and contented themselves, as the apostles did, with the bare imposition of hands.

(a) Tert. de resur. carnis. (b) Cypr. ep. 72, 73, (c) Ambr. de sacram. l. 3. c. 2. (d) Aug. contra Petal. l. 1. c. 104. de baptis. l. 3. c. 16. In ep. 1. Joan. tract. 3. & de diver. ser. 33. (e) Hier. contra Luciferian. (f) Act. 8: 15—17. (g) Cyp. ep. 70. & de oper. card. & unct. Chris.

(a) Optat. Milev. contra Parm. l. 2. (b) Cyril. Catech. mystag. 3.

[1] Cypr. ep. 72. [2] Aug. de diver. serm. 33. [3] Vide Iren. l. 1. c. 21—24. & Epiph. hæres. 21—28. & 41, 42. [4] Apost. const. can. 55.

Friday from the earliest times a fast-day. Saturday a fast-day in the Roman church. The ceremony of anointing the sick with oil. Letters from the councils of Carthage and Milevum to Innocent. Innocent's answer to the councils.

where that heresy was scarce known, some churches, and the Roman in particular, observed both Fridays and Saturdays as fast-days. The Friday was, from the earliest times, a fast-day with all churches, both in the east and the west; the Saturday was only in the west, and even there with very few churches, which had borrowed that custom of the Roman church, as we are informed by St. Austin.[1] Innocent therefore, desirous of establishing in all other churches the custom that obtained in his own, undertakes to prove, first, that all may, and, secondly, that all ought to observe Saturday as a fast. That all may, he proves well enough; but the reasons he offers to show that they all ought, namely, "Because Christ lay in the sepulchre the Saturday as well as the Friday, and the apostles fasted, (as he supposes,) on both days," are manifestly inconclusive as to any obligation. Besides, it was not because Christ lay in the sepulchre, or because the apostles fasted, but because Christ was crucified on a Friday, that a fast was appointed to be observed on that day. In process of time, the custom of sanctifying both days with a fast took place in most of the western churches; and this custom has been made in latter times a general law, and one of the commandments of the church, which all Roman catholics are bound to obey on pain of damnation. However, the severity of it is so far relaxed, that, as they are only required to abstain from meat, the utmost riot and epicurism in other kinds of food, and in wine, may be, and are indulged on their fast-days.

The last article of Innocent's letter relates to the ceremony of anointing the sick with oil, agreeably to that of St. James, "Is any one sick among you," &c.?[2] As the apostle directs the faithful to "call for the elders of the church;" some took from thence occasion to question whether bishops were empowered to perform that ceremony. Innocent therefore answers Decentius, who had proposed the question, that there can be no room to doubt whether or not the bishops have such a power, since the priests can have none, which the bishops have not, of whom they receive all their power. It is true, says Innocent, that St. James ordered the faithful to call for the elders, and not for the bishops; but that was because he knew that the bishops could not have so much leisure from other important duties as the priests. He adds, that this unction must not be applied to penitents; that the oil used in it must be blessed by the bishop; and when it is thus blessed, not the presbyters only, but all the faithful, may anoint with it, both themselves and others. The power of anointing, St. James confined to the elders or priests, and that is the present doctrine of the church of Rome, though Innocent extended such a power to all the faithful. This ceremony, now known by the name of extreme unction, was, in Innocent's time, a kind of sacrament; for so he styles it.[1] But it is now a true sacrament, and such it was declared by the council of Trent.[2]

In the year 416, Innocent received three letters from the African bishops; namely, one from the bishops of Africa, properly so called, assembled at Carthage; another from those of Numidia, assembled at Milevum; and a third from St. Austin, signed by him and four other bishops. The two councils wrote to acquaint Innocent, that they had condemned Pelagius and his disciple Cælestius, of whose opinions I shall speak hereafter, and desired him to add the authority of the apostolic see to their decrees. The letter from St. Austin, and the four other bishops, was to inform Innocent, in a friendly manner, that he was suspected of countenancing those heretics, and favoring their doctrine. This suspicion they themselves seem not to have thought quite groundless: for Possidius, one of the bishops who subscribed the letter, writes, that the African bishops took a great deal of pains to convince Innocent, and his successor Zosimus, that the doctrine of Pelagius was erroneous and heretical, knowing that his followers were striving to infect the apostolic see itself with their poisonous tenets.[3] They strove in vain, says Baronius; and perhaps they did; but the African bishops had never taken so much pains to guard the apostolic see against that infection, had they not thought it capable of being infected. The five bishops sent to Innocent, together with their letter, St. Austin's answer to a letter which he had received from Pelagius, his confutation of a book composed by that heretic, and the book itself, with the passages marked in it which gave most offence, and claimed a particular attention, lest he should overlook them.[4] This was not treating him as an infallible judge. (*)

The letters from the council of Carthage, from that of Milevum, and from the five bishops, were brought to Rome by Julius, bishop of some city in Africa; and, by the same Julius, Innocent answered them with three letters, all dated the 27th of January, of the year 417. The first, which is addressed to Aure-

[1] Aug. ep. 86. [2] James v. 14, 15.

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1248. [2] Concil. Trid. sess. 14. can. 1.
[3] Possid. Aug. vit. c. 18. [4] Aug. ep. 95.

(*) Baronius observes here, that their informing him by a private letter, and not by a public one from the council, of the suspicions that some entertained of him, was a mark of the great respect and veneration they had for the bishop of Rome, whose nakedness they were unwilling, as it became dutiful children, to expose to the eyes of the world. (*a*) And who told Baronius, that, in the like circumstances, they would not have shown the same respect for any other bishop? He had better have observed, and the observation is more obvious, that his being suspected at all evidently proves the infallibility of the apostolic see not to have been, in those days, an article of the catholic faith.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 416. n. 11.

He claims the first a divine right of finally deciding all controversies. Which is not acknowledged by the African nor the Numidian bishops. An instance of Innocent's great subtlety and address. He excommunicates Cælestius and Pelagius.

lius, probably bishop of Carthage, and to the other bishops of that assembly, he begins with commending them for their zeal, their pastoral vigilance, and the regard they had shown for the apostolic see. He thence takes an opportunity to resume his usual and favorite subject, the dignity, pre-eminence, and authority of that see; roundly asserting, that "all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world are, by Divine right, to be referred to the apostolic see, before they are finally decided in the provinces." This was indeed a very bold claim, and a direct asserting to himself the universal supremacy attained by his successors. But it was yet too early for such a claim to be granted; and it is plain the African bishops had no idea of this Divine right. For, had they entertained any such notion, they surely would never have presumed finally to condemn and anathematize, as they did, Pelagius and Cælestius, without consulting at least the apostolic see: neither would they have written to Innocent in the style they did, after they had condemned them: for, in their letter, they did not leave him at liberty to approve or disapprove of what they had done; but only desire him to join his authority to theirs, which they well knew he could not refuse to do, without confirming the suspicion of his countenancing the Pelagians, and their doctrine. "We have anathematized Pelagius and Cælestius," say the fathers of the council of Carthage, "and thought fit to acquaint you with it, that to the decrees of our mediocrity might be added the authority of the apostolic see." This is a modest style, and respectful to the see of Rome; but it is that of men who plainly thought they had a right to act in this matter, by their own judgment and power, without waiting for the award of that see, as they ought to have done, if they had allowed of Innocent's claim. In like manner, the council of Milevum, after informing Innocent of the sentence, which they had pronounced against the two above-mentioned heretics, adds; "And this error and impiety, which has every where so many followers and abettors, ought also to be anathematized and condemned by the apostolic see;"[1] which was putting Innocent in mind of what he ought to do, and not consulting him what they should do. This conduct of the African bishops gave Innocent no small uneasiness. He was at a loss what to do at so critical a juncture. For to approve of a conduct, so derogatory to the pretended dignity of his see, was giving up his claim to the Divine right of finally deciding all ecclesiastical controversies. To disapprove it, was confirming the suspicion of his countenancing the doctrine which they had condemned. But Innocent was a man of great subtlety and address; and he found out, at last, an expedient to extricate himself out of that perplexity, and gratify the fathers of both councils, without either approving or condemning their past conduct. The only thing thay required of him was to join his authority with theirs, in condemning the Pelagian heresy; and that he readily did. But, lest in so doing, he should seem to approve of their having condemned it without first consulting him, in his answer to their letters, he supposed them to have actually consulted him; nay, to have referred to him the final decision of that controversy; and, agreeably to that supposition, he commends them for the deference they had thereby shown to the apostolic see. "You have well observed," says he, "the ordinances of the ancient fathers, and not trampled under foot what they, not in human wisdom, but by Divine order, have established; namely, that whatever is done in places, however remote, should, for a final conclusion, be referred to the apostolic see." And again, "You have had due regard to the honor of the apostolic see, I mean of him who has the charge and care of all churches, in consulting him in these perplexities, and intricate cases."[1] Thus did Innocent maintain his claim, and, at the same time, avoid quarrelling, at an improper season, with those who had acted in direct opposition to it. A necessary policy in the first setting up of such extravagant and groundless pretentions.

In the present letter he not only approves of the judgment given against Pelagius and Cælestius by the African bishops, but alleges several reasons in confutation of the doctrines they taught; and concludes, by declaring them cut off from the communion of the church, agreeably to the sentence of the African bishops, as men not only unworthy of that communion, but of human society, and even of life.[2] The same things he repeats in his answer to the bishops of Numidia; but he seems there to have been sensible, upon a more cool consideration, that, in his letter to the council of Carthage, he had strained his prerogative too high; and therefore in this he confines to matters of faith the general maxim, which he had laid down, concerning the obligation of referring all ecclesiastical matters, for a final decision, to the apostolic see. In the same letter he endeavors to confute, in particular, the doctrine of Pelagius, allowing children, who die without baptism, to partake of eternal life.[3] In his answer to the five bishops, he refers them for his real sentiments, concerning the doctrine of Pelagius, to the other two letters, adding, that he had read the book of Pelagius, which they had sent him, and found nothing in it that he liked, or rather that he did not dislike.[4](*)

[1] Aug. ep. 90—95.

[1] Idem. ib. [2] Aug. ep. 93.
[3] Idem. ep. 91. 93. [4] Idem. ep. 96.

(*) That the Pelagian heresy was first condemned by the African bishops, is a fact so well attested, that one would think it impossible it should ever have come

Cælestius condemned by the African bishops, not withstanding his appeal to Rome. Innocent's letter to Jerom. His letter to John of Jerusalem. Innocent dies. The see of Rome greatly indebted to him for its grandeur.

Cælestius had been condemned by a council held at Carthage, in the year 412, and probably consisting of the same bishops who composed that of the year 416. From their sentence he appealed, as Baronius observes,[1] to the see of Rome, summoning his accuser, Paulinus, to appear at the same tribunal. But all we can infer from thence is, that either Innocent did not receive the appeal, or, if he did, that the African bishops made no account of it, since they condemned him anew, without waiting for the judgment of Innocent, to whom he had appealed.

Innocent wrote two letters more, a little before his death, one of which was to St. Jerom, comforting him in his distress. For some who favored Pelagius, provoked at Jerom's repeated invectives against him, had set fire to his monastery at Bethlehem, and burned it down to the ground, agreeably to the spirit and methods in which religious controversies were now carried on. Their design was to have burned Jerom himself; but he had the good luck to escape out of the flames, and save himself in a strong tower. The two noble virgins, Eustochium and her niece Paula, who led a retired life under the direction of Jerom, met with no better treatment. For those fanatics, breaking into the house where they lived, beat some of their attendants in their presence, killed others, and threatened them with fire and destruction. With this they acquainted Innocent, who thereupon wrote to Jerom, offering to exert the whole authority of the apostolic see against the authors of such excesses, provided he knew who they were: for the two virgins had concealed their names, probably to prevent his exerting that authority, which they had reason to apprehend would be attended with greater evils. Innocent adds, that so long as the authors and promoters of those unheard of barbarities are unknown, he can only condole with those who have suffered by them; but, if they were accused in due form, at his tribunal, he would not fail to appoint proper judges to try them; which, by the way, he had no right to do.

Innocent's other letter is to John, bishop of Jerusalem, who hated Jerom on account of his inveteracy against Origen, and was suspected to connive at the cruel treatment he and his followers had met with. Him, therefore, Innocent reprimands very severely, for suffering such enormous abuses within the limits of his jurisdiction. In his letter he gives him the title of well-beloved brother; but at the same time treats him with more haughtiness than was becoming even in a superior, though he neither had, nor could claim by the canons, any kind of jurisdiction or authority over him.

These letters Innocent wrote in the latter end of January, and died on the 12th of March of the same year, 417, having governed the Roman church near fifteen years; for his predecessor Anastasius died on the 27th of April, 402, and he was chosen soon after his decease, as I have observed above. He was generally esteemed a man of good parts, and well acquainted with the laws and traditions of the church. Hence he was frequently consulted by the western, and sometimes by the eastern bishops, in points both of faith and discipline. Of this general esteem, and the deference that was thereupon paid to his decisions, he took advantage to lay down, with an air of authority, and as undoubted truths, many false, groundless and dangerous maxims, all tending to the diminution of the episcopal power and the advancement of the papal. The dignity of the apostolic see was, as we have seen, the burden of almost all his letters; he even improved it into a claim of supremacy; and we may say, with great truth, that to him the see of Rome was more indebted for the grandeur it afterwards gained, than to all his predecessors together. He formed the plan of that spiritual monarchy which they, by constant application, established at last, in spite of the many almost insurmountable difficulties which they had to contend with. He was the first who, changing the ancient foundation of the primacy, claimed it as the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, as he is styled, and not as the bishop of the first city, though on that consideration alone it had been granted by the councils. I said primacy, because the word supremacy was utterly unknown in those days. The council of Sardica, held in the year 347, had allowed, in some cases, and under several restrictions, appeals to be made to the see of Rome, as has been observed elsewhere.[1] But Innocent, scorning to owe any branch of his authority to that, or any other council, claimed, by divine right, the power of finally deciding all ecclesiastical controversies and disputes; which was claiming, by divine right, an unlimited jurisdiction. It is true, no regard was had to such claims; nor indeed did Innocent dare to pursue them, being well apprised of the opposition he would meet with, if he should then have made such an attempt. He therefore wisely contented himself with laying foundations, and thought it a great advance, as it certainly was, to have openly asserted such notions, and brought the ears of men to endure them,

into any man's thoughts to call it in question. And yet Baronius, upon the authority of a very doubtful passage out of St. Prosper, a contemporary writer, roundly asserts that heresy to have been first condemned, not by the African bishops, but by Innocent. (*a*) The words of Prosper are: "Pestem subeuntem prima recidit sedes Roma Petri. (*b*) These words are variously interpreted by the learned; but all agree in rejecting the interpretation of Baronius, as making (*c*) Prosper contradict a known truth.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 412. n. 26.

(*b*) Prosp. de Ingratis, l. 1. c. 2.

(*c*) Vide Jansenium de Hær. Pelag. p. 16. Merc. t. 1. p. 9.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 412. n. 25.

[1] Vide *ante*.

if not their minds. Had he gone farther, he would have been stopped in his career, and it might have proved fatal to the power of Rome before it was come to an age of maturity; but that he went thus far was of great benefit to it, because it made a beginning, and furnished his successors with a pretence to plead some antiquity for the opinions and principles upon which they proceeded.

Accordingly, the decretals of Innocent are frequently quoted by the advocates for the see of Rome, to show how early the popes claimed, by divine right, and as successors of St. Peter, a universal authority and jurisdiction. But if the principles, on which they founded their claims, were false in Innocent's time, they are still so in ours; if no account was then made of such claims, (and that none was made I have sufficiently shown,) no account ought to be made of them now, no more than if they were dated but yesterday. Nor, indeed, ought the beginning of the fifth century to be esteemed an early time in the Christian church. Great corruptions were then crept into it; and, with regard to the point in question, it was very late. For had the bishop of Rome been supreme head of the church, in right of St. Peter, how came that supremacy to be unknown, and unheard of, for above four hundred years? If the four first centuries could not discover it, on what new light was it revealed to the fifth?

Innocent has been enrolled, by his successors, in the catalogue of saints; and he is now adored in the church of Rome as a saint of the first rate; an honor which, it must be confessed, he better deserved at their hands, in their estimation of merit, than any of his predecessors, or any of his successors, except Gregory VIIth.

ZOSIMUS, FORTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[Honorius, Theodosius the Younger.]

Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, was, according to the Bibliothecarian, a Greek by nation, and the son of one Abraham;[1] which is all we know of him before his election. He was elected and ordained six days after the death of his predecessor, that is, on the 18th of March, 417. (*)

The first thing that engaged the attention of Zosimus, after his election, was the heresy of Pelagius, and his chief disciple, Cælestius, which, at that time, made a great noise in the church. Pelagius was by birth a Briton, and a monk by profession; but one of those who, parting with their estates, and renouncing all worldly honors, lived an austere life; but in no community, and under no rule. Such a monk was the famous Paulinus, such Pammachius, and such probably Pelagius; for I do not find, in any ancient writer, that he ever confined himself to a monastery; nay, the wandering life he led is a strong proof he never did.(†)

As to his parts, Jerom, who could never discover any thing commendable in those he opposed, speaks of him with the greatest contempt, as if he had no genius, and but very little knowledge.[1] But St. Austin, a more candid, and less passionate writer, owns him to have been a man of extraordinary good sense, of a very sprightly genius, of great penetration, and one who was not easily overcome, but rather capable of maintaining, with the strongest reasons that could be offered, the opinions which he once embraced.[2] He lived several years at Rome, at least from the year 400 to 411, and was there well known, and greatly esteemed. For St. Austin, who first heard of him, while he lived at Rome, spoke of him in the first books, which he wrote against him, as of a man, "who passed for a saint, who had made great progress in piety, whose life was chaste, and manners blameless, who had sold and given to the poor all he had," &c.[3] St. Paulinus and St. Jerom seem to have once entertained a no less favorable opinion of him in these respects, than St. Austin did; for they too, in some of their letters, speak of him with the greatest commendations. But he no sooner began to broach his new doctrines than he forfeited their good opinion, and with it every virtue which he had formerly possessed; nay, they pretend that he abandoned himself, at once, to immoderate eating and drinking, and to all manner of debauchery, passing his whole time in revels

[1] Anas. c. 42.

(*) Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum, observes, at the year 443, that in 417, when Zosimus was bishop of Rome, Easter, which ought to have been kept on the 22d of April, was, by a mistake, kept on the 25th of March; (*a*) so that on the 25th of March, Zosimus was in possession of the see; and consequently must have been chosen and ordained on the 18th of that month, the only Sunday in 417, between the 12th of March, when Innocent died, and the 25th. For in those days bishops were commonly ordained on Sundays, and it is very certain, that Zosimus was ordained on that day, since he pretended the ordination of two bishops whom he deposed, to be null, because they had been ordained on another day. (*b*)

Theodoret makes Bonifice the immediate successor of Innocent. (*c*) But all the other writers, without exception, place Zosimus between Innocent and Boniface.

(*a*) Leo, t. 1. p. 413. (*b*) Conc. t. 2. p. 1569.
(*c*) Theod. l. 5. p. 751.

(†) He is commonly styled Pelagius the Briton, to distinguish him from Pelagius of Tarento, who lived about the same time. (*d*)

(*d*) Aug. ep. 106. Prosp. contra Ingrat. l. 1. c. 1.

[1] Jans. Hist. Pel. p. 2. [2] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.
[3] Aug. ep. 95. Pecc. Orig. c. 8—21, &c.

Cælestius, his family, profession, parts, &c. Their doctrine. Both pass over into Africa. Pelagius repairs to Palæstine. Cælestius accused and condemned in Africa. Appeals to Rome, but flies to Ephesus. Pelagius accused in Palæstine by Heros and Lazarus, two Gallican bishops; and absolved by the council of Diospolis.

and banquets, in caressing and pampering his body, which by that means, says Jerom, swelled to such an exorbitant size, that he was more capable of crushing his adversaries with the weight of his carcass than the weight of his arguments.[1] We shall find very few, if any at all, who, upon their teaching doctrines not approved by the fathers, have not been immediately transformed by them, out of their great zeal for the purity of the faith, into monsters of wickedness, though they themselves had perhaps proposed them before for patterns of every Christian virtue. It behoves us, therefore, to be very cautious in giving credit to what they say of those whom they style heretics. With respect to Pelagius, St. Austin, more moderate than the rest, does not charge him with any vices, but only ascribes to hypocrisy the virtues which he had admired in him before.[2]

Cælestius, the first and chief disciple of Pelagius, was, according to some, a native of Scotland or Ireland; according to others, of Campania, in Italy;[3] but, with respect to his country, nothing certain can be advanced. He was descended of an illustrious family, and had applied himself, from his youth, to the study of the law, and made some figure at the bar; but growing weary of that profession, he retired from the world, embraced a monastic life, and lived some years in a monastery;[4] St. Jerom speaks of him as a man of no genius or talents.[5] But. St. Austin entertained a very different opinion of his parts; for he commends him as a good writer, as one who was thoroughly acquainted with all the subtleties of logic, and whose talents would have proved very serviceable, could he have been retrieved from his errors.[6]

The tenets of Pelagius or Cælestius (for those, who embraced them, are styled indifferently Pelagians and Cælestians) may be reduced to the following heads: 1. That we may, by our free-will, without the help of grace, do good, and avoid evil. 2. That if grace were necessary for either, God would be unjust in giving it to one, and denying it to another. 3. That faith, which is the first step to our justification, depends upon our free-will. 4. That the sin of Adam hurt none but him; that children are born in the state which he was in before the fall; that they are not delivered by baptism from eternal perdition, but, without baptism, partake of life everlasting. By life everlasting they meant, a middle state between eternal happiness and eternal misery. 5. That grace is only necessary to render the observance of the commandments more easy.

These opinions Pelagius and Cælestius first broached at Rome, about the year 405, and gained there a great many followers; more says St. Austin, than could be well imagined.[1] They both left Rome in 410, or 411, and, crossing over into Africa, infected many there, says the same author, especially at Carthage, with their new doctrine.[2] Pelagius, after a short stay at Carthage, went first into Egypt, and from thence into Palæstine, where he continued a long time.[3] Cælestius remained at Carthage, hoping to be preferred there to the priesthood; but as he did not use the due caution in propagating his doctrine in that city, he was soon discovered, and accused by one Paulinus, a deacon, before a council, at which several bishops were present, and Aurelius of Carthage presided. The charge brought against him was, that he held the sin of Adam to have hurt him alone; that it could not be imputed to his descendants; and that no sin was cancelled by baptism. These tenets he did not own before the council; but neither would he disown or anathematize them; and therefore the bishops, provoked at his obstinacy, not only condemned his doctrine, but, at the same time, cut him off, as an incorrigible heretic, from the communion of the church.[4] From this sentence Cælestius appealed to the judgment of Innocent, then bishop of Rome, summoning Paulinus, his accuser, to make his charge good at that tribunal. But Cælestius himself laid, it seems, no stress on his appeal; for, instead of repairing to Rome, he fled to Ephesus,[5] where we shall leave him for the present.

Pelagius, in the mean time, was not idle in Palæstine, whither he had retired, as I have said above; but, being countenanced by John, bishop of Jerusalem, he gained daily such numbers of followers there, that Heros and Lazarus, two bishops of Gaul, whom I shall speak of hereafter, happening to be then in Palæstine, thought it incumbent upon them to accuse him to Eulogius, bishop of Cæsarea, and metropolitan of Palæstine. They drew up a writing accordingly, containing the chief heads of the doctrine which Pelagius taught, together with the articles, for which his disciple Cælestius had been condemned by the council of Carthage; and this writing they presented to Eulogius. Hereupon a council was assembled soon after at Diospolis, a city of Palæstine, known in scripture by the name of Lydda. It consisted of fourteen bishops, and Eulogius of Cæsarea presided; but neither of the Gallican bishops was present, the one being prevented by a dangerous malady, and the other not choosing to abandon him in that condition. However, their charge against Pelagius was read, and he examined, by the fathers of the assembly, on the articles

[1] Hier. in Jer.
[2] Vide Jan. hist. Pel. l. 6. c. 24.
[3] Hier. in Jer. et Gernerius in Mar. Mercat.
[4] Gennad. de script. eccles. c. 44.
[5] Hier. ad Ctesiph. c. 3. [6] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.

[1] Aug. ep. 89. [2] Aug. de Gest. Pelag. c. 22.
[3] Aug. ibid.
[4] Aug. ep. 89. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1.
[5] Aug. ib. et de Gest. Pel. 2. 11. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. Oros. apol. p. 801.

He is accused by Heros and Lazarus to the bishops of Africa. The doctrine of Pelagius and Cælestius condemned anew in Africa. They appeal to Rome. Cælestius is driven from Ephesus and Constantinople. Repairs to Rome, and presents himself before Zosimus. He delivers his confession of faith to Zosimus.

it contained. But as nobody appeared against him, as none of those bishops were sufficiently acquainted with the Latin tongue to understand his books, and he disowned some propositions, explained others in a catholic sense, and anathematized all who maintained doctrines repugnant to those of the catholic church, the council pronounced, at the suggestion of John of Jerusalem, the following sentence: "Since the monk Pelagius, here present, has satisfied us, as to his doctrine, and anathematized with us whatever is contrary to the true faith, we acknowledge him to be in the communion of the church."[1] This council St. Jerom styles, "the pitiful synod of Diospolis."[2] But St. Austin, instead of insulting them, calls them "holy and catholic judges;" and will not answer, that he himself might not have been deceived by the artifices of Pelagius, had he been one of his judges.[3]

Heros and Lazarus, surprised to hear that the fathers of the assembly had absolved Pelagius, and despairing of ever being able to get him condemned in the east, where his cause was openly espoused by the bishop of Jerusalem, resolved to apply to their brethren in the west, especially to the bishops of Africa, who they well knew could not be prejudiced in his favor, since they had already condemned his favorite disciple, Cælestius. Pursuant to this resolution, they wrote, by the famous Orosius, who was returning from Palæstine to Africa, to the bishops of that province, accusing Palagius and Cælestius as the authors of an execrable sect; giving them a particular account of what had passed in the council of Diospolis, and acquainting them with the wonderful progress the new heresy made in the east, especially in Palæstine.[4]

These letters were delivered by Orosius to the bishops of the province of Carthage, who, after having caused them to be read in the provincial council, which was then sitting in that city, and, with them, the acts of the council, which had been held five years before against Cælestius, not only condemned the doctrine ascribed to him and Pelagius, but declared, that the same sentence should be pronounced against them, unless they anathematized, in the plainest and most distinct terms, the errors with which they were charged.[5] The example of the bishops of Africa was followed by those of Numidia, assembled at Milevum, and by Innocent, bishop of Rome, as I have related above.

This condemnation, so solemn and general, was attended with the wished for effect. It greatly lessened the reputation of Pelagius and Cælestius, staggered many of their followers, and deterred others from embracing their doctrines. Of this both Pelagius and Cælestius were well apprised; and, at the same time, sensible, that the only means of retrieving their credit, and maintaining the ground they had gained, was to justify themselves either to the bishops of Africa, or to the bishop of Rome, they chose the latter, thinking it more easy to gain over one than many. Besides, in Africa they knew St. Austin, who was in great reputation there, and swayed all the councils as he pleased, to be their declared and irreconcileable enemy; whereas they had many friends at Rome; and, among, the rest, the presbyter Sixtus, who was afterwards raised to that see.[1] In order, therefore, to persuade the bishop of Rome, as Pelagius had done the bishops of Diospolis, that they had been falsely and maliciously accused, Pelagius wrote a letter to Innocent, whose death he had not yet heard of, while Cælestius, trusting to his eloquence, and depending on the favor which the bishops of Rome had always shown to those who recurred to them, undertook a journey to that city. He had fled from Carthage to Ephesus, as I have related above. On his arrival in that city he was well received by the bishop of the place, and even preferred, after he had stayed some time there, to the priesthood. But, in the mean time, his doctrine giving offence to some, while it was embraced by others, great disturbances arose; and he was, in the end, driven out of the city. Being thus expelled from Ephesus, he repaired to Constantinople; but he no sooner began to discover his sentiments there, than Atticus, who then held that see, and kept a watchful eye over him, commanded him forthwith to depart the city.[2] From Constantinople he went straight to Rome; and, finding that Innocent was dead, he presented himself before his successor, Zosimus, declaring, that he was come to Rome, to defend his oppressed innocence at the tribunal of the apostolic see; not doubting but he should make it appear before so knowing and unprejudiced a judge, and confute the many groundless aspersions with which his enemies had strove to blast his reputation in the eyes of the whole church: he complained of the judgment given against him by the African bishops about six years before; and, pretending that his accuser, Paulinus, conscious of his innocence, and his own guilt, had declined the judgment of the apostolic see, he summoned him anew to appear, and make good the charge which he had brought against him. At the same time he presented to Zosimus a request, containing a confession of his faith, with long descants on the articles of the apostolic symbol, concerning which his orthodoxy had never been questioned. But as to grace and original sin, he said, they were not matter of faith; but that

[1] Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 6. 11. 20. 29, 30, 35. ep. 96. 106. Hier. ep. 79.
[2] Hier. ibid.
[3] Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 1. vide Noris hist. Pel. l. 2. c. 8.
[4] Aug. ep. 90.
[5] Idem ibid. ep. 95.

[1] Aug. Pecc. Orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. ep. 104, 105. Prosp. in collat.
[2] Aug. ep. 90. 92. Hier. in Jer. Mercator. com. c. 1.

Cælestius' confession approved by Zosimus. The Roman catholic divines strive in vain to excuse Zosimus. His haughty letter to the African bishops in favor of Cælestius. The characters of Heros, Lazarus, and Patroculus.

he was, nevertheless, ready to acquiesce, even with respect to them, in the judgement of the Roman see.[1]

Zosimus had at this time some affairs of the greatest importance on his hands;[2] but, highly pleased with the pretended submission of Cælestius, and thinking this a favorable opportunity of extending his authority, and drawing to the tribunal of the apostolic see appeals in causes which had been judged and decided elsewhere, he postponed the other affairs to attend to this alone, in his opinion, the most important of all. A day was appointed, without loss of time, for Cælestius to appear in the church of St. Clement, and there give an account of his faith. He appeared accordingly; and the confession being read, which he had delivered to Zosimus, he owned that, and no other, to be his faith. In that confession he did not deny original sin, but declared, in the clearest terms, that he was in doubt about it; and that the belief of original sin was no article of the catholic faith. And yet such a confession was approved by Zosimus as catholic; which was approving, if not the doctrine, at least, the doubts which Cælestius entertained of original sin.[3] The Roman catholic divines have taken great pains to clear Zosimus from this imputation; but have been attended with no better success than St. Austin was before them. For that father, unwilling to condemn one of his brethren, pretended that Zosimus, in approving the confession of Cælestius, did not declare his doctrine to be catholic, but only the disposition of his mind to condemn whatever should be found amiss in his doctrine; for such a disposition, says he, makes a true catholic:[4] he might have added, if sincere, and not feigned; for it was certainly feigned in Cælestius; and consequently Zosimus was no less mistaken in declaring his disposition of mind to be catholic, than if he had made such a declaration with respect to his doctrine. St. Austin himself was sensible of the weakness of his plea, and therefore immediately added; "But, allowing the doctrine of Pelagius and Cælestius to have been approved by the Roman church, all we can infer from thence is, that the Roman clergy was guilty of prevarication;"[5] an inference which he seems to be no way solicitous about, though he could not have admitted it without giving up the question, if he had thought the pope infallible.

Zosimus, however prejudiced in favor of Cælestius, did not take upon him to restore him to the communion of the church, from which he had been cut off by the bishops of Africa, six years before, or to come to any farther resolution till he had imparted the affair to them. He wrote accordingly to Aurelius of Carthage, and to the other African bishops; not that he stood in need of their advice, or wanted to be directed by them, as he let them know in his letter, but because he was willing to hear what they had to object against one who had been first accused at their tribunal. He upbraids those prelates, and with great bitterness and acrimony, as if they had acted with too much haste and precipitation in an affair which required the most mature deliberation. As for Heros and Lazarus, the two great opposers of Pelagius and Cælestius, he inveighs against them with the most abusive language that an implacable rage could suggest. He lets the African bishops know, that if the accusers of Cælestius did not appear at Rome in two months, to make good their charge against him, he would declare him innocent, and admit him as a true catholic to his communion. He styles all such inquiries, that is, inquiries concerning grace and original sin, empty speculations, and trifling disputes, owing to a criminal curiosity, and an immoderate desire of speaking and writing; in which perhaps he was not much to blame: he closes his letter with exhorting them not to trust to their own judgment, but to adhere in every thing to the scripture and tradition.[1]

As for Heros and Lazarus, against whom Zosimus chiefly vented his spleen, while he favored Cælestius; St. Prosper gives us, in his Chronicle, the following account of the former: "Heros," says he, "was bishop of Arles, a holy man, and the disciple of St. Martin. However, he was driven from his see by his own people, though quite innocent, and not even accused of any fault. In his room was placed one Patroculus, an intimate friend of count Constantius, who at that time bore a great sway in the empire, and whose favor they courted, and hoped to earn by that violence." This happened in 412. All we know of Lazarus is, that he was ordained bishop of Aix, in Provence, by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, a prelate of extraordinary merit, as appears from the high commendations bestowed on him by the council of Turin,[2] by St. Jerom,[3] and by Tiro Prosper in his Chronicle. Patroculus, who was intruded in the room of Heros, is painted by Tiro Prosper, a writer no ways prejudiced against the Pelagians, or their friends, as a man of a most abandoned life, and one who turned the episcopacy into a trade, and sold the priesthood to all who had money to purchase it.[4] Baronius interprets the violent death, which he suffered in 426, when he was barbarously murdered by a military tribune, as a punishment from Heaven for his criminal intrusion.[5]

[1] Aug. Gr. Ch. c. 30. 33. Peccat. Orig. c. 23.
[2] Vide Bar. ad ann. 417.
[3] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 6.
[4] Idem ad Bon. ibid. [5] Idem ibid.

[1] Mercat. comm. c. 1. Vide Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 19, 20, &c.
[2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1115. [3] Hier. ep. 4.
[4] Tiro Prosp. p. 51. [5] Bar. ad ann. 425. n. 26.

Heros and Lazarus falsely charged with many crimes by Zosimus. They are both degraded and excommunicated by Zosimus. The injustice of this sentence. The other bishops make no account of the anathemas of Zosimus. Pelagius transmits to Zosimus a confession of his faith.

Such were the characters of Heros, Lazarus, and Patroclus; and yet of the latter, who favored the Pelagians, Zosimus entertained the highest opinion, and often commends him in his letters as a man of great merit and virtue. But the two former, who had distinguished themselves above the rest in opposing the Pelagians, he most outrageously abuses, styling them, in his second letter to the African bishops, two plagues, who, with their nonsensical whims, disturbed the peace and tranquillity of the whole church; whirlwinds and storms, that could suffer none to enjoy any quiet. He adds, that he was not at all surprised at their wickedly attempting to defame with false depositions, and lying evidences, a layman, meaning Pelagius, who had served God so long with an untainted reputation, and shining virtues, since they had raised so many storms in the church, had contrived so many plots, employed so many engines, to compass the ruin of their brethren and colleagues in the episcopacy.[1] No mention is made by the historians of those times of any other storms or disturbances in the churches of Gaul, but such as were occasioned by the expulsion of Heros, and the intrusion of Patroclus; and these Patroclus probably exaggerated beyond measure, laying the whole blame on Heros. For Patroclus was in Rome at the very time Zosimus wrote his letter to the African bishops, fraught with invectives against Heros and Lazarus.[2] In the same letter Zosimus charges the two prelates with several other crimes; namely, that they had both been ordained against the canons, and against the will of the people as well as the clergy, whom, however, they had forced by chains, prisons, confiscations, and the favor of the tyrant, meaning, no doubt, the usurper Constantine, to consent in the end to their election; that Lazarus had ascended the episcopal throne, while his hands were still reeking with innocent blood, &c. But, had they been guilty of such excesses, would Prosper, who lived at this very time, and all the other historians, have passed them over in silence? Would he have styled Heros a holy man? Would St. Austin have called them both his holy brethren?[3] Would the fathers of the council of Carthage in 416, have acknowledged them for their fellow-laborers and colleagues in the priesthood?[4] Would Proculus of Marseilles, one of the most illustrious prelates at that time in Gaul, have ordained Lazarus, while his hands were still reeking with innocent blood? We may therefore, upon the whole, agree here with Baronius,[5] and ascribe the crimes, of which the two prelates were arraigned by Zosimus, to the suggestions of their enemies, especially of Patroclus, in whom Zosimus reposed an entire confidence. However that be, Zosimus, highly incensed against both, not only declared them deposed, as men unworthy of the episcopal dignity, but cut them off from his communion, "For many reasons," says he, "and, among the rest, because they had deposed themselves."[1]

This sentence he pronounced in their absence, without even acquainting them with the crimes laid to their charge; not reflecting, in the height of his passion, that he was, at that very time, complaining of the African bishops for having condemned Cælestius in his absence, reproaching them with too much haste and precipitation, and laying it down as a rule never to be swerved from, that no man ought to be condemned before he is heard, let the crimes laid to his charge be ever so great. As for their deposing themselves, or voluntarily abdicating their dignity, it is very certain, if Prosper is to be credited, that Heros did not abdicate, but was violently driven from his see. If Lazarus abdicated, (for Cardinal Noris[2] and others[3] are of opinion he did not,) that ought not to have been imputed to him as a crime, any more than it was to Nazianzen, bishop of Constantinople, and many others, who were not even censured by their enemies on that account. The other bishops seem to have made no account of the anathemas of Zosimus; for they still continued to communicate with them, and acknowledge them for their colleagues;[4] the name of Heros was inserted into the diptychs of the church of Arles after his death; and Lazarus was, according to some, even restored to his see.[5]

Not long after Zosimus had written the letter, which I have mentioned above, to the bishops of Africa, in favor of Cælestius, he received one from Praylius, bishop of Jerusalem, warmly recommending to him the cause of Pelagius; and another from Pelagius himself, in his own vindication, and with it a confession of his faith. These letters were directed to Innocent; but he being dead before they reached Rome, they were delivered to Zosimus. In the Confession of Faith, Pelagius owned that "baptism ought to be administered to children as well as to the adult," and that, "notwithstanding our free will, we want the assistance of grace."[6] Neither of these propositions was inconsistent with, or repugnant to, his doctrine; for though he denied original sin, he allowed baptism to be administered even to children, but only for their sanctification. He admitted the necessity of grace, but not grace as that word was understood by St. Austin, and the other bishops who opposed him; for by grace he meant no more than the remission

[1] Bar. ibid.
[2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1571.
[3] Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 16.
[4] Idem ep. 90.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 23. 20.

[1] Bar. ibid. n. 27, 28, 29.
[2] Noris Hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 12.
[3] Gallia Christiana, t. 1. p. 2.
[4] Merc. comment. c. 3.
[5] Gall. Christ. ibid.
[6] Aug. Gr. Ch. c. 30. & Pecc. Orig. c. 18, 19.

Zosimus approves of the confession of faith of Pelagius; and censures the African bishops for condemning him. The African bishops maintain their former judgment. Paulinus, summoned to Rome, refuses to obey the summons. The council of Carthage condemns anew the Pelagian doctrine without waiting for the judgment of Zosimus. The policy of the African bishops.

of sins, instruction, the example of Christ. In this confession he did not disown any of his tenets; but, not thinking it safe or advisable openly to own them, he industriously declined explaining himself more distinctly on either of the above-mentioned heads. Zosimus, however, fully satisfied with his confession, and quite astonished (to use his own words) at the rash proceedings of the African bishops, in condemning, as heretics, men whose doctrine was so sound and orthodox, immediately transmitted to Aurelius of Carthage, and his colleagues in Africa, the confession as well as the letter, which had been sent him by Pelagius. On this occasion he wrote himself a second letter to the African bishops, which we may justly style a panegyric on Pelagius and Cælestius, and a bitter invective against their accusers, Heros and Lazarus. This letter he concludes with exhorting the bishops of Africa to the love of peace and unity, and condemning, as guilty of an injustice unknown even to the pagan Romans, those who gave judgment in the absence of the persons accused, what crimes soever were laid to their charge,[1] as I have observed above.

The African bishops were no less surprised to find Zosimus so warmly engaged in favor of Pelagius and Cælestius, than Zosimus was surprised at their having condemned them. However, they were determined to stand to the judgment which they had given, though sensible that such a determination would not fail to produce, if Zosimus did not yield, a misunderstanding, and perhaps an entire separation, between Rome and Africa. This St. Austin seems chiefly to have apprehended, and to have been resolved, if it should so happen, to abdicate and retire.[2] To prevent this evil, which would have proved very detrimental to the common cause, many letters passed between Rome and Africa:[3] but as none of those that were written at this juncture by the African bishops, have reached our times, having been probably destroyed by those whose interest it was to destroy them; all we know concerning this affair is, that the Africans maintained, with great steadiness, their former judgment against the pretensions of Zosimus; and would never allow a cause that had been determined in Africa, to be re-examined at Rome, the rather as Innocent, the predecessor of Zosimus, had concurred with them in condemning both Cælestius and his doctrine.[4] The letter from Zosimus to the African bishops was carried by one Basilius, sub-deacon of Rome, who was charged with a verbal order for the deacon Paulinus, the first who accused Cælestius, to repair to Rome. To this summons Paulinus returned answer, that as the bishops of Africa had condemned Cælestius upon his accusation, it was no longer incumbent upon him, but upon them, to show that his accusation was well grounded; and therefore he could not conceive why Zosimus should require him to take a journey to Rome.[1]

In the meantime, Aurelius of Carthage was under the greatest apprehension, lest Zosimus should be prevailed upon by Cælestius, and the other Pelagians at Rome, to take some hasty step in their favor. Having therefore assembled, with all possible expedition, a council at Carthage, he first wrote, in his own and their name, to Zosimus, earnestly entreating him to suspend all further proceedings in an affair of such moment, till he was more fully informed. This letter was written, and a messenger despatched with it to Rome, while the council was yet very thin; the haste Aurelius was in to stop the proceedings of Zosimus not allowing him to wait the arrival of all. When the rest came, and they were in all two hundred and fourteen, they unanimously confirmed their former sentence, and, without waiting for the judgment of Zosimus, condemned anew the doctrine of Pelagius and Cælestius.[2] The decrees, which they made on this occasion against the Pelagians, were received, says Prosper, by Rome, by the emperors, no doubt, Honorius and Arcadius, and by the whole world.[3] And yet, in the making of these decrees the bishop of Rome had no hand; so that it was not Rome, but Africa, it was not the pope, but the bishops of Africa, or, more truly, St. Austin, (for he governed entirely that council,) who taught the church what she was to believe, and what disbelieve, concerning grace and original sin. One of these decrees is related by Prosper,[4] wherein the two hundred and fourteen bishops declare, that "we are aided by grace, not only in the knowledge, but in the practice, of virtue; and that without it we can neither think, speak, or do any thing whatsoever that is pious or holy.[5] This, and the other decrees of the council, were sent immediately to Rome by the fathers, who composed them, with a letter for Zosimus, declaring that they were determined to adhere to the judgment, which his predecessor, Innocent, had formerly given against Pelagius and Cælestius, till such time as both owned, and in the most plain and unexceptionable terms, the necessity of grace, and abjured the opposite doctrine. It was the effect of a refined policy in the African bishops not to mention their own judgment, but to lay the whole stress on that of Innocent, though his was not only preceded, but produced, or rather extorted, by theirs. They hoped that the regard, which they pre-

[1] Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 25. 29.
[2] Hier. ep. 195. 209. [3] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.
[4] Aug. ib. & Bar. ad ann. 413. n. 4. & Quesnel. in Leon. opera, p. 676.

[1] Quesnel. ibid. p. 675. [2] Prosp. chr. & in coll. c. 10.
[3] Prosp. chron. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 2.
[4] Prosp. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3. [5] Idem ibid.

Zosimus begins to yield. His boasting letter to the African bishops. The doctrine of Pelagius condemned again in a council at Carthage. Appeals beyond sea forbidden by the council, on pain of excommunication. Law enacted by Honorius against the Pelagians.

tended to have for Innocent, would bring Zosimus to a better temper, and divert him from absolving those whom his predecessor had so lately condemned. As Zosimus had reproached them in his letter for believing too easily those who had appeared against Cælestius, they, in their turn, represented to him, that he ought not so easily to have believed Cælestius, and those who spoke in his favor. In the same letter, they gave him a particular account of all that had passed in Africa concerning Cælestius. No wonder, therefore, that Zosimus should have complained of the length of the letter, calling it a volume, and saying[1] that "he had got through it at last." With this letter, Marcellinus, sub-deacon of the church of Carthage, was despatched to Rome, and he arrived there in the beginning of March, 418.

Zosimus was alarmed at the steadiness of the Africans. He plainly saw from their letter, and more plainly from their decrees, that they were determined not to yield; and therefore, apprehending the evil consequences that would infallibly attend his continuing to protect Pelagius and Cælestius against them, he resolved to yield, and withdraw, by degrees, his protection from both. Hence, in his answer to the council, he contented himself with setting forth and boasting the preeminence, authority, and prerogatives of the apostolic see; which however, more modest than his predecessor, he did not ascribe to divine institution, but to the canons of the church, and prescription. He tells the African bishops, that though he is vested with a power of judging all causes, though his judgment is irreversible, yet he had chosen to determine nothing without having first consulted them; and this he dwells upon as an extraordinary favor. He expresses great surprise at their seeming to be persuaded, that he had given an entire credit to Cælestius; assures them that he had not been so hasty, being well apprised that the last and definite judgment ought not to be given but with the greatest caution, and after the most mature deliberation; and in the close of his letter lets them know, that, upon the receipt of their first letter, he had suspended all further proceedings; and, to gratify them, left things in the state they were in before.[2]

In the mean time the African bishops, assembling in council at Carthage, from all the provinces of Africa, and some even from Spain, the more effectually to oppose and defeat any further attempts of Zosimus, in favor of Pelagius and Cælestius, condemned their doctrine anew, and more distinctly than they had hitherto done. This council met on the 1st of May, 418, consisted of 225 bishops, and enacted eight canons, anathematizing the Pelagian doctrine concerning grace and original sin.[1] To these eight canons they added ten more, calculated to establish some points of discipline. Among the latter, the ninth deserves particular notice; for it is there decreed, that presbyters, deacons, and inferior clerks, if they complain of the judgment of their own bishop, may appeal, with his consent, to the neighboring bishops, and from them to the primate or council of Africa. "But, if any one should presume," say they, "to appeal beyond sea, let no man receive him to his communion."[2] To this decree Gratian has added, to save the jurisdiction of the pope, "unless they appeal to the see of Rome;" than which nothing can be more absurd, since it was to restrain the encroaching power of the see of Rome that this canon was made. We must not forget, that St. Austin was present at this council, and signed this, as well as the other canons and decrees, that were, on this occasion, enacted by the 225 bishops.

The Africans had despatched, the year before, the bishop Vindemialis to the court of Honorius, with the decrees of the council held against Pelagius, of which I have spoken above. And those decrees the emperor not only approved, but enacted this year, 418, a severe law against the Pelagians, dated from Ravenna, the 30th of April, and addressed to Palladius, then præfectus prætorio. Honorius there declares, he had been informed, that Pelagius and Cælestius taught, in opposition to the authority of the catholic church, that God had created the first man mortal; that he would have died, whether he had or had not sinned; that his sin did not pass to his descendants; and several other impious errors, that disturbed the peace and tranquillity of the church. To put a stop therefore to the growing evil, he commands Pelagius and Cælestius to be driven from Rome; orders it to be every where notified, that all persons shall be admitted before the magistrates, as informers against those who are suspected of holding their wicked doctrines; and such as are found guilty shall be sent into exile.[3] In virtue of this law, an order was issued by the præfecti prætorio, namely, by Junius Quartus Palladius, prefect of Italy, Monaxius, prefect of the east, and Agricola, prefect of Gaul, commanding Pelagius and Cælestius to be driven out of Rome, and the accomplices of their errors to be stripped of their estates, and condemned to perpetual banishment.[4] A most barbarous treatment for holding opinions, which, if erroneous, were certainly harmless. But it is usual for a persecuting spirit to be as violent upon the most unessential as the most weighty points: and the rage of dispu-

[1] Prosp. ibid. l. 1. c. 2. Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 8. Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 5. 12.
[2] Bar. ibid.

[1] Conc. l. 2. p. 1121. Aug. ep. 47.
[2] Conc. l. 2. p. 1064. Nor. hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 17.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 20.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 4. Nor. hist. Pel. p. 83.

Zosimus summons Cælestius to appear before him, and to condemn his doctrine. Cælestius instead of appearing retires from Rome. Zosimus condemns the confession, which he had approved before. Excommunicates Pelagius and Cælestius; and writes a circular letter against them. Some bishops refuse to sign it, and send a confession of their faith to Zosimus.

tation is never more keen, than when the disputants can hardly define what they quarrel about; especially when the sword of the magistrate is drawn on that side which has least to say for itself in reason and argument. I do not affirm this was the case in the present dispute; but this is certain, that if Pelagius went too far in his opinion, so did his opposers in theirs: and so far his conduct was infinitely better than theirs, that he declared his own notions to be matters very indifferent to catholic faith, and professed a general assent to that faith; whereas they anathematized his opinions as execrable errors, and punished them with all the severity that the most implacable malice could exert.(*)

Pelagius and Cælestius being thus condemned by the decrees of the African bishops, by the law of the emperor, and even by the voice of the people, or rather of the populace, who were every where ready, but no where more than at Rome, to rise against the "enemies of grace," as they were styled, and their abetters; Zosimus thought it not safe to afford them any further protection, unless Cælestius, who was still at Rome, (the imperial law not being yet published there) consented to anathematize the doctrines ascribed to him and Pelagius, in such clear and precise terms as should leave no room, even for his enemies, to question his sincerity. He therefore appointed a day for the Roman clergy, and the neighboring bishops, to assemble; and, acquainting Cælestius with this resolution, he summoned him to appear at the time appointed, that, by condemning whatever he should be required to condemn, he might be publicly restored to the communion of the church, from which he had been cut off by the African bishops. Cælestius was greatly perplexed with this summons: he conceived it impossible to dissemble any longer his real sentiments; but, at the same time, thinking it base to renounce them, and foreseeing the consequences that would infallibly attend his avowing them, after he had been long in suspense what expedient to resolve on, he concluded at last, that the best and safest was, privately to withdraw from Rome, and keep himself concealed till the present storm was blown over. This expedient he chose, and put it in execution with such secrecy, that he was no more heard of till three years after, when he appeared again in Rome.[1]

In the mean time the appointed day came; but Cælestius did not appear: he was summoned anew, and the proceedings were adjourned for a few days; but as he still absented himself, and no tidings could be heard of him, Zosimus was so provoked in seeing himself thus deluded, that without further examination, he condemned the confession of faith, which he had approved before; confirmed the sentence of the Africans, which he had so sharply censured; and anathematizing the doctrine both of Pelagius and Cælestius, declared the one and the other cut off from the communion of the church, if they did not publicly renounce and abjure "the poisonous tenets of their impious and abominable sect."[1] He did not stop here; but, to retrieve his reputation, which had suffered greatly on this occasion, and to atone by an opposite zeal, for that which he had hitherto exerted in their favor, he wrote a long circular letter to all the bishops, anathematizing the doctrine of Pelagius, and exhorting them to follow his example. Copies of this letter were sent into all the provinces of the Christian world, and out of so great a number of bishops eighteen only were found, who refused to receive it, and confirm, with their subscriptions, the anathemas it contained.[2]

As for the eighteen bishops, who refused to join the rest, they alleged, that they could not, in conscience, condemn any man in his absence, and that it was but just they should first hear what he had to plead in his defence, quoting to that purpose the very passages of scripture which Zosimus had quoted in his letter to the Africans, censuring them for condemning Pelagius in his absence. They added, that, as for Pelagius and Cælestius, they had both condemned, in their writings, the errors imputed to them; and therefore did not deserve, in their opinion, the anathemas that Rome and Africa had, perhaps too hastily, thundered against them. Julian, bishop of Eclana in Campania, one of the eighteen, and the most distinguished among them, wrote two letters on this subject to Zosimus, one of which was signed by them all, and contained a confession of their faith, agreeing in the most material points, with the confessions of Pelagius and Cælestius. For there they absolutely reject, and in the strongest terms, original sin, under the name of natural sin; but allow (and in this article alone they differ from Pelagius) that by the sin of Adam, death was let into the world. They entreat Zosimus to acquaint them with what should be found amiss in their confession; but beg that he would not think of employing force, since no force, but that of conviction, could produce in them a change of sentiments. They let him know, in the end of their letter, that they have already appealed to the judgment of an oecumenical council.[3] Zosimus was so provoked at this appeal, that, upon the receipt

(*) Honorius supposes, and likewise his prefects, Pelagius to have been in Rome, when this law was enacted; but it is very certain, that he was then in Palæstine.

[1] Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mar. Merc. comm. c. 1.

[1] Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 3, & 4. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mercat. ubi supra. Prosp. chr. & Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3.

[2] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. Conc. t. 3. p. 319. Prosp. chr. Mer. c. 3.

[3] Merc. subnot. p. 320—326.

The bishops condemned and degraded by Zosimus. They recur to the emperor for a general council; who issues several laws against them. The Pelagian doctrine condemned by two councils in the east. Pelagius driven from Jerusalem. Cælestius returns to Rome. Law issued against him. Is banished all Italy. Is driven from Constantinople, together with Julian, and the other Pelagian bishops.

of the letter, he assembled, in great haste, a council, consisting of the Roman clergy, and the neighboring bishops; and, having caused the letter to be read in their presence, he condemned anew Pelagius and Cælestius, and with them Julian, and the other bishops, who signed it, declaring them guilty of the same errors, and in consequence thereof degraded, as incorrigible heretics, from the episcopal dignity. The prelates, thus degraded, had recourse to the emperor Honorius, complaining of the undeserved severity of Zosimus, and entreating him to convene, by his authority, an oecumenical council, to the judgment of which they were ready to submit both themselves and their doctrine. The emperor seemed at first inclined to grant them their request. But count Valerius, a great friend of St. Austin, and then very powerful at court, not only diverted Honorius from it, but prevailed upon him to enact a law, banishing from Italy Julian, and with him all the bishops, whom Zosimus had deposed.[1] This law was soon followed by another, commanding all bishops to sign the condemnation of Pelagius and Cælestius, on pain of deposition, and perpetual banishment.[2] The Pelagians interpreted their being refused a council, as a token of victory; whence Julian, in a letter which he wrote to his friends in Rome, insults his adversaries, as if they had distrusted their cause, and therefore declined the judgment of an oecumenical council.[3] In another place he reproaches St. Austin, in particular, for courting the friendship of men in power, especially of count Valerius, with no other view but to crush, by their means, those whom he could not convince. St. Austin answered, "That recourse indeed had been had to men in power; but that the Pelagians ought rather to be thankful than complain, on that score, since it was not to crush them, or to do them the least hurt (for they were only driven from their sees, and banished for life), that the interest and power of great men had been made use of, but merely to reclaim them from their sacrilegious temerity."[4] Might not a Decius, a Dioclesian, or any other persecutor of the church, have used the same plea to justify his persecution?

About this time, that is, in the latter end of the year 418, or the beginning of 419, the doctrine of Pelagius was condemned in a council held at Antioch, at which presided Theodosius, bishop of that city; and in another, that met about the year 421, in Cilicia, under the famous Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, who had been hitherto an avowed patron of the Pelagians, had received Julian when driven out of Italy, and even written a book against St. Austin, in defence of the Pelagian doctrine.[1] His conversion was perhaps owing, as that of many others certainly was, to the severe laws enacted against the Pelagians. Soon after the council of Antioch, Pelagius, whom Jerom styles the second Cataline, was driven from Jerusalem, where he had lived a long time, and obliged to fly to some other place for shelter.[2] Whither he retired, or what became of him afterwards, is not recorded. St. Austin supposes both him and Cælestius to have been still alive, while he was writing against Julian, that is, about the year 421.[3] As for Cælestius, it appears from a rescript, or rather a letter, of the emperor Constantius to Volusianus, prefect of Rome, in 421, that he was then in that city. For Constantius writes to Volusianus, that though he had enacted some laws against the ancient as well as the modern heresies, yet he was informed, that they made daily great progress; and therefore, to prevent the disturbances that must arise from thence, he commands the laws to be put in execution, and the enemies of the true religion to be carefully sought for, especially Cælestius, and to be banished, if apprehended, an hundred miles from Rome. To this letter the emperor added, with his own hand, by way of postscript, that the reputation of Volusianus depended on the punctual execution of this order.[4] In obedience to the emperor's commands, Volusianus issued a proclamation, banishing Cælestius an hundred miles from Rome, and threatening with proscription all who should presume to conceal him.[5] Cælestius, however, appeared again in Rome three years after, and even applied to Cælestine, then in that see, to have his cause examined anew. But Cælestine, rejecting his request with indignation, caused him to be banished all Italy.[6] From Rome he repaired to Constantinople, with Julian, and the other bishops of the Pelagian party, who all met there with a more kind reception. The emperor Theodosius the Younger was even inclined to assemble, at their request, a great council; and Nestorius, then bishop of Constantinople, wrote to the pope in their favor. But, in the meantime, Marius Mercator having composed, and presented to the emperor, a memorial against them, they were ordered by Theodosius, in virtue of that memorial, to depart the city.[7] Of Cælestius no farther mention is made by any of the ancients. As for Julian, he wandered, for several years, from place to place, being every where abhorred, detested, and driven out by the populace, as if his presence had been enough to draw down from heaven some remarkable judgment upon them. However, he found an asylum at last in a small

[1] Aug. op. imperf. l. 1. c. 10. ad Val. p. 343. Conc. t. 2. p. 1558.
[2] Mer. Com. c. 3. Nor. hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 16.
[3] Aug in Jul. l. 3. c. 1. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 24.
[4] Aug. op. imperf. l. 2. c. 14.

[1] Merc. comm. c. 3.
[2] Hier. ep. 55.
[3] Aug. in Jul. l. 2. c. 10.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 2.
[5] Phot. c. 53.
[6] Prosp. in coll. c. 4.
[7] Vid. Garn. in Mercat. p. 144.

Julian dies in Sicily. His birth, education, &c. The Semipelagian doctrine. The system of the Jesuits founded on the Semipelagian doctrine.

village of Sicily, where he earned a livelihood by keeping a school, till the year 455, when he died, after he had divested himself of all he had, to relieve the poor of the place in a great famine.[1] He was a man of a sprightly genius, thoroughly acquainted with the scriptures, well versed in all the branches of polite literature, especially in the Greek and Latin poets, and once famous among the doctors of the church.[2] He was descended from an illustrious family. His father was an Italian bishop, for whom St. Austin, notwithstanding his irreconcilable aversion to the son, professed the greatest friendship and veneration.[3] His mother was a lady of the first quality, and yet more commendable for her virtue than her birth.[4] His enemies, envying him even his noble descent, strove to rob him of that honour, small as it, in comparison of his other endowments, by giving out that he was a supposititious child.[5] He was admitted by his father among the clergy, when he was yet very young, and married, when he was of a more mature age, to a lady named Ja, of a senatorial, nay, of the Æmilian family, and the daughter of Æmilius, bishop of Benevento.[6] St. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, did not think it beneath him to write an epithalamium on this occasion, of a most singular kind; for he advises him and his bride to continue virgins, and observe continency.[7] A very extraordinary advice on a wedding day! That the married couple agreed to it then, we are not told; but, not long after, probably on the death of his wife, Julian bound himself to the observance of continency; for he was ordained deacon, and soon after raised to the see of Eclana.[8] He had, long before, embraced the Pelagian doctrine; and was so fully convinced of the truth of it, that he often declared, if Pelagius himself should renounce his doctrine, yet he would not.[9] These sentiments he maintained to the last, choosing rather to be driven from his see, and deprived of all the comforts of life, than to abjure opinions which he thought true, or admit opinions which he thought false. He was buried in the place where he died; and his tomb was discovered in the ninth century, with the following epitaph: "Here rests in peace, Julian, a catholic bishop." From this epitaph some have concluded that he renounced at last the Pelagian doctrine, and died a good catholic. But they were not, it seems, aware that the Pelagians constantly styled themselves catholics, stigmatizing St. Austin, and the rest who opposed them, with the name of Manichees.

Julian is supposed to have dissented in some points from Pelagius, in those especially that relate to grace, and thereby to have introduced, or laid down such principles as naturally tended to introduce the Semipelagian doctrine; which may be reduced to the following heads: 1. That when the truth has been sufficiently declared, we may, by our own free will, without the help of preventing grace, begin to believe it; so that the first beginning of our faith cannot be properly called a gift of God, but our own act. 2. That for all other good works grace is necessary, (and here they differed from the Pelagians); but is never denied to a man, who, by the good use of his free will, has begun to believe. Thus, according to them, grace was the reward of faith, and not faith the effect of grace, which was the doctrine of St. Austin. 3. That, by grace preceding our merits, no more can be meant, than the natural grace and bounty of God, given to man in his reason, and the natural faculties of his soul; by the good use of which, he may render himself worthy of the extraordinary grace that is necessary for him to work out his salvation. 4. That the children who die before they attain the years of discretion, are eternally rewarded or punished, according to the good or bad life they would have led, had they attained to the years of discretion. A most impious tenet! making God punish sins with eternal misery that were never committed: yet not quite so impious as that of St. Austin; who, without having recourse to the supposition of crimes foreseen, supposed innocent children to be eternally damned for a crime committed by Adam, if, by the fault of their parents, they were not baptized. Other tenets of the Semipelagians were these: 5. That the notion of election and reprobation, independent on our merits or demerits, is maintaining a fatal necessity, is the bane of all virtue, and serves only to render good men remiss in working out their salvation, and to drive sinners to despair. 6. That the decrees of election and reprobation are posterior to, and in consequence of our good or evil works, as foreseen by God from all eternity. On these two last propositions the Jesuits found their whole system of grace and free will, agreeing therein with the Semipelagians against the Jansenists and St. Austin; though, not daring to contradict the Doctor of Grace, as he is styled, they pretend their doctrine, and not that of the Jansenists, to be the true doctrine of St. Austin; which has occasioned endless disputes and endless volumes. The latter popes have all favored the Semipelagians or Jesuits against the Jansenists and St. Austin; and Clement XI. above all the rest, by his famous bull Unigenitus. But the popes who lived nearer those times, especially Gelasius and Hormisda, were all zealous asserters of the doctrines of St. Austin; nay, Hormisda declared the doctrine contained in the books of that father, namely, in those he wrote on predestination and perseverance, to be the doctrine of the catholic church;

[1] Gennad. c. 45. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. & op. imperf. l. 1. c. 68.
[4] Merc. subnot. c. 4. Aug. op. imperf. p. 22.
[5] Merc. ib. p. 40. [6] Paulin. car. 14.
[7] Idem ibid.
[8] Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 21. et l. 4. c. 11. Mer. Comm. c. 3. [9] Aug. ep. 106.

Zosimus quarrels with some bishops of Gaul. The occasion of this quarrel.

which was declaring every true catholic to be a predestinarian.[1] For the doctrine of predestination, (as predestination has been since understood by Calvin and his followers), is there laid down in the plainest terms; which so shocked some persons, otherwise eminent for their piety, say Prosper and Hilarius,[2] that they could not help censuring it, as a doctrine repugnant to the sense of the church, and the fathers; nay, as a doctrine, which, were it even true, ought not to be made public, since it was not necessary that men should know it; and if they did, it would render all exhortations to good works vain and useless.[3] But these, say the Jesuits, pretending their system to be the pure doctrine of St. Austin, misunderstood that father, as did Faustus, the famous abbot of Lerins, when he wrote, "That if it be true, that some are predestined to life, and others to destruction, as a certain holy man (St. Austin) has said, we are not born to be judged, but we are judged before we are born; so that there can be no equity in the day of judgment."[4] To speak impartially, it is no easy matter to determine what system St. Austin had formed to himself, with respect to grace, free will, and predestination: for, in one place, he seems to reject and condemn what he had been laboring to prove and establish in another. Hence Julian, whose understanding was far more methodical, used often to quote him against himself, as the Jesuits and Jansenists still do in maintaining their systems, though diametrically opposite, to be entirely agreeable to his doctrine. He was apt to run into extremes, and, in confuting one error, to lay a foundation for many others. Hence, even his greatest admirers are often at a loss how to make him agree either with the church or himself. However, his great knowledge in those days, his extraordinary zeal for what he called the catholic doctrine, and, above all, his heaping daily volumes upon volumes against all who opposed it, so dazzled the understandings of the popes themselves, that, looking upon him as an inspired writer, they suffered him to dictate even to them, as if he had been pope, and they common bishops; as if infallibility had been transferred from Rome to Hippo, and no longer vested in them, but in him.

But to return to Zosimus: as his partiality to Pelagius and Cælestius occasioned a quarrel between him and the African bishops; his partiality to Patroclus, who had usurped the see of Arles, as I have related above,[5] occasioned, in like manner, a quarrel between him and some bishops of Gaul; and from the latter he reaped no more credit or honor, than he had done from the former. It arose on the following occasion: The bishops of Arles and Vienne had been long contending for the metropolitan dignity, and the jurisdiction attending it, over the provinces of Narbonne and Vienne: and the decision of the controversy having been referred, some years before, to a council that was held in Turin, it had been there decreed, that the bishop who should prove his city to be the metropolis of those provinces according to the civil division of the empire, should enjoy the metropolitan dignity, and the privileges annexed to it; but, in the mean time, to avoid any breach of charity, that both should exercise the jurisdiction of a metropolitan over the churches that were nearest to their respective cities.[1] Thus matters continued, till Patroclus repairing to Rome, and there imposing upon Zosimus, who was quite unacquainted with the merits of the cause, prevailed upon him, by flattering his vanity and ambition, to decide, in his favor, the controversy, which had been so long depending. Zosimus censured very severely, as I have observed above, the African bishops, for acting, as he pretended, with too much haste and precipitation, in the case of Cælestius. But, surely, no man ever deserved to be more justly censured, on that score, than himself: for, not to mention the case of Heros and Lazarus, whom he excommunicated and deposed in their absence, and without hearing what they had to plead in their defence, he took upon him to decide the present controversy, which a council had left undetermined, upon the information given him by one of the parties concerned, without hearing the other: for, giving an entire credit to all Patroclus said, or could say, in behalf of himself and his church, he wrote a letter, addressed to all the bishops of Gaul, declaring, that, for the future, he would receive no bishops or ecclesiastics coming to Rome from those provinces, unless they brought with them letters of communion, called "formatæ," from the metropolitan of Arles, and excommunicating those who should transgress this order.[2](*) The privilege of granting the "formatæ" was only personal; for Zosimus did not grant it to the see of Arles, but to Patroclus, whom he styles his "holy brother, in consideration of his extraordinary merit." To such a degree had he suffered himself to be imposed upon, by a man, who was the disgrace of his order.[3] In the same letter he vests him as bishop of Arles, with a metropolitan jurisdiction over the province of Vienne and the two provinces of Narbonne, adjudges to his see all the parishes and territories that had ever been subject to the city of Arles, and grants him a full power to decide and finally determine all controversies that should arise in the three above-mentioned provinces, provided they were not of such

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1531.
[2] Prosp. et Hil. Literæ. ad Aug. l. 7. p. 542. 546.
[3] Prosp. & Hil. ibid.
[4] Vide Sirmond. hist. prædest. c. 1, 2, &c.
[5] See p. 151, 153.

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1156. [2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1567.
(*) These letters were given, in the primitive times, to travelling ecclesiastics, that their brethren, in the places through which they passed, knowing who they were, and whence they came, might admit them to their communion.
[3] See p. 153.

Zosimus is opposed by the bishops of Gaul; especially by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles. Proculus excommunicated and deposed by Zosimus. But continues to discharge the functions of his office.

consequence as required them to be examined at Rome.[1] The only reason Zosimus alleges for thus exalting the see of Arles to the prejudice of the see of Vienne, is, because Trophimus, the first bishop of Arles, had converted those provinces to the Christian religion. A reason both false and impertinent: false, because Trophimus flourished in the year 250,[2] and the church of Arles was famous as early as the year 177, when they wrote, with their brethren of Lyons, to the faithful in Asia:[3] impertinent, because it was to the dignity of each city, and to nothing else, that the dignity of the sees was owing. Hence the council of Turin wisely adjudged the metropolitan dignity to him who should prove his city to be the civil metropolis, with respect to the contested provinces, as I have observed above. Zosimus, however, wrote a second letter, which he addressed to all the bishops of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, confirming to the see of Arles all the rights and privileges which he had granted in his first, and rejecting, with scorn, the decree of the council of Turin.[4]

The bishops of Gaul, namely, Simplicius of Vienne, Hilarius of Narbonne, and Proculus of Marseilles, amazed and astonished at the temerity of the bishop of Rome, openly refused to acknowledge his authority, or submit to his sentence. Zosimus, highly provoked at the opposition he met with, wrote several threatening letters to Hilarius and Proculus, as if he determined to cut them off from his communion, if they did not yield, and acknowledge Patroclus for their metropolitan. As for Simplicius, he seems to have acted with less vigor on this occasion than the other two; and it was perhaps on that account that he has been sainted. Hilarius too yielded at last, not to the menaces of Zosimus, which he made no account of, but to those of count Constantius, the avowed patron of Patroclus,[5] whom he allowed, on that consideration, to ordain a bishop at Lodeve, within the limits of his province, which was owning him for his metropolitan. But nothing could shake the firmness and constancy of Proculus. Zosimus, thinking he could frighten him into a compliance, began with reproachful language; from reproaches he proceeded to menaces; and from menaces, to summon him to Rome, to answer there for his presuming to ordain bishops in a province (the second, Narbonnese,) that had been adjudged by the apostolic see to the metropolitan of Arles. But Proculus made so little account of his reproaches, menaces, and summons, that I do not even find he returned them an answer. It is at least certain, that he did not obey the summons, and that he continued to exercise the same jurisdiction, which he had exercised before, opposing to the repeated and peremptory orders of Zosimus a canon of the council of Turin, appointing him metropolitan of the Narbonnensis Secunda.[1] Zosimus, transported with rage in seeing his authority thus slighted, wrote three letters, all dated the 29th of September, 417, namely, one to the people and clergy of the province of Vienne, another to those of the Second Narbonnese, and the third to Patroclus. In the two former he inveighs bitterly against Proculus, and confirms anew to Patroclus the metropolitan dignity and jurisdiction, which have been so unalterably entailed, says he, on the see of Arles, by the decrees of the fathers and councils, that it exceeds even the power and authority of the Roman church to transfer them to, or entail them upon, any other.[2] This was disclaiming, in the plainest terms, the power of dispensing with the canons, which has since proved so beneficial to the apostolic see. And yet Zosimus was acting the whole time in direct opposition to the fourth canon of the council of Nice, vesting, as it was understood by the subsequent councils, the bishop of each metropolis with the metropolitan dignity and jurisdiction over the whole province. Zosimus, in his letter to Patroclus, encourages him to resume and exercise, in spite of Proculus, the metropolitan jurisdiction over the Second Narbonnese, which Proculus had so unjustly invaded and usurped. This Patroclus durst not attempt, though seconded by the whole power of the apostolic see; which wrought the pride, ambition and resentment of Zosimus to such a pitch, that, giving the reins to his passion, he thundered the sentence of excommunication against Proculus, declared him unworthy of, and degraded from, the episcopal dignity, and committing the church of Marseilles to the care of Patroclus, commanded him to exercise there the jurisdiction with which he was vested. The power of the apostolic see was now exhausted, and, what drove Zosimus almost to despair, exhausted to no effect; for Proculus, to show how little regard he paid to the sentence pronounced against him at Rome, ordained a bishop soon after he was acquainted with it. Zosimus, sensible that the authority of his see was here at stake, would not abandon the attempt. He wrote two letters more on the same subject, one to Patroclus, exhorting him to exert, with vigor and severity, the power with which he was vested; and at the same time commanding him to declare, in his name, that he should never be prevailed upon to acknowledge those whom Proculus had ordained. The other letter was to the people, clergy, and magistrates of Marseilles, stirring them up against Proculus, and encouraging them to drive him out, and receive another in his room at the hands of Patroclus. These letters occasioned great disturbances in the church of Marseilles, which was now rent into two opposite parties, some refusing to acknowledge Proculus, and others declaring that they would acknowledge no

[1] Conc. ib. p. 1567—1569. [2] Euseb. l. 5. c. 1. [3] Conc. t. 2. p. 1668. [4] Greg. Tur. hist. Franc. l. 1. c. 30. [5] Conc. ibid. p. 1581.

[1] Conc. ibid. p. 1155. [2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1570.

His steadiness in opposing the encroachments of Rome. Zosimus dies. His character. Zosimus sainted by a mistake of Baronius.

other.[1] But, in spite of the utmost efforts of Zosimus, of Patroclus, and their partisans, Proculus still kept his ground, still continued to exercise all episcopal as well as metropolitan functions, as he had formerly done. He thought even the evils attending a schism of a less dangerous tendency than those which he apprehended from the encroachments of the bishops of Rome. Had all the prelates thus stood up in defence of their just rights and privileges against the papal usurpations, the church had never been reduced to that deplorable thraldom, which she groaned under for so many ages. But, alas! there have been in all times but too many Simpliciuses, who, out of a mistaken principle, have chosen rather to yield to an encroaching power, than to raise disturbances, and forego their own ease, by withstanding it; but too many Patrocluses, who, to gratify their own ambition, have prostituted their sacred dignity to the ambitious views of the pope, and raised him, at the expense of their own order, that they might be raised by him in their turn. Proculus, though deposed, excommunicated, calumniated, persecuted by Zosimus and his tools, kept to the last possession of his see; nay, and was acknowledged for lawful bishop of Marseilles, for metropolitan of the Second Narbonnese, not only by the bishops of Gaul, but likewise by those of Africa.[2] He was still alive in 427, when he condemned the monk Leporius for maintaining Christ to have been born man only, but to have deserved, by his good works, to become God.[3] The encomiums bestowed on him by the council of Turin, by St. Jerom, and Tiro Prosper, as I have observed above, are a sufficient confutation of all the calumnies uttered against him by Zosimus, and the rest of his enemies.

The last letters of Zosimus, that is, his letters to Patroclus, and the people of Marseilles, are dated the 5th of March, 418, and he died in the latter end of the same year, on the 26th of December, says Baronius,[4] upon the authority, we may suppose, of some ancient pontifical.(*)

The distemper which he died of lasted a long time, and was attended with such violent fits, that he was often thought to be dead before he died. It was during his illness that he wrote his last letters; and yet they are no less remarkable than the rest for that fire and vivacity, that strength of expression, and even that elegance and purity of diction, that were peculiar to him. He was a man of great address in the management of affairs; well knew how to turn every thing to his advantage; and in the several disputes which he engaged in, he forgot nothing that could any ways distress those who opposed him. He was apt to engage too rashly, giving an entire credit to those who, by a servile submission, flattered his ambition; and when he had once engaged in a cause, as he was of a haughty and imperious temper, impatient of control, passionate, headstrong, full of, and elated with, the dignity of the "apostolic see," it required the greatest art and address in his brethren to bring him into their measures, and withhold him from raising fatal divisions in the church. His whole conduct and behavior towards them, the haughty and peremptory style which he assumed in writing to them, sufficiently show that he looked upon them as infinitely below him, as bound to yield a blind obedience to all his commands, and submit, without reply, to all his decisions: and it is not to be doubted but, had he lived longer, and not met with the vigorous opposition which he did from the bishop of Marseilles, he would have made great progress towards reducing his "fellow-ministers" and "fellow-laborers," as they are styled by St. Cyprian, to that state of dependence, not to say slavery, which in the end they have been reduced to by his successors. He was the first who made use of the expression, "for so it has pleased the apostolic see;"[1] an expression which his successors have all adopted, as the language of the highest authority, and such as exempted them from giving any account either of their actions, or of the motives that prompted them so to act. But, to paint Zosimus to the life, we want no other colours than those, which the African bishops, who were but too well acquainted with him, have furnished us with in the letter which they wrote to his successor Boniface. "We hope," say they, "that since it has pleased the Almighty to raise you to the throne of the Roman church, we shall no longer feel the effects of that worldly pride and arrogance, which ought never to have found room in the church of Christ."[2] In the same letter they complain of their having been made to endure such things as it was almost impossible for them to endure, which however they were willing to forget. Hard indeed and tyrannical must the treatment have been, which they met with at the hands of Zosimus, since it could extort from so many venerable prelates a complaint of this nature, and that in a letter to his immediate successor. Zosimus however has been sainted, and is now worshipped by the church of Rome as a great saint, not so much in regard of his own merits, as by a blunder of Baronius in revising and correcting the Roman martyrology. The case is pretty singular, and may not be thought

[1] Conc. ibid. p. 1574. [2] Du Pin, t. 3. p. 827.
[3] Cassian. incar. l. 1. c. 4. [4] Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 72.

(*) He is said to have been buried near the body of St. Laurence, on the Tiburtine way, on the 25th or 26th of December, according to Anastasius the Bibliothecarian; (a) but on the 27th, according to an ancient pontifical, which agrees better with the letters of Symmachus concerning the election of his successor Boniface: so that he may have governed one year nine months and eight or nine days, which is the time that Prosper allows him. (b)

(a) Anast. c. 42.
(b) Vide Pontaci not. in chron. Prosp. p. 777.

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1567. [2] Conc. t. 2. p. 1141.

Schism in the church of Rome. Boniface and Eulalius both chosen. The governor of Rome and the emperor favor Eulalius, who takes possession of the church of St. Peter. The friends of Boniface write to the emperor.

quite unworthy of a place here, by reason of the consequences, which every protestant reader may draw from it. In the martyrology of Bede was marked, "St. Zosimus, martyr, who suffered for the confession of the faith." This martyr an ignorant transcriber mistook for the pope of the same name, and, concerned to find so little said of so great a saint, set down all he knew of him. This copy Baronius perused, and, reading there what the transcriber had added of his own, concluded the saint mentioned in that place to be pope Zosimus, and accordingly, upon the supposed authority of Bede, allotted him a place among the other saints in the Roman martyrology. As for his being said to have suffered martyrdom for the confession of the faith, Baronius ascribed that to the ignorance of the transcriber, making but one saint out of two, though they lived at so great a distance of time from each other; for the martyr lived in the earliest times, and is mentioned by St. Polycarp, who flourished two hundred years and upwards before the pontificate of Zosimus. To this double blunder of the transcriber and Baronius is Zosimus indebted for the worship and honors that are publicly paid him in the church of Rome. Indeed that church is not more grossly deluded in paying an idolatrous worship to saints, upon the authority of her "infallible guide," than in the objects to whom that worship is paid.(*)

BONIFACE, FORTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS THE YOUNGER.]

[Year of Christ, 419.] ZOSIMUS being dead, great disturbances arose about the election of his successor. Eulalius, whom authors distinguish with the title of archdeacon, shutting himself up in the "Lateran" with part of the people, and some presbyters and deacons, was there chosen by them in the room of Zosimus. At the same time a great number of the people, many presbyters, and some bishops, assembling in the church of St. Theodora, named the presbyter Boniface to the vacant see. Both were ordained the same day they were chosen; Boniface, by nine bishops, and in the presence of seventy presbyters; Eulalius, by three bishops only, and in the presence of a very small number of presbyters; but the bishop of Ostia was one of the three; and he claimed, from a custom which had long obtained, the right of ordaining the bishop of Rome. Symmachus, governor of the city, did all that lay in his power to prevent this double election; but, not succeeding therein he immediately despatched an express to the emperor Honorius, then at Ravenna, with a letter dated the 29th of December, 418, acquainting him with what had passed. But his account was not impartial: he represented Eulalius as lawfully chosen, and his competitor as a usurper. Honorius therefore, by a rescript dated the 2d of January, 419, ordered him to persuade Boniface to retire from Rome, to use force, if persuasions did not prevail, and to apprehend and punish the ringleaders of the sedition, if any should be raised on that occasion. With this rescript the emperor despatched Aphrodisius a tribune and notary; and Symmachus, having received it on the 6th of January, sent early next morning his primiscrinius, or first secretary, with an order for Boniface to attend him, and hear what he had to impart to him in the emperor's name, letting him know, in the mean time, that he must not take upon him to exercise any episcopal functions; for such was the will and pleasure of the emperor. This order Boniface received while he was holding an assembly in the church of St. Paul without the walls; but paid no regard to it; nay, those who attended him, falling upon the secretary, who brought it, treated him very roughly; which Symmachus no sooner knew than he caused the gates of the city to be shut, and kept Boniface out. In the mean time Eulalius, improving to his advantage the absence of his competitor, repaired to the church of St. Peter, took possession of it amidst the loud acclamations of his partisans, and exercised there all episcopal functions.

The avowed partiality of Symmachus for Eulalius left no room to doubt but he had misinformed the emperor. The bishops therefore, with the presbyters and people, who had chosen Boniface, thought it their duty to transmit to him a candid and impartial account of the late transactions: and this they did accordingly, entreating the emperor at the same time to revoke his former order, and to summon both Eulalius and Boniface to court, in order to try their cause there. Their re-

(*) Bollandus, to saint Zosimus in a more honorable way, supposes him to have once had a place in the martyrology of St. Jerom; and complains of those who have taken the liberty to strike out his name. One would think he had found his name in some copy of that martyrology, or at least heard of it; but he ingenuously owns, that he never found it there himself, nor heard of any who did; adding, that nevertheless he is fully persuaded it was once there, and that he cannot think otherwise; and it is upon his "not being able to think otherwise" that he founds his supposition, his complaints, and the saintship of Zosimus; (a) which is allowing them to have no foundation at all.

(a) Boll. conat. ad chronol. Pont. p. 61, 62.

Who summons a council to decide the controversy. A more full council summoned. Eulalius disobeys the emperor, and is driven from Rome. Boniface indebted to the emperor for his dignity. Boniface applies to the emperor for a law to restrain the ambition of the candidates to the papacy. His law for that purpose. Boniface free from ambition.

quest appeared just; and Honorius, in compliance with it, sent an order to Symmachus, dated the 13th of January, 419, commanding him to suspend the execution of his former order, and to notify to the two competitors, that they, and those who ordained them, must repair to Ravenna, on pain to him who should fail to appear there on the 8th of the ensuing February, of having his election declared null. Several bishops were summoned to attend at the same time, Honorius thinking it proper, that a dispute of that nature should be decided by none but bishops. However, to remove all suspicion of partiality on his side, he would not allow those to sit as judges, who had been any ways concerned in the election or ordination of either of the competitors. The bishops met; but not being able to agree among themselves, Honorius thought the affair of such importance, that he put it off to the 13th of June, with a design to have it decided then in a full council. He wrote accordingly, not only to the bishops of Italy, but to those too of Gaul and Africa, inviting them to the council, and acquainting them with the time and place of its meeting. In the mean while he strictly enjoined both Boniface and Eulalius to keep at a distance from the city, lest their presence should occasion disturbances there. But as Easter approached, he appointed Achilleus, bishop of Spoleti, who was of neither party, to perform the episcopal functions at Rome during that solemnity. This Eulalius could not brook; and therefore returning to Rome, in open defiance of the emperor's orders, he assembled the people, seized on the Lateran, and shutting the doors against Achilleus, performed in that basilic the episcopal functions usual at Easter. The emperor, being acquainted by Symmachus with what had passed, was so provoked at his disobedience and temerity, that, by a rescript dated from Ravenna the 3d of April, and received at Rome on the 8th of the same month, he commanded Symmachus to drive Eulalius from the city, and to put Boniface in possession of the disputed see; which was accordingly done.(*)

Thus was an end put to the schism; thus was Boniface placed on the Roman see, and vested with the papal dignity by the clemency of the emperor, as Largus proconsul of Africa expresses it in his letter to the bishops of that province;[1] and not by the authority of a council consisting of two hundred and fifty-two bishops, which some have brought down from the clouds, without even letting us know where or when they assembled.[2]

All we know of Boniface before his election is, that he was the son of one Jucundus, a presbyter,[1] was stricken in years, well versed in the ecclesiastical laws, of an unblemished character; and, what enhances his merit, chosen against his will. Thus say his friends, in the letter which they wrote in his behalf to the emperor Honorius.[2] His first care, after he found himself in the quiet possession of his see, was to prevent for the future, so far as in him lay, the cabals and intrigues that might be formed at other elections, as they had been at his, to the great disturbance of the city, and scandal of the Christian religion. With this view he wrote to the emperor, entreating him to restrain, by some severe law, the ambition of those who, trusting more to their intrigues than their merit, aspired to a dignity that was due to merit alone.(*)

The emperor, in compliance with so just a demand, enacted a law, well calculated to prevent effectually the evil complained of, and keep the ambition of the candidates to the papacy within due bounds. For by this law, when two persons were chosen, neither was to hold the dignity, but the people and clergy were to proceed to a new election. This is the first instance, that occurs in history, of princes intermeddling in the election of the pope; an evil, says F. Pagi, which, from small beginnings, grew to such a height as to reflect great shame and disgrace on the Roman church.[3] But it must be observed, that the original evil was the corruption, the violence, and the many disorders which the clergy and people were guilty of in those elections. It was this which, at the request of the pope himself, called on the emperors to interpose their authority, as the only adequate remedy to such abuses. The succeeding emperors followed the example of Honorius, and the Gothic as well as the Lombard kings, the example of the emperors, as we shall see in the sequel of the present history.

Boniface was naturally a lover of peace, and an enemy to all strife and contention. He did not claim, nor attempt to usurp, any new power over his colleagues; but yet he would not part with any his predecessors enjoyed, by what means soever they had acquired it; and those who attempted to curtail the usurped jurisdiction of the apostolic see, met with as vigorous an opposition from him as they could have done either from Innocent or Zosimus. In short, he had not ambition enough to enlarge his authority, but thought himself in conscience obliged "to maintain the just rights," as he styled and believed them, "of the see in which it had pleased Divine Providence to place him, though unworthy of so great

(*) The original copies of the letters from Symmachus to the emperor, and of the emperor's rescripts to Symmachus, giving a full and distinct account of the present schism, are lodged in the Vatican library, and have been thence copied by Baronius. (a)

(a) Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 1—42.

[1] Bar. ib. n. 37.

[2] Vid. Bar. ib. n. 34. & Baillet. vies de saints, 35 Oct.

[1] Platina in Bon. [2] Apud. Bar. ann. 419. n. 8.

(*) This letter bears date the first of July, 419.

[3] Pagi, crit. hist. in annal. Bar.

Dispute between him and the bishops of Illyricum. Law of Theodosius concerning disputes that arise in Illyricum. Three letters of Boniface. He maintains, with authority, his pretended rights. He revokes the privileges granted by Zosimus to the church of Arles.

an honor." His steadiness in asserting these claims appeared chiefly in the dispute that arose between him and the bishops of Illyricum, over whom Damasus had usurped, as I have related elsewhere,[1] and his successors maintained a particular power and jurisdiction. The transaction is thus related by the writers of those times. The see of Patræ in Achaia, one of the provinces of Illyricum, being vacant, the bishop of Corinth, metropolitan of that province, did all that lay in his power to get Perigenes, a presbyter of an unexceptionable character, chosen in the room of their deceased bishop. But his endeavors proving unsuccessful, he returned to Corinth, and died soon after. Upon his death, the people and clergy of Corinth, to honor his memory, and show the regard they had for one whom he had favored, unanimously named Perigenes to succeed him. But as they apprehended some opposition from the bishops of the same province, they wrote to Boniface, begging him to confirm their election with his authority. Boniface referred them to Rufus, then bishop of Thessalonica, and his vicar in those parts, declaring that, as for himself, he had nothing to object either against their election, or the person elected. Rufus notified to the bishops of the province, and the metropolitans of the diocess, the approbation of Boniface, and his own; but it was not received by all in the same manner. The greater part indeed agreed to the ordination of the new bishop; but some opposed it with great warmth, prompted, most probably, by the jealousy they entertained of the growing power of the see of Rome: for, at their request, a law was published by the emperor Theodosius, dated the 14th of July, 421, commanding all disputes, that should arise in the diocess of Illyricum, to be finally determined by the bishops of that diocess, after they had consulted the bishop of Constantinople.[2] This was taking those provinces from the bishop of Rome, and, in some degree, subjecting them to the bishop of Constantinople, or at least opening a door for such a subjection. The power of the bishops of Constantinople was already grown very considerable, and their ambition keeping pace with that of the bishops of Rome, neither let any opportunity slip of extending the jurisdiction of their own see at the expense of the other. In the present case the bishop of Constantinople, availing himself of the favor of the emperor, and the disagreement that reigned among the Illyricum bishops, summoned, without loss of time, a council to meet at Corinth, and there to examine the ordination of Perigenes, though he had been ordained, and his ordination approved of both by Rufus and Boniface. This step, quite unexpected, alarmed Boniface; he divested himself at once of his pacific disposition, and, assuming the air and style of authority, he wrote three letters, all dated the same day, namely, 11th of March, 422, encouraging the friends of the apostolic see to maintain its rights, and threatening those who dared to invade them. The first was to Rufus of Thessalonica, whom he animates not to suffer any innovations, but vigorously to withstand those, who assumed an authority that did not become them, and to which they had no kind of title or claim, meaning, no doubt, the bishop of Constantinople. The second letter he wrote to the bishops of Thessaly, exhorting them to acknowledge the authority of Rufus, and no other. The third was addressed to the bishops of Macedon, Achaia, Thessaly, Epirus, and Dacia, who had been summoned by the bishop of Constantinople to assemble at Corinth, and there deliver their opinion concerning the ordination of Perigenes. In this letter he complains, in the strongest terms, of so bold and daring an attempt, asking, in the style of a sovereign, "What bishop shall presume to question an ordination approved by us? What bishop could take upon him to assemble a council with that view and intent? Read," he adds, "read the canons, and there you will find, that the see of Rome is the first, the see of Alexandria the second, and that of Antioch the third. These are the three great sees; these the sees which the fathers have distinguished above the rest, with ample privileges, and extensive jurisdiction." Since he refers them to the canons to show, that these three sees are superior to the see of Constantinople, both in dignity and jurisdiction, it were to be wished he had, at the same time, acquainted them by what canons his predecessors had exercised over the provinces of Illyricum the jurisdiction which he now so zealously asserts. But that is more than it was in his power to do. However, in the present letter, he threatens with excommunication such of the Illyrican bishops as shall, in defiance of his orders, comply with the summons which they have received, or presume to question the ordination of Perigenes. What was the issue of this dispute is not recorded by any of the ancients; but a modern historian[1] informs us, that the emperor Honorius interposing, at the request of Boniface, in behalf of the see of Rome, prevailed upon Theodosius to revoke his former law, and enact another in its room, confirming to the apostolic see all its ancient privileges, and enjoining the præfectus prætori to see the latter law put in execution. The historian quotes this law from the archives of the Roman church. But as it is not to be found either in the Theodosian or the Justinian code, its authenticity may be justly suspected.

The same year 422, Boniface gave a signal instance of his equity and love of justice, which redounds greatly to his honor, and

[1] See p. 104.
[2] Cod. Theod. l. 45. de. Episcop. l. 6.

[1] Fleury hist. eccles. l. 24. n. 31.

Boniface revokes the privileges granted by Zosimus to the church of Arles. A remarkable instance of his moderation. His death.

therefore ought not to be omitted. He was sensible, that his predecessor Zosimus, abusing his authority, had acted in the affair of the Gallican bishops, in a most partial and arbitrary manner; that the see of Arles had no just title to the many privileges, which he had been induced, by his partiality for Patroclus, to heap on it, at the expense of two other sees; and, consequently, that it was incumbent upon himself, now that he had the power in his hands, to rectify by a better use of it, what his predecessor had done amiss. The love of justice therefore prevailing in him over all other considerations, he annulled, by a letter addressed to Hilarius of Narbonne, whatever had been done by Zosimus in favor of the see of Arles, restored and confirmed to the sees of Narbonne and Vienne all the rights and privileges, which they had been so unjustly divested of, and declaring all the grants and concessions made to the see of Arles repugnant to the canons, strictly enjoined the bishop of Narbonne not to suffer his brother of Arles to exercise, in virtue of them, any kind of authority within the limits of his jurisdiction.(*) The conduct of Boniface was afterwards approved, and that of Zosimus justly condemned, by pope Leo the Great, declaring in a letter which he wrote to the bishops of the province of Vienne, that the privileges, which the apostolic see had granted to Patroclus, were afterwards revoked by a more equitable sentence.

One of the many artifices, employed by the popes to aggrandize their see, was to raise divisions among their colleagues, or to foment underhand those that others had raised. For in such divisions they never stood neuter, but, taking part in the quarrel, nay, and making themselves principals, they warmly declared in favor of one party against the other, that, by supporting them, they might be in their turn supported by them in all their pretensions. To this worldly wisdom, this wicked policy, Boniface was an utter stranger: for he did not lay hold of a very favorable opportunity, which the division, that reigned at this time among the bishops of Gaul, offered him, to improve his authority, and extend his jurisdiction. The metropolitan dignity was disputed there by the bishops of Vienne, of Narbonne, and of Arles, as I have observed above. During that contest the clergy of Valence, quarrelling with their bishop Maximus, charged him with several crimes; but not caring to accuse him at the tribunal of any of the three competitors (for that had been acknowledging, in one of the three, the metropolitan jurisdiction then in dispute), they arraigned him at Rome, and summoned him to plead his cause there before Boniface. Most other popes would have eagerly embraced such an opportunity of enlarging their power; nay, and founded upon this particular case the general right of judging, and finally determining, all causes of the like nature. But Boniface declared, in his letter to Patroclus, and the other bishops of the seven provinces of Gaul, that though Maximus had been accused at his tribunal, though he had not appeared to clear himself from the crimes laid to his charge, and might thereupon be thought guilty, and be justly condemned; yet he would not take upon him to pronounce such a sentence, because that bishop "ought, according to the canons, to be judged and condemned, or absolved, in his own province." An instance of moderation that reflects no small honor on the memory of Boniface; the rather as he had before his eyes the recent examples of Innocent and Zosimus, the two most ambitious and arrogant popes the church had yet seen. He closes his letter with exhorting the bishops of the seven provinces to assemble against the first of November, that Maximus may be cleared, if innocent, or condemned, if guilty.

Boniface died on the 4th of November, 422, having held the chair three years, nine months, and some days. He was buried in the cemetery of the martyr St. Felicitas, on the Salarian way; where he is said to have built an oratory. He is worshipped by the church of Rome among her saints, an honor which few of his predecessors better deserved. But it is a wonder that the last instance I have given of his moderation, and regard to the canons against the claims of his see, did not exclude him out of the calendar. His festival is kept on the 25th of October; and Bede quotes a Book of Miracles wrought by pope Boniface;[1] but whether by the first pope of that name, or the second, he does not inform us, though he seems to give an entire credit to every idle tale that legend contained. And here I cannot help observing, by the way, that the less necessary miracles became, the more they were multiplied. In Bede's time, and the three preceding centuries, men were rather inclined to believe too much than too little; and yet in no other time was there a greater profusion of miracles. From an ancient epitaph quoted by Baronius,[2] it appears that Boniface died very old; that he had served the church from his tender years; that by his engaging behavior he put an end to the schism, and that he relieved Rome in the time of a famine.

(*) This letter is dated the 2d of February, 422.

[1] Bed. in collectan. in fin. [2] Bar. ad ann. 423. n. 8, 9.

Celestine chosen without opposition. Antony, one of St. Austin's disciples, appointed by his interest bishop of Fussala. Antony's scandalous behavior. He is deprived of the administration, and all jurisdiction, by a council. He appeals to Rome. Prevails upon the primate to write in his behalf to Rome. How received by Boniface.

CELESTINE, FORTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS II., VALENTINIAN III.]

[Year of Christ 422.] UPON the demise of Boniface, Celestine was chosen in his room, without the least disturbance or opposition. Eulalius indeed, who was still alive, and led a retired life in the neighboring province of Campania, was tempted by his friends in Rome to try his fortune a second time, but he did not choose to quit his solitude, and involve both himself and them in new troubles. Celestine was a native of Rome, the son of one Priscus, and a deacon, if not a presbyter, at the time of his election.[1]

He was scarce warm in the chair, when he received a letter from St. Austin on the following occasion. As the small town, or rather village of Fussala, belonging to the bishopric of Hippo, the see of St. Austin, stood at a great distance from that city, the good bishop thought he could not better consult the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants, who had but very lately abandoned the party of the Donatists, than by causing their town to be erected into a separate bishopric, and letting them have a bishop of their own. This was indeed abridging both his own jurisdiction and revenues; but as he had the good of the people more at heart than either, he pursued his scheme with success, and prevailed upon his colleagues in Numidia to ordain a young man named Antony, whom he had brought up from his infancy, the first bishop of the place, though at that time only a reader. This promotion, per saltum, as it is styled, was strictly forbidden by the popes in their decretals; but to their orders St. Austin paid no greater regard than the other bishops did, though he always spoke of them, and to them, with all the respect that was due to the first bishop in the west. St. Austin had soon occasion to repent his transgressing those regulations, which, it must be owned, are in themselves very wise: for Antony, who was but a youth, and had been kept by St. Austin under great restraint, no sooner found himself free from all control, than abandoning himself to the indulgence of his youthful passions, he thereby scandalized the new catholics to such a degree, that they let St. Austin know the conduct of their bishop, unless he was quickly removed, would certainly drive them to the last extremity; meaning, perhaps, that they should be forced either to put him to death, or to join anew the Donatists, whom they had but lately forsaken. Such menaces alarmed St. Austin no less than the conduct of his favorite disciple surprised him. A council was immediately summoned at his request, by the primate of Numidia; Antony was ordered to attend it, and the inhabitants of Fussala invited to lay their complaints before the assembly. The summons was complied with by all, and Antony, by a great number of witnesses, convicted of rapine, violence, and extortion. But, because some capital crimes laid to his charge were not sufficiently proved, the fathers of the council, out of an unseasonable compassion, contented themselves with only condemning him to restore to the inhabitants of Fussala what he had with violence taken from them. They were even inclined to leave him in the quiet possession of his church; but that being warmly opposed by the people, they deprived him of the administration, and of all jurisdiction; but as he still retained the episcopal dignity, they did not choose to remove him to another city to live there even as a private person, lest they should be thought to transgress the rules of the fathers forbidding translations.[1] None could think so who were the least acquainted with those rules.

Antony satisfied, pursuant to his sentence, the inhabitants of Fussala, whom he had wronged. But pretending that he had been unjustly deprived of his bishopric, he resolved to appeal to Rome. He was sensible that his appealing at this juncture, when the point of appeals was warmly disputed, as I shall relate hereafter, was merit enough to recommend him to the favor of that see. However, not trusting to that alone, as Boniface was still alive, he first engaged in his favor his own primate, the primate of Numidia, who, having been excused on account of his great age from assisting at the council, was not well acquainted with what had passed there. Him therefore he easily persuaded, that he had been very ill used by the council: "For had they thought me guilty, (said he,) of the rapine and extortions, that were laid to my charge, they ought, and, without all doubt, would have deposed me: they have not deposed me; and therefore did not, as is manifest, think me guilty. If I did not deserve to be degraded from my dignity, I did not deserve to be driven from my see." Thus he artfully turned the mercy that had been shown him against those who had shown it; and, having by that means imposed upon the primate, persuaded him to write a letter in his behalf to Boniface. With this letter he repaired to Rome, but did not meet there with

[1] Vid. Noris hist. Pel. l. 2. c. 10.

[1] Aug. ep. 261. de civ. Dei. I. 22. c. 8.

The people of Fussala write against Antony to Celestine. Are seconded by St. Austin. Celestine acquiesces in the sentence of the council of Numidia. An end put to the schism formed by Eulalius. Apiarius, a presbyter of Sicca, appeals to Rome. Zosimus restores him to the rank from which he had been degraded. To support his pretensions, endeavors to impose upon the African bishops the canons of Sardica for the canons of Nice.

the reception he expected: for all he could obtain of Boniface was a letter to the bishops of Numidia, requiring them to reinstate him in his see, "provided he had represented matters as they truly were." This conditional request Antony, on his return to Africa, improved, it seems, into an absolute command: for he threatened the people of Fussala with a visit from the imperial troops and commissaries, if they did not receive him as their lawful bishop, in compliance with the orders of the apostolic see.[1] In the mean time Boniface dying, and Celestine being chosen in his room, the people of Fussala apprehending, as St. Austin writes, greater evils from a catholic bishop, after their return to the church, than they had done from a catholic emperor during their separation, wrote a most pathetic letter to the new pope, entreating him to pity their condition, to curb Antony in his unchristian attempts, and to redeem them, by his authority, from the calamities which they had reason to apprehend from that prelate's cruelty and ambition. In the same letter they imputed all their misfortunes to Austin, who had set over them such a bishop. And this Austin was so far from taking amiss, that he owned the charge, and even backed their request with a letter of his own, conjuring Celestine by the memory of St. Peter, who abhorred all violence and tyranny, not to use either with the people of Fussala, who, he said, had but too much reason not to submit tamely to the galling yoke from which they had been so lately delivered. He adds, that if, in spite of all his endeavors and remonstrances, he should still have the mortification to see the church of Fussala plundered and tyrannically oppressed by one whom he had raised to that see, he should think himself obliged to atone for the share which he had in his crimes, by resigning his own.[2] Celestine was so affected with these letters, that he immediately acquiesced in the sentence of the council of Numidia; and the new bishopric of Fussala being suppressed, that town, with its district, was again subjected to the see of Hippo. From these letters, that were written by the Africans on this occasion, it appears, that the bishops of Rome used, in those days, to send some of their ecclesiastics into Africa, to see the sentences, which they had given, executed there; and that those ecclesiastics came with orders from the court for the civil magistrates to assist them, where their assistance should be required, or thought necessary.

The schism formed by Eulalius was not, it seems, yet quite extinct in Rome in the year 425, for I find a law of that year, dated the 17th of July, and addressed to Faustus, prefect of the city, commanding all Manichees, heretics, schismatics, and sects of every denomination, to be driven out of Rome; but more especially those, who, separating themselves from the communion of the venerable pope, kept alive a dangerous schism. Over these Faustus enjoined to keep a watchful eye, to summon them to communicate with Celestine, and, if they did not comply with the summons in twenty days, to banish them a hundred miles from Rome.[1] This law was issued by Placidia, who, upon the death of her brother Honorius, which happened in the month of August, 423, and that of the usurper John, killed in 425, governed the western empire, as guardian to her son Valentinian III. The law she issued, probably put an end to the schism; for no further mention is made of it by any historian.

It was in the time of Celestine, and the following year, 426, the fourth of his pontificate, that the bishops of Africa, quite tired out with the daily encroachments of the bishops of Rome, and not able to brook the despotic and arbitrary power which they had begun to exercise over them, took the no less laudable than necessary resolution of breaking their chains before they were thoroughly riveted, and asserting their ancient liberty, by effectually removing what had endangered it, the pernicious abuse of appealing to Rome. The incident, which gave occasion to that resolution, was the appeal of a presbyter of Sicca, named Apiarius, who, being convicted of many crimes, and thereupon degraded and excommunicated by his own bishop, Urbanus, appealed to Zosimus, then bishop of Rome. Zosimus, who missed no opportunity of acquiring new power, or improving the power which he had acquired, not only received the appeal, but, without ever hearing the other side, restored Apiarius both to his rank, and the communion of the church. This was the boldest attempt that had yet been made upon the rights and liberties of the African churches; and therefore the bishops in those parts, all uniting in a cause that was common to all, loudly complained of such an arbitrary act, as an open violation of the canons of the church, forbidding those, who had been excluded from the communion by their own bishop, to be admitted to it by any other.[2] Zosimus, finding the African bishops had taken the alarm, and were determined to restrain his power within the limits prescribed to it by the canons, and, on the other hand, being well apprised, that he could allege no canons, that had ever been received by them, to countenance the power which he claimed, and had exercised, thought it would be no great crime to recur to fraud on so urgent an occasion. Agreeably to this scheme, he caused two ca-

[1] Aug. ep. 261. [2] Aug. ibid.

[1] Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 184.
[2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1018. Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 60.

With this view he sends a solemn embassy into Africa. The surprise of the African bishops on this occasion. A general council assembled at Carthage. The conduct of Faustinus, the pope's legate, on this occasion. The resolution taken by the council.

nons to be transcribed from the council of Sardica; the one allowing presbyters and deacons, when rashly excommunicated by their own bishops, to appeal to the neighboring bishops; and the other, authorizing the appeal of all bishops to the bishop of Rome. Had the Africans received these canons, he intended to have justified, by the former, his judging and absolving Apiarius, notwithstanding the distance between Rome and Numidia; and, in virtue of the latter, to get the canon revoked, which the African bishops had lately made, forbidding, on pain of excommunication, appeals beyond sea; that is, to Rome. Nothing less than an entire subjection of the African churches to the see of Rome would satisfy the boundless ambition of Zosimus; and such a subjection would infallibly have ensued, had the two above-mentioned canons been received by the African bishops in the sense which Zosimus did, and seemed determined to make others, put upon them. But the main point was, to persuade the bishops of Africa to admit such canons, especially at so critical a juncture. The council of Sardica had never been received there: nay, they were, it seems, at this very time, utter strangers both to that council and its canons; so that it was useless to quote them as such. Of this Zosimus was aware; and therefore, as he stuck at nothing that stood in the way of his ambition, he resolved, by one of the most impudent and barefaced impostures recorded in history, to try whether he could not impose upon the bishops of Africa the canons of Sardica for the canons of Nice. With this knavish view, and to render the imposture more solemn, and less suspected, he despatched into Africa three legates, namely, Faustinus, bishop of Potentia, in Picenum, and two Roman presbyters, Philippus and Asellus. Their instructions, contained in a letter addressed to themselves, were, to require of the African bishops a strict observance of the two above-mentioned canons of Nice; to complain of their repairing so often to court; and to desire them not to communicate with Urbanus of Sicca, who had deposed Apiarius, or even to send him to Rome, if he refused to correct what he had done amiss:[1] that is, we may suppose, if he did not restore Apiarius to his rank, and the communion of the church.

With these instructions the legates set out for Africa, where they no sooner arrived, than a council was convened, at which assisted, among the rest, Alypius, bishop of Tagaste, St. Austin's great friend, and Aurelius, bishop of Carthage. When the legates first appeared before the council, the bishops desired them to lay their instructions before the assembly; which they were at first unwilling to do, contenting themselves with declaring their commission by word of mouth. But the Africans knowing whom they had to deal with, and thereupon pressing them to communicate their instructions in writing, they complied at last, and produced the letter I have mentioned above, which was immediately registered. When it was publicly read, it is impossible to conceive the surprise and astonishment that appeared in the whole assembly. They had never heard of those canons; and to find them thus confidently ascribed to the council of Nice, was what appeared to them strange beyond expression. Warm disputes arose, of which, however, we know no particulars. Several different Greek copies, several Latin copies, were sent for, and carefully examined and compared; but no such canons could be found there. However, as the legates continued to maintain, with an unparalleled impudence, the disputed canons of Nice, the council agreed to observe them, till they had, by a more diligent inquiry, discovered the truth.[1]

They continued their sessions; but as they were few in number, as the point in dispute was of the utmost consequence, and nearly affected all the bishops of Africa, they thought it should be communicated to all; and that, without the concurrence of all, no resolution should be taken. A general council was accordingly assembled at Carthage, consisting of two hundred and seventeen bishops, from the different provinces of Africa. They met, for the first time, on the 25th of May, 419. Faustinus being placed next after Aurelius of Carthage, and Valentine, primate of Numidia, and the two presbyters, Philippus and Asellus, after the other bishops. Being all seated, Aurelius moved that the canons of Nice might be read, from the copies which they had of that council in Africa. But this was warmly opposed by Faustinus, insisting upon their reading, in the first place, his instructions, and coming to some resolution concerning the observance of the canons of Nice, which he was charged by the apostolic see to require of them. "It matters not," said he, "whether or not those canons are to be found in your copies, or, indeed, in any other. You must know, that the canons and ordinances of Nice, which have been handed down to us by tradition, and established by custom, are no less binding than those that have been conveyed to us in writing." To this speech the bishops returned no answer; without doubt, because they thought it deserved none. However, at his request, his instructions were read, and warm debates ensued. Alypius was of opinion, that since the disputed canons were not to be found in any of their copies, messengers and letters should be immediately despatched to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1137—1144.

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1144—1148.

The affair of Apiarius, how settled by the council. The African bishops write into the east for authentic copies of the council of Nice. The pretended canons not found in those copies, and the dispute dropped by Boniface. The power of receiving appeals claimed by the popes only as granted by the canons.

Antioch, for authentic copies of the acts and canons of Nice. This proposal Faustinus highly resented, as an outrage offered to the apostolic see, which, he said, was thereby arraigned of fraud and forgery. He therefore advised them to write to Boniface, who, by this time, had succeeded Zosimus, and, leaving to him the care of examining the authority of those canons, submit the whole to his judgment, to his known prudence and discretion. He added, that by acting otherwise, they might give occasion to great divisions and disturbances in the church. Aurelius, not to exasperate the legate, whom he found to be a man of a haughty, imperious, and intractable temper, made no other reply, but that they would write to Boniface. St. Austin promised to observe those canons so long as it could be reasonably supposed that they were the canons of Nice. The other bishops made the same promise; which was confirming the resolution the council had taken the year before. Here the legate exaggerated anew the affront they offered to the Roman church; adding, that the only reparation they could make, for questioning the authenticity of canons proposed by her, was to leave the deciding of that point to her, and acquiesce in her judgment. But the warmth, the earnestness, the passion which he betrayed in his speech, and in his whole conduct, served only to heighten the jealousy, and confirm the suspicions, of the African bishops. It was therefore universally agreed, in spite of the remonstrances, entreaties, and menaces of the legate, that Aurelius should write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, for authentic copies of the canons of Nice: that if the canons, quoted by Faustinus, were found in those copies, they should be punctually observed; if not, that a new council should be convened, and such resolutions taken, as the fathers who composed it, should think proper[1].

Matters being thus settled, with respect to the pretended canons of Nice, concerning appeals, the council took next into consideration the case of Apiarius, which had given occasion to the present dispute between Rome and Africa; and it was agreed, that Apiarius should make the due submission to his bishop, and thereupon be readmitted to his communion, and restored to his rank. However, as he had given great offence to the people of Sicca, by his scandalous life, he was ordered, by the council, to quit that city; but, at the same time, allowed to exercise the functions of his office in any other place.[2] This medium the council wisely chose between the two opposite sentences; that of Urbanus excommunicating and deposing him, and that of Zosimus restoring him to the communion and the priesthood. Such was the issue of the appeal of Apiarius: and I leave the reader to judge, whether Baronius should boast of it as he does. And now nothing remained, but to acquaint Boniface with the acts and resolutions of the council; and this was done accordingly by a letter, which they all signed, and delivered to the legates. In that letter they begged Boniface to procure, from the east, authentic copies of the canons of Nice, promising to observe the canons in dispute, till such copies were procured; but this upon condition, that if those canons were not found to be genuine, they should recover their ancient privileges, and not be forced to "submit to a yoke, which ambition alone could impose."[1]

With this letter the three legates set out from Africa, on their return to Rome. Upon their departure, the African bishops wrote, agreeably to the resolution they had taken, to Atticus of Constantinople, and Cyril of Alexandria, begging they would cause to be transcribed, and sent into Africa, the most authentic copies they had of the canons of Nice. With this request the two bishops readily complied; and the same year, 419, the messengers sent to Alexandria and Constantinople returned with the wished for copies, and very friendly and obliging answers, which are still extant,[2] from Cyril and Atticus, addressed "to Aurelius, to Valentine, and to all the bishops of Africa assembled at Carthage." As for the bishop of Antioch, the Africans probably did not write to him; at least, they had no answer from him.(*) They immediately compared the two copies, sent them from the east, with their own, especially with that which Cæcilianus of Carthage had brought with him from Nice, where he had assisted at the council; and found them agree in every particular, without any trace of the canons that Zosimus had produced: upon which they despatched the same ecclesiastics with them to Rome, whom they had sent into the east. Boniface, who was an enemy to all fraud and imposition, acquiesced; the dispute was dropped; so that the canon, which the African bishops had lately made, forbidding appeals to Rome, and Zosimus had thus fraudulently attempted to defeat, remained in its full vigor; and the churches of Africa were suffered quietly to enjoy their ancient rights and privileges, so long as Boniface lived. But in the pontificate of his successor Celestine, the storm broke out anew.

It may not be improper here to observe, that Zosimus, though wholly bent on exalting his see, and straining every prerogative to the highest pitch, yet did not presume to exalt it above the canons; did not claim the

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1145—1149.
[2] Concil. t. 2. p. 1137—1145.

[1] Ibid. p. 1137—1141. [2] Ibid. t. 2. p. 1144.

(*) It is very observable, that the Alexandrian copy was originally sent from Rome by Marcus, bishop of that city, upon a complaint made by the Egyptian bishops, that the Arians had burnt all the copies of the council of Nice that were then found in Alexandria.

Whether Zosimus ignorantly mistook the canons of Sardica for those of Nice. Apiarius excommunicated anew. He appeals again to Rome, and is restored by Celestine, and sent back attended by the legate Faustinus. A general council assembled. Apiarius appears before it, with Faustinus.

disputed power of receiving appeals, of judging, deciding, &c. independently of the canons. And was not this owning himself, but for the canons, to be upon the level with the other bishops his colleagues; at least in respect to this point? Is not the scandalous method which he took on this occasion to extend his own power, and curtail that of the African bishops, a demonstration of his deriving his claim from the canons alone? Could there ever offer a better opportunity, could there ever occur a more urgent necessity, of asserting a "divine right?" As Zosimus therefore never asserted, nor even mentioned, such a right, we may well conclude, that he either had no notion of it, or did not think it sufficiently grounded to be of any use in the present dispute. And yet this "divine right" of receiving appeals from all parts of the world, of constituting, confirming, judging, censuring, suspending, deposing, removing, restoring bishops, and all other ecclesiastics, is now held, as an article of faith, by all true Roman catholics; insomuch that to dispute such an article, would be no less dangerous, in countries where the inquisition prevails, than to dispute any article of the apostolic or Nicene creed. It is true, Innocent the First, as the advocates for the see of Rome observe, had claimed, by "divine right," the power of finally deciding all controversies. But he himself seems to have been sensible that he had gone too far, for what else could have induced him to restrain that claim, as soon as he had set it up, to "matters of faith alone?"[1] Had Zosimus thought the general claim capable of being maintained, he need not have recurred, as he did, to fraud and imposture. The pretensions of Innocent, in their utmost extent, were indeed renewed, in process of time, by his successors; but not till the intolerable abuse, which they made of the power granted them by the canons of Sardica, on which they founded all their usurpations, obliged other councils to revoke those canons; and then it was, that, no other means being left of maintaining their ill-gotten power, they revived the claim of Innocent, and, challenging no longer by the canons, but by "divine right," the prerogative of receiving appeals, they put it out of the power of all future councils to abridge or restrain it.

The three cardinals, Baronius, Bellarmine, and Noris, thinking the imputation of ignorance less injurious to the memory of Zosimus, less derogatory to the dignity of the apostolic see, than that of fraud and imposture, suppose him to have ignorantly mistaken the canons of Sardica for the canons of Nice; which is supposing, that in the whole archives of the Roman church there was not a single genuine copy of the council of Nice, or that Zosimus had never perused it; and to suppose either is highly absurd. Besides, the whole conduct of the legate, the pains he took to divert the African bishops from consulting other copies, and, when he could not prevail, his recurring to "unwritten" canons; and, as that too proved ineffectual, his striving by all possible means to persuade the Africans to leave to the pope the care of examining other copies, and to acquiesce, without any further inquiry, in what should thereupon be determined by him, plainly shows, that the legate was privy to the fraud, and apprehended a detection.

Apiarius, being obliged to quit Sicca, as I have related above, retired to Tabraca, another city of Numidia, and led there so scandalous a life, that he was excommunicated anew. Hereupon he appealed again to Rome, and Celestine, which is very surprising, notwithstanding the vigorous opposition which his predecessors had, but very lately, met with from the African bishops, in attempting to restore this very presbyter, not only declared him innocent, and admitted him to his communion, but sent him back into Africa, attended by the legate Faustinus, who was ordered to see him reinstated. The Africans were but too well acquainted already with the presumption and arrogance of the bishops of Rome; and yet such an insolent act quite surprised them. For Celestine had neither examined the crimes, which Apiarius was charged with, nor heard the witnesses, nor even condescended to let them know, that he intended to judge him anew.

He wrote, indeed, two letters to them on this occasion, but which seemed merely designed to insult them: for, by the first, he gave them notice of the arrival of Apiarius at Rome, which, he said, had given him great joy; and by the second, which was brought by Faustinus, he acquainted them that he was overjoyed to have found him innocent. From this despotic and extraordinary way of acting, the African bishops concluded, that Celestine was determined to keep no measures with them, and that nothing less than an entire subjection of the African churches to the see of Rome would satisfy his ambition. But they were resolved to maintain, at all events, the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. A general council was therefore assembled, and Apiarius summoned to attend. He obeyed the summons, and appeared before the council at the time appointed, but in company with Faustinus, showing thereby, that he placed greater confidence in him than in his own innocence. Faustinus spoke first, and pressed, with great warmth, the fathers of the assembly to readmit Apiarius to their communion, since he had been declared innocent by the apostolic see, and admitted by Celestine to the communion of the Roman church. The bishops replied, that in Africa, Apiarius had been found guilty, and that in Africa his innocence must he made to appear, before they could

[1] See p. 156.

The legate's insolent conduct. Apiarius pleads his own cause. Faustinus assists him. Apiarius, struck with sudden remorse, owns the crimes laid to his charge. The African bishops renew the canon forbidding appeals to Rome. Their letter to Celestine.

receive him again to their communion. As they stuck to this point, Faustinus undertook his cause; but, instead of proving, as he had promised to do, or even attempting to prove his innocence, he inveighed, from the beginning of his speech to the end, and in very harsh and opprobrious language, against the council, and all the members, who composed it. Apiarius was sensible, that the speech of Faustinus, instead of reconciling the African bishops to him, had incensed them more than ever against him; and therefore thinking it advisable to take the cause into his own hands, he stood up as soon as the other had done; and, with a modesty capable, as he thought, of atoning for the insolence of Faustinus, endeavored to clear himself from the crimes that had been laid to his charge. When he had spoken, the witnesses against him were heard; and the trial lasted three whole days, Apiarius striving, with great art and subtilty, to invalidate the depositions, and Faustinus prompting him when he was at a stand. He might, perhaps, have escaped condemnation, partly by his own craft and address, partly by the powerful protection of the bishop of Rome, had he been able to withstand the stings of his own conscience. But, on the fourth day, when Faustinus began to triumph as sure of victory, Apiarius, struck with sudden remorse, damped at once all his joy, by voluntarily owning, to the great surprise of all present, and the unspeakable confusion of Faustinus, every crime with which he had been charged. Those crimes the fathers have thought fit to wrap in oblivion; and indeed it was not proper, that posterity should know them; since they were "heinous, incredible, such as ought not to be mentioned, and drew sighs and tears from the whole assembly."[1] And this is the man whom two popes, both now worshipped as saints in the church of Rome, absolved as innocent; and, as innocent, would have supported with force and violence, had not providence almost miraculously interposed, to prevent the evils that would have ensued. They could not but know that Apiarius was guilty; at least they did not know that he was innocent. But as he had been declared guilty in Africa, their declaring him innocent, whether he was so or not, gave them an opportunity of renewing the attempts of the apostolic see on the liberties of the African churches; and it was, no doubt, with this view that they absolved and restored him. But, as he was not hardened enough in iniquity for their purpose, he owned himself guilty, in spite of their judgment declaring him innocent, and thereby defeated their schemes for the present. For the Africans, now sensible that there was no wickedness which the bishops of Rome would not countenance, in order to establish their power in Africa, to the utter subversion of all ecclesiastical order and discipline there, thought themselves bound, as they tendered the welfare, peace, and tranquillity of the churches committed to their care, to act with that vigor and steadiness, which so urgent an occasion seemed to require. Accordingly they first absolutely cut off Apiarius from the communion of the church; then renewed, in stronger terms than ever, the canon, which had given so great offence at Rome, prohibiting, on pain of excommunication, appeals beyond sea, under any pretence whatsoever; and this prohibition they extended to ecclesiastics of all conditions and ranks. Faustinus blustered, vapored, threatened; but all in vain. The bishops not only signed, all to a man, the above-mentioned canon, but wrote a synodal letter to Celestine, acquainting him with what had passed in the case of Apiarius, and earnestly entreating him not to give ear for the future to those, who should have recourse to him from Africa, nor receive to his communion such as they had excluded from theirs: "For we must let your venerableness (venerabilitas tua) know," say they, "that it has been so established by the council of Nice. And though mention is there made of clerks only, and laymen; yet there is no room to doubt but it was their intention, that such a rule should extend to bishops too; and it would be a great irregularity, should your holiness (a title then common to all bishops) over-hastily and unduly admit to your communion bishops, who have been excommunicated in their own provinces. Your holiness therefore must not receive the presbyters, and other clerks, who, to avoid the punishment which they deserve, recur to you; the rather as we know of no constitutions thus derogatory to the authority of our churches; and the council of Nice has subjected the bishops themselves to the judgment of their metropolitan. The fathers of that council have decreed, with great wisdom and equity, that all disputes should be finally determined in the places where they began, being sensible, that the grace of the Holy Spirit, necessary for judging rightly, would not be wanting in any province; especially as every man, who thinks himself injured, may apply for redress, if he pleases, to the synod of his own province, or to a national council. Would it not be presumption in any of us to suppose or imagine, that God will inspire a particular person with the spirit of justice, and refuse it to many bishops assembled in council? And how can a judgment, given out of the country, and beyond sea, be right, where the necessary witnesses cannot be present, by reason of their sex, of their age, or of some other impediment? As for your sending legates, we find no such ordinance in any council, nor in the writings of the fathers. As for what you have sent us by our colleague Faustinus, as a canon of the council of Nice,

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1145—1148.

we must let you know, that no such canon is to be found in the genuine and uncorrupt copies of that council, which have been transcribed and sent us by our fellow-bishop Cyril of Alexandria, and the reverend Atticus of Constantinople. Those copies we sent to Boniface, your predecessor of worthy memory. We therefore earnestly beg you would send no more legates, nor ecclesiastics, to execute your judgments here, lest you should seem to introduce worldly pride and arrogance (typhum sæculi) into the church of Christ." They conclude with entreating him not to suffer Faustinus to continue any longer among them.[1] Celestine, finding the spirit with which they acted, and sensible that it would be useless to employ force at this juncture, thought it advisable to acquiesce for the present, and wait till a more favorable opportunity should offer for him, or his successor, to renew the attempt.(*)

The following year, 427, Sisinius, bishop of Constantinople, being dead, the bishops in those parts were for appointing Proculus in his room. But, as Proculus had been ordained before, though never installed, bishop of Cyzicus, they were under some apprehension, lest his promotion to the see of Constantinople should be deemed a breach of the canons forbidding translations. But Celestine, whom they consulted on this occasion, delivered them from that apprehension, declaring, in a letter, which he wrote at this time to Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch, and Rufus of Thessalonica, that they might safely place on one see a bishop named to another; nay, and a bishop who actually governed another;[2] that is, he declared translations lawful.†

The same year Celestine wrote to Perigenes of Corinth, Donatus, of Nicopolis in Epi-

[1] Concil. t. 2. p. 1148, 1149. [2] Socr. l. 7. c. 29.

(*) Schelstrate would make us believe, that Gregory the Great prevailed upon the African bishops to revoke the canon forbidding the presbyters and inferior clergy to appeal to Rome; (a) and Davidius, that the Africans changed their minds with respect to the appeals of bishops, as soon as they were informed, that such appeals had been allowed, and approved of, by the council of Sardica. (b) But neither alleges any solid reason, or even conjecture, to prove facts of such importance; nay, what Davidius advances is certainly false, since the canons forbidding all appeals to Rome, made at this time, were still quoted among the other canons of the African collection in 825, and confirmed by a council held at Carthage that year. (c) Some pretend that Celestine separated himself on this occasion from the African bishops, and that this separation continued between their churches, and that of Rome, till the beginning of the VIIth century, when Eulalius of Carthage, and his colleagues, desirous of putting an end to the schism, revoked all the canons that had been made in 426, derogatory to the rights of the Roman see. (d) This they advance upon the authority of a piece commonly ascribed to pope Boniface II. But that piece is so evidently supposititious, that Baronius himself is forced to give it up.

† Against translations there may be reasons in policy; but there can be none in conscience; and none that are at all to the purpose, have been alleged either by the councils, or fathers, though the former have exerted all their authority to prevent them, and the latter all their oratory to make them appear criminal. The councils of Arles, of Nice, of Alexandria, of Sardica, of Chalcedon, of Antioch, forbid them on the severest penalties the church could inflict. The council of Sardica, by its first canon deprived such bishops, as should change their churches, even of the lay-communion: and because some pleaded, or at least the council apprehended they might plead, the desire and request of the people; to leave no room for such an excuse, the council, by its second canon, deprived those, who should allege it, of the lay-communion, even at the point of death. (a) The council of Alexandria, under St. Athanasius, in their epistle to all the catholic bishops, speak thus of Eusebius, who had been translated from Berytus to Nicomedia: "Eusebius did not reflect on the admonition of the apostle, 'Art thou bound to a wife? do not seek to be loosed. For if it be said of a woman, how much more of a church? to which if one is tied, he ought not to seek another; that he may not be likewise found an adulterer, according to the scripture.'" (b)—What analogy between a wife and a bishopric? The bishops of that assembly were even of opinion, that Eusebius, by abandoning his former church, had annulled his episcopacy. In the synod under Mennas, it was laid to the charge of Anthimus, that being bishop of Trebisond, he had adulterously seized on the see of Constantinople. (c) In the same strain have the fathers declaimed against translations, whenever an opportunity offered of bringing in that favorite topic; for the canons and decisions of the councils were only the private opinions of the major part of the bishops, who composed them. They generally inveigh against that adulterous traffic, as if they supposed a bishop to be married to the church, which he was ordained to serve, or tied to it by bonds no less indissoluble than a husband to his wife: and it was upon that supposition, that they charged with adultery those who passed from one church to another. But that supposition none of them have been able to make good either from scripture or reason. As for the command of the apostle in his letter to Timothy, "a bishop must be the husband of one wife," which some of them have interpreted as levelled against translations; the far greater part both of the fathers and councils have in that passage understood the word wife, not in a metaphorical, but a natural sense, and thereupon excluded from the episcopal dignity such as had been twice married. But allowing St. Paul to have meant a church by the word wife, the most obvious and natural interpretation we can give to his words is, that he there forbids pluralities of bishoprics, which were once very common in the church of Rome.

But whatever reasons the fathers and councils may have alleged, or could allege, against translations, they have themselves defeated them all by the contrary practice. For some of the greatest saints, and lights of the church, have been either translated, or approved and promoted the translations of others. The famous Methodius, who suffered under Diocletian in the year 311, or 312, passed from the see of Olympus, in Lycia, to that of Tyre. (d) Eustathius, who is supposed to have presided at the council of Nice, was translated from Beræa to Antioch: that is, from a small see to the second in the east; (e) nay, Sozomen ascribes this translation to the council of Nice itself. (f) Syderius, bishop of Erythra, in Libya, was translated by Athanasius to Ptolemais, the metropolis of the whole Pentapolis. (g) Euphronius, bishop of Colonia, a small town on the borders of Armenia, was, by a synod, consisting of all the orthodox bishops of that province, translated to the metropolitan see of Nicopolis: that translation was highly applauded by St. Basil, who thought it owing, not to human prudence, but to a particular inspiration of the Holy Ghost; (h) the Arians being very powerful in that city, and no man more fit to make head against them than Euphronius. The inhabitants of Colonia were very unwilling to part with their bishop; and the ecclesiastics there even threatened to join the Arian party, if

(a) Schel. Eccles. Afric. p. 50.
(b) Dav. jugemens Canoniques des Evesques, p. 663, 664.
(c) Concil. t. 4. p. 1636.
(d) Van. Espen. in Can. p. 216.

(a) Concil. t. 2. p. 628. (b) Syn. Alex. apud Athan.
(c) Concil. sub Mem. p. 9. apol. 2.
(d) Hier. vir. ill. c. 83. Socr. l. 6. c. 13.
(e) Theod. l. 1. c. 6. Theoph. Eutych. & alii.
(f) Soz. l. 1. c. 2. (g) Synes. ep. 67.
(h) Basil. ep. 292.

He complains of several abuses that prevailed in some churches of Gaul. Bishops not distinguished formerly by their dress from the laity.

rus, and Basil, of Larissa in Thessaly, all three metropolitans of Illyricum, recommending to them an entire submission to the see of Rome, and to that of Thessalonica; Rufus, who presided there, having been appointed by him to determine, in his name, all disputes that might arise among them. He lets them know, that, in virtue of the submission, which they owed to the see of Thessalonica, and he required of them, they were to ordain no bishops, assemble no councils, without the knowledge and consent of Rufus; which was restraining to the see of Thessalonica, that is, engrossing to himself (for the bishop of Thessalonica acted only as his vicar), the privileges which the council of Nice had granted to all metropolitans. It is observable, that in this very letter Celestine affects an entire obedience to the canons of the church. "We ought," says he, "to subject our will to the rules, and not the rules to our will; we ought to conform to the canons, and strictly observe what they prescribe."[1] But he did not govern himself by this maxim upon other occasions.

The following year, 428, he wrote a long letter to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne, against several abuses that prevailed in those parts. This letter he begins quite in the style of a modern pope: "As I am, says he, appointed by God to watch over his church, it is incumbent upon me every where to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room; for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored." Thus, under the name of "pastoral vigilance," he extends, at once, his authority and jurisdiction over all the churches of the Christian world. The first abuse he complains of was a particular dress assumed by some bishops, wearing, in imitation of the monks, a cloak and girdle. With this novelty Celestine finds great fault, and exhorts the bishops to distinguish themselves from the people by their doctrine, and not by their garments, by the sanctity of their manners, and not by the mode of their dress, by the internal purity of their souls, and not by the external attire of their bodies. What a large field would the so many different and ridiculous habits of the monks and friars, the costly attire of bishops and cardinals, and, above all, the gorgeous and stately apparel of Celestine's own successors, have opened for his zeal, had he lived in our days! He pleasantly adds, that if they understood, in a literal sense, the words of our Savior, "Let your loins be girded about,"[2] they ought to interpret other passages after the same manner, and never appear without lamps and staves in their hands. And was not this condemning, at least ridiculing, the monkish habits, an essential part of which is the girdle? (*) The other abuses, which

---

Euphronius was taken from them. (a) But they were in the end prevailed upon by St. Basil to acquiesce in the will of God, who, said he, had inspired the prelates with such a resolution. (b) From these (and many other instances might be alleged) it is manifest that the fathers spoke like mere declaimers, when they compared a bishop who left one church, and took another, to a husband, who abandoned his wife, and married another woman. But indeed they only inveighed thus, generally speaking, against translations, when the persons translated were of the party which they opposed; it was then adultery, it was forfeiting the episcopal dignity, to pass from one church to another. But when they apprehended that such changes could any ways promote the cause which they had espoused and maintained, those changes were thereby sanctified, and owing to a particular inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

Pope Gelasius II. excused translations by the example of St. Peter. "Who dares to maintain," says he, "that St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, was to blame for changing the see of Antioch for that of Rome?" (c) And who dares to maintain that any bishop is to blame for doing what the prince of the apostles had done before him? But were there no other instances beside that of St. Peter to give a sanction to translations, I should readily grant them never to have been allowed in the church. For St. Peter never was bishop of Rome, as I have shown already; (d) and some of the reasons, proving him never to have been bishop of Rome, make equally against his pretended episcopacy of Antioch. Most of the ecclesiastical writers indeed suppose him to have been bishop of Antioch; but St. Luke is quite silent on that head, though within the compass of his history, as Jerom observed; (e) and his silence ought to be of more weight than the authority of writers who lived some ages after. Origen, who flourished in the third century, was the first who mentioned St. Peter's see of Antioch, saying, it was held by Ignatius after him. (f) Origen was copied by Eusebius, and Eusebius by those, who came after him.

On translations, a modern writer of the court of Rome reasons thus:—

"Translations have been severely censured by the fathers, and often condemned both by the popes and the councils. But neither can the councils tie the hands of the popes, nor can one pope tie the hands of another. The power of dispensing with all canonical impediments the popes hold by divine right; which therefore can only be restrained by divine authority. However, translations ought not to be allowed, but on most urgent occasions; and it is in order to prevent them that the popes have adopted the wise regulations of some well governed republics, where certain goods are not prohibited, but loaded with such customs as are next to a prohibition." (g) The canons were made for the good of the church and the people; and therefore cannot be binding when they oppose either. Hence it follows, that there being in such cases no room left for a dispensation, nothing ought in justice to be exacted for it. And yet, let the occasion be ever so urgent, a very considerable sum must be paid into the apostolic chamber for the pretended dispensation. If the occasion is not urgent, they allow the canons to be binding; and what can induce the popes to dispense with them, but that, which one of them taxed those bishops with, who seek translations, avarice, filthy lucre, and an ungodly desire of greater wealth? (h) as if the canons had been made with no other view, but to give the popes an opportunity of filling their coffers by granting leave to transgress them.

(a) Id. ibid. (b) Id. ibid. & ep. 290. 293.
(c) Gelas. II. ep. 1. (d) See above, p. 1.
(e) Hier. in Gall. ii. (f) Orig. in Luc. hom. 6.
(g) Contius de Curia Romana.
(h) Anast. ep. 2.

[1] Coll. Rom. per Holsten. p. 85—87.
[2] Luke. xii. 25.

(*) From this passage it is manifest, that in those days the bishops, and other ecclesiastics, were not yet distinguished by their dress from the laity, at least when they were not actually discharging the functions of their office. Whether they used, even then, any particular dress or attire, may be justly questioned. Dionysius Exiguus thinks they did not; (a) and F. Sirmond is of the same opinion. For, according to Sirmond, the ecclesiastics used no other dress in the church, but that which they wore daily out of the

(a) Biblioth. Jur. Can. per Justel. t. 1. p. 210.

The Pelagian doctrine prevails in Britain. The Britons recur to the Gallican bishops, who send Germanus and Lupus into Britain. Their journey. Miracles wrought by them on the sea, and after their landing. The whole island reclaimed. Germanus returns anew, and utterly roots out the Pelagian heresy. Beginning of the dispute between Nestorius and St. Cyril.

Celestine wanted to have redressed, have nothing new in them, or that has not been mentioned before in this history; and therefore I omit repeating them here.

About this time the Pelagian doctrine began to prevail, almost universally, in Britain, being preached here either by the natives, who had adhered to their countryman Pelagius abroad, and were returned home, or by others, who, finding themselves, in virtue of the imperial laws, every where persecuted on the continent, had fled to this island for shelter. The leading man of the party here was one Agricola, the son of a British bishop named Severianus.[1] But that Severianus himself, or any of his collegues, countenanced their doctrine, is not vouched by any of the ancients. Fastidius, indeed, a British writer, who flourished at this time, betrays, in his writings, a strong bias to the Pelagian tenets. But it may be justly questioned whether he was a bishop. For in the treatise which he wrote on the duties of a Christian life, he makes excuses for taking upon him to instruct others; which a bishop would hardly have done, that being his province and duty.(*) However, if the British bishops did not countenance the Pelagian doctrine, neither did they oppose it, at least with the vigor they might; else it had never made, in so short a time, the progress it did. The catholics, having no prospect of relief from their own pastors, had recourse to those of Gaul; who, being affected with their complaints, immediately summoned a great council, and chose, with one voice, St. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and St. Lupus, bishop of Troyes, to pass over into Britain, and there maintain the catholic cause.[2] Thus Constantius, a presbyter of Lyons, who lived in this century, and after him Bede. But Prosper, who flourished likewise in this century, writes, that the two prelates were sent into Britain by Celestine.[3] The Gallican bishops, perhaps, acquainted the pope with the choice they had made, and he approved it; which was enough for Prosper, a notorious flatterer of the popes, to ascribe the whole to Celestine. The two missionaries set out for Britain in the latter end of the year 429, and, passing through Paris, had an interview there with the famous St. Genevieve, who, at the persuasion of St. Germanus, to whom her future sanctity was revealed, promised to consecrate her virginity to Jesus Christ. From Paris they pursued their journey to the sea side, and embarked; but were very near being cast away by a storm, before they reached the British coast. This storm the author supposes to have been raised by the devil; but we may more reasonably suppose it to have been raised by himself, that he might have an opportunity of displaying the power of his imagination in describing it, and make room for the miracle by which it was laid. For St. Germanus, who had slept the whole time, being awaked by the mariners just as the vessel was on the point of sinking, first reprimanded the sea, as Neptune did of old the winds, for attempting to defeat their pious undertaking; and then pouring into it a few drops of oil, assuaged at once the fury of the waves, and miraculously restored the wished-for calm. Upon their landing, the people flocked to them from all parts; and, being convinced of the truth which they preached, by the miracles which they wrought, abjured daily by thousands the Pelagian doctrine, which they had so rashly embraced. But their teachers and leaders kept out of the way: they were unwilling to enter the lists with men, whom Heaven had endowed with such miraculous powers. However, as the whole of their cause was now at stake, they agreed, at last, to meet the two prelates, and met them accordingly. But this meeting proved fatal to the Pelagian cause; for the Pelagians declining to undertake the cure of a blind girl that was presented to them, St. Germanus, by applying to her eyes some relics, which he always carried about with him, cured her at once of her blindness, and with her the whole island.[1] But these miracles were soon forgotten: according to the same author, the Pelagian heresy took root again, and new miracles were wanted to check its growth. Germanus therefore, in the year 447, returned to Britain; exerting here anew his wonder-working power, confounded his antagonists, and, not leaving behind him the least shoot of so poisonous a weed, returned in triumph to Gaul.[2] In his second journey into Britain he is said to have been attended by St. Severus, bishop of Treves.

The following year, 430, is one of the most remarkable years in the annals of the church. For it was in that year that the famous dispute began between Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and St. Cyril, bishop of Alexan-

church. However, as they reserved the best habits they had for the sacred functions, and used them on no other occasion, when modes in dress began to alter, the fashion changed before they were worn out. Thus, by degrees, the dress which they used in the church varied from their common dress, as well as from that of the people; the new habits for the serivce of the church being made after the mode of the ancient, in which they were accustomed to perform their functions. Anastasius, Platina, and Baronius, give us particular accounts, I may say, the history, of every part of the mass-priest's dress, instituted, according to them, and used long before this time.

[1] Prosp. chr.

(*) Besides, the Benedictines, in their edition of the works of St. Austin, assure us, that, in a very ancient manuscript copy of Gennadius, Fastidius is not styled bishop, the word bishop being added to the original copy in a much fresher hand. And yet most of our modern writers not only suppose him to have been bishop, but bishop of London. (a)

(a) Vid. Miræum in not. ad Gennad.

[2] Constant. l. 1. c. 19. apud Surium, t. 4.

[3] Prosp. chron.

[1] Constant. ubi supra.

[2] Constant. vit. S. Ger. l. 2. c. 1. apud Sur. t. 3. 30. Julii.

What occasioned this dispute. The characters of Cyril and Nestorius. Cyril will not allow Nestorius to explain his meaning. He defames him and writes against him to the emperor. Nestorius excommunicates and deposes those who side with Cyril. Causes some of them to be imprisoned and whipped. Nestorius strives to gain Celestine and the western bishops. Cyril writes to Celestine, and sends him the homilies of Nestorius, with his own comments upon them.

dria, which rent the whole church into two opposite and irreconcilable factions. What gave occasion to that dispute was, the title of "mother of God," which began at this time to be commonly given to the Virgin Mary. Such a title Nestorius thought very improper, derogatory to the majesty of the Eternal Creator, and only calculated to lead the unwary into gross mistakes concerning the mystery of the incarnation, and the nature of Christ. For he argued, that it could not be said, without a kind of blasphemy, "that God was born of a woman, that God had suffered, that God had died," nor, consequently, "that the Virgin Mary was the mother of God. We must not imagine," said he, "that God, or the Word, was born of the Virgin Mary; but we ought to believe, that God, or the Word, was united to him, who was born of the Virgin Mary."[1] The title of "mother of Christ" was that which he thought should be given to the Virgin, as containing all that was meant by the other, without the impropriety and offence of the expression, and without danger of confounding the divine nature of Christ with the human. This doctrine was received, and maintained with great warmth by some, both ecclesiastics and laymen, and with no less warmth opposed by others. The latter thought it was calling in question the divinity of Christ, and degrading the Virgin Mary, to rob her of the glorious title of the "mother of God;" and her glory was now become one of their highest concerns. At the head of these was St. Cyril, a man of a most haughty and imperious temper, impatient of contradiction, obstinately wedded to his own opinion, passionate, revengeful, and more eagerly bent, at least in the present dispute, upon conquering his adversary, than discovering the truth. In some of these qualities he was well matched by Nestorius; but the latter was not so eager for victory, so tenacious of his own opinion, or rather of his own terms, (for the whole dispute was about terms) as not to be ready to explain them; which had he been allowed to do, an end had been put at once to the quarrel. But Cyril would hearken to no explanations. He peremptorily required Nestorius to acknowledge and confess the Virgin Mary to be the "mother of God," without any distinction or explanation; and because he would not comply, he defamed him all over the east, as a reviver of the heresy of Paul of Samosata, denying the real union between the human and the divine nature in the person of Christ; stirred up the people of Constantinople, his own flock, against him; and spared no pains to discredit him with the emperor, and other great persons at court. For he wrote three letters to court: one to the emperor Theodosius, to his wife Eudoxia, and to his sister Pulcheria; another "to the Queen's Virgins, and Brides of Christ," that is, to Pulcheria and her sisters; and a third "to the empresses," that is, to Eudoxia and Pulcheria. The purport of these letters was to prove, that the Virgin Mary was, and ought to be styled, the "mother of God;" that to dispute such a title was rank heresy; and that whoever disputed it was unworthy of the protection of the imperial family.

Nestorius, being now sensible, that Cyril was determined to keep no measures with him, resolved, in his turn, to keep none with one who had given him so great provocation. He therefore assembled a council at Constantinople, and there, with the unanimous consent of the bishops, who composed it, he solemnly excommunicated the laymen, and deposed the ecclesiastics, who rejected his doctrine.[1] He did not stop here; but caused several ecclesiastics, monks, and laymen, the friends of Cyril, to be apprehended, to be dragged to the public prison, and to be there whipped very severely, as disturbers of the public peace, and sowers of heresy and sedition. What chiefly provoked him, was a paper posted up in a public place of the city, declaring him a heretic, and guilty of the heresy formerly held by Paul of Samosata, denying a true union between the Word and the humanity in the person of Christ; which was one of the many calumnies broached against him by Cyril to blacken his reputation.

Thus were the Christians in the east divided into two opposite parties, irreconcilably incensed against each other, and reviling each other with all the opprobrious names malice and rage could suggest. But Cyril's party was by far the most numerous and powerful. Nestorius therefore, having striven in vain to strengthen his party in the east, resolved in the end to try the west, being well apprised, that the authority of the bishop of Rome, and the other western bishops, would be abundantly sufficient to turn the scale. He therefore wrote a long letter to Celestine, acquainting him with what had passed in the east, and explaining, without the least disguise or equivocation, the doctrine he held; nay, he sent him all the homilies, which he had preached on that subject. In this letter he owns his irreconcilable aversion to the words "mother of God," as raising ideas, especially in the minds of the vulgar, inconsistent with the majesty of the Supreme Being. He adds, that by disputing the title of "mother of God," he only meant, that the Word was not born of the Virgin Mary.[2]

St. Cyril, being informed that Nestorius had written to Celestine, summoned a coun-

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 1124. Cyr. ep. 38. Petav. dog. theolog. t. 4. l. 1. c. 7.

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 327. [2] Conc. t. 3. p. 349—356.

The popish writers have no occasion to boast of the recourse had by Cyril to Celestine. Nestorius condemned by a council held at Rome. Celestine acquaints Nestorius with the judgment of the western bishops. Celestine appoints Cyril his vicegerent.

cil at Alexandria; and by their advice, wrote the famous letter to Celestine, which has reached our times. In that letter he acquaints him with the state of affairs in the east, and the disturbances raised there by Nestorius, as if himself had been no ways concerned in them; tells him that it is absolutely necessary, that all the bishops of the church should unite as one man against that prelate; that the bishops in the east are well disposed to join in the common cause; and that they only waited to know from him, whether they were to communicate with Nestorius, or openly renounce his communion. At the same time Cyril sent to Rome the homilies of Nestorius, the letters which he had written to him, his answers, and with them a writing containing the sentiments of the fathers concerning the mystery of the incarnation. For the gospel, the "testimony of Christ," was already laid aside, and the testimony of men taken, in most disputes, for the rule and standard of the Christian belief. The Roman catholics have no reason to boast, as they do, of the recourse had by St. Cyril on this occasion to the pope. For Posidonius, one of Cyril's deacons, who was despatched with the abovementioned papers to Rome, was directed, in his private instructions, not to deliver them, but to bring them back to Alexandria, if he found that Nestorius had not applied to Celestine;[1] so that if Nestorius had not recurred to the pope, Cyril never would. Posidonius found, upon inquiry, that Nestorius had written to Celestine; and thererore delivered to him, pursuant to his instructions, all the papers with which he was charged. Cyril wrote in Latin, and even caused the homilies of Nestorius to be translated into that language, with his own comments upon them; whereas Nestorius had sent them in the original Greek, and wrote his letters in the same tongue; which had obliged Celestine to send them into Gaul, to be translated there by the famous Cassian, who was a native of Thrace, and lived then at Marseilles, there being none, it seems, in Rome or Italy, sufficiently qualified for that task. Cyril having thus got the start of his antagonist, though he wrote the last, Celestine was, by his writings, prejudiced to such a degree against Nestorius, before he had heard what he had to offer in his defence, that all he did or could offer afterwards availed him nothing. Celestine indeed perused all his papers as soon as they were translated and sent back from Gaul, but perused them with the strong prejudices which he had imbibed from the writings of Cyril; so that he discovered in each homily, nay, in every line, "heresies, impieties, and blasphemies," not to be uttered or heard.

A council was therefore assembled at Rome, to condemn, rather than to examine, the "new doctrine." At this council, assisted most of the western bishops;[1] Celestine presided; the homilies were read, and with them the letters both of Cyril and Nestorius. Celestine made a long speech, to prove not only by the passages which Cyril had suggested to him out of the fathers, but by others from St. Hilarius, from pope Damasus, and from a hymn which St. Ambrose had caused to be yearly sung by his people on Christmas day, that "the Virgin Mary was truly the mother of God."[2] When he had done, Nestorius was declared the author of a "new and very dangerous heresy," Cyril was highly extolled for opposing it, his doctrine was applauded by all as strictly orthodox, and sentence of deposition pronounced against such ecclesiastics as should refuse to sign it.

Before the council broke up, Celestine wrote to Nestorius, acquainting him with the judgment of the western bishops upon this dispute; and at the same time warning him, that if, in the term of ten days after the receipt of that letter, he did not publicly condemn the doctrine which he had hitherto taught, and teach the doctrine which he had hitherto condemned, he should be deposed without any further delay, and cut off from the communion of the church.[3] This letter is dated the 11th of August of this year, 430. He wrote several other letters, all bearing the same date, namely, one to Cyril; one to the clergy, monks, and people of Constantinople; one to each of the bishops of the chief sees; and one to the church of Antioch. All these letters were to the same effect, namely, to acquaint those, to whom they were addressed, with the sentence pronounced by the council of Rome against Nestorius, and encourage them to be assisting in the execution of it. His letter to Cyril deserves particular notice: for he there appoints him to act in the present affair, that is, in excommunicating and deposing Nestorius, "as his vicegerent, in the name, and with the authority, of his see."[4] It must be observed here, that the bishops of Rome, neither alone, nor jointly with the whole body of the western bishops, had, or even claimed at this time, the power of deposing the bishop of Constantinople, or indeed any other bishop in the east, without the consent and concurrence of the eastern bishops. This Cyril well knew; and therefore lest Celestine should, on that consideration, decline giving judgment against Nestorius, he made him believe, that the eastern bishops were all disposed to join against the pretended heresiarch; that they waited only his determination, and were ready to concur, to a man, in executing the judgment which he should give. This was making Celestine believe, that the eastern bishops had chosen him for their judge in the present

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 346. & concil. app. per Balus. p. 45.

[1] Mercat. t. 1. p. 71.

[2] Concil. t. 3. p. 379. Arnobii Junioris cum Serap. conflict. p. 548.

[3] Concil. t. 3. p. 374—376.

[4] Ibid. p. 349.

He is imposed upon by Cyril. Cyril sends Celestine's letter to Nestorius; and requires him to retract his pretended errors, on pain of being deposed. Nestorius inclined to yield for the sake of peace. The doctrine of Cyril judged impious by the orientals. An oecumenical council summoned by the emperor to meet at Ephesus.

dispute, and agreed to acquiesce in his decision. It was upon this presumption that Celestine pronounced the above-mentioned sentence against Nestorius, and appointed Cyril to act in his room, with the authority which he falsely supposed to have been granted him on this occasion. I say, "falsely," for what Cyril wrote to him was absolutely false, namely, that all the bishops in the east were ready to join him against Nestorius, and concur in executing the sentence which he should pronounce. Several bishops had declared for Nestorius, and not one, that we know of, against him, at the time Cyril wrote, besides Cyril himself, and the other Egyptian bishops, who were entirely governed by him; nay, the sentence pronounced at Rome was matter of great surprise to all, but more especially to John of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, who could not help censuring, with some sharpness, the western bishops, as acting rashly in an affair that required the most mature deliberation. But Cyril was chiefly to blame, who, to engage the western bishops on his side, and by their means compass the ruin of his antagonist, had represented the state of affairs very differently from what it really was.

It was doubtless a very extraordinary thing for a bishop of Alexandria to accept the commission of vicegerent or deputy to the bishop of Rome; and Celestine would hardly have thought of offering him such a commission, if he had not been sensible that, from the heat of his passion upon this occasion, he would be willing to act in any capacity, that would empower him to hurt his antagonist. So ably did the popes, from the earliest times, avail themselves of every circumstance that could give them the means to promote and extend their jurisdiction!

The above-mentioned letters from Celestine were all sent to Cyril, who was to convey them to those they were addressed to; which he did accordingly, accompanying them with letters of his own, all calculated to inflame his colleagues and the rest of the clergy, as well as the laity, against Nestorius, as an enemy to "the mother of God" and the catholic church. As for the letter to Nestorius himself, he despatched four bishops with it to Constantinople, who chose to deliver it to him while he was assisting at Divine service, in the great church, with his clergy, and many persons of distinction belonging to the court. His view in this was to render their legation the more solemn, and thereby alarm the populace, who hitherto had taken no part in the quarrel. With Celestine's letter they delivered to him one from Cyril, peremptorily requiring him to retract his errors, to confirm his retraction with a solemn oath, and publicly to anathematize twelve propositions contained in the letter, and extracted out of his works. Cyril let him know, that if he did not comply with his demand, before the time fixed by Celestine was expired, he would take care to have the sentence of the western bishops executed with the utmost rigor and severity. Nestorius received the letters, and desired the legates to meet him the next day at his own house; but when they came, he did not admit them; nor did he return any answer either to Celestine or Cyril. However, in a sermon which he preached six days after, that is, on Saturday, the 13th of December, he declared, that, to maintain the peace and tranquillity of the church, to put an end to the present dispute, which might be attended with greater evils than his enemies seemed to be aware of, he was ready to grant the title of "Mother of God" to the Virgin Mary, "provided nothing else was thereby meant, but that the man born of her was united to the Divinity."[1] This sermon, and another which he preached the next day, the 14th of December, on the same subject, he sent to John, bishop of Antioch, one of the most eminent prelates both for piety and learning at that time in the church. John perused them with great attention, and finding nothing in them that was not, in his opinion, entirely agreeable to the catholic doctrine, he concluded the present dispute to be happily ended. But Cyril was not yet satisfied; he peremptorily required Nestorius to anathematize the twelve propositions which I have mentioned above; and to anathematize them was, in the opinion of the bishop of Antioch, and of almost all the bishops of his patriarchate, anathematizing the doctrine of the church, and approving that of the Apollinarists, which had been condemned by the church. For Cyril, in combating the distinction maintained by Nestorius between the two natures in Christ, seemed to have run headlong into the opposite doctrine confounding the two natures; insomuch that John of Antioch thought himself not only obliged to warn his colleagues in the east, by a circular letter, against such impious doctrines, but to cause them to be confuted in writing, by two of the most learned prelates of his patriarchate.[2] They were answered by Cyril, incapable of yielding, or even giving up a cause, which he had once undertaken to defend. Thus a new quarrel broke out between Cyril and the bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, of which it is foreign to my purpose to give here an account.

Nestorius, foreseeing the storm that the dispute between him and Cyril was likely to raise in the church, had, in order to prevent it, applied to the emperor Theodosius for the assembling an oecumenical council, even before he received the letters of Celestine and Cyril, which I have mentioned above; and, upon his application, the emperor had sum-

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 395—410. Socr. l. 7. c. 34.
[2] Concil. t. 3. p. 1150. Liberat. c. 4.

Theodosius' letter to Cyril. Irregular proceedings of the council. The sentence they pronounced against Nestorius. In what terms they acquainted Nestorius with the sentence pronounced against him. The council of Ephesus unworthy of that name.

moned a council to meet at Ephesus by Whitsuntide of the following year, 431. The letter, which Theodosius wrote on that occasion, was dated the 19th of November, 430, and addressed to all the metropolitans, who were thereby enjoined to attend at the place and time appointed, and bring with them such of their suffragans as might be well spared from the service of the churches in their respective provinces. Besides the circular letter to all metropolitans in common, Theodosius wrote to Cyril in particular, to let him know that he looked upon him as the sole author of the present disturbances, and therefore expected that he would not fail to attend the council at the time appointed; that from him he would admit of no excuse; that his punctual compliance with the present order was the only means of regaining his favor, and inclining him to think that it was not any private pique, or animosity, but a persuasion that he was defending the truth, which had prompted him to act, as he had hitherto done, so contrary to all the rules of modesty and discretion. In the same letter he reproaches Cyril, and in the sharpest terms, with pride, arrogance, and presumption; and even charges him with having attempted to sow division in the imperial family. But this charge was groundless, having no other foundation, but Cyril's having written apart to Pulcheria and her sisters, which the emperor supposed to have been done with a design to raise a misunderstanding between him and them.[1]

The council met at the time and place appointed, pursuant to the emperor's orders. But every thing was transacted in that assembly so contrary to all the rules of justice, and even of decency, with so much prejudice and animosity, that they seemed to be all actuated by the spirit of Cyril, and to have met with no other view than to gratify his private passion and revenge. Cyril presided, who was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of Nestorius. They began their sessions before the arrival of John of Antioch, and the bishops of that patriarchate, who were supposed to favor Nestorius, though they had certain intelligence of their being within a few days' journey of Ephesus; nay, they would not even wait for the pope's legates, and a good number of bishops who were coming from Italy, and the Island of Sicily. Nestorius and count Candidianus, whom the emperor had sent to assist at the council in his name, earnestly begged them to put off the sessions only for four days longer, assuring them that John and his suffragans would reach Ephesus within that time. But all in vain: they were determined to condemn Nestorius, right or wrong; and therefore could by no means be prevailed upon to wait the arrival of those who, they apprehended, would oppose, and perhaps might entirely defeat the end for which alone they seemed to believe they had been assembled.[1] Nestorius was summoned to appear the very next day, and clear himself before the council of the impious doctrine with which he was charged. He refused to comply till the orientals, that is, those of the patriarchate of Antioch, were arrived; and, upon that refusal, the council met very early next morning, read all his letters and homilies, condemned the doctrine they contained, approved the doctrine of Cyril, whose letters were likewise read; and closed this very remarkable session with pronouncing sentence of deposition and excommunication against Nestorius, in the following terms: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, against whom the most wicked Nestorius has levelled his blasphemies, declares him, by the mouth of this council, deprived of the episcopal dignity, and cut off from the communion of the episcopal order."[1] This sentence was signed by all the bishops who were present, pasted up in the most public places of Ephesus, and notified to all the inhabitants by the criers of the city. It was no sooner known than the whole city resounded with loud shouts of joy, the streets were illuminated, and the people, crowding to the church where the council was held, attended the bishops with lighted torches in their hands, and great acclamations, to their respective habitations, the women walking before them, and burning perfumes.[2] It had been as dangerous for Nestorius to show himself in Ephesus, at this juncture, as it was formerly for St. Paul, the Ephesians being no less devoted now to the Virgin Mary than they were in the apostle's time to their great Diana, and their superstition no less mischievous, though the object was changed. The Virgin Mary was the patroness of Ephesus, the Ephesians believing then that they possessed her body. But it is now believed by the church of Rome, that she was taken up, soul and body, into Heaven, and the festival of her assumption is kept with great solemnity on the 15th of August, being preceded by a vigil or fast. The council took care to acquaint Nestorius with the sentence which they had pronounced against him; and the note which they wrote to him on that occasion shows too plainly, that they were swayed in all they did by passion alone. For the note was thus directed: "To Nestorius, a second Judas."[3]

Such is the account which the ancients give us of the first oecumenical council of Ephesus, one of the four, which Gregory the Great received with as much veneration as the four gospels.[4] But notwithstanding his authority, we may, perhaps, with more truth, apply to this council than to any other what Nazianzen wrote of the councils of his time;

[1] Liberat. c. 4. Concil. t. 3. p. 434.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 534.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 531—517
[3] Concil. t. 1. p. 560.
[4] Greg. l. 1. ep. 24.

The council of Ephesus protested against by the imperial commissioner and seventy-six bishops. They act contrary to all rules of justice and religion. The conduct of Cyril is sharply censured by his greatest friends. The orientals arrive.

namely, "that he had never seen an assembly of bishops that ended well; that, by assembling, they had always heightened rather than cured the evil; that in such assemblies, passion, jealousy, prejudice, envy, the desire of victory generally prevailed; and that those who took upon them to judge others, were, generally speaking, swayed by some private grudge, their zeal being owing more to the ill will which they bore to the criminals, than the aversion which they had to their crimes.[1] As to the present assembly, it may be justly questioned whether it deserves the name of a council, or ought not rather to be styled a seditious and tumultuary conventicle of men, assembled with no other view but to revenge the private quarrel of their head and leader. For they met against the will of the imperial commissioner, count Candidianus, who represented the person of the emperor; nay, upon his acquainting them that it was the will of the emperor they should wait the arrival of the oriental and western bishops, they drove him by force out of the assembly. Candidianus, seeing the emperor's orders thus trampled under foot by the riotous bishops, entered a protest against their proceedings, and declared them null. This protest was addressed, "To Cyril, and the bishops assembled with him."[2] Nestorius likewise, seven bishops who were assembled with him, and sixty-eight more, all protested against the meeting of the council till the arrival of the orientals: so that seventy-six bishops, who were then actually in Ephesus, protested against, and absented themselves from the council. As, therefore, neither the orientals nor the western bishops were yet come, the assembly was composed only of Egyptians and Asiatics, who were entirely devoted to Cyril. But how irregular soever their meeting was, their method of acting, after they met, was no less irregular. Cyril, who was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of Nestorius, received the depositions against him, examined the witnesses, gave what explication he pleased to his words, and delivered his opinion the first; which was acting in open contradiction to the known laws of justice and religion. In the first session, several things were transacted, that might have given full employment for several sessions. How could they examine, in so short a time, the twelve propositions which Cyril required Nestorius to anathematize, propositions that were capable of so many different interpretations, that were afterwards so differently interpreted, and occasioned endless quarrels and disputes, some admitting them as catholic, and rejecting the opposite propositions as heretical; others admitting the opposite propositions as catholic, and rejecting them as heretical, without being able to agree in any thing else but in anathematizing and cursing each other? How could they compare the many passages out of the homilies of Nestorius, with the different contexts, in order to find out his true meaning? To examine so many different propositions, all relating to a subject above our comprehension, and in terms hardly intelligible to the most speculative understanding, to declare which were heterodox, and which orthodox, which were agreeable, and which disagreeable, to the doctrine of the fathers, (for the scripture was out of the question) and all this in a few hours, was, it must be owned, a most wondrous performance. But the orientals were at hand: John of Antioch was a man of great credit: it was apprehended that the many bishops who were then in Ephesus, and had absented themselves from the council, might join him, and he Nestorius. Despatch was therefore to be used, and the business of many sessions transacted in one, that Cyril might have his full revenge before their arrival.

It was in this light that the conduct of Cyril and the other bishops appeared to St. Isidore of Pelusium, a prelate of great learning and sagacity, and one who professed a particular friendship for Cyril. For, being informed of what had passed at Ephesus, he was so shocked at the conduct of his friend, that he could not help censuring it with great severity. "Your conduct," said he, in a private letter to him, "and the tragedy which you have lately acted at Ephesus, are matter of great surprise to some, and diversion to others. It is publicly said, that you sought only to be revenged on your enemies, and that you have therein imitated your uncle Theophilus; and, indeed, though the persons accused may be different, the conduct of the accusers is the same. You had better have continued quiet, than revenge your private injuries at the expense of the public peace, and tranquillity of the church, by sowing dissensions among her members, under the color of piety and religion."[1] Theophilus, whom Isidore mentions in his letter, was bishop of Alexandria, uncle to Cyril, and at the head of the faction that deposed Chrysostom.[2]

Five days after the deposition of Nestorius, John of Antioch and the orientals arrived; and great was their surprise, when they were informed by count Candidianus, who came to wait on them, of what had passed. John had always advised Nestorius to allow the title of "mother of God" to the Virgin Mary, for the sake of peace; but could not think him a heretic for disputing it. But as to the doctrine of Cyril, he looked upon it as rank Apollinarism; and, as such, had caused it to be confuted. No wonder, therefore, if, upon hearing that the doctrine of Cyril had been de-

[1] Naz. ep. 55. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 702.

[1] Isid. Pel. l. 2. ep. 110. [2] See above, p. 294.

The orientals insist upon the points that had been so hastily decided, to be examined anew. Which being refused by Cyril, they assemble apart. The two councils anathamatize and excommunicate one another. Both recur to the emperor. He approves the deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon. All three arrested by the emperor's order, who endeavors, in vain, to reconcile the bishops. He orders both councils to send a certain number of deputies to Constantinople. He hears them at Chalcedon. Is, at first, favorable to the orientals and Nestorius; but afterwards declares against them.

clared catholic, that the doctrine of Nestorius had been condemned as heretical, and he excommunicated and deposed for holding it, he insisted, as he did, upon their agreeing to have those points examined anew, and more maturely, before he would assist at the council. This demand he thought the more reasonable, as Cyril had assured him, by a letter dated but two days before the meeting of the council, that they should not meet till his arrival. But Cyril, as we may well imagine, would by no means consent to it; which so provoked John, that, after several expostulatory letters between him and Cyril, he assembled, at last, his orientals apart, and, with them, such as adhered to him, about fifty in all. In this new council, the proceedings of the other were examined; and, being found repugnant to the canons, and owing merely to rancor and passiou, they were, by the whole assembly, with one voice, declared null. The orientals did not stop here; but, after a strict examination of the doctrine of Cyril, they declared it heretical; and, in virtue of that declaration, pronounced sentence of excommunication and deposition against him, against Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, a zealous stickler for his doctrine, and against all the bishops who should communicate with either, till they had publicly retracted their errors. The blow was soon returned by Cyril, and those who sided with him; the orientals were all declared Nestorians, and, with Nestorius, deposed, excommunicated, anathematized. War being thus declared between the two councils, expresses were immediately despatched by both, to the emperor, and their friends at court; for they were both sensible, that the doctrine of those, who had most friends there, would, in the end, prove the most orthodox. The emperor read, with great attention, the accounts transmitted to him by both parties, and would have approved and confirmed the proceedings of the orientals, had he not been diverted from it, first by his physician, named John, and afterwards by Acacius, bishop of Berœa, who happened to be then at court. For the present Theodosius contented himself with approving the deposition of Nestorius, of Cyril, and of Memnon, who, he said, well deserved such a punishment, as being the chief authors of the present disturbances; "For, as to their faith, (he added,) I believe they are all three alike orthodox." Which was true; and more than both councils had been able to find out.

The emperor, having taken this resolution, despatched count John to Ephesus, with orders to drive the three incendiaries, Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, out of the city, and persuade the bishops to assemble in one council. Count John, soon after his arrival, caused the three bishops to be arrested and confined; but could by no means bring about an accommodation between the two parties; the orientals obstinately refusing to communicate with the friends of Cyril, till they had anathematized his doctrine; and his friends no less obstinately requiring the orientals to anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius, before they would communicate with them; so that John was obliged in the end, notwithstanding all the pains he took, to acquaint the emperor, that he had found the minds of the bishops so soured and exasperated against one another, that it was impossible ever to reconcile them. The emperor, upon the receipt of his letter, despatched an order to both councils, enjoining them to send a certain number of deputies, both the same number, to Constantinople, where he proposed to have the points in dispute impartially examined. In compliance with this order, the two councils sent each eight deputies, who immediately set out, with proper instructions, for Constantinople; but, arriving at Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus, they were stopped there by an order from the emperor, it not being thought safe for the orientals to enter Constantinople, the monks, who were very numerous in that city, having prejudiced the populace against them. They arrived at Chalcedon in the latter end of August; and, on the 4th of September, the emperor came to the palace of Ruffinus, in that neighborhood, and there heard both parties, with great patience. He was, at first, so favorable to the orientals, that they thought themselves sure of victory; and even wrote to their friends at Ephesus, desiring them to thank him for the kindness he had shown them. But, to their great surprise, the face of affairs changed at once. They had been already admitted four times to the emperor's presence, and heard by him with much kindness: but, in the fifth audience, which they thought would complete their triumph, the emperor, after receiving them with great coolness, told them, abruptly, that they had better admit both Memnon and Cyril to their communion, and abandon the defence of Nestorius. They were thunderstruck with such a proposal, and strongly remonstrated against it. But Theodosius, deaf to their remonstrances, returned the next day to Constantinople, carrying with him the deputies of the adverse party, in order to have a new bishop ordained by them, in the room of Nestorius. Soon after his return, he issued an edict, declaring Nestorius justly deposed, reinstating Cyril and Memnon in their sees, and giving all the other bishops leave to return to their respective churches, they being all alike orthodox.[1] This was declaring the council dissolved; and it was dissolved accordingly; but the disturbances which it oc-

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 727—730. Cotel. Monum. Eccl. Græc. p. 41.

To what this change was owing. Cyril did not preside as the pope's legate. The council assembled without the approbation of the pope. The whole dispute about words. Nestorianism an imaginary heresy. Nestorius and Cyril agree in the substance.

casioned, were not composed till many years after.

The sudden change in the emperor, with respect to the orientals, is ascribed by Acacius, bishop of Beræa, to the gold that Cyril caused to be prodigally distributed, on this occasion, among the courtiers. For Acacius writes, that one of the eunuchs of the court, by name Scholasticus, dying possessed of great wealth, the emperor found a note among his papers, acknowledging the receipt of large sums remitted to him by Paul, Cyril's nephew, in Cyril's name.[1] It is true, we are not bound to give credit to Acacius, as Du Pin observes. But in what other manner can we account for so sudden a change, for such an inconsistent method of acting? The emperor thinks both parties equally orthodox, and yet declares Nestorius justly deposed, and restores Cyril and Memnon to their sees; and that soon after he had appeared more favorable to the friends of Nestorius than to those of Cyril. To what else could this be owing, if it was not the effect of bribery?

The pope's legates, namely, Arcadius, Projectus, and Philippus, the two former bishops, and the latter a presbyter, did not arrive at Ephesus till some time after the condemnation of Nestorius; but they signed the judgment that had been given against him, being directed by Celestine to agree in all things with Cyril. Cyril presided as bishop of Alexandria, the first see after that of Rome. While he was absent, Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, supplied his room; a plain proof, that he did not preside as the pope's legate; for if he had, his room could not have been supplied by the bishop of Jerusalem, but by them. Besides, if Cyril had been vested with the character of the pope's legate, what occasion had there been to send three more? Bellarmine and Baronius both allow this council to have been assembled by the emperor; but with the previous approbation, say they, and by the advice of, Celestine. That the council was convened by the emperor, is past all doubt, it being said, and repeated above twenty times in the acts, that "they were assembled by the will of the most religious emperors." But of Celestine not the least mention is ever made by any of the fathers, not even by Cyril. The above-mentioned writers found their assertion on a letter of St. Austin, and on the acts of St. Petronius. But both these pieces are now universally rejected as supposititious.

As to the dispute, which occasioned the assembling of this council, the contending parties seem to have agreed in the substance, and to have only quarrelled about words: at least the emperor thought so, as I have observed above; and, what is more, Nestorius himself. For in the letter which he wrote to Celestine, acquainting him with the resolution Theodosius had taken of assembling a council, he only told him, that it was for some important affairs of the church; adding, that as to the dispute between him and the bishop of Alexandria, it was not a matter of such mighty moment, as to require the decision of an oecumenical council. And truly both Nestorius and Cyril, so far as we can judge from their own words, acknowledged one person in Christ, and two natures, the natures distinct, but inseparably united; which was the catholic belief. Now the subject of the dispute was, whether, in virtue of that union between the human and divine nature, the properties of the former might, or might not, be ascribed to God, and those of the latter to man. The negative was maintained by Nestorius, and the affirmative by Cyril; the one rejecting as blasphemous, and the other admitting as orthodox, the following expressions: "God was born, God suffered, God died, Mary was the mother of God;" which was plainly disputing about words only, or expressions. It is true, Cyril charged Nestorius with the doctrine of Paul of Samosata, for rejecting them; and Nestorius, Cyril with that of Appolinaris, for admitting them; but neither owned the tenets that were by the other ascribed to him: so that Cyril was only a heretic of Nestorius' making, and Nestorius of Cyril's: Nestorius acknowledged a real union between the two natures in Christ, and Cyril a real distinction. But they did not, and, perhaps, when they were once warmed with disputing, would not, understand each other. "Nestorianism," says a modern Roman catholic writer,[1] "Is but an imaginary heresy. Had Nestorius and St. Cyril understood one another, they had agreed, and prevented the scandal which their quarrelling brought on the church. But the Greeks have always been great disputants; and it was by them that most of the first heresies were broached. The subject of their disputes was, generally speaking, some metaphysical speculation: and their method of handling it arrant chicanery. From equivocal terms, they drew false inferences, and from inferences passed to injuries. Thus they became irreconcilable enemies, and, forgetting truth, fought only to hurt one another. Had they but cooly explained their thoughts, they had found that in most cases no room was left, on either side, for the imputation of heresy."

In the present dispute, Cyril, the more to oppose, or rather to provoke, Nestorius, affected to use, on all occasions, not only the expressions, which I have mentioned above, but others that seem to involve a still more apparent contradiction: namely, "The Eternal was born in time, the impassible suffered, the immortal died, life died." At these expressions the orientals were no less shocked than Nestorius; and therefore separating

[1] Lup. divers. ep. c. 41.

[1] M. Simon. hist. crit. de la creance et des coutumes des Nations du Levant.

What meant by the communication of Idioms. The expressions of Nestorius more proper than those of Cyril. A particular reason for rejecting the title of "mother of God." The fate of Nestorius. He is ordered to return to his monastery.

themselves from the communion of Cyril, whom they concluded to have fallen into the errors of Apollinaris, they insisted upon his either condemning or explaining the expressions he used, before they would admit him to their communion, or any, who communicated with him. He chose the latter; and then it appeared, that they had been all fighting the whole time in the dark; for by those expressions Cyril meant no more, than that Christ, who was God, was born, suffered, and died; that Mary was the mother of Christ, who was God; the very doctrine and expressions which Nestorius had been all along contending for, and Cyril had been combating with so much warmth. But Nestorius was already deposed by the faction of Cyril, and Maximus chosen and ordained bishop of Constantinople in his room.

The expressions of Cyril were approved by the council of Ephesus, and have therefore been adopted by the church of Rome. But her schoolmen, well apprised of the objections to which they are liable, to excuse them from blasphemy, have been obliged to recur to what they call a "communication of idioms," in virtue of which the properties of both natures, say they, may be ascribed to the "hypostasis," or person in whom both natures were united. Thus we may say, according to them, "God was born, God suffered," because the person, who was God, "was born, and suffered." Thus indeed they excuse the expressions of Cyril from blasphemy: but still it must be owned, that the expressions used by Nestorius, "Christ was born, Christ suffered, Christ died," were at least far more proper. For, after all, this "communication of idioms" is, in fact, nothing else but a rhetorical figure: so that Cyril spoke like an orator, and Nestorius like a philosopher: the expressions of the former were, in a strict sense, false and blasphemous; those of the latter, in the strictest sense, true and orthodox. Tropes and figures serve only to disguise the truth, to lead men into errors, and therefore ought to be laid aside by all who seriously inquire after truth, or explain it to others. I shall conclude with observing, that if by a "communication of idioms" the properties of the human and Divine nature may be ascribed to the person, in whom those two natures were united: the properties of the body and soul might, by a like communication, be ascribed to the person, in whom the body and soul are united: so that it might be said, with as much propriety, "man is immortal, man will never die," because the soul is immortal, and will never die, "as God was mortal, God died," because the humanity was mortal and died. The case is parallel, and the "communication of idioms" must justify both expressions, or neither.

As to the title of "mother of God," to which Nestorius had a more than ordinary aversion, he seems to have rejected it on a particular account; for the same reason that induced Clement XI. to suppress the title of "grandmother of God," which, in his time, began to be commonly given to St. Anne; namely, because "it was offensive to pious ears; piarum aurium offensiva." If the Virgin Mary was the mother, St. Anne was, as properly speaking, the grandmother of God. Why then should the mother be robbed of so glorious a title, while the daughter is suffered to enjoy it? Why should Nestorius be deemed a heretic for denying it to the daughter, rather than Clement for denying it to the mother? The one was as offensive to the ears of Nestorius, as the other could possibly be to the ears of Clement. However, the former did not consult his ears alone, but his reason too, as has been shown above; whereas the latter must have consulted his ears only, there being no shadow of reason, why the one title should be allowed, and not the other.

As for Nestorius, he received an order from the emperor, while the council was still sitting, commanding him to quit Ephesus, and retire to the monastery of St. Euprepius in the suburbs of Antioch, where he had led a monastic life before he was raised to the see of Constantinople. This order he received with great joy, having often declared, that he wished for nothing so much as to spend his life in solitude and retirement, far from the troubles that threatened the church.[1] In the letter, which he wrote to Antiochus, the præfectus prætorio, by whom the emperor's order was communicated to him, he told him, that to be thus deposed, for standing up in defence of the orthodox faith, was a greater honor than he had ever presumed to aspire to, or hoped to attain. The only favor he begged of Antiochus was, that he would employ his whole interest at court, in order to obtain public letters of the emperor, that might be read in all the churches, condemning the doctrine of Cyril.[2] The following year, 432, Celestine wrote a very pressing letter to Theodosius, dated the 15th of March, conjuring him, as he tendered the purity of the faith, to confine Nestorius to some uninhabited place, where it might not be in his power to infect others with his pestilential doctrine; which was begging the emperor to drive him out, like a wild beast, from human society, to perish in a desert. He wrote, at the same time, a circular letter to the bishops in those parts, exhorting them to second him with all their power and interest at court.[3] Theodosius, hearkening only to the impulses of his own good nature, withstood all the solicitations of Nestorius' enemies for four years. But, in the end, being made to believe, that by showing mercy to such an obstinate heretic, he rendered himself unworthy of mercy; and

[1] Evag. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. t. 3. p. 741.
[2] Concil. app. p. 108. [3] Concil. t. 3. p. 1070, 1071.

Nestorius is banished into Arabia, at the request of Celestine, and the bishops of his party. His books forbidden, and ordered to be burnt. Is frequently removed from one place to another. Treated with great barbarity. His death. Nestorius himself a cruel persecutor.

that to treat him with severity was the most effectual means of drawing down the blessings of Heaven upon himself, and the empire; his good nature yielded, and he issued an order, addressed to Isidore, then the præfectus prætorio, enjoining him to cause Nestorius to be conveyed to Petra in Arabia, to end his days there, by way of atonement for the mischief he had done. With him were banished, to the same place, count Irenæus, his great friend and protector, and Photius, a presbyter of Constantinople, who had written in his defence against Cyril.[1] The same year the emperor issued an edict, dated the 30th of July, commanding the disciples of Nestorius to be called Simonians;(*) his books to be every where sought for, and publicly burned; and all persons, in whose possession they were, to deliver them up to the magistrates. By the same edict the Nestorians were forbidden to hold any assemblies in the cities, villages, or in the fields, and the places were confiscated, where such assemblies should be held, as well as the estates of those who should frequent them.[2] This edict was published both in Greek and in Latin, that it might be understood by the subjects of both empires.

The enemies of Nestorius were not yet satisfied; they thought his confinement to Petra too mild a punishment; and therefore, before he had been long there, they prevailed upon the emperor to remove him from Petra to Oasis, in the deserts between Egypt and Libya, a place in which the greatest criminals were usually confined in those days.[3] He was still in Oasis, when Socrates wrote, that is, in 439, but the town being soon after surprised by the barbarians, named Blemmyes, he was carried by them into captivity, but set again at liberty, and even informed by them, that the town would, in a short time, be attacked anew by another clan of barbarians. Upon this information he withdrew to the city of Panopolis, and immediately acquainted the governor of Thebais with the motives that had induced him to quit the place, which he had been confined to by the imperial edict, entreating his highness (celsitudinem tuam) to notify them to the emperor, and suffer him to continue there till his pleasure was known. But the governor happened to be a zealous catholic, or rather a true courtier; and therefore, without waiting for the emperor's order, he sent a band of soldiers to convey, or rather to drag him to Elephantine, on the most distant borders of his government. This the governor seems to have done on purpose to destroy him, and thereby ingratiate himself both with the church and the court. For the soldiers he employed on this occasion, were not Romans, but barbarians; and when they were got above half way to Elephantine, they were enjoined, by a counter order from him, to bring their prisoner back to Panopolis with all possible expedition. As he was hurried on by the merciless barbarians, notwithstanding his old age, the weakness attending it, and the hurts he received from a fall, he arrived at Panopolis, quite spent, and so worn out with the fatigues of that painful journey, that no one thought he could outlive it many days. But the governor was impatient to hear the news of his death; and therefore, before he could recruit his strength, quite exhausted by this journey, he obliged him to undertake another, ordering him to repair, without delay, to a certain place within the territory of Panopolis. As he outlived this journey too, the governor, bent on having the merit and glory of destroying the pretended heresiarch, ordered him immediately to undertake a fourth; and this put an end to all his troubles. For nature sinking under the fatigues he was forced to undergo, without intermission or respite, his strength quite failed him, and he died.[4](*)

Such were the sufferings, such was the end, of the famous Nestorius; and both reflect no small disgrace on the ecclesiasties of those times, especially on Celestine and Cyril; for by them this cruel persecution was raised, and by them it was carried on; the laymen being only the ministers of their cruelty and revenge. Such a treatment was quite undeserved by Nestorius, with respect to his doctrine, as I have shown already, but was not so, it must be owned, in another respect: for he was himself a most furious persecutor of all those, who had the misfortune to be stigmatized with the name of heretics; and it is not to be doubted, but Cyril would have met with the same treatment at his hands, had his party prevailed, as he did at Cyril's. In the sermon, which he preached on the very day of his ordination, he thus addressed the emperor, who was present: "make the orthodox faith, O mighty prince, reign alone on the earth; and I will make you reign in Heaven. Lend me your assistance to exterminate the here-

[1] Concil. ib. p. 1058, 1059. & ap. p. 884.

(*) The emperor ordered them to be so called, merely to render them odious; for there was not the least affinity between the heresy of Simon the magician, and the doctrine that was ascribed to Nestorius. In this Theodosius followed the example of his predecessor Constantine, who to disgrace the Arians, and prejudice the populace against them, ordered them to be called Porphyrians. For when a man was once declared a heretic, all means of rendering him infamous were deemed just and lawful. But neither edict ever took place.

[2] Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 190. Concil. t. 3. p. 1200.

[3] Socr. l. 7. c. 34. [4] Idem. ib.

[1] Evagr. l. 1. c. 7.

(*) An anonymous writer, quoted by Evagrius, (a) relates, that before Nestorius died, his tongue was devoured by vermin, which he interprets as a punishment justly inflicted on him for the blasphemies he supposes him to have uttered. This account Evagrius seems not to have credited; but Theodorus the reader, Theophanes, and Theodoret, have taken it upon the word of the anonymous writer, by whom it was probably invented to render the name of the pretended heresiarch odious to posterity.

(a) Evag. l. 1. c. 7.

The doctrine of the Jansenists approved by Celestine. Palladius the first bishop of Ireland.

tics, and I will lend you mine to exterminate the Persians."[1] This was proclaiming war against all who dissented from him; and the war, thus proclaimed, he began without loss of time, and pursued with the utmost fury, causing the imperial laws against heretics to be vigorously executed, and stirring up the mob, not only in Constantinople, but in the neighboring provinces, against dissenters of all denominations. This occasioned a universal confusion, and, in some places, a great deal of bloodshed; insomuch that the emperor was obliged to interpose his authority, and protect, to a certain degree, as friends to the state, those whom the bishop was for exterminating as enemies to the church. I will not presume to interpret the severity that was practised upon him, as a judgment from Heaven for the severity which he had practised upon others; agreeably to those words of our Savior, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you;"[2] but I cannot help looking upon the treatment he met with, however severe, as a just and well deserved retaliation; and upon him as a man altogether unworthy of our compassion.

But to return to Celestine: In the year 431, he wrote to the Gallican bishops, exhorting them to stand up in defence of the doctrine of St. Austin, and to silence, with their authority, all who opposed it: for it was opposed by many; among the rest by the famous Cassian, as utterly inconsistent with merit and free-will. To this letter are commonly annexed nine articles concerning grace and freewill; and, in these articles, styled there, "the authorities of the bishops of the holy apostolic see," is contained, in the most plain and express terms, the doctrine of the Jansenists, condemned in our days by the famous bull Unigenitus of Clement XI.[3] It is true, some pretend those articles to be falsely ascribed to Celestine. But they have passed for his, ever since the sixth to the present century: they have been placed among his decrees, by Dionysius Exiguus; were quoted as his by Petrus Diaconus in 519, by Cresconius, an African bishop, towards the end of the sixth century, and by all, who have had occasion to mention them since that time.

The same year died St. Palladius, the first bishop of Ireland. He belonged to the Roman church, and had been sent by Celestine some years before into Britain, to stop the progress of the Pelagian heresy in this island. From Britain he had passed over into Ireland;* and, having converted there some of the inhabitants, he returned to Rome, to beg of Celestine that a bishop might be sent thither. Celestine complied with his request, ordained him first bishop of Ireland, and sent him back into that island. Thus Prosper, who lived at this very time.[1] The Irish writers tell us, that, finding their countrymen, whose conversion was reserved by Heaven for St. Patrick, very obstinate, he abandoned the island, and died in the country of the Picts, that is, in Scotland, on his return to Rome.[2] His body, indeed, was long worshipped in Scotland; but that is no proof of his having been ever there. *

The same writers tell us that St. Patrick was at Rome, when Celestine received the news of the death of Palladius; and that thereupon he ordained him bishop on the 30th of July, 432, about a year after the ordination of Palladius, whose room he was sent over to supply.[3] But that they are therein mistaken, and that St. Patrick was not ordained till many years after the death of Celestine, I shall show hereafter.

Celestine did not long outlive Palladius; for he died the following year, 432, on the 26th of July, having governed the Roman

[1] Socr. l. 7. c. 29. [2] Mark iv. 24.

[3] See the works of St. Leo, by F. Quesnel, and Du Pin, Biblioth. eccl. t. 3. part 2.

* Prosper writes, that he was sent ad Scotos; whence the Scotch writers conclude him to have been sent into Scotland, and the Scots have long looked upon him as the apostle of their nation. But that he was sent into Ireland, and not into Scotland, is manifest from Prosper's own words. For speaking of Celestine, by whom Palladius was sent into Britain to make head against the Pelagians, while he endeavored, says he, "to maintain the Roman island catholic, he made a barbarous island Christian." (a) The island, therefore, which he made Christian, was a different island from that of Britain; and consequently could not be Scotland. The inhabitants of Ireland began, as early as the fourth century, to be known by the name of Scoti or Scots; so that Scoti and Hiberni were but different names of one and the same people. It is true, that St. Patrick, in such of his writings as have been judged by the critics the most authentic, seems to distinguish the Scoti from the Hiberni: but that distinction is only with respect to merit and rank; for he speaks constantly of the former as men of a superior rank to the latter. And indeed the name Hibernus, though more ancient by many ages than that of Scotus, appears to have been in great contempt among the neighboring nations in St. Patrick's time. (b) The Hiberni were perhaps the mechanics, and the Scoti the gentry, or men who followed more noble professions. By the latter was afterwards founded the kingdom of Scotland. Bollandus is of opinion, that the Hiberni came originally from Britain, and were the first inhabitants of Ireland; and that the Scoti, a more warlike race, come from some other country, subdued the Hiberni, as the Saxons did the Britons. (c)

(a) Prosp in Coll. 410. (b) Boll. 17 Martii.
(c) Boll. ibid.

[1] Prosp. in Coll. c. 41. & chron.

[2] Vid. Boll. 17. Martii.

* The learned archbishop Usher will not allow Palladius to have been the first bishop of Ireland; alleging against that opinion several fragments out of the lives of Irish saints, some of whom are said to have been bishops, and to have converted many of their own countrymen, as early as the middle of the fourth century. (a) From the fragments he produces, I cannot judge of the pieces themselves. But Bollandus, who seems to have perused them, maintains them to be of no earlier a date than the twelfth century; and most of them to be fabulous, which indeed he proves undeniably by several passages quoted from them (b) And can the authority of such pieces invalidate, or indeed any ways affect the authority of Prosper, who tells us in express terms, that Palladius was ordained by Celestine, the first bishop of Ireland? As for what the primate offers to elude the authority of Prosper, it is scarce worthy of notice; namely, that the word primus is not to be found in the edition of that writer by Du Chesne. For it is to be found, as Usher himself owns, in all the other editions, and even in Bede, as well as in every other author, who has copied Prosper's chronicle.

(a) Ush. Brit. eccl. ant. p. 781—794.
(b) Boll. 17 Martii. [3] Id. ibid.

church nine years, ten months, and seventeen days.[1] Both he and Cyril have been sainted, merely in consideration of their extraordinary feats against Nestorius, and those who adhered to him; for cruelty to heretics was now a cardinal virtue, capable of atoning for the greatest crimes. As for Cyril, he had no better title to that honour than the monk Ammonius, whom he sainted, and publicly commended as a holy martyr, because he died on the rack for having attempted, at the head of five hundred riotous monks, to assassinate, and dangerously wounded, Orestes, the governor of Alexandria, in a quarrel between him and Cyril.* Celestine was buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, where he is said to have caused the history of the council of

[1] Prosp. ann. 432.

(*) "The bishops of Alexandria had begun," says Socrates, (*a*) "to exceed the limits of the ecclesiastical power, and intermeddle in civil affairs, imitating therein the bishop of Rome, whose sacred authority had long since been changed into dominion and empire." The governors of Alexandria, looking upon the increase of the episcopal power, as a diminution of the civil, watched all opportunities of mortifying the bishops, in order to restrain them within the limits of the spiritual, and prevent their encroaching on the temporal jurisdiction. But Cyril, from the very beginning of his episcopacy, bid defiance to the civil power, acting in such manner as showed but too plainly, that he would be kept within no bounds. For soon after his installation, he caused, by his own authority, the churches, which the Novatians were allowed to have in Alexandria, to be shut up, seized on the sacred utensils, and plundering the house of their bishop, Theopemptus, drove him out of the city, stripped of every thing he possessed. (*b*) Not long after, the Jews, who were very numerous in Alexandria, having one night treacherously murdered several Christians there, Cyril next morning, by break of day, put himself at the head of the Christian mob, and without the knowledge of the governor took possession of the synagogue, drove the Jews out of Alexandria, pillaged their houses, and allowed the Christians who were concerned with him in the riot, to appropriate to themselves all their effects. This the governor highly resented, and not only rebuked Cyril very severely for thus entrenching on his jurisdiction, and usurping a power that did not become him, but wrote to the emperor, complaining of him for snatching the sword of justice from him, to put it into the hands of the undiscerning multitude. This occasioned a misunderstanding, or rather an avowed enmity, between Cyril and Orestes. With the former sided the clergy, the greater part of the mob, and the monks; with the latter the soldiery, and the better sort of the citizens. As the two parties were strangely animated against each other, there happened daily skirmishes in the streets of Alexandria. For the Alexandrians, as Socrates observes, (*c*) and is well known, were of all people the most seditious and ungovernable. The friends of the governor, generally speaking, made their party good, having the soldiery on their side. But one day as Orestes was going out in his chariot, attended by his guards, he found himself very unexpectedly surrounded by no fewer than five hundred monks come from the mountains of Nitria. The monks were, in those days, the standing army of the bishops; but are now of the popes alone, who being sensible how serviceable such a formidable corps might prove to the apostolic see, not only against the laity, but the bishops themselves, exempted them from their jurisdiction, and made them immediately dependent on themselves. But of the monkish orders, their founders and institutions, I shall speak at length on occasion of their being first taken by the popes into their service. The Nitrian monks in the service of Cyril having surrounded the governor's chariot, first dispersed, with several volleys of stones, the small guard that attended it, then falling upon him, dangerously wounded him, and seemed determined to put an end to the quarrel between him and Cyril, by putting an end to his life. But the citizens, alarmed at his danger, flew to his rescue, put the cowardly monks to flight at their first appearance, and having seized on the monk Ammonius, by whom Orestes had been wounded, delivered him into his hands. The governor, to deter others from the like attempts, and to mortify Cyril, whom he well knew to be at the bottom of the plot, caused the monk to be tortured with so much severity that he expired on the rack. But Cyril, partly out of spite to the governor, and partly to reward the zeal which the monks had exerted in attempting to assassinate his antagonist, caused him to be honored as a holy martyr, under the name of Thaumasius, being himself ashamed to pay him that honor under the name of Ammonius. (*a*)

(*a*) Socr. l. 7. c. 7. (*b*) Id. ibid.
(*c*) Socr. l. 7. c. 13.

The partisans of Cyril, alike mortified and enraged at the death of Ammonius, resolved, at all events, to revenge it; and the person they singled out among the friends of Orestes to wreak their rage and revenge on, was one, who, of all the inhabitants of that populous city, deserved it the least. This was the famous and so much celebrated Hypatia, the wonder of her age for beauty, virtue, and knowledge. She kept a public school of philosophy in Alexandria, where she was born; and her reputation was so great, that not only disciples flocked from all parts to hear her, but the greatest philosophers used to consult her, as an oracle, with respect to the most intricate and abstruse points of astronomy, geometry, and the Platonic philosophy, which she was particularly well versed in. (*b*) Though she was very beautiful, and freely conversed with men of all ranks, yet those she conversed with were so awed by her known virtue and modesty, that none, but one of her own disciples, ever presumed to show in her presence the least symptom of passion or tenderness; and him she soon cured. (*c*) Orestes entertained the highest opinion of her abilities, often consulted her, as the other governors had done before him, and in all perplexed cases governed himself by her advice. As she was the person in Alexandria whom he most valued, and in whose company he took the greatest delight, the friends of Cyril, to wound him in the most tender and sensible part, entered into a conspiracy to destroy the innocent lady, and by her death deprive him of that comfort. This barbarous resolution being taken, as she was one day returning home in her chariot, a band of the dregs of the people, encouraged and headed by one of Cyril's ecclesiastics named Peter, attacked her in her chariot, pulled her violently out of it, and throwing her on the ground, dragged her to the great church called Cæsareum. There they stripped her naked, and with sharp tiles, either brought with them, or found there, continued cutting, mangling, and tearing her flesh, she bearing it with the greatest firmness and constancy, till nature yielding to pain, she expired under their hands. Her death did not satisfy their rage and fury. They tore her body in pieces, dragged her mangled limbs, with a thousand outrages, through all the streets of Alexandria, and then, gathering them together, burned them in a place called Cineron. (*d*) Such was the end of the famous Hypatia, the most learned person of the age she lived in, and one of the best, though not a Christian. Who could believe Christians, nay, ecclesiastics, not to say bishops, capable, in those early times, of such barbarities? The account which I have given from Socrates of the tragical end of Hypatia, is confirmed by Damascius in his life of Isidorus, the philosopher, written towards the end of the present century. (*e*) He makes Cyril the author of that barbarous murder. But Damascius, say Du Pin and Tillemont, was a pagan, and therefore deserves no credit. I wish it could not be made out so easily as it may, that, though a pagan, he deserves to be credited on this occasion. The mob was headed, in perpetrating that horrid murder, by one of Cyril's ecclesiastics; and I do not find, that he was ever punished, or even reprimanded, by his bishop, on that score. When the emperor was first acquainted by Orestes, with what had happened, he expressed the greatest indignation, and a firm resolution to punish the offenders with the utmost severity. But Edesius, a deacon of the church of Alexandria, who resided at Constantinople, with the character of Cyril's nuncio, having gained over the

(*a*) Socr. l. 7. c. 14.
(*b*) Soc. ibid. Theophan. p. 70, 71. Suid. p. 976, 977.
(*c*) Socr. et Suid. ibid. (*d*) Socr. l. 7. c. 14.
(*e*) Suid. p. 977.

Sixtus chosen. First a friend, and afterwards an inveterate enemy, of the semi-Pelagians. He approves and receives the council of Ephesus. He strives to reconcile the oriental and Egyptian bishops. In the year 433, the emperor interposes his authority.

Ephesus to be painted.[1] In the year 820, pope Pascal I. caused his body to be translated to the church of St. Praxedes. And it is still worshipped both there and in the cathedral of Mantua.[2]

Thus far the history of the popes has been merely ecclesiastical, and therefore less entertaining: but the affairs of the church will begin very soon to be so interwoven with those of the state, as to render the history both ecclesiastical and civil. The popes will soon make a very different figure from that which they have hitherto made; no longer mere bishops, but bishops and princes; and the bishop almost entirely lost in the prince; no longer contending only with their colleagues for spiritual power and jurisdiction, but, at the same time, with the greatest monarchs for dominion and empire; nay, employing the sword as well as the keys, and heading, as directed by their ambition or interest, both councils and armies. We shall see the western empire utterly extinct, and Italy successively invaded, and partly held by the Heruli, by the Goths, by the Greeks, the Lombards, the French, the Italians, the Germans, and the Normans; and the popes managing their affairs, in all these revolutions, with so much art and address, as to reap, from most of them, some considerable advantage for themselves. Events more interesting, though, in reality, not more important, than those which the present volume relates; and which, to the very end of this history, will be succeeded by others, equally proper to excite the attention even of such readers as seek for amusement alone.

SIXTUS III. FORTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

THEODOSIUS II. VALENTINIAN III.

[Year of Christ, 432.] Upon the death of Celestine, Sixtus, the third of that name, was chosen, with one consent, in his room.[1] He was by birth a Roman, the son of one Sixtus, and in 418, a presbyter of the Roman church.[2] At first he favored the Pelagians; but, changing sentiments, upon their being condemned by Zosimus, he became a most inveterate enemy and persecutor of all who professed that doctrine, insomuch that his zeal seemed to exceed all bounds, even to St. Austin,[3] who was at the head of the anti-Pelagian party, and not at all remarkable for his moderation. In the year 430, he wrote a long letter to Nestorius, exhorting him to yield to Cyril, as the only means of averting the evils, that were ready to fall on him.[1] But Nestorius was already too far engaged in the dispute to follow his advice. Soon after his election he wrote to Maximus, who had been raised to the see of Constantinople, in the room of Nestorius, and to several other bishops in the east to let them know, that he approved and received the council of Ephesus.[2]

He spared no pains to reconcile the oriental and Egyptian bishops. The former, under John of Antioch, would not own Nestorius to have held heretical doctrines, or to have been lawfully deposed; and the latter, under Cyril, peremptorily insisted on their condemning him as a heretic, and signing his deposition. It must be observed, that the orientals did not maintain the doctrine that was ascribed to Nestorius, but only that Nestorius held no such doctrine: so that it was a question de facto, and not de jure, that kept the contending parties thus divided. Sixtus wrote a circular letter to the orientals, exhorting them to peace and concord: but as peace and concord were only to be purchased by signing the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius, his exhortations had not the desired effect.[3] At last Theodosius, who was a weak and bigotted prince, ascribing the bad success of his arms in Africa to his neglect in procuring the tranquillity of the church, thought himself obliged to interpose his authority. He wrote accordingly to the heads of the two parties,

ministers, with the large sums that were remitted to him, (not by the mob, or the ecclesiastic who headed them, for he was only a reader), the emperor was not only appeased, but prevailed upon to grant a general pardon to all who were concerned in that riot. (*a*) But, by pardoning them, he drew down vengeance from Heaven upon himself, says the historian, and was deservedly punished in the persons of those who were most dear to him. (*b*) He alludes, perhaps, to the unhappy end of Valentinian III. his cousin and son-in-law, who was murdered on the 17th of March, 455, and to the misfortunes which the whole imperial family was involved in after his death.

The church of Rome, which has sainted this man, may think herself concerned in honor to justify all his proceedings; but surely the church of England is not. I shall not, therefore, attempt such a vindication; but having truly and faithfully related the facts from a contemporary historian, shall leave the character of Cyril to be judged of from them, and content myself with wishing, that one, whose zeal for the Christian religion was sometimes meritorious, had better understood the true bounds of that zeal, and the true spirit of that religion, than he appears to have done upon many occasions.

(*a*) Suid. p. 977. Socr. ibid. (*b*) Socr. ibid.

[1] Anast. p. 547. [2] Boll. Apr. 6.

[1] Prosp. chron. monum. eccl. Græc. per Cotel. t. 2. p. 44, 45.

[2] Prosp. in Coll. c. 44. [3] Aug. ep. 191.

[1] Gennad. c. 54. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1178.

[3] Cotel. ibid.

John of Antioch and Cyril at last reconciled. The orientals divided among themselves, some of them adhering to their patriarch, and some to Nestorius. The latter wrote to Sixtus in favor of Nestorius. The patriarch of Antioch recurs to the secular power. Some bishops comply with the imperial edicts, and condemn Nestorius.

John of Antioch, and Cyril, commanding the former to anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius, and sign his deposition; and the latter to anathematize his own anathemas against Nestorius. John obeyed with great reluctance: Cyril would not retract a syllable of what he had said or written, during the dispute. However, he condescended, in the end, to explain such of his propositions as had given most offence. With that explanation John was, or pretended to be satisfied, and the communion between him and Cyril was renewed.[1]

The conduct of John was highly commended by some of his party, but no less blamed by others. The former, finding Cyril unalterably bent on the ruin of Nestorius, thought it would be no crime to sacrifice one man to the public welfare, and the tranquillity of the church. But the latter, not casuists enough to think evil might be done, that good might come, could on no consideration be prevailed upon to abandon Nestorius, or own him guilty: nay, looking upon their patriarch as a betrayer of the common cause, they met at Anazarbus, in Cilicia, and there not only excommunicated anew, and deposed Cyril; but with great solemnity pronounced the same sentence against all who communicated with him. Having thus revolted from their own patriarch, they wrote to Sixtus, giving him a particular account of the irregular proceedings of the council of Ephesus, clearing Nestorius from the calumnies of his enemies, charging Cyril with heretical and impious doctrines, and censuring, in the sharpest terms, John of Antioch, for communicating with him, without requiring him to condemn the doctrine for which he had cut him off from his communion. This letter was signed by the bishops of Syria Euphratensis, of the two Cilicias, of Bithynia, Thessaly, and Mœsia;[2] so that many bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, though abandoned by their patriarch, still continued to adhere to Nestorius, and thinking him unjustly condemned, stood up in defence of his innocence. The answer of Sixtus to this letter has not reached our times; but we may well suppose it to have been entirely agreeable to those which he wrote soon after his election, to John and Cyril, commending them for sacrificing their private animosities to the public tranquillity, and approving their agreement, as well as the terms, on which they had agreed.[3]

The patriarch of Antioch, greatly concerned to see his authority thus scorned, and set at nought, by those of his own patriarchate, wrote several letters to the refractory bishops, striving to convince them, that Nestorius had been justly deposed: but, finding that his arguments and reasons were of no greater weight with them than his authority and example, he had recourse in the end to more effectual means of convincing, penal laws, and imperial edicts. Accordingly, at his request, two edicts were enacted, commanding all the bishops to be driven from their sees, and sent into exile, who should refuse to communicate with the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, or to sign the condemnation of Nestorius. As these edicts were executed with the utmost severity, most bishops complied. But Alexander of Hierapolis, metropolitan of Syria Euphratensis, and Eutherius of Tyana,* two of the most eminent pre-

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 1087. Liberat. c. 8.
[2] Concil. append. per Balus. p. 810—820.
[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 1177. Vincen. Lirin. Common. c. 43.

* He wrote an excellent treatise, which has long passed under the name of St. Athanasius, and was by Photius ascribed to Theodoret, but is quoted by Marius Mercator, who lived at this very time, as the work of Eutherius. In that piece the author first enumerates the many evils that were ready to fall upon those of his party; evils capable, as he expresses it, of affording a no less copious subject for lamentations than those which the prophet Jeremiah formerly complained of. As it was urged against him, that Nestorius had been condemned by almost all the bishops of the catholic church, he alleges several instances to prove, that the many have often erred, that truths have been often maintained, and supported, by the few; adding, that numbers may indeed frighten, but cannot convince; that in receiving or rejecting a doctrine, we ought not to be swayed by the number, or by the authority, of those who have rejected or received it before us, but merely by the number or strength of those reasons on which it is grounded; that a majority is not always owing to conviction, but often to selfish and worldly motives, and therefore, in most cases, deserves very little regard, if any at all; that, in the present case, many have adhered to Nestorius, and thought him orthodox, till, recourse being had to the secular power, they found that they must either condemn him as a heretic, or be driven from their sees into exile. Were we to inquire what the majority has been owing to in most councils, we should find that it was not to conviction, but to very different motives. And yet, in the church of Rome, all are bound, on pain of damnation, to believe that doctrine, which has the majority on its side. It is this principle that Eutherius undertakes to confute, in the first part of his work, as inconsistent both with reason and facts. In the second part he answers, with great sense and learning, the reasons that some alleged to deter people from reading the scripture; and the very same as those which are still alleged by the Roman catholics for the same purpose. But Eutherius fully answers them, by showing, that whoever reads the scripture with due humility and attention, will there discover all that is necessary for him to know: that the scripture is the standard of our faith; and that such as dissuade men from so useful a study, can have nothing else in view but to prevent, by that means, a discovery of the errors they teach. Eutherius, throughout the whole work, speaks like a true protestant; and, upon protestant principles, rejects the opposite errors. From what he writes, it appears, that about this time, the study of the scripture first began to be publicly discountenanced; so that we need not wonder, if, in this and the following centuries, we shall see truth almost entirely banished from the church, and error, attended by the most superstitious and idolatrous practices, introduced in its room, and every where reigning, without control, till the time of the reformation, when the study of the scripture was again countenanced and revived. The remaining part of this treatise Eutherius employs in clearing the orientals from the errors that they were charged with by the Egyptians, who adhered to Cyril, and in combatting the expressions used by him, and those who followed him. Eutherius was deposed, and confined to Scythopolis in Palæstine, but removed from thence

Some bishops refuse to comply with the edicts and are banished. The troubles composed at last. The letter from Sixtus to the eastern bishops a mere forgery. The bishops of Illyricum attempt, in vain, to withdraw themselves from all subjection to Rome. Churches said to have been repaired or enriched by him.

lates at that time in the church, chose rather to lose their sees, than to keep them at the expense of their consciences. Alexander was admired and revered for his piety and learning, even by the most sanguine of the opposite party, who therefore left nothing unattempted to gain him over: but he was so fully convinced of the innocence of Nestorius, and the malice of Cyril, that neither his friends could prevail upon him with exhortations, nor his enemies with threats, to anathematize the one, or communicate with the other, nay, he used to say, that if the dead should all rise up, and advise him to admit Cyril to his communion, he would reject their advice with scorn, and still look upon him as a heretic, unworthy of the catholic communion.[1] Twelve more maintained, to the last, the same sentiments; but they being deposed, and others more compliant ordained in their room, the doctrine, or rather the expressions of Cyril, were universally received, and made catholic; those of Nestorius were universally rejected, and he was condemned as a broacher of heresy. Thus were the troubles, occasioned by the quarrel between the orientals and Egyptians, composed at last, and the church restored to her former tranquillity, which, however, was but short-lived, as we shall soon see.

A long letter from Sixtus III. to the eastern bishops, establishing several of the papal prerogatives, has been long received as genuine, and is quoted by Bellarmine,[2] to prove, that councils ought to be called by none but the pope, Sixtus saying there, "The emperor Valentinian has summoned a council by our authority." But that letter is wholly made up of passages borrowed from the VIIIth council of Toledo, from Gregory the Great, from Felix III. from Adrian, and from the Theodosian and Justinian codes; and therefore evidently supposititious. Sixtus is supposed to have written it on occasion of his having cleared himself before a council, from the charge of debauching a sacred virgin. But the acts of that council are so manifestly fabulous, that even Binius and Baronius have been forced to give them up, though the emperor Valentinian, whom the acts suppose to have assisted at the council, is there said to have referred the pronouncing of the sentence to the pope himself, "because the judge of all ought to be judged by none." It was, without all doubt, to establish this maxim, that the acts of this council were forged, as well as those of the famous council of Sinuessa, which I have spoken of elsewhere.[1] As for the charge brought against Sixtus, it is indeed vouched by Anastasius and Platina, and those who have copied them, but not by any more ancient, or more credible writer.(*)

In the time of Sixtus the bishops of Illyricum made several attempts towards the recovery of their ancient liberty. They had borne the yoke ever since the pontificate of Damasus;[2] but as it grew daily more galling, they resolved in the end to shake it off, pleading a decree of the late council of Ephesus, by which it was enacted, that no bishop should claim or exercise any kind of authority or jurisdiction over provinces, which had not been from the beginning subject to his see. Sixtus wrote on this occasion three letters;(†) and, partly by menaces, partly by exhortations, prevailed upon the Illyrican bishops, unwilling to raise new disturbances in the church, to acquiesce, though the above-mentioned decree had been signed by all the bishops of the council of Ephesus, and even by the legates of his immediate predecessor.[3]

Sixtus is said to have built or repaired some churches, and to have enriched others with magnificent presents.[4] Pope Nicolas IV. pretends, that he distinguished the church of St. Mary the Greater with perpetual indulgences.[5] But it is certain, that the name of indulgence, as that word is now commonly understood, was not known in his time, nor many ages after. Three small treatises have long passed under the name of Sixtus;[6] but if they are really his, they must have been written before Pelagius and Cælestius were condemned by Zosimus; for the author, whoever he was, betrays a great bias to their doctrine.

to Tyre, where he died.(a) His treatise, which every protestant must read with pleasure, is to be found in the second volume of the works of St. Athanasius, under the name of that father, and in the fifth volume of the works of Theodoret, published by Father Garnier.

(a) Concil. append. p. 886.

[1] Lup. divers. epist. c. 148.

[2] Bell. de Concil. l. 2. c. 12.

[1] See pp. 38, 39.

(*) To the acts of this council are commonly added, those of the judgment supposed to have been given at Rome, on occasion of an appeal, made to that see, by one Polychronius, said to have been bishop of Jerusalem, and to have appealed from the judgment of his colleagues in the east, to that of the bishop of Rome. The acts of this judgment too have been long received as genuine, and often quoted to prove, that the power of receiving appeals, claimed by the popes, has been acknowledged even by the eastern bishops; nay, one of the popes, Nicolas I. appeals to them as genuine, in a letter, which he wrote to the emperor Michael. And yet that they are a mere forgery, may be as easily as evidently made to appear. For that judgment is supposed to have been given while the emperor Valentinian was the seventh time consul with Avienus, that is, no fewer than eleven years after the death of Sixtus. Besides, it is manifest from the acts of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, that Juvenalis assisted at both as bishop of Jerusalem; and the first of these two councils was held a year before the election of Sixtus, and the latter eleven years after his death; so that Polychronius was not bishop of Jerusalem in his time: it may be even questioned whether there ever was a bishop of Jerusalem bearing that name; at least I can find none in the catalogues of the bishops of that city, that have been handed down to us.

[2] See pp. 104, 105.

(†) One of these letters is dated the 8th of July, 435, the other the 18th of December, 437, the third bears no date.

[3] Cotel. ubi supra, p. 88. 90. Concil. t. 4. p. 115. 117.

[4] Bar. ad ann. 440. n. 5. [5] Bolland. 28 Martii, p. 16.

[6] Biblioth. Patr. t. 5. p. 573, 656.

Sixtus dies. Leo, before his election, archdeacon of the Roman church. Employed with success in affairs of great moment. Chosen while absent in Gaul. He applies himself, with great zeal, to the functions of his office. His sermons. His letters. He extends the law of celibacy, to the subdeacons.

Sixtus died in the year 440, and on the 18th of August, if he governed, as Prosper writes, eight years and nineteen days. He was buried according to Anastasius, in the church of St. Laurence, called "in Lucina," which he had built; and is now honored by the church of Rome as a saint, on account, perhaps, of his having supported, against the bishops of Illyricum, the claims and pretensions of his see; for I know of no other extraordinary merit that could have entitled him to that honor.

LEO, (THE GREAT,) FORTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[THEODOSIUS II. VALENTINIAN III. MARCIAN, AVITUS, MAXIMUS, MAJORIANUS, LEO THRACIUS.]

[Year of Christ, 440.] Leo, surnamed the Great, was a native of Rome,[1] and not of Volterra, in Tuscany, as the pontificals make him; the son of one Quinctianus, and, at the time of his election, archdeacon of the Roman church. When Sixtus died, he was absent in Gaul, whither he had been sent, either by Sixtus or Valentinian, to make up a difference between the famous Aetius, the greatest general of his time, and a lord in that country, of great interest and power, named Albinus. As the western empire was then at the lowest ebb, being overrun by the Goths, the Burgundians, the Franks, and the Hunns, and governed by Placidia, and her son Valentinian III. a youth of no experience, and very slender parts, it was apprehended, that a misunderstanding between these two great men might be attended with fatal consequences: and to prevent them Leo was pitched upon as a man of all others the most capable, by reason of his eloquence and address, of succeeding in such a negotiation. He succeeded accordingly; Aetius and Albinus were reconciled, the apprehension of the evils, that their disagreement was likely to produce, was removed, to the great satisfaction of Valentinian and Placidia, and Leo honored by both as the angel of peace, as the deliverer of the empire.[2] When Sixtus died, he was chosen, though at so great a distance from Rome, with one consent to succeed him, no one presuming to stand in competition with a man of his reputation and merit. Upon his return to Rome, which happened six weeks after his election, he was received by the people and clergy, with the greatest demonstrations of joy, and ordained the Sunday following, the 29th of September, 440.[3]

From the very beginning he applied himself wholly to the functions of his office, instructing the people committed to his care by his sermons, and the rest of the Christian world by his letters. He thought the preaching of the word the indispensable duty of every bishop, and more especially of the bishop of Rome.[1] But that duty has been, long since, almost entirely neglected by the popes as well as by the other Roman catholic bishops, among whom there are very few who ever preach, or think it, as Leo did, a part of their duty to preach. He preached ninety-six sermons that have reached our times, of which thirty-two are on the fast of the ember weeks, and twelve on that of lent. He is the first who mentions the former fast, and the institution of it he ascribes to Moses, pretending, in opposition to the unanimous decision of the apostles, in the council of Jerusalem, that the Jewish precepts, with respect to fasts, and several other practices, are binding under the Gospel dispensation:[2] and it is upon this erroneous, or rather heretical principle, that he excludes those from orders who had married widows.[3]

Of the many letters he wrote 141 are still extant entire; and the fragments of several others, calculated, for the most part, to revive the ancient discipline, and banish the many abuses that had crept into the church; but he also enjoined some things not warranted by the ancients, and undoubtedly contrary to the terms of the Gospel. In a letter which he wrote, about the year 442, to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne, he extends the law of celibacy to the subdeacons, who nevertheless were not to abandon the wives they had married, while in the inferior degrees, but, changing the carnal into a spiritual marriage, live with them not as wives, but as sisters.[4] This law however did not universally obtain, even in the suburbicarian provinces, till long after Leo's time; nay, some of his successors, and among the rest, Gregory the Great, thought it very hard that subdeacons should be debarred from all commerce with the wives they had married, or even from marrying.[5] The contrary practice prevailed in Gaul, even in Leo's time, as appears, from the canons of the first council of Orange; of the second of Arles, and of that of Angers, only forbidding deacons to marry. In the same letter Leo

[1] Prosp. chron.
[2] Idem ad ann. 441. Leo serm. 1.
[3] Leo ep. 16. c. 7.

[1] Leo serm. 1.
[2] Idem serm. 16.
[3] Serm. 19.
[4] Leo ep. 2.
[5] Greg. l. 2. Regist. ep. 42.

Leo quarrels with Hilarius of Arles. Occasion of this quarrel. Celidonius deposed in Gaul, appeals to Leo. Leo admits him to his communion. Hilarius repairs to Rome. He speaks, with great liberty, to Leo. Consents to hear Celidonius, in the presence of Leo. His behavior on that occasion, how represented by Leo. Leo causes him to be seized.

declares, that it is no sin for a clerk to give his daughter in marriage to a man that keeps a concubine, nor for the woman, whom he marries, to live with him; and that a man, who quits his concubine to live with his wife, is not guilty of adultery. The concubines spoken of here, were slaves whom their masters lived with, as with their wives, without having any commerce with other women; and it was doubted, it seems, in those days, whether their agreeing to live thus together, might not be deemed a true marriage.

The letter which Leo wrote in 445, to the bishops of the province of Vienne, is no less remarkable, than the occasion on which it was written. Celidonius, bishop of Besanzon, being accused of having formerly married a widow, and sentenced some criminals to death, while, being yet a layman, he exercised the office of a judge; Hilarius, bishop of Arles, and exarch of the seven provinces of Narbonne, a most strict observer of the ecclesiastical discipline, as established by the canons, assembled a council, and the charge being proved by several persons of great distinction, and other unexceptionable witnesses, Celidonius was deposed by the unanimous consent of all the bishops, who composed the assembly, and another ordained in his room. From this sentence, which was, no doubt, agreeable to the canons, he appealed to Leo, and, repairing to Rome, complained there of his having been unjustly condemned and deposed: the predecessors of Leo had, but very lately, met with such a check from the African bishops, in pursuing their pretended right of receiving appeals, as had obliged them to give over, or rather to suspend that pursuit;[1] which, one would think, might have deterred Leo from engaging in a like dispute with the Gallican bishops: but he, no less intent than the most ambitious of his predecessors, on the great object, which they all had in view, the exaltation of his see, readily embraced the opportunity that offered, of sounding the disposition of the Gallican bishops, and trying whether he might not, in the same attempt, meet with better success in Gaul, than Zosimus and Celestine had lately met with in Africa. With this view, he not only received Celidonius with great demonstrations of kindness, but admitted him to his communion; nay, and allowed him, in defiance of the judgment given against him in Gaul, to exercise the functions of his office in Rome: but he found the prelates in those parts no less jealous of their just rights and liberties, no less upon their guard, against all papal encroachments, than the most zealous among the Africans. Hilarius had presided at the council, and therefore, thinking it chiefly incumbent upon him, to oppose the irregular proceedings of Leo, and maintain the sentence pronounced by the council, he no sooner heard of the reception Celidonius had met with at Rome, than he set out, on foot, for that city; and, performing on foot the whole journey, though it was then in the depth of winter, he equally surprised both Leo and Celidonius with his unexpected arrival. Being introduced to Leo, after he had visited the tombs of the apostles and martyrs, he addressed him with all the respect that was due to the bishop of the first city; but, at the same time, with all the liberty of one, who, in every other respect, thought himself his equal: he acquainted him with the motives of his journey; complained of the reception he had given to Celidonius, who had been deposed in Gaul, and yet was allowed to discharge all episcopal functions in Rome; begged he would govern according to the approved and received rules of the church, and redress, at least by a private order, such an open violation of the canons. He added, that if he thought his complaints just, it was to be hoped, he would take care to have the evil speedily removed, on which they were founded; if he did not, that he should give him no farther trouble, not being come to Rome, to engage in a dispute, but only to pay his respects to him; to inform him of the truth; and to beg he would maintain inviolate the canons of the church, and suffer himself to be governed by them alone.[1]

Though Hilarius had declared, that he was not come to Rome to engage in a dispute, which was, in effect, declaring that he did not acknowledge, in Leo, the power of receiving appeals, or re-examining a cause determined elsewhere; yet he consented to hear, in the presence of Leo, and some other bishops, what Celidonius had to offer against the judgment passed upon him by the Gallican bishops. We know but very little of what was said, on either side, at that interview: and that little we know only from Leo, who assures us, that Hilarius behaved with great insolence; that in the transport of his passion, he uttered things, that no layman would have uttered, and no bishop could hear; that he himself, was greatly concerned to see a bishop thus exposing himself, and degrading his character, but bore the whole with great patience.[2] Had Hilarius given us an account of what had passed on that occasion, he had probably told us a different story; at least, the subsequent conduct of Leo leaves great room to question his boasted forbearance and patience; for, upon the breaking up of the conference, without any regard to a man of Hilarius' dignity and character, he caused him to be seized and kept under arrest;[3] an instance of violence, which Rome had not yet seen with respect to a bishop, and in matters,

[1] See p. 167, et seq.

[1] Leonis op. per Quesnel, t. 1. p. 744—754.
[2] Leo ep. 10. c. 3. [3] Leon. op. t. 1. p. 744.

Hilarius escapes from Rome, and returns to Gaul. Leo's irregular and passionate conduct on this occasion. He cuts Hilarius off from his communion. And strives to discredit him among the Gallican bishops. What crimes laid by Leo to his charge. Leo maliciously represents some of his actions.

not of faith, but only of discipline. From Leo's own account it appears, that the insolent behavior, which he complained of in Hilarius, consisted merely in his maintaining, with the freedom that became him, the liberties of the Gallican church; in his opposing the encroachments of Leo; and in refusing to acknowledge his pretended right of judging at Rome a cause, which had been already judged in Gaul: for, giving an account of what happened in that interview, he taxes Hilarius with refusing to submit to St. Peter, and acknowledge the primacy of the Roman church;[1] as if the primacy included the power of receiving appeals, which it certainly did not, since all the western bishops owned the primacy at this very time, and not one of them such a power.

Leo, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Hilarius, appointed a day for examining, and judging anew, the cause of Celidonius: but before the appointed day came, Hilarius, that he might not be obliged to appear, or be any ways accessory to such irregular proceedings, found means to escape from his guards, and travelling through by-roads, after a most painful journey, arrived safe at Arles. Leo was so provoked at his escape, that, out of pique to him, he immediately annulled the judgment of the council, at which he had presided, declared Celidonius unlawfully deposed, cleared him from the charge of having ever married a widow, though proved by a great number of unexceptionable witnesses, and restored him to his former dignity.[2] He did not stop here; but in the height of his resentment declared Hilarius cut off from the communion of the apostolic see; deprived him of all jurisdiction over the seven provinces; suspended him from ordaining any bishop, or even assisting at the ordination of any; and, to be more fully revenged on him, utterly suppressed the dignity of exarch, annexed to the see of Arles.[3] Such treatment did the best of men meet with from the bishops of Rome; when, prompted by zeal for the welfare of the church, and the observance of her laws, they attempted to check their lawless ambition and encroachments. Leo carried his resentments against Hilarius still farther; for, in order to discredit him among the bishops of his own diocess, who looked upon him as a true pattern of every Christian virtue, he wrote the letter, which I have mentioned above, well calculated for that purpose, but altogether unworthy of a man of Leo's character and reputation: for, giving an entire credit to every malicious report he had heard, to the prejudice of that excellent prelate, he inveighs against him in the most bitter terms, as one, who was a disgrace to the episcopal order, and therefore deserved to be deprived, not only of the power and jurisdiction, which he had wantonly abused, but of the dignity itself. To read Leo's letter, so long as he speaks in general terms, one would conclude the bishop of Arles to have been guilty of the blackest crimes; but when he descends to particulars, it plainly appears, that his only crime was, his rebellion against St. Peter, and his not acknowledging the primacy of his see, that is, his not suffering, out of respect to St. Peter, his pretended successors to exercise a despotic and tyrannical dominion over the churches committed to his care: for the only things he charges him with, are, his having ordained some bishops against their will;* his taking delight in condemning bishops, and excommunicating laymen; his performing the journey, when he visited the diocess, with a quickness and expedition ill becoming the gravity of a bishop. From Leo's words we should conclude, that he rode post, were we not assured, by the author of his life, that he never travelled otherwise than on foot: but the charge against Hilarius, on which Leo lays the greatest stress, is his having ordained a new bishop, in the room of one of his suffragans, named Projectus, who indeed lay dangerously ill, and, as was thought, past recovery, but nevertheless recovered, and was re-established, or rather confirmed, in the possession of his see.[1] Of this remarkable transaction not the least mention is made by Honoratus, bishop of Marseilles, who was one of the disciples of Hilarius, and wrote his life. But, allowing the fact to be true, many circumstances, unknown to us, might have concurred to justify the conduct of Hilarius on that occasion. As Leo does not reproach him with performing that ordination alone, or without the consent and approbation of the other bishops of the same province, which, as both were commanded by the canons, he would certainly have done, had Hilarius failed in either, we may well suppose two bishops more, at least, to have been present, and the rest to have concurred with their suffrages; and that I can hardly think they would have done, but on a very urgent occasion, such an occasion as sufficiently justified the breach of the canon forbidding two bishops to be ordained for one and the same see. However, that breach Leo, blind with passion and prejudice, studies to exaggerate into an unpardonable crime, maliciously suppressing, in order to set it out in the worse light, the material circumstance of the dangerous malady, or rather approaching death, as was apprehended, of Projectus: I said maliciously, because Leo could not be unapprised of that circumstance.

[1] Leon. ep. 10. c. 7.
[2] Leon. op. t. 2. p. 744. et ep. 10. c. 3. et 7.
[3] Concil. t. 3. p. 1400. Leo ep. 9. et 10.

(*) This practice obtained in several places, and was never before found fault with. St. Austin writes, that in Africa, when men of eminent parts and virtue declined the episcopal dignity, to which they had been named by the people and clergy, they were even kept in prison till they accepted it. (a)

[1] Leo ep. 10. (a) Aug. ep. 173.

Leo sacrifices truth to the exaltation of his see. He applies to the emperor, of whom he obtains a rescript, establishing his authority in Gaul. What required of the Gallican bishops by that rescript. This rescript no proof of the pope's authority over the Gallican church.

In the same letter he employs the whole force of his eloquence in displaying the privileges, and magnifying the authority, of the apostolic see, roundly asserting that, upon appeals from Gaul, his predecessors had frequently reversed or confirmed judgments given there. It were to be wished he had alleged one instance at least to confirm so bold an assertion; but that was more than was in his power to do, Celidonius being the first Gallican bishop who ever thought of appealing from the judgment of his colleagues in Gaul, to that of the bishop of Rome. This Leo could not but know; but probably thought it no crime in so material a point to sacrifice truth to the exaltation of his see.

He was sensible that little regard would be paid to his decrees by the Gallican bishops, to that especially, which suppressed the ex-archate or primacy of Arles. In order therefore to prevent all opposition, and establish at once his authority in Gaul, he resolved to apply to the emperor, and engage in his favor the secular power.[1] Valentinian III. was at this time emperor of the west, a very weak prince, and therefore a fit tool for a man of Leo's craft, ambition, and address. To him therefore he applied, and, having by many false and malicious insinuations strangely prejudiced him against Hilarius, as a disturber of the public peace, nay, as a rebel not only to the authority of the apostolic see, but to the majesty of the empire (for he stuck at nothing), he obtained the famous rescript, vesting the bishops of Rome with an absolute and uncontrolled authority over the Gallican churches and bishops. It was addressed to Aetius, general of the Roman forces in Gaul; and, under pretence of maintaining the peace and tranquillity of the church, Valentinian there requires the Gallican bishops to pay an entire obedience and submission to the orders of the apostolic see; which he supposes (as had been falsely suggested to him by Leo) to have been ever practised till the time of Hilarius; he commands all bishops to hold and observe, as a law, whatever it shall please the bishop of Rome to ordain or decree; and strictly enjoins the magistrates to oblige those, who shall be summoned to Rome, to obey the summons. He adds, that as Leo has a right to command what he pleases, with respect to the discipline of the church, there ought to have been occasion for no other authority but his own, to make all men concur in executing the judgment which he had lately given against Hilarius, whom he styles a traitor, and an enemy both to the church and state, both to Leo and himself; nay, he imputes it to him as a crime, that he had, by a bold and unprecedented attempt, deposed some bishops, and ordained others, without having first consulted the bishop of Rome.[2] From this rescript, which was undoubtedly dictated, if not penned, by Leo, as some have thought, it appears, that, notwithstanding his boasted sanctity, he carried his pretensions much higher than the most ambitious of his predecessors had done; nay, that he aimed at nothing less than to have himself acknowledged as absolute monarch of the whole church. The preceding popes had indeed claimed and exercised a far greater power than was allowed them by the canons; but yet that power they pretended to derive from the canons, as appears from the long dispute between them and the African bishops, with respect to this very point of appeals now disputed by the Gallican bishops.* But Leo, sensible that his views were too extensive to be any ways countenanced by the canons, however misconstrued, had the assurance to command, without any regard to them, "all bishops to observe as a law, whatever it should please the bishop of Rome to command," and at the same time to declare, "That he had a right to command what he pleased;" which was abrogating at once all ecclesiastical laws, substituting his own will in their room, and assuming to himself, by that means, the soul monarchy of the church. His daring to go such a length was owing to the credit he had with the emperor, both before and after his elevation to the popedom, and to the weakness of that prince, which, being well known to him, encouraged him to make an attempt that would have been vain and absurd under one of a different character But throughout his whole papacy he never failed to make the utmost advantage he could of his favor with the emperors both in the west and the east, for the advancement of the see of Rome; and in this his example was followed, with all possible care, by his successors.

The rescript of Valentinian has been often quoted by the advocates for the see of Rome, to prove, that the popes have ever exercised an uncontrolled authority and jurisdiction over the Gallican church. For the emperor, say they, by this rescript, grants no new privilege to the Roman see, but only confirms the practice and custom that had obtained, time out of mind. But the authority of the emperor can be of no weight here, since the emperor believed what Leo told him; and what he told him was certainly false, as I have shown above. It is true, that Celidonius was restored, according to the most probable opinion,[1] and Importunus driven out, who had been ordained by Hilarius in his room. But that was owing to the imperial rescript, not to Leo's decree; for Hilarius, and with him the other Gallican bishops, opposed to the last the papal encroachments, and could never be induced to acknowledge the pretended power in the see of Rome, of receiving appeals, and

[1] Leo ep. 10. [2] Concil. t. 3. p. 1401. Leo ep. 10.

* See p. 170. [1] Chifflet, t. 2. p. 115.

Hilarius strives to appease Leo. He writes to him; and sends deputies to Rome to soften Leo, but all in vain. Auxiliarius employed to mediate a reconciliation. Leo inflexible. Auxiliarius' letter to Hilarius. Hilarius' steadiness. The conduct of Leo repugnant to all principles of morality and religion.

re-examining a cause which they had determined. As for Leo's decree, depriving the church of Arles of its primacy, it has been evidently shown, by a learned critic, that it never took place.[1]

While Leo was using his utmost efforts to bring Hilarius into disgrace with the emperor, and by that means compass his ruin, the holy prelate lay dangerously ill at Arles; and being greatly concerned to see a man of Leo's rank and character abandoning himself thus to passion and revenge, he left nothing unattempted, he could think of, to appease him. He would not indeed yield to his lawless ambition, and, out of a criminal complaisance, give up the just rights and liberties of the church committed to his care and protection, but strove, by all other lawful means, by all kinds of honest submission, to allay his resentment, and bring him to a more Christian temper. He first wrote to Leo, clearing himself, in the most submissive and respectful terms, from the many malicious and groundless aspersions of his enemies, which the pope had credited, without giving himself the trouble to inquire whether they were true or false, and charged him with as real crimes. As Leo did not condescend to answer this letter, the bishop of Arles, actuated by a truly Christian spirit, and mindful of the command of our Saviour,[2] despatched to Rome Ravennius, a man of distinguished merit, at that time one of his presbyters, and afterwards his successor in the see of Arles, hoping, by his means, to remove the prejudices which Leo had imbibed against him. But neither Ravennius, nor the two bishops Nectarius and Constantius, both men of eminent sanctity, whom the metropolitan of Arles sent afterwards, with the character of his legates, to soften Leo, and incline him, if possible, to a reconciliation, could make the least impression on his obstinate mind. He was unalterably bent on having his authority acknowledged by the Gallican church, without limitation, as required by the imperial rescript, and would hearken to no other terms till that was complied with. On the other hand, Hilarius, not caring to purchase the favor of the pope at the expense of his conscience, had strictly enjoined his legates not to agree to any terms that might prove in the least prejudicial to the rights and privileges which they enjoyed by the canons, and of which he looked upon himself as the guardian. With this disposition on either side the legates were soon convinced that it was impossible for them to succeed in their negotiation. However, before they left Rome, they resolved to make one attempt more, and try whether, by the interest of some man in power, they might not prevail upon the pope to relinquish his pretentions, or, at least, to be reconciled to a man, who opposed them, not out of any disrespect to the apostolic see, but merely because he thought them inconsistent with the canons.

Of all the great men at that time in Rome, Auxiliarius seemed to them the most proper to be employed on this occasion. He was prefect of Italy, and had been formerly of Gaul, where he had contracted an intimate friendship with Hilarius, of whose virtue he entertained the highest opinion. To him, therefore, they applied, and he, glad of the opportunity that offered of serving a friend, whom he so much valued, readily took upon him the office of mediator between him and Leo. But his mediation proved unsuccessful; Leo could by no reasons or remonstrances be prevailed upon either to abate of his pretensions, or admit Hilarius to his communion, till he had owned the power, which he said the Roman see had always enjoyed, and the most pious emperors had lately confirmed, that is, an absolute power over all the churches of Gaul. Auxiliarius, grieved to find that his good offices had not answered his expectations and wishes, wrote the following letter to Hilarius, soon after his interview with Leo: "As you look upon all transitory things with an eye of contempt, and are not capable of being elated with joy, when they succeed, or dejected with grief, when they miscarry, I need not, in writing to you, disguise the truth, out of an apprehension of disturbing the tranquillity of your mind." He then acquaints him with the disposition and temper, in which he had found Leo towards him, and adds, "I see not the least appearance of pride or arrogance in the conduct of your holiness; but men cannot bear plain truth, and are offended, if we speak our thoughts freely. The Romans must be courted, and it is only by condescension and complaisance that they are to be gained. Could you bring yourself to that, you would lose nothing, but gain much by it. I therefore beg it as a particular favor, that you would. A little condescension on your side will lay the storm, and restore the wished for tranquillity."[1] Thus Auxiliarius: but as Hilarius was better acquainted than the prefect seems to have been, with the duty and obligations incumbent on a bishop, he thanked him for his advice, but did not embrace it. On the contrary, he continued to the last steady and unalterable in his former resolution, choosing rather to die out of Leo's communion, than be restored to it by yielding up to his ambition the rights and liberties which had been trusted to his care.

The conduct of Leo on this occasion was so remarkably scandalous, so inconsistent with all principles of morality or religion, that the

[1] Quesnel. dissert. prima de S. Hil. c. 8 et 9.
[2] Matt. v. 23, 24.

[1] Concil. t. 3. p. 1401. Leon. op. t. 1. c. 17. p. 714.

church of Rome, which honors him not only as one of her greatest popes, but greatest saints, has thought herself obliged to employ some of her ablest pens to excuse or rather disguise it. But that it was altogether inexcusable, may be easily made to appear: for, in the first place, the bishop of Rome had no kind of right, even by the canons of Sardica,* and much less by those of any other council, to the power which Leo claimed, and at this juncture exercised, over the Gallican church. In the second place, because the bishop of Arles, out of a conscientious regard to the canons and established laws of the church, refused to acknowledge such a power, Leo, upon that provocation alone, giving, or pretending to give, an entire credit to every report he heard to his prejudice, without inquiring whether they were true or false, without leaving him room to clear himself, or allowing any one to speak in his defence, condemned him as guilty, cut him off from his communion, and, depriving him of all authority and jurisdiction, reduced the first bishop of Gaul, so far as in him lay, to the state of a layman. 3dly, In order to compass the ruin of the innocent prelate the more effectually, he applied to the emperor, though he had imputed as a crime to Hilarius his having had recourse, (as he falsely supposed,) in ecclesiastical matters, to the secular power; and, representing him not only as a man of an insufferable pride and presumption, but as a rebel to the state, brought him into danger even of his life; and this irreconcilable aversion, this implacable hatred, he maintained to the last, in spite of all the submissions Hilarius could make, compatible with his conscience and duty, to appease him. Lastly, giving full scope to his unbounded ambition, and most egregiously abusing the confidence which the young and inexperienced prince reposed in him, he made him believe what he himself knew, and could not but know, to be false, and by that means surreptitiously obtained a rescript highly derogatory to the liberties of the church, utterly repugnant to the canons of all the councils, that had been held to that time, and calculated only to establish the papal power on the ruins of the ancient discipline, and all ecclesiastical laws. As for Hilarius, the church of Rome herself has cleared him from the many calumnies, with which Leo, and his other enemies, strove to blacken his reputation; for by that church he is now honored as a saint of the first class; nay, even Leo seems, in the end, to have acknowledged his innocence; for speaking of him after his death, he calls him Hilarius of holy memory;[1] which was, in a manner, retracting all he had written against him.

The jesuit Papebrok, convinced, on one hand, of the innocence of Hilarius, but on the other, not daring to find fault with Leo, pretends to justify both, saying, that the metropolitan of Arles was "guilty before Leo, but not before God," that is, in other words, Leo believed him guilty, though he really was not. And was it excusable in Leo, to believe him guilty, to condemn him as guilty, upon the bare testimony of his avowed enemies, as he certainly did? Ought he not, in conscience and justice, to have heard both parties, as he set up for a judge, before he condemned or absolved either? Besides, it may be very much questioned, whether or no Leo did believe him guilty of the faults, which he lays to his charge, it being almost incredible, that a man of his sense and penetration should not, at least, suspect the truth of what he had heard against a prelate of Hilarius's reputation and character from those only, whose interest it was, as he well knew, to have him condemned.

The zeal which Leo exerted against the Manichees, the worst of heretics,(*) might

* By the canons of Sardica, the most favorable to the see of Rome, and fatal to the church, that ever were made, the pope was only empowered, upon an appeal to him, to order the cause to be re-examined, not at Rome, but in the province, and by such of the neighboring bishops as he should name.(a) But Leo claimed a power of summoning bishops to Rome, and judging their cause anew there.

(a) See p. 57.

[1] Leo ep. 50.

(*) As the heresy of the Manichees made a great noise in the church for many ages, and is much spoken of by the fathers, it may not be improper to give a succinct account here of the author, or rather the authors, of that sect, and their tenets. The first principles of the Manichees were broached about the middle of the second century, by one Scythianus, a native of Arabia, who, observing many beings in the universe, opposite to, and incompatible with one another, argued from thence, that the causes, from which they proceeded, were, in like manner, opposite and incompatible. To prove this doctrine, he wrote four small books; the first styled, "the Mysteries;" the second, "the Chapters;" the third, "the Gospel;" and the fourth, "the Treasure." As he had but one disciple, named Terbinthus, he travelled to Jerusalem, hoping to gain some proselytes there, but died soon after his arrival in that city.(a) He was a man of a sprightly genius, and, though he had applied himself to trade from his youth, and by that means acquired great wealth, he had not suffered himself, by his application to business, to be diverted from the study of the Greek and the Egyptian sciences; and is said to have addicted himself chiefly to the study of magic, at that time in great request all over the east.(b) Upon his death, Terbinthus, seizing his books, and all the gold and silver he had brought with him, fled into Persia, and there took the name of Buddas, lest he should be discovered by his true name, and sued by the widow of his deceased master for the effects he had seized. Among the Persians he passed for a prophet, giving out, that he was born of a virgin, and brought up among the mountains by an angel, who had instructed him in all the sciences of the Egyptians: but having one day ventured to enter into a public dispute about his two opposite principles, with the priests of Mithra, or the sun, he was by them so shamefully silenced, that, not presuming ever after to appear, he lived retired in the house of a widow, and left to her, at his death, both the books, and the money, of which he had defrauded his master's widow. The woman seeing herself thus enriched at once, (for Buddas left her very considerable sums) she purchased a slave about seven years old, named Cubrichus, gave him his liberty, adopted him, and, grudging no expense to have him well educated, and instructed in the sciences and philosophy of the Persians, she bequeathed to him the books, and whatever else she possessed at the time of her death. Cubrichus, who

(a) Archelai Epis. contra Manet. disput. a Vales. edit. p. 94—96. Epiph. hær. 66. c. 1. et. 2. Socr. l. 1. c. 22.

(b) Epiph. c. 3. Arch. p. 96.

atone, if any thing could, for his unaccountable conduct on this occasion. The Manichees, who were still a very numerous sect, flying from the provinces, which the barba-

neither wanted parts nor address, studied the books, with the greatest application; and, having made himself master of the doctrine they contained, and improved it with many new opinions of his own, he began to preach it in the city, where the king of Persia resided, that is, in Seleucia, or Ctesiphon. But first, to conceal his original meanness, he took care to change the name of Cubrichus into that of Manes, signifying, in the Persian language, speech, and alluding to the talent, which he certainly had, of speaking well. (a) And this is the man, who became afterwards so famous, or rather infamous, by founding a sect, which soon spread all over the empire, had great numbers of followers, both in the east and the west, and kept its ground for the space of at least 700 years, in spite of the utmost efforts of the temporal, as well as the spiritual power, combined to suppress and destroy it. His doctrine was, at first, universally rejected with indignation and contempt, especially by the Christians; and, therefore, to render them the less averse to it, he began to mix some of their doctrines with his own, styling himself, in his letters, "Manes, the apostle of Jesus Christ;" and sometimes, the paraclet sent into the world to reform the manners of mankind, agreeably to the promise which Christ had made to his apostles. (b) Having made his escape out of prison, to which he had been confined by the king of Persia, probably Sapor, for killing his son, whom he had undertaken to cure, he fled into Mesopotamia, where he was so confounded, in a public dispute with Archelaus, bishop of Cascar, or Carræ, that he withdrew to a small village on the river Stanga, with a design to keep himself there for some time concealed; but as that village stood within the bounds of the Persian dominions, he was seized there, and carried to the king, who, to revenge the death of the prince he had murdered, caused him to be flayed alive, his body to be thrown to the dogs, and his skin stuffed with straw, to be exposed to public view, on one of the gates of the city, where it was still to be seen in the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius. (c) After his death, Archelaus, having assembled all the Christians and bishops in that neighborhood, with great solemnity, anathematized him, his new opinions, and all his followers. (d) Such was the end of the chief author and founder of the famous sect of the Manichees.

As for the tenets of this sect; 1. They held two opposite principles, or natures; the one the author of good, whom they called God; the other the author of evil, whom they styled Satan, but both eternal, immortal, and independent of each other, which was, in reality, admitting two Gods. They believed the light in the sun and the moon, to be the substance of God; and, therefore, adored the sun as the throne of his power, and the moon as the seat of his wisdom. (e) And it was in opposition to that idolatrous worship, that Leo endeavored to suppress the custom that had long obtained among the Christians, of turning to the east when they prayed. He alleges two reasons why it should be suppressed, and both worthy of particular notice; the first, because men may easily pass from worshipping God in the sun, to worship the sun itself; for he supposes some, who, in his time, used to kneel down before the sun, to have paid that respect, not to the sun, but to God in the brightest work of his hands. The second reason he alleges is, because it is a wicked profanation of the worship of the true God, to use the same ceremonies in worshipping him that are used by the pagans, when they worship their idols. (f) By the first of these reasons, images ought to be banished from all places of worship, at least for the sake of the gross and ignorant vulgar, who may easily, and commonly do, pass from the worshipping of God, or our Savior, in an image or statue, to worship the image or statue itself; and I may safely say, that among the Roman catholics, there is scarce one in a thousand, who does not immediately address, in his prayers, the image itself, which is rank idolatry. Of the images of the saints, and the worship that is paid them, I shall speak hereafter. By Leo's second reason, the far greater part of the ceremonies, used at present by the church of Rome, are evidently condemned, as a wicked profanation of the worship of the true God, since most of them have been borrowed of the pagans, as is notorious, and has been demonstrated, by an eminent writer of our own time. (a) But to return to the Manichees; they taught, that in a combat between the good and the evil principle, the former had been obliged to yield part of its own substance to the latter; that the two natures were mixed together; and that to the mixture of the two natures, the soul of man owed its origin; insomuch that each man had two souls, the one consisting of the substance of the good principle, the other of the substance of the evil. The particles of the good nature were, according to them, in all the beings of this universe, mixed with, and chained to the particles of the evil nature; such however, as happened to be in the food, which they used, were, in being used by them, delivered forever from so painful a bondage. Thus was gluttony, with them, a cardinal virtue, and eating to excess highly meritorious. They rejected the Old Testament, and some parts of the New, especially the Acts of the Apostles; pretending the Old Testament, by reason of the different spirit that appeared in it from that of the New, to have been dictated by the evil principle, and the New to have been, in many places interpolated and corrupted. They denied the mystery of the incarnation, maintaining Christ to have been born, to have suffered and died, only in appearance. They acknowledged no free-will, ascribing all sinful actions to the evil principle, and to the good principle all good actions. They held the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls, believing, that even the trees, fruits, herbs, and all other vegetables had souls, by which they were rendered capable of grief and pain. Of this they thought the juice, that issues from them, especially from the fig, when first cut or gathered, and which they called tears, a sufficient proof. Upon this principle, they condemned husbandry and gardening as sinful professions; and used to say, that an usurer was less guilty than a husbandman or gardener. They seem to have entertained the same opinion of a military life, and to have held it unlawful to make war; for on that score Moses was greatly blamed by Faustus, one of the most renowned teachers they ever had: and yet the famous general Sebastian professed their tenets; but he was, probably, only one of their auditors, and not of their elect. To marriage they professed the greatest abhorrence; and to the begetting of children, because the particles of the good principle were, by generation, more streightly united, according to their doctrine, to the particles of the evil. (b) These were, so far as I have been able to gather from the ancients, the fundamental principles of a sect, the most famous, after that of the Arians, of all that ever sprung up in the church.

Their sect consisted of two sorts of persons, namely, of their auditors, or hearers, whom they called "catechumens," and their elect, who were thoroughly instructed in their doctrine, and professed to conform their lives to it. (c) The latter were, by their rule, to abstain from wine, meat, eggs, milk, and fish. Had an elect plucked up but one blade of grass, gathered a single fruit or flower, or pulled a leaf off of a tree, he had been immediately excommunicated, had it been proved, and never re-admitted to their communion. Such was their institution. But St. Austin, who was one of their auditors for the space of nine years, declares, that he never knew one of their elect, who had not been convicted, or at least suspected, of some transgression; he adds, that he had himself informed against some of them, but that he could never prevail upon the rest to take the least notice of his information. (d) They pretended to observe the gospel in the literal and strictest sense, not possessing money, houses or lands; but if we believe St. Austin, (e) though their pockets were empty, their coffers were full. As they held marriage to be sinful, they preached up virginity, acting, in that respect, more agreeably to reason and good

(a) Epiph. c. 4. hær. Hieru. cat. catech. 6. Arch. p. 96. Euseb. chron.

(b) Epiph. Arch. Cyr. ibid. Aug. hær. 46.

(c) Cyril. Epiph. Arch. ibid. Socr. l. 1. c. 22.

(d) Arch. p. 100.

(e) Aug. hær. 46. in Faust. l. 5. c. 11.

(f) Leo ser. 7. in Natal. Domini.

(a) Dr. Middleton, in his "Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism."

(b) Aug. hær. 46. et in Faust. per tot. Theodoret. hær. fab. l. 1. c. 26. Arch. p. 196—199, &c.

(c) Aug. hær. 4.

(d) Aug. de morib. Manich. l. 1. c. 34. et l 2. c. 19.

(e) Aug. in Faust. l. 5. c. 5.

rians had seized, especially from Africa, after the taking of Carthage, in 439, by Genseric king of the Vandals, had repaired, in great numbers, to Rome, as a place of safety. They did not publicly own their impious doctrine; but, pretending to be catholics, frequented the churches; assisted at the sacred mysteries, and even received the eucharist; so that they not only lived undisturbed, notwithstanding the severe laws that had been enacted against them; but by an external appearance of an extraordinary piety and devotion, gained daily new proselytes to their abominable sect. There were Manichees in Rome when St. Austin went first to that city, that is, in the year 383, for he lodged in the house of a Manichee, and most frequently conversed with those, who professed their doctrine.[1] However, they were obliged, even then, to keep themselves concealed, several severe laws having been published against them before that time.(*) But though they had lived, and

sense, than their opposers, the catholics, who, owning with the apostles marriage to be honorable in all, yet preached up virginity, and decried marriage, with as much zeal as the Manichees themselves; nay, and excluded from it, in spite of the apostle, great numbers of the one and the other sex. The Manichees had their sacred virgins as well as the catholics; and St. Chrysostom does them the justice to own, that they observed a strict poverty, that they kept their fasts with great rigor; and, what is still more, lived chaste and undefiled. (a) The Manichees abstained from wine, as I have observed above, calling it "the gall of the prince of darkness," but rioted, says Austin, (b) in other liquors, that had the same effect as wine; and in other viands, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, (c) no less pleasing to the palate, than those which they were commanded to forbear. Though it was a crime with them to gather fruit, yet they did not scruple to eat that which others had gathered, nor even to force others to gather it for them. (d) They not only taught, that the particles of the good principle, in the food they used, were redeemed by them from their slavery, flying from their stomachs up to heaven: but held, that the same particles, when used by others, were tied with a new and stronger tie to the evil matter. Hence it was an unpardonable crime with them, and a kind of sacrilege, to let others have any share of the eatables that were given to them; and, therefore, when they had eaten till they could not possibly eat any more, but were upon the point of regorging what they had eaten, they used to cram the children, who were of their sect, till they were ready to burst; nay, they were accused at Rome, of having forced some children to eat, till they actually did burst. (e)

The laws or rules which I have mentioned here, were only binding with respect to their elect. As for their auditors, or catechumens, they were allowed to eat meat, to drink wine, to cultivate the ground, and even to marry, if they chose it, but were, by all means, to avoid the begetting of children, and the killing of any living creature, let the occasion be ever so urgent. (f) Though the Manichees eat to excess, by principle; yet their auditors, as well as their elect, kept two fasts in the week, the one on Sunday, in honor of the sun; and the other on Monday, in honor of the moon. (g) They seem to have admitted baptism; but did not look upon it either as a sacrament, or a necessary ceremony. The great and chief mystery of their sect was their eucharist; and it was in celebrating the eucharist that they committed the abominations, with which the fathers have reproached them. We might indeed suspect the testimony of the fathers, it being well known, that in declaiming against heretics they were apt to exaggerate, and did not always scrupulously adhere to truth. But that the Manichees abandoned themselves, in the celebration of their eucharist, to the most impure and infamous practices, is not only attested by them, but has been often proved by unexceptionable witnesses, nay, and owned by themselves, before the civil magistrates in Italy, in Gaul, in Paphlagonia, and in Africa. To that mystery of iniquity none but their elect were admitted, and what passed on that occasion was concealed with so much secresy from the rest, that St. Austin, though he had been nine years their auditor, did not even know at what time they used to celebrate their eucharist, or in what place. (h)

As to their hierarchy, they had, in imitation of Christ and his apostles, a college, consisting of thirteen elect, of whom twelve were called "the masters," and the thirteenth "the chief." By the masters their bishops were ordained, and their presbyters and deacons by the bishops. The other elect, as well as the masters, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were employed in instructing their catechumens, propagating their doctrine, and preaching it in the countries, where it had not yet been received. Manes himself had three famous disciples, Hermias, Addas, and Thomas. Her-

(a) Chrys. de virg. c. 4.
(b) Aug. de morib. Manich. c. 16.
(c) Cyril. catech. 6.
(d) Cyril. ibid. Epiph. hær. 66. c. 28.
(e) Aug. de morib. Manich. c. 16, 17.
(f) Aug. contra Lit. Petil. l. 3. c. 17. in Faust. l. 20. c. 23. hær. 46.
(g) Aug. ep. 86.
(h) Aug. in collat. cum Fortunat. Manich. c. 25.

mias preached his doctrine in Egypt; Addas, called also Adimantus, in Syria; and Thomas in India. They were succeeded by others, who, being sent into different countries, gained every where, and even in Rome, considerable numbers of proselytes: insomuch that Epiphanius, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century, speaks of the Manichees as a famous sect, that had already got footing in many places. (a) And thus much of the origin, tenets, and practices of a sect that has made, for so many ages, so great a noise in the world, and could brag of having once had among its followers one of the brightest lights of the church.

[1] Aug. confess. c. 5.

(*) Julian, proconsul of Africa, having informed the emperor Dioclesian, that a new religion, brought from Persia, countenanced the greatest abominations, and thereby occasioned great disturbances in the province, the emperors Dioclesian and Maximian, by a rescript dated from Alexandria, the last day of March, 290, commanded the leading men among the Manichees to be burnt alive, and all their writings with them; the persons of quality, who had embraced, or should embrace, their impious doctrine, to be condemned to work in the mines, and the rest to be all beheaded. (b) Valentinian I, in 372, declared all places confiscated, where the Manichees should meet to teach their profane doctrine, ordering, at the same time, their teachers, wherever they should be found, to be punished with the utmost severity. (c) The emperor Gratian, by a law issued in the year 379, granted to Christians of all persuasions the free exercise of their religion, except the Manichees, the Photinians, and the Eunomians. (d) In 381, Theodosius I. declared all Manichees infamous, and incapable of giving or receiving any thing by will, even of inheriting their paternal and maternal estates. (e) This law he confirmed the following year, adding, that those who distinguished themselves from the rest by a particular profession of piety, meaning, no doubt their elect, should be punished with death; and commanding them to be everywhere carefully sought for. In virtue of this law, Messianus, proconsul of Africa, in 389, caused some, whom he had discovered, to be immediately executed. (f) Honorius declared the Manichees in general traitors to the state, and ordered them to be treated as such. (g)

The Manichees were not only persecuted by the Roman emperors, but by other princes too, and with no less severity. Huneric, the son and successor of Genseric, king of the Vandals, in Africa, caused great numbers of their elect to be burnt alive, and drove the rest out of his dominions. (h) They were very numerous in Persia, and in greater repute there than the

(a) Epiph. hær. 66. c. 1.
(b) Bar. ad ann. 287. n. 3.
(c) Cod. Theod. l. 3. p. 113.
(d) Cod. Theod. l. 7. p. 120. Socr. l. 5. c. 2.
(e) Cod. Theod. l. 9. p. 124.
(f) Aug. contra Lit. Petil. l. 3. c. 25.
(g) Cod. Theod. l. 35. p. 152.
(h) Victor Vitensis de perfec. Vandal. l. 2. p. 17.

The Manichees discovered in Rome by Leo. And many of them seized with their bishop. Their abominable mysteries, declared by Leo, in a grand assembly. And owned by them. Some of them converted, others persist in their errors, and are banished. Leo warns all bishops by a circular letter to be upon their guard against them.

exercised their religion in Rome, undiscovered by other popes, they could not long escape the vigilance of Leo; for as he kept a watchful eye over the flock committed to his care, he soon discovered, in some, an uncommon depravation of manners; and inquiring, with great care and application, to what it was owing, he found that there were Manichees in Rome, and that part of his flock was infected with their poisonous doctrines. Upon that discovery, he spared no pains to find them out; and, being informed by some, whom they had attempted to seduce, where they assembled, he caused great numbers of them to be seized, in virtue of the imperial edicts, and among the rest, their bishop, and some of their teachers. Having them thus in his power, his first care was, to learn of them their true tenets, and the secret practices of their sect; which he had no sooner done, than he assembled the neighboring bishops, and those who happened to be then in Rome, with a great number of presbyters; inviting to the assembly, even the laymen of any rank, the great officers of the empire, and the senate. Baronius bestows on this assembly the name of a council;[1] but the emperor styles it only "Leo's audience."[2] Being all met, and in great expectation, Leo ordered the elect of the Manichees, that is, their teachers and chief men among them, to be brought forth. Great was their confusion, when they first appeared before so grand an assembly; but, being encouraged by Leo, they first owned their impious tenets, their superstitious practices, and discovered a crime, which modesty, says Leo, would not allow him even to name; but it was so fully proved, adds he, that the most incredulous were thoroughly satisfied it was true: for all those who had been concerned in that abominable act, were present; namely, a girl twelve years old, the two women who had brought her up, and prepared her for the crime; the youth who debauched her; and the bishop, who presided at that detestable ceremony, and directed it. All agreed, without the least contradiction or variation, in their depositions; but the act was so abominable in itself, says Leo, that we could hardly bear to hear it, nor can we relate it, without offending the chaste ears of those who hear us. It appeared from the confession, which their bishop made openly, and gave in writing, that they committed those abominations chiefly on their festivals. Of all that passed on this occasion, authentic acts were drawn up, and sent by Leo into all the provinces of the empire, that they might serve for an antidote against the abominable doctrines of that sect.[1] Some of the Manichees, whom Leo had caused to be arrested, abjured their errors; and, having first performed the due penance, were received by him into the church. But against those who continued obstinate, the imperial laws were put into execution, and they condemned to perpetual banishment. They deserved, says Leo, a more severe punishment; but to punish them more severely, was repugnant to the spirit of the church, and to that lenity in which she places her chief glory, abhorring to shed the blood even of the most detestable heretics.[2] How different the spirit of that church is now, those too well know, who have ever had the misfortune to be any ways concerned with that tribunal, of all that ever were heard of, the most cruel and sanguinary, the tribunal of the inquisition. But, even in Leo's time, the lenity of the church was not so very remarkable, as much to be boasted; I do not mean with respect to the Manichees, whose immoralities, if not exaggerated, deserved to be punished with the utmost severity; but with respect to those, who for holding opinions ever so harmless, but not entirely agreeing with the doctrines then in vogue, were stripped of all their effects, driven from their habitations, and condemned to perish for want, in the deserts, or the most inhospitable places of the empire. These punishments, it is true, were inflicted by the imperial edicts and laws, for the church had not yet acquired any temporal power; but they were procured (as is well known) by the rulers of the church, especially by the bishops of Rome; and it was generally speaking, at their request and solicitation, that they were put in execution. As several Manichees found means to make their escape from Rome, Leo took care to warn, by a circular letter, all bishops to be upon their guard against them, to cause them to be seized, when discovered, and to prosecute them without mercy according to the utmost rigor of the imperial laws.[3] Those of that sect, who had been apprehended in Rome, having been forced to declare who were their bishops, who their teachers, and their elect, in the other cities and provinces, they too were all seized, and banished, with the rest, to the most distant parts of the em-

Christians, till the reign of Cabades; and he too countenanced them at first; but the Christians having afterwards gained his favor by a great miracle, which they were supposed to have wrought, he began to persecute the Manichees with great cruelty, and in the year 525, made a general massacre of all who were found in his dominions to profess their doctrine. (a) They met with no better quarter from the Sueves in Spain, from the Franks in Gaul, or the other nations, that settled in the different provinces of the empire. And yet they were, though thus universally detested, abhorred, and persecuted, still a numerous sect in the beginning of the ninth century. The Waldenses, who sprung up in the twelfth century, were stigmatized by their enemies with the odious name of Manichees; but that their doctrine was very different from that of the Manichees, nay, that it was altogether orthodox, I shall show in a more proper place.

(a) Cedren. p. 364. Zonar. l. 3. p. 49. Misc. hist. l. 15. p. 458, 459.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 441.

[2] Leon. op. t. 1. p. 426. et ep. 15.

[1] Prosp. chron. Leo, ep. 8. et 15.

[2] Leo, ep. 8. [3] Leo, ep. 8. Prosp. chron.

Leo procures a severe law from the emperor against the Manichees. A great conformity between the elect of the Manichees and the monkish orders. The heresy of Priscillian revived in Spain. Turibius of Astorga implores the assistance of Leo to suppress it.

pire. Leo's zeal did not stop here, but applying to the emperor Valentinian III. who was then in Rome, and informing him of the wicked doctrine, and abominable practices of that sect, obtained a law, dated the 19th of June, 445, confirming all the laws enacted against them by his predecessors, and commanding them to be treated as sacrilegious persons, banishing them from the cities, excluding them from all employments both civil and military, declaring them incapable of giving or receiving any thing by will or testament, of suing any one at law, or making any contract; and ordering all persons to inform against them, without being bound, in giving their information, to observe the usual forms of the law.[1] But the Manichees were so far from being retrieved from their errors by the severity of these laws, that they gloried in them, as St. Austin informs us,[2] and boasting that they suffered for the sake of justice, the more they suffered, the more obstinately they adhered to the doctrine for which they suffered. That Leo did not extirpate this wicked sect, as his panegyrists pretended that he did, is very certain; for, not to mention other countries, where they were very numerous long after his death, in the latter end of the sixth century, many, who professed their doctrine, were discovered in Sicily, though one of the suburbicarian provinces, and immediately subject to the see of Rome, nay, on the very lands belonging to that see, nor could Gregory the Great, notwithstanding the pains he took, drive them quite out of the island.[3] In the ninth century their doctrine obtained, almost universally, in the two provinces of Lycaonia and Phrygia, being greatly countenanced by the emperor Nicephorus.[4] But soon after his death they seem to have failed of themselves, no farther mention being made of them in history.

The reader must have observed[5] a wonderful conformity, with respect to abstinence from meats, between the elect among the Manichees and the monkish orders. For some of them abstain by rule, as the Manichees did, not only from meat, and every thing that comes from meat, but from all sorts of fish too, choosing rather to die than to taste any kind of animal food, though prescribed as the best, and sometimes as the only means of saving their lives. The abstinence of the Manichees was in some degree more rational than that of the monks; for they abstained from such food only as, in their opinion, proceeded from the evil principle, to whom they ascribed a dominion equal with that of God, or had in its mixture a greater number of the evil particles than of the good; and was therefore held by them to be unclean. But, to believe that so many good things have been given us by God for our use and pleasure, yet think it criminal, as the founders of some of the monkish orders have done, ever to use them, or meritorious constantly to abstain from them, is not only absurd and ridiculous, but wicked and blasphemous, since it can be only owing to a notion highly injurious to God, as if he took delight in vexing and tormenting his creatures, or seeing them vex and torment themselves. Had they not better acknowledge, with the Manichees, a good and bad principle, than thus transform, with their heathenish notions, the good principle into a bad one?

It was not against the Manichees alone, that Leo exercised his zeal for the purity of the faith. In his time the Priscillianists, of whom I have spoken elsewhere,[1] were grown very numerous in Spain, the long wars between the Romans and the barbarians, who entered that province in 409, having given them an opportunity of propagating their doctrine, without the least check either from the spiritual or the temporal power. When the troubles were somewhat composed, Turibius, bishop of Astorga, apprehending that the church had suffered by the late distractions, as much as the state, the better to inform himself of the disorders that might have crept in during the war, undertook a visitation throughout the province. On this occasion he discovered, to his great surprise, the extraordinary progress which the doctrine of Priscillian, however infamous, had insensibly made in most churches, especially in those of Galicia, which at this time was subject to the Sueves. In some places it was countenanced by the bishops themselves; at least they could not be prevailed upon to join their colleagues in the vigorous measures suggested by Turibius to suppress it. He therefore had recourse to Leo, giving him a particular account of the doctrine taught by the Priscillianists, (*) and

[1] Leon. op. t. 1. p. 426, 427.
[2] Aug. in Faust. l. 5. c. 1. [3] Greg. l. 2. ep. 25.
[4] Miscel. hist. l. 24. p. 779. Zonar. t. 3. p. 100.
[5] See note, p. 194.

[1] See p. 112.

(*) He reduces their whole doctrine to the following articles: 1. That the spiritual beings proceed from the essence of God. 2. That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are but one person. 3. That Jesus Christ is the Son of God, merely because he was born of a virgin. 4. That all ought to fast on Christmas day, and on Sundays. 5. That the evil spirits were never good; that they were not created by God, but formed out of the chaos and darkness. 6. That marriage is unlawful, and the begetting of children highly criminal. 7. That our bodies were formed by the devil, and are not to rise from the dead. 8. That the elect are born of women, but conceived of the Holy Ghost. 9. That our souls were created in heaven, but confined to our bodies, by way of punishment for the crimes they had committed. 10. That the planets and stars govern all things by an unavoidable fatality. This summary of their doctrine was, by Turibius, extracted out of their own books, and sent by him to Leo.(a) In practice they did not much differ from the Manichees, the same, or almost the same, infamous mysteries being common to both; for, in the trial of Priscillian before the emperor Maximus, it appeared, that he had countenanced all manner of debauchery, that he had held nocturnal assemblies of lewd women, and that he used to pray naked among them.

(a) Conct. t. 4. p. 1737. Leon. op. t. 1. p. 460.

Priscillian anathematised, and his doctrine condemned by two councils in Spain. The doctrine of Eutyches begins to make a great noise in the church. Who Eutyches was. His doctrine. Charged with teaching doctrines which he never taught.

imploring his assistance against the spreading evil. Leo in his answer commends the zeal of Turibius; condemns the doctrine of Priscillian, as impious and detestable; and declares all who tolerate heresies no less guilty than those who embrace them. Agreeably to this, in the same letter he approves of the death of Priscillian and some of his disciples, formerly executed by an order from Maximus, who had usurped the sovereignty of Gaul.[1] On this letter of Leo, F. Maimbourg lays great stress to prove, that heresy is a capital crime, and may be justly punished with death;[2] as if the authority of Leo could counterbalance that of the gospel, discountenancing all kinds of persecution, and recommending mercy even towards those who rejected our Savior in person, because he "came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

Indeed, the crimes ascribed to Priscillian and his adherents, were such as merited death from the civil laws, and were only more dangerous by being perpetrated under a notion of religion; so that the punishing them, in any manner, was not persecution; but Leo's doctrine extended to such religious opinions as, though erroneous, did not impel those who held them, to commit any crimes, and with which, therefore, the civil magistrate had nothing to do: this is properly persecution; and the want of attending to this plain distinction, is what has sometimes led even good men to favor that practice, so contrary to reason, and the gospel of Christ.

Leo, with his answer to Turibius, sent into Spain a circular letter to all the bishops of that province, earnestly entreating, or rather commanding them, to assemble, without delay, a general council, or if that could not be conveniently done, at least a provincial synod, and there, by condemning the doctrine of Priscillian, clear themselves in the eyes of the world, from all suspicion of their adhering to, or conniving at, his errors. In compliance with his desire or command, two councils were held, the one at Toledo, the other at Braga, then the metropolis of Galicia; and in both Priscillian was anathematized with his doctrine, and all who received or approved it; seventeen articles were drawn up to be signed by all bishops, on pain of deposition, and such measures taken, at the suggestion of Leo, as put an immediate stop to the growth of that heresy, and would have utterly suppressed it, if they had been more steadily pursued.[3]

[Year of Christ 448.] But the doctrine of Eutyches, which began about this time to make a great noise in the east, opened a larger field for the zeal of Leo, than the exploded heresies of Priscillian or Manes. Eutyches was a monk, and abbot of a monastery of three hundred monks, in the neighborhood of Constantinople, where he had led a chaste and continent life, for the space of seventy years, as he himself declared in a letter, which he wrote this very year. He had even taken a resolution of never setting his foot out of the doors of his monastery, but upon the most urgent occasions. He was, after Cyril, the most inveterate enemy Nestorius had, and therefore one of that prelate's chief favorites; for to him, though no bishop, Cyril sent, as a token of his friendship, a copy of the acts of the council of Ephesus. He used to brag, that he was grown hoary in combating heresies, and defending the faith. When Nestorius first broached his doctrine, he did not scruple to quit his monastery, notwithstanding the resolution he had taken to live ever shut up in it as in his tomb, and repair to court, in order to prejudice the emperor, so far as in him lay, against the pretended heresiarch. He was looked upon by those of his own party, that is, by the Egyptians, and the other enemies of Nestorius, and the orientals, as a man of extraordinary sanctity; and, in the instruction which Epiphanius, archdeacon of Alexandria, sent to Maximian, bishop of Constantinople, he is styled, "the holy and most reverend Eutyches."[1] As to his parts, he is said to have had little knowledge, and to have been very slow of apprehension. Pope Leo ascribes his errors not to malice, but ignorance, styling him an "old, imprudent, and ignorant dotard;"[2] and F. Petau paints him as a man of stupid and unsettled mind.[3] However, he seems to have been better acquainted with the subtleties then in vogue, than most of those who opposed him.

As to the doctrine he taught, it may be reduced to the two following heads: 1. That as there was but one Christ, so there was but one nature in Christ. 2. That this nature consisted of the human and the divine natures, become one by the hypostatical union. This he maintained to be the genuine doctrine of Cyril, and entirely agreeable to an expression which that father had frequently used, "The one incarnate nature of the word." And truly it would be no easy task to prove the doctrine of Eutyches heretical, and, at the same time, admit the expression of Cyril as orthodox, which some have attempted to do, as we shall see hereafter. That the soul of Christ had been created in heaven, and had remained there till the time of the incarnation; that his body was of a different substance from ours, not taken of the Virgin Mary, but brought from heaven; that Christ had been once a mere man, but was become God, by being united to the divine nature; that the Divinity itself had suffered, and been crucified; were no part of his doctrine, but only

[1] See p. 112.
[2] Maimb. hist. du Pontificat de St. Leon, l. 1.
[3] Leo, ep. 15. Leon. op. t. 1. p. 459. Concil. t. 2. p. 1227. et t. 5. p. 837.

[1] Leo. ep. 52. Liberat. c. 11. Prosp. chron. Concil. t. 4. p. 273—275.
[2] Leo, ep. 21. 26, 27.
[3] Pet. dog. t. 4. l. 1. c. 14.

The orientals declare against his doctrine, and declare it heretical. The Egyptians, in opposition to the orientals, declare for it. Domnus of Antioch, at the head of the orientals. His character, and the character of Dioscorus of Alexandria, who headed the Egyptians. His pride, ambition, and tyrannical government.

inferences drawn from it by his enemies, and denied by him. He even admitted of two natures in Christ, the human and the divine; but these two natures, by being united, were, according to him, in an ineffable manner, become one, there being, as he often repeated, but one Christ, and not two. His meaning, therefore, was certainly orthodox; for he meant no more than that there was but one Christ; and this catholic truth he thought could be no otherwise maintained than by supposing, that the two natures were become one, in a manner which he did not comprehend, nor pretend to explain. But it was not his doctrine alone, or rather his expressions, that gave offence; he was charged with speaking contemptuously of the fathers, nay, with having called them heretics, and having, on a certain occasion, declared, that he did not take them, but the holy scripture, for his guide; and that he was satisfied with studying the scripture, without troubling himself about the opinions and sentiments of the fathers.[1] A heinous crime indeed!

As Eutyches had greatly disobliged the orientals, that is, the bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, charging them with Nestorianism, because they would not admit the expressions of Cyril, and had even procured from the emperor Theodosius II., with whom he was in great favor, an edict, driving several of them from their sees, and sending them into exile, he no sooner began to teach his doctrine, than they, all to a man, declared against it. Domnus, the nephew and successor of John, in the see of Antioch, put himself at the head of the party; and having assembled a council without loss of time, it was there declared, with one consent, that the doctrine of Eutyches was the same with that of Apollinaris, and altogether incapable of being understood, or expounded, in a catholic sense. Before they broke up, to lessen the credit of Eutyches at court, they wrote to the emperor, informing him of what had passed, and giving him a particular account of the pretended errors of the new heresiarch.[2] To this letter the emperor returned no answer, nor did he take the least notice of the charge it contained, ascribing it, perhaps, to what it may be but too truly ascribed to, a spirit of revenge.

In the mean time, Dioscorus, the successor of Cyril in the see of Alexandria, hearing that the orientals had declared against Eutyches, thought that a sufficient motive to declare in his favor. For the ancient animosities between the Egyptians and the orientals still subsisted, and the latter had but very lately sided with the bishop of Constantinople in a dispute between him and Dioscorus about jurisdiction. The bishops of Egypt all ranged themselves under the banner of their patriarch, and with them a whole army of monks, zealous in the defence of one of their own profession, though, generally speaking, utterly unacquainted with the merits of the cause. And thus, after a few years of a very precarious and unsettled peace, was war again openly declared between the two rival patriarchs and their suffragans; a war, which did not end as the other ecclesiastical wars, which I have hitherto had occasion to mention, in councils only, and the result of councils, curses, anathemas, depositions, exiles; but in slaughter and bloodshed, one of the most eminent prelates of his age having lost his life in the quarrel: and all this for words or expressions, in speaking of a mystery, which neither party understood, or pretended to explain.

The heads of the two opposite parties, Domnus and Dioscorus, were but ill matched. Domnus, who had spent a great part of his life in the desert, was a man of a mild disposition, and very slender parts; had little knowledge, less resolution, and no foresight to avoid difficulties, or address to extricate himself out of those which he could not avoid.[1] Dioscorus, on the contrary, was a prelate of excellent parts, of great subtlety, penetration, and address, well versed in most branches of learning, and no less distinguished by an apparent piety before his elevation, than he was by an apparent moderation for some time after it. Leo styles him, in one of his letters, "a prelate adorned with many virtues, and enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost;"[2] and another very eminent writer of that time paints him as a man who despised all worldly grandeur, and was wholly intent upon securing a place for himself in the kingdom of heaven.[3] But he soon changed, or rather pulled off the mask, when it could serve no end to wear it any longer, and swelled with pride, in seeing himself raised to so high a station, and vested with so much power, he committed such excesses in the use of it, as procured him the surname of Dioscorus the Tyrant.[4] As the see of Alexandria had been held for the space of threescore years by one family, that of Cyril, the bishops had, by the indulgence of the emperors, the connivance of the governors unwilling to quarrel with them, and the support of the monks, and their own relations, whom they had enriched with the ecclesiastical revenues, greatly encroached on the secular power, and made themselves, in a manner, sovereigns of that city. But Dioscorus carried his usurpations far beyond the bounds, at which the most ambitious of his predecessors, even Cyril himself, had thought it advisable to stop. For without any regard to the governors, who represented the emperor, and acted in his place, he imprisoned, fined, and even condemned to banishment, all whom

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 193. Leo, ep. 24, 25. 27. 59. 77.
[2] Facund. l. 12. c. 5.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 727. Bolland. 20. Jan. p. 308.
[2] Leo ep. 11. c. 1.
[3] Theodoret. ep. 60.
[4] Concil. t. 4. p. 414.

He persecutes the relations of Cyril. Applies to his own use what was given and designed for the support of the poor. He treats the Alexandrians with great cruelty. Is supported at court by the eunuch Chrysaphius. Acts as sovereign of all Egypt. Eutyches opens his mind, and owns his doctrine to Eusebius of Dorylæum. Who treats him as a heretic And charges him with heresy, before Flavianus of Constantinople.

he disliked, or who seemed to dislike him. He began with the relations of his predecessor, whom he stripped of the immense wealth they possessed, and reduced to beggary, pretending they had been enriched with the revenues of the church, the patrimony of the poor.[1] And indeed this charge seems not to have been groundless; at least Cyril gave reason to think it was not; for by his will he bequeathed a very considerable sum to his successor, conjuring him not to molest his relations: and why should he have been under any apprehension that his successor would molest them, had he not known that the wealth they were possessed of belonged, at least in part, to the church, and might be claimed by his successors? However that may be, while Dioscorus was thus prosecuting the relations of Cyril, under pretence that they had been enriched with what he called the patrimony of the poor, he was enriching himself with what truly was the patrimony of the poor; for a lady of great distinction, named Peristeria, having bequeathed a very large sum to the hospitals, and the poor of Egypt, he seized the whole for himself; nay, and caused the corn, which was given yearly by the emperor for the support of the poor Christians in Libya, where no corn grew, to be conveyed into his own granaries; and there kept it, while they were starving, till a year of great dearth, when he sold it at most exorbitant prices, without bestowing a single grain on the poor, for whose use it was given.[2] His conduct, with respect to the people of Alexandria, was that of a perfect tyrant; for he did not scruple, upon the least provocation, to seize by force on their estates, to cause their houses to be set on fire, their trees to be cut down, their pleasant gardens to be destroyed, and such of them as were most obnoxious to him, to be sometimes privately, and sometimes publicly, murdered by a band of ruffians, whom he kept constantly in his pay; insomuch that had not Theodorus, then governor of Egypt, from time to time, ventured to check him, and flattered the people with the hopes of a speedy redress, he would, in a very short time, have turned that populous city into a desert.[3] He was powerfully supported at court, by the eunuch Chrysaphius, who had an entire ascendant over the emperor, and a large share in the spoils of the Alexandrians; and it was on that consideration, that the governor did not choose to break with the bishop; being sensible, that he would thereby hurt, if not entirely ruin, his own fortune, without bettering the condition of the people. However, by his good offices in behalf of the citizens, and his great complaisance and condescending behaviour towards Dioscorus, he had the satisfaction of saving the estates, and even the lives, of many, whom the cruel and avaricious prelate had destined to death or beggary. Dioscorus was so elated with the extraordinary deference and respect the governor paid him, that, blind with pride and ambition, he began to look upon himself as sovereign of Alexandria, and king of all Egypt; insomuch that he caused those who, upon the death of Theodosius II., came to Alexandria to proclaim Marcian in his room, to be driven out of the city, for presuming to proclaim another emperor in Egypt while he was alive.[1] Thus much of the character and conduct of a man whom I shall have frequent occasion to mention in the sequel, as the chief author of the disturbances I am to relate, and the evils attending them. And now to resume the thread of the history.

The emperor, as I have related above, returned no answer to the letter of Domnus, and the other orientals, charging Eutyches with heretical opinions concerning the incarnation. But, in the mean time, Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum in Phrygia, being informed that Eutyches taught a new doctrine, which had given great offence to the orientals, resolved to learn of Eutyches himself his true sentiments; for, as to the orientals, he knew them to be greatly prejudiced against him, and therefore capable of having been swayed, in censuring his opinion, with passion and revenge. Pursuant to this resolution, he had several private conferences with Eutyches, who opened his mind to him with great freedom and candor, not thinking that any exception could be made against his doctrine, by one who had defended Cyril, and opposed Nestorius, with so much zeal as Eusebius had done. But, to his great surprise, he found him so shocked at the bare mention of "one nature in Christ," that, instead of allowing him room to explain or defend his opinion, he began to treat him as a heretic, and exhort him to abjure such an impious tenet, lest, by obstinately defending it, he should involve both the church and himself in endless troubles. Eutyches, unmoved by his exhortations, maintained his doctrine to be the pure doctrine of Cyril, and his expressions to be entirely agreeable to the expressions of that father, which had been approved by the council of Ephesus. Eusebius, finding his exhortations and remonstrances made no impression on the mind of Eutyches, resolved to apply to Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, and arraign him of heresy at his tribunal. Flavianus had assembled several bishops to examine a judgment that had been given by the metropolitan of Lydia, against two of his suffragans. At that assembly as-

[1] Liberat. c. 10. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 399—402.
[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 395—399.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 414, 415.

Flavianus unwilling to receive the accusation; but receives it, and summons Eutyches to appear before the council then sitting. He appears and owns his doctrine. Is anathematized by the whole council. Refuses to retract his doctrine; and is condemned, and deposed. He appeals to an oecumenical council, and writes to Leo. His doctrine taught by two popes.

sisted Eusebius among the rest, who, rising from his seat, when the business was despatched, for which they had met, presented unexpectedly a memorial, requiring them to summon Eutyches, and oblige him to give an account of his faith, and answer the charge of heresy, which he was ready to prove against him. Flavianus was not a little alarmed at this accusation. Eutyches was in great credit at court; Chrysaphius, the reigning eunuch, professed a particular friendship for him; the Egyptians, with Dioscorus, whom every man dreaded, at their head, had declared in his favor; and the orientals, who had condemned him in their synod, were, on that very score, thought by the emperor still to adhere to the doctrine of Nestorius. Upon these considerations Flavianus was for leaving the orientals to pursue the accusation they had begun, in what manner they pleased, without taking part either with them against Eutyches, or with the Egyptians in his favor. He therefore pressed Eusebius, with great earnestness, to drop his accusation, or at least to defer it to a more proper season, but to no effect: Eusebius, in spite of all he could say, still insisted upon his memorial being registered, and Eutyches summoned to give an account of his faith. Flavianus, finding him unalterable in his resolution, complied in the end with his request; and Eutyches was accordingly summoned to appear, on an appointed day, before the council, and there answer the charge brought against him by the bishop of Dorylæum. He refused to obey the first and the second summons, pleading the resolution he had taken, never to set foot out of his monastery; but complied with the third, finding the council was determined to proceed against him according to the canons, if he did not, that is, to excommunicate and degrade him from the priesthood. The day appointed for his appearance in the last summons, was the 22d of November; and on that day he appeared accordingly; but surrounded and guarded by a great number of monks, officers, and soldiers, not knowing to what extremities the fathers of the council might suffer themselves to be carried by their great zeal for what they called the purity of the faith. Being admitted, and examined on several articles relating to the mystery of the incarnation, he returned such answers to the questions that were put to him, as fully satisfied the whole assembly. But being at last pressed by Florentius, metropolitan of Sardes, to declare, without ambiguity, and in the plainest terms, his real sentiments concerning the nature of Christ, he confessed, with great candor, that he acknowledged two natures before the union, and but one after it.

At these words the whole council was in an uproar, and nothing was heard but anathemas and curses, each bishop there present striving to distinguish himself above the rest, by being the foremost in uttering the most bitter and severe his zeal could suggest. When the tumult and noise began to abate, Flavianus, addressing Eutyches, let him know, that unless he acknowledged two natures after the union as well as before it, and anathematized all who held the contrary opinion, he should be obliged to proceed against him according to the canons. Eutyches replied, that he believed Christ to be perfect God and perfect man; that nothing more had been required by the fathers of Nice and Ephesus; that he had read in St. Cyril, in St. Athanasius, and in the other fathers, of two natures in Christ, abstracting from the union or incarnation, but in none the least hint that could countenance the doctrine of the two natures after the union; but nevertheless that he was ready to confess them, should the bishops of Rome and Alexandria desire or command it. This was plainly appealing to those two bishops; but the fathers of the council, without taking the least notice of such an appeal, no doubt because they did not think it worthy of their notice, proceeded to the sentence, and declared Eutyches fully convicted of having revived the heresies of Valentine and Appollinaris, and therefore degraded from the sacerdotal dignity, cut off from the communion of the church, deprived of the government of his monastery; and all, who for the future should converse with him, were in like manner separated from the communion of the faithful. This sentence was signed by thirty-two bishops, and twenty-three abbots.[1]

Eutyches, seeing himself thus condemned by the council, appealed from their sentence to the patriarchs of Rome, of Alexandria, of Jerusalem, to the bishop of Thessalonica, and other bishops, that is, to an oecumenical council. At the same time, he wrote a long letter to Leo, informing him of his having been condemned by the council of Constantinople, which he ascribed to the intrigues of his avowed enemy, Eusebius, of Dorylæum, assuring him, that he held none of the errors for which he had been condemned, but sincerely anathematized the doctrine of Valentine and Appollinaris; and complaining, in the strongest terms, of the conduct of Flavianus, who, he said, had condemned him, without allowing him to explain his doctrine, or deigning to read a confession of faith, which he had presented to the council. In the same letter he not only owns his opinion, without the least dissimulation or disguise; but alleges several passages out of the fathers, and some from two of Leo's predecessors, Felix and Julius, to confirm it. The words of Julius, as quoted by him out of one of that pope's letters, are as follows: "It must not be said that there are two

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 220—243. Liberat. c. 11.

He applies to the emperor, for the assembling of an oecumenical council. The emperor, unwilling to assemble a council, strives to reconcile Eutyches and Flavianus. Flavianus will hearken to no terms. The council summoned. Leo invited to attend. His answer to the emperor's invitation. The instructions given by the emperor to his commissioners. Leo condemns the doctrine of Eutyches. His famous letter to Flavianus.

natures in Christ after their union; for as the body and soul form but one nature in man, so the divinity and humanity form but one nature in Christ."[1] The very doctrine of Eutyches. Indeed the advocates for infallibility will not allow that letter to be genuine; but none of them have been yet able to prove it suppositious: and it is not at all probable that Eutyches, in writing to Leo, would have quoted a letter of one of his predecessors, who had lived but in the preceding century, had he not known it to be genuine. At least Leo never reproached him with quoting writings that were not genuine, but only with ignorantly misinterpreting the fathers he quoted.

Eutyches could hardly believe, that Leo would condemn a doctrine that had been taught, in the plainest terms, by one of his predecessors. However, not to depend entirely upon his judgment, as he had great interest at court, he applied at the same time to the emperor, for the assembling of an oecumenical council. Theodosius had nothing more at heart than the peace of the church; and no prince was ever more ready to concur in the measures that were thought the most proper to produce or to maintain it. But he knew by experience, that the assembling of councils was, of all others, the least proper for the attaining of so desirable an end; and therefore, notwithstanding the great regard he had for Eutyches, he rejected, at first, his request, being determined to try whether he could not, by some other means, divert the storm which he saw, with great concern, beginning to gather. The means he chose was, to mediate a reconciliation between Eutyches and Flavianus, and persuade the former to make some submissions to his bishop, and the latter to accept them, and restore Eutyches to the government of his monastery, and the communion of the church. With this view, he sent a friendly message to Flavianus, exhorting, and even condescending to beg him to be satisfied with the symbol of Nice, without perplexing himself with subtleties and distinctions, concerning a mystery which he could not pretend to understand or explain. But Flavianus could by no entreaties be prevailed upon to hearken to the proposal; so that Theodosius was obliged, in the end, to have recourse to a council; and accordingly, by a circular letter, dated the 30th of March, 449, he summoned all the heads of the diocesses in his dominions to meet at Ephesus, on the first of August, each of them with ten metropolitans, and the like number of other bishops, under their jurisdiction:[2] so that the bishops who assisted at this council must in all have been one hundred and twenty, the eastern empire consisting, at this time, of six diocesses, namely, Egypt, the east, properly so called, or the patriarchate of Antioch, Asia, Pontus, Thrace, and Illyricum. At the same time, the emperor wrote to Leo, acquainting him with the resolution he had taken of assembling an oecumenical council, with the place and time, at which it was to meet; and inviting him to it, in order to concur with his brethren in examining a difficulty, in point of faith, that had been lately started. Leo, in his answer to this letter, commended the zeal which the emperor had shown, on all occasions, for the purity of the faith, and the peace of the church; but begged he might be excused from attending in person, since the affairs of his own church required his presence, and, besides, none of his predecessors had ever assisted in person at councils held out of Italy. However, he promised to send legates, who should act in his name; and the persons he chose for that purpose were, Julius, bishop of Puteoli, now Pozzoli, Renatus, and Hilarius, the former presbyter, and the latter deacon, of the Roman church, and afterward his successor in that see. These he styles, and it is the first time the pope's legates were so styled, legates "de latere suo,"[1] that is, belonging to the church of Rome, or under her immediate jurisdiction.

Theodosius, having thus summoned the bishops to Ephesus, despatched thither Elpidius, one of his privy council, and Eulogius, secretary of state, with an order for the proconsul of Asia to assist them, with all the troops under his command, in maintaining the public peace, and keeping the city quiet, while the council was sitting. Their private instructions were, to assist at the council, and suffer nothing to be transacted there rashly, and without due deliberation; to take into arrest, without distinction, or regard to their rank, such as should attempt to raise disturbances in the council; to oblige those, by whom Eutyches had been condemned, to be present at the council, but not allow them to vote, since the council was assembled chiefly to examine the judgment which they had given; and lastly, to transmit to court a distinct and impartial account of every thing that should be proposed, debated, or transacted in the council.[2]

In the mean time, Leo, being informed by Flavianus, of what had passed in the council of Constantinople, highly approved of the proceedings and decisions of that assembly, openly declared against Eutyches, condemned his doctrine as heretical and blasphemous, and strictly enjoined his legates, at their setting out for the east, to agree in all things, and act in concert with the bishop of Constantinople, whose faith he knew to be orthodox. He answered that prelate by a letter, which is deemed one of the most valuable monuments of antiquity, and is thought to

[1] Lup. coll. c. 225. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 101—104.

[1] Leo, ep. 28. [2] Concil t. 4. p. 108.

Several other letters written by Leo, on this occasion. Chrysologus' answer to Eutyches. The council meets at Ephesus. The order in which they sat.

have contributed more than any thing else, to the great fame and reputation which he afterwards acquired. For he there explains at length, and with all the perspicuity the subject can bear, the doctrine of the church, concerning the mystery of the incarnation, and alleges from the scripture, and the fathers, all that can be said to confirm it. This letter was afterwards received by the oecumenical council of Chalcedon, and by all the bishops of the catholic church; nay, in the western churches it was constantly read, during the advent, together with the gospel. The council of Rome, under Gelasius, anathematized all who should reject but a single word it contained;[1] and Gregory the Great would allow none to be truly orthodox, who did not admit the definitions of the four first oecumenical councils, and Leo's letter.[2] It was received by the council of Apamea about the year 535, and styled by the fathers of that assembly, "the true column of the orthodox faith."[3] Some even caused it to be read to them at the point of death, to show that they died in the faith of the church.[4] But what reception it met with from the present council, we shall see hereafter.

Leo wrote several other letters on this occasion, all bearing the same date with that to Flavianus, the 13th of June, 449, namely, one to the emperor Theodosius, one to the empress Pulcheria, one to the abbots of Constantinople, and one to the council.[5] These letters were all calculated to prove the doctrine of the two natures, to confute the opposite opinion, and to encourage those, to whom they were addressed, to contribute, so far as in them lay, towards extinguishing the flame, which Eutyches had ignorantly kindled. For Leo constantly ascribes the errors of Eutyches to his ignorance; and speaks of him in his letters, as a man altogether incapable of understanding either the catholic system, or his own. These letters were all delivered to the legates, who set out for Ephesus about the latter end of June.

Eutyches had not written to Leo alone, but, at the same time, to all the bishops of the chief sees in the west; and among the rest, to the famous Petrus Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna: and that Prelate returned him the following answer; that he was greatly surprised to hear of disputes about a point, that should no more be questioned than the incarnation itself; that as to the quarrel between him and Flavianus, he was not sufficiently informed to determine who was in the right, and who in the wrong, having heard but one party; that if any thing relating to the faith still remained undecided, the desire he had of maintaining the peace and unity of the church, engaged him to decide it jointly with the bishop of Rome, and not by his own authority alone; and therefore, he could only advise him to hearken, with submission, to the doctrine which that bishop had already declared in his writings.[1] On this letter some of the advocates of the see of Rome have laid great stress; as if Chrysologus had thought it unlawful in any case whatever, for a bishop to judge in matters of faith, without the consent of the bishop of Rome. But surely, they can by no prejudice be so blinded, as not to see, that Chrysologus speaks here, only with respect to the present case; and that, in the present case, it had been great temerity in him, and contrary to the union and concord, that ought to reign among bishops, to have set up for a judge, or even to have delivered his opinion, without consulting the first bishop of the catholic church, who was near at hand, and to whom Eutyches had appealed, as well as to him. Besides, what right had the bishop of Ravenna to judge, without the consent and concurrence of Leo, and his other brethren in the west, to whom Eutyches had appealed, a cause that had been already judged and determined by a whole council? Leo himself was an utter stranger to the doctrine which the friends of his see endeavor to prove from the letter of Chrysologus; for though no pope was ever more jealous than he of the authority of St. Peter's throne, as he styled it, yet he never found fault with Flavianus for judging and condemning Eutyches, without either his consent or his knowledge. I might add, that the bishops of Ravenna were bound, on a particular account, to act in concert with, and in some kind of dependence upon the see of Rome, since it was chiefly by the interest of the bishops of Rome, that their city was raised, about this very time, to the rank of a metropolis, and they vested with the metropolitan jurisdiction.

The council had been appointed to meet on the first of August, as I have related above; but they did not assemble till the 8th of that month, when they met, for the first time, in the great church, where the first council of Ephesus had been held eighteen years before. They were in all one hundred and forty-nine, counting the bishops who assisted in person, and the deputies of those who did not. Dioscorus presided, by the emperor's express order, seated on a high throne. Julius of Puteoli, the pope's first legate, held the second place; Domnus of Antioch was placed after Juvenalis of Jerusalem, and Flavianus of Constantinople after both. To the deacon Hilarius, Leo's other legate, and Dulcitius, notary of the Roman church, was assigned the last place of all. As for Renatus, the pope's second legate, he died in the island of Cos, on his way to Ephesus.[2] Flavianus,

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1263. [2] Greg. l. 5. ep. 2.
[3] Concil. t. 5. p. 101.
[4] Vigil. Tapsens. in Eutych. p. 83.
[5] Leo, ep. 26, 27, 28, 29.

[1] Concil. t. 1. ante Concil. Chalced.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 251. 254.

Flavianus, and the bishops of his party, excluded from voting. Leo's letter to the council not read. Eutyches presents a confession of faith to the council; which is approved; and all are anathematized, who maintained the two natures. Eutyches absolved and restored. Flavianus, and Eusebius of Dorylæm, deposed. Hilarius, the pope's legate, protests against the sentence.

and the other bishops, who, jointly with him, had condemned Eutyches in the council of Constantinople, were declared parties, and, as such, excluded from voting in the present council. This, however consonant to justice, was contrary to the practice of the church; for Alexander, and the other bishops of Egypt, who had condemned Arius, were nevertheless allowed to vote in the council of Nice, assembled to examine their judgment, and his doctrine; and a few years before, Cyril, and the bishops of his diocese, were admitted among the judges of Nestorius, though they had already condemned him in a national synod.

The bishops being seated, and the emperor's letter for the calling of the council read, according to custom, Hilarius presented Leo's letter to the council, and Dioscorus ordered it to be received and read. But the notary, who was ordered to read it, not having immediately complied with the order, and some disputes arising in the mean time, it was laid aside, and no more thought of. Some of the bishops, and among the rest Julius the legate, were for examining in the first place, and settling the point of faith in dispute; but it being carried by a great majority, that Eutyches should be first heard, he was called in, and ordered to give an account of his faith. In compliance with that order, he presented a confession of faith, declaring that he held the doctrine of Nice, with that of Cyril, as approved by the council of Ephesus, and sincerely anathematized Manes, Valentine, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and all who had been condemned by the church, from the time of Simon the magician, to the present. This confession being read, Flavianus rising up, desired that Eusebius of Dorylæum, his accuser, might be likewise heard; and this motion was seconded by the legates. But Elpidius and Eulogius, who assisted at the council in the emperor's name, let them know, that they had been called together, not to judge Eutyches anew, but those who had judged him; and therefore that their only business was, to examine the acts of the council of Constantinople; which was done accordingly, without the least disturbance, to the seventh session, where Eusebius of Dorylæum was said to have pressed Eutyches to acknowledge two natures in Christ after the incarnation. But when that passage was read, the same tumult and uproar was raised in the present council, against Eusebius, for requiring two natures to be owned in Christ, as had been raised against Eutyches in the former, for refusing to own them; nay, and in part, by the same prelates. "Let Eusebius be burned alive," they all cried out with one voice; "let him be cut asunder; as he divides, so may he be divided." Dioscorus, not satisfied with these confused cries, desired, that those who could not raise their voices so as to be heard, should lift up their hands, in token of their concurring with the rest in anathematizing the doctrine of the two natures. His voice, his threatening mien, the presence of the soldiers, the menaces of the monks, who were more dreaded than the soldiers themselves, and had surrounded the place where the council was held, struck such a terror into the whole assembly, that, lifting up their hands, they all joined, as one man, in crying out aloud, "whoever admits of two natures, let him be anathematized, let him be driven out, torn in pieces, massacred."[1] The doctrine of Eutyches being thus declared orthodox, he was not only restored, with one consent, to the communion of the church, and the government of his monastery, but by all extolled with the most pompous and fulsome encomiums on his courage in daring to teach, and his firmness in daring to defend, the true and genuine doctrine of the fathers; and on this occasion, those distinguished themselves the most by their panegyrics, who had most distinguished themselves by their invectives before.[2] I do not find, that either Flavianus, or the legates, offered to oppose the restoration of Eutyches, or spoke a single word in defence of the sentence pronounced against him by the council of Constantinople.

Dioscorus, finding the prelates thus intimidated, and himself, through their pusillanimity, absolute master of the council, thought this a favorable opportunity of crushing at once all the enemies of Eutyches, and resolved to use it. He began with Flavianus, and Eusebius of Dorylæum; and pretending that they had acted contrary to a decree of the first council of Ephesus,(*) the one in accusing Eutyches, and the other in condemning him, he declared them both, in virtue of that decree, anathematized and deposed. Flavianus, in hearing the sentence, appealed from Dioscorus, saying, "I except against you," (παραιτοῦμαί σε); and he said no more, but delivered his appeal, in writing, to the pope's legates.[3] (†) Victor, of Tunes, Theodoret, and Leo himself, write, that the legates opposed the deposition of Flavianus with great intrepidity, and protested aloud against the injustice of the sentence.[4] But Prosper, Leo's secretary, and the acts of the council, only take notice of the opposition that was made by Hilarius, and of him they speak with the greatest commendations, without ever mentioning the bishop Julius.[5]

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 188, 189. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 255.

(*) The fathers of Ephesus only forbid any symbol to be publicly made use of, besides that of Nice. But their decree Dioscorus interpreted, as if they had forbidden any article to be defined, that was not in express terms contained in that symbol.

[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 305.

(†) Bellarmine, Davidius, and Lupus, make long descants on this appeal, pretending it was to Leo Flavianus appealed. But Leo himself supposes him to have appealed to an oecumenical council, since it was upon his appeal, that he pressed the emperor to assemble one; (a) which he would never have done, had Flavianus appealed to him alone.

(a) Leo, ep. 39, 40.

[4] Concil. p. 39. 46. Theodoret. ep. 116.

[5] Prosp. chron.

The other bishops intercede for Flavianus. The soldiers, monks, and rabble, break into the council. The terror and consternation of the bishops. Dioscorus obliges all the bishops to sign a blank paper. The pope's legates refuse to sign it. Some of the bishops inhumanly beaten. The blank paper, how filled up by Dioscorus. Flavianus treated with great barbarity. Is sent into exile, but dies on the road. Is honored as a saint.

The other friends of Flavianus, well apprised of the injustice of the sentence, and unwilling to confirm it with their suffrages, but apprehending, at the same time, the dreadful consequences of their opposing or any ways disobliging Dioscorus, rose from their seats, and, prostrating themselves before him, begged, in the most submissive terms, that he would consider what he was doing, and not proceed to such extremities, which they could not approve without betraying their consciences, and rendering themselves unworthy of the rank they held in the church. But the only answer he returned to their prayers and entreaties was, that were his tongue to be cut out, he would not order a single syllable to be altered in the sentence they had heard. As the bishops, not satisfied with this answer, continued, in the same humble posture, to intercede for Flavianus, Dioscorus, losing all patience, started up unexpectedly from his throne, and with a stern look and angry voice, "What!" said he, "do you think to raise a tumult? Where are the counts?" meaning Elpidius and Eulogius, the imperial commissioners. The counts, who were both present, upon hearing themselves called, immediately ordered the doors of the church to be set open; which was no sooner done, than the proconsul of Asia entered, surrounded with a band of soldiers, and followed by a confused multitude of the rabble and monks, some of them with chains in their hands, and others with clubs and stones, the usual arms of that militia. It is impossible to express the terror and confusion which their appearance occasioned in the assembly: some of the bishops took refuge behind the throne of Dioscorus, while others either crept under the benches, on which they were sitting, or strove to conceal themselves, the best they could, in the most retired places of the church; for the doors were all well guarded, and no bishop was allowed to go out. In the midst of this confusion, Dioscorus, raising his voice, cried out, with an imperious tone, "The sentence must be signed; if any one objects to it, let him take care, for it is with me he has to deal." At these words, the bishops, trembling and pale with fear, resumed their places; when Dioscorus, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem, attended by an armed multitude, carried about a blank paper, and presenting it to each bishop, obliged all to sign it. Juvenalis signed it the first, Domnus of Antioch signed after him, and the rest after Domnus, in the order they sat, except the Egyptians, who were not required to sign till all the rest had, that they might have something to plead, in case, upon a change of affairs, they should be obliged to give an account of their conduct; and it was upon this consideration that Dioscorus himself chose to sign the last of all.[1] The defection was general; for out of one hundred and forty-nine bishops, and their deputies, not one was found, besides the pope's legates, who had the courage to withstand the menaces of Dioscorus and his satellites. They indeed stood up to the last in defence of Flavianus; nor could they by any menaces be prevailed upon to follow the example of the rest, declaring, with great intrepidity, when threatened by Dioscorus, that they had rather suffer a thousand deaths, than it should ever be said that he had been countenanced in his wickedness by the representatives of the apostolic see.[1] Dioscorus however spared them; but some other bishops, who, animated by them, refused at first to sign the above-mentioned paper, he caused to be inhumanly beaten; and one among the rest, for only pointing at the soldiers, while he was upon the point of signing, to declare, that he did not do it freely, but merely out of fear. The treatment these met with so awed the rest, that they all signed, without betraying the least reluctance or scruple;[2] and then the paper, to which they had all set their names, was filled up by Dioscorus with the charge of heresy against Flavianus for acknowledging two natures in Christ, and with the sentence of his deposition for presuming to condemn Eutyches, in defiance of an express canon of the council of Ephesus, because he acknowledged but one; which was there declared the true catholic and orthodox doctrine. Flavianus, in hearing the sentence read, excepted anew against Dioscorus; which so provoked that haughty prelate, that he, and others of his party, falling upon him, in a transport of passion, first beat him in a most barbarous manner, as it were in emulation of one another, and then, throwing him on the ground, trampled upon him till he was ready to expire; when Dioscorus, not thinking he had yet his full revenge, ordered him to be carried, in that condition, to prison, and the next morning, when he was scarce able to stir, into exile. The soldiers appointed to attend him, dragged him as far as Epipus in Lydia, two days journey from Ephesus, where he died of the bruises he had received in the council, three days before, and the fatigues he had been forced to undergo in his journey.[3] He is now honored as a saint, by the church of Rome; and his festival is kept, with great solemnity, on the 24th of November, at Recanati, between Loreto and Macerata, and Giula-nuova in Abruzzo, the former city pretending to have one of his arms, and the latter the rest of his body. Upon the death of Theodosius, the emperor Marcian, his successor, caused the body of Flavianus to be translated from Epipus to Constantinople, and to be deposited there in the church of the apostles:[4] but of a

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 113. Liberat. c. 12.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 32. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 939.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 403. Liberat. c. 12. Prosp. chron.
[4] Leo. ep. 59.

Hilarius, the pope's legate, escapes from Ephesus. Many of the orientals deposed, with their patriarch, and sent into exile. The council dissolved. This council never received in the west. The deposition of Flavianus confirmed by the emperor. All condemned who held the same doctrine, and likewise their books and writings. Leo assembles a council in the west. Writes to the emperor for the assembling of an oecumenical council. Writes to the empress Pulcheria, and several others.

second translation no mention is made by any credible writer.

Hilarius, the pope's legate, terrified at the treatment Flavianus met with in the council, withdrew unexpectedly from Ephesus, before the death of that prelate, and, travelling only in the night, and through by-roads, got safe out of the reach of Dioscorus, who, as he suspected, was determined to treat him no better than he had done Flavianus, if he could by no other means prevail upon him to consent to his condemnation.[1] With Flavianus were condemned, deposed, and sent into exile, the greater part of the orientals, and Domnus, their patriarch, though both he and his suffragans had, through fear of forfeiting their sees, signed the condemnation of Flavianus, anathematized the doctrine of two natures, and consented to every thing else that Dioscorus had required of them. The crime laid to their charge was, their having formerly opposed Cyril, and lately Eutyches, whose doctrine, it was pretended, they could not condemn as heterodox, without approving and admitting that of Nestorius, as catholic and orthodox. The day after the deposition of the orientals, Dioscorus unexpectedly left Ephesus, and by his departure dissolved the council.

This council, though oecumenical, and lawfully assembled, was never received, as the reader may well imagine, by Leo and the other bishops in the west; nay, they would not even allow it to be styled a council, but stigmatized it with the name of "Latrocinium Ephesinum," the name by which it is generally known, on account of the violence, peculiar to robbers, that was used there by Dioscorus, and those of his party. Facundus, bishop of Hermiana in Africa, who flourished in the time of Justinian, alleges this council, and that of Rimini, to show, that there is no depending on the definitions of councils, when the bishops, who compose them, are not free, but awed either by princes, or their own brethren.[2] There are but very few, if any, oecumenical councils, whose definitions can, by this rule, be depended on. The definitions of this council were soon after declared null by that of Chalcedon; and Leo did all that lay in his power to procure an edict from the emperor Marcian, forbidding it even to be mentioned, lest posterity should know, that such a judgement had ever been given, that such an assembly, or conventicle, as he styles it, had ever been held.[3] However, Dioscorus and Eutyches had interest enough at court to obtain an edict of the emperor Theodosius, not only confirming the condemnation and deposition of Flavianus, and the other bishops, but commanding all, who professed the same doctrine, which he there supposes to be the doctrine of Nestorius, to be treated in the same manner. By the same edict, persons of all ranks and conditions were forbidden, on pain of perpetual banishment, to harbor or conceal any, who taught, held, or favored the tenets of Nestorius, Flavianus, and the deposed bishops; and the books, comments, homilies, and other works, written by them, or passing under their names, were ordered to be publicly burned.[1] The good emperor was utterly unacquainted with the circumstances attending the deposition of Flavianus; nay, the friends of Eutyches and Dioscorus at court, especially the favorite eunuch Chrysaphius, concealed from him, with so much care, every circumstance that could any ways prejudice him against the council, that in the height of the disturbances, and universal confusion, which reigned all over the east, and had been occasioned by the condemnation of Flavianus, he wrote to the emperor Valentinian, that, by the deposition of so turbulent a prelate, peace had, in the end, been happily restored to all the churches in his dominions.[2]

In the mean time Leo, being informed by his legate Hilarius, who had escaped from Ephesus, of what had passed there before his departure, assembled, without delay, a council at Rome, consisting of almost all the western bishops; and, with their advice, wrote to Theodosius, in his own and their name, complaining of the violence that had been committed at Ephesus, and entreating him, in the name of the Holy Trinity, to declare null what had been done there, and leave all things in the condition they were in before the council of Constantinople, till a greater number of bishops should assemble from all parts of the world, to give their opinion concerning a point, in which they were all equally concerned. He begs, that they may be allowed to assemble in Italy, since his legates had protested against the decisions of the council of Ephesus, and to them Flavianus had delivered his appeal. As he was not a subject of Theodosius, but Valentinian, over whom he had a great ascendant, he speaks, throughout his whole letter, with great freedom, of the council of Ephesus, though approved by Theodosius; and even warns that prince to be more upon his guard against those, whose interest it was to deceive him, because the sins that were committed by men acting with his authority, would, on the last day, be imputed to him.[3] Not satisfied with writing to the emperor, he wrote at the same time to the empress Pulcheria his sister; to the clergy, nobility, and people of Constantinople; to the

[1] Liberat. c. 12.
[2] Facund. l. 12. c. 3.
[3] Concil. t. 4. 674.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 864. Theodoret. ep. 140.
[2] Theodoret. ep. ad Joan. Germaniciæ Epis. p. 702.
[3] Leo ep. 40.

The emperor Valentinian at Rome. Leo applies to him for the assembling of an oecumenical council. In his grief, not forgetful of the dignity of his see. The emperor and the empresses write to Theodosius, and entreat him to assemble an oecumenical council, but in vain.

abbots of that city; to Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica, and to Julianus, bishop of the island of Cos.[1] In all these letters he encourages, exhorts, entreats those, to whom they were addressed, to continue in the communion of Flavianus, for he had not yet heard of his death, to adhere steadfastly to the ancient faith, in defiance of all the powers combined against it, and to join him in defending the truth, and combating, even at the expense of their lives, the opposite errors. In his letter to Pulcheria, who was greatly addicted to the see of Rome, and has therefore been sainted, he entreats her to employ all her interest with the emperor to obtain the assembling of an oecumenical council, and all her authority to prevent the evils that would be otherwise occasioned by the war, which had been lately declared against the faith of the church, vesting her for that purpose with the legation of St. Peter. The deacon Hilarius wrote likewise to the empress Pulcheria, and in his letter had the vanity to brag, as if the vigorous resolutions taken by Leo were chiefly owing to him.

Not long after Leo had written these letters, the emperor Valentinian, with his mother Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius, came from Ravenna, the usual place of their residence, to visit the churches of the saints in Rome, according to a superstitious custom which began to obtain about this time. They arrived in that city on the eve of the chair of St. Peter, a festival, which was then kept, as it is to this day, with great solemnity, on the 21st of February. The very next morning they went to perform their devotions in the church of that apostle; and, in entering it, were received by Leo, attended by a great number of bishops, whom he had assembled from the different provinces of Italy, to make, on that occasion, a more grand and awful appearance. He no sooner came into the presence of the imperial family, than he burst into tears; and when he began to speak, his words were so interrupted with sighs, as not to be understood by any that heard him. Having thus, like a skilful orator, disposed the emperor to hearken to him with attention, and entirely gained the two empresses, who are said to have mixed their tears with his, though they could not yet know why he shed them, he restrained for a while the excess of his grief, and addressing the emperor with a more intelligible voice, first represented, with his usual eloquence, the great danger the church was in, and the calamities she had reason to apprehend from the violences committed at Ephesus, and the deposition of the holy bishop Flavianus. Then resuming his sighs and tears, he conjured the emperor and the empresses, by the apostle to whom they were going to pay their respects, by their own salvation, and the salvation of Theodosius, to write to that prince, and spare no pains, since the true faith and religion were at stake, to persuade him to declare null, whatever had been done by the unhappy council of Ephesus, to restore Flavianus, whom he still believed alive, to his former dignity, and refer the whole affair to the judgment of the apostolic see. A modest demand indeed! But he immediately added, that bishops being allowed to assemble in Italy from all parts of the world, he (the pope) might hear them, and together with them, impartially examine every step that had been hitherto taken by either party. His grief did not make him forget his own dignity, or that of his see. For in the close of his speech he put the emperor in mind of the eminent rank he held in the church; of his being raised above all other bishops; and its being, on that consideration, incumbent upon him, as Flavianus had appealed, to apply for the assembling of a council.[1] In compliance with his request, Valentinian, as well as the two empresses, wrote to Theodosius before they left Rome, entreating him, by all that was holy, to agree on the assembling of an oecumenical council in Italy, as the only means of healing the divisions, which the violent and irregular proceedings of the council of Ephesus had already occasioned in the east, and would soon produce in the west, the bishop of Rome, and the other western bishops, being determined never to acquiesce in the decisions of that assembly; so that a general schism would ensue, and an entire separation between the east and the west, unless an oecumenical council were quickly assembled. In all these letters long descants are made on the dignity and pre-eminence of the Roman see; which has induced some to think that they were dictated by Leo himself. And indeed the sentiments are his; for he insinuates them in several of his letters; but the style comes far short of the propriety and elegance so remarkable in the writings which all agree to be his. To these letters Theodosius returned no other answer, than that he had done already all that could be done, to procure and maintain the peace and unity of the church, which he had as much at heart as they; that Flavianus, the author and firebrand of the late disturbances, having been deposed, the so much wished for calm and tranquillity had, by that means, been restored to all the churches in his dominions; and therefore as there could be no occasion for the assembling of any more councils, he begged they would lay aside all thoughts of that kind.[2]

In the mean time several bishops, who had been assisting to Dioscorus in the violences committed at Ephesus, being informed of the measures that Leo was pursuing to procure

[1] Leo. ep. 41. 43, 44, 45. 47.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 52. 55.

[2] Concil. p. 52. Liberat. c. 12.

Some of the bishops through fear abandon the party of Eutyches. Dioscorus, to encourage the rest, excommunicates Leo. Leo writes anew to Theodosius and Pulcheria. Despatches four legates to the court of Constantinople. Theodosius dies. Pulcheria marries Marcian, on whom she bestows the empire. The new emperor's obliging letter to Leo. He promises to assemble a council, and to make Leo absolute master of it. He writes again to Leo. Oecumenical councils assembled by the emperor, not by the pope.

the assembling of an oecumenical council, which they well knew would give them no quarter; and apprehending from his courage and zeal, as well as from the great interest he had not only with the imperial family in the west, but likewise with Pulcheria, the sister of Theodosius, that he might prevail in the end; began to abandon the party of Eutyches, and make some overtures towards an accommodation with the friends of Leo in the opposite party.

Of this Dioscorus was well apprised, and therefore, as he was himself a stranger to all fear, to show how little he valued the bishop of Rome, and thereby inspire with new courage those, whom he saw inclined to draw back, he solemnly excommunicated Leo, in an assembly of ten bishops, for presuming to judge anew, and annul what had been by the eastern bishops already judged, and finally determined. The sentence was signed by the ten bishops, who all separated themselves from the communion of Leo; much against their will, says Theodoret; but Dioscorus was so dreaded by all, that not even his friends had courage enough to speak or act freely before him.[1] Of these proceedings Leo took no notice for the present; but steadily pursuing the same measures, he wrote anew to Theodosius, notwithstanding the discouraging answer that prince had returned to Valentinian and the empresses; and in that, as well as in the letter which he sent at the same time to the empress Pulcheria, he may be truly said to have omitted no reason or argument, that could possibly be offered to convince both, that it was absolutely necessary an oecumenical council should be convened without delay, and that Italy was the most proper place for it they could choose.[2] Leo was not satisfied with letters alone; he despatched at the same time, four legates to the court of Constantinople, namely, two bishops, Abundius and Asterius, and two presbyters, Basilius and Senator. Their instructions were to acquaint the emperor, by word of mouth, with the irregular and violent proceedings of the council of Ephesus, to which he seemed, and really was, an utter stranger; and to inform him of the dreadful effects it had produced in his own dominions; for at this time a general schism, occasioned by that council, reigned in the east; the bishops of Thrace, of Egypt, and Palestine, siding with Dioscorus; and those of the patriarchate of Antioch, of Asia, and Pontus, standing up in defence of the innocence of Flavianus.

This had proved a dangerous legation, had Dioscorus been still in power; but before the legates reached Constantinople, Theodosius was dead, Marcian was declared emperor in his room, and Chrysaphius, the great friend and supporter of Eutyches and his party, publicly executed. As Theodosius left no issue male behind him, his sister Pulcheria, who had shared the sovereignty with him, and bore the title of Augusta, during his life, remained by his death sole mistress of the empire; and no person was more capable of governing it well. However, as no woman had yet reigned alone in either empire, she thought it advisable to marry, notwithstanding the resolution she had taken to continue a virgin to her death; and the person she chose for her husband was Marcian, a man of extraordinary qualifications, though descended from a family of no great distinction. To him therefore she was married, after he had, at her request, solemnly promised to suffer her, agreeably to the resolution she had taken, to live and die a virgin. As Pulcheria was greatly attached to the see of Rome, and had a particular veneration for Leo, the new emperor, out of complaisance to her, not only received his legates with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, but wrote him a most obliging letter to acquaint him with his accession to the imperial throne, to implore the assistance of his prayers, and assure him, that he had nothing so much at heart as the unity of the church, and the extirpation of heresies; and that, in order to procure the one and the other, he was determined to assemble an oecumenical council, of which the bishop of Rome, whom he styles the first bishop, should be absolute master.[1] Not long after he wrote anew to Leo, inviting him into the east to assist in person at the council which he proposed to assemble, and desiring him, if he did not care to undertake such a journey, to acquaint him with it, that he might summon all the bishops in his dominions to meet at the place which Leo should choose.[2] "Thus wrote Marcian," says Baronius,[3] "well knowing, that it is by the authority of the bishop of Rome alone that oecumenical councils can be lawfully assembled." I should be glad to know what records helped Marcian to that knowledge. It would puzzle Baronius to point them out, nothing being better known, nothing more certain, if there is any truth in history, than that all the oecumenical councils held till Marcian's time in the church, were assembled by the imperial authority, and not by the papal. To deny, or even to question this truth, would be arrant scepticism; and therefore of all the pretensions of the bishops of Rome, that of their being vested, by Divine right, with the power of assembling, translating, and dissolving councils, as Leo X. defined it,

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 398. Lupi notæ in Can. t. 1. p. 893, 894.
[2] Leo ep. 52. et 54.

[1] Leo t. 1. p. 550, 551. Theodoret. t. 1. p. 551.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 61.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 450. p. 121. edit. Antwerp.

Eutyches and Dioscorus abandoned by most of their friends. Anatolius of Constantinople receives the letter of Leo, and anathematizes Nestorius, Eutyches, &c. The exiled bishops re-called, and Eutyches confined. Marcian summons all the bishops to meet at Nice in Bithynia. Leo sends legates to assist at the council in his room.

may perhaps be justly reckoned the most intolerably impudent; since it gives the lie at once to all the monuments of antiquity, nay, and to the councils themselves, where it is said, and often repeated, that they met "by the authority, by the decree, by the command of the most pious emperors," without the least notice being ever taken of the bishop of Rome, or his authority. The bishops who composed this very council, that was held under Marcian, when they were assembled, owned themselves "to have been gathered together by the grace of God, and the command of the emperors." Not a word of the pope, by whose authority alone they were assembled, according to Baronius. Leo indeed, in speaking of this council, cunningly brings in the apostolic see: "It has been thought fit, (says he,) that a general council should be convened by the command of the Christian princes, and with the consent of the apostolic see.[1]" He could say no more, and every other bishop might have said as much with respect to his see. And yet pope Gelasius had the assurance to affirm, that this very council was convened "by the authority of the apostolic see alone."[2] As for the annalist, he sufficiently confutes elsewhere what he advances here; for he owns, that the second and fifth oecumenical councils were convened and held, the one against the will of Damasus, and the other of Vigilius,[3] and consequently not by their authority.

The extraordinary deference and regard paid both by Marcian and Pulcheria to the bishop of Rome, changed at once the face of affairs all over the east. The change began at court, and the example of the court was soon followed by the church. Such of the ministers as had, in the late reign, espoused with most warmth the cause of Eutyches, and pretended most zeal for his doctrine, became all on a sudden the most implacable enemies both of him and his doctrine.[4] And no wonder, says Theodoret, since they had no other rule of faith, but the will of the emperor. It were to be wished the church had given no occasion for the like reproach. But the change was no less sudden, no less remarkable, in the church than it was in the court. For the inclinations of the imperial family were no sooner known, than Anatolius, who had been chosen bishop of Constantinople in the room of Flavianus, and had been ordained by Dioscorus, and the bishops of his party, assembled in great haste all the bishops, abbots, presbyters, and deacons, who were then in Constantinople, and in their presence not only received and signed the famous letter of Leo to Flavianus concerning the incarnation, but at the same time anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, their doctrine, and all their followers, declaring, that he professed no other faith but what was held and professed by the Roman church, and by Leo, meaning, by the court, and the emperor. The example of Anatolius was followed by the other bishops, and the rest of the assembly, except three abbots, and a few of the clergy; and nothing was heard but anathemas against Eutyches, whom most of those, who uttered them, had but a few months before honored as "a new apostle," as the "true interpreter of the doctrine of the church and the fathers."[1] Those, who allege the declaration made at this time by Anatolius, and his council, to prove, that they acknowledged the infallibility of Leo and the Roman church, deserve no answer; it being manifest, that the compliment (for so I may style it) was not paid to Leo, or his church, but to Marcian and Pulcheria.

The letter of Leo being thus received by the bishop and clergy of Constantinople, and soon after by all the bishops of the east, excepting those of Illyricum, Palæstine, and Egypt; Marcian, at the request of Leo, recalled, by a special law, the bishops, who had been banished by the council of Ephesus for defending the doctrine it contained, removed Eutyches from the government of his monastery, and confined him to a place in the neighborhood of Constantinople, till the meeting of the council, which he intended to assemble.[2] Leo had begged both of Theodosius and Marcian, that the council might be assembled in Italy, and Marcian, in the very first letter he wrote to him, had left the place to his choice; but afterwards, changing his mind, probably on account of the eruption made at this time by Attila in the western empire, by a circular letter, dated the 17th of May, 451, he summoned all the bishops in his dominions to meet at Nice in Bithynia, by the first of September. This was a great disappointment to Leo: however, he immediately despatched into the east, Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum in Sicily, and the presbyter Bonifacius, to assist at the council as his legates, together with Lucentius, bishop of Asculum, and Basilius, a presbyter, whom he had sent already to Constantinople. By the two former he wrote to Marcian, to Pulcheria, and to the fathers of the council, to excuse his not assisting in person, and beg, that since the far greater part of the bishops, by receiving his letter, had already condemned the doctrine of Eutyches, they would, to avoid all disputes, condemn it anew, without any further examination, without hearkening to any who should offer to defend or to explain it.[3]

[1] Leo ep. 61.
[2] Gelas. ep. ad epis. Dardaniæ.
[3] Bar. ad ann. 553.
[4] Theodoret. ep. 138, 139.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 531. Leo ep. 60, 61. 68.
[2] Leo ep. 60. 63. Concil. ibid. p. 66. Theodoret. ep. 139.
[3] Leo ep. 62. 73, 74, 75.

The council transferred from Nice to Chalcedon. The number of the bishops. The imperial commissioners. The order in which the bishops were placed. Reason why the pope's legates presided at this council. The chief bishops all alike exceptionable. Calvin better acquainted with the state of affairs at this time than Bellarmine.

The bishops met at Nice, on the first of September, agreeably to the emperor's summons and command. But, in the mean time, the Hunns breaking into Illyricum, Marcian, who had promised to assist at the council in person, did not think it advisable to quit the metropolis at that juncture; and therefore wrote a very obliging letter to the bishops at Nice, requiring them to remove from that city to Chalcedon, separated from Constantinople only by the Bosphorus, which in that place is not a mile over. They readily complied with his request, and the council met for the first time, in the great church of St. Euphemia in Chalcedon, on the 8th of October, 451.[1] It was the most numerous council that had been yet held; for it is said, by most writers, to have consisted of 630 bishops, all, besides the pope's legates, two bishops from Africa, and one from Persia, subjects of the eastern empire. Marcian proposed, and had a great desire, to be present in person; but, thinking his presence more necessary in Illyricum, where the barbarians were committing dreadful ravages, he appointed the six first officers of the empire, and the most distinguished men in the senate, to supply his room at the council, with the character of his commissioners; and marched himself at the head of his army to the relief of the oppressed province.[2] When the council met, the commissioners placed themselves in the midst of the assembly, near the banisters of the altar. On their left, the most honorable place after theirs, sat the bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius, with the presbyter Bonifacius, the pope's legates. Of the presbyter Basilius, the fourth legate, no mention is made in the acts of the council, or by any writer; whence we may, with better reason, suppose him to have been dead or indisposed, than imagine, with De Marca, that he absented himself because Anatolius of Constantinople would suffer three legates, but not four, to set above him.[3] Next to the legates were Anatolius, Maximus of Antioch, Thalassius of Cæsarea, Stephanus of Ephesus, and all the bishops of the diocess of Pontus, of Asia, of Thrace, and of the patriarchate of Antioch, except those of Palæstine. On the right were seated Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenalis of Jerusalem, Quintillus of Heraclea in Macedon, in the room of Anastasius of Thessalonica, Peter of Corinth, with the bishops of Egypt, of Illyricum, of Palæstine. In the middle of the assembly was placed, on a high and stately throne, the book of the Gospels. At this grand assembly the pope's legates held the first place among the bishops, and presided, not in virtue of any right which they had, or even pretended to have, of presiding at an oecumenical council held in the east; but because those, who might have claimed that honor as their due, had all forfeited it by their late conduct. And it was their late conduct, not his right, that Leo alleged, in one of his letters to the emperor, as a reason why his legates should be allowed to preside. "It is fit," says he, "that Paschasinus should preside at the council in my name, because some bishops have not withstood the efforts of error with due firmness and constancy."[1] And truly, if we reflect on the conduct of the chief bishops in the east, we shall find them all equally exceptionable, all equally unworthy of being placed at the head of such an assembly. Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and Thalassius were the chief authors of the violences committed at Ephesus; Stephen of Ephesus had not only yielded to their violences himself, but forced others to yield; and besides, was not a lawful bishop, having seized on the see of Ephesus by force, and by force kept himself in it; and was afterwards, on that account, deposed by the council. Maximus of Antioch had been ordained in the room of Domnus, who had been unjustly deposed by the council of Ephesus. Anastasius of Thessalonica did not assist in person, and if he had, he would never have pretended to preside, when the legates of the pope were present, whose vicar he was for the provinces of East Illyricum. Anatolius of Constantinople might indeed have claimed the right of presiding at a council held within the limits of his jurisdiction, and perhaps did; for he was canonically chosen upon the death of Flavianus, and canonically ordained. But as he had been ordained by Dioscorus, and had formerly lived in great friendship with that prelate, (for he was a presbyter of Alexandria, and his nuncio at the court of Constantinople, when he was raised to that see) it was justly apprehended he would not judge impartially, but might be somewhat biassed in favor of his old friend. From what I have said it is manifest, that Calvin was, at least, better acquainted with the history of the church, and the state of affairs at this time in the east, than the great champion of the Roman see, Bellarmine: for the former having written, that Leo begged it of the emperor as a favor, that his legates might be allowed to preside at the council of Chalcedon, and that the emperor granted him his request, because he found none besides them on whom he thought proper to confer such an honor at that juncture; the latter styles both these assertions "bare faced and most impudent lies," adding, "that Leo sent his legates to preside without asking the emperor's leave, or any body's else."[2] But which of the two was guilty of a bare-faced and most impudent lie, I leave

[1] Concil. t 4. p. 69. Liberat. c. 13.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 77, 78. Facund.
[3] Pet. de Marc. de Concord. Sacerd. et Imp. l. 5. c. 6.

[1] Leo ep. 69
[2] Bellar. de Concil. et Eccl. l. 1. c. 19.

The great arrogance of the pope's legates. They will not allow Dioscorus to sit as a judge; who is placed in the middle of the assemby. Dioscorus falsely charged by the legates, with having assembled the council of Ephesus. Charge brought against Dioscorus. His firmness and intrepidity. He is charged with many enormous crimes.

the reader to judge. And, after all, the imperial commissioners may be properly said to have presided; for the council was entirely governed by them, and by the pope's legates only in their absence. Hence they are always named the first, and the bishops after them, in the order they were placed.

When the bishops were all seated, the pope's legates, rising up, and advancing into the middle of the assembly, "We have here," said Paschasinus, holding a paper in his hand, "an order from the most blessed and apostolic pope of the city of Rome, which is the head of all churches, by which his apostleship hath been pleased to command (præcipere dignatus est ejus apostolatus), that Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, should not be allowed to sit in the council. Let him therefore be ordered to withdraw, else we must withdraw." The commissioners asked, what they had to object against Dioscorus in particular. "He must," replied Lucentius, "be called to account for the judgment he gave at Ephesus, where he presumed to assemble a council without the consent of the apostolic see; which has never been thought lawful, which has never been done: as he is therefore to be judged, he ought not to sit as a judge." Here one of the commissioners interrupting him, "Neither ought you," said he, "to sit as a judge, since you take upon you to act as a party. However, let us know what particular crime you lay to the charge of Dioscorus; for it is not agreeable to justice or reason that he alone should be charged with a crime, of which many others are no less guilty than he." To this the legates made no other reply, than that Leo would by no means suffer Dioscorus to sit or act in that assembly as a judge, and that they must withdraw if he did, agreeably to their instructions. The commissioners finding them unalterable, and apprehending the disturbances which their absenting themselves from the council would occasion, yielded at last; and, ordering Dioscorus to quit his seat, placed him by himself as a person accused, in the midst of the assembly.[1]

It is hard to conceive what the legates meant, by charging it as a crime upon Dioscorus, that he had presumed to assemble a council without the consent of the apostolic see: for it was not by him, but by the emperor Theodosius, that the council of Ephesus, and they could mean no other, was assembled; and to the assembling of that council Leo consented; that is, he obeyed the summons of the emperor, inviting him to it, and was present in the legates, whom he sent to act in his room; and no other consent had been hitherto required of the bishops of Rome, or any other bishop. As to what the legates added, that it had never been thought lawful to assemble a council without the consent of the bishops of Rome, that it had never been done, it is so repugnant to truth, that might the authenticity of the acts of the council be questioned, no man, who has but dipped into ecclesiastical history, would believe they could have had the assurance gravely to advance, in an assembly of six hundred and thirty bishops, such notorious and palpable falsehoods. And yet their authority is alleged by Bellarmine,[1] and after him by all the Roman catholic divines, to prove, that the power of assembling oecumenical councils is vested in the pope alone, as if their authority could be of any weight, or deserve the least regard, when it evidently contradicts the most unexceptionable monuments antiquity can produce.

But to return to the council. In the first session Eusebius of Dorylæum, appearing against Dioscorus, charged him with having approved, in the late council of Ephesus, the doctrine of one nature in Christ, with having condemned the doctrine of two natures, deposed Flavianus for maintaining it, and forced, by introducing armed men into the council, all the bishops there present to sign the unjust sentence which he had pronounced. In answer to the first part of the charge, he owned, without betraying the least fear or concern, that he had condemned, still did, and ever would condemn, the doctrine of two natures in Christ, and all who maintained it; that he held no other doctrine, but what he had learned of the fathers, especially of Athanasius, Nazianzen, and Cyril; that he had chosen rather to condemn Flavianus than them; and that those who did not like his doctrine might use him as they pleased, now they were uppermost, and had the power in their hands, but in what manner soever they should think fit to use him, he was unalterably determined, his soul being at stake, to live and die in the faith which he had hitherto professed. As to his having forced the bishops to sign the condemnation of Flavianus, he answered, that the constancy of every Christian, and much more of a bishop, ought to be proof against all kind of violence, and death itself; that the charge brought by Eusebius lay heavier against them than it did against him, and therefore it was incumbent upon them, as the more guilty, to answer it.[2] In the second session were received and read several memorials, charging Dioscorus with many enormous crimes, with leading a lewd and debauched life, to the great scandal of his flock, and even with attempting to usurp the sovereignty, and styling himself king of Egypt. These memorials were all addressed, "To Leo the most holy, blessed, and universal patriarch of the great city of Rome, and to the holy and oecumenical council of Chalcedon."[3]

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 93. 96.

[1] Bellar. de Concil. et eccl. l. 1. c. 12.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 173—181. [3] Concil. ibid. p. 394.

Dioscorus condemned and deposed. He is banished. The decree or symbol composed by this council. Eutyches no less orthodox than Leo. The two parties quarreled about words. And held the same doctrine.

Some have laid great stress on the title of "universal patriarch," here given to Leo, not reflecting, that in the council of Ephesus, the same title was given to Dioscorus,[1] and consequently, that it was, with respect to both, a mere compliment, owing to that flattery which has been in all ages peculiar to the Greeks. At this session, Dioscorus was not present, but nevertheless as he had been three times summoned, the legates, after a short recapitulation of the crimes laid to his charge, with the consent of the council, proceeded to the sentence, and declared him deposed from the episcopal dignity. The sentence was pronounced in Leo's name, and thus worded: "Leo, archbishop of the great and ancient Rome, by us, and the present synod, with the authority of St. Peter, on whom the catholic church and orthodox faith are founded, divests Dioscorus of the episcopal dignity, and declares him henceforth incapable of exercising any sacerdotal or episcopal functions." This sentence was signed by the whole council, and immediately transmitted to the emperor, who not only confirmed it, but soon after confined Dioscorus to the city of Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in the year 454, the third of his exile, anathematizing to his last breath the doctrine of two natures, and all who held it.[2] The remaining sessions were chiefly employed in restoring to their sees the bishops who had been deposed by the council of Ephesus; in deciding controversies between neighboring bishops in point of jurisdiction; and above all, in settling the catholic belief, with respect to the mystery of the incarnation, which occasioned warm disputes. But at last a symbol or creed was happily composed, to which they all agreed; and the substance of it was, that there is but one Christ, perfect God, and perfect man, in his divinity consubstantial with God, and consubstantial with us in his humanity; that in him the two natures were united without change, division or mixture; and subsisted not in two persons, but in one, agreeably to the symbol of Nice.[3] This the fathers of the council would not allow to be called a symbol or creed, but only a decree, the composing of any new symbols or creeds having been strictly forbidden by the first council of Ephesus, which was universally received.

If we compare the doctrine, contained in this symbol or decree, with that which was taught by Eutyches, we shall find the pretended heresiarch to have been, at the bottom, no less orthodox than Leo himself. For Dioscorus, whom we may suppose to have been well acquainted with his doctrine, in the very first session of the present council, anathematized all, "who admitted in the incarnation any change of the Divine nature, any confusion or mixture of the two natures;"[4] which was confessing "the two natures to have been united in Christ without change, division, or mixture." In the same session Eustathius of Berytus, who maintained the doctrine of Eutyches with no less warmth than Dioscorus, anathematized "all, who, by acknowledging but one nature, denied Christ to be consubstantial with us according to his humanity, or, by acknowledging two, divided Christ,"[1] which was owning Christ "to be consubstantial with us in his humanity," agreeably to the present decree. That Christ was perfect God and perfect man, that in him there was but one person or hypostasis, was never denied or even questioned by Eutyches, or any of his followers. As to the expression of "the one incarnate nature of the word," it had been used by Cyril; Flavianus himself owned, that in one sense, he did not reject it;[2] and F. Petau plainly shows, that it may be understood in a catholic, as well as in a heretical sense.[3] And yet when Eustathius of Berytus was charged before the council with having used that expression, they all cried out, without requiring or allowing him to explain it, that he was guilty of heresy; which so provoked that prelate, that having then in his hand the book, in which Cyril had used the same expression, he threw it at them, saying, "Read what Cyril says; it is Cyril you anathematize, and I am proud of being anathematized with him."[4] From what I have said it is manifest, that the contending parties agreed in the substance, and only quarreled, as they had done in the case of Nestorius, about words and expressions. Eutyches, it is true, maintained, that there was only one nature in Christ; but he thereby meant no more than that there was but one Christ, as evidently appears from the inferences which he and his followers drew from the admitting of two natures. But as the expressions he used might be easily wrested to an heretical sense (and so might the expressions of those who opposed him,) his enemies, especially the orientals, whom he had greatly disobliged, understood them in that, deduced from them, and would not understand them in any other sense. As for Leo, it was only upon the information, which Flavianus, and those who with him had condemned Eutyches, were pleased to give him, that he could judge of his doctrine: and by them he was so far imposed upon as to believe, that the sentiments, which they ascribed to him, because deducible, as they thought, from his doctrine, were really his, and owned by him. This plainly appears from his famous letter; for he employs the far greater part of it in combating a heretic of Flavianus' making, and confuting opinions, which Eutyches was no less ready to anathematize than he. When the point in dispute was examined in the present council

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 270.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 426. Leo ep. 81. Evag. l. 2. c. 3.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 566. [4] Concil. t. 4. p. 173.

[1] Ibid. p. 176. [3] Concil. ibid. p. 16.
[2] Pet. dog. t. 4. l. 1. c. 14. [4] Concil. t. 4. p. 173.

The emperor Marcian comes in person to the council. The symbol or decree signed by all. The rise of the see of Constantinople.

with more attention, and less prejudice, than it had been in those of Constantinople and Ephesus, it appeared, that the only difference between the Eutychians and their adversaries was, that the latter maintained Christ to be in two natures, and of two natures (ἐν δύο φύσεσι, καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων), whereas the former would not allow him to be *in*, but only *of*, two natures. And it was this small difference, in speaking of a mystery so much above the comprehension of human understanding, that set all the bishops of the church at variance, and inflamed them to the degree we have seen, against each other, that occasioned the assembling of so many councils, the deposing and persecuting of so many bishops, and was likely to have produced no less disturbances in the state than it did in the church, as the princes in those days interested themselves warmly in the quarrels of the ecclesiastics. How many evils would have been prevented, had Flavianus followed the friendly advice which Eutyches gave him? For the latter being interrogated by him in the council of Constantinople, whether he believed in two natures after the incarnation, "I believe, (he replied,) that Christ is perfect God, and perfect man; but here I stop, and advise you to do so too." But it was the misery and vice of these times, that in all church disputes they sought for contention and victory, not for peace, and would never stop till by deductions and consequences, often very unfair, they had drawn their adversaries into some trap of words, which might implicate them in the heresy laid to their charge. The most orthodox of the clergy could not speak or write on the mysteries of our faith, without imminent danger of having their expressions misunderstood, or wilfully wrested, by their enemies, into an heretical sense; which was no sooner done than they were accused, and councils assembled to judge of their doctrine, or rather to condemn it, upon their own interpretations; the peace of the whole church, and sometimes of the state, was disturbed by the flame, that was raised upon these disputes; and at last the contending parties were found to have differed only in words, and about points which neither was able to explain. Upon the whole, it may be truly said, that it was in these times no less dangerous to speak or write upon matters of faith, than under the greatest tyrants, upon matters of state: for as every thing there, that is said or written, may be called treason; so every thing here was called heresy, and punished as such: nor are innocent men in more danger there from informers or delatores, than they were here from every priest or monk with whom they conversed, or who read their books, especially when the zeal of the latter was sharpened, as in these times it generally was, by desire of revenge for some former persecution, which they had suffered themselves.

On the 25th of October, when the sixth session was held, the emperor Marcian came in person to the council, and in his presence the symbol or decree, which I have mentioned above, was read, approved, and signed, by all the members of the assembly. The pope's legates signed the first in the name of Leo, whom Lucentius styled "bishop of the whole church," and the other two "bishop of the universal church of Rome."[1] The other bishops signed, according to the rank of their sees, declaring, that they did it freely, and of their own accord, because they believed that, and no other, to be the genuine doctrine of the apostles.[2]

Matters of faith being thus settled to the satisfaction of both parties, the council took next the discipline of the church into consideration; when the famous canon was enacted, vesting the bishop of Constantinople, who had long since begun to rival the bishop of Rome, with a new power, or rather confirming to him that, which in imitation of the bishop of Rome, he had already assumed. The bishop of Byzantium was at first but a suffragan to the bishop of Heraclea, ex-arch of the diocese of Thrace, comprehending six provinces; namely, Thrace, Rhodope, Europa, Hæmimontis, Mœsia Secunda, and Scythia. But Byzantium being chosen by Constantine for the place of his residence, honored with his name, and made the seat of another empire, the bishops of this new metropolis, thinking their see raised with the city, not only withdrew all subjection to their exarch, but taking great state upon them, began to act as if they had been as much exalted above other bishops, as their city was above other cities. This gave, as we may well imagine, no small umbrage to their brethren; but the great interest the bishops of Constantinople had at court, enabling them to oblige or disoblige whom they pleased, the other prelates chose rather to gain their favor by yielding to their ambition, than incur their displeasure by opposing it. Hence the grandeur of the see of Constantinople, and the splendor the bishop of that city lived in, began very early to dazzle the eyes of those who most panted after honor and promotion. Eusebius strove, even in Constantine's time, to exchange the metropolitan see of Nicomedia for that of Constantinople, though the latter had not yet been distinguished by the canons with any particular mark of dignity: and a few years after Eudoxius, a prelate of an unbounded ambition, was translated to the same see from that of Antioch, which was one of the three great patriarchal sees. In the year 383, the bishops of Constantinople were already so far exalted, by the connivance and tacit consent of their colleagues, as to take place of all the bishops in the east. Hence at the second oecumenical council,

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 576. Facund. l. 5. c. 3.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 607.

The bishops of Constantinople assume the patriarchal authority over the diocese of Thrace. Invade those of Pontus and Asia.

held in that year at Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzum, then bishop of that city, was allowed to preside, though the patriarch of Alexandria, the first, by the canons, after that of Rome, was present; an honor which Gregory, who was an utter enemy to all pride and ostentation, would never have claimed, nor even accepted, had he not been entitled to it by an established custom, and the unanimous consent of his brethren. From what has been said it is manifest, that the second oecumenical council only confirmed to the bishop of Constantinople an honor for which he had already the sanction of an established custom, when the fathers of that assembly decreed, that the bishop of New Rome should have the first place of honor after the bishop of Old Rome.[1] It is observable, that Timotheus of Alexandria, who was present when this canon was made, and had, by the regulations observed till that time, an undoubted right to the first place of honor after the bishop of Rome, never once offered to oppose this new regulation, nor to dispute with Nectarius, chosen in the room of Gregory, who resigned while the council was yet sitting, the honor of presiding at such an assembly. And what else could inspire that prelate with so much moderation, when his rank and the dignity of his see were at stake, but his knowing, that the bishop of Constantinople enjoyed already, by an established custom, which it was now in vain to oppose, the honor conferred on him by that canon? It is therefore altogether surprising, that Leo should have roundly asserted, as he did in one of his letters,[2] that the above-mentioned canon never took place. If he really believed it never did, he betrayed an ignorance of what passed in the east, quite unaccountable. For that the bishops of Constantinople peaceably enjoyed the first rank of honor in the east, even before that canon was made, has been sufficiently shown; and to suppose, that they would have parted with it, after it had been confirmed to them by the decree of an oecumenical council, which gave them the same right to the second place among the prelates of the church as the bishop of Rome had to the first, is not only absurd and ridiculous, but evidently repugnant to the known practice that obtained in the east. For, not to speak of metropolitans, but only patriarchs, who yielded the precedency to the bishop of Constantinople, in the year 394, Nectarius presided at a council which was composed of all the most eminent prelates in the east, there being present, among the rest, the famous Theophilus of Alexandria, Flavianus of Antioch, Helladius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Paul of Heraclea, all patriarchs.[3] Theophilus wanted neither courage nor ambition to maintain his rank, and was not a man tamely to yield to what he could have disputed. Sisinnius of Constantinople, a prelate universally commended for his moderation, and quite incapable of claiming any kind of pre-eminence, to which he had not an undoubted right, presided at a council held in the year 426, at which several patriarchs assisted, and Theodosius of Antioch among the rest.[1] In all the accounts we have of the councils held in the east after the second oecumenical council, the bishop of Constantinople is constantly named the first.[2] It is true, that in the second council of Ephesus the fifth place was allotted to Flavianus; but he was there considered as a party; and the pope's legates complained, in the council of Chalcedon, of the injustice that had been done him in defiance of the canons, meaning, no doubt, the canon placing him next to the bishop of old Rome; and that place was accordingly given to his successor, Anatolius, in the council of Chalcedon, though many patriarchs, and, among the rest, those of Alexandria and Antioch were present. Leo therefore either advanced what he knew to be false, or was grossly mistaken, and less acquainted with what had passed in the east, than one would think he could possibly have been, when he so positively asserted, that the canon in favor of the bishop of Constantinople had never taken place.

But, after all, no power, no authority or jurisdiction, was granted by that canon to the see of Constantinople: it was placed only in rank and dignity next to the see of Rome. However, as dignity naturally inspires a desire of power, and is, at the same time, a most effectual means of attaining it, the bishops of Constantinople no sooner found themselves thus raised above their colleagues, than they took upon them by degrees to exercise a power answering the rank to which they were raised. They began with Thrace, and alleging that Constantinople, which was the head of that diocese, according to the civil polity established by Constantine, ought to be so too according to the ecclesiastical polity, which was founded on the civil, they assumed at once the title, claimed the rights, and exercised, within the limits of that diocese, all jurisdiction peculiar to a patriarch. And thus was the patriarch degraded almost into the rank of a suffragan, and the suffragan raised to that of a patriarch. As we read of no opposition made to so great a change by the bishop of Heraclea, till this time the patriarchal see, we may well conclude it to have been effected with the concurrence, or most probably, by the command of the court, where the bishops of Constantinople bore a great sway. They were not long satisfied with this new jurisdiction. Their ambition increasing as their power increased, they soon began to extend their authority beyond the limits of the diocese of Thrace, and invade

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 814.
[2] Leo. ep. 79.
[3] Concil. t. 2. p. 1151.

[1] Phot. c. 55.
[2] Concil. t. 3. p. 1059. Concil. ap. p. 887. et t. 4. p. 116. 234. 735. 738.

Chrysostom the first who exercised jurisdiction in Pontus. Which is vested by law in his immediate successor. And maintained by the rest. Their extensive power. They invade the provinces subject to the bishop of Rome: but without success. They extend their jurisdiction over the patriarchate of Antioch.

the neighboring dioceses of Pontus and Asia. The first, who paved the way for these encroachments of the see of Constantinople, in those parts, was Chrysostom, who, being invited by the bishops of Asia, upon the demise of their ex-arch Antoninus, to settle the affairs of that church, which he had left in a deplorable condition, assembled a council at Ephesus, and there deposed several bishops convicted of simony, appointed others in their room, ordained the new bishop of Ephesus; and, on his return through the diocese of Pontus, took upon him to depose the metropolitan of Bithynia, in spite of the strong opposition he met with there both from the people and clergy, and to appoint him, by his own authority, a successor.[1] With his conduct in Asia no fault can be found; for he was invited thither by the Asiatics themselves, and acted in concert with them. But his exercising the like jurisdiction in the diocese of Pontus, whither he had not been invited, was an open violation of the canons, and as such alleged against him in the famous council ad Quercum. However, Atticus, his immediate successor, treading in his footsteps, not only claimed the power of ordaining bishops in the two dioceses of Pontus and Asia, but procured a law from the emperor vesting in him alone that power.[2] But such a privilege was only personal, was granted to him, and not to his see.[3] Hence, upon his death, the bishops of Asia and Pontus resuming the exercise of the right, which the canons gave them, began to supply the vacant sees, as they had formerly done, without the consent, or even the knowledge, of the bishop of Constantinople. But the successors of Atticus, pretending the abovementioned prerogative to have been granted to him, as bishop of the imperial city, and therefore to his see, and all who should succeed him in it, claimed it as their right; and, being supported in this, as they were in their other usurpations, by the court, exercised, in spite of all opposition, the same power and jurisdiction in the dioceses of Pontus and Asia, as they did in Thrace. They had learned, it seems, of the bishops of Rome, the important lesson, never to part with any power which they had once acquired, by what means, and upon what terms, soever they had acquired it.

And now the bishop of Constantinople had raised himself, in the course of a few years, from the low condition of a suffragan, to that of a patriarch, and the greatest patriarch in power and jurisdiction, then upon earth, having under him not one diocess only, as the other patriarchs, but three, comprising twenty-seven provinces, and as many metropolitans. And it is observable, that in all those provinces he exercised both the metropolitan and patriarchal jurisdiction, ordaining the common bishops as well as the metropolitans: nay, he carried his usurpations so far, as not only to ordain, but even to name, both the metropolitans and other bishops, without consulting either the people or clergy, pretending thereby to prevent the disturbances often attending popular elections, and the raising to the episcopal dignity men incapable of discharging, as they ought, the duties of that office.[1] Such an extensive, absolute, and uncontrolled jurisdiction might, one would think, have satisfied the ambition of those prelates. But the desire of power, like that of wealth, knows no bounds, is ever restless, and whetted, rather than allayed, by the acquisitions it makes. The bishops of Constantinople no sooner found themselves in the quiet possession of the power they had usurped, than they began to think of extending it farther by new usurpations. They thought themselves now a match for the bishop of Rome; and accordingly made their first attempt on East Illyricum, over which Rome had long exercised an usurped jurisdiction. Thus did the two great usurpers first meet, when that of Constantinople was shamefully foiled, Boniface, who then governed the Roman church, having, by better concerted measures, utterly defeated those of his rival. The latter therefore, finding in the bishop of Rome too subtle and powerful an adversary to contend with, abandoned the enterprise for the present, and, turning his efforts against the patriarch of Antioch, less powerful than that of Rome or Alexandria, made himself in that patriarchate sufficient amends for his late disappointment. For not long after Flavianus of Constantinople not only received an appeal from a council held at Antioch, but restored to their former dignity two ecclesiastics, who had been deposed by that council;[2] which a man of his modesty and moderation[3] would never have attempted, had not his predecessors extended their jurisdiction over that patriarchate. Anatolius, who succeeded Flavianus, and was at this time bishop of Constantinople, not only took upon him to ordain Maximus of Antioch, but to divide the province of Phœnicia, one of the chief provinces of that patriarchate, into two, and even to excommunicate the metropolitan of Tyre, because he would not consent to that division; and this without giving himself the trouble, or thinking it necessary, to consult Maximus, though he was then at Constantinople, or even mention it to him.[4]

Thus did the bishops of Constantinople, out of the five dioceses, into which the whole east was divided, subject, in the course of a few years, four to their see. But this extensive jurisdiction was a barefaced usurpation,

[1] Soz. l. 8. c. 6. Pallad. vit. Chrys.
[2] Socr. l. 9. c. 28. [3] Idem ibid.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 838. Socr. l. 7. c. 37.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 981. [3] Leo, ep. 97.
[4] Concil. t. 4. p. 838.

Anatolius applies to the council of Chalcedon for a confirmation of the jurisdiction enjoyed by his see. The imperial commissioners, as well as the bishops, of the council, incensed against the pope; and why. Even his friends provoked at the conduct of his legates. The bishop of Constantinople equalled in every thing but precedency to the bishop of Rome. The pope's legates withdraw from the council.

repugnant to the canons, and entirely owing to the interest they had at court, and the deference, that was thereupon paid them by their brethren. Of this Anatolius, the present bishop, was well apprised; and therefore, desirous of building his power on a more stable foundation, he resolved to apply to the fathers assembled at Chalcedon; not doubting but, as his see had been declared the second in dignity, they would allow him jurisdiction and power suitable to his rank. However, as he was a prelate of excellent parts, and great penetration, he thought it advisable, in the first place, to sound the disposition of the imperial commissioners, as well as the bishops, who composed the council; and these he found all highly incensed against the pope and his legates, and ready to concur in any measures that could more effectually enable the bishop of Constantinople to check the growing power, and oppose the daily encroachments, of the bishop of Rome. What chiefly incensed them against the pope was the unseasonable concern he betrayed, at so critical a juncture, for the honor and dignity of his see. For though he thought the orthodox faith to be in imminent danger; though he had often declared, that nothing could save the church but an oecumenical council; yet when he had in the end prevailed upon the emperors, partly by his letters, partly by his sighs and tears, to assemble one, he not only refused to assist in it in person, because it was not held in Italy, but would not send legates to supply his room, till it was agreed, that they should preside; and that even the presbyters, who represented him, should take place of the bishop of Constantinople, and all the patriarchs of the east. His standing upon such punctilios, when the peace and unity of the church were at stake, gave great offence both to his friends and his enemies.

To this was added the haughty behavior of his legates, who, presuming on the emperor's favor, took such state upon them in the council, as neither the commissioners nor bishops could bear. But what most of all shocked them was, that the first legate, in giving judgment against Dioscorus, and pardoning those who had concurred with him in his violent measures, ascribed the one and the other chiefly to Leo, and only to the council as acting by his authority, and in his name. "Leo deposes, Leo forgives by us, and the present council," &c., were the words of the sentence, as if the whole power had been lodged in him, and by him communicated to the council, no otherwise than it was to his legates. Such arrogance and presumption estranged from the bishop of Rome, even those whom he had personally obliged, and who, on that score, had been hitherto greatly attached to his see. Anatolius therefore, thinking this a proper season to apply for a confirmation of the privileges and jurisdiction, which his see enjoyed only by custom, caused Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople, it not being proper that he himself should appear in an affair of that nature, to move it in the council. As, except the pope's legates, and the bishops of Illyricum, the council entirely consisted of eastern bishops; as they were all alike jealous of the growing power of the bishops of Rome, and wanted, as some of them openly declared,[1] a no less powerful protection to defend them against his encroachments; the motion was approved, and the famous canon, the 28th of the council of Chalcedon, made and signed by all the bishops who were present.

By that canon was confirmed the decree of the second oecumenical council, placing the bishop of New Rome next in dignity to the bishop of Old Rome. 2dly, The former was vested with a patriarchal jurisdiction over the three dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. 3dly, He was empowered to ordain all bishops in such places of those dioceses as were in the hands of the barbarians; which was, in other parts, the privilege of the metropolitans. And lastly were granted to the see of Constantinople in general terms, and without restriction or limitation, all the rights, prerogatives, and privileges, that had ever been granted to, or enjoyed by, the see of Rome.[2] Thus was the see of Constantinople equalled in all things, but precedency, to the see of Rome; and the so much boasted supremacy of that see reduced to a mere primacy of order and dignity. The decree met at first with some opposition from the bishops of Asia and Pontus; but it was signed in the end by all but the bishops of Illyricum, Thalassius of Cesarea, ex-arch of Asia, Eusebius of Ancyra, and perhaps a few more. Theodoret of Cyrus in Syria, one of the most pious and learned prelates at that time in the church, signed among the rest, and likewise Eusebius of Dorylæum, though he had been received and entertained at Rome with great kindness by Leo, when he was driven from his see, and had been restored to it chiefly by his means and interest.[3]

As for the legates; the motion was no sooner made by Aetius, than they quitted their seats, and declaring, that they had no directions "from the archbishop of the great city of Rome concerning matters of that nature," withdrew in great haste from the council. And truly Leo, suspecting some such design, had strictly enjoined them, in their secret instructions, to remember the dignity of him who sent them; to represent him by a suitable conduct and behavior; and to oppose, to the utmost of their power, such as, presuming on the dignity of their cities, should, on that score, claim or arrogate to themselves any rights or privileges that had

[1] Concil t. 4. p. 814, 815. [2] Concil. ib. p. 795. 798.
[3] Concil. ib. p. 798, 799. 803.

The example of the legates not followed by a single bishop. They oppose the decree, falsely pretending it was surreptitious, or extorted by force, or repugnant to the canons of Nice. The canon is confirmed by the imperial commissioners. The emperor, the empress, and Julian of Cos, write to Leo, begging him to confirm the twenty-eighth canon.

not been yet granted them by the canons.[1] It was in compliance with these instructions that they withdrew, vainly promising themselves, that their example would be followed by many others, and the motion by that means be dropped. But, to their great mortification, of the many bishops who were present, not one offered to stir from his place: so that they retired alone, and in the utmost confusion. Being thus withdrawn, they waited with fear and impatience to hear what had passed; and were no sooner informed, than they applied to the commissioners, earnestly entreating them to order the fathers of the council to meet once more; for that was supposed to be the last session. They met accordingly, and the very next day; when Paschasinus, having first begged leave of the commissioners to speak, "We are informed, (said he,) that some regulations were made yesterday, which we apprehend to be repugnant to the canons, and inconsistent with the peace of the church, which the emperor has been laboring with so much zeal and application to settle; therefore, as they were made in our absence, we beg they may be read." "In your absence? (replied Aetius,) you absented yourselves, and left the council, though I entreated and even pressed you to stay." He then delivered the canon to be read, with the names of all the bishops who had signed it; which so surprised Paschasinus, that he could not utter one single word. But his colleague Lucentius, rising up, said, "the bishops have been imposed upon; they have not signed freely; they have been forced." But that reproach the bishops answered, all crying out, with one voice, "no kind of violence has been used; we all knew what we were doing, and we did it freely; we did it of our own accord." Not satisfied with this declaration in common, the chief men among them protested in particular, that no violence, no artifice, had been used, but that they had all signed of their own motion.[2] And yet Leo, to prejudice the world against that canon, maintained to the last, that it had been extorted by force; and the violence, that had been used with the bishops, who signed it, he often alleges, in his letters, as a reason why it should be universally rejected.[3] Did his legates never inform him of what had passed? Did he never peruse the acts of the council, though often referred to them by Anatolius? Or did he advance, because it best served his purpose, what he himself knew to be false?

The unanimous declaration of the bishops, that no kind of force or artifice had been used, leaving no room for the legates to except against the decree on that score, they pretended in the next place, that it was repugnant to the sixth canon of the council of Nice. But that canon being read first by Paschasinus, and afterwards by Aetius; and the bishops having all delivered it as their opinion, that nothing had been enacted either by the present, or by the second oecumenical council, that could be thought any way repugnant to the canons of Nice; the commissioners asked them, whether they had willingly and freely signed the canon in dispute. Here they all protested anew, and called God to witness, that they had signed it of their own accord, that no compulsion had been used. The commissioners therefore, finding the legates had nothing further to offer, confirmed, in the emperor's name, what the council had done, the bishops applauding their judgment, and all crying out, "This is a just sentence; we are all of the same opinion; we will all abide by the judgment you give."[1] The legates complained of the affront, as they styled it, that was offered to the apostolic see in their presence; protested against it; and addressing themselves to the commissioners, desired that their protest might be entered in the acts of the council, that the pope of the universal church, knowing they had opposed such unlawful proceedings, might judge himself of the injustice that was done to his see, and take such measures as he should think fit to redress it. The commissioners returned them no answer; but rising up, "What we have pronounced, (said they,) the whole council has approved;" and thus put an end to that session.[2]

The bishops met again; but it was only to write to Marcian and Leo, and acquaint both with the transactions of the council. The emperor, in hearing the canons read, not only expressed the greatest satisfaction at the regard the fathers had shown for the see of the imperial city; but apprehending from the opposition, which the pope's legates had made to the twenty-eighth canon, that the pope himself might oppose it, and thereby involve the church in new troubles, he immediately despatched Lucianus, a bishop of Thrace, and the deacon Basilius, to Rome, charging them to leave nothing unattempted, that could divert Leo from opposing a decree, that had been made, signed, and confirmed by so many bishops. At the same time he wrote a very kind and friendly letter to Leo, congratulating him on the good success of the council, and entreating him, with the greatest condescension and good nature, to join the rest in what they had done in favor of the see of Constantinople, which he looked upon as done to himself. The emperor's letter was accompanied by others from the empress Pulcheria, from Anatolius, and from Julian of Cos, a prelate in whom Leo reposed an entire confidence, as being most zealously attached to the orthodox faith, and his see. These

[1] Concil. ib. p. 726. [2] Ibid. p. 705. 809.
[3] Leo, ep. 79, 80. 87.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 809. 819. [2] Concil. ibid.

Leo opposes the twenty-eighth canon with great warmth. The true reason why he opposes it. The reasons he alleges. The bishops of the council provoked at Leo's obstinacy. The emperor commends him, and obliges Anatolius to appease him.

letters were all calculated to soothe Leo, and procure, by that means, his approbation of the above-mentioned decree. Julian of Cos, in his letter, alleged several arguments to convince him, that such a regulation would, in the end, prove very advantageous even to those churches, that seemed to have most reason to complain of it; and concluded with begging it as a favour, for which he should owe him an eternal obligation, that he would not oppose the whole body of the eastern bishops in an affair, that, properly speaking, concerned them alone.[1] He was afraid, as appears from his letter, that Leo, taking umbrage at the extensive jurisdiction granted by the council to the see of Constantinople, should be thereby prompted, notwithstanding his prudence and discretion, to enter into such measures as might endanger the peace of the church. Hence he was very pressing with him not to condemn what a whole council had approved, and the most numerous, and best conducted council the world had yet seen. As for the bishops who had assisted at the council, he well knew they were unalterably determined to maintain their own decree, whether the pope approved it or not.

It was by these letters that Leo first heard of the determination of the council; and he no sooner heard it, than, blind to all other considerations, and only actuated by jealousy, envy, and ambition, he resolved to oppose it with all his might, and at all events. He saw his rival now but one step behind him; he was apprehensive he might soon get before him; and therefore looking on the increase of his power as a diminution of his own, he determined to dispute the former with the same resolution and vigor he would the latter. He also saw the consequences of allowing the dignity of the city to regulate that of the see, and was desirous to establish a different notion for the support of the pretended dignity and privileges of his see. That these were the principles on which he acted, is but too plain; but to persuade the world, that his opposition was owing to more Christian motives, he took care to disguise them with a pretended zeal for the decrees of Nice, for the practice of antiquity, for the rights and privileges of the patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Antioch. And that zeal, which he said it would be highly criminal in him not to exert, on such an occasion, he alleged in his answer to Marcian and Pulcheria, as the only motive that restrained him from concurring with the rest, in exalting, agreeably to their inclination, the see of Constantinople. "Far be it from me," said he, in his letter to Marcian, "to envy the see of Constantinople its due lustre: but as the decree lately enacted in favor of that see, is an open violation of the canons of Nice; as it is incumbent upon me to watch and see, that the decrees of that great and venerable assembly be punctually observed, I should think myself guilty of an unpardonable crime, should I, upon any consideration whatever, connive at the least transgression of those sacred laws; laws of eternal authority, which no council, however numerous, can ever abrogate or annul." The same things he urges in answer to Pulcheria; only taking there more upon him, as he knew her to be greatly attached to his see, he declared, by the authority of St. Peter, the late decree void and null, as utterly inconsistent with the established discipline of the church. In both letters he ascribes the procuring of such unwarrantable honors for the see of Constantinople to the pride and ambition of Anatolius; entreats both Marcian and Pulcheria to divert him, by their authority, from pursuing such wild pretensions; and concludes with declaring, that, as for himself, he is unalterably determined to withstand them to his last breath, thinking himself bound in duty, as presiding in the apostolic see, to maintain the ancient customs, and oppose all innovations, by whomsoever introduced.[1] In his answer to Anatolius he even threatens to cut him off from his communion, if he does not relinquish his pretensions,[2] that is, if he does not renounce the privileges and honors, that had been quietly enjoyed by his predecessors for a long series of years, and confirmed to his see, by the decrees of two oecumenical councils. Had the privileges and honors enjoyed by the see of Rome a better sanction? Had Leo a better right to the first place, than Anatolius had to the second? In his letter to Julian of Cos, he gently reprimands that prelate for suffering his good nature to be imposed upon, so far as to ask what it was alike criminal to ask and to grant. He expresses the greatest friendship and regard for him, as for one, who had hitherto so well deserved of the orthodox faith, and the apostolic see: but at the same time lets him know, that he prefers the observance of the canons to his friendship; and therefore advises him as a friend, not to trouble him for the future with such requests, but rather strive to divert Anatolius from attempting what it was impossible for him ever to accomplish, and what he might soon repent his having ever attempted.[3]

The presumption, and invincible obstinacy, which Leo betrayed on this occasion, gave great offence to all the bishops who had assisted at the council. They could not brook his presumption, taxing, as he did in all his letters, so numerous a council with a breach of the canons of Nice, as if he alone had reached the true meaning of those cannons, or alone had a due regard for the discipline established by them in the church. But the emperor was so far from resenting, as the fathers of the council thought he would do, Leo's thus peremptorily refusing to comply

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 798. Leo, ep. 78, 79, 80, 81.

[1] Leo, ep. 78, 79. [2] Id. ep. 80. [3] Idem. ep. 81.

Anatolius' letter to Leo unworthy of a man of his rank. What prompted the emperor to favor the pope.

with his request, that on the contrary he commended him for his inviolable attachment to the canons of the fathers;[1] nay, and obliged Anatolius, upon Leo's threatening a second time to cut him off from his communion, to appease the angry pope by a letter, well calculated indeed for that purpose, but ill becoming a prelate of Anatolius' dignity and rank in the church.[2] For in that letter forgetting both, he addressed him with such terms and expressions, as might be thought degrading in an address from the meanest bishop to his metropolitan or patriarch. He begins with expressing the greatest uneasiness and concern at Leo's forbearing to write to him; for Leo had declared he never would be reconciled to him, nor have any kind of intercourse or communion with him, till he had assured him by his letters, that he sincerely renounced those claims and pretensions, that had rendered him unworthy of his correspondence. In the next place, Anatolius excuses himself, as if he had been no ways instrumental in procuring the controverted decree, and lays the whole blame on the ecclesiastics of Constantinople, pretending it had been solicited by them alone. He adds, that, as for himself, he was a stranger to all ambition, but that of executing what his holiness should think fit to command; and that, after all, the validity of what had been done by the council depended on its being confirmed by his see.[3](*) The good emperor thought himself bound both as a Christian, and as emperor, to maintain the peace of the church at any rate; and to prevent the bishops from quarrelling about power, after he had, with so much trouble, brought them to agree about the faith. But, on the other hand, he was too well acquainted with the jealous temper of the bishop of Rome, too sensible of the umbrage he took at the least increase of power in his rival of Constantinople, though he strove to disguise it with the specious name of zeal for the canons, to imagine he ever

[1] Facund. l. 5. c. 4. Concil. t. 4. p. 1207.
[2] Leo ep. 105. [3] Leo ibid.

(*) This letter is frequently quoted to prove, 1st, that the bishop of Constantinople acknowledged the authority of the bishop of Rome over him, and his see. 2dly, That the validity of decrees, enacted even by oecumenical councils, depends on their being confirmed by the see of Rome. But as to the first, who can think, that Anatolius, saying "he had no other ambition than that of executing the commands of his holiness," really meant what he said? From the very terms he made use of, it is manifest he did not; else we might conclude him to have acknowledged the bishop of Rome for his lord and master; since no vassal can address his sovereign in terms of greater submission and duty. It is not from the words of men, especially in letters and addresses to persons in high stations of life, but from their actions, that we are to judge of their sincerity; and in the present case it is but too plain, that Anatolius had some other ambition besides that of executing the commands of his holiness, nothing being more certain, than that he was the first and chief promoter of the controverted decree, though, in his letter to Leo, he thought it advisable to disown it. "Words of honor or respect," that is, compliments, "common among men, are not to be interpreted, as importing real dependence and subjection in the one, or real power and authority in the other," said the Greek emperor in the council of Florence, when some expressions, used by the fathers in their letters or addresses to the popes, were alleged to prove, that they had acknowledged the papal authority.(a) The pope styles himself, in all his bulls, "servus servorum Dei," "the servant of the servants of God;" but, at the same time, he requires even his colleagues to acknowledge him for their lord, and to swear fealty to him as such.

As to what Anatolius says, in the second place, to the pope, that "the validity of what had been done by the council, depended on its being confirmed by his see;" it is certain, that neither he, nor any of the fathers of the council, thought so; else they would never have ordered the controverted canon to be registered, as they certainly did, among the other canons of the council, without waiting till it was confirmed by him, notwithstanding the warm and repeated protests and remonstrances of his legates against it. But whatever Anatolius may have thought, or said, on the present occasion, it is well known, that his predecessors all maintained, and so did all the bishops in the east, the decree of the council of Constantinople, allotting the second place to the see of that city, to be valid and binding; and that none of his successors ever questioned the validity either of that, or the present decree, though neither was confirmed, but both were strongly opposed, by the see of Rome. It is true, the fathers of Chalcedon wrote to Leo, entreating him to confirm the decree they had made; and so they would have written, for the sake of peace, unity, and concord, to any other bishop of rank and character, who had taken upon him to oppose it. But it is observable, that in their letter, though extremely complaisant and respectful, they very industriously avoided all terms and expressions, that might incline Leo, or others, to imagine they thought the validity of their decree any ways depended on its being confirmed by him, or his see.(a) This letter was signed by all the bishops who were present at that session, and by Anatolius the first of all; which was implicitly acknowledging the decree to be valid, though opposed by the pope's legates, and not yet confirmed by him. At the same time Anatolius wrote separately to Leo; but it was only to complain of the opposition, made by his legates, to what it had pleased an oecumenical council to ordain in behalf of his see.(b) For in that letter he did not so much as desire Leo to confirm what the council had done. From what has been said, it is manifest, that, with respect to the validity of the decree, Anatolius thought as the other bishops did. He expressed, it is true, very different sentiments in his letter to Leo. But that letter he wrote in obedience to the express command of the emperor, requiring him to satisfy the bishop of Rome; and he was well apprised, that he could by no other means satisfy the bishop of Rome, but by pretending, contrary to his known and avowed sentiments, the decree of the council to be null, unless it were confirmed by him. Anatolius therefore was not so much to blame for thus prostituting, in some degree, the dignity of his see, and the independency of councils, to the ambition of his rival, as the emperor himself. He was indeed a pious and religious prince, an excellent soldier, and well acquainted with the discipline of the army, in which he had been brought up from his youth, and had served several years as a private man, but an entire stranger to the episcopal rights, and the discipline of the church, as appears from his conduct, not only on the present, but on several other occasions. Besides, he had been wrought up by Pulcheria, as she had been by Leo, who had an entire ascendant over her, into a mighty opinion of the merit of St. Peter, above that of the other apostles, of the privileges, dignity, and pre-eminence of his throne; and both were made to believe, that they were promoting the interest of the Christian religion, and the glory of St. Peter, while, to the utter subversion of all order and discipline, they were only feeding the unchristian pride, and boundless ambition, of the pretended successor of that apostle.

I might add here, that Anatolius perhaps meant no more, than that as, without the consent of the emperor, the decree of the council could not be valid, the validity of it would depend on the pope, since, if he did not confirm it, the emperor seemed inclined to revoke his consent, and so annul the decree.

(a) Con. Flor. Sess. 25.
(a) Concil. t. 4. p. 834—838. (b) Leo ep. 80.

Leo reconciled with Anatolius; but the canon put in execution by the successors of Anatolius. All the bishops of the council strangers to any privileges due to the see of Rome by divine right, or that were derived from St. Peter. All ecclesiastical primacies, superiorities, &c. of human institution.

would yield. In order therefore to divert him from rekindling the war, and involving the church with new troubles, which his excommunicating Anatolius would unavoidably have done, he obliges the latter, who was his subject, to submit, and write the letter I have mentioned. Thus were many of the prerogatives, which the bishops of Rome have since claimed as their right, extorted either from princes, or their own colleagues, choosing rather to gratify them in their demands, however unreasonable, than to endanger the peace of the church, by opposing them as they ought to have done. Hence we may account for what Baronius often observes, though his observation is very far from being universally true; namely, that the best princes, as well as prelates, have been the most complaisant to the popes; that complaisance was owing in them, as it was in Marcian, to their love of peace and charity; and those only were a match for the popes, who valued either as little as they.

Leo expressed the greatest joy at the receipt of Anatolins' letter, and, construing the expressions he used into an entire submission, as if he relinquished his pretensions, and owned the canon of Chalcedon to be a violation of the canons of Nice, he renewed his correspondence with him, and acquainted him by a very obliging letter, that he was fully satisfied with his present, and had entirely forgotten his past, conduct.[1] Some are of opinion, that Anatolius really meant to renounce his pretensions; others, that he meant no more than to compliment Leo, by an apparent submission, into a better humor, and by that means satisfy both him and the emperor.[2] However that be, certain it is, that the canon was put in execution; that the bishops of Constantinople, in spite of all the efforts of Leo, and his successors, continued to exercise a patriarchal jurisdiction over the three dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace; and that they claim, to this day, the precedency of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. By this canon was established a kind of warfare between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, the two first bishops of the church, who should have set a better example to the rest, disputing, in defiance of the gospel, and to the great scandal of the Christian name and religion, who should be the greatest, till they became irreconcilable enemies, and renounced for ever all communication with each other.

Before we dismiss this subject, it may not be improper to observe, that out of the six hundred and thirty bishops who composed the present assembly, not one knew, or had the least notion of any honors, privileges, or prerogatives, due to the see of Rome by divine right, or that were derived to it from its pretended founder, St. Peter. On the contrary, they supposed every prerogative, peculiar to that see, not only to be of human institution, but to have been granted merely in consideration of the city. This evidently appears from the terms they used in confirming the decree of the second oecumenical council, placing the see of Constantinople next in dignity to that of Rome: "Whereas the see of Old Rome," say they, "had been, not undeservedly, distinguished by the fathers, with some privileges, *because that city was the seat of the empire;* the fathers of Constantinople were prompted by the same motive to distinguish the most holy see of New Rome with equal privileges, thinking it fit, that the city, which they saw honored with the empire, and the senate, and equalled in evey civil privilege to Old Rome, should be likewise equalled to her in ecclesiastical matters."[1] Not a word here of St. Peter, of his chair, of any privileges, or honors, derived from him to the see of Old Rome, or inherent in it by divine right. All the privileges then enjoyed by that see, are said to have been granted by the fathers, and the dignity of the city is alleged as the only motive that induced the fathers to grant them. And indeed we need only dip into the history of the church, or the writings of the fathers, to be fully convinced, that no privileges were originally enjoyed by one see, but what were common to all; that there were originally no first or second sees, but that all were equal, entirely independent of each other; and consequently that all primacies, superiorities, dependencies, are of human institution, having been first introduced by custom, and afterwards confirmed by several councils, as necessary or expedient for the better regulating of ecclesiastical matters, and the maintaining of unity and concord among the prelates of the church. I have shown elsewhere[2] the ecclesiastical polity to have been formed on the plan of the civil, and the sees to have been ranked according to the cities, without any kind of regard to their founders; and therefore shall only observe here, that the fathers of Constantinople, in decreeing to that see the second place in dignity, when the city had attained to that honor, acted agreeably to the principles on which the ecclesiastical hierarchy was grounded; and that the fathers of Chalcedon acted likewise agreeably to the same principles, in decreeing to the see, which had been thus exalted, a jurisdiction suitable to its dignity. And it is to be observed, that neither of these decrees was in the least derogatory to the canons of Nice, though it was chiefly on that consideration they were both, by Leo, declared null, and as such rejected by him and his successors. For in the original and authentic copies of that

[1] Idem. ep. 106, 107.
[2] Concil. t. 4. per Quesnel, p. 1207. Liberat. Brev. c. 13.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 838. [2] See p. 14.

Rome herself owes her primacy to the councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon. The 28th canon of Chalcedon no ways derogatory to the canons of Nice. Canons, repugnant to those of Nice, allowed by the popes to be valid, when made in favor of their see. The decrees of Nice not more irreversible than those of any other oecumenical council.

council, no mention at all is made of rank, or the precedency of one see with respect to another; so that the council of Constantinople might, without derogating in the least from the canons of Nice, have decreed even the first place to the see of that city. I said, in the original and authentic copies of that council; for in the Latin translation of the sixth canon, which Leo's legates had the assurance to produce in the council of Chalcedon, the see of Rome was said to have always enjoyed the primacy.[1] But these words were looked upon by all the fathers of that assembly as an interpolation and forgery; and therefore have been since left out in the best translations of those canons, and even by Dionysius Exiguus, in his Roman code. And indeed they are quite foreign to the purpose of the canon to which they were added; a canon relating only to authority and jurisdiction, as we shall see hereafter. I must add, that as nothing was determined by the first oecumenical council, that of Nice, concerning rank or precedency, but only by the second, that of Constantinople, it was to the latter, and to the very canon which Leo opposed, as his successors have done, with so much warmth and obstinacy, that Rome herself owed her primacy; for nothing that concerned the whole church, could be determined without the concurrence of the whole church, that is, of an oecumenical council. And the council of Constantinople was the first that made any regulations concerning rank or precedency. And it was on the canon of that very council, especially after it had been confirmed by the council of Chalcedon, that the emperors founded their edicts, declaring the see of Rome to be the first, and that of Constantinople the second. "We declare," says Justinian, in one of his laws,[2] "the most holy pope of Old Rome to be the first of all bishops, agreeably to the canons; and the most holy archbishop of Constantinople, called New Rome, to hold the second place after the holy apostolic see of Old Rome." It is true, that at the time of the council of Constantinople, the see of Rome was already, by custom or prescription, in possession of the first place. But it is likewise true, that the see of Constantinople was, by custom or prescription, in possession of the second place; and had been so ever since the removal of the imperial seat to that city. Thus, after all, Constantinople held the second place by the same charter as Rome did the first; or let the popes produce a better, without recurring to the chimerical and exploded notion of a divine right, to which the fathers both of Constantinople and Chalcedon were utter strangers, as I have shown above.

From what has been said, it is manifest, that the first part of the canon of Chalcedon, confirming the second place of honor to the see of Constantinople, was no ways derogatory, as Leo pretended, to the canons of Nice. But neither was the second part of that canon, vesting the bishop of Constantinople with a patriarchal jurisdiction over the three dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. For by the 6th canon of Nice, and Leo could mean no other, was only confirmed to the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, a power and jurisdiction over certain districts, like to that which the bishops of the city of Rome was authorized by custom (not by divine right, not as the successor and heir of St. Peter) to exercise over the suburbicarian provinces. Not a word there of Asia, Pontus, or Thrace; and it was over these dioceses alone, that the council of Chalcedon extended the jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople; or rather confirmed, to use the words of the council, the custom, which obtained in the holy church of Constantinople, of ordaining metropolitans in Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. But allowing the canon of Chalcedon to have been derogatory to that of Nice, it was not surely more so than the 3d, 4th, and 5th of Sardica, allowing appeals, under certain restrictions, to the see of Rome, were to the 5th of Nice, ordaining all causes to be finally decided by the bishops of each province. And yet the power of receiving appeals Leo claimed, and maintained, perhaps with more warmth than any of his predecessors had done, though grounded on a canon repugnant to the canons of Nice, canons, with him, of an eternal and inviolable authority; for so he frequently styles them, when they restrained the ambition of others; but of none, when they set bounds to his own. And here, by the way, since Leo, in all his letters, lays so great stress on the eternal and irreversible authority of the canons of Nice, why should the canons of that, rather than those of any other oecumenical council, be thought unalterable, irreversible, everlastingly binding? I mean such canons as relate only to the ecclesiastical polity, or the discipline of the church. The faith indeed is unalterable, and so are the canons containing definitions of faith, because what is true at one time, must be true in all times. But, in point of discipline, experience teaches us, that what is expedient, and even necessary, at one time, may be quite otherwise at another. Hence several regulations, wisely made by oecumenical councils, in ancient times, have been no less wisely revoked by other councils, in later ages. And to suppose decrees or ordinances of any council whatever to be irrevocable, and everlastingly binding, is supposing the church, which is represented alike by all oecumenical councils lawfully assembled, to have a power of modelling her discipline, as she thinks proper, but not of altering, let the occasion be ever so urgent,

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 812.
[2] Justin. novel. 131. tit. 14. c. 2.

Leo's plea, that Constantinople was not an apostolic see, quite nugatory. Baronius contradicts himself. The bishop of Constantinople vested with a most ample power of receiving appeals.

the discipline she has once established; than which nothing can be more absurd.

As to Leo's other plea, namely, that Constantinople was not an apostolic see, it is quite nugatory, and scarce worthy of our notice. For neither was Alexandria an apostolic see, and yet it was preferred to Antioch, that most ancient and truly apostolic church, as Sozomen styles it,[1] supposed to have been founded, and governed, for seven whole years, by St. Peter himself. Cæsarea of Palestine was not an apostolic see; and yet it was preferred to Jerusalem, not only an apostolic see, but the seat of our Lord himself, the mother of all churches, and of all churches the most famous for the mysteries of our redemption, and the most revered.[2](*) Here Baronius chimes in with Leo, in exclaiming against the fathers of Chalcedon, for supposing the dignity of the sees to have any dependence upon, or relation to, the dignity of the cities; not remembering, it seems, or thinking his readers did not remember, that he had owned elsewhere[3] the see of Alexandria to have been preferred to that of Antioch, for no other reason, but because the prefecture of Egypt, having Alexandria for its metropolis, was more honorable than the prefecture of Syria, whereof Antioch was the metropolis; and that he had acknowledged, at the same time, "no other rule to have been observed by the ancients, in instituting the ecclesiastical sees, than the division of provinces, and the prerogatives before established by the Romans.[4]

The fathers of Chalcedon were not satisfied with ranking the see of Constantinople next in dignity to that of Rome, with equalling it in every other prerogative and privilege to the see of Rome, and extending its patriarchal jurisdiction over three whole dioceses: but in order to raise the bishop of the imperial city still higher, and honor his see with a new mark of distinction, well becoming the dignity of the city, and the empire, they thought proper to vest him with a most ample and unlimited power of receiving appeals from all other ecclesiastical tribunals, at least in the east, and of finally deciding all controversies and causes whatever. These are the very words of the canon: "If any bishop shall have a dispute with the metropolitan of his province, he shall appeal to, and be judged by, the exarch of the diocese, or by the see of Constantinople."[1](*) I said, "at least in the east;" for though such a power was granted, without any exception, restriction, or reservation; yet I cannot think it was the intention of the council to extend it beyond the limits of the eastern empire. However that be, we may well challenge the pope, and all the advocates for the papal power, to produce any thing in favor of his pretensions, that can be compared with the present decree; a decree enacted by the most numerous and most regular council that had been held till that time in the church; that was freely signed by all the bishops who composed it, and was afterwards confirmed by the imperial edicts. It was chiefly by this decree, that the bishop of Constantinople was encouraged, as we shall see hereafter, to assume the title of oecumenical patriarch, to style his church the head of all churches, and to claim, on the downfall of the western empire, the primacy itself.(†)

[1] Soz. l. 3. c. 8.

[2] Epiph. syn. Const. Optat. l. 6. p. 169.

(*) All bishops were originally distinguished from presbyters, by the name of apostles; the names bishop and presbyter being, in the early times, common to them with mere presbyters. "The same persons," says Theodoret,(a) "were anciently styled bishops and presbyters, while those who are now called bishops, were named apostles. But, in process of time, the name of apostle was appropriated to the first apostles; and then the name of bishop was given to those who before were called apostles." This he repeats in several other places of his writings.(b) The same thing is asserted in a work, which is commonly ascribed to St. Ambrose. "All bishops," says that writer, "were at first called apostles;"(c) and elsewhere,(d) "they who are now called bishops, were originally called apostles." As all bishops were styled apostles, so were all bishops' sees dignified with the title of apostolic sees. "The catholic church," says St. Austin.(e) "is spread and propagated over the whole world, by the apostolic sees, and by the succession of bishops, who sit in them." The title of apostolic is likewise given by Sidonius Apollinaris,(f) by Paulinus,(g) and many others, to the sees of private bishops. However, it was afterwards appropriated to such sees as had been founded by some of the apostles: and lastly claimed by the popes, as peculiar to their see, because founded, as was supposed, by the prince of the apostles.

(a) Theodt. Com. in 1 Tim. iii.

(b) Idem Comm. in Phil. i. 1. et in Phil. ii. 25.

(c) Ambros. Com. in Eph. iv.

(d) Idem Comm. in Gal. i. 1. Amularius de off. Eccles. l. 2. c. 13.

(e) Aug. ep. 42. ad Fratres Madaurens.

(f) Sid. l. 6. ep. 1.

(g) Paulin. ep. 45.

[3] Bar. ad ann. 39. n. 10. [4] Idem ibid.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 763.

(*) This canon was evidently repugnant to the canons of Nice. And yet Leo, who, agreeably to his principles, might have rejected it, on that score, as null, took no more notice of it, than if it had been entirely agreeable to those canons. And indeed he acted therein a very wise part; since he well knew the canons of Sardica, allowing appeals to the see of Rome, to be no less derogatory to the canons of Nice, than that of Chalcedon, allowing appeals to the see of Constantinople. And to have pretended the canons of Nice to be irrevocable, irreversible, everlastingly binding, when they curtailed his own power, as well as that of his rival, had been carrying the joke a little too far.

(†) One would hardly believe that the above-mentioned decree could be so interpreted as to favor the pretensions of the popes. And yet it was so interpreted by Pope Nicolas in one of his letters:(a) "To say the primate, or ex-arch of the diocese," these are his own words, "is as much as to say the primate of the dioceses, or of all the dioceses; and whom but the vicar of the prime apostle could the holy synod style the primate of all the dioceses?" Thence he concludes, that, agreeably to the canon of Chalcedon, appeals should be first made to the pope, and only with his permission, and the consent of the party, to the bishop of Constantinople. He chose, it seems, rather to admit the decree of so great an assembly, and explain it away, if by any means he could, than absolutely reject it; and after all, his explanation, however absurd and ridiculous, is not perhaps more so, than most of the reasons alleged by Leo, to color the ambition and jealousy, by which alone, as it is but too apparent, he was prompted to oppose and reject the unanimous determination of so respectable and numerous a council.

(a) Nic. l. ep. 8.

The authority assumed by the pope's legates, in this council, no argument of his supremacy. Blasphemies of the popes and their flattering divines, concerning their power.

Before we proceed to the other transactions of the present pontificate, I must beg leave to interrupt, for a while, the thread of the history, and observe, that it is chiefly from the authority, assumed by the pope's legates, in the present council, and the acquiescence of the bishops who composed it, as well as of the imperial commissioners, that Bellarmine,[1] and after him the other popish writers, argue the superiority of the pope to oecumenical councils, that is, to the whole church. And it is in this pretended superiority, that the arbitrary, despotic, and uncontrollable monarchy of the pope, commonly known by the less odious name of supremacy, is properly said to consist. For by such a superiority, those who maintain it, that is, all true papists, mean, 1. That the authority of the pope is greater than that of any council, however numerous, though even composed of all the bishops of the catholic church; insomuch that should such a council and the pope disagree, all men would be bound, on pain of damnation, to abandon the former and adhere to the latter. 2. That no council can make laws, that are binding with respect to the pope, or that the pope may not abrogate and annul at his pleasure, let them be ever so expedient, just, or necessary, agreeably to the famous aphorism of Innocent III., equally pregnant with nonsense and blasphemy, "We, according to the plenitude of our power, have a right to dispense with all right;"[2] that is, in other words, we have a right to do wrong, or a power to change wrong into right. And truly Bellarmine is so complaisant to the popes, as to allow them that power; for, according to him, "should the pope enjoin vice, and forbid virtue, the church would sin, if she did not believe virtue to be evil, and vice to be good."[3] But that infamous doctrine was not first broached by Bellarmine. It was taught long before his time; for cardinal Zabarel, who flourished near four hundred years ago, writes, that "in his, and in the preceding times, the popes had been persuaded, by their flattering divines, that they might do whatever they pleased, even such things, as were in themselves, and with respect to others, unlawful; and so could do more than God himself."[4] 3. In virtue of the above-mentioned superiority, the pope, how profligate soever and wicked, can by no council be judged or deposed. "Should a pope be so wicked," says one of the papal canons, "as to carry with him innumerable souls to hell, let no man presume to find fault with him, or reprove him, because he, who is to judge all men, is to be judged by none."[5] Such propositions cannot be heard without horror: and yet they alone are deemed true Roman catholics, they alone are favored and caressed by the popes, who hold, teach, and maintain them. Bellarmine employs a whole book to prove, that the pope is not the antichrist.[1] I will not take upon me to say, that he is, (*) though that has been the opinion of several men of very great learning, but whether he is the antichrist or not, the doctrines he teaches are certainly antichristian, and the antichrist, come when he will, cannot teach or countenance worse; nay, to be a complete antichrist, or completely opposite to Christ, who was "meek and lowly in heart," who owned, that his "kingdom was not of this world," who fled, when the people would have made him king, he must copy from the pope, suffering his power to be called, in an address to him, "infinite, omnipotent, incomprehensible,"[2] and claiming to himself "all power in heaven, and in earth, as having been constituted prince over all nations, and all kingdoms, with a plenitude of power to root up, and to plant; to destroy, and to save; to raise up and pull down at his pleasure."[3]

To prove the spiritual supremacy of the pope (for of the temporal we shall have occasion to speak at length hereafter,) Bellarmine recurs in the first place to scripture; and having plainly descried the pope in the "faithful and wise steward" spoken of in St. Luke,[4] and in "the good shepherd," mentioned by St. John,[5] he argues thus; as the steward is above the household, as the shepherd is above the flock, so is the pope above the church.[6] To the authority of the scripture he adds that of two councils, namely, of Sinuessa, under Marcellinus, and of Rome under Sylvester; both declaring that "the first see is to be judged by none.(†) But that no such coun-

[1] Bell. de Concil. auct. l. 2. c. 17.
[2] Inn. III. Decret. Greg. l. 3. tit. 8. c. 4.
[3] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 5. [4] Zabar. de Schif.
[5] Si Papa sue, &c. Grat. dist. 40. c. 6.

[1] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 3.
(*) Our king James I, used jocularly to say, that he would not swear the pope was the antichrist; but if there were a hue and cry after the antichrist, the pope would certainly be taken up.
[2] Aug. Triumph. de Potest. eccles. in præf. ad Joan. xxii.
[3] Pius V in Bull. contra R. Eliz.
[4] Luke. 12: 42. [5] John 10: 11.
[6] Bell. ibid.
(†) It was natural for the popish writers, in the handling of such a subject, to recur in the first place to the council of Jerusalem, and attempt to prove, from the conduct of their first pope, St. Peter, who did not think it below him to assist at it in person, his superiority to that, and the superiority of his pretended successors to all future councils. And yet of that council most of them take no more notice than if it had never been held: an incontestable proof, that they could discover nothing in the behavior of St. Peter towards the other apostles, or in the behavior of the other apostles towards St. Peter, that could in the least countenance the doctrine, which they were striving to establish, or rather that did not absolutely discountenance it. And, truly, what mark of distinction did St. Peter require; what mark of distinction did the others yield to him in that assembly? In the first place, it was not summoned or convened by him; but some pretending, that it was needful to circumcise the Gentiles, the apostles and elders came together, by common agreement, to consider of this matter (*a*) 2dly, St. Peter did not preside, but rather St. James, to whom, says Chrysostom, as bishop of Jerusalem, the government was committed. (*b*) 3dly, When there had been much disputing, so that every one delivered his opinion with great freedom,
(*a*) Acts 16: 5, 6. (*b*) Chrys. Hom. 59.

The haughty behaviour of the pope's legates at the council. The acquiescence of the bishops, who composed the council.

cils were ever held, I have shown elsewhere;[1] and as to his proof from scripture, it is too ridiculous and trifling to deserve a grave answer; and therefore I shall only say, that to discover the pope in the "wise steward," or in "the good shepherd," one must be no less sharp-sighted than Innocent III. was, who found him out, with all his attributes, in the first chapter of Genesis.[2] And indeed he is as plainly there, as in any other place of the Old or New Testament. But what Bellarmine, and the other Roman catholic writers, chiefly urge, in favor of the papal supremacy, is the behavior and conduct of the pope's legates in the council of Chalcedon.

It must be owned, that they acted there, as if the person they represented were above the council, and perhaps with the air of as much authority, as the legates of any pope have done since that time. In the first opening of the council they addressed the commissioners, who represented the person of the emperor, and were all men of the first rank, in the dialect of the highest authority. "We have," said they, "an order from the most blessed and apostolic pope of the city of Rome, &c. by which he has been pleased to command," &c. Did the pope's legates, at the council of Trent, speak in a more lofty strain? In the charge they brought against Dioscorus, they imputed it to him as a crime, that he had presumed to assemble a council without the consent of the apostolic see; which, they said, had never been thought lawful, and had never been done. In the sentence, which they pronounced against that prelate, they named the "archbishop of the great and ancient city of Rome" in the first place, themselves in the second, and the council after both; nay, they ascribed the deposing of the second bishop of the catholic church chiefly to Leo, and only to the council as acting under him, and by his authority: Leo deposes by us, and the present council, &c. were the words of the sentence, as if the whole power had been lodged in him, and by him communicated to the council, no otherwise than it was to his legates. The like style they used in restoring the bishops, who had been deposed or suspended for joining Dioscorus in the violences committed at Ephesus: "The apostolic see," said the legates, "forgives them, and Leo, the most holy archbishop of Rome, receives them to his communion, because they have acknowledged their fault, and submitted to him, and the holy oecumenical council." Upon the whole, say the popish writers, at this grand assembly, the legates acted, as if the authority of the person, whom they represented, were superior to that of the council; as if the council only acted by an authority borrowed of him, or at least subordinate to his.

On the other hand, the bishops who composed the council, never once offered to control or dispute the authority they assumed; nay, on the contrary, in the letter which they wrote to Leo, at the breaking up of the council, they styled themselves the members, and him the head, adding, that it became the head to approve and confirm what the members had done, as the members had, with great readiness, seconded their head in every good resolution he had thought proper to suggest.[1] These expressions from a council of six hundred bishops, and, what deserves particular notice, almost all eastern bishops, have given the champions of the papal power occasion to triumph, as if the controversy were plainly decided in their favor, and no room were left, even for the most obdurate heretics, to dispute the supremacy, or the superiority of the pope to oecumenical councils, that is, to the collective body, as they express it, of the universal church. It belongs to the head, says Bellarmine,[2] to govern the other members at pleasure; it would be in them the highest presumption, should they pretend to govern the head instead of being governed by it, and downright frenzy, should they attempt to cut it off, how grievously soever distempered. A most impious doctrine! calculated to subject the whole church, which Christ, in his goodness, has been pleased to make free, to the arbitrary will of one man, and thereby reduce her to a state of the most deplorable thraldom, without any possible means of re-

St. Peter rose up, and delivered his, backing it with reasons, (*a*) and not exacting a blind faith to what he said, though undoubtedly grounded on a particular revelation. After him spoke Paul and Barnabas; and, when they had done, St. James first confirmed, with reasons drawn from the scripture, what they had said, and then with apostolic gravity formed the definition, and pronounced the decree; I therefore judge (διὸ ἐγὼ κείνω), "that is," says Chrysostom, "I authoritatively say, that we trouble not them, who, from among the Gentiles, are turned to God," &c. (*b*) so that St. Peter made an harangue, as an ancient author observes; (*c*) but St. James enacted the law. Such is the account we have of this council in holy writ; and I shall add nothing to it, but only observe, that if, on this important occasion, greater respect was shown to one apostle than to another, if greater authority was exerted by one apostle than by another, the greater respect was shown to St. James; and by St. James was exerted the greater authority. And yet I do not find, that his successors ever attempted to build a supremacy on such a foundation, though infinitely more capable of bearing it, than any that have been yet laid by those, who pretend to have succeeded St. Peter. But St. Peter, say some, apprised of his rank, spoke the first. He had showed himself better apprised of his rank, had he spoken the last, pronounced the decree, and enacted the law. Besides, he did not speak the first of all; for there had been much disputing, before he offered to speak. His speaking before the other apostles is no better proof of his being any ways superior to them, than that, which has been alleged by some to prove that St. John was, in some respects, superior to him; namely, because he outran him, and got first to the sepulchre; (*d*) which, in the opinion of some visionaries, and even of St. Jerom, contained infinite mysteries.

(*a*) Ver. 7—11. (*b*) Ver. 13—19.
(*c*) Hesych. apud Phot. cod. 275.
(*d*) John 20: 4.

[1] See p. 39. et 53.
[2] Inn. III. in Decret. Greg. I. 33. 6.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 838.
[2] Bell. de Concil. auct. l. 2. c. 17.

No such power assumed by the legates of other popes. What encouraged them to take so much upon them. The exercising of a power no argument of a right to that power. The acquiescence of the bishops to what owing.

deeming herself from it, should her governor even turn tyrant, and attempt to destroy her; for the only remedy allowed in that case is, patience and prayers, till it pleases God to put an end to his tyranny, either by converting him, or by putting an end to his life.[1]

But that no such doctrine can be deduced from the conduct of the legates, the acquiescence of the bishops and imperial commissioners, or any expressions used by the council, may be easily shown. And first, as to the assuming conduct and behaviour of the legates, if it was owing, as the papal writers would make us believe, to their being apprised of a superiority to all oecumenical councils vested in the person, whom they represented, why did not the legates, sent by the predecessors of Leo to the other oecumenical councils, exert the like authority? Were they, or were they not, apprised of a superiority to all oecumenical councils vested in the person, whom they represented? If they were not, we may well conclude the popes, who sent them, to have been strangers to it themselves; and consequently the boasted supremacy to be, in the end, but a free gift of their flattering divines. If they were, why did they not act accordingly? Why did they not produce orders and commands from the most blessed and apostolic pope of Rome? Why did they not claim at least the honor of presiding where they had the power of commanding? In short, why did the popes so carefully conceal, for the space of four hundred and fifty years, a truth, which it was of the utmost importance for the whole Christian world to know? I say carefully conceal, for if we examine the conduct of the legates, who assisted at the other oecumenical councils, we shall find nothing either in their speeches or actions, that looks, as if they thought the person, whom they represented, superior to those councils. Hence Bellarmine, and the other popish writers, from the imaginary councils of Sinuessa and Rome, immediately pass to that of Chalcedon. We must therefore either allow the legates of Leo to have been the first, who were apprised of the papal supremacy, or ascribe their taking so much upon them to some other cause. And indeed the cause is obvious. The emperor, as I have observed above, had made Leo absolute master of, and consequently superior to the council; and it was in virtue of that adventitious and borrowed superiority, that the legates assumed such airs of authority. From their conduct therefore we can only conclude, that the emperor, who empowered them to act as they did, was superior to the council. And truly we shall find the imperial commissioners, when we come to examine their conduct, acting as if the supremacy were lodged, not in the pope, who was represented by the legates, but in the emperor, whom they represented. I might add here, that the assuming or exercising a power does not argue a right to it in the person, by whom it is assumed or exercised, ambitious men being but too apt, as daily experience teaches us, to exceed the bounds, which the laws prescribe. Now the argument for the supremacy, founded on the conduct and behavior of the legates in the present council, supposes neither the popes, nor their legates, to have ever exercised or assumed a power, to which they had not an undoubted right. For from the conduct of the legates, acting as if the person, whom they represented, were above the council, the advocates for the papal supremacy conclude the person, whom they represented, actually to have been above the council, than which nothing can be more absurd. In the second council of Ephesus, an oecumenical council, as lawfully assembled as that of Chalcedon, Dioscorus acted as if he had been above the council; nay, as if every bishop there present, the pope's legates not excepted, had been obliged to act, vote, and even think, as he directed. And yet from his thus acting, no one will conclude him to have had a right thus to act. The exercising of a power may, but too often, be alleged as an instance of pride, arrogance, and ambition in the person, by whom it is exercised, but can never, by itself, be brought as a proof of any right whatever to that power.

But the bishops who composed the council, as well as the imperial commissioners, say the popish divines, acquiesced in the authority assumed by the legates. And to what else can their acquiescence be ascribed, but to their being as well apprised of the supremacy of the pope as the legates themselves? In what other manner can we account for it? In the same manner as we have accounted for the conduct of the legates; namely, from their having been made by the emperor absolute masters of the council; which restrained both the bishops and commissioners from offering to oppose them. Besides, with respect to the bishops, it was not the interest either of those, who had opposed Dioscorus in the late council of Ephesus, or of such as had sided with him, to dispute at this juncture whatever authority the legates were pleased to assume. As to the former, they looked upon Leo as their great champion, as the common protector of themselves and their cause, as one, who was fighting their battles, and who alone was capable, by reason of his rank, and the great interest he had at both courts, of fighting them with success. On the other hand, those who had sided with Dioscorus (and with him had sided the most eminent prelates in the east, namely, Juvenalis of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basilius of Seleucia) were all, in a manner, at the merey of Leo: and so was Maximus of Antioch, who had been ordained, in defiance

[1] Bell. ibid. c. 19.

The bishops act as if they did not acknowledge the pope's authority. The ignorance or disingenuity of pope Nicolas and Bellarmine. The fathers of the council act as if they were strangers to the pope's supremacy.

of the canons, while his predecessor was still alive. As for Anatolius, who held the first place after the legates, he had a turn of his own to serve, as we shall see hereafter, and therefore, to gain the good will of the pope, was of all the most complaisant to his legates. But though the bishops did not, for the reasons I have alleged, dispute the authority assumed by the legates (and it is in that sense alone that they can be said to have acquiesced in it), yet they acted as if they did not acknowledge it. For though the legates brought in, on all occasions, "the most holy and most blessed archbishop of Rome," and even placed him before the council, the bishops never once mentioned him. The summons sent to Dioscorus was from "the council assembled in the city of Chalcedon;" not "from Leo and the council." The legates, in voting for the deposition of that prelate, added to his other crimes, his having "presumed to excommunicate Leo, the most holy and most blessed archbishop of the great city of Rome."[1] But of that crime not one of the other bishops took the least notice; some of them, and among these were Anatolius and Maximus, condemning him because he had not obeyed the summons sent him by the council; others, because he had deposed Flavianus, and received Eutyches to his communion, and many for no other reason, but because he was condemned by the rest.[2] And here I cannot help observing, by the way, the ignorance or disingenuity of pope Nicolas I. roundly asserting Dioscorus to have been deposed by the council of Chalcedon, not so much for heresy, as for his unheard of presumption in daring to give judgment against the high pontiff.[3] This blunder Bellarmine adopts, as if he had never perused the acts of the council; and, adding to it another of his own, namely, that Dioscorus excommunicated Leo in the second council of Ephesus, argues thus in favor of the papal supremacy: the second bishop of the church was condemned for presuming to judge the pope, even in an oecumenical council; *ergo* the pope cannot be lawfully judged by an oecumenical council, and is consequently above it.[4] It is chiefly on this foundation that Bellarmine builds the supremacy; which is building on the sand; since Dioscorus was not condemned by the council, for judging the pope; nor did he judge and excommunicate the pope in the second oecumenical council of Ephesus; but at Nice, in his way to Constantinople, the year after the council of Ephesus, and in a council of ten bishops only, all Egyptians, who attended him on his journey.[5]

But to leave Bellarmine, and return to the fathers of the council; in the note, which they wrote to Dioscorus, acquainting him with the judgment they had passed upon him, they took no notice of the "archbishop of the great city of Rome," or of any crime committed against his holiness; for it was conceived in the following terms: "We let you know, that because you despised the sacred canons, disobeying this holy and oecumenical council, and being charged with many crimes, refused to appear before this great and holy synod to justify yourself, though three times summoned, you have been deposed, by this holy and oecumenical council, from your episcopacy, and suspended from all ecclesiastical functions the thirteenth day of the present month of October."[1] Eusebius of Dorylæum had been received by Leo to his communion, as a bishop, after he had been deposed by the council of Ephesus; and yet he presented a petition to the fathers of the council, begging them to restore him to his dignity.[2] Had he thought the pope above the council, he would only have let them know that Leo had restored him, and required them to acknowledge him accordingly as a lawful bishop. Theodoret of Cyrus was suspected, very unjustly, of Nestorianism, and on that suspicion had been deposed by the council of Ephesus. Leo declared his faith to be orthodox, and admitted him to his communion as a lawful bishop. However, he was only allowed to sit in the present council as one, whose case was depending, and cause undecided, till his faith was examined anew, and he acquitted by the judgment of the synod;[3] a plain proof, that the bishops were as great strangers to the pope's infallibility, as they were to his supremacy.(*)

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 426. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 427—448.
[3] Nicol. I. ep. ad Mich. imper.
[4] Bell. de Concil. auct. l. 2. c. 17.
[5] Concil. ibid. p. 398.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 451. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 382.
[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 101.

(*) With respect to the former prerogative, since the reception, which Leo's famous letter to Flavianus met with from the present council, is alleged by the Roman catholic divines, as an undeniable proof, or demonstration, as some are pleased to style it, of the pope's infallibility, I must observe here, that several bishops, particularly those of Illyricum and Palæstine, objected at first against that letter, as strongly favoring of Nestorianism, and admitting, not only a distinction, but an entire separation of the two natures in Christ, nor would they receive it till the legates had anathematized, in Leo's name, the doctrine of Nestorius:(*a*) an undeniable proof, or rather demonstration that those bishops, at least, did not believe in the pope's infallibility. And that the others did not, may be as plainly demonstrated; for in signing Leo's letter, they all declared, that they approved and received it, because they judged it agreeable to the decisions of the councils of Nice, of Constantinople, of Ephesus, and to the letters of St. Cyril.(*b*) And is not their making the decisions of those councils, and, what is still more degrading, the letters of Cyril, the standard of orthodoxy, even with respect to Leo himself, a plain demonstration, that they thought better of them than of him, and consequently that they did not think him infallible? Thus the unanswerable proof or demonstration of the pope's infallibility evidently recoils against those who use it, and utterly oversets what it was employed to support. But they all acknowledged that letter to have been dictated by the Holy Ghost. And so they would the letter of any other bishop, had they found it, upon examination, as they did this, agreeing with the decisions of the other three oecumenical councils, and the letters of Cyril, which were now become the only standard of the orthodox faith, the pope's infallibility being yet unknown, and the holy Scriptures quite out of date.

(*a*) Concil. ibid p. 370. 493.
(*b*) Concil. ibid. p. 408.

The conduct of the commissioners a proof of the imperial supremacy. They exert great authority, even in matters of faith. The acquiescence of the commissioners on some occasions not to be easily accounted for.

As for the acquiescence of the imperial commissioners, on which great stress is laid by the advocates for the papal supremacy; they suffered, it is true, the legates, on some occasions, to take great authority upon them, especially in the proceedings against Dioscorus, whom they knew to be extremely obnoxious to Pulcheria, and, by her means, to the emperor. But, upon the whole, they acted like men fully satisfied, that the supremacy was not lodged in the pope, who was represented by the legates, but in the emperor, whom they represented. They sat in the first place, and are always named the first; they proposed what they thought fit to be discussed; stopped what they did not think proper to be moved; maintained order and decency; and, on a certain occasion, when the bishops began to be very obstreperous, calling one another heretics, blasphemers, assassins, enemies to God, and his church, they reproved them with great authority, put them in mind of their rank and character, gravely reproached them with their indecent behavior, as more becoming the tumultuous rabble, than such an assembly of venerable bishops, and let them know, that neither party should reap any advantage from noise and clamor.[1] It was by them, after they had heard the opposite parties, that most matters were finally decided, the whole synod approving their decisions, and often crying out, with one voice, "your judgment is right; Christ has decided the case; God judges by you."[2] To them, and not to the legates, the bishops applied for what they thought proper, or for what they wanted to be done, openly acknowledging, by the terms they used on such occasions, the supreme authority to be lodged in the person who was represented by them. Thus Eusebius of Dorylæum, addressing himself to them, begged they would "command" his petition to be read;[3] and Atticus of Nicopolis, that they would interpose their authority, and "command" the council to be adjourned for a few days:[4] nay, they were constantly addressed, in the same style, by the legates themselves; "if your authority commands, if your greatness commands," were the terms they used.[5]

They bore a great sway, perhaps too great a sway, even in matters of faith. For they not only insisted on a new creed or symbol being drawn up, in opposition to the legates, and the whole council, pleading a decree of the first council of Ephesus against any new symbols; but rejected one, which, after several days consultation, they had all agreed to, a very small number excepted. This occasioned a warm contest between them and the bishops; the latter pretending their symbol to have been dictated by the Holy Ghost (and so it was, if we suppose the Holy Ghost to be always on the side of the majority), and the latter declaring, that no symbol should pass, to which they did not all agree to a man. In the end the commissioners prevailed; the first symbol was rejected, and a new one drawn up in its room, that which is still extant in the acts of the council, and of which I have spoken above. To the new symbol, or as they styled it, decree of faith, every bishop there present readily agreed; for it was industriously conceived in such terms as could give offence to neither party, the main point in view, with respect to the commissioners, being to make the bishops agree among themselves, no matter in what, and by that means put an end to the troubles of the church and the state. The bishops were all for signing the last decree, as soon as it was drawn up; but the commissioners, rising up, put an end to that session, saying, that before it was signed, it must be shown to the emperor;[1] which was modestly declaring, that they would not suffer it to pass till it was approved by the emperor. From what I have said it is manifest, that the imperial commissioners acted in this, and so they did in all other councils, as if the supreme authority were lodged in the emperor; that the authority they exerted was not disputed, but openly acknowledged, and readily submitted to, at least in matters not immediately relating to the faith, by all the bishops, even by the legates themselves, and consequently that the papal supremacy was, at that time, as little known to the legates, as it was to the other bishops, and the rest of the world. The authority of the commissioners indeed was disputed in matters of faith; and in matters of faith neither the emperors, nor their commissioners ought to have interposed: but nevertheless they did interpose; and, abusing their authority, or supremacy, as we may call it, obliged the bishops, as the popes have done in latter councils, to define and establish such doctrines as were found to suit their own interest the best: insomuch that were the many perplexing and intricate creeds, now held by the church of Rome, carefully garbled; were the articles only of the Christian religion retained, and those of the imperial and papal rejected, Christianity would, by that means, be restored, even in that church, to its original and primitive purity.

But if the supreme authority was lodged in the emperor, say they who stand up in defence of the papal supremacy, what could restrain the imperial commissioners from checking the legates, when they produced commands from the most holy archbishop of Rome, and letting them know, that the emperor alone had a right to command? Why did they not interpose their authority in vindication of the rights of their master, when

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 101—104.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 706. 819.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 320.
[4] Concil ibid. p. 289.
[5] Concil. ibid. p. 464. 451, &c.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 322. 567. Liberat. c. 13.

Leo's name placed before that of the council, no proof of his being above the council. The expressions used by the council, no proof of their owning the pope's supremacy.

the legates frankly advanced, that no council could be lawfully assembled without the consent of the apostolic see? which had been an open invasion of those rights, if the supreme authority had been vested in the emperor. To what the tame behavior of the commissioners on these occasions may be ascribed, is not easy to determine; but that it was not owing to their acknowledging the papal supremacy, is manifest from what I have said; and to what else it might have been owing, is foreign to our present purpose to inquire. Perhaps the commands, which the legates produced from Leo, were understood both by the imperial commissioners, and the members of the council, as only regarding the legates themselves; so that in what terms soever they expressed themselves, they were thought to mean no more, than that they were commanded by Leo to withdraw from the council, if Dioscorus was suffered to sit in it as a judge. It is certain, at least, that Leo himself meant no more; for his instructions to the legates, with respect to this point, were thus worded: "You must not suffer Dioscorus to appear in the council, under any other character but that of a person accused: if he presumes to sit in it as a judge, you must cause him to be driven out, or quit the council yourselves."[1] Leo therefore did not command, nor pretend to command the council; and, so long as he did not, it matters little whether his legates did or not. As to the silence of the commissioners, when the legates roundly asserted, that it had never been thought lawful to assemble a council without the consent of the apostolic see; that it had never been done; it is indeed very surprising; and I will not take upon me to account for it, but only observe, that we cannot suppose it to have been owing to their not questioning the truth of what was advanced by the legates, as the Roman catholic writers pretend, without arraigning all the chief officers of the empire of the grossest ignorance, an ignorance far more unaccountable than their silence itself. For nothing is better attested in history, nothing more certainly known, than that several councils had been held before that time, without either the consent or the knowledge of the apostolic see: and whoever peruses the acts of the present council will find some of the commissioners to have been better acquainted not only with the history, but the canons of the church, than most of the bishops.

But the name of Leo, says Bellarmine,[2] is placed before that of the council, in the many petitions and memorials presented to that great assembly. And so is the name of the first or chief member of a society before the name of the society itself. And are we to conclude from thence the first or chief member of a society to be above the whole society? Leo was the first and chief member of that assembly, or council, as presiding at it, under the imperial commissioners; and it was on that consideration alone that his name was placed, in some petitions and memorials, before that of the council. Had he been above the council, that is, had his authority been greater than the authority of the whole council, for that the Roman catholic writers mean by his being above the council), the bishops had been but his counsellors, and consequently there had been no occasion to name the council at all. It must be observed, that most of the memorials and petitions, presented to the council, were addressed either to the emperor, or to the commissioners, and such only to Leo and the council, as contained complaints against Dioscorus; the commissioners having, by the emperor's orders, absented themselves from the session, in which the cause of that prelate was heard, and he condemned.[1] It was therefore to Leo, only in their absence, and as supplying their room, that the abovementioned petitions were addressed. As for the titles of "the most holy, the most blessed, and universal patriarch, the two first were common to all bishops, especially to the metropolitans; and the latter began, about this time, to be given to the three great patriarchs, probably in regard of the great extent of their jurisdiction. Pope Gregory the Great writes, in one of his letters,[2] that the title of oecumenical bishop was offered to Leo by the present council. But he was certainly mistaken, and seems not to have distinguished what was done in the council, from what was done by the council. In the council indeed, when the commissioners were absent, the petitions against Dioscorus were presented to the legates of Leo, with this address, "To the oecumenical archbishop of the holy city of Rome;" but the council itself gave him no such title.

As to the expressions of the council, styling themselves, in their letter to Leo, the members, and him their head; he was, no doubt, their head, and they were the members, in the same sense as the person, who presides at any society or assembly, is said to be the head, or at the head, of such a society or assembly; and the rest are styled the members. The bishops, in calling him their head, and themselves the members, spoke only with respect to the present council, as is manifest from the context. But Bellarmine supposes them to have acknowledged him for the head of the whole church; and it is upon that false supposition that he grounds his doctrine; a doctrine which we shall hereafter see condemned, in express terms, by two oecumenical councils; namely, those of Constance and Basil,[3] though both held in the times when the papal power had attained to

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 93.
[2] Bellar. de Concil. auct. l. 2. c. 17.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 367. Evag. l. 2. c. 18.
[2] Greg. l. 4. ep. 32.
[3] Concil. Const. Sess. 4. et Basil. Sess. 33. 38.

The fathers of the council act as if they thought themselves superior to the pope. Leo himself implicitly owns the authority of an oecumenical council to be greater than his. Italy ravaged by the Hunns, under Attila. Leo sent with two others to treat with him.

its full height; "it being better," as had been defined before by the council of Tours, "that such a head, when infected, should be cut off, than that it should be suffered to communicate the infection to the other members."[1] But, not to depart from the present council, the fathers who composed it, notwithstanding their styling themselves the members, and Leo the head; notwithstanding the extraordinary deference they seemed to pay both to him and to his legates; showed very plainly, when other matters were settled to their satisfaction, that such an uncommon deference and regard did not proceed from their looking upon Leo, as in any respect superior to themselves; but rather that they looked upon themselves as superior to him. For, resuming at last, and exerting the spirit that became them, they passed a decree, as I have related above, highly displeasing to the legates, and which they well knew would be no less displeasing to Leo himself, without suffering themselves to be diverted from it either by the warm opposition it met with from them, or the more violent opposition they foresaw it would meet with from him. And it is observable, that Leo, in combating that decree, did not find fault with it, or pretend it to be null, because it was made against his sovereign will, which he would not have failed to do, had he been apprised of his supremacy; but alleged such reasons against it, as might have been used by any other factious and arrogant bishop, who had been prompted by some particular motive, or humor of his own, to stand out against the rest of his brethren, and thwart, so far as in him lay, their determinations. But if Leo, say they, had not been well apprised of his supremacy, he had never opposed a decree which had been passed and signed by all the fathers of the council, to a man. The argument evidently recoils against them; for if, from his standing out against the whole council, we may conclude him to have been well apprised of his supremacy, we may well conclude the whole council, from their standing out against him, to have been utterly unapprised of it; so that all our adversaries can gain by this way of arguing, is, that Leo, and Leo alone, was apprised of his supremacy; that he was indeed above the council, in his own opinion; but that, in the opinion of every body else, the council was above him. But, after all, Leo, however conceited of his own dignity, and the authority of his see, was nevertheless so far from carrying his ambition to such an extravagant height, as to conceive himself to be above all councils, that is, to be the sole, absolute, and incontrollable monarch of the church, that he often acknowledges, as I have observed above, the canons of Nice to be of an eternal and inviolable authority with respect to all, to be with respect to all equally binding. And was not this acknowledging the authority of one, and consequently of every other oecumenical council, lawfully assembled, to be greater than his own? I need not say, that, by owning the authority of a council to be greater than his, he owned the council to be above him. And now that I have made it undeniably appear, by examining more narrowly into the conduct of those who were anyways concerned in the present council, (which it was not the business of the popish writers to do), that the papal supremacy was, at this time, utterly unknown, not only to the rest of the world, but to the pope himself, notwithstanding the authority assumed by his legates, I shall resume the thread of the history, not doubting but the importance of the subject will sufficiently atone for the length of the digression.

The following year, 452, Leo had occasion to employ his talents more usefully, and with better success. Attila, the famous king of the Hunns, commonly styled Flagellum Dei, or the scourge of God, being driven out of Gaul, broke unexpectedly into Italy; and, having made himself master of several cities, and among the rest, of Aquileia, Pavia, and Milan itself, at that time the usual seat of the emperors of the west, bent his march straight to Rome, hoping to enrich himself with the spoils of that wealthy metropolis. As the city was not in a condition to stand a siege; as the emperor Valentinian III. not daring to face so formidable an enemy in the field, had shut himself up in Ravenna, and the Roman general Aetius, who but the year before had obliged the Hunns to abandon Gaul, betrayed now no less fear than the rest; the Romans expected daily to see Attila, and his numberless army at their gates. In this deplorable situation of affairs, the only means that occurred to the emperor and his council, of saving Rome, and delivering the Roman people from slaughter and bondage, was to enter into a treaty with the conqueror, and by the best peace they could obtain, put an end to so destructive a war. Accordingly it was determined that a solemn embassy should be sent to Attila, with such proposals as might be acceptable both to him and his army. On this occasion the Romans, remembering how successful the eloquence of their bishop, and his address in negotiations, had formerly proved, prevailed upon him to put himself at the head of the present embassy. With him were joined Albienus, and Trigecius, both men of the first rank, of long experience in negotiations, and known abilities. The three embassadors immediately set out, with a grand and numerous retinue, for the enemy's camp on the banks of the Minzo, in the neighborhood of Mantua; and were received, on their arrival, by the king of the Hunns, with the greatest demonstrations of kindness and joy.[1] The reception they met with is commonly ascribed, by the ecclesias-

[1] Concil. Turon. Sess. 13.

[1] Jornand. rer. Goth. c. 42—49.

A treaty concluded between Attila and Valentinian. The success of this negotiation ascribed, but not owing, to a miracle. Nor to the eloquence of Leo, or his majestic appearance. But to the bad situation of Attila's affairs. The monks of Egypt and Palæstine declare against the council of Chalcedon. Headed by one Theodosius.

tical writers, to the fame of Leo's extraordinary sanctity, which had reached the camp before them. However that be, the terms they proposed were readily agreed to by Attila; and a treaty of peace was soon concluded between him and Valentinian; in virtue of which he immediately commanded his troops to forbear all hostilities; and soon after leaving Italy, repassed the Alps, and even retired beyond the Danube.[1]

The success of this negotiation is commonly ascribed to a miracle; for it is said, that, while Leo was haranguing Attila, one or two men, of a majesty more than human, supposed to have been St. Peter and St. Paul, appeared standing by him, threatening the barbarian with drawn swords pointed at his breast, if he did not grant all that Leo required of him. This account has been adopted by the church of Rome, and allowed a place in the Roman breviary, a book of great authority, as having been declared by the bulls of several popes, to contain nothing but what is vouched by the best historians. However, as no mention is made, nor so much as a distant hint given of this miraculous apparition, either by Leo himself, his secretary Prosper, or any other contemporary writer, in the accounts they have transmitted to us of the present embassy, and the circumstances attending it, some among the Roman catholics themselves, though zealous sticklers for other miracles, have taken the liberty to question this; and Francis de Harley, archbishop of Paris, even caused it to be struck out of all the breviaries that were used within the limits of his jurisdiction. But it is still retained in the Roman breviary, the popes being sensible, that, should they encourage such inquiries, and part with one miracle, they would be soon obliged to part with all.*

Prosper, and, after him, most of the historians who flourished at that time, or soon after, will have the unexpected success of the present negotiation to have been entirely owing to the eloquence, and majestic appearance of Leo, which at the same time softened and awed the barbarian into a compliance with every thing Leo could wish or require of him. But Attila, according to the character those very writers give him, was by no means a man to be so easily softened or awed; and therefore I cannot think so highly of Leo's eloquence, and the majesty of his appearance, as to believe the victorious king of the Hunns would have yielded to either, had he not been persuaded, that it was his interest to yield. And that it was his true interest, may be easily shown. His army was at this very time in the greatest distress for want of provisions; a contagious distemper raged in his camp; a chosen body of troops, sent by Marcian out of the east, was in full march to join those which Valentinian had ordered to assemble in Italy; and another body, sent likewise by Marcian, having broken into the country of the Hunns, committed there dreadful ravages without restraint or control; insomuch that, before the arrival of the ambassadors, Attila, was in suspense whether he should pursue his march to Rome, or abandon Italy, and return home.[1] And in these circumstances there was no occasion either for a miracle, or an extraordinary eloquence, to incline him to the latter; especially as the conditions offered him were such as he ought not, in prudence, to have rejected, had his affairs been in a much better situation than they really were; for one of the conditions was, that an annual pension should be paid him by the emperor;[2] and he had, but five years before, required very little more of the emperor Theodosius to grant him a peace, though he had made himself master of seventy towns, and defeated the imperial troops in two pitched battles.[3] The eloquence of Leo therefore was not so triumphant on this occasion, as Prosper would make us believe that it was.

[Year of Christ, 453.] The following year Leo found, in the monks of Egypt and Palæstine, a more outrageous and stubborn enemy to contend with, than he had done in Attila and his Hunns. For those monks, a most riotous and turbulent race, persuaded that the fathers of Chalcedon had betrayed the faith, and established a doctrine repugnant to that of Nice, began, as soon as the council broke up, to assemble in great numbers, and, out of the abundance of their zeal for what they thought the orthodox faith, to threaten with death and destruction all who should refuse to anathematize the council, its symbol, and the letter of Leo. They were headed by one of their own profession named Theodosius, a man of restless spirit, and who had been very troublesome to the prefects of Egypt, till he was, in some degree tamed by Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, of whom I have spoken at length above. For, having one day dropped some words that seemed to reflect on the con-

[1] Idem ibid. et prosp. chron. ad ann. 452.

* For this miraculous apparition Baronius quotes the author of the Historia Miscella.(a) He might as well have quoted the famous Raphael, since the supposed apparition of the two apostles to Attila, and the officers of his army, is deservedly reputed the most wondrous performance of that inimitable artist. For the author of the Historia Miscella flourished, according to Baronius himself, as late as the eighth century. And what regard can the testimony of so late a writer deserve with respect to a transaction, not mentioned by any of the contemporary historians, who would not, and indeed could not, without an unpardonable omission, have passed it over in silence, had it been true? Besides, Baronius could not but know, that the miraculous apparition is to be met with in one edition only of the history he quotes, namely, in that of Gruter, which was printed from the only manuscript copy, that contained this account, and with it many others unquestionably fabulous. This the annalist well knew; but it was not his business to own it.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 452. n. 57—59.

[1] Jornand. rer. Goth. c. 41—49.

[2] Idem ibid.

[3] Jornand. reg. c. 44. Prisc. p. 51—53.

The monks make themselves masters of Jerusalem. Their cruelties there. Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, makes his escape, and Theodosius ordained in his room. Another bishop, and several others, massacred in Jerusalem. And in the other cities of Palæstine. Leo writes to the monks. The disturbances quieted by the emperor. Genseric, king of the Vandals, solicited by the empress Eudoxia to invade Italy.

duct of that haughty and passionate prelate, he was by his order immediately seized, whipped till he was ready to expire, and in that condition put upon a camel, and carried, as a public malefactor, through the chief streets of Alexandria, exposed to the outrages of the insulting rabble. However, as he was still in great credit with the friends of Eutyches, he no sooner declared against the council that had condemned him, than he saw himself at the head of a numerous army of monks and anchorites, who were soon joined by all the outlaws, thieves, and robbers in those parts. With this army he advanced to Jerusalem, made himself master of that city, and, having reinforced his army there from the public jails, he abandoned to their fury all whom he thought less orthodox than himself. The monks and their auxiliaries, being thus let loose, the city was soon turned into a scene of blood and slaughter; several persons, venerable for their piety, were cruelly massacred, their houses were plundered, and set on fire; and none were spared, who had the courage to own two natures in Christ, that is, who adored, with Nestorius, two Christs, two Sons, and two persons; for thus was the doctrine of two natures interpreted by Theodosius, and the monks his divines. They spared no pains to gain over Juvenalis, bishop of the place; but as he could not be prevailed upon to anathematize the decree, which he had signed a little before at Chalcedon, they deposed him, and caused their leader Theodosius to be ordained in his room; who was no sooner installed, than he gave private orders to some of his followers to despatch Juvenalis, being sensible that, so long as he lived, he would be ever attempting to recover his see. But that prelate having made his escape, the assassins, not finding him, fell upon Severianus, bishop of Scythopolis, and, upon his refusing to acknowledge but one nature in Christ, they massacred him, and all who were with him. And he is now honored as a martyr by the church of Rome. Many others underwent the same fate, and among the rest the deacon Athanasius, a man famed for his sanctity. He ventured one day to reproach the new bishop with his cruelty; which so provoked him, that he immediately caused the deacon to be put to death, and his body to be dragged, in a kind of triumph, through the chief streets of the city, and then to be thrown to the dogs. The monks were charged by the emperor Marcian with this uncommon piece of barbarity. From Jerusalem Theodosius sent large detachments of his monks and assasins into the other cities of Palæstine, with an unlimited commission to extirpate, murder, and destroy all, especially the bishops, who should refuse to anathematize the doctrine of two natures, and the council of Chalcedon. This commission was executed with a cruelty hardly to be matched in history. In some cities the bishops were the first who joined them; and where they offered to withstand them, they were inhumanly murdered, with the greater part of their clergy; and those who had murdered them, were appointed in their room. The laity, it seems, met with no better quarter than the clergy. For Marcian reproaches the monks with having insulted, and used with great cruelty, even some women, no less conspicuous for their birth than their piety.[1] These are the troubles of Palæstine, so often mentioned in the letters of Leo, who, to do him justice, left nothing unattempted to bring the riotous monks to a sense of their duty, and put an end to the disturbances, which they had raised in those parts. With this view he wrote a great many letters, and among the rest a very long one to the monks themselves, wherein he strives to prove the doctrine of Eutyches, condemned at Chalcedon, to be a no less dangerous heresy, than that of Nestorius condemned at Ephesus.[2] This letter made no small impression on some of the monks, who, thereupon, abandoning Theodosius, returned to their monasteries. But it was by the imperial authority, or rather troops, that the disturbances were in the end entirely composed. For Marcian, being informed of the intrusion of Theodosius, and the excesses committed by him, and his monks, despatched an order to count Dorotheus, governor of Palæstine, commanding him to assemble, without delay, the troops quartered in that, and the neighboring provinces, to put himself at their head, and to treat as enemies both to the church and empire, all whom he found bearing arms. This order was no sooner known, than Theodosius, to avoid falling into the hands of Dorotheus, who was ordered to seize him, and send him well guarded to Constantinople, privately withdrew from Jerusalem; and, having, with the assistance of his friends, got safe out of Palæstine, took sanctuary among his brethren on Mount Sinai. Upon the flight of their leader, the monks soon dispersed; Juvenalis returned to his see; and by his means the province was restored, in a very short time, to its former tranquillity.[3]

Leo was, for some time, diverted from attending to the affairs of the east by the death of Valentinian, murdered on the 17th of March, 455, and the many calamities, which that event produced in the west. For Maximus, by whom Valentinian was murdered, not only caused himself to be proclaimed emperor in his room; but, that he might have some title to the imperial crown, obliged Eudoxia, the deceased emperor's widow, to marry him, while his hands were yet reeking with the blood of her former husband and sovereign. As she had loved Valentinian

[1] Evag. l. 2. c. 5. Theoph. chronograph. p. 92. Leo, ep. 97. 110. Concil. t. 4. p. 851. 858. 878, 879.
[2] Leo, ep. 86. [3] Concil. t. 4. p. 879. Evagr. l. 2. c. 5.

Genseric makes himself master of Rome. Leo meets him. And is well received. But cannot restrain him from plundering the city, and even the churches. He returns to Africa with an immense booty. The emperor Maximus murdered.

with the greatest tenderness, the finding herself obliged to live with his murderer, provoked her to such a degree, that she resolved at all events, to revenge his death, and at the same time to redeem herself from a situation, to her, of all others, the most grievous and painful. With this view she resolved to apply to the famous Genseric, king of the Vandals in Africa, who she well knew would be glad of any pretence, and would neglect no opportunity of invading Italy, and distressing the empire. To him therefore she despatched a messenger in whom she could confide, conjuring him to come and rescue her out of the arms of a tyrant, who had imbrued his hands in the blood of her husband, and his friend: for Valentinian had concluded a peace with Genseric two years before, and yielded to him great part of Africa. As the empress assured him, that he would meet with no opposition, and, at the same time, promised to assist him to the utmost of her power, he put to sea without loss of time, and steered his course straight to Rome. The sudden and unexpected appearance of so numerous a fleet struck the dastardly Romans with such terror and dismay, that, instead of putting themselves in a posture of defence, they threw open their gates as soon as the king of the Vandals appeared before them, and surrendered at discretion.[1] In this extremity Leo did not abandon his flock; but with great intrepidity went out to meet the enemy, as they approached the city. But as the Romans had nothing to offer, that could, in any degree, countervail the pillage of so wealthy a city; and Genseric had nothing to fear; he was not, though a Christian, so much affected by the eloquence of Leo, or awed by the majesty of his appearance, as the king of the Hunns is said to have been, though a heathen. But neither did his mediation prove quite ineffectual; for the king of the Vandals, notwithstanding his attachment to the doctrine of Arius, received the first of the catholic bishops with all the respect that was due to his rank and character; nay, and was so far affected with his prayers and tears, as to grant to them what he thought it would be of little advantage for him to refuse. He would not indeed be restrained, though Leo alleged all the motives that could be alleged to restrain him, from pillaging the city, the public as well as the private houses, and even the churches; or from carrying the inhabitants into captivity; but promised, and observed his promise with great fidelity, that the city should not be set on fire; that no blood should be shed where no opposition was met with; and that none should be tortured, to confess, I suppose, what wealth they were possessed of, and where it lay concealed.[1] The Vandals entered Rome on the 15th of June, 455, and continued there till the 29th of the same month; during which time there was no house, no church, no public building, which they did not ransack, and strip of all their wealth, and valuable monuments. When nothing was left which they thought worth carrying off, they put the immense treasure they had amassed on board their ships, and, re-embarking, put to sea, with a booty sufficient to enrich all Africa, and with as many captives as they could stow on board their fleet. Among these were the empress Eudoxia, her two daughters Eudocia and Placidia, Gaudentius, the son of the Roman general Aetius, and several other persons of great distinction. As for the usurper Maximus, he attempted to save himself by flight as soon as the enemy's fleet appeared off the coast; but the populace, highly incensed against him for thus shamefully abandoning those whom it was his duty to protect, fell upon him, as he was flying with some of his court, put him to death, and threw his body into the Tiber, after it had been ignominiously dragged through the chief streets of the city, and lain for some time exposed to the insults of the enraged multitude.[2] Genseric, whom the ecclesiastical writers paint as an inhuman tyrant, and a mere barbarian, perhaps to be thus revenged on him for the sack of Rome, treated his royal captives with the greatest respect, and entertained them in a manner suitable to their high rank, till the year 462, when he sent back Eudoxia with her daughter Placidia to the emperor Leo, the successor of Marcian, but kept Eudocia, and married her to Hunneric his eldest son.[3](*)

[1] Evag. l. 2. c. 7. Procop. Bell. Vand. l. 2. c. 4. Jorn. rer. Goth. c. 45. Theop. p. 93.

[1] Prosp. chron. p. 55.

[2] Procop. Bell. Vand. l. 2. c. 4. Jornand. rer. Goth. c. 45.

[3] Theoph. p. 93. Procop. ibid.

(*) Baronius, upon the authority of Anastasius and pope Adrian I. supposes Leo to have prevailed upon Genseric to spare the churches of St. Peter, St. Paul, and the Lateran. (*a*) For, in the edition of Anastasius, which the annalist perused, it is said, that the Vandals did not carry off with them six vessels of silver, each weighing one hundred pounds, which Constantine had presented to these churches. But as it is said in the same place of that edition, that Leo, having caused those vessels to be melted down, renewed, with the silver, the sacred vessels of all the churches of Rome; (*b*) for which purpose surely six hundred pounds weight of silver could, by no means, be sufficient, we may well conclude the text in that edition to have been corrupted. In the Louvre edition of Anastasius, Leo is said to have given new vessels to the churches, in the room of those that were melted down, no doubt by the Vandals, and among the rest six, each weighing one hundred pounds, in lieu of those that had been given by Constantine: (*c*) so that, according to the Louvre edition, those vessels fell into the hands of the Vandals, who consequently must have plundered the above-mentioned churches. As for pope Adrian, he only says, as quoted by Baronius, that in his time there still was a statue of gold, which the emperor Valentinian had given to the church of St. Peter: (*d*) and so there might, though the church had been pillaged; since it is not to be doubted but that many valuable effects were removed before

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 455. n. 13. (*b*) Bar. ibid.
(*c*) Anas. p. 27. (*d*) Bar. ibid.

Year of Christ 457.—Marcian dies. New disturbances raised by the Eutychians, with Timotheus Ælurus at their head. Ælurus aspires to the bishopric of Alexandria. His stratagem to gain the monks. By their means is ordained bishop of Alexandria.

These troubles, and the mischiefs they occasioned, seem to have engrossed Leo's care and attention, so as to leave him no leisure to write. For, from the 13th of March to the present year, we have not a single letter of his till the 9th of June, or, as some will have it, till the 11th of June, 457, when the disturbances that happened in Egypt, obliged him to resume his correspondence with the east, and interpose anew, and very seasonably, in the affairs of those churches.

For the emperor Marcian dying in the beginning of that year, his death was no sooner known in Egypt, than the Eutychians, who were very numerous there, especially in Alexandria, thinking themselves now free from all restraint, began to renew their efforts against the council of Chalcedon, which the deceased emperor had made it the chief business of his reign to defend and establish. They were stirred up, and headed, by one Timotheus, surnamed, from the fierceness of his nature, Ælurus, that is, "the cat,"[1] a name famous in the annals of the church. He was originally a monk; but, being raised by Dioscorus to the priesthood, he adhered to that prelate, after he was condemned and deposed by the council of Chalcedon. Proterus, who was chosen bishop of Alexandria in the room of Dioscorus, did all that lay in his power to make him quit the party he had embraced; but, finding him unalterably attached to the doctrine as well as the person of the condemned bishop, he assembled a council at Alexandria in 452, and there condemned him, and with him some bishops and monks, who, in defiance of the council of Chalcedon, continued still to acknowledge Dioscorus for lawful bishop. The bishops, thus condemned, were, by Marcian, driven from their sees, and sent into exile.[2] Ælurus perhaps was banished at the same time, at least he was no more heard of till the present year, 457, when he appeared again in Egypt, and, with his appearance, put an end to the tranquillity which that province had enjoyed for some years. As both Dioscorus, and the emperor, who supported the election of Proterus, were now dead; as the Alexandrians were, for the most part, greatly dissatisfied with their bishop, and of all people the most fond of riots and tumults, as the historians observe on this, and on many other occasions; Ælurus did not despair of being able to improve their present disposition into an open revolt from their lawful pastor, and to raise himself to the patriarchal throne in his room. But this he well knew could not be easily accomplished without the help and concurrence of the monks, the common incendiaries of every sedition. In order therefore to gain them, and secure them to his interest, he used, in the darkest nights, to go round their cells, clothed in black, that he might not be seen or distinguished; to call them by their names; and, when they answered, to tell them, with a counterfeit voice, that he was an angel, sent from God, to command them, in his name, to avoid the communion of Proterus the Nestorian, and place the pious and orthodox Timotheus in his room.[1] The monks entertained not the least suspicion of deceit or imposture (for credulity now prevailed in the highest degree, especially among them, as appears from their legends; and miracles were forged and believed by wholesale); but began to look upon Ælurus as appointed, by God himself, bishop of Alexandria, and upon themselves as the instruments chosen by God to bring about what he had appointed. They therefore all declared, with an enthusiastic zeal, for this darling of Heaven; and, repairing, by his direction, to Alexandria, raised a dreadful tumult there; in the height of which Ælurus, attended by his monks, and a band of desperadoes, whom he had supplied with arms, broke open the doors of the great church, and caused himself to be ordained by two bishops, who had both been formerly deposed. When the ceremony was over, he took possession of the episcopal throne, and was proclaimed, with the repeated huzzas of the monks, and the rabble, the sole lawful bishop of Alexandria, and the metropolitan of all Egypt.[2]

Proterus, alarmed at so bold an attempt, and not doubting but the next would be upon his life, during which the episcopacy of the usurper would be very precarious, thought himself obliged to consult his own safety; and therefore, as he was unwilling to oppose force to force, he left the episcopal palace, and, flying to the church of Quirinus, took sanctuary in the adjoining baptistery;(*) a place,

the enemy entered the city, and concealed till they withdrew. But whatever Anastasius or Adrian may have written, the contemporary writers are all silent on this head. And who can believe, that if Leo had prevailed upon the king of the Vandals to spare those three churches, the richest in Rome, Prosper would have passed over in silence such a remarkable instance of the force of his eloquence? Prosper, who extolled it so much, and with so little reason, on occasion of the success that attended his negotiations on the banks of the Minzo.

[1] Evag. l. 2. c. 8. Concil. p. 898.

[2] Evag. l. 2. c. 8. Concil. p. 893—899.

[1] Theodor. p. 552. Evagr. ibid. Niceph. Call. l. 15. c. 16.

[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 893. Evagr. Niceph. Theodor. ubi. supra, Liberat. c. 15.

(*) Baptisteries were anciently buildings distinct from the church, consisting of a porch, where the catechumens renounced Satan, and made their confessions of faith; and an inner room where the ceremony of baptism was performed. The baptisteries were very capacious, because the stated seasons for baptism recurring but seldom, great multitudes were usually baptized at the same time. We sometimes read even of councils meeting and sitting in baptisteries.(a) Some modern writers have confounded the baptistery and the font, which, however, were anciently very different things; the baptistery being the whole building, and the font only the fountain or pool, into which persons were immersed at the time of their baptism. For baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the apos-

(a) Vide Du Fresne Comm. in Paul. Silentiar. et Concil. Chalced. act. 1.

Proterus, the lawful bishop, murdered. Ælurus excommunicates Leo, and all who held the doctrine of Chalcedon. Several bishops driven from their sees. Ælurus supported by his friends at court. The Eutychians demand a new council. Leo opposes the assembling of one.

says the council,[1] which the barbarians revered, and the pagans themselves, though they knew not why. But the sacredness of the place was no protection against the ambition of Ælurus, or the rage of his followers; and the most innocent blood was spilt, to use the expression of the council, where the most guilty ought to have been spared.(*)

The lawful bishop being thus removed, Ælurus, without loss of time, assembled a council; and, together with the bishops who composed it, (four or five in number, who had been all degraded by Proterus, and banished by Marcian,) anathematized the council of Chalcedon, and all who had received it; especially, and by name, Leo, Anatolius, and Basilius, who had lately succeeded Maximus in the see of Antioch. In virtue of this sentence, pronounced by him, and his mock council, he excommunicated, deposed, and, by his own authority, drove from their sees, all the bishops of the patriarchate of Alexandria, who refused to sign the abovementioned anathema, and abjure the faith of Chalcedon, the impious tenet, as he styled it, of two natures in Christ. In the room of those whom he thus drove out, he took care to place such of his own party, as had distinguished themselves above the rest, by their attachment to his interest, and their zeal for his doctrine.[1] Not only the bishops, but the other ecclesiastics, and even the laymen, who had the courage to stand up in defence of the faith of Chalcedon, were every where persecuted, as declared heretics, and obliged either to communicate with Ælurus, or save themselves from the rage of his partisans, by quitting their churches and country.[2]

These disturbances afforded a large field to the zeal of Leo; and indeed it required all his zeal, interest, and authority, to redress the evils, which they had already occasioned, and to prevent the far greater evils, which it was justly apprehended they might occasion. For though the crimes committed by Ælurus were notorious, yet he was not only screened by the friends he had at court, from the punishment they deserved, but even maintained in possession of the see, to which he had opened himself a way by such enormous excesses. The emperor Leo, the successor of Marcian, had, from the very beginning of his reign, openly declared in favor of the council of Chalcedon; and by an ordinance, addressed to the metropolitans throughout his dominions, confirmed all the laws made by his predecessors, especially by Marcian, for the defence and support of the orthodox faith.[3] However, as some of the most powerful men of the empire, and, among the rest, the famous patrician Aspar, to whom the emperor owed his crown, his son Ardaburius, and Basiliscus, brother to the empress Verina, had espoused the Eutychian cause, and supported it with all their interest, the emperor, to gratify them, began to hearken to the bishops of that party, remonstrating against the council of Chalcedon, and pressing him to convene another; to the decisions of which they solemnly engaged to submit, and finally acquiesce;[4] nay, Facundus assures us, that he was absolutely determined to assemble another oecumenical council, in order to have examined anew the mystery of the incarnation.[5]

The convening a council for that purpose was, no doubt, highly injurious to the authority of the church, since it was calling in question what she had so solemnly defined. Leo therefore, who looked upon it in that light, was no sooner acquainted with the design of the emperor, than he exerted all his credit, interest, and authority, to divert him from it. With this view, he wrote letters upon letters to the emperor, to Aspar, and the other men in power, to Anatolius, and all the other patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops of any note in the east.[6] In his letters to the emperor, he represented, in the strongest terms, the dan-

tolical practice, and was never dispensed with by the church, except in case of sickness, or when a sufficient quantity of water for immersion could not be procured. In both these cases, baptism by aspersion or sprinkling was allowed, but in no other. In the primitive times there were no baptisteries; and yet baptism was administered even then, as appears from Justin Martyr, (a) and Tertullian, (b) in a place distinct from the church; probably in any place, where there was water; for, in those days, it mattered little, as we learn from Tertullian, (c) whether a man was baptized in the sea, or in a lake, in a river, or in a fountain, in the Jordan, or in the Tiber. And here we may observe, by the way, that from these words, it is manifest, that the many superstitions, and idle ceremonies, now practised by the church of Rome, in solemnly exorcising and blessing the baptismal water, were utterly unknown in those early times, though they are held by that church, upon the authority of one of those who have often misled her, (d) to be of apostolic institution. In the sixth century baptisteries were still distinct buildings from the churches. But in that age baptism began, in some places, to be administered in the porch of the church, and not long after it was, almost every where, performed in the church itself. (e) I know but of one ancient baptistery still standing, that near St. John Lateran at Rome, which has been kept up to maintain and propagate the famous fable, that Constantine was baptized there by pope Sylvester.

(a) Justin. apol. 2.
(b) Tertull. de Bapt. de Coron. mil. c. 3.
(c) Tertull. de Bapt. c. 4.
(d) Basil. l. de Spir. Sanct. c. 27.
(e) Vide Durant. de ritib. Eccles. l. 1. c. 19. n. 4.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 894.

(*) With Proterus were murdered in the same place, six of his ecclesiastics, who attended him in his flight. Their bodies the assassins left there; but that of Proterus they conveyed, in a kind of triumph, to a place called Tetrapylus, where they hung it up on a gibbet; and, after it had been some time exposed there to the view and insults of the inhuman and barbarous rabble, they dragged it, torn, mangled, and disfigured as it was, through the chief streets of Alexandria, and then burnt it, and dispersed the ashes, to deprive their bishop of those honors that were not denied to the greatest criminals. (a)

(a) Concil. p. 899. Evagr. l. 2. c. 8. Liberat. c. 15.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 899. Leont. act. 5. p. 512. Phot. c. 230. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 905.
[3] Concil. t. 4. 892—895. Leo ep. 115. 122.
[4] Leo ep. 116. 129. [5] Facund. l. 12. c. 2.
[6] See Leo's Letters, from 115 to 134.

Leo diverts the emperor from assembling a new council; he orders the decree of Chalcedon to be examined by the bishops of each province, in a provincial synod.

ger of re-examining what had been already examined, and finally decided, by so numerous a council. In those to the bishops he advised, exhorted, and encouraged them to join, all as one man, in defence of the council of Chalcedon, as the only means of defeating effectually the wicked attempts of the Eutychians; since it could not be imagined, that either the emperor or his ministers would ever think of convening a council, in order to examine a doctrine that was unanimously received by all the bishops of the catholic church.[1] His letters seem to have made no great impression on the emperor, or his ministers. But the bishops, no less apprehensive of the danger than Leo himself, since the authority of the church was at stake, all joined, with great readiness, in a cause that was common to all; and their union rendering a new examination both needless and dangerous, the emperor laid aside all thoughts of assembling a new council.

However, to gratify, in some degree, the Eutychians, who were very powerful at court, instead of assembling the bishops in one place, he wrote a circular letter to all the metropolitans throughout his dominions, enjoining them to assemble the bishops and ecclesiastics of their respective provinces, to examine together with them the symbol or decree of Chalcedon, and to acquaint him with their sentiments concerning that decree, as well as the intrusion of Ælurus, which was very differently represented to him by the different parties.[2] This letter the emperor sent not only to the bishops, but to such of the Anchorites as were most renowned for the sanctity and austerity of their lives, and, among the rest, to the famous Simeon Stylites, and Baradatus, who were universally reputed the two greatest saints of the present age, the former living, for the benefit of mankind, on the top of a pillar, and the latter in a cage.(*) For now superstition began to prevail, and men were sainted for actions that savoured more of madness than sanctity.

[1] Leo ep. 118, 119. 121.

[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 108. Facund. l. 12. c. 3. Marcell. chron.

(*) Symeon is said, by the contemporary writers, to have passed the last thirty-six years of his life on the top of a pillar, placed on the summit of a high mountain, in the territory of Antioch, without ever coming down, unless it was to change his pillar, which he did, according to those writers, five times, either causing the same pillar to be raised, or new ones to be built, each higher than the other, that he might thus remove farther from the earth, and more and more approach heaven. His first pillar was nine feet high; the second eighteen; the third thirty-two; the fourth forty-eight; and the last, on which he died, sixty. He chose this kind of life in the year 423, and passed four years on the first pillar, three on the second, ten on the third, four on the fourth, and fifteen on the last. They were all but three feet broad, so that he could never lie down; nor was he ever seen to sit; but constantly stood, exposed like a statue, to the heat of the summer, and the cold of the winter, both excessive in that climate; to the rain, snow, winds, and all the inclemencies of the air and the seasons. He spent his whole time, till the hour of *none*, that is, till three in the afternoon, in prayer and meditation; and then preached from his pillar to the crowds, that flocked daily from all parts to see and hear him, composed their differences, resolved their doubts, and answered all the questions they asked him. At the setting of the sun he dismissed the multitude, gave them his blessing, and again betook himself to prayer; during which, he was observed to bend his body several times in a minute, and to bow so low as almost to touch his feet with his forehead. Some, out of curiosity, took upon them to count how often he thus bowed in a day; and Theodoret, the famous bishop of Cyrus, assures us, that one, who came with him to see so great a prodigy, having attempted to do it, counted twelve hundred and forty-four such bows, and then, finding he had undertaken too difficult a task, gave over counting. Other things no less surprising are related of this wondrous man. For he is said to have taken no kind of food, but on Sundays, observing a rigorous fast the other six days of the week; to have wholly abstained, at least once a year, and sometimes twice, and oftener, from all food, for forty days together; to have stood the whole last year of his life on one foot, having lost the use of the other by an ulcer; and, lastly, to have died in that posture, and continued in it till his body was, with great solemnity, taken down from the pillar. During his life-time people flocked from all parts of the known world to see so new, so surprising a spectacle; insomuch that Theodoret, who wrote while he was still living, nay, twenty years before his death, could appeal for the truth of what he wrote concerning him, not only to the subjects of both empires, but to all the inhabitants of the earth. Numberless multitudes, says that writer, are seen daily arriving, by different roads, at the holy mountain, like so many rivers running into the sea; from the east the Ismaelites, the Persians, the Armenians, the Iberians, the Ethiopians, and other more distant nations; from the west, the Italians, the Gauls, the Spaniards, the Britons, and people, utterly unknown to us, who border on them. These all know what I write to be true; and to them I appeal.(*a*) Thus Theodoret. But, after all, I should be glad to know how he, how those to whom he appeals, knew, or could know, that Symeon never came down from his pillar; that he observed such long and rigorous fasts. Theodoret did not live constantly at the foot of the pillar, to watch him; but only came from time to time to pay him a visit, and at sun-set was dismissed with the rest: so that we may question the truth of such wondrous things, without arraigning the veracity of so famous a writer, since it is not upon his own knowledge, but the testimony of others, that he relates them; probably of the Anchorites, who inhabited the neighboring desert, a most simple, credulous, and ignorant race. By these many things, still more surprising, were reported of their fellow-Anchorites, and, through the prevailing superstition of that credulous age, universally believed, though exceeding all belief. Amongst other things, they gave out, that he never took any kind of food. But that Theodoret did not believe, though he does not question his having yearly observed a rigorous fast for forty days together; as if it were more extraordinary, incredible, or miraculous for a man to fast forty years, than forty days. Theodoret wrote in 440, that is, twenty years before the death of Symeon, and when he had lived but sixteen years on his pillar. So that the surprising things that are said to have happened in the twenty last years of his life, and at his death, are attested only by one of his disciples, named Antony, who wrote a very minute account of his life, of his death, and of the miracles he is supposed to have wrought, both in his life-time, and after his death. Of this work a very ancient manuscript copy, in the original Greek, is lodged in the library of the duke of Bavaria, which has been translated into Latin by Bollandus.(*b*) But it is filled with such absurd and improbable stories, with such amazing events, and absolutely impossible, as must stagger credulity itself. In one place, for instance, the saint is said to have helped some persons, by a miracle, to do what they were struck dumb by another miracle for having done; but by a third restored to the use of their tongues.(*c*) In no other legend is there such a profusion of useless miracles as in this; and yet it is held in the greatest esteem by the church of Rome, and has been copied, with some notable improvements, by all the historians, who, since Antony's time, have related the actions of Sy-

(*a*) Theodoret. vit. Patr. c. 26.

(*b*) Bolland. 5 Jan. (*c*) Bolland. ibid. p. 266.

Several provincial synods held. The decree of Chalcedon received by all but the bishops of Pamphylia. Their answer to the emperor.

In compliance with the emperor's order, the metropolitans assembled their suffragans, and other ecclesiastics of their respective provinces; and having, together with them, examined both the decree of Chalcedon, and the different relations of the intrusion of Ælurus, which the emperor had caused to be transmitted to them, all agreed, but the bishops of Pamphylia, in receiving the decision of the council, which, in their answer to the emperor, they declared themselves ready to defend at the expense of their lives; and in condemning Ælurus as altogether unworthy, not only of the episcopal dignity, but even of the name of a Christian, if truly guilty of the crimes that were laid to his charge.[1] The Anchorites agreed with the bishops in receiving the council, and in condemning Ælurus: Baradatus added in his letter, that since the heretics would not answer to the voice of their pastors, the emperor should make them hear the roaring of the lion;[2] which shows of what spirit he was. As for the bishops of Pamphylia, which was then divided into two provinces, they differed from the rest. Epiphanius, metropolitan of Perga, and his council, consisting of fifteen bishops, received the decree of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo, not as definitions of faith, but only as instructions, explaining the doctrine of the fathers; and begged, that neither might be otherwise received by their colleagues, till the doctrine of the council, concerning the two natures in Christ, was explained in more clear and intelligible terms, since they had not subtlety and penetration enough to distinguish between Christ's being in two natures, which the

meon, especially by Theodorus, the reader, and Evagrius.

It would be cruel to rob the church of Rome of one of her greatest saints, with such a croud of miracles in his train; and therefore I will not take upon me to say, that Symeon was prompted by the desire of fame and popular applause, to embrace such an extraordinary and painful state of life; but only observe, that another was, namely, Nicander, surnamed likewise Stylites, from his living, as Simeon did, on the top of a pillar.(a) He was, for some time, no less honored and revered than Symeon, people crowding from all parts to see him. But having, for want of craft, and due circumspection, betrayed a desire of praise, and besides some fondness for women, a rock on which many great saints have split, he was abandoned even by those who had most admired him. When he found himself thus discovered and forsaken, he came down, took his leave of the pillar, and condescended to live as other men did. Symeon was more cautious, especially with respect to women. For he is said, from the time of his conversion to the day of his death, to have avoided even the sight of a woman;(b) nay, of his own mother. For we are told by his disciple Antony, that his mother, who had not heard of him for the space of twenty-seven years, being come to see him while he stood on his second pillar, which was inclosed by a high wall, he would not see her, nor be seen by her, till after her death. For the good woman is said to have died of grief, the third day after her arrival, finding, that neither by her prayers nor tears she could prevail upon her son to admit her within the inclosure. When Symeon heard she was dead, he caused her body to be brought in; and, having said a short prayer over it, restored her to life. But her life was short; for she only opened her eyes, saw her son, smiled, and then, shutting her eyes again, died the second time, and was buried at the foot of the pillar.(c) Evagrius writes, that no woman was allowed to set foot in the church, which was built after his death, in the place where his pillar had stood. These, and many other such idle tales, are gravely related by the ecclesiastic writers of those times; and it is upon the authority of such writers that the church of Rome pretends the power of working miracles, which she makes one of the signs of the true church, to have been entailed upon her, and by her exercised in all ages, from the times of the apostles to the present. But the very last I have mentioned may be alleged as an instance, to convince every sensible man, that even the best attested of her miracles ought to be looked upon as arrant fables. For that Symeon raised his mother from the dead is gravely related by a contemporary writer, who solemnly declares, that he was an eye-witness of the miracle he relates; nay, that it was wrought not only in his sight and presence, but in the sight and presence of many others: he wrote soon after the death of Symeon, and consequently when many were still living, who might have disproved what he wrote: but he was so far from being under any apprehension on that score, that he appeals to them as eye-witnesses of what he wrote. We may add, that all the writers, who have described the wondrous acts of Symeon since his time, have copied him, and without betraying the least suspicion of his being deceived, or of his designing to deceive others, have related the same miracle, and with the same circumstances as they found it related by him. Were the church of Rome to make an inventory of all her miracles, she would find none among them better attested than this, and very few so well. And yet if we appeal to our reason, and examine this so well attested miracle, with the least degree of attention, we shall find it attended with such circumstances as no evidence whatever can render credible. For who can believe that a great saint, such as Symeon is said and supposed to have been, would have suffered his mother to die of grief, when he might have saved her life, only by allowing her the satisfaction of seeing him? To believe this, we must suppose filial duty, respect, and obedience to be capital sins; and cruelty and ill-nature, in children to their parents, to be cardinal virtues. Besides, what can be conceived more absurd, more repugnant to reason and good sense, than that Symeon should suffer his mother to die of grief rather than to see him, and the very next minute raise her from the dead that she might see him? That had been working the greatest of miracles merely out of wantonness, and to attain an end that might have been attained without any miracle at all. And to suppose that God would suffer the power of working miracles to be thus, I may say, idly sported with, would be evidently detracting from his infinite wisdom.

It is not merely to confute such an idle tale that I have dwelt so long on this subject, but to show, by so remarkable an instance, that, universally speaking, there is no depending on the testimony or protestations, however solemn, even of those who pretend to have been eye-witnesses of the miracles they relate and attest, unless where the end for which those miracles are said to be wrought, appears to be worthy of God, and when there is no just suspicion of interest or prejudice to bias the relator, which distinguishes the miracles attested in the gospel from almost all others, after the apostolic age. There have been in all ages, since the times of the apostles, and even in their time, impostors in point of miracles, as well as doctrine; nay, it might be shown by many instances, that some, in other respects pious and Godly men, have not scrupled, nay, I may say, have thought it meritorious, on certain occasions, to forge miracles themselves or adopt and foster those which they knew to have been forged by others.

All we know of Baradatus, the other Anchorite, to whom the emperor sent his circular letter, is, that he shut himself up in a wooden cage, and lived there several years, without ever being able to stand upright; but was in the end obliged to quit his painful dwelling, by the bishop of Antioch, in whose diocess he lived,(a) and who, it seems, did not approve of that whimsical manner of life.

(a) Nil. ep. 114, 115.

(b) Greg. Turon. de glor. Confess. c. 26. Bolland. Mart. t. 2. p. 9.

(c) Bolland. 5 Jan. p. 266. 270. Vit. Patr. l. 1. p. 172.

(a) Theodoret. vit. Patr. c. 27.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1081. Evagr. l. 2. c. 10, Facund. l. 12. c. 3.

[2] Concil. p. 976.

The emperor invites Leo to Constantinople. His answer to the emperor's letter. The emperor sends Leo's letter, establishing the two natures, to Ælurus. Leo against entering into disputes with the Eutychians. The reasons he alleged. Despatches legates into the east.

council had taken so much pains to establish; and his being of two natures, which they had condemned: so that the council had, so far as it appeared to them, condemned and defined, received and rejected, the same doctrine, only expressed by different terms. And this, in effect, was the case, as I have shown above. They added, that as they seemed all to agree with respect to the doctrine, it mattered little by what terms they expressed it; whether they acknowledged two natures united without confusion, or one incarnate nature; but the latter they thought the more proper of the two.[1] They agreed however with the rest, in condemning Ælurus. The letter of Amphilochus of Sida, the other metropolitan of Pamphylia, has not reached our times; but all agree, that he condemned Ælurus for the violence he had used, but absolutely rejected the decree of Chalcedon.[2](*)

To none of the western bishops was the circular letter sent, but to Leo; and him the emperor even invited to Constantinople.[3] In answer to this he wrote two letters, begging the emperor, in the first, to excuse him from undertaking a journey, which the agreement of the bishops had made unnecessary;[4] and in the second, explaining, and confirming with the testimony of the fathers, the doctrine of two natures.[5] This letter became very famous;[6] and is often quoted by the writers of that, and the succeeding ages.

But Ælurus, though condemned by Leo, and all the other bishops of the church, both as a heretic, and homicide, was, it seems still in favor at court. For the emperor had no sooner perused Leo's letter, than he sent it to him, despatching, for that purpose, Diomedes the silentiary into Egypt. Ælurus laid hold of that opportunity to write to the emperor; and in his letter censured, with great smartness and liberty, both Leo's letter, and the council of Chalcedon; and at the same time begged, that he would allow a dispute, or conference, to be held in his presence, between the disciples of Eutyches or Dioscorus, and any whom Leo, since he had put himself at the head of that party, should name or appoint. The emperor did not dislike the proposal; and accordingly wrote to Leo to acquaint him with it, and desire him to send into the east such persons as he should think best qualified to enter the lists with the Eutychians, and convince them of their errors.[7] Such a proposal, we may be sure, was not relished by Leo. And indeed disputes of that nature are better calculated to exasperate than to convince, the disputants on both sides being, on such occasions, strongly prepossessed in favor of the cause, which they undertake, and firmly determined not to yield. Leo therefore absolutely refused to comply with the proposal, alleging, what he had urged in all his letters, that it was both dangerous and unnecessary to examine anew, or to question, what had been already examined and defined by an oecumenical council. He added, that as for himself, he could not consent to the proposed dispute, without incurring the penalties inflicted by the law of the late emperor Marcian, forbidding all disputes about religion, on pain of deposition for the ecclesiastics, and banishment for the laity.[1] For in those days the popes thought themselves bound, as well as the meanest of the ecclesiastics, or people, to obey the imperial laws, and liable to the same penalties, if they disobeyed them. But this in Leo was a mere pretence; for by Marcian's law were only forbidden disputes in public places, and in the hearing of the populace, lest our mysteries should be discovered to the Jews and pagans;[2] of which there was no danger in the present case. However, Leo promised to send legates into the east, since the emperor desired it; but at the same time protested, that it was by no means his design, they should enter into disputes with persons who had been already condemned, or about points that had been already decided; and that he sent them only to instruct the faithful, to persuade them to avoid, as declared heretics, all who did not receive the council of Chalcedon, to press the expulsion of Ælurus, and procure the restoration of the bishops, whom he had driven from their sees.[3] This letter is dated the 22d of March of the present year, 458, and, the following August, Leo despatched into the east, agreeably to his promise, Domitianus and Geminianus, both bishops, but of what sees is not well known. By them he wrote anew to the emperor, repeating what he said in his former letter, and besides setting forth the heinousness and enormity of Ælurus' crimes, lest the emperor should be prevailed upon to overlook them, which the great interest he had with the chief ministers, especially with Aspar, gave the world good reason to apprehend.[4] As for the reception the legates met with, and their transactions at the court of Constantinople, I find no account of them in the ancients, and none of the moderns are to be relied on. All we know for certain is, that they were still at Constantinople in 460, that Ælurus was not driven from the see he had usurped till that year; and that his being

[1] Concil. p. 935, 936.
[2] Phot. c. 230. Evagr. l. 2. c. 10.
(*) These letters were all collected, by the emperor's order, into one body, known by the name of Encyclia, or the circular letters. They were, at the desire of Cassiodore, translated into Latin, by Epiphanius; and that translation alone has reached us; though not entire, the whole collection containing now but thirty-seven letters. Two very ancient manuscript copies of it are lodged in the libraries of the chapter of Beauvais, and of St. Germain de Prez.
[3] Leo, ep. 125. Evagr. l. 2. c. 9.
[4] Leo, ep. 125. [5] Leo, ep. 134.
[6] Phot. c. 228. [7] Evagr. l. 2. c. 10. Leo, ep. 132.

[1] Leo, ep. 132.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 839. Cod. Just. lib. 1. tit. 1. lege 3.
[3] Leo, ep. 132. [4] Leo, ep. 133.

Oecumenical councils not deemed infallible. Nicetas of Aquileia consults Leo concerning some points of discipline. Leo's answer. Errors in his letter concerning marriage, and the eating of immolated meats. His doctrine concerning baptism, now heresy in the church of Rome. No virgins to be consecrated under the age of forty.

driven from it then, was not owing either to the pope, or his legates, as we shall see hereafter. I cannot help observing here, that Leo, to divert an orthodox, and, I may say, a religious prince, for such was the present emperor Leo Thracius, from causing to be examined anew, or disputed, what had been already examined and decided by an oecumenical council, lawfully assembled, never once pleaded the infallibility of such councils; but only that a new examination was unnecessary, was dangerous, was forbidden by an imperial law. A plain proof, that oecumenical councils were not yet thought infallible, at least, that their infallibility was not then what it is now, an article of faith; else Leo had certainly alleged it as a fundamental reason why a new examination should not be allowed; and indeed, in the present case, there had been no occasion to allege any other.

Leo did not suffer his care and attention to be so engrossed by the affairs of the east, as not to mind, at the same time, those of the west. For in this very year he wrote a long letter to Nicetas of Aquileia, concerning some points of the ecclesiastical discipline, which it was of the utmost importance to examine and establish. The Hunns having, in their retreat out of Italy, carried with them great numbers of captives, some women, believing their husbands dead, or persuaded that they should never see them again, had married other men. But many of the captives unexpectedly returned, re-demanded their wives, and upon their refusing, which some of them did, to quit their second husbands, had recourse to Nicetas, the chief bishop in those parts. Some of the captives had been forced, by the barbarians, to eat of meats immolated to idols; and some to receive baptism at the hands of heretics. With all these, Nicetas was at a loss how to proceed; and therefore, distrusting his own judgment, he charged Adeodatus, a sub-deacon of the Roman church, who was returning from Aquileia to Rome, to lay his difficulties before Leo, that he might direct him how to act in the above-mentioned cases. This gave occasion to a circular letter, addressed to all the metropolitans, at least, in the west, that what he had prescribed to one might be known to all, and by all observed. In that letter he clears those women from all guilt, who, believing their husbands were dead, had married other men; but adds, that they are bound to return to their first husbands, provided their first husbands required them to return; and that they ought to be cut off from the communion of the faithful, if they did not return when re-demanded.[1] This condition, if required to return by their first husbands, if re-demanded, he never omits, as if it were not to be questioned but they might continue with their second, if their first husbands did not re-demand them. As for those who had eaten of immolated meats, or meats offered to idols, he will have them to atone for their crime by a public penance, not even excusing from the crime, or exempting from the penance, such as had used that for want of all other food, that is, when they must either have used it, or perished with hunger. Leo was, it seems, of St. Austin's opinion, who thought it could be lawful, on no occasion whatever, to eat of such meats. But St. Paul was, very plainly, of a different opinion; it being, according to his doctrine, no sin in a Christian to eat of meats offered to idols, provided he does not think it a sin, nor give thereby offence to weak brethren.[1] Leo subjects likewise to a public penance, all who, having been baptized, suffered themselves, out of fear, or even out of ignorance, to be re-baptized by a heretic minister. But as for those, who were but once baptized, though they had received their baptism at the hands of a heretic, he only requires them to be confirmed by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the imposition of hands; that they may thereby receive the virtue and sanctification of baptism, having received nothing of that sacrament before, besides the bare form.[2] The doctrine diametrically opposite to this is now an article of faith in the church of Rome; and Leo's doctrine rank heresy; though laid down by him in instructing the church, or, as it is called, speaking ex cathedra. For, according to the present doctrine of that church, baptism, whether it be administered by a catholic or a heretic, has the same virtue, cancels original sin, confers grace, sanctifies; and consequently, if the church does not err, Leo did in defining the contrary; namely, that "of baptism nothing is received at the hands of a heretic, besides the bare form." I might add, that the bare form, or external ceremony of baptism, is not the sacrament of baptism, a sacrament being, as is allowed by all, who allow of any sacraments, "a visible sign of invisible grace; and hence it follows, that baptism, when administered by a heretic, is not a sacrament according to Leo's doctrine, but a bare external, and to all purposes useless ceremony, leaving the persons to whom it is administered, in the same condition it found them.

The same year, 458, the emperor Majorianus, who reigned in the west, enacted the famous law, at the suggestion of Leo, as is said in the pontificals, forbidding virgins under the age of forty to be consecrated, or to take the veil of virginity; on pain to their parents, of forfeiting the third part of their estates, if they suffered them to be consecrated

[1] Leo ep. 129.

[1] See ep. ad Rom. xiv. et 1 Corinth. viii.
[2] Leo ubi supra.

Virgins now allowed to take the veil of virginity at the age of sixteen. Benedict XIII. attempted to correct that abuse. But his good design over-ruled. The law forbidding virgins to be consecrated under the age of 40, not owing to Leo.

before that age; and of proscription to the ecclesiastics, who should be any ways accessary to their consecration.[1] By the 16th canon of the council of Chalcedon, held in 451, virgins, who had once taken the veil of virginity, or, as it is now expressed, had made their profession, were forbidden, on pain of excommunication, ever to marry.[2] By the 15th canon of the same council, deaconesses* were likewise forbidden to marry after their consecration, and anathematized together with their husbands, if they did.[3] With respect to the latter it was ordained, that none should be consecrated under the age of forty, let the occasion be ever so urgent; but for the consecration of the former no age was fixed. Majorianus therefore, thinking it incumbent upon him to prevent young women from entering rashly, as many did, into a state so repugnant to nature, which they could not afterwards change, though they might repent, for the rest of their lives, their having ever embraced it, by an edict, dated the 26th of October, of the present year, extended to all virgins the law, which the fathers of Chalcedon had made and designed for the deaconesses alone. And how many scandals and abuses had been prevented by so wise an ordinance, had it continued in vigor, the world but too well knows. Young women are now allowed to take the veil of virginity at the age of sixteen; that is, they are allowed to dispose of themselves for life, when they are not yet thought capable of disposing of any thing else; to vow perpetual virginity, when they scarce understand what they vow, at least, when they can have but a very faint idea of the difficulties of keeping it through their whole lives. These considerations, confirmed and enforced by the bad success that attended many of the unexperienced novices, in the warfare they had so rashly undertaken, strongly inclined a conscientious pope[1] in our days to declare void and null all vows of perpetual chastity that should be made, for the future, by virgins under the age of twenty-five, that age having been fixed by the African canons. The good pope supposed no virgin to be a stranger at that age, to this kind of war, but all to be as well acquainted, as ever they could be, both with the enemy's strength, and their own. Those alone therefore, who had attained to that age, he thought properly qualified to engage in such a war, since they alone could know, by experience, whether or not they could withstand the enemy to the last, and faithfully perform what they so solemnly promised, in ranging themselves under the banner of chastity. Those alone too he thought worthy of the punishments indifferently inflicted, by the undiscerning canons, on all, who had the misfortune to be in the end overcome. But his design, though entirely agreeable to humanity, justice, and good sense, was over-ruled; and the opposition it met with from the sacred college, as it is called, and the divines of his council, was so strong, and so universal, that he thought it advisable to lay it aside, seeing that it required the whole plenitude of his power, which he was unwilling to exert, to put it in execution. The reasons they alleged to support their opposition, were better calculated for the meridian of Italy, than for that of a more temperate climate. Their chief reason, and that on which they laid the main stress, was, that very few, if any at all, would choose, at the prescribed age, when their passions were strongest, to put themselves out of a condition of ever gratifying them, even in a lawful and innocent manner. Thus the monasteries would be all deserted, and, at the same time, many poor, but noble families, encumbered with a greater number of daughters, than they could either marry, or maintain, suitably to their rank. Upon the whole, the pope was obliged to content himself with charging the bishops, as they would answer it at the last day, not to allow any virgins, under the abovementioned age, to take the veil of virginity, whom they had not found, upon the strictest examination, made by themselves, or by persons, in whom they could confide, sufficiently apprised of the difficulties and hardships attending the state, which they proposed to embrace.

The above-mentioned law, forbidding the veil of virginity to be given to virgins under the age of 40, is said, in the pontificals, to have been procured by Leo; nay, Anastasius pretends an ordinance to have been first issued by him, forbidding virgins to be conse-

[1] Cod. Theod. nov. 8. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 763.

(*) The order of deaconesses was of apostolic institution; for St. Paul calls Phœbe a deaconess (Διάκονος) of the church of Cenchrea.(a) They were to be widows, who had borne children, who had been but once married, and were advanced in years. But these rules were all frequently dispensed with. Some imperial laws required all deaconesses to be sixty years of age; others required them to be at least fifty; but the council of Chalcedon was satified with the age of forty; and even the canon of that council was not always strictly observed. As to their office, they were, I. to assist at the baptism of women, and on that occasion, as all were baptized by immersion, to undress and dress them, and to anoint them with the holy oil, in compliance with the custom that then obtained in the eastern churches. II. To instruct the women catechumens, before they were baptized. III. To visit and attend women, when sick, or in distress. IV. To minister to the confessors in prison, which they could do with less danger than the other ministers of the church. And, lastly, To regulate the behavior of women in the church; whence in some canons they are styled governesses. They were ordained, or rather consecrated, by the imposition of hands; for their ordination gave them no power to perform any functions of the sacerdotal office. This order, though agreed on all hands to have been of apostolical institution, has been long since suppressed in the Latin, as well as in the Greek, church. For, after the tenth or eleventh century, the word diaconissa is made use of only to signify a deacon's wife, as the words presbytera and episcopa are to signify the wife of a presbyter, and the wife of a bishop.

(a) Ad Rom. xvi. 1.

[3] Concil. ibid.

[1] Benedict XIII. chosen in 1724.

Leo suppresses the custom of publicly confessing private sins. Penance how practised in the primitive church. In those times all public and notorious sinners expelled the congregation. Not re-admitted till they had atoned for their crime by a public penance. The rigor and severity of that penance.

crated, who had not been tried for the space of forty, or, as we read in the Louvre edition of that author, of sixty years.[1] But Leo declares, in one of his letters,[2] even those virgins, who had only resolved to embrace the state of virginity, which some did, when they were yet very young, and thereupon had assumed the habit peculiar in those days to such as had taken that resolution, bound in conscience to live virgins, and guilty of prevarication, if they ever married; which is utterly inconsistent with his requiring a forty or a sixty years trial.

The following year, 459, Leo, by a letter dated the 6th of March, and addressed to the bishops of Campania, Samnium, and Picenum, suppressed a custom that prevailed among them, with respect to the confession of penitent sinners, whom they obliged to write down all their sins, and then caused them to be read in the hearing of the whole congregation. This custom Leo condemns as repugnant to the apostolic rule, and tending to deter sinners from using the remedies which penance afforded, since either shame might withhold them from publicly owning their sins, or the fear of being accused by their enemies, or punished, upon their own confession, by the civil magistrate, and the ministers of justice. Leo therefore commands so pernicious a practice to be forthwith abolished, as not only dangerous, but likewise unnecessary; that confession being fully sufficient, which is made first to God, and then to a priest, who will intercede for the sinner, and pray with him for the remission of his sins.[3] From Leo's own words it is manifest, that he does not condemn and abrogate here public confession in general; but only a public confession of hidden sins, that is, of sins, which, unless from the sinner's own confession, it was not publicly known he had ever committed. As for the practice of publicly confessing public sins, that part of the primitive discipline was kept up long after Leo's time, and absolutely required, at least, in the west.

As confession, I mean auricular confession, or confession made to a priest, which Leo recommends in the letter I have mentioned, has been defined by the church of Rome to be of divine institution, to be a condition indispensably required for the remission of sins committed after baptism, and an essential part of penance, which in latter times has been declared a sacrament, it will not be foreign to my purpose, to give here an historical account of penance, as it was practised in the primitive ages, of the various changes it has undergone, and the improvements it has received from the time it was first introduced into the church, till it was raised by the councils of Florence and Trent, to the rank of a sacrament, and all were anathematized, who did not acknowledge the new dignity, with which it was by their authority vested. It is well known, that, in the primitive times, such delinquents as fell into public and grievous sins after baptism, were, upon legal conviction, expelled the congregation, and never re-admitted till they had atoned for their crime by a public penance. This expulsion is styled, in the writings of the fathers, "a driving away from the church,[1] a casting out from the communion of the church,[2] a driving from communion,[3] a separation from the church,[4] an ejecting out of the church,[5] a killing with the spiritual sword."[6] Men in that condition were looked upon as accursed by God, as limbs of Satan; and therefore were by all avoided, even in civil commerce, and common conversation, agreeably to the advice of the two apostles, St. Paul,[7] and St. John.[8] If the delinquent continued obstinate in his sin, he was abandoned by the church, and looked upon, in every respect, as a heathen and a publican. But if, touched with remorse, he sued for a reconciliation, and gave visible marks of a sincere repentance, and hearty abhorrence of his crime, he was admitted to penance; but not till he had, for a whole year, solicited that favor in a most penitent and humble manner, appearing at the church door in sackcloth and ashes, prostrating himself at the feet of the faithful, as they went in, begging their prayers, and striving, with his groans and tears, to "move to compassion the merciful church of the merciful Christ."[9] When the year was expired, he was admitted to penance, that is, he was allowed to perform that penance, which the church required of every public and notorious offender, before she would re-admit him to the participation of the sacred mysteries. While the penitent, as he was now called, continued in that state, he was to wear no ornaments of dress, but to appear at the meetings of the faithful in sackcloth and ashes, standing among the catechumens in the lower part of the church. He was to abstain from bathing, feasting, and all other innocent diversions; from pleading, trading, and serving in war; from marrying, if single; and from the use of matrimony, if married; for which reason no married persons were admitted to penance without the consent of the innocent party. In some churches, namely, in those that had no parabolani, whose office it was to attend the sick, and bury the dead, that employment was put upon the penitents, as a proper exercise for men in their situation. The public fasts of the church they were to observe with the greatest strictness, appearing, chiefly on those days, with a

[1] Vide Bolland. Apr. t. 1. p. 33.
[2] Leo, ep. 2. [3] Leo, ep. 138.

[1] Apud Euseb. l. 7. c. 7.
[2] Tertull. de Præscrip. advers. Hæret.
[3] Idem de Monogam. [4] Cyp. ep. 38.
[5] Idem ep. 40. [6] Idem ep. 62.
[7] 1 Corinth. 5: 11. Rom. 16: 17. 2 Thess. 3: 14.
[8] 2 John 10. 11.
[9] Euseb. l. 5. c. 28. Tertull. de Pœnit. c. 9. et de pudicit. c. 13. Epist. 31. apud Cypr. Socr. l. 3. c. 13.

A public confession required of the penitent, when he was re-admitted. How absolved. Public penance not thought necessary to salvation. None admitted twice to public penance, or twice absolved.

coarse habit, with a dejected countenance, and a penitential mien, to atone, as St. Cyprian expresses it, with their fasting and sorrow, "for having formerly tasted the devil's meat." Lastly, penitents were excluded for ever from the clerical order; and such of the clergy as had done public penance, were never restored to their former dignity.[1] How long the penitent continued in that state cannot well be determined; some were held in it a year only, some two years, some ten, some twenty, some thirty, according to the nature and quality of the offence, the grief and sorrow of the offender, and the will and pleasure of the bishop, or rather, in the earliest times, of the whole congregation.(*)

But how long and rigorous soever the penance was, the penitent was to endure it humbly, patiently, and thankfully, till he had completed "the legal and full time of satisfaction," as St. Cyprian styles it;[2] which being ended, he came into the church "covered with sackcloth and ashes, throwing himself at the feet of the clergy and laity, and, with tears in his eyes, begging their pardon and forgiveness."[3] At this time, for the greater demonstration of his sorrow and concern, he was to make a public confession of his sin, that is, he was to own himself, before the whole congregation, guilty of the sin for which he had been expelled, and worthy of the punishment, which he had undergone.[4] Such a confession was looked upon as the source and spring of all true repentance;[5] and, on that account, is recommended in the writings of the fathers, as an indispensable preliminary to absolution. As soon as confession was over, the penitent kneeled down before the bishop and the clergy, who, laying their hands on his head, blessing him, and, at the same time, saying the Lord's prayer, restored him, by that ceremony to the full communion of the faithful, received him to the peace of the church, and declared him partaker again of all the privileges, which, for a while, he had forfeited by his crime.[1] This was what the fathers and councils meant by the famous expressions, of "remitting sins, absolving sinners, loosing their bonds, granting them pardon," &c. which are all but so many different ways of expressing one and the same thing; namely, the repealing the sentence of excommunication, with which the sinner was bound, and restoring him to the outward communion of the church, from which he had been excluded for his sins, and the scandal he had given.

Such was the penance of the ancients. But it must be observed, that though it was so strongly recommended by the fathers, though it was never dispensed with, at least in the primitive times, with respect to public and notorious offenders; yet it was not thought absolutely necessary to salvation, nor was it to absolve sinners from their sins, but only from the excommunication, which they had incurred by their sins, that the church required it. The latter is evident from the practice of St. Cyprian, who allowed a presbyter to absolve the penitent in the absence of a bishop, and a deacon in the absence of a presbyter;[2] and to a deacon no divine of the church of Rome will allow the power of remitting sins; though he may, by an extraordinary commission, be empowered to absolve the sinner from the excommunication, which he has incurred by his sin. That penance was not thought absolutely necessary to salvation, may be easily demonstrated; for in some churches persons guilty of idolatry, murder, or adultery, were excluded for ever from penance, and the peace of the church;[3] and generally speaking, if a sinner, after having once performed public penance, either relapsed into the same, or committed any other public and grievous sin, he was not admitted to a second penance, or a second confession, in order to be absolved again; but exhorted to repent in private, to make private confession of that and his other sins to God, that he might obtain of him that pardon and mercy which the church, in her wisdom, thought fit to deny.[4] Hence it is manifest, that, in those days, salvation was thought to be attainable without confession, either public or private, made to man, or any kind of sarcedotal absolution. I say, "without confession, either public or

[1] Vide Pacian. Paræn. ad. pœnit. Tertull. de pœnit. c. 9. Cyp. de laps. Hier. in Joel. c. 2. Ambros. de pœnit. l. 2. c. 10. Concil. Carth. 4. can. 81. Syric. ep. 1. Concil. Arel. 2. can. 22.

(*) By the council of Nice, such as voluntarily apostatized from the faith, were to undergo a twelve years penance.(*a*) St. Basil appoints 30 years penance for wilful murder, and adultery; 10 for a wilful miscarriage; 7 for fornication; 3 for a third marriage, and one or two for a second.(*b*) For most of the fathers were greatly inclined to, and some of them not a little tainted with the heresy of the Montanists, acknowledging one marriage, as they did one God;(*c*) though our Savior, as St. Austin well observes,(*d*) found no fault with the woman, who had been married seven times. By the canons of Gregory of Nyssa, voluntary murder was punished with 27 years penance; adultery with 18; fornication with 9; and the robbing of graves with 9.(*e*) When the offence was remarkably great and scandalous, the offender was to continue among the penitents so long as he lived, being allowed to partake of the sacred mysteries only at the hour of his death; nay, St. Cyprian assures us, that many of his predecessors had absolutely refused to admit adulterers, to communion at their very last hour, suffering them to go out of the world without any manner of reconciliation, and remitting them for pardon to God alone.(*f*) This severity however, as favoring of Novatianism, was afterwards corrected, and the greatest sinners were allowed communion at the point of death, if they desired it.

(*a*) Concil. Nic. c. 11.
(*b*) Basil. ep. ad Amphil.
(*c*) Tertull. de Monogam. c. 1.
(*d*) Aug. de bono viduitat. c. 12.
(*e*) Greg. Nyss. ep. can. ad Letoium.
(*f*) Cypr. ep. 55. ad Antonian.

[2] Cyp. ep. 59. [3] Apud Euseb. l. 5. c. 28.
[4] Tertull. de pœnit. Euseb. l. 6. 2. 34. Carnol. apud Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. Cyp. ep. 11. et de lapsis.
[5] Tertull. ubi supra.

[1] Cyp. ep. 10. 11, 12. Optat. l. 2. Hier. contra Lucif. c. 2.
[2] Cyp. ep. 13. [3] Cyp. ep. 52.
[4] Herr. Pastor. l. 2. mandat. 4. Clem. Alexandrin. strom. 2. c. 13. Tertull. de pœn. c. 7. et. 9. Orig. hom. 15. in Levit. Concil. Elib. can. 3. 7. 47. Aug. ep. 54. ad Macedon. &c.

The office of the penitentiary, when first instituted, and on what occasion. That office suppressed, and to what that was owing. Private confession abolished in the east. Not thought then to be of divine institution. Cavils of Boronius.

private, made to man;" for to suppose, with cardinal Perron, those, who for the enormity of their sins, or their relapses, were excluded from public penance, to have been allowed the benefit of private penance, of private confession, and absolution, is supposing the church to have been most indulgent and merciful to those who least deserved her indulgence and mercy. And it is on this consideration, that the jesuit Petavius explodes the notion of the cardinal as a mere dream, only brought in to serve an hypothesis, without any foundation in ancient history, or a single instance in the practice of the primative times.[1]

I have observed above, that public penance, including public satisfaction and confession, was enjoined by the church only for public and enormous sins, such as reflected particular disgrace on the Christian name and profession. However, many, for their greater satisfaction, and ease of their minds, chose to undergo public penance, and openly to confess even private sins when grievous. But as these voluntary penitents out of the abundance of their zeal, and want of discretion, often brought such sins upon the public stage as had better been kept secret, seeing they either hurt the penitents themselves, or gave scandal to the church; to avoid the one and the other inconvenience, it was thought proper to appoint in each church a presbyter, under the name of the "penitentiary presbyter," to whom all, who desired to be admitted to public penance for private sins, should first confess those sins; and afterwards either confess them in public, if he thought proper; or if he did not, atone for them by a private penance, which he, by his office, was empowered to enjoin. This new office is said to have been instituted in the time of the Decian persecution, which broke out in the year 250, probably because the number of those, who apostatized then from the faith, and afterwards returning to themselves, desired to be reconciled to the church, was too great for the bishops to attend them, together with the voluntary penitents, and at the same time discharge, as they ought, the other duties of their pastoral office. We are indebted to Socrates for this account of the first institution of the penitentiary priest;[2] an office that is still kept up, but very differently managed, in all Roman catholic cathedrals. Sozomen, who has copied Socrates, adds, that the presbyter, appointed to discharge that office, was to be a prudent man, lest he should suffer sins to be publicly confessed, that ought to have been kept secret; and a secret man, lest he himself should be tempted, on any occasion, to disclose and divulge the crimes that had been privately revealed to him.[3]

The institution of the penitentiary priest was universally received, and maintained in the church till the year 390, when that office was suppressed, and the practice of private confession utterly abolished, first at Constantinople, by Nectarius, bishop of that city, and afterwards all over the east, on the following occasion: a woman of distinction having confessed her secret sins to the penitentiary priest, he enjoined her, by way of satisfaction, to fast and pray, that she might thereby "show forth works worthy of repentance." In compliance with this injunction the contrite penitent remained in the church, attending her prayers, after the rest were all dismissed. Her remaining thus alone offered a favorable opportunity to one of the deacons of making an attempt upon her virtue; he made it; she yielded; and the crime was committed in the church itself, without any regard to the sacredness of the place. With this new sin the woman returned to her confessor; and he, very injudiciously, either obliged or suffered her to confess it before the whole congregation. The people heard it with indignation, and began, for the misbehavior of one, as it but too often happens, to revile, in a most outrageous manner, the whole body of the clergy. The city was all in an uproar; and Nectarius, to appease the tumult, not only deposed the deacon, and removed the penitentiary; but, the more effectually to prevent, for the future, the scandal that might arise from the divulging of private sins, utterly abolish that office, "leaving every man free," these are the very words of the historian "to partake of the holy mysteries, according to the direction of his own conscience;"[1] which words plainly imply an utter abolition of private, or, as it is now styled, "auricular confession." Sozomen adds, that the example of Nectarius was followed by almost all the bishops of the east; but that the office of the penitentiary priest was still kept up in the west, to prepare men for the public penance of the church, which he thence takes occasion to describe at length, as it was then practised at Rome, and in the other western churches.[2] It is to be observed, that Socrates, of whom I have chiefly copied the present account, was by profession a civilian, lived at this very time in Constantinople, and had what he relates from the mouth of Eudemon, the presbyter, who first advised Nectarius to abolish the office of the penitentiary priest, and utterly abrogate private confession.[3]

From this account, vouched not by Socrates alone, but likewise by Sozomen, who flourished at the same time, it is manifest, that auricular confession was not thought then, as it is now, to be of divine institution, or absolutely necessary to salvation. For if such an opinion had obtained, who can imagine, that Nectarius, a most orthodox prelate, would have ever attempted to abolish it; that the other eastern bishops would, almost all to a man, have so readily followed his example,

[1] Petav. not. in Epiphan. p. 238.
[2] Socrat. l. 5. c. 19. [3] Soz. l. 7. c. 16.

[1] Socr. l. 5. c. 19. [2] Soz. l. vii. c. 16. [3] Socr. ibid.

Cavils of Belarmine. Private confession early practised, but not thought necessary. Only matter of advice.

as they certainly did? In answer to this, Baronius questions the truth of the fact, striving to prove, by a long, senseless, and impertinent descant, that Socrates, who relates it, was tainted with the heresy of Novatian, not acknowledging in the church the power of forgiving sins; and thence concluding the suppression of the above-mentioned office, as related by him, to be a mere invention of his.[1] But that Socrates, who lived at this very time in Constantinople, would have so confidently asserted, and asserted of his own knowledge, such a notorius fact as happening there, had no such fact happened, is what Baronius himself, I will take upon me to say, did not believe, notwithstanding the pains he takes to make others believe it. As for the charge of Novatianism, on which he grounds his peremptorily rejecting the authority of Socrates; that writer, it must be owned, seems to have entertained a good opinion of all who were of that persuasion: he often commends them, and even honors Novatian, the founder of that sect, with the title of martyr. But yet he ranks them among the sects that were separated from the church;[2] and on the present occasion, he did not at all approve of the advice, which Eudemon gave to Nectarius; for when he was acquainted with it, by Eudemon himself, he told him, that he much doubted whether his counsel was for the advantage of the church, since it would be attended with the neglect of mutual reproof, and the transgression of that rule of the apostle, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."[3] Hence it is manifest, that he approved of private confession for the sake of mutual reproof, one of the chief ends for which it was instituted, as we shall see hereafter; and consequently that he cannot be supposed to have forged the account he gives of the abrogation of that practice, with a design to countenance, in the Novatians, the opposite practice and doctrine.

Bellarmine owns the office of the penitentiary priest to have been suppressed by Nectarius, and, after his example, by almost all the bishops of the east. But as to what Socrates adds, that every man was left free to partake of the holy mysteries, that is, of the eucharist, according to the direction of his own conscience, he pretends the historian thereby to have meant no more, than that men were thenceforth freed from the obligation of appearing, when conscious to themselves of any sin, before the public tribunal of the church, that is, from the obligation of confessing it in public. But nothing is more certain, than that the obligation of undergoing public penance, of which public confession was an essential part, for public sins, subsisted in the church several ages after the time of Nectarius; and as to private sins, neither was there in his time, nor had there ever been, any law obliging men to confess them in public. Such an abuse indeed had crept into some provinces of Italy, as I have observed above; but it was immediately condemned and suppressed by Leo, as utterly repugnant to the apostolic rule. Thomas Waldensis, more ingenious than either Baronius or Bellarmine, candidly owns the practice of private confession to have been condemned and abrogated by Nectarius; but adds, that in abolishing it he was guilty of a great and unpardonable error.[1] But, if that had been thought an error, would not some of his colleagues in the east have opposed him in such an attempt? Would they almost all have so readily followed his example? Pope Nicolas could not be unacquainted with what Nectarius had done; and yet he styles him, in one of his letters, "the expugner of heretics, the defender of the church;"[2] and such commendations we may suppose the bishop of Rome would never have bestowed on the bishop of Constantinople, had he been guilty of a great and unpardonable error.

Private confession, or confession made in private to man, began, it must be owned, in the earliest times, to be practised in the church.[3] But that it was not thought necessary to salvation, even by the fathers, who have most recommended it, and who are chiefly quoted by the Roman catholic divines, to prove its necessity, has been, I may say, demonstrated by several protestant writers, especially by the learned Daillé, in his elaborate work on Auricular Confession.[4] I shall therefore only observe here, I. That the example of the first Christians, of whom it is said, that "many came, and confessed, and declared their deeds,"[5] on which great stress is laid by the advocates for private confession, may be well alleged to prove such a confession to be a virtuous and commendable action; and that indeed it proves, allowing the passage I have quoted to be understood of the confession of sins, which some have questioned.[6] But as their example has not the force of a law, it is absurd to conclude, from their confessing their sins on a certain occasion, that every Christian is bound to confess to man whatever he has done amiss, or else to be everlastingly guilty of sin. The first Christians "had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need."[7] And yet their example, with respect to such actions, in themselves far more commendable than the bare confession of sins made to a man, is by none looked upon, or has ever been interpreted as a law, binding all, who profess the

[1] Bar. ad ann. 56. n. 27, 28, &c.
[2] Socr. l. 6. c. 20. 23. [3] Idem, l. 5. c. 19.

[1] Thom. Wald. t. 2. c. 141.
[2] Nic. ep. ad Phot. in VIII. Synod. act. 4.
[3] Iren. l. 1. c. 9. Tertull. de pœnit. Orig. hom. 2. et hom. 3. in Levit. hom. 2. in Psal. 37. Cyp. l. 3. ep. 8. et Serm. 5. de laps.
[4] Daillé de confess. auric. l. 4. c. 25. [5] Acts 19: 18.
[6] Luth. in sua versione, et Brentius in comment. ad hunc locum. [7] Act. 2: 44, 45.

Not to be made to a priest more than to any other good man. In the twelfth century, confession made to God alone thought sufficient.

same religion, to have every thing common, to sell their possessions and goods, though the first Christians are all said to have done so, and not all, but "many that believed, came and confessed." 2. All promises of forgiveness upon confession are understood, in the church of Rome, upon confession made to a priest. And yet this condition is no where expressed. And is it probable, or rather is it not highly improbable, that the scripture should ever mean, and never express, that one condition, without which all the rest is utterly of no effect? St. James advises us to "confess our faults," not to a priest, rather than to a layman, but, in general terms, "one to another,"[1] that is, to any righteous man; for he immediately adds, "And pray for one another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." And no one will say, that a layman may not be a righteous man, as well as a priest. It was not till many ages after, that, by these words, "one to another," St. James was made to mean priests only. For he was not yet thus understood, at least generally speaking, in the eleventh century; as is manifest from the famous Lanfranc of Canterbury, who, in a treatise, which he composed on the Secrecy of Confession, writes, that "the confession of public sins should be made to a priest, by whose ministry the church binds and looses, what she publicly knows; but that private sins may be confessed to any ecclesiastic, nay, and to a layman, since it is recorded of some of the holy fathers, that they were directors of souls, though not in orders.[2](*)

3. In the twelfth century, confession made to God alone was still thought sufficient to salvation: witness Geffery, abbot of Vendome, Peter Lombard, and Gratian, who all assure us that, in their time, in the twelfth century, many held confession to God alone to be sufficient; and would not allow of any necessity or obligation of confessing to a priest;[3] nay, Gratian, after quoting the authors on each side of the question, leaves the reader at liberty to take which he pleases, seeing either had wise and religious men to authorize and defend it.[4](†) But, in the following century, the present doctrine of the church of Rome, concerning the necessity of auricular confession, was at last finally established in the council of Lateran, held under Pope Innocent III. in 1215,[1] and thenceforth it was deemed heresy to teach, that confession made to God alone was sufficient, or confession made to a priest was not necessary to salvation.(*)

[1] James 5: 16.

[2] Tract. de Confess. inter opera Lanfr. edita Paris. anno 1648.

(*) I am sensible that F. Dachery is not willing to allow Lanfranc to have been the author of that piece. But he has not been able, in the opinion of the best critics, to prove that he was not; and all agree it to have been written in or near his time, that is, late in the eleventh century.

[3] Goffrid. l. 5. ep. 16. Lombard. distinct. l. 4. sect. 7. Gratian de pœnit. dist. 2. c. 89.

[4] Gratian. ibid.

(†) There is another passage in Gratian to the same purpose, which is to be found in the Venice edition of that writer, published by authority in 1501, but has been left out in all the later editions. As it exhibits the different opinions of the divines of those days, concerning the institution of auricular, or, as it is there styled, oral confession, it may not be improper to insert it here, as a specimen of their reasoning, and their skill in divinity. The words of Gratian are: "We must now inquire when oral confession was first instituted. Some are of opinion, that it was instituted in Paradise, immediately after the fall: the Lord saying unto Adam, 'Where art thou?' For he spoke thus, that Adam might confess, and his confession might serve as a pattern for the confession of others. But as, in interrogating Adam, he had not, it seems, sufficiently apprised him that he was to make his confession, he applied, in the next place, to the fratricide Cain, saying, 'Where is Abel, thy brother?'" These very able divines seem not to have understood what they were about; for their design was to show, when confession, made to a man, was first instituted; and the confession, required in the passages they quote, was a confession made to God alone. "Others think," continues Gratian, "that confession was first instituted under the law of Moses, when Joshua commanded Achan to confess his crime, and all Israel stoned him with stones." But neither was the confession required by Joshua, a private confession, or a confession made in private to a priest. It was a public confession; a confession made to God, in the hearing of Joshua, and the whole people of Israel: "and Joshua said unto Achan, My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him," &c. (a) "Others think," adds Gratian, "that it is not in the Old, but in the New Testament, that we must look for the institution of confession. These will have it to have been instituted by St. James, saying, 'Confess your faults one to another.' But they had better have ascribed its original to some tradition of the universal church, than have attempted to prove it from the Old or New Testament. The traditions of the church are binding; and therefore we are bound to confess our sins; but the Greeks are not, whom that tradition has not reached, no more than the tradition concerning the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist. Hence it follows, that St. James neither instituted nor commanded, but only advised, confession; for had he commanded it, his command had been binding even with respect to the Greeks, notwithstanding the contrary practice that prevails among them." (b) From this passage it appears that, in the twelfth century, auricular confession was not yet commonly thought to be of divine institution; that some divines indeed strove to prove that it was, but went so awkwardly about it, that the contrary opinion prevailed as the more probable of the two. But what the divines could not make out with arguments, the council of Trent established afterwards with anathemas, declaring all those anathematized who should teach or hold, that sacramental or auricular confession was not of divine institution. (c)

(a) Josh. 7: 19. (b) Grat. de pœn. dist. 5. c. 1.
(c) Seff. 14. can. 6. [1] Concil. Lateran. 3. c. 21.

(*) And yet, long after that council, some writers of great note could not help owning confession, as then practiced by the church of Rome, to have been unknown to the ancients. Among the rest, Beatus Rhenanus, in his preface to Tertullian's Book on Penance, which he published in 1521, expresses himself thus: "We need not wonder that no mention is made by Tertullian, of the secret confession (clancularia), made by those who receive the eucharist; since that confession was utterly unknown in his time. That author was, in the opinion of Du Pin, well versed in human learning, well acquainted with the ancient theology, ever continued attached to the catholic church, and ended his days in her bosom. (a) But, not many years after, the council of Trent let the world know, what neither Rhenanus, nor any other, however well versed in the ancient theology, had been able to discover; namely, that secret confession, as it was then, so it had been always, and from the very beginning, practised by the church. (b)

(a) Du Pin. nouv. Bibl. t. 14. p. 176. (b) Sess. 14. can. 6.

On what founded the doctrine of the church of Rome, concerning the obligation of confessing to a priest. The priest, in the opinion of Leo, could only pray for the sinner. The supplicatory form of absolution used in the church till the 13th century. The authoritative, when introduced into England. The present form of absolution used in the church of Rome. Penance not a sacrament till the 15th century.

4. The only reason alleged by St. James, why we should confess our sins one to another, that is, to any righteous man, as St. Austin explains this passage,[1] is, that we may mutually assist each other with our prayers. The fathers, however, countenanced and recommended private confession upon other motives; namely, for the sake of direction, instruction, spiritual comfort, mutual reproof, and private admonition; and as the bishops and priests were, generally speaking, supposed to be the best qualified for such offices, they exhorted men to recur chiefly to them, each to his own bishop or pastor: and it is upon these passages out of the fathers, the priest being never mentioned in scripture, that the church of Rome founds her doctrine concerning auricular confession made to a priest. Lastly, Leo, after declaring, in his letter to the bishops of Campania, that confession made in private to a priest was sufficient, when the sins were private, adds, that the priest will pray with the sinner for the remission of sins;[2] which is no more than what any pious Christian might have done, and all it was then thought a priest could do. For had Leo believed the power of pardoning and forgiving sins to be vested in the priesthood, it is not to be doubted but he would have urged it on the present occasion.

But it was not till many ages after Leo's time that such an opinion began to obtain, no other form of absolution but the "supplicatory, or absolution by prayer," having been used in the church till the latter end of the 12th, or the beginning of the 13th century.[3] But it being then, and not till then, luckily discovered, that the prayer of the priest not only *availed* more, and was more *effectual* towards *healing* the sinner, and obtaining the remission of his sins, than the prayer of any other *righteous man*, which St. James seems not to have known; but moreover that he was vested with a full and unlimited power of remitting sins, and retaining them at pleasure; upon such an important discovery, the ancient form of absolution was changed or rather improved; and to the supplicatory, "Christ absolve thee," was added the authoritative, "I absolve thee." Thomas Aquinas, surnamed the "angelic doctor," who flourished about the middle of the 13th century, points out the time of this remarkable change; for he tells us, that the authoritative form of absolution was found fault with by a learned man, his contemporary, asserting, that thirty years were scarce passed, since the supplicatory form only, "Almighty God give thee remission and forgiveness," was used by all.[4] The authoritative form was first established in England in 1268, when, by a council held that year at London, under cardinal Ottoboni, the pope's legate, all confessors were enjoined to use it.[1] The present form of absolution in the church of Rome runs thus: "Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee, and I, by his authority, absolve thee, in the first place, from every bond of excommunication, suspension, and interdict, as far as I have power, and thou standest in need: in the next place, I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." This form is partly supplicatory, partly authoritative; but all agree, that it is only in virtue of the latter, that sins are forgiven. And hence it follows, by an obvious, but undeniable consequence, that the so much boasted power of forgiving sins lay dormant in the church for the space of 1200 years; the form of absolution, in virtue of which alone sins are forgiven, having never been used during that period of time.

Penance, including confession and absolution, is now a sacrament in the church of Rome, and one of the seven. But that doctrine too is of a late date, and was first taught, in the 12th century, by Peter Lombard, commonly styled, "the master of the sentences."[2] His opinion was adopted by all the schoolmen, who came after him; and, at length, declared an article of faith by the council of Florence, in the 15th, and afterwards by that of Trent, in the 16th century.(*)

And thus far of private confession, from the earliest times, when it was only matter of advice, and free choice, and was thought equally good, whether made to a priest, or a layman, to its being first restrained to the priesthood, then declared necessary to salvation, and, lastly, raised to the rank of a sacrament.

And now to return to Leo; in the year 460, he received, at last, the joyful tidings of the expulsion and exile of Timotheus Ælurus, the

[1] Aug. tract. 58. in Joan. [2] See p. 211.
[3] Usher. Answer to the Challenge, p. 88. Cardinal Bona rer. Liturg. in append. p. 763. Morin. de pœnit. l. 8. c. 8, 9, &c.
[4] Aquin. opus. 22. de forma absol. c. 5.

[1] Coll. hist. eccl. Vol. I. p. 474.
[2] Lomb. l. 4. Sentent. distinct. 14.
(*) It is true, that Victor, bishop of Cartenna in Mauritania, who lived in the 5th century, in a small treatise, which he wrote on penance, styled it a sacrament, (a) as Bellarmine has taken care to observe. (b) But nothing is better known, than that the word sacrament was a general name with the ancients, for every sacred ceremony, rite, or mystery. Thus the washing in water, and the imposition of hands in baptism, were styled, by the council of Carthage under Cyprian, two sacraments; (c) nay, Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona, distinguished three sacraments in baptism. (d) St. Austin calls exoreism a sacrament; (e) and the same name is bestowed both by that father, (f) and the third council of Carthage, (g) on the salt that was anciently given to the catechumens before baptism. In the same sense penance, as practised in Victor's time, was, no doubt, a sacrament; that is, a sacred and religious ceremony.
(a) Vict. de pœnit. c. 20.
(b) Bell. de pœnit. l. 1. c. 10.
(c) Concil. Carth. apud Cyp. et Cyp. ep. 72. ad Steph.
(d) Pacian. serm. de Bapt. Bibl. patr. t. 3. p. 77.
(e) Aug. homil. 83.
(f) Idem de peccat. merit. l. 2. c. 26.
(g) Concil. Carth. 3. c. 5.

Timotheus Ælurus driven from the see of Alexandria in the year of Christ, 460. Timotheus Salophacialus chosen in his room Tranquillity restored to the church. Leo dies. His character.

usurper of the see of Alexandria. For this public benefit, as he styles it, the church was chiefly indebted to Gennadius, the new bishop of Constantinople, who, in spite of the strong opposition he met with from Aspar, and the other friends of Ælurus, at court, procured in the end, an order from the emperor, commanding him to be driven from Alexandria, and confined to Gangra, in Paphlagonia; which was done accordingly.[1] But the emperor, being informed that he held schismatical meetings in the place of his exile, ordered him to be removed from thence into the Taurica Chersonesus, now Crim Tartary, where he was strictly guarded till the year 476, when we shall see this extraordinary man seizing, by force, the see of Alexandria a second time, and again, by force, driven from it. In his room was unanimously chosen, by the people and clergy of Alexandria, Timotheus, surnamed Salophacialus, that is, "the white," a man universally beloved, and no less esteemed for the purity of his faith, than the probity of his manners.[2] To him many submitted, who till then had steadily adhered first to Dioscorus, and afterwards to Ælurus, being gained over by his mild, affable, and engaging behavior.[3] Thus after so long, and so violent a storm, was the so much wished for calm restored, for a while, to that, and all other churches.

[Year of Christ, 461.] But Leo did not long enjoy the tranquillity which he had been so long laboring to procure, and which, to do him justice, was chiefly owing to his unwearied zeal, and constant application, though Gennadius had the glory of completing the work. Salophacialus was chosen about the middle of July, 460, and Leo died on the 10th of November, 461, having governed the Roman church twenty-one years, one month, and thirteen days.[4] He was buried in the church of St. Peter, or rather in the porch of that church, where no popes had yet been buried, but such as had died, or were supposed to have died martyrs[5]. His body was translated from the porch into the church about the latter end of the seventh century; and when the altar placed over it was pulled down in 1607, the skeleton was found entire, and removed into the new church, where it is still kept, and publicly worshipped chiefly on the 11th of April.[6] The city of Perigueux too pretends to have his whole body; and the city of Wirtzbourg and Sens considerable parts of it;[7] for in all these places great honor is paid to his reliques, whether real or suppositious, it matters little.

Leo was, without all doubt, a man of extraordinary parts, far superior to all, who had governed that church before him, and scarce equalled by any, who governed it after him. He is extolled by the ancients chiefly for his unwearied zeal in defending the catholic faith, and unshaken steadiness in combating the opposite errors, that either sprung up, or were revived, in his time. And truly their encomiums on that score are not ill bestowed; though on some occasions he had better have tempered his zeal, and acted with more moderation. But then his ambition knew no bounds; and to gratify it, he stuck at nothing; made no distinction between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood;[1] as if he had adopted the famous maxim of Julius Cæsar,(*) or thought the most criminal actions ceased to be criminal, and became meritorious, when any ways subservient to the increase of his power, or the exaltation of his see. For that was the object he had chiefly in view; that the point in which all his cares, all his thoughts and endeavors, finally centred; that he scarce ever forgot in his letters; and but too often remembered in his sermons, many of which are filled with useful apophthegms on "the dignity and pre-eminence of the apostolic see, on the merit of St. Peter, on the respect that is due from persons, even in the highest stations of life, to the chair of the first apostle, and prince of the apostles." So much was he attached to that object, that after he had procured, with infinite labor and pains, the assembling of an oecumenical council, as the only means of ascertaining the catholic faith, and saving the church, at that time in the utmost danger, from the prevailing party of Eutyches and Dioscorus in the east, he was ready, notwithstanding his extraordinary zeal, to undo all he had been doing, and to render that very council ineffectual, had not his legates been allowed to preside;[2] an undeniable proof, that he had more at heart the advancement of his see, that is, of his own power and authority, than either the purity of the faith, or the welfare of the church. His whole conduct upon that occasion, so very different from that of our Savior, who was "meek and lowly in heart," who rebuked his disciples for quarrelling "which should be the greatest," and gave his followers so many precepts against a spirit of pride and domination, has justly been urged, by many writers, against his pretended sanctity, and the extraordinary honors that are paid to him as a saint by the church of Rome. I shall therefore only observe here, that he has, and ever will have, the demerit of establishing an everlasting warfare between the east and the west, between Constantinople and Rome; the bishops of Constantinople, and their brethren in the east,

[1] Theoph. p. 96.
[2] Theoph. ibid. Evagr. p. 305. Leo, ep. 139.
[3] Liberat. p. 107, 108.
[4] Vide Bolland. II. April. ap. n. 5. p. 15.
[5] Aring. l. 2. c. 8.
[6] Bolland. ubi supra, et Pont. p. 65. Aring. p. 160.
[7] Bolland. 11. Apr. p. 20.

[1] See p. 192.
(*) "Nam, si violandum est jus, regnandi gratia violandum est: aliis rebus pietatem colas.(a)
(a) Suet. in Jul. c. 30.
[2] See p. 217.

thinking themselves bound to stand to a decree, which had been so unanimously enacted by their predecessors, in an oecumenical council; and none of the later bishops of Rome, how peaceably soever inclined, daring to receive as valid a determination, which one of the greatest of their predecessors had, with so much warmth, maintained to be null. Of this dispute we shall see the dreadful effects in the sequel of the present history; and they ought all to be charged to Leo's account. For his authority drew in all the western bishops to take the same part, and extended its influence over their successors, as well as his own. But as his ambition, in the pursuit of its own ends and designs, tended also to raise and promote the greatness of his see, that very crime became the cause of his sanctification, being more meritorious to Rome than all his virtues. Indeed, he was a principal founder of her exorbitant power. He brought with him to the pontificate, not only greater abilities, but more experience and practice in state affairs, than any of his predecessors; and used these advantages, through a long course of years, to advance the dignity and prerogatives of his see, with great skill and address, as well as intrepid assurance and courage. A modern protestant writer[1] says, he had every virtue, that was compatible with an unbounded ambition. This I will not deny; but shall only observe that such an ambition, in a Christian bishop, is a vice, for which no virtue can well atone.

As for the writings of Leo, they are admired, and very justly, by all men of judgment and taste, for the strength and energy of the expression, the justness of thought, and the purity of style, in which he is thought to have far excelled all who wrote, at least in the Latin tongue, before him.(*) His writings, or rather the doctrines, which he takes care to inculcate in his writings, concerning the dignity and prerogatives of St. Peter's throne, have procured him, from his successors, a place among the doctors of the church; and he is accordingly honored with that title. He is now commonly distinguished with the surname of the Great, which indeed better belongs to him than that of holy; but the ancients were strangers to that title, and probably thought it unbecoming a bishop.(*)

[1] Jurieu, apud Bail. in Leon.

(*) A modern critic (the abbé Anthelmi), will have St. Prosper, Leo's secretary, to have been the author of all the writings, both letters and sermons, ascribed to that pope. But the dissertation which he wrote on that subject, and published in 1689, has been fully answered by two other learned critics, F. Quesnel, and M. Du Pin.

(*) We are told that a very beautiful woman being admitted, among others, to kiss Leo's hand, on Easter day, according to the custom that then obtained, he was surprised with a sudden attack from an enemy, whom he believed to have been long since entirely subdued; and felt that he was still a man. But it cost his hand dear; for the ceremony was no sooner over than he cut it off, thinking he thereby fulfilled the command given in St. Matthew.(a) However, as by being thus maimed he became incapable of discharging some of the duties of his pastoral office, he soon repented what he had done; and, desirous of having his hand again, he applied to an image of the Virgin Mary, said to be one of the many that were painted by St. Luke, the very image which, on that account, is honored to this day in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, at Rome, with an extraordinary worship. The Virgin heard his prayers, restored him his hand, and, by a no less miracle, extinguished in him the fire of concupiscence, to the very last spark. But his immediate successors, knowing themselves to be, at least, as frail as he, and not caring to expose their frailty to the like danger, changed the ancient custom, and gave no longer their hand, but their foot, to be kissed: and thus to the frailty of Leo, the custom, which still obtains, of kissing the pope's foot, is said to owe its first origin.(b) The fact here related is gravely attested by St. Antoninus, and many others, and was represented in a very ancient picture, on the wall of the old church of St. Peter. But Clement VIII. chosen in the latter end of the sixteenth century, taking offence at the representation, (for the devil was there painted in the shape of a lecherous satyr, presenting to the pope, with a leering look, and a contemptuous smile, a beautiful woman), caused it to be erased; and, at the same time charged Baronius to disprove the fact, which he thought no-ways redounded to the credit of his great predecessor. This task Baronius, who always wrote as he was bid, readily undertook; and the dissertation he published on the occasion is worthy of particular notice. For he there strives to convince the world, that tradition had confounded pope Leo with the iconoclast emperor Leo, who had caused the right hand of St. John Damascene to be cut off, which he very gravely tells us, was restored to him by a miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, adding, "And hence did these old women's stories (garrularum fabulæ vetularum), concerning Leo, take their rise:" as if the miraculous cure savored more of an old woman's story in the one case, than it does in the other. And, after all, if what is said of Leo was the "invention and dreams of old women, without the least appearance of truth," why did the popes suffer such dreams to be represented in so holy a place as the Vatican? Why did none of the predecessors of Clement undeceive the world, by ordering such fabulous representations to be erased? The reason is obvious; they believed them as well as the credulous vulgar; and were, like them, imposed upon, by old women's stories and tales, or else they were not ashamed to impose upon others what they had too much sense to credit themselves.

As for the custom of kissing the bishops' hands, that mark of respect was paid them very early, even by the emperors themselves; "kings and princes," says St. Ambrose, "do not disdain to bend and bow their necks to the knees of the bishops, and kiss their hands."(c) But the custom of kissing the pope's foot was not introduced till many ages after Leo's time, no mark of respect being then shown to the bishop of Rome, no title given him, but what was common with him to all other bishops, at least to the patriarchs.

(a) Matth. 18: 8.

(b) Vide Theop. Raynaud. Hoplothec. sect. 2. serie 3. c. 10. et. 20. et Sabellic. l. 5. Andr. Eborens. tit. de Castit. & Majol. l. 1. de. irregularitate.

(c) Ambr. de dignit. sacerd. c. 2.

Hilarius chosen. He writes to Leontius of Arles. Mindful even in his first letter, of the dignity of his see, The papal grandeur owing to the ambition of the bishops. Leontius courts the favor of the pope against the bishop of Vienne. The pope's answer to the letter of Leontius. It was not the province of the bishops of Rome to see that the canons were every where observed.

HILARIUS, FORTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THRACIUS, SEVERUS, ANTHEMIUS.]

[Year of Christ 461.] LEO being dead, Hilarius, or, as he is sometimes called, Hilarus, was chosen in his room, and ordained on the 19th of November, 461, after a vacancy of nine days. He is said, in the pontificals, to have been a native of Sardinia, and the son of one Crispus.[1] At the time of his election he was archdeacon of the Roman church; and had assisted, while he was but a deacon, at the council of Ephesus, under Dioscorus, with the character of Leo's legate a latere. But of his conduct at that dangerous juncture, and his precipitous flight from Ephesus, I have spoken already.

The first letter he wrote after his ordination was to Leontius, exarch of Arles, and his particular friend, to acquaint him with his promotion, and desire him to impart the joyful tidings to all the bishops within the limits of his jurisdiction, that both he and they might exult with him, and join their prayers with his, for the peace, unity, and welfare of the church.[2] He is the first pope, perhaps the first bishop, who wrote in that style, and openly owned the joy which he felt, in seeing himself raised to the episcopal dignity. He does not forget, even in his first letter, though a letter only of compliment, the great object which they constantly had all in their view, the primacy of St. Peter, and the dignity of his see; for he tells Leontius, that he does not doubt, but every one knows, wherever tradition is preserved uncorrupted and pure, what respect and deference is paid, in the Spirit of God, to St. Peter and his see.[3] This letter is dated the 25th of January, 462. Soon after he wrote a second letter to Leontius, in answer to one, which that prelate had written to him, as soon as his promotion was known in Gaul, and sent to Rome by a person of distinction, named Pappolus; not doubting, but by such early marks of respect and esteem he should prejudice the pope in his favor, and engage him on his side, against his rival in power, the bishop of Vienne. For when no room was left for bishops to quarrel about the faith, they were sure to quarrel about power, the neighboring bishops especially contending with as much warmth and animosity against each other, about the limits and extent of their spiritual, as neighboring princes usually do about the limits and extent of their temporal dominion. Hence as the bishops of the imperial city bore, on account of their rank, a great sway in ecclesiastical matters at the courts of princes, both parties, in their unhappy disputes, had recourse to them, striving which should, by the most servile submission, earn their protection and favor. Thus did the other prelates, especially in the west, for the sake of some small addition of power, of some inconsiderable advantage over a neighboring colleague, betray the just rights of the whole order, to strengthen that power, which it was their common interest and duty to curb and control.

The bishop of Arles, in his letter to Hilarius, after congratulating him on his promotion in terms, that would have better become a courtier than a bishop, exhorting him to pursue the great work which Leo had begun, and not to abandon the enterprise, till he had overturned the walls of Jericho from the foundation, meaning perhaps, the supposed heresy of Eutyches; to favor the see of Arles, as his predecessors had all done; and to restrain, by his authority, the unwarrantable efforts of envious men, whose hatred to that see increased daily, and became daily more dangerous. The envious men were the bishops of Vienne, who disputed with the bishop of Arles, the metropolitan power and jurisdiction over some neighboring cities. At this time St. Mamertus was bishop of Vienne; and Leontius too is commended as a great saint. But the saints were, of all men, the most covetous of power, the most encroaching, and the most abusive, when their encroachments met with the least opposition. Hilarius, in his answer to Leontius, highly approves of the regard he has shown for St. Peter and his chair; expresses a great desire to have the discipline of the Roman church established in all other catholic churches, that there might be but one discipline, as there was but one faith; and, above all, he extols his zeal for requiring him to watch, and take care that the rules of the fathers, that is, the canons of the church, be every were strictly observed. This last passage is frequently alleged to prove, that it was the peculiar province of the bishops of Rome to watch and see, that the canons were observed by all the bishops of the catholic church; that he was vested with a power to censure and punish all who transgressed them; and that such a power, which was in effect some sort of universal jurisdiction, was acknowledged by the primate of Arles, and consequently, by the other Gallican bishops. But in the letter of Leontius, which is still

[1] Vide Bar. ad ann. 449. n. 99.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1034. [3] Concil. ibid.

It was the province of every metropolitan and patriarch within the limits of their respective jurisdictions, to see that the canons were observed. The pope's third letter to Leontius. Hermes is appointed bishop of Narbonne at the nomination of his predecessor in that see. The pope reprimands Leontius for not acquainting him with it. The character of Hermes irreprehensible. And his election canonical.

luckily extant,[1] not the least mention is made of the rules of the fathers, or the canons; nor so much as a distant hint given, which could possibly induce Hilarius to imagine, that he was required to see, that the canons were every where observed, or that Leontius thought such a province to be any part of his duty. However, supposing himself to have been acknowledged by Leontius for guardian general of the canons, he closes his letter with declaring, that "for the sake of that unity and concord, which ought to reign among the bishops of the Lord, he will take care, that the ordinances of the fathers be every where punctually complied with, and that all bishops seek not their own things, but Christ's."[2] But to maintain the unity and concord that ought to reign among the prelates of the church, the fathers of the second oecumenical council had enacted a general law, contained in their second canon, forbidding all bishops, the bishop of Rome not excepted, to concern themselves at all with ecclesiastical matters, without the limits of their respective jurisdiction. This wise ordinance was confirmed by several subsequent councils, and thought so necessary to restrain "the bishops of the Lord" from quarreling about power, that it was adopted into the civil law. "When an ecclesiastic," says Justinian in one of his laws,[3] "shall be accused in point of faith or morals, or charged with a transgression of the canons; if he is a bishop, he shall be examined before his metropolitan; but if he is a metropolitan, before the archbishop," that is, the patriarch, "to whom he is subject." By these laws each metropolitan was to see the canons observed within the limits of his province; each archbishop, that is, patriarch or primate, within the limits of his diocese; and none were to concern themselves with ecclesiastical matters without the bounds of their jurisdiction. It was therefore the province and duty of the bishops of Rome to watch and see, that the canons were observed within the bounds of the suburbicarian provinces. But their care they could extend no farther without transgressing those very canons, for the observance of which they pretended such an extraordinary zeal.

But to return to Hilarius: he wrote the same year a third letter to Leontius, but in a very different style from the two former. This letter was written on the following occasion: Rusticus, metropolitan of Narbonne, having ordained his archdeacon, named Hermes, bishop of Beziers, and the people refusing to receive him, he named him, with the consent of the people and clergy of Narbonne, for his own successor; and Hermes succeeded him accordingly in that see. As this affair no way concerned the bishop of Rome, Leontius did not think it at all necessary to acquaint him with it; nor indeed was it his business to do it, as we shall soon see. But Hilarius, who had heard of it from others, ascribing his silence on such an occasion, to want of respect for St. Peter, resented it as an affront offered to his chair; and in the height of his resentment, wrote to the primate of Arles in terms, that had better become a sovereign reprimanding his vassal, than a bishop complaining of a brother and colleague. The letter begun thus: "We are amazed to find you so forgetful of the Christian law, as not to have acquainted us of the iniquitous things, that have happened in a province belonging to your monarchy,(*) [a new phrase for metropolitan power] that we might correct what you either will not, or cannot correct." He then inveighs against Hermes for daring to intrude himself, "by a most wicked usurpation, and execrable presumption, into the vacant see of Narbonne; and charges Leontius to transmit to Rome, without delay, a distinct account of the whole affair, signed by him and other bishops, that they might know what he should think fit to determine, and prescribe to be done.[1]

Hermes was a man of an unblemished character, well known at Rome, and, without all doubt, to Hilarius himself, though, in his letter, he is pleased to call him "one Hermes," as if he had never before heard of his name. For, in the late pontificate, he had been sent by his predecessor, to Rome, and had for some time resided there. His not having been received at Beziers was not owing to any demerit in him, but to the irreconcileable hatred, that Frederick the Visigoth bore him.(†)

As the life of Hermes was irreproachable, so was his promotion to the see of Narbonne, in the strictest sense, canonical. For, upon

[1] Spicileg. veter. aliquot Scrip. per D. Luc. Dacheri. t. 5. p. 578.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1040. [3] Novel. 137. c. 5.

(*) Hilarius supposes Narbonne to be under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Arles. It had indeed been subjected to that see by Zosimus. But his decree was reversed by Boniface, his immediate successor, and Leo confirmed what Boniface had done.(a) It is quite surprising, that Hilarius should have been thus unacquainted with the transactions of his own time.

(a) See p. 165.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1040, 1041.

(†) Frederic was the brother of Theodoric II. king of the Visigoths in Gaul, who were zealous Arians, and, at this time, masters of Narbonne, and the neighboring provinces. Hermes perhaps was too able, or too zealous a stickler for the catholic cause, and on that score (for I know of no other) hated, opposed, and persecuted, by Frederic. That prince had not only stirred up the people of Beziers against their new bishop; but, upon his being received by the people and clergy of Narbonne, he had immediately despatched a deacon, named John, with a letter to the pope, informing him, that Hermes had, by a most wicked usurpation, and execrable presumption, intruded himself into the see of Narbonne. For thus Frederic expressed himself in his letter to the pope; and the pope, no less incensed against the catholic bishop than the Arian prince, whom he even styles his son, vented his passion with the same words in the letter he wrote to Leontius.(a)

(a) Concil. t. p. 1040, 1041.

Why condemned by Hilarius. The pope, sensible that he had been imposed upon with respect to the election and ordination of Hermes, yet causes his promotion to be declared uncanonical by a council held at Rome. Yet he is suffered to keep his see, but divested of the power of ordaining the bishops of the province.

the demise of his predecessor, he was received, without the least opposition, by the people and clergy of that city, and by all acknowledged for their lawful bishop. Rusticus, it is true, had named him for his successor; but it was with their consent and approbation that he named him; and the naming thus a successor was neither forbidden by the canons,(*) as Hilarius pretended, nor was it without precedents. I shall only mention two, and both very remarkable. Macarius of Jerusalem, a saint of the first rate, ordained St. Maximus, bishop of that city, then named him, with the consent of the people and clergy, for his successor in the patriarchal see, and kept him with him, that, upon his death, he might be installed in his room.[1] St. Austin not only appointed one of his presbyters to succeed him in the see of Hippo, but caused him to be solemnly chosen by the people and clergy, whom he assembled for that purpose.[2] The truth is: Rusticus had acquainted Leo with his design of naming Hermes; and, to prevent all disputes, had desired the pope to approve it. Leo would not;[3] yet Rusticus named him, and the nomination took place. This Hilarius could not brook; and it was in the heat of his passion, at seeing the authority of his predecessor, and consequently his own, thus slighted, that he wrote the letter I have quoted, covering, and, in a manner, sanctifying his pride and ambition, with the usual disguise of zeal for the canons.

But he had scarce written that letter, when two Gallican bishops, Faustus and Auxanius, both privy to what had happened at Narbonne, arrived at Rome; and their arrival proved very seasonable. For the two prelates, surprised to find the pope incensed to such a degree against their colleagues, and without the least appearance of justice or reason on his side, did all that lay in their power to appease him. They gave him a true account of the election and ordination of Hermes, very different from that which had been transmitted to him by Frederic, an avowed enemy to that prelate, as well as the faith, which he professed and defended. The pope, sensible that he had been imposed upon by the Arian prince, and had acted too rashly, suffered himself to be so far prevailed upon by the remonstrances of the two prelates, as to assemble the bishops, who were then at Rome, (and many were then in that city, come from different provinces, to celebrate the anniversary of his promotion,) in order to lay the affair before them. By this council, consisting chiefly of bishops immediately subject to the bishop of Rome, and therefore entirely at his devotion, the promotion of Hermes was declared uncanonical, and repugnant to the rules of the holy fathers, though some of the greatest among the holy fathers had shown, by their practice, as I have observed above, that they either did not know of any such rules, or did not receive them. But it was the constant practice of the popes, before they openly set up their sovereign will in the room of the canons, to pretend every thing they approved to have been commanded, and every thing they disapproved to have been forbidden, by the canons. Thus they governed as despotically by their will, while they owned themselves bound by the canons, as they did after they had withdrawn themselves from all obedience to the canons, and acknowledged no other law but their will. As for the other bishops, they either acquiesced out of ignorance, believing, without farther inquiry, such things to have been really commanded or forbidden by the canons, as were solemnly declared by the pope to be so; or out of complaisance pretended to acquiesce, especially in matters that did not appear to them of any great importance, as they were not attending so much as they ought to have done, to the papal artifices and views.*

But though the promotion of Hermes was judged uncanonical by the pope, and his mock council; yet the new bishop was not deposed, but suffered, out of their great indulgence, and for the sake of peace, to keep his see. However, lest they should be thought to connive at such unlawful practices, it was thought fit he should be degraded from the rank of a metropolitan, and reduced almost to the state of a mere suffragan; which was done accordingly; the power of ordaining the bishops

(*) The twenty-third canon of Antioch, which seems to forbid such nominations, (a) was not received till many years after the time of Hilarius; and besides, the learned, generally speaking, understand that canon, as only forbidding nominations not authorized by the consent and approbation of the people and clergy. (b) The council of Antioch was held in 341.

(a) Concil. t. 2. p. 575.

(b) Vide Thom. disc. 1. 1. 2. c. 22.

[1] Soz. l. 2. c. 10. [2] Aug. ep. 110.

[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 1041.

(*) Of the unaccountable ignorance of the bishops, even with respect to the canons of oecumenical councils, innumerable instances occur in history. I shall here mention one only, which is well worthy our notice. The ordaining of two bishops for one and the same place was strictly forbidden by the first oecumenical council, and the most revered of all, that of Nice. And yet in the same century, in which that council was held, St. Austin was ordained bishop of Hippo by the primate of Numidia, and the other prelates of that province, while Valerius was still alive, and sat in that see; nay, it was at the request of Valerius, that he was ordained. And it is observable, that their thus transgressing the canon of Nice was not owing to any disregard they had for that council, or because they thought its laws might, on some occasions, be dispensed with; but because they were all alike ignorant of that law. (a) St. Austin became afterwards acquainted with it; and therefore would not suffer his successor, after he had named him, and caused him to be chosen, to be ordained while he himself was yet living. (b) Of the ignorance that reigned, generally speaking, among the other bishops, with respect to the canons, the popes were well apprised, and availed themselves of it accordingly, roundly asserting, upon the least prospect of advantage to their see, the holy fathers to have commanded or forbidden, what it had never come into the thoughts of the holy fathers to command or forbid.

(a) Aug. ep. 110 et 64. Possid. in vit. Aug. c. 8.

(b) Idem ep. 110.

The grandeur of the popes owing as much to the ambition of other bishops, as to their own. Hilarius provoked against Leontius and Mamertus. His letter to the former. What provoked him against Mamertus. His threatening letter to that bishop. His letter to the Gallican bishops.

of the province, which was vested in all metropolitans, by the sixth canon of Nice, being transferred from him to the most ancient bishop of the province; but with this clause, "that, upon the death of Hermes, it should revert to the see of Narbonne, since the city was innocent, though the bishop was guilty;"[1] which it would be no easy task to show, since the citizens had all concurred with their suffrages in raising him to the episcopal dignity. The determination of the council Hilarius immediately notified to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne, of Lyons, of Narbonensis prima and secunda, and of the Maritim Alps, by a letter dated the 3d of December, 462. In the same letter were contained several regulations concerning the discipline of the Gallican church; but in what manner they were received by the bishops in those parts, I find no where recorded. However, I am inclined to suppose, with Baronius, that they met with no opposition, but were by all most punctually executed. For, at this very time, the Gallican bishops, especially those of Arles, of Vienne, of Narbonne, of Aix, and of Embrun, were all at variance, quarrelling among themselves about power and jurisdiction, with as much warmth as if the whole of the Christian faith and religion were at stake, and striving which should engage the pope on his side, by the most punctual and ready obedience to whatever he should please to suggest. Thus did the ambition of others contribute as much to the aggrandizing of the popes as their own; the other bishops being glad to compound, as it were, for the power of commanding their neighboring colleagues, with suffering themselves to be commanded by the bishop of Rome, who was at a distance. This disposition in the prelates of the church, the popes took care to improve, with their usual art and address, siding sometimes with the one, and sometimes with the other, till they brought, at length, all the west insensibly, and by degrees, under their yoke, as has been observed even by a very eminent Roman catholic writer.[2] For the extraordinary regard, deference, or submission, with which they were apt to bribe the apostolic see, in their quarrels and disputes with one another, were afterwards construed, by the popes, into an indispensable duty, and exacted with the utmost rigor both of them and their successors.

[Year of Christ, 463.] Hilarius seems to have been wholly bent on reducing the Gallican church, and entirely subjecting it to his see. For, being informed, the following year, 463, that Mamertus of Vienne, a great saint, but not at all free from the epidemical distemper, as I may call it, which reigned at this time among the bishops of Gaul, the lust of power, had taken upon him to ordain the bishop of Die, a city once under the jurisdiction of Vienne, but then subject to the bishop of Arles, he wrote again to Leontius, severely rebuking that prelate for not acquainting the apostolic see with so daring an attempt. From this letter one would conclude, that the primate of Arles acted, in that station, as a mere deputy, or rather emissary, appointed by Rome to watch the conduct of the Gallican bishops; and, when he discovered anything amiss in their behavior, to inform against them, at the high tribunal of their sovereign lord the pope. But this treatment Leontius well deserved, and could expect no better, after he had acknowledged, as he did in his very first letter to Hilarius, the authority of the popes, and thereby left himself, and his see, to their mercy. In the same letter Hilarius charges the bishop of Arles to cause the unwarrantable attempt of Mamertus to be examined by a national synod, and to inform him of the true state of the case by a synodal letter, that he (not they) might, with the assistance and direction of the Holy Ghost, determine what was most expedient to be done at so critical a juncture.[1] He could not have expressed more earnestness and concern, had the catholic faith, or the church, been in imminent danger. But both were very safe; nay, and the canons too, of which he had set up for guardian-general. What then could thus alarm him? Mamertus had presumed, in a hostile manner, to extend his jurisdiction beyond the limits to which it had been restrained by the authority of the apostolic see.[2] For Leo adjudged the city of Die to the see of Arles. But Mamertus, refusing to stand to his judgment, continued to exercise there the same jurisdiction after, as he had done before that judgment was given. This Hilarius construed into an unpardonable crime; and, alarmed at it as an enormous excess, charged Mamertus, in a letter he wrote the following year, 464, to the bishops in those parts,(*) with pride, arrogance, presumption, prevarication; he even threatened to divest him of all the privileges he then enjoyed, as metropolitan of Vienne, if he dared to maintain what he had done, or pretended what he had done to be right and lawful. As to the bishop, whom Mamertus had ordained, St. Marcellus, the pope will not allow him to be acknowledged as such, till his ordination is confirmed by Leontius, whom he leaves at full liberty to confirm it or not, as he shall think fit.[3]

As this was an affair of the utmost importance, Hilarius wrote the same year a long letter on the same subject, to Victurus, Inge-

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1042.
[2] Du Pin. Biblioth. des Auc. Eccles. t. 3. part. 2. p. 572.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1043. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 1044, 1045.
(*) This letter is dated the 24th of February, and was addressed to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne, of Lyons, of Narbonensis Prima, Narbonensis Secunda, and the Alpes Penninæ.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 1044, 1045.

Hilarius owns himself indebted to the emperor for the power he claims. The bishops of Spain consult the pope. [Year of Christ 465.] The subject of their letters. They acknowledge the pope for the successor of St. Peter.

nuus, Idatius, and sixteen other Gallican bishops, who are all named in the address; and in that letter, to authorize the conduct of his predecessor, as well as his own, in assuming and exercising such an arbitrary power over those churches and bishops, he has recourse, not to any divine right, nor even to the ecclesiastical canons; but to a law of the emperors, meaning, no doubt, for he could mean no other, the law which was enacted, at the suggestion of Leo, by Valentinian III. "Our brother Leontius," says the pope, "could forfeit no honor, could be justly bereaved of no right, that had been granted him by my predecessor, of holy memory; because it has been decreed, by a law of the Christian princes, that all regulations concerning the churches and their rulers, made by the bishop of the apostolic see, to maintain concord and peace among the priests of the Lord, and keep up the ecclesiastical discipline, should be received with veneration, and by all inviolably observed."[1] This was challenging a power to regulate and model, at pleasure, the Gallican, as well as all other churches within the bounds of the empire; for the imperial law could extend no further; but, at the same time, owning, and in the plainest terms, such a power to be a free gift of the emperors. Of the law vesting the pope with such an extensive authority, I have spoken above;[2] and therefore shall not remind the reader here, that it was universally looked upon as surreptitious, having been enacted at the suggestion of a most ambitious, crafty, and designing pope, by a weak, unexperienced, and bigotted prince, perhaps one of the weakest that ever swayed the imperial sceptre, and grounded upon facts known to be false. However, considering the present disposition of the Gallican bishops, the selfish views most of them had at this time, the jealousy they entertained of each other, and the court they were all making to the pope, it is not to be doubted but his directions were received, and most punctually obeyed. St. Mamertus alone did not, it seems, submit to the pope's authority; for, in a council held at Arles in 475, I find him placed, not among the metropolitans, but the suffragans; and Hilarius had threatened to divest him of the metropolitan dignity, if he did not own himself guilty in transgressing the regulations made by Leo, and did not promise to observe them for the future, as sacred and inviolable laws.[3] To such an extravagant height did this arrogant pope carry the claims of his see, though he may be said, in some degree, to have let them down, by owning himself indebted to the emperors for the power he claimed. As for Mamertus, who was thus persecuted by the pope, all the contemporary writers, but more especially Sidonius, bishop of Clermont, paint him as a prelate of extraordinary merit, as a great saint; and he is now honored as such by the successors of Hilarius, notwithstanding the pains that pope took to blacken his character. He was the author of the rogation fast, which was afterwards adopted by the Roman, and most other churches in the west.[1]

While Hilarius was wholly intent on subjecting to his see the churches of Gaul, a favorable opportunity offered of extending his authority over those of Spain. Silvanus of Calahorra had taken upon him to ordain bishops, without the knowledge or consent of his metropolitan, Ascanius of Tarragon; nay, he ordained the curate of a village in another province, and ordained him, against his will, bishop of the village. In these ordinations he was assisted by some of his neighboring colleagues; but they being prevailed upon by the bishop of Saragosa, to separate themselves from his communion, he ordained alone, by a new breach of the canons, all who wanted to be raised to the episcopal dignity. Ascanius therefore, and the other bishops under his jurisdiction, thinking the authority of the bishop of Rome would add great weight to theirs, wrote to Hilarius, entreating him, by a synodal letter, to assist them with his advice, that they might know how to proceed against the refractory bishop, as well as those whom he had ordained.[2] At the same time Ascanius, and the other bishops of that province, wrote a second letter to Hilarius, concerning another affair. Nundinarius, bishop of Barcelona, had shown, on his death-bed, a great desire to have one Irenæus for his sucsessor, who was then bishop of another church. However, as that church was part of the diocess of Barcelona, and Nundinarius had yielded it to Irenæus, with the approbation of all the bishops of that province, Ascanius and his colleagues thought they might, without any breach of the canons, comply with the desire of their dying brother; the rather as Irenæus was a prelate of an unexceptionable character, and the whole body of the nobles, clergy, and people, demanded him, with great earnestness, for their bishop and pastor. A decree was accordingly issued by the bishops of the province assembled in council, appointing Irenæus bishop of the vacant see of Barcelona. In their decree, to obviate all objections, they very judiciously observed, that what they did now, had been done by others on several occasions. However, they unadvisedly suffered themselves to be prevailed upon by Vincentius, at this time duke of the Tarragonese, and a great friend of Hilarius, to write to Rome, and desire the pope to confirm their decree.[3] In this, as well as in the former letter, they express the greatest regard and respect for the apostolic

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1045. [2] See p. 192.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 1045—1047.

[1] Sid. l. 5. ep. 14. et l. 7. ep. 1.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1033. [3] Concil. ib. p. 1034.

Baronius owns the popes liable, as other men, to error and prejudice. His remark on their applying to the pope. They do not acknowledge in the pope a power of dispensing with the canons. The pope's answer to the Spanish bishops. He declares against translations; but at the same time acts in opposition to the canons of several councils.

see, acknowledging the bishop of Rome for the successor of St. Peter, "whose primacy ought to be loved and feared by all." They add, "that they recur to his see, that they may receive answers from a place, where error and prejudice find no room, where nothing is determined, but after a mature and truly episcopal deliberation."[1] Here Baronius exults; but I must take notice of what he said but a few pages before, on occasion of the quarrel between this very pope and Mamertus of Vienne. "Be not surprised, reader, that the Roman pontiff Hilarius should thus bitterly inveigh against Mamertus, a prelate of eminent sanctity; for in litigious points every man may be easily deceived; St. Leo inveighed with no less acrimony against St. Hilarius. Who does not know, that the ears of the popes are often prepossessed with false accusations: that the popes themselves are not proof against surprise, so that they persecute the innocent, and, at the same time believe, that they act agreeably to the laws of justice and equity?"[2] I have nothing to object against so plain a truth; and therefore shall only observe, that if, in litigious or doubtful points, the popes, by the annalist's own confession, lie open, as well as other men, to error and prejudice, I cannot see why he should exult as he does, in finding them complimented by the Spanish bishops with a kind of infallibility, even in litigious points, unless it be because those good bishops seemed to entertain a better opinion of them, than he himself thought they deserved. His remark on the application of the same bishops to the pope, for a confirmation of their decree translating Irenæus from one see to another, ought not to pass unobserved. For having exhibited their letter; at these words, "We therefore humbly entreat your apostleship to confirm the decree which we have made," he stops his reader to make him take notice, that it belonged to the bishop of the Roman see only to dispense with the canons. But how that can be gathered from their words, is not easy to guess; since their words only import a request to the pope, that he would confirm the decree, which they had made; so that they had made the decree without consulting his apostleship, nay, and would have put it in execution, had not the governor of the province officially interposed. But him Baronius keeps behind the curtain, and never suffers to appear, that the bishops may be thought to have applied to Rome, of their own motion, and not at his persuasion, as they certainly did. Upon the whole it is manifest, that the Spanish bishops were so far from suing to Rome for a dispensation in favor of Irenæus, or acknowledging in the pope a power to dispense with the canons, that they did not even judge it at all necessary to acquaint him with what they had done, thinking it to be right, as they declare in their letter, (quod juste a nobis videtur factum), though done without his knowledge or consent. The annalist is too impatient, in too great haste, to see his "high pontiff" vested with the lucrative power of dispensing with the canons. But for that satisfaction he must wait some ages. At this time the ecclesiastical laws were thought binding with respect to all, unless some advantage accruing to the church required them to be dispensed with; and in that case, as they had been made for the good of the church, so for the good of the church they might be dispensed with by every bishop, at least by every provincial synod.

The pope received the two above-mentioned letters from Spain, while he was holding a council on occasion of the concourse of bishops come to Rome, to celebrate, according to custom, the anniversary of his ordination. To that assembly, consisting of forty-eight bishops, of which number thirty-nine were of the vicariate of Rome, and immeditelay subject to the Roman see, Hilarius caused both letters to be read; and they were no sooner read, than it was decreed, with respect to Irenæus, that he should quit the church of Barcelona, and return to his first see, because "Nundinarius had desired, by his last will, that he might succeed him, as if bishoprics were hereditary."[1] No other reason was alleged in the council. But Hilarius, knowing that to be quite frivolous, and easily answered, bethought himself afterwards of a better, namely, the general prohibition of passing from one church to another; and that prohibition he urged in his answer to the Spanish bishops. But as they had desired him to confirm their decree, without engaging to revoke it, if he did not; and besides, had observed, in their letter, that what they did, had been practised by others, on several occasions; the pope was under no small apprehension, lest they should, notwithstanding their pretended respect for the successor of St. Peter, slight his decree, and stand to their own. Taking therefore advantage of the attachment the governor of the Tarragonese had shown for the Roman see, and depending upon his assistance, he despatched into Spain a subdeacon, named Trojanus, charging him to see the decree, which had been issued by him and his council, punctually executed.[2] But whether it was executed or not, is no-where recorded; and therefore the pope's answer to the Spanish bishops may well be alleged as an instance of his attempting, with the assistance of the secular power, to exercise authority over them, but not of their having acknowledged his authority, or submitted to it.

The zeal which the pope exerted for the observance of the canons, in the case of Ire-

[1] Concil. ibid. [2] Bar. ad ann. 464. n. 8.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1062, 1063. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 1036

Hilarius' plea for acting in opposition to the councils. His affronting behavior to the Spanish bishops. A general toleration granted by the emperor Anthemius. Opposed by the pope. The emperor yields.

næus, was very remarkable, as F. Tomassin well observes.[1] But it was only in the case of Irenæus that he exerted such an extraordinary zeal. For, as to Silvanus, though that rebellious and schismatical bishop ought to have been degraded by the apostolical constitutions,[2] confirmed by the canons of almost innumerable councils, yet the pope, as if his zeal had here lost its edge, ordered the Spanish bishops to overlook all his transgressions, and freely forgive him; nay, in defiance of the apostolical constitutions,[3] of the canons of Nice,[4] canons everlastingly binding, as his predecessor styled them, of Antioch,[5] Laodicea,[6] Arles,[7] Turin,[8] Sardica,[9] Ephesus,[10] and Chalcedon,[11] he confirmed the bishops, whom Silvanus had ordained.[12] An excellent guardian of the canons indeed! His decree however, confirming their ordination, was not absolute, but conditional; for he confirmed them on condition that they had married none but virgins; that they had not been twice married; that they were not unacquainted with letters; that they had not lost any of their limbs, nor the use of any; and had never undergone public penance.[13] Not a word of their morals; though the pope could hardly suppose all, whom Silvanus had ordained, to be even in that respect free from all blame; since they had chosen, or at least had consented, to receive ordination at his hands, by an open and most barefaced violation of the known laws of the church.

To excuse the extraordinary indulgence shown to Silvanus, the pope pleads, in his answer to the Spanish bishops, the necessity of the times.[14] For the disobedient and refractory bishop was, it seems, countenanced, and strongly supported by some men in power; and Hilarius was too good a politician to disoblige men in power, by an unseasonable zeal for the observance of the canons, at the very time he stood in need of their authority to establish his own.

The Spanish bishops had recurred to the pope, as I have observed above, "that they might receive answers from a place, where error and prejudice found no room; where nothing was determined but after a mature and truly episcopal deliberation. But if they really thought they should receive any such answers from Rome, they were soon undeceived. For though the letter, charging Silvanus with so many scandalous irregularities, was signed by all the bishops of the province; yet the pope, upon the receipt of a letter from the partizans of that bishop, contradicting in part what the others had all affirmed and attested, concluded at once what they had affirmed and attested to be false; and accordingly told them flatly, in his answer to their letter, that they had advanced things which he knew to be false; that Silvanus had indeed ordained some bishops, without the approbation of the metropolitan; but, as to the rest of the charge, it was false, and absolutely groundless.[1] This was, in plain terms, giving the lie to the bishops of the whole province, and giving it upon the bare testimony of persons who might have been corrupted, and probably were; at least their avowed friendship for the schismatical bishop ought to have made the pope suspend his judgment till he had discovered, or tried to discover the truth by a farther inquiry. What was the issue of this affair is not related by any contemporary writer; but we may well conclude the Spanish bishops to have been cured, by the pope's conduct, of the mighty opinion, which they seemed to entertain of his impartiality; and to have been, at the same time, fully convinced, that his decrees were not always the result of "a mature and truly episcopal deliberation;" though by his complaisance to the great men among them their subjection to him was more confirmed.

Of Hilarius no mention is made in the following year, 466, but, in 467, I find him busied in opposing, at Rome, one Philotheus, a great favorite of the new emperor Anthemius, who brought him with him out of the east, when he came to Rome to take possession of the western empire. Philotheus himself professed the doctrine of the Macedonians, denying the divinity of the Holy Ghost. But he was, it seems, a man of more generous principles than most in his time, a friend to liberty in matters of religion, and an enemy to that spirit of persecution and tyranny, which now universally prevailed, at least in the west. For, soon after his arrival at Rome with the emperor, he employed all the interest he had at court, to obtain leave not for those of his own sect only, but for Christians of all denominations, to assemble publicly by themselves, to own openly the doctrines they held, and to serve God in the manner which they believed to be the most agreeable to him. This leave he obtained; but the pope, in the utmost alarm and consternation, opposed it with so much warmth, that the emperor thought it advisable to revoke the permission he had granted, before it took place. Pope Gelasius writes, that his predecessor Hilarius, presenting himself before the emperor, in the church of St. Peter, obliged him to promise upon oath, that he would suffer no schismatical assemblies to be held in Rome.[2] What Gelasius writes, is not improbable: for the popes, taking advantage of the frequent changes of the emperors; of their absence from Rome, for they did not now reside there;

[1] Thom. Ancienne et nouvelle discip. &c. l. 2.
[2] Apost. Const. can. 35.
[3] Con. Apost. 35.
[4] Con. Nic. can. 4.
[5] Con. Antioch. can. 19.
[6] Con. Laodic. can. 12.
[7] Con. Arelat. 2. can. 5, et 6.
[8] Con. Taurin. can. 2.
[9] Con. Sardic. 3.
[10] Con. Ephes. decret.
[11] Con. Chalced. act. 3. et can. 25. de Epis. Cypr.
[12] Concil. t. 4. p. 1036.
[13] Concil. t. 4. p. 1036.
[14] Concil. ibid.

[1] Concil. ibid. [2] Gelas. ep. 13. t. 4. Concil. p. 1208.

of the disturbances and revolutions in the state, and the great respect and veneration, which their character, and the grandeur they affected, procured them from the common people; began now to act as sovereigns of Rome, the emperors themselves not thinking it safe, as the empire was at the lowest ebb, and invaded on all sides by the barbarians, to disoblige or oppose them.

This opposition to the toleration procured by Philotheus, which was indeed a novelty, at this time, in the Roman empire, in which a spirit of persecution had long prevailed, was the last action of Hilarius' life. For he died the same year, 467, having governed the Roman church six years, wanting two months and some days, if his death happened, as is most probably supposed, on the 10th of September.[1] As he was no less zealous for the exaltation of his see, than Leo, whom he seems to have taken for his pattern; and not only maintained, but improved, the usurpations of his predecessors, especially with respect to the Gallican church, except in his unwary concession of a derivation of the papal from the imperial power, a slip that had no consequences; he has been thought as worthy as they, of a place among the saints; and is now accordingly worshipped as a saint. His conduct in the council of Ephesus, under Dioscorus, has procured him the title of confessor; but to that title he would have had a much better claim, had he not been in too great a hurry to leave the place; nay, had he stayed only one day longer at Ephesus, he had bidden fair for the title of martyr. But he was, it seems, fully satisfied with that of confessor; and therefore, being informed of the treatment Flavianus had met with (for he had taken care to absent himself from that session), he withdrew that very night from Ephesus, in disguise, and with the utmost precipitation, leaving every thing he had behind him.[2] He was, by his instructions, to repair from Ephesus to Constantinople, being charged by Leo with two letters, the one for the emperor Theodosius, and the other for the empress Pulcheria. But, instead of complying with that part of his instructions, he bent his flight to Italy, not thinking himself any where safe in the east. The danger he apprehended his life to be in on this occasion remained fresh in his memory so long as he lived, and he was ever afterwards thankful for his happy deliverance. But, robbing the true author of his safety of the glory that was due to him alone, he gave it to St. John the Evangelist, whom he had invoked, as the tutelary saint of Ephesus, in his distress. For, being raised, twelve years after, to the papal dignity, he built a magnificent chapel, in honor of that saint, styling him, in the inscription, "his deliverer."(*) This would have been deemed rank idolatry but half a century before. For St. Austin, who flourished in this very age, in disputing with Maximinus, the Arian bishop, used the following arguments to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost: That he must be God, because temples were built and dedicated to him, which it would be sacrilege to build or dedicate to any creature.[1] The same father answers elsewhere,[2] with scorn and contempt, the charge brought by Faustus, the famous Manichee, against the catholics, as if they built and dedicated temples to their martyrs, calling it a false and groundless imputation. Had he lived a few years longer, his argument against Maximinus had lost all its force; and he had been obliged to own what Faustus alleged against the catholics to be but too true, and well grounded. For now saint-worship began to prevail; to saints, temples and chapels were built and dedicated; and men began anew "to serve the creature more than the Creator."

As to the writings of Hilarius, a letter has been ascribed to him, and even inserted, as his, in the second council of Nice, wherein he quotes a passage out of Chrysostom, to prove the lawfulness of image-worship. But that letter is now given up by all as suppositious. His style is less florid than that of Leo, but clear and expressive. It was at his request, while he was yet archdeacon of the Roman church, that Victorius, a native of Limoge in Aquitain, composed his famous Paschal Cycle, so much commended by Gennadius, Cassiodore, Gregory of Tours, and Isidore of Seville.

[1] Marcel. chron. Bolland. Martii. t. 2. p. 31.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 52.

(*) "Liberatori suo Beato Joanni evangelistæ Hilarius episcopus famulus Christi." He built another chapel in honor of St. John Baptist, with the following inscription on the frontispiece: "† Hilarus episcopus, † Sanctæ plebi Dei †;" and on the gates, which were of brass, were engraved, and lined with silver, the following words: "In honorem Beati Joannis Baptistæ Hilarus episcopus, Dei famulus, offert." Both chapels stood in the baptistery, near the Lateran, now commonly called the baptistery of Constantine.(*a*) Adjoining to the porch of the baptistery was an oratory; on the walls of which Hilarius caused to be represented, in Mosaic work, the martyrdom of Flavianus, with Dioscorus, and his satellites, stamping on his breast, as he lay on the ground. This oratory, with some remains of the Mosaic work, was still to be seen in the time of Sixtus V.(*b*)

(*a*) Vide Bar. ad ann. 449. n. 89. 100.
(*b*) Bar. ibid. n. 99.

[1] Aug. contr. Maxim. l. 1. t. 6. p. 288.
[2] Aug. contr. Faust. l. 2. c. 21.

Simplicius chosen. Great revolutions in the state. And disturbances in the church. Acacius, his character.

SIMPLICIUS, FORTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THRACIUS, LEO THE YOUNGER, ZENO, ANTHEMIUS, BASILISCUS.]

[Year of Christ, 467.] Hilarius was succeeded by Simplicius, chosen ten days after the decease of his predecessor; that is, according to the most probable opinion, on the 20th of September, 467. All we know of him before his election is, that he was a native of Tibur, now Tivoli, and the son of one Castinus.[1] There either happened some disturbances at his election, or he apprehended some might happen at that of his successor. For on his death-bed he charged Basilius, the præfectus prætorio to Odoacer, king of Italy, to assist at the election, and suffer none to be made without his advice and direction.[2] This afforded princes a plausible pretence to interpose in the elections, which they improved, as we shall see in the sequel.

Simplicius governed the Roman church in the worst of times; and in his pontificate happened great revolutions both in the east and the west, both in the church and the state. Italy, with its proud metropolis, which for so many ages had given law to the rest of the world, saw itself enslaved by a contemptible barbarian, whose family, country, and nation, are not well known to this day.(*) For Odoacer, having taken, and confined to a castle in Campania, the young emperor Augustus, or Augustulus, and reduced all Italy, caused himself to be proclaimed king of that country, not caring to assume the purple, or any other mark of the imperial dignity. Thus failed the very name of an empire in the west, in the year 476, of the Christian era, and the ninth of Simplicius. As for the other provinces formerly belonging to the western empire, the Romans had taken their last farewell of Britain, ever since the year 422, or 423[3]. Spain was held by the Sueves and Visigoths; Africa by the Vandals; and the Burgundians, Visigoths, Franks, and Alans, had erected several tetrarchies in Gaul. In the east Zeno, the successor of Leo, was driven from the throne by Basiliscus; and Basiliscus, in his turn, by Zeno. Of these, the latter favored, underhand, the Eutychian party; and the former openly, having, from the very beginning of his reign, or rather usurpation, publicly declared against the council of Chalcedon. This occasioned great confusion, and endless disorders in the church; and the Eutychian faction once more became formidable.

While the princes were thus contending for kingdoms and empires, the prelates of the church were struggling, with no less warmth and ambition, for spiritual power and dominion. The sees of Alexandria and Antioch were become the prey of ambitious and interested men; and the bishop of Constantinople, no longer satisfied with the second place, began, in defiance of the council of Chalcedon, to aspire to the first; though the bishop of Rome would not even allow him the second, but strove, in defiance of the same council, to keep the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch between him and his rival. Acacius was, at this time, bishop of Constantinople, a prelate of great abilities, and greater ambition; a despiser of wealth, but covetous of glory; of an engaging behavior, and an external appearance, that commanded respect; easy of access, ever ready to serve all, who applied to him, or stood in need of his assistance, and on that account greatly beloved both by his people and clergy, especially by his clergy, who, to testify their gratitude for the tender regard he showed for them, placed his portrait in all the churches of Constantinople. He was the best courtier of his time; understood mankind the best; and as by his complaisance and good offices he endeared himself to all persons of an inferior rank, so he won, by the arts of insinuation and flattery, in which none excelled him, the favor and confidence of the great. The emperor Leo entertained so high an opinion of his talents, of his integrity, and sincere attachment to the true interest both of the empire, and the imperial family, that he determined nothing concerning either, till he had consulted him; he even allowed him a seat in the senate, where no ecclesiastic had sat before him, either in the east or the west; and would have him in all points, that were canvassed there, to deliver his opinion the first.[1] He was chosen

[1] Vide Bolland. 2. Mart. p. 233.

[2] Concil. Rom. sub Symm. cap. Bene, dist. 96.

(*) Odoacer, the first king of Italy, is called by Theophanes, a Goth.(a) by Marcellinus, king of the Goths,(b) and by Isidore, prince of the Ostrogoths.(c) Jornandes styles him, in one place, king of the Rugians,(d) and in another, king of the Turcilingians.(e) He was meanly born,(f) and a private man in the guards of the emperor Augustulus, when the barbarians in the Roman service revolting, chose him for their leader.(g) He professed the doctrine of Arius, but being a friend to toleration, troubled no man on the score of his faith or religion, during the 17 years he continued master of Italy: so that the church enjoyed under him, and so she did under the Ostrogoths, his successors in the kingdom of Italy, though likewise Arians, the same liberty and privileges, which she had enjoyed under her own princes.

(a) Theoph. p. 102.
(b) Vide Vales. rer. Franc. p. 228.
(c) Isidor. chron.
(d) Jornand. reg. succ. c. 49.
(e) Idem rer. Goth. c. 45.
(f) Ennod. Panegyr. Theodor. p. 303.
(g) Procop. p. 308.

[3] Vide Alford. ad ann. 422. et Bed. chron.

[1] Theod. Lect. p. 553—555. Theod. p. 97. Evagr. l. 2. c. 11. Niceph. chron. Suid. p. 117.

Acacius is chosen bishop of Constantinople, and quarrels with the bishop of Rome. [Year of Christ, 472.] Obtains an edict, confirming the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon. Aspires to the primacy. Opposed by Simplicius. The bishop of Seville appointed vicar of the see of Rome. The appointing of vicars a most subtle contrivance.

bishop of Constantinople in the room of Gennadius, who died in the latter end of the year 471, and the very next year he entered the lists with the bishop of Rome; and, after a short truce, the war was kindled anew between the two sees. The emperor Marcian, by obliging Anatolius, the predecessor of Gennadius, to yield to Leo, and commending the zeal of that pope for the observance of the canons, had tacitly revoked, as it was understood at Rome, his edict confirming the 28th canon of Chalcedon. Acacius therefore, that no room might be left to dispute or question the honors and privileges granted to his see by that council, as wanting the imperial sanction, applied to the emperor Leo, and obtained of him an edict, confirming, in a most ample manner, all the honors, privileges, and prerogatives, that had ever been yielded to, or enjoyed by, the most holy church of Constantinople.[1] As the emperor, in that edict, styles the church of Constantinople, the mother of his piety, of all Christians, and of the orthodox faith, and will have Acacius, and his successors, to take place of other bishops, without restriction or limitation, in consideration of the royal city, Baronius is of opinion, and his opinion is not ill-grounded, that Acacius, seeing the western empire on the brink of ruin, and governed by a subject of the eastern empire, for such was Athemius, appointed by the eastern emperor, and sent from Constantinople, began to look upon that city as the metropolis, and first city of the empire, and upon himself as the first bishop.[2] This Baronius styles a bold, daring, foolish, unwarrantable, and wicked attempt. But, in spite of all his epithets, it had been entirely agreeable to the principles, on which the ecclesiastical hierarchy was originally grounded. For why was the first place allotted to the see of Rome, the second to that of Alexandria, and the third to the see of Antioch, when primacies and precedencies were first established in the church? For no other reason, but because the cities were so ranked when that regulation was introduced. And why was the see of Constantinople afterwards raised, by two oecumenical councils, above those of Alexandria and Antioch? Because the city of Constantinople, in becoming a New Rome, and the seat of the empire, as well as Old Rome, was thereby raised above the other two. Might not therefore the bishop of Constantinople, agreeably to the same principles, claim the first place, when, upon the downfall of the western empire, that city became the first, and the only seat of the empire? Had he not then the same title to the first place, which he had before to the second? Was it so very absurd in him to pretend that the primacy was removed, when the ground was removed, on which it stood? However that be, Simplicius was no sooner informed of the edict issued by the emperor, than, taking the alarm, as if the Christian religion, and the whole church were in imminent danger, he despatched into the east Probus, bishop of Canusium in Apulia, with the character of his legate, charging him to remonstrate against it as repugnant to the known laws of the catholic church. What was the issue of this legation is not known, since pope Gelasius, the only writer who mentions it, says no more, than that Probus protested against the imperial edict, in the name of Simplicius, and made it appear, that is, attempted to make it appear, in the presence of the emperor, that "it was not on the dignity of the cities that the ecclesiastical dignities depended, but on the manner of the ecclesiastical dispensation, confirmed and established by the tradition of the fathers."[1] But on what was the ecclesiastical dispensation founded? On the civil, without all doubt, that is, on the dignity of the cities, as I have demonstrated in several places of this history.

While Simplicius was thus pleading the "manner of the ecclesiastical dispensation, and tradition of the fathers," against the pretended usurpations of his rival in the east, he was himself striving to maintain and improve, in defiance of both, the real usurpations of his predecessors in the west. Of this such of his letters to the western bishops, as have reached our times, are a sufficient proof; and of them I shall speak here according to the order, in which they are commonly placed, not being able to ascertain the times, in which they were written. His first letter is to Zeno, bishop of Seville, and metropolitan of the province of Bætica, appointing him his vicar in those parts, and charging him, as such, to see that the apostolical decrees, and the rules of the fathers, were punctually complied with by all his brethren.[2] The appointing of vicars was, as I have observed elsewhere,[3] a most subtle contrivance, and perhaps, of all others, the best calculated to extend and enlarge the papal authority. For such of the bishops as were the most capable, by their rank or interest, of defeating the ambitious views of the popes, being taken with the bait of that imaginary honor, instead of opposing the daily encroachments of Rome, thought themselves bound, by their new office, to support and promote them; and they were the more inclined to think so, and to act accordingly, as every addition to the papal power was, at the same time, an addition to their own. The appointing of vicars was the contrivance of Damasus; and that contrivance his successors took care to improve with such art and address, as to reduce, in the term of a few

[1] Leg. 16. c. de Sacrosanct. Eccles.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 472.

[1] Gelas. ep. II. t. I. Epist. Rom. Pont.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1068.
[3] See pp. 104, 105.

Simplicius' letter to John of Ravenna. He invades the right of the metropolitans.

years, the extensive country of East Illyricum, where it first took place, to the servile condition, in most respects, of a suburbicarian province.[1] It is therefore very surprising, that from the time of Damasus to the days of Simplicius, that is, for the space of near one hundred years, none of the intermediate popes, though daily contriving new ways and means of establishing their spiritual monarchy, should ever have thought of this, when they knew it, by experience, to be the most successful of all. It is not to be doubted but Zeno accepted the commission, and, acting agreeably to the pretended power annexed to it, caused, so far as in him lay, all the decrees that were sent from Rome, to be punctually executed; for I find him highly commended by Felix, the successor of Simplicius in the Roman see.[2](*)

The second letter of Simplicius was written to John, bishop of Ravenna, and metropolitan of the province of Æmilia, on the following occasion: the people and clergy of Modena chose one Gregory, presbyter of the church of Ravenna, for their bishop; but, not being able to prevail upon him, by any other means, to accept that dignity, they took him by force, and dragged him before John his metropolitan, who ordained him, in spite of his opposition, and repeated protestations against the violent proceedings of the people. Forced ordinations were very frequent in the primitive times; but that practice had been lately prohibited by the imperial laws;(†) and besides, as Gregory was possessed of an estate, belonging to the church of Ravenna, which he was to give up, upon his being translated to another church, it was surmised John had ordained him against his will, that he might have the disposal of that estate. However that be, the pope reprimands him very severely; nay, and threatens to divest him of the right of ordaining in that province, or even in his own church, should he for the future be guilty of the like transgression. He adds, that he would have deprived him then of that right, but for a reason which he did not choose to commit to writing; but had charged the bishop Projectus to acquaint him with it by word of mouth. However, he will have Gregory to continue bishop of Modena; but, by an attempt on the known rights of metropolitans, yet unprecedented, he exempts him from all subjection to the bishop of Ravenna, and declares him immediately subject to the see of Rome.[1](*)

As for the estate which Gregory possessed, the pope orders him to resign it, and the bi-

1 See p. 104.

2 Concil. ibid. p. 1072. Bolland. 25. Feb. p. 508.

(*) This letter, though placed the first among those of Simplicius, bears no date.

(†) Innumerable instances of forced ordinations occur in history. St. Austin was ordained presbyter by force: (*a*) and so were Paulinus, (*b*) Nepotianus, (*c*) Paulinianus, St. Jerom's brother, (*d*) St. Martin, bishop of Tours, (*e*) and many others; nay, in some places, it was a common practice with the people, when they had chosen a person for presbyter or bishop, if he declined that burden, to lay violent hands on him, and carry him, by main force, to the bishop who was to ordain him, whether he consented to his ordination or not. If he fled, every bishop was empowered to apprehend and ordain him wherever he was found, and to send him back, thus ordained, to his own bishop. (*f*) Of all forced ordinations, that of the famous anchorite Macedonius is, perhaps, the most remarkable; for Flavianus of Antioch, by whom he was ordained, did not even let him know what he was doing, till the ceremony was over. When the anchorite understood that he was ordained presbyter, he broke forth into a violent rage against the bishop, and all who had been any ways concerned in the action. (*g*) I leave the Roman catholic divines to reconcile this practice, allowed by the church in those early times, with their present doctrine, requiring not only in the bishop who ordains, the intention of ordaining, but in the person who is to be ordained, the intention of receiving ordination, as conditions, without which the ordination would be absolutely void and null. The practice of forced ordinations continued to obtain, both in the east and west, till the middle of the fifth century, when it was suppressed by the emperors Leo and Majorianus, forbidding any man to be ordained against his will, and setting at liberty all, but bishops, who were thus ordained, as if they had never received ordination. (*a*) As for bishops, their ordination however forced, was, by the same law, to stand good; and they were not allowed to relinquish their office, or ever afterwards to return to a secular life; (*b*) nay, another law of the emperors Leo and Anthemius, among the other qualifications of a bishop, requires him to be so far from seeking the episcopal dignity, that he must be compelled to accept it. (*c*) However this practice was certainly wrong, without any warrant from Scripture, and contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion. It was also particularly hard in those times, when, by being forced into orders, men were forced into a state of celibacy too.

(*a*) Possid. vit. Aug. c. 4.
(*b*) Paulin. ep. 35. inter. Epist. Aug.
(*c*) Hier. ep. 3.
(*d*) Epiph. ep. ad Joan. Hierosol.
(*e*) Sulpit. Sever. vit. S. Mart. l. 1. p. 224.
(*f*) Epiph. ubi supra.
(*g*) Theodoret. Hist. Relig. c. 13.

(*a*) Leo Novel. 2. in Append. ad Cod. Theodos.
(*b*) Leo Novel. ibid.
(*c*) Cod. Just. l. 1. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 31.

1 Concil. t. 4. p. 1068, 1069.

(*) From the pope's threatening to deprive the metropolitan of Æmilia of the right of ordination, Baronius concludes the metropolitan dignity, enjoyed by that church, to have been a free gift of the apostolic see. (*a*) But who can be so little conversant in the annals of the church, as not to know, that the dignity of the sees depended on that of the cities, and the dignity of the cities on the will and pleasure of the emperor, who alone had, as is agreed on all hands, the right and power of raising a city to the rank of a metropolis? When a city was thus raised, the bishop was, till the time of the council of Chalcedon, thereby, without any farther declaration, entitled to all the rights and privileges of a metropolitan, unless the contrary was, as it sometimes happened to be, expressly decreed. But as it became a common practice among bishops, especially of considerable cities, to apply to the emperors, or their friends at court, for rescripts advancing their cities, and of course themselves, to a higher rank, the fathers of Chalcedon, to defeat the views of their ambitious brethren, and prevent the confusion, which the frequent changes occasioned in the ecclesiastical polity, declared by their twelfth canon, that the bishops of such cities, as were thus preferred to the rank of a metropolis, should indeed enjoy the honor and title of a metropolitan, but not the rights annexed by the canons to the metropolitan dignity. (*b*) The bishop of Ravenna was, till the time of Valentinian III. suffragan to the bishop of Milan, that city belonging to the vicariate of Italy, of which Milan was the metropolis. But Valentinian erecting it, at the request of the pope, into a metropolis, it became, by that means, the capital of the province of Æmilia. And in that sense the bishop of Ravenna may be said to have been indebted to the see of Rome for his new dignity. In short, it was by the interest of the pope, not by his authority, that the city of Ravenna was made a metropolis.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 482. (*b*) Concil. t. 4. p. 762.

shop of Ravenna to pay him an annual pension out of the revenues of another estate in the territory of Bononia, now Bologna, which likewise belonged to his church.[1](*)

The third letter of Simplicius is addressed to the bishops Florentius, Equitius, and Severus, who had charged Gaudentius, bishop of Aufinum, now Ofene in Abruzzo, in their neighborhood, with several transgressions of the canons concerning ordinations; with having sold some bond-men or slaves belonging to his church; and having appropriated to himself, for the space of three years, three-fourths of the revenues of his church, destined, as is said there, for the fabric of the church, for the maintenance of the poor, and the subsistence of the ecclesiastics.[2](†) The pope, in his answer to the letter of those three bishops, I. charges Severus to cause a full res-

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1069.

(*) This letter is dated the 30th of May, 482, or, as some will have it, 470. (*a*)

(*a*) Vide Bolland. 2. Mart. p. 154.

[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1069, 1070.

(†) The quadrupartite division, or the division of the ecclesiastical revenues into four parts, first took place about this time, in the pontificate of Simplicius, (*a*) and not in that of Sylvester, chosen in 314, as some have supposed. In this division, the first part was for the bishop; the second, for the rest of the clergy; the third for the fabric of the church; and the fourth for the poor. (*b*) The revenues thus divided arose partly from the voluntary oblations of the pious and charitable Christians, and partly from the real estates which the church possessed. In the primitive times, the ministers of the Gospel depended entirely, as to their maintenance, on the charity of the faithful, which indeed knew no bounds, so long as the primitive zeal continued warm. It is observable, that, in the first ages of the church, an opinion universally prevailed, that the world was to last but a short time. "You must know," says St. Cyprian, "and hold for certain, that the end of the world is at hand, and the time of the antichrist;" (*c*) and Lactantius assured the Christians of his time, that "all those who had made a computation of time, grounded on Scripture and profane history, had declared, that the world could not last longer than two hundred years." (*d*) This firm persuasion inspired the Christians with an utter contempt for the things of this world, and therefore greatly contributed to the enriching of the church. In the year 251, the Roman church, though not yet possessed of any real estate, maintained no fewer than fifteen hundred poor, besides virgins, widows, and all her ministers; (*e*) and the wealth of the other churches, especially in the great cities, increased in proportion. But this increase of wealth was of no advantage to the clergy, during the first two hundred years of the Christian religion. For they lived all that time in common, as the monkish orders do now; had no money, nor had they occasion for any, being supplied with the necessaries of life (and they required no more) by those, who were charged with the administration of the ecclesiastical goods. But about the year 220, they began to live in separate houses, and to have each their subsistence money paid daily, weekly, or monthly, in proportion to their number, to the number of the poor, and the wealth of each particular church. In this distribution a larger proportion was allowed to the presbyters than to the deacons, and a larger to the deacons than to the other inferior officers. St. Cyprian indeed put the two lectors Celerinus and Aurelius upon a level with the presbyters, allowing them the same share. (*f*) But he acted therein, as writers observe, contrary to the common rules, perhaps in consideration of their extraordinary merit, and the great sufferings they had undergone for the faith, though yet very young. Hence it appears, that each minister's portion was assigned by the bishop, and at his pleasure.

(*a*) Vide can. Vobis 23. quæst. 2.
(*b*) Gelas. in can. quatuor. 27. 12. quæst. 2.
(*c*) Cyp. ep. 58.
(*d*) Lact. Inst. divin. l. 7. c. 25.
(*e*) Euseb. l. 6. c. 41. Prud. p. 77. Chrysol. p. 468.
(*f*) Cyp. ep. 34.

Though the churches had acquired very early great wealth, yet they possessed no real estates till the latter end of the third, or the beginning of the fourth century; the Christian churches, as well as the Jewish synagogues, being deemed unlawful assemblies, and consequently incapable, by the Roman laws, (*a*) of holding real estates. And it was for this reason, that "those who were possessed of lands and houses," instead of giving them as was practised after Constantine's time, sold them, and gave the prices of them to the church. However, the observance of the laws being utterly neglected, during the troubles that attended the captivity of the emperor Valerian, some devout people, laying hold of that opportunity, settled real estates on the church. But these were all confiscated, in the year 302, by the emperors Dioclesian and Maximian. In the year 310, Maxentius restored to the Roman church all her possessions; and Constantine, having embraced the Christian religion in 312, published an edict nine years after, addressed to the people of Rome, whereby he gave all persons liberty to leave, by will, real estates, and whatever else they pleased, to the churches, especially to the Roman church (*b*) This law, published by a Christian emperor, out of his great zeal for the Christian church and religion, proved, in the course of a few years, more hurtful to both, than any, that had ever been enacted, by the pagan emperors, against them. As the voluntary oblations were still very abundant, the overplus of the accruing revenues was now employed in the purchasing of real estates. By this means, as well as by gifts and donations, some churches acquired immense possessions, those especially of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. Of these the latter, though the least wealthy, maintained a very numerous clergy, and fed daily more than three thousand poor.

Though the wealth of the church was thus increased, the ancient method of administering and dispensing it was still kept up. The oblations, as well as the revenues arising from the real estates, were yet in common; nay, the private gains of each clergyman were thrown into the common stock, and managed as formerly, by the deacons, subdeacons, and other stewards. But as the bishops had the disposing of them, and ordered the distributions at their pleasure, they took the liberty to apply the far greater part of them to their own use; so that the fabrics, in many places, fell to ruin, the poor were left quite destitute, and the clergy but very indifferently supplied. To prevent these evils, it was agreed, in the western church, (for the eastern church kept still the established usage of living in common) that the above-mentioned division into four parts should be made; and it was made accordingly, about the year 470, as is generally supposed, the third of Simplicius. But it was not in all places settled in the same proportion; nor could it, in the nature of things, be so settled. In some churches the number of the clergy called for a greater share than the poor; in other churches the contrary happened; in great cities the expense of the fabric required a larger share than was necessary in the smaller cities. By the poor were meant only the poor of the place; for it was incumbent on the bishop to entertain the clergy, and defray the expenses of the poor, who came from other places. The fabric of the church, besides that properly so called, comprehended the habitation of the bishop, of the clergy, of the sick, and the widows.

This division was only with respect to the revenues; for the stock or funds remained still entire and undivided under the administration of the deacons and subdeacons, who received the rents, and assigned to each their share. But differences arising daily between the bishops and the clergy, about their respective shares, that no room might be left for such disputes, a division of the lands and funds themselves was proposed, and readily agreed to by both parties. As this division was not made by public authority, but by a private agreement between the bishops and their clergy, it did not every where take place at the same time, but was in some churches established sooner, and later in others. These portions of the ecclesiastical estates were, by a borrowed name, styled "beneficia" or "benefices;" for so those lands were called

(*a*) L. 2. D. de Colleg. l. 1. c. de Judæ. l. 8. c. de hæred. instit.

(*b*) L. 4. Cod. Theodos. de episc. et Cler. l. 1. C. Just. de SS. Eccles.

Several punished. Zeno driven out by Basiliscus. [Year of Christ 475.] Who declares against the council of Chalcedon. Ælurus restored to the see of Alexandria. He repairs to Constantinople. Is well received there by the populace, but opposed by the clergy. [Year of Christ 476.] The pope writes to the emperor against him.

titution to be made by Gaudentius, of every thing belonging to the church, which he had either disposed of to others, or appropriated to himself. II. He declares those degraded and deposed, whose ordination was not agreeable to the canons. III. He confines the bishop of Aufinum to the administration only of one-fourth of the ecclesiastical revenues, that is, of his own share, charging one Onager, presbyter of that church, with the administration of the other three. Lastly, He divests him of the power of ordaining, which he had abused, and appoints Severus to ordain in his room, and even in his church.[1] This was leaving him scarce any thing but the bare name of a bishop. The pope indeed was his metropolitan, and, as such, empowered to redress abuses, and punish transgressions, within the purlieus of his jurisdiction. But as neither his power, nor that of any other metropolitan, was independent and arbitrary, he was neither to censure nor punish, especially with so much severity, without the advice and approbation of his suffragans assembled in council; and Simplicius is no where said to have assembled a council on this occasion; nor even to have given the accused bishop an opportunity of clearing himself from the heavy charge brought against him by the neighboring bishops.(*)

But the confusion and disorders, that in the year 475, began in the east, left Simplicius no leisure, during the remaining part of his pontificate, to attend to the affairs of the west: in that year Zeno, the son-in-law and successor of Leo, was driven from the throne; or rather shamefully abandoned it to his rival Basiliscus; and the new emperor no sooner found himself in possession of the empire, than he openly declared against the council of Chalcedon, recalled the famous Timotheus Ælurius,[2] who had been confined to the Taurica Chersonesus by the emperor Marcian, and, by a particular rescript, restored him to the see of Alexandria, held at that time, by Timotheus Salophacialus,[3] a zealous stickler for the faith of Chalcedon. The imperial rescript had scarce reached Egypt, when Ælurus, who must have kept himself concealed somewhere there, unexpectedly appeared, and, entering Alexandria at the head of a numerous band of robbers and outlaws, put Salophacialus to flight, and took anew possession of that see.[1] He was soon joined by Petrus Mongus, a deacon of the church of Alexandria, who had been banished with him for his violent attachment to the Eutychian party; by Petrus Fullo, of whom I shall have occasion to speak hereafter; and by many others, who had dissembled their sentiments during the reigns of Marcian and Leo.

Ælurus, finding he had nothing to fear at Alexandria, where he was in great favor with the populace, left Egypt this very year, and repaired to Constantinople, with a design to acquaint himself with the strength of the Eutychian party in that metropolis, and sound the disposition of the people and clergy there. The court was changed, and he did not doubt but the church would change with the court. But he was soon convinced of his error: for though he entered the city in a kind of triumph, being attended by crowds of people, crying out, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord;" yet the clergy and abbots, with Acacius at their head, declared against him, and would not even allow him, notwithstanding the favorable reception he met with at court, to set foot in any of their churches.[2] However, the favor that was shown him there, recommended him to many; and, in spite of the ecclesiastics, and all their efforts, his party grew daily more powerful and formidable. Some ecclesiastics therefore of Constantinople, with the abbots and monks of that city, apprehending the faith of Chalcedon to be in imminent danger, agreed to acquaint Simplicius with the state of affairs, not doubting but he would heartily join his interest and authority to theirs, against a man, who had been already condemned by his see. Their letter the pope received on the 10th of January, 476, and, thinking no time was to be lost at so critical a juncture, he wrote the same day to the emperor Basiliscus, conjuring him, as he tendered his own happiness, and the preservation of the authority, with which he was vested, to maintain inviolable what had been approved and decreed by the whole church, concerning either the faith or Ælurus; to remand that parricide, that new Cain, to the desart, which he had been so deservedly confined to, and to peruse the letters, which Leo, his predecessor in the apostolic see, had formerly written to the council of Chalcedon, and to the emperors, Marcian and Leo.[3] Simplicius did not, or more probably, would not know, that Ælurus was countenanced by Basiliscus himself; for he styles him a most re-

in the Latin tongue, which the princes distributed among their soldiers, engaging them thereby to guard the frontiers, to serve in war, when wanted, to defend the strong holds, and to perform other services of the like nature. This name the ecclesiastics chose, as alluding to their spiritual warfare. Of the other branches of the ecclesiastical revenue, I shall have occasion to speak hereafter; especially of tithes and first-fruits, the paying of which was quite free and voluntary, during the three first centuries of the church, began to be strongly recommended in the fourth and fifth, but was not established by law till late in the sixth.

[1] Concil. ibid.

(*) This letter is dated the 19th of November of the year after the consulship of Leo Augustus; (a) so that we cannot fix the precise year in which it was written, Leo having been consul in the years 471, 473, and 474.

(a) Concil. ibid. p. 1070.

[2] See p. 234. [3] See above, p. 247.

[1] Theodor. Lect. p. 556. Evagr. l. 3. c. 4. Liberat c. 16.

[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1070—1077. Theod. Lect. p. 556. Theop. p. 104. Cedren. p. 352.

[3] Concil. ibid. p. 1072, 1073.

Ælurus assembles a council at Constantinople. Basiliscus publishes his famous encyclical letter; and commands all bishops to sign it. Acacius refuses to sign it. The emperor insists on his signing it. Acacius' stratagem to raise the mob.

ligious and Christian prince. Of Leo's letters he transmitted copies to Acacius, though then under no small concern at his not having heard from him on such an occasion. Acacius, perhaps jealous of the power and authority of his rival, industriously avoided giving him an opportunity of intermeddling in the affairs of his church. However that be, Simplicius wrote two letters to him; one at this time, and the other on the 30th of the same month, exhorting him in both to oppose, with all his might, the wicked attempts of the enemies of God, and his church; and, above all, to prevent the assembling of a new council.[1] His answer to the ecclesiastics and abbots of Constantinople was much to the same purpose.[2]

But the emperor was so far from paying any kind of regard to the letters of Simplicius, or the remonstrances of Acacius, that he suffered Ælurus to assemble a council this very year at Constantinople, when the bishops, who had been driven from their sees for maintaining the doctrine of the fathers, that is, the Eutychian bishops, were all restored; and whatever had, till that time, been done or attempted against Ælurus, was declared void and null.[3] Of what bishops this council consisted, or how many, is not recorded. But it no sooner broke up, than Basiliscus published his famous encyclical letter, ordinance, or decree, addressed to Timotheus, "the most reverend and most holy archbishop of the noble city of Alexandria." The emperor begins it with declaring, that he has nothing so much at heart, as to see all good and well disposed Christians united in one faith, the ancient faith of the church; and that as it was his first and chief duty to establish that faith, so it was the duty, which he thought himself first of all bound to discharge. He then launches into high commendations of the symbol of Nice; proposes it as the only rule of faith, and bulwark against all heresies; confirms the acts of that council, and with them those of the second oecumenical council, and of the first and second of Ephesus. But as for pope Leo's famous letter, and the acts, decisions, and decrees of the council of Chalcedon, he strictly enjoins all bishops not only to anathematize, but to burn them, wherever they are found, as introducing a doctrine repugnant to that of Nice, and only calculated to raise and foment eternal quarrels among the prelates of the church. He peremptorily requires the bishops throughout the empire to sign this letter; and adds, that if any person whatever, from that time forward, shall dare only to name the council of Chalcedon, in speaking, writing, or disputing, he shall be deposed, if a bishop, or an ecclesiastic; and punished, if a monk, or a layman, with exile, and the confiscation of all his effects.[4]

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1072—1077. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 1078.
[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 1081. Liberat. c. 16.
[4] Evagr. l. 3. c. 4. Theod. Lect. p. 556. Liberat. c. 16.

The publication of this letter, or decree, was attended with greater disturbances at Constantinople, than the emperor had foreseen. The clergy, and the monks, who were very numerous in that city, took the alarm; the populace joined them, and Acacius, putting himself at their head, peremptorily refused, in defiance of the emperor's express command, to sign a decree, which appeared to him calculated, not to establish, but utterly to overset, the ancient faith of the church. But the emperor was as peremptory as the bishop; he absolutely insisted on the bishop's paying that obedience to his commands, which he said was due from every subject to his sovereign. On the other hand, the bishop pleaded his conscience, and the offence it would give to all good Christians to see a man, in his station, publicly anathematize the doctrine which he had hitherto professed, and profess the doctrine which he had hitherto anathematized. The emperor was deaf to all remonstrances; and, finding he could prevail by no other means, resolved, in the end, to employ force; and, repairing in person, to the great church, compel Acacius, in the presence of his clergy, to sign the decree. But he had timely notice of the emperor's design, and even of the day on which it was to be put in execution. On that day therefore, to raise the mob, and the monks, he appeared clad in black; and, at the same time, caused both the episcopal throne, and the altar, to be covered with veils of the same color. This was a new sight to the Greeks, nothing of that color being allowed in their churches; and it had the wished-for effect. The mob, alarmed at the appearance of such a phenomenon, portending, as was given out, the imminent ruin of the church, flew from all parts of the city to her rescue. The women were no less forward, on this occasion, than the men; and the children as forward as either. They were all alike seized with an enthusiastical fury; all alike determined to stand up in defence of their bishop, and in him of the church, against any violence that should be offered to the one or the other. At the same time appeared a formidable army of monks, with clubs in their hands, and great store of stones, their usual ammunition, and the only arguments they were capable of employing with success, in defence of the church, and the faith.[1] The emperor, finding the populace thus inflamed, thought it advisable to forbear all public violence, which he was sensible would be attended with a good deal of bloodshed, and ordered Acacius to be privately murdered. But neither could that order be put in execution, the bishop being guarded night and day by numerous bands of monks relieving one another.[2] Acacius was bound, on a particular account, to maintain the council of Chalce-

[1] Theod. Lect. p. 556. Theophan. p. 105.
[2] Suid. Ϛ, p. 510.

Acacius no enemy in his heart to the Eutychian party. The emperor's letter received by the bishops in the provinces. Acacius engages in his quarrel, Daniel Stylites—who writes to the emperor; and, at the request of Acacius, repairs to Constantinople, where he preaches against the emperor, and raises the mob.

don, the present grandeur of his see being grounded, as we have seen, on a decree of that council. But, in other respects, he was certainly no enemy to the Eutychian party, as appeared soon after; nay, some historians, supposing him to have been, at this very time, an Eutychian in his heart, will have the opposition he made to have been owing to the fear he was in of the populace and the monks, zealously attached to the faith of Chalcedon.[1] But as, in countries under an absolute and arbitrary government, men are seldom more afraid of the populace than the prince, the opposition of Acacius may, perhaps, be more naturally ascribed to the motive I have mentioned, seeing he could not anathematize the council of Chalcedon, without renouncing the honors, privileges, and extensive jurisdictions, entailed on his see by that council.

The bishops in the provinces were more complaisant; for the emperor's letter was no sooner published in Asia, than the bishops of that exarchate, being assembled in council, received it all to a man, nay, and by a synodical letter, returned the emperor thanks for employing, in defence of the ancient faith of the catholic church, the power which it had pleased heaven to put into his hands. They did not stop here, but, with great solemnity, excommunicated, deposed, and anathematized Acacius, and all who, with him, should refuse to receive the divine and apostolic letter of their most holy lord Basiliscus;[2] thus making a pope of the emperor, and submitting, not only the discipline and order of the church, but the faith itself, to an imperial decree. The example of the Asiatics was followed by most other bishops; and no fewer than six hundred signed the emperor's letter.[3] Thus was the council of Chalcedon as universally condemned and rejected, as it had been, but eighteen years before, universally approved and received.

In the mean time, the emperor having caused one of the eunuchs of his bed chamber to be burnt alive, for daring to speak in defence of the council of Chalcedon, his death struck the monks and populace with terror; and their zeal for the church, and the faith of the fathers, began visibly to cool. Acacius therefore, in order to revive it, and keep alive among them that spirit of rebellion, on which alone his safety depended, resolved to engage in his quarrel, if by any means he could, an anchorite named Daniel, who had stood many years on the top of a pillar in the neighborhood of Constantinople, and was on that account held by the populace in the greatest veneration. For several were now induced by the fame and reputation which Symeon, the first author of that whim, had acquired, to embrace the same whimsical method of life. To Daniel therefore Acacius first wrote a pathetic letter, acquainting him with the danger, to which his zeal for the catholic faith of Chalcedon had exposed him, and imploring him, in his present distress, the prayers and protection of a man, whom heaven had distinguished with particular blessings. The simple anchorite, fired with zeal on the receipt of this letter, and forgetful of the subjection, that is owing by every soul to the higher powers, wrote to his sovereign in such terms, as would have been deemed in any, but a saint, the height of arrogance and presumption. For, in his letter, he taxed him with tyranny, styled him a new Dioclesian, and insolently threatened him, as if he had been the dispenser of kingdoms, with the loss of the empire.[1]

Acacius having thus, by a pretended zeal for the faith of Chalcedon, secured to his party so great a saint, resolved to make a proper use of the high opinion which the people of Constantinople entertained of his sanctity. He was sensible, that, should he prevail upon the hermit to descend from his pillar, to repair to the city, and there preach openly against Basiliscus, as an avowed enemy to the church, the monks and populace would, by that means, be wrought up to such a pitch of enthusiastical madness and fury, as might end in a general rebellion, and endanger at the same time the emperor's life and his crown. To attain this end, two bishops were employed, who, representing to Daniel, in Acacius' name, the danger that threatened the church, and the faith, conjured him, as he tendered the welfare of both, to quit his pillar for a while, and repair with them to Constantinople, where his presence would give new life to the orthodox party, and reclaim many souls from eternal perdition. The anchorite was not a little surprised at such a proposal. He had stood already sixteen years on his pillar; and was very unwilling to remove farther from heaven, and return to the earth. However he recurred to prayer, and received, in an ecstacy, an express command, as is said, from heaven, to obey Acacius. He obeyed, came down, and suffered himself to be carried to Constantinople; for we are told his legs were so weakened, that he could not walk, though he had stood already sixteen years without ever once sitting down, and stood afterwards eighteen more. The whole city crowded out to meet him, received him with loud acclamations, and attended him in triumph to the place, where Acacius waited his arrival. There he preached to the numberless multitude; and his sermon was entirely made up of most bitter and reviling invectives against the emperor, as a traitor to God, as an enemy to his church, as a heretic, on whose head was ready to burst the indignation of heaven. His words had the foreseen and wished-for effect; the populace were inflamed against Basiliscus to such a degree, that

[1] Theophan. p. 105. [2] Evag. l. 3. c. 5. et 6.
[3] Evagr. l. 3. c. 4.

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 7. Surius 2. Decemb. p. 228.

The emperor obliged to quit the city. Daniel follows him at the head of the monks and the rabble; but is obliged to return without seeing him. Miracles cease when most wanted. Ælurus employed in establishing the Eutychian party in the east. Exempts the patriarchal sees from all subjection to the see of Constantinople. Petrus Fullo restored to the see of Antioch.

some, out of spite to him, were for setting fire to the city, and others for burning the palace, and the emperor in it, with the whole imperial family. But Basiliscus, apprized of their disposition and designs, thought it advisable to quit the city; and accordingly withdrew to the palace of Hebdomon, at a small distance from Constantinople, leaving Daniel, as he expressed himself at his departure, master of the city, and all its inhabitants.[1]

The anchorite, not satisfied with thus raising in the populace a spirit of rebellion, and thereby driving his sovereign from the metropolis, resolved to follow him, and taking advantage of the present disposition of the people, and the emperor's fright, oblige him to retract his encyclical letter. He therefore no sooner understood, that the emperor was retired to the Hebdomon, than he set out for the same place, at the head of the seditious rabble, and an army of monks. He is said to have performed a miraculous cure on the road, and on his arrival at the palace to have struck a Gothic lord dead, who could not forbear laughing at seeing a person of his odd figure carried on the arms of men, like a consul.[2] However, the soldiers of the emperor's guard, being either unacquainted with the miracles wrought by Daniel, or not believing them, which is more likely, as they were not orthodox, but Goths and Arians, resolutely declared, that neither he, nor any of his retinue, should set foot in the palace. Their resolution damped the courage of the multitude; allayed their zeal; nay, and seems to have even checked the miraculous power of their head and ringleader. For though it would have cost him but one miracle more to beat down the gates and walls of the palace, and open himself a way, in spite of all opposition, into the emperor's closet itself, he tamely withdrew, and, shaking off the dust of his feet, returned to the city; and there resumed, and exerted anew, his wonder-working power.[3] Daniel had, like most other saints, an unlimited power of working miracles among those who believed in miracles; but could perform none among those who did not. Miracles are now wrought daily abroad, by every monk, priest, or nun, of any reputation for sanctity; few indeed in France, but many in Italy, and more in Spain in Portugal. But none even of their missionaries can perform the least miracle among us, though they must own miracles to be quite necessary here, and quite unnecessary in their own countries.

During these disturbances at Constantinople, Ælurus was not idle, but laboring, and not unsuccessfully, to strengthen the Eutychian, and weaken the opposite party in the other cities of the empire. He left the metropolis after a short stay there, and, repairing to Ephesus, replaced Paul on that see, who had been deposed by Acacius, because he had caused himself to be ordained by the bishops of his diocese, according to the ancient custom; and not by the bishop of Constantinople, agreeably to the 28th canon of Chalcedon. At the same time he exempted the patriarchal see of Ephesus, as well as those of Heraclea in Thrace, and Cæsarea in Cappadocia, from all subjection to the see of Constantinople, reinstating them in all the rights and privileges which they had enjoyed before the council of Chalcedon. Such bishops as refused to receive the emperor's letter, he caused to be every where deposed, and others, who signed it, to be chosen in their room. In a council held at Ephesus, and consisting of all the bishops of that diocese, he excommunicated, anathematized, and deposed Acacius, as one, on many accounts, unworthy of the episcopal dignity. This sentence was signed by all, who were present at the council, that is, by all the bishops of the exarchate of Ephesus.[1] The same year was Petrus Fullo, a name famous in the annals of the church, restored, by means of Ælurus, to the see of Antioch, which he had formerly seized by force, but had been driven out by the emperor Leo.[2](*)

He was now sent back to Antioch, after he had signed the emperor's letter, with an order from court, for the count of the east to see him reinstalled, and to maintain him in possession of that see. Julian, the lawful bishop, did not long outlive the loss of his see; but died soon after with grief.[3] Anastasius of Jerusalem was one of the few who refused to sign the emperor's letter; but he too was driven from his see, and an abbot, named Gerontius, a most zealous stickler for

[1] Theod. Lect. p. 556. Theoph. p. 104.
[2] Theodor. Lect. p. 556. Vide Bar. ad ann. 476. n. 52—59.
[3] Idem ibid.

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 6. Theoph. p. 104.
[2] Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 5. Theod. Lect. p. 556.
(*) Petrus was originally a fuller, and thence surnamed Cnapheus or Fullo. He afterwards embraced a monastic life; but, being expelled after the council of Chalcedon, for his inviolable attachment to the sentiments of Eutyches, he repaired to Constantinople in the time of the emperor Leo. There he became first known to Zeno, the emperor's son-in-law, and afterwards emperor, who, liking his conversation, and not disliking his doctrine, took him with him to Antioch, upon his being appointed count or governor of the east. At Antioch, Fullo soon gained such numbers of followers, being protected and countenanced by Zeno, that Martyrius, then bishop of that city, finding himself become, by his artful insinuations, obnoxious to, and forsaken by, the greater part of his flock, resigned his charge, declaring in the great church, at the time of his resignation, that he willingly abandoned a disobedient clergy, a rebellious people, and a polluted church. Upon his resignation, Fullo caused himself to be ordained, and seized by violence on the episcopal throne, being supported by those of his party, and underhand by Zeno himself. But the emperor no sooner heard of his intrusion, than he ordered him to be apprehended, and sent into exile. This order, however, was not put in execution, Fullo having, no doubt, with the connivance of Zeno, made his escape before it was publicly known. (a)
(a) Theodor. Lect. p. 556. Liberat. c. 18.
[3] Theodor. Lect. ibid. Theoph. p. 104.

A great revolution both in the state and the church. Basiliscus submits to Acacius and Daniel. The insolent conduct of the latter. He annuls his former decree by another. Basiliscus driven out, and Zeno restored. He writes to the pope. The pope's answer.

the doctrine of Eutyches, put in his room.[1] Thus did the Eutychian party prevail anew all over the east; all the chief sees, but that of Constantinople, being now in the hands of the avowed enemies of the council of Chalcedon.

But their reign was short; for the very next year, 477, the great revolution that happened in the state, was attended with a no less remarkable revolution in the church. Zeno, who had lain about twenty months concealed in Isauria, his native country, being privately informed, by his friends, of the state of affairs in Constantinople, and encouraged by them not to neglect so favorable an opportunity of recovering the empire, appeared unexpectedly; and, putting himself at the head of what troops he could assemble, bent his march straight to Constantinople. Basiliscus was thunderstruck with the news; he distrusted the soldiery, whom he had disobliged by his avarice; and as to the people he was well apprised they would declare against him, and join his rival as soon as he appeared. In this distress he was so mean spirited as to repair, attended by his wife Zenonides, to the great church, and there, forgetful of the imperial dignity, publicly to ask pardon of Acacius and Daniel, for his past conduct, and implore, with a flood of tears, their favor and protection. He even demeaned himself so as to fall prostrate before Daniel, and, embracing his knees, to beg he would suffer mercy to take place of justice, and no longer look upon him as an enemy to God, or his church, since he was ready to atone, in what manner Acacius and he should think proper, for the mischief he had done. But the insolent anchorite, proud of his victory, and quite unaffected with seeing his sovereign thus prostrate at his feet, triumphed over him, reprimanded him in the sharpest terms, and assured him, that vengeance would soon overtake him.[2] Such was the spirit of this man, of this great worker of miracles; a spirit very different from that of the gospel.

Basiliscus had promised Acacius and Daniel to atone for the mischief he had done; and he was as good as his word, notwithstanding the little encouragement he met with from them. For upon his return to the palace, he annulled his former decree by another, which was thence called the anticirculatory letter or decree. For he there commanded the ancient faith, in which he himself had been baptized, to be alone professed by all; declared void and null all other regulations, ordinances, and decrees whatever, issued in his reign, and repugnant to that faith; and restored to the holy see of Constantinople, and to Acacius, whom he styles "the most reverend and most holy patriarch and archbishop," all the honors, rights, and privileges, enjoyed by them to that time.[1] Thus he hoped to appease the storm raised against him, or at least to stop any further mischiefs from it to himself and his kingdom. But all was in vain. Acacius was implacable. The anchorite still continued to preach and inveigh against him; the multitude, governed by them, grew every day more outrageous; Zeno advanced without opposition; and the unhappy Basiliscus, abandoned by all, left the palace; and taking refuge with his wife and children, in the great church, laid down his crown on the altar, and resigned the empire. But Acacius, partly out of revenge, and partly to ingratiate himself with Zeno, delivered them all into his hands; and they were, by his order, starved to death in a castle of Cappadocia, where they died, embracing each other.[2] And now the work being done, for which the hermit had been invited to Constantinople, Acacius, who had no farther occasion either for his zeal or his miracles, suffered him to return to the solitude; and accordingly he resumed his former station on the top of his pillar, where he was honored this very year with a visit from the emperor, and his wife Ariadne.[3]

Zeno no sooner found himself replaced on the throne, than he wrote to Simplicius, returning him thanks for the zeal and steadiness, with which he had, in conjunction with Acacius, opposed Basiliscus.(*) In the same letter he assures the pope, that he has brought with him to the throne a firm resolution utterly to abolish the Eutychian heresy, to exterminate all who profess it, to cause the council of Chalcedon to be received by all, and to restore Salophacialus to the see of Alexandria.[4] The pope, in his answer, dated the 9th of October, congratulates Zeno on his restoration, approves and commends the godly resolution he had taken to extirpate all, who were infected with the Eutychian heresy, and begs him not only to drive out Ælurus, and restore Salophacialus, but to condemn to perpetual banishment all who had been ordained by the former.[5]

The news of Zeno's restoration no sooner reached the provinces, than bishops flocked from all parts to Constantinople, to assure him of their attachment to his interest, and the faith he professed, the faith of Chalcedon. The emperor received them with the greatest demonstrations of respect and esteem, but soon remanded them all to their respective churches, where their presence was more necessary than in the metropolis. At the same time he wrote to the bishops of the two

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 5. Theoph. p. 107.
[2] Theodor. Lect. p. 556, 557.

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 7. Theodor. Lect. p. 557.
[2] Procop. Bell. Vand. l. 1. c. 7.
[3] Sur. 11. Decemb. p. 229.
(*) No notice is taken by the contemporary historians, of any opposition made by Simplicius; nor indeed of his having any ways concerned himself with those affairs.
[4] Concil. t. 4. p. 1078, 1079. [5] Concil. ibid. p. 1079.

The doctrine of Eutyches condemned by those, who had received it a few months before. The prelates, better courtiers than bishops. Uncertain what they believed. The Asiatics distinguish themselves on this occasion. Ælurus dies. Salophacialus restored.—[Year of Christ, 478.] John of Antioch is driven out, and Stephen chosen in his room. He is murdered.—[Year of Christ 479.] The new bishop of Antioch ordained by Acacius at Constantinople. Zeno and Acacius acquaint the pope with it.

patriarchates of Antioch and Ephesus, who had, but a few months before, received, almost universally, the doctrine of Eutyches, and thundered anathemas against that of Chalcedon, commanding them to assemble in council, and settle among themselves, what they should judge necessary for the peace, welfare, and tranquillity of the church. They understood his meaning; a council was convened without delay, and, by all who composed it, the doctrine of Eutyches was anathematized and condemned; Paul of Ephesus, and Fullo of Antioch, the abettors of that heresy, were excommunicated and deposed; the symbol or decree of Chalcedon was received as the only rule and standard of the Christian faith, concerning the Incarnation; and the same curses were now pronounced, nay, and by the same persons, against all, who did not receive it as such, that had been pronounced but a few months before, against all who did.[1] Unhappy times! when the prelates of the church, better courtiers than bishops, had no other rule of faith but the will and pleasure of the prince. And are the definitions of such men, whether assembled in national or oecumenical councils, to be received by us as oracles, and put upon the level with scripture? Can their faith be set up for the standard of ours, when it is not well known to this day, what their faith was; what they believed or disbelieved? On this occasion the Asiatics distinguished themselves above all the rest. It had been given out the year before, that they had not signed the letter of Basiliscus freely, and of their own motion; and they, to prevent such a report from gaining credit, had published a kind of manifesto, wherein they protested and declared, in the most solemn manner, that with them no force, no violence or compulsion, had been used; but that they had all signed "freely, by choice, and wholly of their own motion, the divine and apostolic letter of the most religious and most Christian emperor."[2] But now they were not ashamed to declare, and even protest upon oath, in a letter to Acacius, that their signing the letter of Basiliscus was owing merely to force and compulsion; and that they had never held any other faith, but that of Nice, Constantinople, and Chalcedon.[3]

This sudden revolution and change of affairs, though not unforeseen, affected Ælurus to such a degree, that he died this year at Alexandria. His followers gave out, that he foretold the day of his death; and well he might, if what Liberatus writes be true, namely, that he put an end to his life with a draught of poison.[4] But that report was perhaps industriously spread in opposition to the other, and to prevent the ignorant and credulous multitude from looking upon him as a prophet. He was scarce cold, when Petrus Moggus or Mongus, whom he had appointed his archdeacon, was chosen, by those of his party, to succeed him. But him the monks soon drove out, and replaced on that see Salophacialus the lawful bishop. The emperor not only approved what they had done, but ordered all ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, who in the term of two months did not communicate with the blessed Timotheus Salophacialus, to be divested of their dignities, and banished Egypt.[1] At Antioch, the Eutychian party still prevailed, being countenanced there by John, who had driven out Fullo, and seized on his see. The other bishops therefore, assembling in council, deposed him, and ordained one Stephen in his room, a zealous preacher of the true faith,[2] that is, a violent man of their party. But his zeal, and the violent measures he pursued, provoked those of the opposite party to such a degree, that the enraged multitude falling upon him one day in the church of St. Barlaam, murdered him at the very altar, dragged his body through the chief streets of Antioch, and threw it into the Orontes.[3] He is now honored as a saint, and his festival is kept on the 25th of April. The emperor, to revenge his death, ordered all to be apprehended and executed, without distinction, who should be found to have been any ways accessary to it.

But now at Antioch the two parties were so exasperated against each other, that the emperor, apprehensive of the disturbances that would infallibly attend the ordaining of a new bishop in that city, commanded Acacius to perform the ceremony at Constantinople. Zeno and Acacius were both well apprised of the umbrage the bishop of Rome might take at such an ordination. For though an entire harmony reigned at this time between Rome and Constantinople; yet the bishop of Rome, still looking upon his brother of Constantinople as his rival in power, kept a watchful eye over him, lest he should any ways improve the present disturbances to the advancement of his see. To prevent the pope therefore from looking upon the ordination of the patriarch of Antioch by the bishop of Constantinople in that light; when the ordination was over, and not before, both the emperor and Acacius wrote to Simplicius, acquainting him with it, and at the same time with the reasons that had obliged them to dispense with the ancient practice. The emperor, in his letter, even condescended to promise, with a kind of oath, that the patriarch of Antioch should, for the future, be ordained as usual, by the bishops of his dio-

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1042. Evagr. l. 3. c. 8. Theoph. p. 107.
[2] Evagr. l. 3. c. 9. [3] Idem ibid. [4] Liber. c. 16.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1055.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 1256. Theoph. p. 107.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 1032. Evagr. l. 3. c. 10. Theoph. p. 110.

The pope approves it. Salophacialus dies; and John Talaia is chosen in his room. Occasion of the quarrel between him and Acacius; who empoys all his interest at court against him. Talaia charged with perjury. Whether guilty of that crime. Petrus Mongus proposed for the see of Alexandria.

cese.[1] The pope, in his answer to these letters, approves the ordination, since the distracted state of the church of Antioch had made it necessary; but strongly recommends to the emperor the observance of his promise, and warns Acacius to forbear, in time to come, all attempts of the like nature, that no room may be left for complaints on either side.[2]

The person whom Acacius had ordained, Stephen the younger, (so sallied to distinguish him from his predecessor, named likewise Stephen), died in the year 482, the third of his episcopacy, and was succeeded by Calendion, a zealous stickler for the faith of Chalcedon.[3] The same year died Salophacialus of Alexandria, and in his room was chosen and ordained John Talaia, a presbyter of that church, who immediately wrote, according to the custom that then obtained, to the bishops of the chief sees, acquainting them with his promotion, and begging their communion. With his letter to Simplicius he despatched two ecclesiastics.[4] But the letters for the other two patriarchs, Acacius and Calendion, with one for the emperor, and another for Illus, the prime minister, and his great friend and protector, he sent by the common courier, charging him to deliver the letter he had for Illus before any other. But Illus was not then, as Talaia supposed, at Constantinople. The emperor, growing jealous of his power, in order to keep him at a distance from the metropolis, had appointed him general of the east, and sent him to Antioch. The courier therefore pursued his journey to that city, carrying with him the letters he had for Acacius and the emperor. In the mean time Acacius heard of the promotion of Talaia, and receiving no letters from him, construed his supposed silence into contempt; the rather, as Talaia had been wanting, on another occasion, as he apprehended, in the respect that was due to a person in his station. For, having been sent by Salophacialus to Constantinople upon some private affairs in 478, he there gained the confidence of Illus, and, depending upon his friendship, seemed to undervalue, and entirely neglect, that of Acacius.[5] The haughty prelate therefore, transported with rage, and bent on revenge, resolved to employ all the interest he had at court against the new patriarch; and his interest there was very great, the emperor owning himself indebted chiefly to him for the recovery of his crown. He aimed at nothing less than to drive the new chosen bishop from his see, and to get another appointed in his room. With this view he painted him to the emperor in the blackest colors, as a man unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and even of the name of a Christian. He charged him with Eutychianism, with hypocrisy, with an inviolable attachment to Illus, who was now in disgrace, and soon after joined the usurper Leontius. But what he chiefly urged against him was, his having accepted the episcopal dignity by a sacrilegious and barefaced violation of the promise he had made to the emperor himself, and confirmed with his oath. For the emperor, discovering in him, during his stay at Constantinople, a great deal of ambition, and apprehending that, upon the demise of Salophacialus, he might, by improper means, cause himself to be chosen in his room, and thereby give occasion to new disturbances, would not suffer him to return to Alexandria, till he had promised, upon oath, not to accept the bishopric of that city.[1] As Talaia joined the pope against Acacius, and is now, on that score, honored as a saint, the writers on that side, to clear him from perjury, pretend, upon the authority of Zacharias the rhetorician, a writer in other matters of no authority even with them, that he only promised, upon oath, not to seek or canvass for the episcopal dignity. But that he bound himself, by his oath, not to accept it, is positively affirmed by Liberatus, by Evagrius, nay, and by the emperor himself,[2] who, in the letter he wrote to the pope concerning this affair, expressed himself thus: "Talaia is to blame for disturbing the church to get himself acknowledged bishop of Alexandria, after he had promised, upon oath, never to sit in the throne of that church. He has broken his oath, and is guilty of sacrilege."[3] That Talaia therefore was guilty of a breach of his oath in accepting the episcopal dignity, seems undeniable; and as to the charge of Eutychianism, it would be no easy task to clear him from it, if what was said of him be true, namely, that he persuaded Salophacialus to insert the name of Dioscorus in the diptychs.[4] Indeed Eutychius of Alexandria styles him a Eutychian.[5] But his authority is as precarious as that of Zacharias, and there is no depending upon either.

Acacius, having by his artful insinuations, as we are told, though there seems to have been no occasion for art, strongly prepossessed the emperor against Talaia, as a man quite unworthy of the high post, to which he was raised, began, in the next place, to think of a proper person to put in his room. There were at this time in the church of Alexandria several ecclesiastics of great abilities, who had distinguished themselves by their zeal for the symbol of Chalcedon, and their abhorrence of the opposite doctrine. But Acacius was for reconciling the two parties, and not inflaming them still more against each other;

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1032. [2] Concil. ibid.
[3] Evagr. l. 3. c. 10.
[4] Liberat. c. 18. Concil. t. 4. p. 1081.
[5] Liberat. c. 16. Theoph. p. 110.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1169, 1170. Liberat. c. 17. Evagr. l. 3. c. 20.
[2] Liberat. Evagr. ibid. [3] Evagr. l. 3. c. 20.
[4] Liberat. c. 17. [5] Eutych. t. 2. p. 107.

An agreement between Mongus and Acacius, and upon what terms. It is approved by the emperor. He acquaints the pope with his design of raising Mongus to the see of Alexandria; who opposes it, and writes to the emperor and Acacius.

and therefore, overlooking those zealots, as he had no occasion at present for their zeal, he fixed, in his mind, on Petrus Mongus, as the only person, who, if he came into his measures, might enable him to accomplish so commendable a design. Mongus, it is true, had ever been a most zealous defender of the Eutychian doctrine, and was now at the head of that party. But Acacius well knew, that his zeal would hardly be proof against so tempting an offer as that of the patriarchal see of Alexandria; and, besides, was determined to propose no terms to him, but what he might readily comply with, both in honor and conscience. Mongus lay at this time concealed in Alexandria, but had some friends at Constantinople, in whom he could confide; and by them an agreement between him and Acacius was managed, and soon concluded. By this agreement, Acacius was to prevail upon the emperor to confirm Mongus in the see of Alexandria, to which he had been formerly, but unlawfully, chosen; while Mongus engaged, on his side, to contribute, so far as in him lay, to the uniting of the two parties, and putting an end to the schism, that had reigned so many years all over the east. The agreement being made, Acacius, without loss of time, applied to the emperor, who indeed was not a little surprised at first, to hear Mongus proposed for the see of Alexandria, and proposed by Acacius, whom he knew to have hitherto behaved, on other occasions, as his most bitter and inveterate enemy. However, being satisfied, in the end, with the reasons that prelate alleged, he not only promised to second his views, but extolled, with the greatest encomiums, his zeal and upright intention in thus sacrificing, as it became a Christian prelate, his private resentment to the public tranquillity of the church, and the state.[1]

As Mongus had been condemned by Simplicius, and declared by him, at the remonstrances and request of Acacius, unworthy of the episcopal dignity; nay, and of the name of a Christian;[2] the emperor thought, that the pope should be acquainted, either by himself, or Acacius, with his design of raising such a man to that dignity before it was put in execution. He wrote accordingly himself to Simplicius; for Acacius declined that office, and, at the same time, despatched a solemn embassy to Rome, charging Uranius, who was at the head of it, to persuade the pope, if by any means he could, to concur in the same measures with him and Acacius. Such a proposal from the emperor, who had issued, not long before, an order for apprehending, and even for executing Mongus, should he be found in Egypt, or presume to set his foot in that province;[3] so heavy a charge against Talaia, whom the emperor, in his letter, arraigned of perjury; and the silence of Acacius in an affair of so great importance; surprised and alarmed the pope to such a degree, that he avoided returning any answer to the embassadors at their first audience. He heard them again the next day, and so far yielded to their remonstrances, as not to answer, for the present, the letter he had received from Talaia, though he was, at the time of their arrival, upon the point of answering it, and thereby acknowledging him for lawful bishop of Alexandria. As for Mongus, he declared, that he would not, upon any consideration whatever, communicate with him, and much less own such a monster of wickedness for his colleague. The embassadors urged, in the strongest terms, the reasons that inclined the emperor, though a most zealous defender of the faith of Chalcedon, to raise him to the see of Alexandria, notwithstanding his former demerit, of which their master was as well apprised as the pope; but thought that even the greatest crimes ought to be forgotten, and that mercy ought to take place of justice, and forgiveness of revenge, upon the prospect of any advantage accruing thence to the church or the state. But the pope was inflexible, and deaf to all reasons. The embassadors, therefore, having no hopes of succeeding in their negotiation, left Rome, after a very short stay there, and returned to Constantinople. By them the pope wrote to the emperor, and likewise to Acacius, though he had received no letters from him, acquainting both with his firm and unalterable resolution of never acknowleging Mongus for lawful bishop. In his letter to the emperor, he conjures him, by all that is holy, not to suffer the church of Alexandria ever to depart from the doctrine of St. Mark; and in that to Acacius, he gently upbraids him with his silence on such an occasion; and, not suspecting him to have any hand in the promotion of Mongus, begs him, by their mutual friendship, to divert, by all means, the emperor, from putting in execution a design, which would be attended with the utter ruin of the catholic interest in Egypt, and most dreadful disturbances all over the east.[1] The emperor and Acacius, satisfied by these letters, and the relation of the embassadors, that the pope would never yield, nor be prevailed upon to approve of their measures, gave themselves no farther trouble about his approbation; nay, Acacius did not even answer this letter, nor another to the same purpose, which the pope wrote to him a few months after.[2](*) As he was determined to pursue his own measures in spite of the pope, he probably thought it advisable to break off, at once, all correspondence with Rome, being well apprised, that such a correspondence would only give occasion to mutual reproaches, would exasperate

[1] Liberat. c. 17, 18. Theoph. p. 112.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1082. [3] Evagr. l. 3. c. 11.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1032, 1033. [2] Concil. ibid.
(*) His first letter to Acacius is dated the 15th of July of the present year, and his second the 6th of November.

The emperor publishes his henoticon, or decree of union. The articles it contained. It is received by Mongus; who is installed in the see of Alexandria. The henoticon received in Egypt; and Mongus acknowledged for lawful bishop.

both parties, and end at last in curses and anathemas on both sides.

In the mean time deputies arrived at Constantinople, sent by Mongus, with full powers to negotiate a reconciliation between the two parties. They had several conferences with Acacius; and the result of these conferences was the famous henoticon, or letter of union, published by the emperor, with a design to unite all his loving subjects in one faith and communion; and addressed to the clerks, monks, and people of Egypt and Libya. In that letter, the emperor, after solemnly protesting, that he has nothing so much at heart as the purity of the catholic faith, the tranquillity of the church, and the welfare of his subjects, 1. Declares, in the name of the churches spread over the whole world, that no other symbol, doctrine, or definition of faith, has been received, or ought to be received, but that of Nice, confirmed by the fathers of Constantinople. 2. He pronounces all separate from the congregation of the faithful, who held any other. 3. He receives the doctrine and definitions of the fathers, assembled at Ephesus to condemn Nestorius, because, agreeable to the definitions of Nice; and likewise the doctrine of those, who met afterwards to condemn such as maintained the same errors. This was receiving the second council of Ephesus, at which Dioscorus presided, as well as the first. 4. He requires all to anathematize Eutyches; to confess the Word to have taken flesh of the holy Virgin, whom he styles "the Mother of God; to have taken flesh really, and not only in appearance; to be one, and not two; to be consubstantial with his Father, according to his Divinity, and with us, according to his humanity, without any mixture or confusion. Lastly, he anathematizes all who shall profess, teach, or maintain any doctrine not contained in this letter, wherever, and by whomsoever defined, whether by the council of Chalcedon, or by any other council.[1] The emperor industriously avoids, as the reader must have observed, all mention of the nature or natures of Christ, judging, and indeed very wisely, that it mattered little, whether men believed Christ to be "in two natures," and "of two natures," or only "of two natures," but not "in two natures," so long as they believed him to be true God, and true man, to be one Christ, and not two, which they all did. The council of Chalcedon indeed, defined Christ to be "of and in two natures;" and their obliging all to receive that metaphysical speculation as an article of faith, and engaging the emperors to persecute those, who did not, as heretics, and the worst of men, gave rise to the disturbances I have hitherto described. The emperor therefore, having first laid down, in the fourth article of his henoticon, the doctrine that was held and professed by both parties, concerning the incarnation, forbids any other to be taught or maintained; which was silencing the Eutychians, as well as those who opposed them.

The henoticon was no sooner published at Constantinople, than Acacius caused a copy of it to be transmitted to Mongus at Alexandria, with an order from the emperor, enjoining Apollonius, prefect of Egypt, to drive out Talaia, and see Mongus installed in his room, upon condition that he received the emperor's letter, and promised to write letters of communion to Acacius, to Simplicius, and to the bishops of the other chief sees. To these two conditions was added a third, namely, that he should not anathematize the council of Chalcedon farther than it was anathematized by the emperor in his letter; so that he was to receive all the decrees, definitions, and canons of that council; and among the rest, the twenty-eighth, placing his see after that of Constantinople; and only to reject the perplexing article, concerning the two natures in Christ. With these conditions Mongus readily complied; and was thereupon, pursuant to the emperor's orders, proclaimed lawful bishop of Alexandria, and placed, with great solemnity, on the episcopal throne.[1]

The new bishop, soon after his installation, convened a general assembly of the laity, as well as the clergy of Alexandria, where the henoticon was read, and received by all who were present. Mongus made an excellent discourse on the occasion, exhorting his flock to mutual love and charity, and conjuring them to unite in one faith, as they were united in one baptism; to join in one place, as they were joined in one worship; and above all, to lay aside the odious names of Eutychian and Nestorian, with which they had hitherto branded each other. At the same time he wrote, agreeably to his promise, letters of communion to Acacius, to Simplicius, and to the bishops of the other great sees. All in the east, but Calendion of Antioch, received them, acknowledged him for lawful bishop of Alexandria, and embraced his communion.[2] As for Simplicius, he rejected his letter, as we may well suppose, with the utmost indignation. At Constantinople the henoticon was publicly received by Acacius and his clergy; and such as had passed till that time for Eutychians, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, were, upon their receiving it, admitted to his communion.[3] The example of Acacius was followed by all the eastern bishops, Calendion only excepted, even by Martyrius of Jerusalem, famed above all the rest for his sanctity.[4] In Egypt indeed some bishops and other ecclesiastics, obstinately refused to receive the emperor's decree; not that it contained, even in their opinion, any heresy, but because no mention was made

[1] Liberat. c. 17. Evagr. l. 3. c. 14. Leont. sect. 5.

[1] Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 20. Theodor. Lect. p. 565. Theoph. p. 112.
[2] Liberat. c. 17. et 18. [3] Idem c. 17.
[4] Evagr. l. 3. c. 1.

Mongus causes the henoticon to be received in Egypt. Talaia withdraws to Antioch; and from thence to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 483.] Where he is acknowledged for lawful bishop. The conduct of the pope greatly to blame. Talaia charged with simony.

there of the "nature of Christ;" and rather than to part with the important article, that Christ was "in and of two natures," they were, out of the abundance of their zeal, for rekindling the war, of which they had all seen, and some of them had felt, the woful effects. But Mongus put it out of their power, driving them from their churches, as disturbers of the public tranquillity; and appointing others, more peaceably inclined, in their room.[1]

In the mean time, John Talaia, who had been driven from the see of Alexandria to make room for Mongus, privately withdrew from that city; and, not thinking himself safe in Egypt, fled in disguise to Antioch, to put himself there under the protection of his friend Illus. But Illus had forfeited all his power and interest at court; and therefore could only recommend him, which he did very warmly, to the patriarch Calendion, who had admitted him to his communion, as lawful bishop of Alexandria; and besides bore a secret grudge to Acacius, for having taken upon him to ordain, without his knowledge, one John Codonatus, bishop of Tyre, a see subject to the see of Antioch. However, he wrote in behalf of the deposed bishop, both to Acacius, and the emperor. But apprehending his letters would be of very little weight with either, he advised Talaia to repair to Rome, to lay his case before Simplicius, and implore the protection of his see.[2](*) The very worst advice he could have given him, since he, by following it, not only revived the troubles, that were upon the eve of being entirely composed, but gave occasion to an entire separation between Rome and Constantinople, as we shall soon see.

Talaia, in compliance with the advice of Calendion, set out for Rome in the latter end of this, and arrived in that city in the beginning of the following year, 483. He was received by the pope, as all were, whether guilty or innocent, who had recourse to the apostolic see; and upon that merit alone, for I know of no other, acknowledged by him for lawful bishop. In his first audience, he acquainted the pope with all the particulars of the cruel persecution raised and carried on, with an implacable hatred, by Acacius and Mongus against him. This persecution, the loss of his see, and the other calamities, that had befallen him, he ascribed to his inviolable attachment to the doctrine of Leo, and the faith of Chalcedon, boldly asserting, that they had driven him from the see, to which he had been canonically chosen and ordained, merely to make room for a man, who had signalized himself by his zeal for the opposite tenets. To inflame the pope still more against Acacius, he did not forget his having ordained, by on open violation of the canons, Codonatus bishop of Tyre, without the consent or knowledge of Calendion, as if he aimed at nothing less than to extend his jurisdiction all over the east. He concluded with begging Simplicius, as he tendered the welfare of the church of Alexandria, to write in his behalf to the bishop of Constantinople.[1] He took no manner of notice of the only crime, that was laid to his charge, and for which alone he had been deposed, that of perjury. As that crime rendered him quite unworthy of the dignity, to which he had been raised, and he had been charged with it by Zeno himself, in the letter he wrote to Simplicius, it was the height of insolence in the pope to acknowledge such a man for lawful bishop without the consent, or even the knowledge, of the emperor. For to believe him innocent, was giving the emperor the lie; and if he believed him guilty, but thought that his guilt might be overlooked in consideration of the extraordinary zeal, which he pretended to have for the council of Chalcedon,(*) he ought surely to have acted therein in concert with Zeno, who had deposed him. But perjury was not the only crime laid to his charge. Zacharias arraigns him of simony, as if he had supplied with money the want of merit, and by dint of money opened him-

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1072. Evagr. l. 3. c. 21. Liberat. c. 18.
[2] Evagr. l. 3. c. 15. et 16. Liberat. c. 18. Concil. t. 4. p. 1042.

(*) This Baronius,(*a*) and the other Roman catholic writers, style an appeal. But, 1. There can be no appeal, properly speaking, where no judgment has been given; and against Talaia no judgment had been given. The emperor knew him to be guilty of perjury; and thereupon, thinking him quite unworthy of the episcopal dignity, removed him, and appointed another in his room. 2. I should be glad to know, why his recurring to the pope should be called an appeal, rather than his recurring to Illus? He recurred to both with the same view, to crave their protection; first to Illus, and then to the pope, whom he probably would never have troubled, had that minister still been in power. 3 On his arrival at Rome the only favor he begged of Simplicius was, that he would write to Acacius in his behalf. (*b*) And was not this evidently applying to the pope only as a mediator? Had he applied to him as a judge, he would not have been satisfied with only desiring him to write in his favor; but would have required him to act as a judge, to try his cause, and restore him, if innocent, by his sovereign authority, to the possession of his see. The historian indeed uses the word *appellavit*, he appealed. But from what I have said, it is manifest, that in what manner soever he expressed himself, he could mean no more than that Talaia had recourse to the pope, or applied to the pope. But Baronius, and indeed all other writers on his side of the question, are very apt, for want of reasons, to lay stress upon words, without any regard to the meaning of the authors, or the sense in which they used them. Thus, because Simplicius, in one of his letters to Acacius, uses this expression, "delegatum tibi munus attendes," "attend to the charge delegated to you," Baronius concludes him to have been appointed by the pope, his legate, or vicar-general, for the east. Had Simplicius, instead of "delegated," used the word "committed," (which he might have done, it being plain from the context, that he meant no more by the former, than is imported by the latter,) Baronius would never have thought of vesting Acacius with the legatine dignity.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 483. n. 1. (*b*) Liberat. c. 18.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1082. Evagr. l. 3. c. 15. Liberat. c. 18.

(*) Pope Gelasius, in one of the letters he wrote in behalf of Talaia, says, whatever character he might have or deserved in other respects, his faith had never been found fault with, since he had been always deemed a true catholic,(*a*) that is, he was a good catholic whether a good or a bad man, and as such worthy of a bishopric.

(*a*) Concil. t. 4. p. 1169.

Simplicius writtes to Acacius in behalf of Talaia. Simplicius dies. The præfectus prætorio will not suffer the election to be made without him. Publishes a law, forbidding the popes to alienate the goods of the church.

self a way to the episcopal throne.[1] That writer, it is true, was no friend of his; but Liberatus, who was, owns, that while Talaia was oeconomus of the church of Alexandria,(*) he sent frequently very rich presents to Illus, the reigning favorite. And what end could he have in thus courting the friendship of that minister, but to engage him in his interest against the approaching election of a new bishop, Salophacialus being then advanced in years, and very infirm? What Zacharias writes therefore was not, it seems, a mere fiction and calumny, without any ground or foundation, as Baronius would make us believe. Liberatus, however prejudiced in his favor, observes, that he made those presents to Illus while he was oeconomus; which was plainly charging him, at least, with a misapplication of the ecclesiastical revenues. However, the emperor urged no other crime against him, but the breach of his oath, that being the only crime of which he knew him to be guilty; and he would lay no other to his charge.

Simplicius had already written two letters to Acacius without receiving an answer to either, as I have related above. However, at the request of Talaia, he wrote a third; nay, and a fourth, if Liberatus may be credited,[2] reproaching Acacius anew with his silence in an affair of such importance; complaining of him for having admitted Mongus to his communion, without the knowledge and consent of the apostolic see; and striving to convince him, that he must either prevail upon Mongus to receive the definition of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo, without any restriction or limitation whatever, or absolutely separate himself from his communion.[1] The reason he alleged why Acacius ought not to have communicated with Mongus without the consent of the apostolic see, was, because he had been excommunicated both by the bishop of Constantinople, and himself; and therefore ought not to have been released from that bond by either without the consent of the other;[2] which was declaring, that no bishop, nor the pope himself, was empowered to absolve a person condemned, without the consent of the bishop, who condemned him. To neither of these letters did Acacius return any answer; and Simplicius died soon after; that is, on the 2d of March, of the present year, 483, having presided in the Roman church fifteen years, five months, and some days.[3] He is now honored as a saint, and on the 2d of March his pretended relics are yearly exposed to public veneration at Tivoli, where he is said to have been born.

[1] Apud Evagr. l. 3. c. 12.

(*) The oeconomus was an officer, chosen out of the clergy, to manage the ecclesiastical revenues, under the inspection of the bishop. The fathers of Chalcedon ordained, by their twenty-sixth canon, that every church having a bishop should likewise have an oeconomus or steward, to manage the revenues of the church, that they might not be embezzled, nor any reproach brought upon the priesthood. That office was originally discharged by the bishop himself, with the assistance of his archdeacon. But they having, upon the general conversion of the heathens, too much business of another nature to mind this, it was thought necessary to appoint officers, under the name of oeconomi, or stewards, who should have no other employment. (a)

(a) Vide Morin. de Ordinat. Eccl. Part 3. Exerc. 16. c. 5.

[2] Liberat. c. 18. [3] Concil. t. 4. p. 1336.

FELIX II. FORTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ZENO, ANASTASIUS, ODOACER, KING OF ITALY.]

[Year of Christ 483.] The death of Simplicius was attended with some disturbances in Rome,[3] which, however, did not prevent the people and clergy from proceeding to the election of a new bishop. But while they were assembled for that purpose, in the church of St. Peter, Basilius the præfectus prætorio, and lieutenant of king Odoacer, entered the assembly; and, addressing the electors, that is, the people, the senate, and the clergy, expressed great surprise at their taking upon them to appoint a successor to the deceased bishop, without him; adding, that it belonged to the civil magistrate to prevent the disturbances that might arise on such occasions, lest from the church they should pass to the state; that Simplicius had conjured him, on his death-bed, as they all well knew, to suffer no election to be made without his advice and direction; and that, were Simplicius still alive, nothing of moment ought to be undertaken till it was approved by him who represented the person of the king. He then declared all they had done, without him, to be null; and ordered the election to be begun anew, though it was already near concluded. But, in the first place, he caused a law to be read in the name of Odoacer, forbidding the bishop, who should now be chosen, as well as his successors, to alienate any inheritance, possessions, or sacred utensils, that now belonged, or should for the future belong, to the church; declaring all such bargains void; anathematizing both the seller and the buyer; and obliging the latter, and his heirs, to re-

[1] Idem ibid. [2] Idem ibid.

[3] Bar. ad ann. 483. n. 4. Bolland. 2. Mart. p. 133.

Felix chosen. Talaia presents a petition to him against Acacius. The new pope assembles a council. Legates sent into the east. By them the pope writes to the emperor and Acacius. Acacius summoned to Rome.

store to the church all lands and tenements thus purchased, how long soever they may have possessed them.[1] From this law it is manifest, that great abuses must have prevailed at this time in Rome, in the management of the goods belonging to the church; and that the popes must have given occasion to such a regulation, since it seems to have been made for them alone, though none had sat in that see, through a long series of years, but such as were sainted after their death. We frequently meet with laws restraining abuses, especially in the clergy, of which not the least notice is taken by the ecclesiastical writers of those very times, who, it seems, did not think it necessary to acquaint posterity with them.(*) The law being read, the votes were gathered anew; when Cælius Felix was unanimously chosen, after a vacancy of six days, according to some, and, according to others, of twenty-six.[2] He was a native of Rome, the son of a presbyter, named likewise Felix; and probably had been married, and had children.(†)

The new pope was no sooner ordained, than John Talaia, who was still at Rome, presented a petition to him, containing heavy complaints against Acacius; and at the same time minutely informed him, by word of mouth, of the state of affairs in the east, of the general defection of the bishops there, of the cruel treatment those met with from Acacius and Mongus, who dared to stand up in defence of the true faith; and of the deplorable condition to which the church of Alexandria was reduced by the usurper of that see. The pope, proud to see a patriarch of Alexandria thus applying, in the quality of a suppliant to his throne, resolved to exert all his interest and power, that it might not be said he had applied in vain. A council therefore was assembled without delay, the bishops, who had met to ordain the new pope, being still in Rome; and it was there determined, that since letters had hitherto proved ineffectual, neither Acacius, nor the emperor, having deigned to answer them, legates should be immediately despatched, with proper instructions, into the east. For this legation were chosen Misenus and Vitalis, the former bishop Cumæ in Campania, and the latter of Tronto, a city of Picenum, long since ruined. To them was added Felix, defender or syndic of the Roman church,(*) whom the pope styles a man of great integrity. By them Felix wrote both to Zeno and Acacius, conjuring them, as they tendered the salvation of their souls, for which he expresses great concern, not to suffer a man, whom the one had condemned, and the other had proscribed as a heretic, to sit in the see of St. Mark. In his letter to Acacius, he tells him, that he is loth to find fault with his conduct; but cannot help suspecting his silence in an affair of such moment; that, considering the interest he was known to have at court, there was good reason to believe, that he was not willing to hinder what he did not hinder; and that not to oppose an error, or defend the truth, when one may, is approving the one, and betraying the other.[1]

Besides these letters, the legates were charged with two papers; the one addressed to Acacius, and styled a "summons (citationis libellus"); for Acacius was there summoned to justify his conduct in an assembly of bishops before St. Peter. The other was addressed to the emperor, and called a "lamentation (deplorationis libellus"); the pope lamenting, in that piece, the unhappy state of the church of Alexandria, of which he lays the whole blame on Acacius; adding, that since the person, whose see Mongus had usurped, had presented a petition against that bishop, the laws both ecclesiastic and civil obliged him to clear himself from the crimes that were there laid to his charge.[2] The pope knew Talaia to be extremely obnoxious to the emperor, and therefore industriously avoided ever mentioning his name in the letter he wrote to that prince, or in his lamentation. Evagrius writes, that Acacius was summoned to appear at Rome in person.[3] But pope Gelasius says, in express terms, that it was left to his choice, either to appear in person before St.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1336.

(*) In a council held at Rome in 502, under pope Symmachus, the conduct of Basilius on this occasion was censured, as an attempt on the rights which the people had of choosing their own pastors: But very unjustly; since Basilius left them at full liberty to choose whom they pleased, and only complained of their proceeding to an election without him, on whom it was incumbent to prevent or suppress all disorders and disturbances incident to popular elections. But what the bishops of that council chiefly complained of, and very loudly, was, Odoacer's presuming, though a layman, to anathematize those who were of the ecclesiastical order; "Laicum hominem anathema ecclesiastico ordini dictare," was what they could not brook. But that dialect Odoacer, and before him the emperor Zeno,(a) had learned of them; and both thought, that they had as good a right to curse the clergy, and the pope himself, as the pope and the clergy had to curse the rest of the world. The present council indeed declared it repugnant to the canons for a layman to anathematize an ecclesiastic;(b) but I should be glad to know by what law or canon the right of cursing was restrained to their order.

(a) See p. 269. (b) Concil. t. 4. p. 1337, 1338.

[2] Bolland. 25 Feb. p. 504.

(†) It is more probable, considering the distance of time, that he was the great-grandfather of pope Gregory I. chosen in 590, than Felix III. chosen in 526, for one of the two was.(c)

(c) Vide Bar. not. mart. p. 94. & Bolland. ubi supra.

(*) The defensores ecclesiæ were the proctors or syndics of the church, whose province it was to solicit the cause of the church, or of any single ecclesiastic, when injured or oppressed: and to sue for redress in a civil court, or apply immediately to the emperor. These defensores were, in some places, chosen out of the clergy, and, in others, out of the laity. Nay, I find them in the same place ecclesiastics at one time, and laymen at another. Thus at Rome they were laymen in the time of Zosimus,(a) and ecclesiastics in the pontificate of Gregory the Great.(b)

(a) Zos. ep. 1. c. 3. (b) Greg. ep. 48.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1097, 1098. Evagr. l. 3. c. 18. Liberat. c. 18.

[2] Concil. ibid. [3] Evagr. ubi supra.

Instructions given to the legates. The legates arrested and imprisoned. They yield, and publicly communicate with Acacius. The pope informed by the monks of the prevarication of the legates. The emperor and Acacius write to the pope. The legates deposed—[Year of Christ, 484.]

Peter, or to appoint another to appear in his room.[1] The private instructions given to the legates, were, to press the emperor, but with great circumspection and prudence, to drive Mongus both from the see, and the city of Alexandria; to maintain the authority of the council of Chalcedon; to let Acacius know, that he must anathematize Mongus, and answer the request which Talaia had presented to St. Peter against him; to try whether they could persuade the emperor to send Acacius to Rome, that his cause might be judged and decided there; which had been gaining a great point; but it was both presumption and folly to attempt it; lastly, the legates were strictly enjoined not to communicate, under any pretence whatever, with Acacius, till he had done what the pope required him to do.[2]

With these instructions the legates, that is, the two bishops (for Felix was detained by sickness), set out for Constantinople in the latter end of the present year, 483. But on their arrival at Abydus, on the straits of the Hellespont, now the straits of the Dardanels, they were arrested there by an order from the emperor, and thrown into prison. Their papers were all by force taken from them, and they even threatened with death, as disturbers of the public peace, if they did not communicate with Mongus and Acacius. The threats and menaces they withstood with great firmness and constancy; but their virtue was not proof against caresses, promises, and the large sums that were offered them. To these they yielded, and, upon their yielding, they were set at liberty, and allowed to pursue their journey to Constantinople, where they were received with the greatest marks of kindness and esteem both by Acacius and Zeno. The former immediately challenged their promise, and, finding them disposed to perform it, that is, to communicate with Mongus and himself, he appointed them, and likewise the apocrisarii, or nuncios of Mongus, to attend him the very next day at his habitation, in order to proceed together from thence to the great church, and there, in token of an entire reconciliation, celebrate together in common the sacred mysteries. To this the legates readily agreed; but it was no sooner known that they had, than some monks and presbyters, the avowed enemies of the two bishops, flew to the house where the legates were lodged, to divert them, if possible, from so scandalous a resolution, which, they said, would reflect an eternal ignominy on their memory, and be in the end unavoidably attended with the utter ruin of the catholic cause in the east. But the legates were determined to earn the promised sums; and therefore, knowing upon what errand these importunate zealots were come, they could by no means be prevailed upon to hear, or even to see them.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1201, 1202.
[2] Concil. ibid. Evagr. l. 3. c. 18. Theoph. p. 113, 114.

The monks and presbyters attempted, by all the stratagems their zeal could suggest, to gain admittance; but, their stratagems proving all unsuccessful with persons come from Rome, they wrote a note, reproaching them, in the sharpest terms, with their scandalous conduct: and of that note, they conveyed one copy to them in a basket of herbs, another in a book, and a third they had the boldness to fasten with a hook to the garment of one of the legates, while they were attending Acacius in the public procession. For the next day the legates met Acacius at the episcopal palace, agreeably to their appointment; and from thence attended him, with the apocrisarii of Mongus, in procession to the great church; which was a kind of triumph for the bishop of Constantinople. Divine service was performed with the greatest solemnity, in the presence of a numberless multitude; Acacius officiated: the name of Mongus was rehearsed aloud in the diptychs; and the legates received the eucharist with the apocrisarii; which was communicating with them in the strictest sense, and consequently with Mongus as lawful bishop.[1]

The pope was soon acquainted with the conduct of his legates. Cyril, abbot of a monastery in Constantinople, who from the beginning had opposed the union of the two parties, immediately despatched Symeon, one of his monks, to inform Felix of what had passed. The legates themselves arrived soon after (for they made but a very short stay at Constantinople), and brought with them two letters for the pope, the one from Acacius, and the other from the emperor. The former owned, in his letter, that he communicated with Mongus, whom he maintained to be lawful bishop of Alexandria, John Talaia having, by a sacrilegious violation of his oath, rendered himself unworthy of that dignity. The emperor urged the same crime in his letter; and begged the pope would give himself no trouble about a man of that character, which, he told him, was absolutely to no purpose. As to Mongus, he assured him, that his faith was orthodox; that, after the strictest examination, it had been found to be orthodox; and that he had not been acknowledged either by Acacius or himself, for bishop of Alexandria, till he had signed the definitions of Nice, to which those of Chalcedon were entirely agreeable.[2]

The pope received the letters; but Symeon had so prejudiced him against the legates, that he would not admit them to his presence, till he had assembled a council; which, after hearing them, and those who accused them, might, together with him, judge of their conduct. A council was assembled accordingly, consisting of sixty-seven Italian bishops; and

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1082—1084. Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 20, 21. Theoph. p. 114.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 1082. Evagr. l. 3. c. 20. Liberat. c. 18.

Mongus excommunicated anew by the pope. Articles of the charge brought against Acacius. The western bishops had no power over the bishop of Constantinople. Acacius judged and deposed, by the pope, and his council.

before them Misenus and Vitalis were arraigned, and convicted of having communicated with Acacius and Mongus, to the great prejudice of the catholic cause in the east. As they had acted therein in direct opposition to their instructions, and the positive orders received from the pope, they were, for their disobedience, and the countenance they had given to the "Eutychian heresy," declared unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and at the same time excluded from the participation of the sacred mysteries, so long as the see of Alexandria should be held by an heretical bishop.[1](*)

The legates being thus condemned, the council, in the next place, excommunicated Mongus anew; for he had been already excommunicated by Simplicius; and, at the same time, declared, that the Roman church never had, nor ever would own him for lawful bishop, because he had been ordained by heretics, and therefore ought to be forever debarred from governing a catholic church.[2]

But the most notable feat performed by this council, and which has rendered it famous in the annals of the church, was the trial and condemnation of the bishop of Constantinople. That prelate had greatly provoked the bishops of Rome, and plainly shown, by his late conduct, that he made no account of the boasted power of the throne of St. Peter. He had excommunicated Mongus as a man unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and even of the name of a Christian; and persuaded Simplicius to pronounce the same sentence against him: yet, upon his being afterwards reconciled with him, he not only absolved him, by his own authority alone, but raised him, by his interest, to the second see in the east, without so much as acquainting the pope with such a design, either before or after it was put in execution. He had undertaken to unite the two parties, and with that view dictated to the emperor the "henoticon," or "decree of union;" caused it to be published in the emperor's name; obliged all bishops to sign it; persecuted the ecclesiastics, and drove from their sees the bishops, who did not receive it; and all this without thinking it necessary to consult the pope in an affair of such importance, or even deigning to return an answer to the many letters, to the repeated declarations, remonstrances, and protestations of Felix himself, and his predecessor Simplicius, against it. Of the summons requiring him to answer the petition of Talaia, and clear himself, before St. Peter, from the things laid there to his charge, he took no more notice than if it had never been issued; which was interpreted by the pope as a mark of the greatest contempt. He had by an open violation of the canons forbidding bishops to meddle with the affairs of another diocese, or to exercise there any kind of power, authority, or jurisdiction, ordained Codonatus, bishop of Tyre, subject to the see of Antioch; and not only restored, but raised to the priesthood, a deacon, named Hymerius, whom that patriarch had formerly deposed. To all this was added the treatment, which the legates had met with, the violence that was offered them, and their prevarication in communicating with a man anathematized by the apostolic see, which was by them chiefly ascribed to Acacius.

These were the heads or articles, upon which a council, consisting only of sixty-seven bishops, all of Italy, and most of them, if not all, immediately subject to the pope, took upon them to try the patriarch of Constantinople, though they could not but know (for I can hardly suppose them to have been to such a degree unacquainted with the laws and practice of the church), that they had no kind of authority over him. When Chrysostom, one of the predecessors of Acacius, was summoned, by Theophilus of Alexandria, to appear before a council, consisting chiefly of Egyptian bishops, he paid no sort of regard to that summons, alleging, that, "agreeably to the canons, the affairs of the provinces were to be regulated by the bishops of the provinces; and consequently, that it was very incongruous the bishops of Thrace should be judged by those of Egypt."[1] And was it not still more incongruous, that the first bishop of the east should be judged by those of Italy? The Egyptians, finding Chrysostom did not appear, tried him nevertheless, and condemned him. But of their sentence the bishop of Constantinople made no more account than he had done of their summons, urging the same reason, that the bishops of one diocess had no power over those of another; that the bishops of Thrace were not to be judged by those of Egypt. From those of Egypt therefore he appealed to a general council, which was plainly declaring that he acknowledged no other superior power. Of this appeal pope Innocent approved; nay, and did all that lay in his power to procure the assembling of a council. He was Chrysostom's great friend; he was fully convinced of his innocence: and yet he did not take upon him to judge his cause himself, and declare him innocent; which it cannot be doubted but he would have done, especially when he found that the emperor would not hear of a council, had he believed such a power to be vested in him, or any assembly of western bishops, however numerous.

The above-mentioned articles being read to

[1] Concil. ibid. Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 20.

(*) Vitalis died about the year 495, of a sudden death; and in the same year Misenus was restored by pope Gelasius, both to the communion of the church, and his rank, though the see of Alexandria was then, and many years after, held by bishops whom Rome styled heretics. (a)

(a) Concil. ibid. p. 1272.

[2] Concil. ibid. p. 1083. Evagr. l. 3. c. 21.

[1] Pallad. dial. 2.

The deposing of Acasius; the boldest attempt the popes had yet made. Felix despatches Tutus to Constantinople, to acquaint Acacius with the sentence; who gets safe to that city. The sentence, how notified to Acacius.

the council, and proved by Acacius's own letters, as well as by the deposition of the legates, and the monks, sent for that purpose, by their abbots, from Constantinople, the bishops, who composed that assembly, were all of opinion, for such was the opinion of the pope, that Acacius deserved to be condemned, anathematized, and deposed. Hereupon an act was drawn up, in the nature of a letter, addressed to Acacius in the name of Felix alone, but signed by the sixty-seven bishops of the council. In that act or letter the pope upbraids the bishop of Constantinople with his past conduct; repeats and exaggerates every article of the charge; and concludes thus: "undergo therefore, by the present sentence, the lot of those whom you are so inclined to favor; and know, that you are deposed from the episcopal dignity, deprived of the catholic communion, cut off from the number of the faithful; that you have no longer the name, nor the power, of a bishop, having been condemned by the Holy Ghost, and the apostolic authority; and that you can never be loosened from the bond of the present anathema."[1] In the same council another act, or decree, as Evagrius styles it, was made in the pope's name, importing, in a few words, for it was designed to be set up in all public places both at Rome and Constantinople, that Acacius had been deposed by the sentence of Heaven, for slighting the monitory letters that had been sent him, and imprisoning the pope in the person of his legates. All bishops therefore, ecclesiastics, monks, and laymen, were warned by Felix, "bishop of the holy catholic church of the city of Rome," not to communicate with the said Acacius late bishop of Constantinople, on pain of being anathematized, and punished by the Holy Ghost, who would not fail to execute the sentence "S. Spiritu exequente."[2] This was the boldest attempt the popes had yet made. They had indeed assumed, and were daily exercising, as we have seen, a kind of "supremacy," or absolute authority, over the bishops of Italy, Gaul, and Spain; and had long since attempted to bring all Africa under subjection. But with the eastern bishops they had hitherto used great caution and reserve, contenting themselves, let the provocation be ever so great, to deny them communion, which every other bishop had a power to do. Thus when the legates of Innocent were not only imprisoned, but treated with the utmost barbarity by Atticus, then bishop of Constantinople;[3] that pope no otherwise resented the many outrages offered to him in the person of his legates, than by separating himself from the communion of those, to whom he ascribed them. Had Innocent thought himself vested with any kind of power or authority over the bishop of Constantinople, he was not a man to have let it lie dormant on such an occasion.

The above-mentioned sentence, or letter to Acacius, is dated the 28th of July; and a few days after Felix wrote to the emperor, to the clergy of Constantinople, and to the ecclesiastics and monks of the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, acquainting them with the judgment that had been given by the church against Acacius and Mongus, as if he and a few Italian bishops were the whole church; exhorting them to submit to her sacred laws; and, at the same time, letting them know, that they must either renounce the communion of Peter Mongus, or that of the apostle St. Peter.[1] With these letters the pope did not choose to despatch legates into the east, not doubting but they would meet with the same treatment as Vitalis and Misenus had lately done, if not worse; and, besides, the emperor, to prevent the disturbances which he apprehended the pope would strive, by his emissaries, to raise in Constantinople, where all things were quiet, had ordered the avenues to that city, both by sea and land, to be narrowly guarded, and all persons, who could not give a satisfactory account of themselves, to be arrested, and their papers, if any should be found upon them, to be seized, and immediately conveyed to himself, or Acacius. Of this order intelligence was soon given by the monks to the pope, who thereupon chose an ancient clergyman of the Roman church, named Tutus, who was well acquainted with the roads, as the most proper person to execute so dangerous a commission. Tutus readily accepted it, and, having every where escaped, with great address, the vigilance of the guards, he arrived safe and undiscovered at Constantinople. But now, apprehending the danger that would probably attend his delivering to Acacius the letter, with which he was charged, he applied to the monks, who in all desperate attempts were the forlorn hope of their party. And indeed they acted as such, on the present occasion: for taking upon themselves to acquaint the bishop of Constantinople with his condemnation, they fastened the pope's letter to his garment, while he was either celebrating, or entering the church to celebrate, the sacred mysteries. This occasioned, according to Nicephorus,[2] a great tumult, in which several monks were killed, and several wounded, by the friends of Acacius. But of this tumult no notice is taken by Liberatus, who lived the nearest to those times, and began to write about the year 460. Neither did Felix, or any of his successors, ever reproach the bishop of Constantinople with the murder of those monks, though, to blacken his character, they did not even scruple to charge him with crimes which he had never committed. Baronius however has allotted a place to the

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1072, 1073. Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 21.
[2] Concil ibid. p. 1083. Evagr. ibid. [3] See p. 136.

[1] Conc. t. 4. p. 1083—1088. [2] Niceph. l. 16. c. 17.

Tutus gained over by Acacius, communicates with him. He is excommunicated on his return to Rome. Acacius, in his turn, excommunicates the pope. An entire separation between the east and the west. What induced the eastern bishops to side with Acacius. The pope the author and cause of this schism.

supposed martyrs in the calender of saints; and their pretended relics are exposed in several places, to public worship, on the 8th of February.[1] Acacius gave himself no trouble about the monks; but being soon informed, that the pope's letter had been brought by Tutus, he resolved to put his constancy to the same trial as he had lately done that of the legates. He recollected, that they had withstood his threats, but yielded as soon as money was offered them; and thence concluding the offer of money to be the proper bait for the Roman clergy, he caused, in the first place, a considerable sum to be privately promised to Tutus, on condition that he would communicate with him. There was no occasion for any other trial; the old priest yielded at once; agreed to the proposal, and communicated with Acacius, though he had still fresh in his memory the severe sentence against the legates, and could not doubt but the like sentence waited him. But present advantage blinds and hardens men, generally speaking, against all the terrors of a future punishment. The fall of Tutus, joined to that of the legates, mortified the friends, and afforded new matter of triumph to the enemies of the Roman see. The monks took care to acquaint the pope immediately with it. They even found means to get into their possession the very letter which Tutus wrote to Acacius, when he agreed to his proposal. That letter they conveyed to Rome; and the unhappy clergyman, upon his return, was anathematized as a traitor to God, and the apostolic see, and for ever excluded from the participation of the sacred mysteries, that is, of the eucharist.[2]

The pope's letter having been conveyed to Acacius, in the manner I have related, that prelate expressed in perusing it, for he read it as soon as the service was ended, more surprise at the unprecedented boldness of the bishop of Rome, than concern at the sentence it contained. He knew that the pope had no sort of power or authority over him; and therefore to show how little he valued his communion, or feared his anathemas, he in his turn anathematized him, cut him off from his communion, and ordered his name to be struck out of the diptychs. The conduct of Acacius was approved not only by the emperor, and the whole church of Constantinople, three abbots excepted, and some of their monks, but by almost all the bishops in the east, even by Andreas of Thessalonica, at that time the pope's vicar for east Illyricum. They all joined Acacius, and together with him, separated themselves from the communion of the pope, and of such as communicated with him, that is, of all their brethren in the west.[3] Such was the rise, and such the occasion, of the first general schism, a schism that continued for the space of thirty-five years, between the east and the west, between the Latin and Greek churches. I will not take upon me to justify Acacius, nor to examine here how far he was guilty; but only observe, that had he been undeniably guilty of every article contained in the charge brought against him, it did not belong to the pope, and a few Italian bishops, entirely at his beck and devotion, to try, condemn, and depose the first bishop in the east. This could only be lawfully done by a general council; and the pope's having presumed to do it, by his own authority, was the chief plea of the eastern bishops for separating themselves from his communion, and joining Acacius. They did not all approve of the past conduct of that prelate; and many among them, had an oecumenical council been called, would have probably voted against him. But to acknowledge him to have been lawfully condemned and deposed, when condemned and deposed only by the pope, and his council, had been acknowledging in the pope a supreme and uncontrolled authority over all the bishops of the earth, and subjecting the whole church to the arbitrary will of one man. It was chiefly on this consideration, that they sided with Acacius, as appears from the letters of the popes themselves,[1] who therefore ought not to have reproached those prelates, as they frequently did, with preferring the friendship of Acacius, and the favor of Zeno, to the communion of the apostolic see; since it was not to gain the favor or friendship of either, but to defeat the most bold, illegal, and dangerous attempt, that had been yet made by the apostolic see, that they joined in the present dispute the bishop of Constantinople. In short, matters were now, by the rashness of Felix, brought to a crisis. The eastern bishops found themselves reduced to the necessity of living subject to, or separated from, the Roman see) for Felix had excommunicated all, who, after his sentence, should communicate with Acacius); and they chose the latter.

From what has been said it is manifest, that the present schism, and the evils attending it, ought, in justice, to be charged to the account of the pope alone, notwithstanding the incredible pains which the Roman catholic writers have all taken to clear him, and lay the whole blame on the Greeks. For it was he who separated himself the first from their communion, and separated himself from it, because they would not submit to a judgment which he had given, and they apprehended to be, as it undoubtedly was, inconsistent with their liberties, as well as the known laws and practice of the church. As for the arguments in favor of the papal supremacy, founded on the excommunication and deposition of the

[1] Bar. Martyr. 8 Feb.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1085, 1086. Liberat. c. 18. Theoph. p. 114. Evagr. l. 3. c. 18.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 1092. Facund. in Mocian. p. 565. Liberat. c. 18.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1199.

The pope deposing the bishop of Constantinople no argument of his supremacy. Not looked upon as such by the popes themselves. No power exercised by them but what they pretended to be common to all bishops. All the bishops in the east renounce the communion of Rome; [Year of Christ, 485.]

bishop of Constantinople, they are quite frivolous, and scarce worthy of notice, though displayed with great pomp and flourish of words by Baronius, and the other Roman catholic writers. For, 1. As Felix excommunicated and deposed Acacius, so did Acacius, in his turn, excommunicate and depose Felix. And why should the same sentence be an argument of supremacy in the one, and not in the other? 2. The Greeks paid no more regard to the sentence of the pope, than if it had been issued by the bishop of Eugubium, of Rhegium, or of Thanis.(*) And whether we may not conclude from thence, more agreeably to reason and good sense, that he had no kind of power over the bishop of Constantinople, than from his taking upon him to exercise such a power, that he really had it, I leave the reader to judge; and shall only observe, that if he was truly vested with an absolute and uncontrolled authority over all the bishops of the catholic church, it is very surprising, that the greater part of the bishops of the catholic church should have been, for the space of near five hundred years, utterly unacquainted with a truth which it was of the utmost importance for them to know. 3. Felix, it is true, excommunicated and deposed Acacius by the apostolic authority, that is, by the authority of the apostolic see, as the sticklers for the supremacy have taken care to observe. But he himself was soon sensible, that he had gone too far; and therefore, to remove the just umbrage which the Greeks, whom he did not expect to find so much upon their guard, had taken at such an extraordinary attempt, he declared, in a letter to Vetranio, an eminent prelate in those parts, and of no small interest at court, that it was not by his own authority he had excommunicated and deposed the bishop of Constantinople, but by the authority of the council of Chalcedon, excommunicating and deposing all who held, or communicated with those who held, the Eutychian doctrine;[1] which was plainly disowning what he had done, and resigning the authority he had assumed, when he found, that the Greeks had taken the alarm, and were determined not to acknowledge it. Had he thought himself vested with that extensive and unlimited power which his successors have claimed, he would not have failed to ascertain it at so critical a juncture. He would have let the Greeks know, as pope Eugenius did a thousand years after, that all patriarchs, and consequently all other bishops, must yield to his will;[1] and either have told them, in the words of Innocent III. that "the confirmation, translation, and deposition, of bishops, were reserved to the Roman pontiff, not so much by canonical constitution as by divine institution;"[2] or informed them, upon their pleading the liberties and independency of the Greek church, that "it was of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff," as was afterwards defined by pope Boniface VIII.[3] But such doctrines were yet unknown to the popes themselves, none of them being yet arrived at such a height of arrogance, or rather impiety, as to damn all who refused to submit to their sovereign will. Felix therefore, instead of maintaining the authority which the Greeks apprehended he had assumed; or pretending to any privilege, power, or jurisdiction, peculiar to him, or his see; took great pains to persuade his brethren in the east, that he had assumed none but what was common with him to all other bishops, all bishops being, as he often declared, equally empowered to cut off from the communion of the church such as communicated, in defiance of the laws of the church, with known and avowed heretics.[4] The like declaration was made, and in a more ample manner, by Gelasius, the immediate successor of Felix, in a kind of manifesto which he wrote on this subject, and addressed to the bishops of Dardania, as we shall see hereafter. To what straits and distress must the popish writers be reduced, since, to support the supremacy, they are forced to recur to facts which the popes themselves have declared to have no kind of connection with the supremacy!

And now to resume the thread of the history, all communion and correspondence between the east and the west being entirely broken off, the emperor, to maintain concord and unity among the bishops in his dominions, issued an order, commanding all, without distinction, to be deposed, as disturbers of the public peace, who should refuse to sign the henoticon, or to communicate with the most holy archbishops of Constantinople and Alexandria. With this order the far greater part readily complied; and the few who did not, were, pursuant to the emperor's order, deposed, driven from their sees, and sent into exile; insomuch that in the term of a few months there was not a single bishop to be found in the whole east, who had not written letters of communion to Mongus and Acacius, and thereby renounced the communion of Rome.

(*) The bishops of Eugubium, of Rhegium, and of Thanis, are instanced by St. Jerom as the lowest and the least considerable in the church; and yet are said, by the same father, to be equal (by their original institution, and abstracted from the ecclesiastical canons, and imperial laws) to the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria, all bishops being alike the successors of the apostles, who had no superiority over one another, and were commanded by our Saviour to affect none. "Wherever a bishop is," says Jerom, "whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, at Alexandria or Thanis, he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood. The power of wealth does not make a bishop higher, nor does the lowness of poverty make him lower; for they are all alike the successors of the apostles. (*a*)

(*a*) Hier. ep. 85.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1092, 1093.

[1] Concil. Flor. p. 484.

[2] Inn. III. in Gregor. Decret. l. 1. tit. 7. c. 2.

[3] Extrav. com. l. 1. tit. 8. c. 1.

[4] Concil. ibid.

Acacius dies, and Fravitas is chosen in his room; [Year of Christ, 489.] His election thought miraculous. Fravitas writes to the pope; who is satisfied with his letter; but requires the name of Acacius to be struck out of the diptychs. Fravitas dies; [Year of Christ, 490.] His supposed miraculous election, a mere imposture.

In this state matters continued, nothing worthy of notice happening either in the east or the west, till the year 489, when Acacius died, and Flavitas, or Fravitas, was chosen in his room. He was a presbyter of the church of St. Thecla, in Constantinople, and so renowned for what was then called sanctity, that Felix, though highly incensed against Zeno, could not forbear commending that prince for procuring the election of a man, whose faith, he said, was as orthodox, as his life was spotless.[1] His election was thought to have been miraculous. For the emperor, to prevent the disturbances which he apprehended would attend the election of a new bishop at so critical a juncture, caused a blank paper, sealed with his own seal, to be laid on the altar of one of the churches, and with it a writing, whereby he and the whole church of Constantinople bound themselves to choose the person, whose name should be found written on the blank paper. Both papers being deposited on the altar, the church was shut up, and the avenues to it carefully guarded night and day by bands of soldiers, relieving one another, all under the immediate command of Cosmus the great chamberlain; for the emperor would trust no other. A rigorous fast was enjoined, and strictly observed by the whole city, for the space of forty days; during which time, prayers were daily put up to the Almighty, that he would be pleased to direct his people in the choice of their pastor, and signify his will to them by one of his angels. When the forty days were expired, the paper was opened, with great solemnity, in the presence of the emperor, of the clergy, and of the whole city; and the name of Fravitas appearing on it, written, as was believed, with a heavenly hand, he was, with loud acclamations, proclaimed lawful bishop of the royal and holy city of Constantinople.[2] No one entertained the least suspicion of any cheat or imposture, miracles being now so frequently wrought, that men were no more surprised at a miraculous event, than at any common event or occurrence of life, nor more inclined to question the one than the other.

Fravitus answered, in appearance, the good opinion which all at Rome entertained of the purity of his faith. For he was no sooner ordained, than he wrote a flattering letter to the pope, begging his communion, and owning St. Peter to be the first of the apostles, to be the foundation stone of the true faith, and the pope to hold the faith which was held, taught, and preached, by that apostle. With this letter, and one from the emperor, recommending him to the pope in terms of the greatest esteem and affection, Fravitas despatched to Rome some ecclesiastics, and several monks in their retinue, who had distinguished themselves by their attachment to the Roman see, and the doctrine of Chalcedon. On their arrival at Rome, they were received by that church with the greatest demonstrations of joy; Felix was fully satisfied with the letters they brought; and nothing now seemed to remain, that could obstruct an entire reconciliation between the two churches. But while the pope was upon the point of concluding it, by admitting Fravitas to his communion, he unluckily bethought himself to ask the deputies, whether the new bishop had yet erased, or had engaged to erase, the name of Acacius out of the diptychs. This demand surprised the deputies; for, to require the bishop of Constantinople to strike the name of his predecessor out of the diptychs, was requiring him to own, that he had been lawfully deposed, which, they knew, the eastern bishops would never allow. The only answer, therefore they returned to the pope was, that they had no instructions concerning that point; and indeed Fravitas had given them none: Felix strove to convince them of the reasonableness of his demand; but finding they industriously avoided either approving or disapproving it, he dismissed them, without admitting the new bishop to his communion; and immediately wrote both to him and the emperor, acquainting them with the motives that induced him to insist on the name of Acacius being put out of the roll of lawful bishops, as an indispensable preliminary to the proposed and wished for union between the two sees.[1]

These letters Felix delivered to the deputies, who immediately set out with them for Constantinople. But before they reached that city, Fravitas died; and, at his death, it appeared that neither was his life so spotless, nor his faith so pure and orthodox, as the pope had believed, and indeed the rest of the world; nay, even those who had most extolled his sanctity, were soon convinced, and, to their great mortification, forced to own, that he was an arrant hypocrite, that his holiness was all counterfeit, and, what gave no small concern to the emperor, and the whole city, that the supposed miracle, which they had all believed, was a mere imposture. For his death was no sooner known, than some usurers began to sue his heirs for very considerable sums. The cause was brought before the emperor, who, finding such exorbitant sums had been all borrowed by Fravitas during the vacancy of the see, began to suspect some simoniacal practice. To discover the truth, therefore, he ordered the heirs of the deceased bishop to be put to the rack; when they owned, that the money was borrowed to bribe the great chamberlain, who, as soon as he received it, opened the paper, wrote on it the name of Fravitas, and then

[1] Liberat. c. 18. Concil. t. 4. p. 1086. Niceph. chron.
[2] Niceph. l. 16. c. 18.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1087. 1091.

Euphemius chosen in the room of Fravitas. He writes to the pope; who insists on his erasing the name of Acacius. Mongus dies, and Athanasius is chosen in his room. Three different parties in the church. Zeno dies, and Anastasius is chosen to succeed him.—[Year of Christ, 491.] Anastasius promises to take the council of Chalcedon for the rules of his faith.

sealed it again with the imperial seal.[1] Hereupon the emperor, provoked beyond expression, in finding he had been thus imposed upon, caused the chamberlain to be immediately executed, and the creditors of Fravitas to be paid out of his confiscated estate.[2] Had this impostor lived long enough to repay the borrowed sums, and not died, as he did, three or four months after his election, what a glorious figure would so remarkable a miracle have made in his legend! For it is not to be doubted, but his spotless life, his miraculous election, and his flattering letter to the pope, would have procured him a place in the calendar of saints, and a suitable legend.

Fravitas was succeeded by Euphemius, a man of an unblemished character, of eminent piety, great learning, and a most zealous defender of the catholic faith.[3] The sincere desire he had of seeing concord and unity reign in the church, prompted him, as soon as he was ordained, to replace, in the diptychs, the name of Felix, which had been struck out by Acacius; to transmit to Rome a confession of his faith, and to beg the pope, as he tendered the welfare of the catholic church, to admit him to his communion, and by that means put an end to so dangerous a schism. Felix received his letter, owned his faith to be truly orthodox; but peremptorily refused to communicate with him, or his church, so long as the names of Acacius, whom he had deposed, and Fravitas, whom he had not acknowledged, were kept in the diptychs. The name of the former, Euphemius could not erase, without allowing him to have been lawfully deposed; nor that of the latter, without owning him to have been no lawful bishop, because he had not been yet acknowledged as such by the pope. The good prelate therefore, aware of the dangerous consequences that might be drawn from his granting either, and not thinking the communion of Rome worth purchasing at so dear a rate, forbore, so long as Felix lived, all farther attempts towards a reconciliation between the two sees.[4]

In the mean time died Petrus Mongus of Alexandria, and in his room was chosen Athanasius, presbyter of that church, and a most zealous stickler for the doctrine of Eutyches. Euphemius therefore separated himself from his communion, and likewise from the communion of Palladius, who had been lately chosen bishop of Antioch, and, at his installation, had publicly anathematized the council of Chalcedon.[5] Thus was the whole church divided into three different parties or factions. The Egyptians, with their patriarch, formed one; the bishops of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, under the patriarch of Constantinople, another; and the western bishops, with the pope at their head, a third. The Egyptians professed the Eutychian doctrine, anathematized the council of Chalcedon, the definitions of that council, and all who received them. The other bishops in the east, except the patriarch of Antioch, and some orientals, who sided with the Egyptians, received the henoticon, and many among them, in which number was Euphemius himself, the decree of Chalcedon, establishing two natures in Christ. The bishop of Rome therefore, and his brethren in the west, entirely agreed, in point of doctrine and faith, with the bishop of Constantinople and those of his party; and the only subject of the quarrel between them was, whether the name of Acacius (for that of Fravitas was soon dropped) should be kept in, or struck out of the diptychs. Euphemius could not strike it out, without disobliging the emperor, and the far greater part of the catholic bishops; and his disobliging them would have occasioned a schism or division among the catholics themselves, more prejudicial, in the present circumstances, to their cause, than a rupture with Rome. On the other hand, the pope was inflexible, and peremptorily required the name of Acacius to be erased before he would communicate with the bishop of Constantinople, or any of his party, let the consequences be what they would. Perhaps he was not sufficiently apprized of the state of affairs in the east; but if he was not, Euphemius was; and therefore apprehending greater evils from his communicating with Rome, upon the pope's terms, than could possibly arise from his continuing out of that communion, he remained satisfied with having done what, in common charity, he thought himself bound to do, in order to gain it.

In the height of these disturbances and divisions died the emperor Zeno, in the beginning of April, 491; and on the 11th of the same month Anastasius was chosen to succeed him, chiefly by the interest of Ariadne, the deceased emperor's widow, whom he had promised to marry, and married accordingly, the very day after his accession. Euphemius, suspected his orthodoxy, and, with a great deal of reason, opposed his promotion, to the utmost of his power; nor could he be prevailed upon by the empress, and the senate, to approve of their choice, till Anastasius delivered to him a confession of faith, under his hand, entirely orthodox, and besides, promised upon oath, to take the council of Chalcedon for the rule of his belief.[1] The patriarch had the populace on his side, by whom he was greatly beloved, and revered: Longinus, the late em-

[1] Niceph. l. 16. c. 18. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Evagr. l. 3. c. 23. Niceph. chron. Theophan. p. 115.
[4] Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 23. Theoph. p. 16. Concil. t. 4. p. 1154.
[5] Liberat. c. 18. Evagr. l. 3. c. 23.

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 29. Theodor. Lect. p. 558.

Anastasius allows liberty of conscience to Christians of all denominations. Felix writes to Anastasius. Felix dies—[Year of Christ, 492.] His character. He is sainted. His letter to the African bishops. The unreasonable rigor of the church discipline.

peror's brother, claimed the crown as his right; and Anastasius had not yet even attained to the rank of a senator, but was only one of the great chamberlain's officers. It was not therefore, in these circumstances, thought advisable to disoblige so popular a man, by reminding him of his duty, and letting him know, that state affairs were foreign to his ministry, that he was to receive and obey the person whom the senate chose, and not take upon him to direct them whom they should choose, or whom they should not. Had Euphemius been bishop of Rome, his refusing to consent to the election of the person, whom the senate had agreed to raise to the empire, till he had examined his faith, and found it orthodox, would have supplied Baronius and Bellarmine with ample matter for descants on the temporal power of the popes; I mean the power of setting up kings, and pulling them down at their pleasure, which the popes have, in the latter times, most boldly asserted. But of such a power in them not the least footstep has yet appeared, though occasions have not been wanting, on which it seasonably might, and even ought to have been exerted, for the good of the church, and the catholic cause.

Anastasius was himself strongly inclined to the doctrine of Eutyches; but nevertheless began his reign with granting liberty of conscience to all his subjects; it being unworthy of a Christian emperor, as he declared in his edict for toleration, to trouble or persecute any who, together with him, adored Christ. Thus he hoped to put an end to all disputes, and see peace restored, in his days, to the church and the state.[1] But the bishops, who received the council of Chalcedon, refusing to communicate with their brethren, who did not, and such as did not, with those who did, the emperor found himself obliged to forbid all bishops, on pain of deposition and exile, to declare for or against that council. Thus both parties were silenced; but yet they would not communicate with one another, nor would the pope communicate with either; so that they were still enemies to each other in their hearts, though restrained from open hostilities, by the fear of losing their sees.

Felix was no sooner informed of the death of Zeno, and the promotion of Anastasius, than he wrote to the new emperor, to congratulate him on his accession to the crown; for he did not doubt, as he expressed himself in his letter, but the authority of so religious a prince would prove as advantageous to the church, and the true faith, as that of his predecessor had been prejudicial to both.[2] Of this letter the emperor took no notice. But Felix did not live long enough to know what reception it met with. He died in the latter end of this, or the very beginning of the following year, 492, having governed the Roman church nine years, wanting some days.[1] He may be said to have exceeded in pride, arrogance, and presumption, all who went before him; at least he attempted what none of them had dared to attempt, not Leo himself, who, in the quarrel between him and Anatolius, one of the predecessors of Acacius, only threatened to separate himself from the communion of that prelate; which was indeed all the canons of the church allowed him to do. But Felix, more bold and enterprising, carried his resentment and revenge to the height we have seen, in open defiance of the ecclesiastic, as well as the imperial laws. I say, his "resentment and revenge;" for it was not out of any zeal for the faith, or the church, that he took upon him to excommunicate and depose the bishop of Constantinople, but merely to be revenged on him, as the Greeks well observed, for the contempt he had betrayed, on several occasions, for the bishop of Rome, and his see.[2] Had he had any real concern for the welfare of the church, nothing would have tempted him to take such an unwarrantable and unprecedented step; for he could not but foresee the dreadful evils that would inevitably attend it. He foresaw them; but, apprehending the dignity of his see to be at stake, and the want of that deference and respect, which he claimed as due to St. Peter, that is, to himself, to be a greater evil than any thing that could befal the church, he pursued his revenge, at all events, and thereby gave rise to the present long and dangerous schism. Such a conduct, we may be sure, entitled him to a place among the saints; and he is now accordingly worshipped as a saint, having deserved well of the apostolic see, how ill soever he may have deserved of the church.

Besides the letters of Felix, which I have already taken notice of, there is one from that pope, dated the 15th of March, 488, concerning those, who, during the Vandalic persecution in Africa, had suffered themselves to be baptized, or rebaptized, by the Arians. From the regulations contained in that letter, the reader may judge of the unreasonable, not to say antichristian rigor of the church discipline in those times. For the pope there requires the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, who had consented to be rebaptized, though forced by the violence of torments, to do public penance so long as they lived; reduces them to lay-communion,(*) and that to be adminis-

[1] Idem ibid. c. 31.

[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1268.

[1] Marcell. chron. Vide Bolland. 25. Feb. p. 508. et Apr. t. 1. p. 34.

[2] Concil. ibid. p. 1198.

(*) There are three different opinions concerning the meaning of that word. Lay-communion was, according to some, communicating among the laymen after the clergy, and without the rails of the chancel. But lay-communion was administered to degraded clergymen in private houses, and on their death-beds, where there could be no room for such a distinction; and consequently lay-communion must import some-

Different opinions concerning lay-communion.

tered only at the point of death; and excludes them forever from the prayers and assemblies of the faithful. As for the other ecclesiastics, and the monks, virgins and laymen, if they submitted, of their own accord, to be rebaptized, they are to atone for their crime by a twelve years public penance; but only by a three years penance, if they yielded by dint of torments; and to a three years penance the pope subjects those too, who had been rebaptized, not only against their will, but even without their knowledge; for it was customary with the Arians to rebaptize the catholics before they were aware, and often

thing besides that distinction. Others therefore are of opinion that to reduce a clergyman to lay-communion, was divesting him of all the power which he had received by his ordination, and reducing him to the state and condition of a layman. This seems to have been the opinion of all the ancient councils and fathers; for they all speak of the ecclesiastics, who were only admitted to lay-communion, as mere laymen, and as incapable of performing any episcopal or sacerdotal functions, as if they had never been ordained. The greater part of the Roman catholic divines allow (and this is the third opinion) lay-communion to import degradation; but then by degradation they mean no more than the suspending of a bishop or a priest from the functions of his ministery. For though the church may, according to them, grant or deny the episcopal or sacerdotal power to whom she pleases, yet she can never revoke it, when once granted. Thus, should a bishop or a priest be guilty of the most enormous crimes; should he for his wickedness be degraded, anathematized, and even cast out of the congregation of the faithful; nay, should he abjure Christ, and the Christian religion, and embrace the Jewish, Mohamedan, or pagan superstition; he would, in spite of the church, and all her anathemas, still retain the power she has given him, still continue to be a Christian bishop or priest, though no more a Christian; and might even ordain, confirm, absolve, consecrate, and perform all the other functions of the episcopal or sacerdotal office, as effectually as the pope himself. This doctrine, however repugnant to common sense, and the practice of the catholic church in all ages preceding the councils of Florence and Trent, necessarily follows the definitions of those two councils concerning the indelible character, which was by them thought a matter of such consequence as to be made an article of faith. (a) By this "character" is meant a real quality, sign, mark, or seal, produced, and imprinted in the soul of a bishop or priest at his ordination, which can by no power upon earth be ever effaced, and is inseparably connected with all episcopal or priestly authority. But that the ancients were all utter strangers to such a character, has been, I may say, demonstrated by several protestant writers; (b) and therefore I shall only observe here, that the present doctrine of the church of Rome, concerning her "indelible character," is evidently inconsistent with the doctrine of the most revered council that was ever held in the church, that of Nice: for by that council it was decreed, that such bishops or presbyters, as had been ordained by a degraded bishop, Meletius of Lycopolis, in Egypt, should not be admitted to serve the church either as bishops or presbyters, till they had been re-ordained. (c) And was not this plainly declaring orders conferred by a degraded bishop to be void and null, and consequently such a bishop to be absolutely divested of all episcopal power and authority? In compliance with this decree, and the directions of the council in their synodical letter to the church of Alexandria, Theodore, bishop of Oxyrinchus, re-ordained all the Meletian presbyters, who returned to the church, without any kind of regard to their former pretended ordination. (d) Neither he therefore, nor they, knew anything of an "indelible character inseparably connected with all episcopal power and authority;" but believe those, whom the church had deposed for their misdemeanors, to be absolutely divested of all the power and authority they had before. And indeed, that a man should be deposed from his office, and yet retain all the power belonging to his office, is so repugnant to reason and common sense, that it is surprising the church of Rome should ever have adopted such a notion.

However, the ancients acknowledged, it must be owned, some kind of distinction between a deposed ecclesiastic, and a mere layman: but that distinction they did not place in any spiritual "mark" or "character" in the soul of the one, and not of the other; nor in any power which the one had, and the other had not; but in this alone, that the ecclesiastic had been once, by the outward form of ordination, or imposition of hands, destined to the sacred ministry; and therefore was qualified to officiate again without a new ordination, should the church think fit to recall him to his office. But this qualification the layman wanted, who had never been commissioned by the church to exercise any spiritual office or function. Ordination, though a transient act, qualifies a man, so long as he lives, to perform all sarcerdotal or episcopal functions, and therefore needs never be repeated. But a man may be qualified for an office, and at the same time have no more of the power belonging to that office, than if he were not qualified for it. The distinction which the ancients acknowledged between a deposed clergyman, and a mere layman, cannot be better illustrated and explained, than by that which they allowed between an apostate Christian, and a mere Jew or pagan. An apostate from the Christian religion to the Jewish or pagan superstition cannot be called, properly speaking, a Christian, is not a member of the Christian church, nor has he any right to the common privileges of a Christian, so long as he continues in his apostacy. But still, in virtue of his baptism, he is qualified, according to the doctrine of the ancients, to be admitted to the communion of the church, after the greatest apostacy, without a new baptism; and this qualification a mere Jew or pagan has not. In like manner a deposed priest or bishop cannot be called, in propriety of speaking, a priest or bishop; does not belong to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, nor has he the power and authority of his former office more than a layman. But nevertheless, he is qualified, in virtue of his past ordination, to perform all the functions of the ministry, when it shall please the church to restore him to his rank and dignity. That qualification a layman wants, who has never been ordained; and in that alone does the difference consist between him and a degraded clergyman.

To conclude, if it is heresy, as has been defined by the church of Rome, to say, that "a clergyman may cease to be a clergyman, and become again a layman;" that "a man who is a priest or a bishop today, may be a layman to-morrow;" all the ancient councils were guilty of heresy. For by them a degraded clergyman is said to be "turned out of office; (a) to be totally deposed; (b) to fall totally from his order; (c) to be unordained [deordinatur]; (d) to be removed out of the order of the clergy; (e) to cease to be of the number of the clergy;" (f) The last is the expression of the council of Nice; and to the champions of the "indelible character" I leave the task of reconciling a man's "ceasing to be of the number of the clergy," and his being still a clergyman.

As to Bellarmine's opinion, understanding by lay-communion, communion in one kind only, (g) it is scarce worthy of notice; nothing being more certain than that clergymen were, by the censures of the church, reduced to lay-communion, when the laity communicated in both kinds: that is owned by almost all the other Roman catholic writers, who indeed seem to have been quite ashamed of Bellarmine's ignorance. (h)

(a) Concil. Flor. in Instruct. Armen. et Trident. Sess. 7. Can. 9.

(b) See Chemnit. Exam. Concil. Trid. part. 2. p. 25. Rivet. Cath. Orthodox. Bellarmin. Enervat. t. 3. c. 5. Perkins Demonstrat. Problemat. p. 130. Alting. Theolog. Elenctica, p. 594. Calvin. Antidot. Concil. Trident. Sess. 7. Can. 9, &c.

(c) Epist. Synod. apud Socrat. l. 1. c. 9. & Theodor. l. 1. c. 9.

(d) Vide Vales. Not. in. Socrat. l. 1. c. 9.

(a) Concil. Carthag. 4. Can. 48.

(b) Concil. Antioch. Can. 5.

(c) Concil. Ephes. Can. 6.

(d) Apud Crab. Concil. t. 1. p. 318.

(e) Concil. Arelat. 1. Can. 13.

(f) Concil. Nicæn. Can. 2.

(g) Bellar. de Eucharist. l. 4. c. 24.

(h) Vide Cardinal. Bona de Reb. Liturg. l. 2. c. 19.

Gelasius chosen in the room of Felix. He writes to the emperor, but not to Euphemius. Euphemius writes to him, begging his communion. The pope insists on his erasing the name of Acacius.

while they were asleep: and what crime had those to expiate, who had been thus baptized? The pope concludes this remarkable letter with declaring those incapable of being ever admitted to the clerical order, who have been baptized, or rebaptized by heretics, whether that has been done with their consent and knowledge, or without either.[1]

Some style this pope Felix III. but I have shown elsewhere[2] the election of Felix, whom they call the second of that name, to have been null.

GELASIUS, FORTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANASTASIUS.]

In the room of Felix was chosen, after a vacancy of five days only, Gelasius, the son of one Valerius, by birth an African, according to some, and a Roman, according to others. Perhaps he was a native of Africa, but born a Roman, (for so he styles himself,[1]) in the sense St. Paul was a Roman, though born in Tarsus. He was no sooner installed, than he wrote a most respectful letter to Anastasius, to acquaint him with his promotion, and recommend to his protection the catholic church, and the faith of Chalcedon.[2] To this letter the emperor returned no answer: but Euphemius, to whom the new pope had not condescended to notify his election, as was customary, wrote to him the first a letter filled with the most tender expressions of affection and friendship, entreating him to pity the unhappy and distracted state of the church, by contributing, so far as in him lay, towards uniting in one communion those who were sincerely united in one faith. But at the same time he lets him know, that he must not think of having the name of Acacius struck out of the diptychs.[3] Either Gelasius did not answer this letter, or Euphemius, impatient to see the evils redressed that afflicted the church, wrote a second letter before the pope could answer his first, (for we know of no answer to the first). In the second letter Euphemius complains, but in the most friendly manner, of the pope, for not having acquainted him, according to the custom that obtained in the catholic church, with his promotion to the episcopal dignity; expresses a most earnest desire of seeing a perfect harmony re-established between the two sees; but assures his colleague in Christ, and begs he may be believed, that the people of Constantinople will never suffer the name of Acacius to be put out of the roll of their bishops. He adds, that Acacius had never been guilty of any heresy; that his faith had never been so much as suspected; that he had indeed communicated with Mongus, but not till Mongus had publicly abjured the errors with which he was charged; that Acacius had been tried, condemned, and deposed, without the concurrence, nay, and without the knowledge of his colleagues in the east, and consequently in defiance of the known laws and practice of the church. However, if the pope still insisted on his name being erased out of the sacred register, he advises him to write to the people of Constantinople, or to send legates into the east, capable of disposing them to consent to his request. He closes his letter with conjuring the pope to take the will of God alone for the rule of his conduct, without suffering himself to be swayed, in an affair of such infinite consequence, by any engagements he may apprehend his see to be under.[3]

This letter the pope answered in a most arrogant, imperious, and peremptory style, declaring, that so long as the name of Acacius was suffered to remain in the diptychs, he would, upon no consideration whatever, be reconciled to the church of Constantinople. He allows Acacius to have been no heretic; but nevertheless pretends, that he had forfeited his dignity by communicating with heretics; and lays it down as a general rule, that an excommunicated person infects such as communicate with him, and that such as communicate with him infect all who communicate with them. Upon this principle he peremptorily refuses to communicate with Euphemius, so long as he kept the name of Acacius in the diptychs, and thereby communicated with one who had excommunicated himself by communicating with an excommunicated person, meaning Mongus. He therefore tells Euphemius, that he must not look upon the letter he writes to him as a mark of communion, since he writes to him only as to a stranger, being absolutely determined to have no communion with those, who preferred the communion of heretics to that of St. Peter. As to his writing to the people of Constantinople, or sending legates into the east, he excuses himself from doing either, since it could not be expected, that those, who would not hearken to the voice of their own pastor, should obey the voice of a stranger.[4] This letter gave great concern to Euphemius. He had flattered himself, that the new pope might be more peaceably inclined than his predecessor, and that, as Acacius had not been ex-

[1] Gelas. Ep. 8. Concil. t. 4. p. 1182.
[2] Concil. ibid. p. 1168. [3] Concil. ibid. p. 1161.

[1] Concil t. 4. p. 1075—1077. [2] See p. 68.
[3] Concil. ibid. p. 1159—1161. [4] Concil ibid. p. 1162.

Euphemius refuses to comply with the pope's demand. [Year of Christ, 493;]—Gelasius writes to the eastern bishops. Strives to prove, that Acacius had been lawfully condemned. His answer to the reasons alleged by the Greeks to show, that he was not lawfully condemned.

communicated by him, he might connive at the small regard that was paid to his memory, the rather, as he had once deserved so well of the church and the faith, and had favored Mongus with no other view, but to gain him over to the catholic interest. But, to his great disappointment, he found Gelasius more obstinate than Felix himself, and more untractable, (acerbus, asper, nimis durus, difficilisque). Being therefore satisfied, that he could by no other means procure a peace with Rome, but by kindling a war in Constantinople, and dividing the catholics there among themselves, which he very justly called incurring a greater evil to avoid a less, he despaired of seeing an end put to the schism in his days, and wrote no more.

The following year, 493, Theodoric, the new king of Italy,(*) having despatched a solemn embassy to Constantinople, at the head of which were Festus, or Faustus, and Irenæus, both Romans of the first rank, and distinguished with the title of illustrious, Gelasius took that opportunity to write a long letter, addressed to all the bishops of the eastern empire, whom he styles, in the address, his beloved brethren, but strives, in the letter, to convince them, that they are all heretics, and all alike excommunicated. The chief purpose and design of this piece was, to answer the reasons alleged by the Greeks to show, that Acacius had not been lawfully deposed, and consequently that it was very uncharitable in the pope, with whom they agreed in all points of faith, to insist on their omitting his name in the list of bishops, as a term of communion. Their reasons the pope reduces to the three following heads: 1. That it did not belong to him, but to a general council, to judge, condemn, and depose the bishop of Constantinople. 2. That Acacius was neither a heretic, nor had he communicated with heretics condemned by the council of Chalcedon; since he had not admitted Mongus to his communion, till he had received the Henoticon, and thereby abjured the errors condemned by that council. 3. That to condemn, anathematize, and depose the bishop of Constantinople, however guilty, without thinking it at all necessary to consult his colleagues in the east, in an affair that so nearly concerned them, argued such a contempt in the pope for the Greeks in general, as nothing could justify or excuse. The first of these reasons Gelasius answers as his predecessor had done; namely, that he had only executed the sentence of the council of Chalcedon, excommunicating the Eutychians, and all who communicated with them; which, says he, was not arrogating to himself any particular or extraordinary power, but exercising that which was common to him with all other bishops. As nothing was more certain, than that Mongus had anathematized Eutyches, and all who held the same doctrine, before Acacius would admit him to his communion, the pope seems to have been greatly at a loss how to answer the second reason of the Greeks, how to maintain the former to have been a heretic, and the latter to have been excommunicated for communicating with him, even after he had, in the most solemn manner, renounced his heresy. After a long descant, therefore, on the dignity and pre-eminence of the apostolic see, he concludes, that what St. Peter, that is, the pope, had bound, no other power could loosen, and what St. Peter had loosened, no other power could bind. Upon this principle he pretends Mongus, whom St. Peter had condemned as a heretic, and never absolved, to have continued a heretic; and consequently Acacius to have been lawfully deposed for communicating with him. In answer to the third reason of the Greeks, he tells them, in plain terms, that they were all biassed in favor of Acacius; that most of them were no less guilty than he; and that it was not usual for a judge, in condemning a criminal, to consult his accomplices.[1]

The inflexible obstinacy of the pope gave great joy to the Greeks of the Eutychian party, who chose rather to live separated from, than united with Rome, and triumphed in seeing their enemies in the east thus deprived of the assistance they might receive from their orthodox friends in the west. Of this evil the catholic bishops were well apprised, and, in order to prevent it, resolved to make one attempt more towards a reconciliation between the two churches. They knew

(*) Theodoric was king of the Ostrogoths, whom the emperor Marcian had allowed to settle in Pannonia, quite dispeopled by the incursions of the Hunns, and other barbarous nations. He was at first greatly favored by the emperor Zeno, and served under him as commander in chief of the Roman cavalry. But afterwards thinking himself ill used by that prince, he not only quitted the service, but at the head of his Goths made war on the empire, till he was persuaded by the emperor to turn his arms against Odoacer, who reigned in Italy. Some write, that Zeno yielded that country to him, and his posterity; (a) for it belonged of right to the emperor of the east; while others pretend, that, by the treaty between him and the emperor, he was to hold it only during his life. (b) However that be, the king of the Goths engaged in this new war with great alacrity; and having, in the term of five years, completed the conquest of Italy, by the reduction of Ravenna after a three years siege, he caused himself to be proclaimed by his Goths king of that country, without waiting for the emperor's permission. And it was to excuse this liberty, and solicit the emperor's approbation, that he despatched Faustus and Irenæus to Constantinople, with the character of his ambassadors. Anastasius approved of what he had done, promised not to molest him in the possession of the country he had conquered, and sent him the ensigns of royalty. Hence it is manifest, that Theodoric himself owned he held his kingdom of the emperors of the east; and by them he even suffered the Roman consuls to be named. (c)

(a) Jornand. Rer. Goth. c. 57. Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 2. c. 6.

(b) Mal. p. 84. Marcell. p. 479.

(c) Procop. ibid.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1217—1221

The Greeks apply to the ambassadors of king Theodoric; who write to the pope in their behalf. The terms they proposed. The pope inflexible. His answer to the letter of the ambassadors. The Greeks excommunicate Gelasius, and all who communicate with him. The continuation of the schism owing to the pope.

no reasons alleged by them would be of any weight; and therefore, applying to the two ambassadors Faustus and Irenæus, who had brought the pope's letter, they begged them to apprise his reverend holiness of the fatal consequences that would inevitably attend their complying with his request. For they could not persuade themselves, that, were the pope well acquainted with the unhappy state of the church in the east, and aware of the evils which they had so much reason to apprehend from their erasing the name of Acacius, he would still insist on such a punctilio. Faustus, who was, it seems, a man of some piety, took upon him to write to the pope, in their name; and wrote accordingly, assuring him, among other things, that neither the emperor, nor the people of Constantinople, would ever suffer the name of Acacius to be omitted in the diptychs; and that to disoblige either, at so critical a juncture, when the Eutychian party was acquiring daily new strength, and the catholic interest was daily declining, would prove a thing of most dangerous consequence, and might end at last in the total ruin of the faith in the east. From the letter of Faustus it appears, that the Greeks, I mean those of the catholic party, were ready even to own, that Acacius had done wrong in absolving Mongus without the consent and concurrence of Rome, nay, and to ask pardon for the contempt it was pretended he had thereby shown for the apostolic see, provided the pope would only connive, for the present, at their keeping his name in the diptychs, and, joining them against the common enemy, refer the decision of so fatal a quarrel to the judgment of a general council, to which they solemnly engaged to submit. They added, that, as the emperor had not yet openly declared either for the Eutychian or the catholic party, but seemed to be in suspense, and to waver between both, they could not justify, in the sight of God or man, their doing any thing that might estrange him from them, or give him the least bias in favor of those, who were alike enemies to them, and to Rome, and sought the destruction of both.[1]

But the pope was not to be moved, and would hearken to no reasons. The apostolic see had condemned and deposed Acacius; and that judgment was to be maintained, let what would happen to the church and the faith. Gelasius therefore, in his answer to Faustus, whom he could not suppose to be any ways biassed in favor of the Greeks, after repeating what he had said in his letter to Euphemius, concludes thus: "As Acacius was condemned, and deposed, according to the canons of the church, and the rules of the fathers, and died under that sentence, the Roman church cannot even connive at his being honored as a lawful bishop after his death, without transgressing the canons and laws by which he condemned him. Let them therefore choose whether they will communicate with Acacius, and his followers, or with the apostolic see, and the apostle St. Peter; for they cannot with both, and in vain they attempt it.[1] This letter Faustus communicated, as soon as he received it, to the leading men of the catholic party; and it had the effect which he apprehended it would. The unparalleled obstinacy of the pope, after they had given him such undeniable proofs of the sincere desire they had of being reconciled with him, after they had made all the advances towards a reconciliation, which they thought compatible with their duty, and the safety of the church, at that time in imminent danger, provoked them to such a degree, that they separated themselves, in their turn, from the communion of Rome, struck the name of Gelasius out of the diptychs, and agreed, to a man, not to communicate with him, or any who communicated with him.[2] Thus was the schism continued, during the pontificate and life of Gelasius: and to whose account the continuation of so great an evil, the division of one half of the church from the other, ought to be charged, needs no great examination to determine. The Greeks had, as appears from the letters of Euphemius and Faustus, very substantial and unanswerable reasons to justify their not complying, at least in the present circumstances, with the terms of communion required by the pope; the pope had none that could, in any light whatever, justify his insisting on such terms, as matters then stood. He alleges indeed several, as we have seen; but they can by no man of the least discernment or penetration be otherwise looked upon than as mere pretences to disguise the true motive of his conduct; namely, the engagement he apprehended himself to be under of maintaining, at all events, what his predecessor had done. He had deposed Acacius, and, to keep the name of a man, whom the apostolic see had deposed, among the names of other bishops, was, with the successor to his power and dignity, a greater evil, so far as we can judge from his conduct, than any that could befal the catholic faith, or the catholic church.

The bishops of East Illyricum, over whom the popes had exercised an usurped jurisdiction ever since the time of pope Damasus, were not so unanimous with respect to the name of Acacius, as Gelasius could have wished; nay, the bishop of Thessalonica, though vicar of the apostolic see in those parts, could not help censuring the conduct of the pope; and kept the name of the late bishop of Constantinople in the diptychs of his church. However, as they agreed in all points of faith, they lived in brotherly concord and unity, not thinking it a matter of such mighty moment, to mention, or omit, the name

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1184, 1185.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1168—1172. [2] Concil. ibid. p. 1185.

[Year of Christ, 494]—Gelasius writes to the bishops of east Illyricum, and tries to set them at variance. He writes to the bishops of Dardania. Misenus of Cumæ absolved, and restored to his rank. Upon what terms. Inconsistency of the church of Rome. The pope alleges a new reason why the name of Acacius should be omitted. No less frivolous than the rest. Gelasius dies.

of a man who was no more, as to quarrel about it. This was treating as a mere trifle what the apostolic see had made a term of communion; and therefore Gelasius, highly displeased with the harmony that reigned among those prelates, in order to interrupt it, and set them at variance, wrote three long letters, addressed to the bishops of the different provinces of East Illyricum. The main purpose of these letters was, to justify the conduct of his predecessor, and his own, with respect to Acacius; to convince the bishops in those parts, and the other ecclesiastics, as well as laity, (for to them too he desired his letters might be read,) that to keep the name of Acacius in the diptychs, or leave it out, was not, as they seemed to imagine, a thing of little or no concern, but a matter of the last importance; and to exhort those who left it out, not to communicate with such as kept it in, but to look upon them as enemies to the church and rebels against St. Peter, on pain of being themselves looked upon as such by the apostolic see;[1] which was obliging them to quarrel either among themselves, or with him. They seem to have chosen the latter; for they continued united among themselves, notwithstanding the great pains Gelasius took to divide them. In one of these letters, that to the bishops of Dardania, dated the first of February, 495, he strives to satisfy some of those prelates, who, it seems, thought it strange, that the bishop of Rome should have condemned a bishop of the imperial city, without the concurrence of an oecumenical council. He repeats there the same frivolous reason which he had alleged in his general letter to the Greeks, and in that to Euphemius; and, greatly piqued at their calling the bishop of Constantinople, bishop of the imperial city, he most insolently styles him a pitiful suffragan of Heraclea, as if the bishop of Constantinople had not the same title to the rank he then held, as the bishop of Rome had to his; all bishops being originally, as I have often shown, on the same level.

These were the last letters Gelasius wrote concerning Acacius. He held indeed a council this year at Rome, consisting of forty-six bishops. But the acts of that council have not reached our times; and all we know concerning it is, that, with the unanimous consent of all the bishops who composed it, Misenus of Cumæ, formerly deposed for communicating with Acacius,[2] was readmitted to the communion of the church, restored to his rank, and reinstated in his see. On this occasion the pope gave a remarkable instance of his mortal aversion to the Greeks; for, before he would grant the wished-for pardon to the penitent bishop, he required him solemnly to protest and declare, in the presence of the council, that he "condemned, anathematized, abhorred, and for ever execrated, Dioscorus, Ælurus, Petrus Mongus, Petrus Fullo, Acacius, all their successors, accomplices, abettors, and all who communicated with them."[1] This was cursing at once the better half of the church, the emperor himself, and, what is more, many persons at this very time eminent in the east for their sanctity; namely, St. Sabas, St. Theodosius, St. Elias, bishop of Jerusalem, St. Daniel Stylites, the Thaumaturgus of his age, &c. These all flourished at this very time, had all communicated with Acacius, lived in the communion of his successors, died out of the communion, nay, under the curse of Rome, and yet (strange inconsistency of that church!) they are now honored by her as saints of the first rate, and invoked by the successors of those by whom they were cursed.

The pope made a long speech to the bishops of the present assembly, before the sentence of absolution was pronounced in favor of Misenus; and on that occasion he alleged a new reason, why he could not suffer the name of Acacius to be kept in the diptychs; namely, because that would be absolving him after his death; which, he says, it was not within the compass of his power and authority to do.[2] By whose power and authority then were the above-mentioned saints, who died under the same sentence with Acacius, not only absolved, but canonized, after their death? To have inserted the name of Acacius in the diptychs, when he was no more, had been certainly absolving him after his death. But it is quite surprising, that Gelasius should pretend to have no such power; since it was, long before his time, the common practice of the church to replace in the diptychs the names of those, who, upon any new discovery after their death, they found to have been undeservedly condemned, and to strike out the names of such as they found to have been undeservedly absolved. This was the usual way of condemning the guilty, and absolving the innocent, after their death, of cutting off the former from, and restoring the latter to, the communion of the church. Thus pope Innocent, one of the predecessors of Gelasius, peremptorily insisted on the name of Chrysostom being inserted in the diptychs after his death; and had not Atticus, then bishop of Constantinople, yielded at last, the keeping a name out had been attended with a no less fatal division in the church, than that, which we have seen occasioned by the keeping a name in.[3] For Innocent was no less obstinate than Gelasius; and indeed it was a maxim with them all never to yield.

The following year, 496, Gelasius died, and is said to have been buried in the church of St. Peter.[4] His death happened in the fifth

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1167—1197. [2] See p. 274.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1270, 1271.
[2] Ibid. p. 1274. [3] See p. 141.
[4] Vide Bolland. Apr. t. 4. p. 34.

Gelasius is sainted. His writings. He condemns communion in one kind only. His treaties on the anathema. The temporal ought not to encroach on the spiritual, nor the spiritual on the temporal power. His treaties against the Lupercalia, which he had suppressed. The feast of the purification said to have been introduced in their room.

year of his pontificate, having governed four years, seven, eight, or nine months, and some days.[1] As his life was, we may say, a constant warfare for the dignity of his see; as he maintained, with an inflexible obstinacy, what his predecessor had done, "with an unshaken firmness and obstinacy," says Baronius, I need not tell the reader, that he has been distinguished with the same honors, and is now worshipped as a saint. He wrote several letters besides those I have mentioned; but they only relate to some particular points of the ecclesiastical discipline, and contain nothing that is either material or new. In his time the sect of the Manichees began anew to spring up in Rome, notwithstanding the pains Leo had taken to root it out.[2] They believed wine to be the gall of the prince of darkness, as I have observed elsewhere;[3] and therefore received the eucharist in one kind only, as the Roman catholics do now, in compliance with the decrees of Constance and Trent. But that practice Gelasius condemned in the strongest terms, ordering such, as did not receive in both kinds, to be excluded from both, *because one and the same mystery cannot be divided without great sacrilege.*[4] Either Gelasius was guilty of a great heresy, or the church of Rome is now guilty of a great sacrilege. We shall see hereafter the doctrine, advanced by Gelasius, to have been, for the space of twelve hundred years, the doctrine of the whole catholic church, however repugnant to that which is now practised and taught by the Romish church; and consequently, if Gelasius was guilty of heresy, the whole catholic church to have been, for so many centuries, guilty of heresy too. But that decree, says cardinal Bona,[5] was made against the Manichees. And what matters it against whom it was made, so long as it is there declared, in general terms, without any restriction or limitation, that "the sacrament cannot be divided, that it cannot be received in one kind only, without sacrilege?"

Besides the letters of Gelasius, four tracts, or small treatises, composed by him at different times, are still extant. The first is on the bond or tie of the anathema (*de anathematis vinculo*). This piece is imperfect, extremely confused, and hardly intelligible; but seems to have been written to justify, or rather explain, an expression in the sentence pronounced by his predecessor against Acacius, namely, that "he never should, nor ever could, be absolved from that anathema," there being no bond that may not be loosened by the power of the keys. But his explanation is as unintelligible as the expression itself. In this treatise he observes, that anciently the royalty and priesthood were often united in one and the same person among the Jews as well as the Gentiles; but that, since the coming of Christ, these two dignities, and the different powers that attend them, have been vested in different persons; and from thence he concludes, that neither ought to encroach on the other; but that the temporal power should be left entire to the princes, and the spiritual to the priests, it being no less foreign to the institution of Christ, for a priest to usurp the functions of sovereignty, than it is for a sovereign to usurp those of the priesthood. Let Baronius and Bellarmine reconcile, if they can, the maxims of Gelasius with those of his successors.

The second treatise is a kind of remonstrance against a Roman senator, named Andromachus, and others, who were for restoring the lupercalia, or feasts celebrated by the pagan Romans in honor of their god Pan. That solemnity, lewd and scandalous as it was, the popes had suffered to be kept yearly under their eyes, till the time of Gelasius. He suppressed it; but the city proving that year very sickly, the Romans, who, it seems, were yet but half Christians, and had only grafted the Christian religion on the old stock of pagan superstition, ascribed the maladies, with which they were afflicted, to the suppression of that festival; and it was to confute this notion, that Gelasius wrote the present treatise. The feast of the purification of the Virgin Mary, commonly known by the name of candlemas, because candles were blessed, as is still practised in the church of Rome, at the mass of that day,(*) is thought by some to have been introduced in the room of the lupercalia,[1] which were kept on the same day. It is true there is no conformity between the ceremonies of the two festivals, as some have observed. But it is likewise true, that though the heathenish rites were, generally speaking, retained almost entire in the Christian feasts, and only sanctified by a change of the object, as the statutes were by a change of the name; yet sometimes it happened, that, in the room of the pagan, a Christian superstition was introduced, entirely different from the pagan; the people only wanting to riot and revel, no matter in honor of whom, or with what ceremonies, as their pagan ancestors had done, and at the same stated times and seasons of the year.

[1] Bolland. ibid. Bar. add ann. 496. n. 1.
[2] See p. 194. et seq. [3] Ibid.
[4] Gelas. ap. Gratian. de consecrat. dist. 2. c. 12.
[5] Boua rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 19.

(*) The candles, that are blessed on candlemas day, are thought to be a sure protection against thunder and lightning, and therefore are lighted by timorous persons in stormy weather. But their chief virtue is to frighten the devils, and drive them away; and for this reason they are kept burning in the hands of dying persons, so long as they can hold them, and by their beds, from the time they begin to be in agony, till they expire; none of the spirits of darkness daring to appear where they give light. To this practice the Italian proverb, "ridotto alla candela, reduced to the candle," owes its rise; and is used to express the greatest distress a man can be reduced to.

[1] Vide St. Elig. Serm. Hanschen. ad diem 2 Feb.

Gelasius' treaties on the two natures. The doctrine of transubstantiation unknown in his time. Pope Gelasius undoubtedly author of this piece. The doctrine contained in that treatise, the doctrine of the church at that time.

The third treatise was composed by Gelasius, to confute the doctrine of the Pelagians, that a man may live free from all sin.

But of all the writings of this pope, that which he published "of the two natures," against Eutyches and Nestorius, is by far the most esteemed. It is called, by a contemporary writer, of no mean character, an excellent performance;(*) and is often quoted by the authors of the following ages. In this treatise, so much extolled and commended by all the ancients, is a passage which shows undeniably, that, in those days, the church was yet utterly unacquainted with the doctrine of "transubstantiation," at least, that Gelasius was. For the right understanding of a passage so favorable to the protestant doctrine, I must premise, that the Eutychians were supposed to believe the human nature in Christ to have been, by its union with the Divinity, absorbed by, and transformed into, the Divinity; so that Christ could not be said to have two natures, after the union. Against these Gelasius undertakes to prove the reality of the two natures in Christ, notwithstanding that union; and argues thus: "The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which we receive, are certainly a divine thing; and by them we are made partakers of the Divine nature; but yet *the substance or nature of bread and wine do not cease to be in them.* Indeed the *image* and *similitude* of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the mysterious action: we are therefore to believe the same thing in our Lord Christ, as we profess, celebrate, and take in his *image*, namely, that, as by the perfecting virtue of the Holy Ghost the elements pass into a divine substance, while their nature still remains in its own propriety; so in that principal mystery (the union between the Divine and human natures), whose efficacy and power these represent, there remains one true and perfect Christ; and both natures, of which he consists, remain in their properties unchangeable."[1] He must be quite blind who does not see, that the whole strength of the pope's argument rest upon this, that the bread and wine in the eucharist retain the nature and substance of bread and wine, notwithstanding their sacramental union with the body and blood of Christ. This he does not prove, but supposes as a truth, not questioned either by the Eutychians or the catholics, and from thence argues the human nature in Christ to retain in the same manner, its own substance, though united with the Divinity. Should we suppose the bread and wine in the eucharist to be changed into the body and blood of Christ, this argument had been of no force against the Eutychians, but might have been by them unanswerably retorted against the catholics.

This passage has absolutely put the Roman catholic divines to a nonplus; and what they have hitherto said, in answer to it, serves only to show, that it cannot be answered. Some of them have attempted to persuade the world, that the above-mentioned treatise is not the work of pope Gelasius, but of another Gelasius, who was a native of Cyzicus, and flourished at this very time, or of a third Gelasius, who was bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, in St. Jerom's time, and whose life they prolong to the rise of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, that they may father this work upon him. But as we know of two bishops, John and Eulogius, both sitting in that see after Gelasius, and before either of those heresies was heard of, Baronius clears Gelasius of Palestine, and fixes the charge of writing such a piece on Gelasius of Cyzicus;[1] nay, not satisfied with proving, he pretends "unanswerably to demonstrate," the latter Gelasius to have been the author of that work, and not his high pontiff Gelasius. It is not worth the reader's while to hear the idle notions, and far-fetched conjectures on which the annalist founds his pretended demonstration, nor is it worth mine to repeat them. I shall therefore only observe, in answer to all that has been, or can be, said, to prove or "demonstrate" the present treatise not to have been written by pope Gelasius; 1. That there is an entire conformity, in point of style, between this and the other writings of that pope, as the learned Du Pin ingeniously owns.[2] 2. That in all the ancient manuscripts it is ascribed to him, and placed among his other works. 3. That it is said by Gennadius, who lived at this very time, and was well acquainted with the pope, to have been "composed by Gelasius, bishop of the city of Rome;[3] and is quoted as his by St. Fulgentius, who wrote not thirty years after, and is called, by Du Pin, an unexceptionable witness,[4] by pope John II. and by all the writers, who, till the time of Baronius, have had occasion to mention it. But after all, what is it to the present purpose, whether Gelasius of Palestine, of Cyzicus, or of Rome, was the author of this piece? Whoever he was, he speaks of the nature and substance of the bread and wine remaining in the eucharist, as of a known truth, which no man disputed; and therefore could neither have himself, nor could he suppose others to have, any notion or idea of Trans-

(*) Gennadius, a presbyter of Marseilles, who flourished at this very time, and wrote several books, of which he has given us himself the catalogue. "I have written," says he, "eight books against all heresies, six against Nestorius, three against Pelagius, a treatise of the thousand years, and the Revelation of St. John, the present treatise, that is, of the eaclesiastical writers, and one declaring my own doctrine, addressed to pope Gelasius."(a) But of all his works, only the two last have reached our times.

(a) Gennad. de Script. Eccles. c, 14.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1199. et Biblioth. Patr. t. 4. p. 422.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 496. n. 1, et seq.

[2] Du Pin, Bibl. Eccles. in Gelas.

[3] Gennad. de script. Eccles. c. 14.

[4] Du Pin, ubi supra.

Baronius strives to reconcile the doctrine of Gelasius with the present doctrine of the church of Rome. How absurdly. Bellarmine's Answer. Cardinal Alan owns the pope, and likewise Theodoret to have denied transubstantiation.

substantiation. And was Transubstantiation, at this very time, the known doctrine of the church, and an article of the Christian faith? If it was, how came the author of a work, which the ancients have thought worthy of the greatest commendations, not to know it? How can we account for his being so little acquainted, though otherwise a man of learning, with the received doctrine of the church, I may say, with his catechism, as to suppose the substance of the bread and wine to remain, when it was an article of faith that it did not remain? Had it in those days, been deemed a heresy to deny Transubstantiation, would the contemporary writers, who mention that work, have all commended it, as they do, and not one of them taken the least notice of the gross heresy it contained?

Baronius, having by a long, tedious, and senseless digression, attempted to prove that treatise to have been written by Gelasius of Cyzicus, and not by the pope of that name, though ascribed to him by all the contemporary writers, undertakes, in the second place, to show, that nothing is there contained inconsistent with the catholic doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, nothing that can give the least countenance to the opposite heresy, and, consequently, that he might safely allow that piece to be the genuine work of the Roman pontiff Gelasius. If so, he has surely taken a great deal of trouble and pains to very little purpose. But to as little purpose does he labor to reconcile the doctrine laid down in that treatise; namely, that, "in the eucharist, the substance or nature of the bread and the wine is not changed, but remains;" with the present doctrine of his church, "In the eucharist the substance or nature of the bread and the wine is changed, and does not remain." But what he says on that head, I shall give in his own words, that I may not be thought to have misrepresented his meaning, with a design to expose him. "It is true," says he, "that the pope, if we allow, as we may, that work to be his, owns the substance of the bread and the wine to remain in the eucharist. . . . . But what did he mean here by the substance or nature of bread and wine? Not what these words truly and properly import. For he has declared, in this very treatise, that he does not pique himself upon the propriety of words. . . . By the substance therefore of bread and wine, he only could, and without all doubt did, mean the species or accidents of bread and wine;" that is, the color, taste, shape, quantity. "These indeed are really distinguished from the substance; but he chose to express them by that word, the school words species or accidents, by which they are properly expressed, not being yet adopted by the church." Thus Baronius;[1] and his answer may, in a few words, be reduced to this, that Gelasius said one thing, and meant another. However, the annalist is so well pleased with it, as to call it, with his usual modesty, a "plain demonstration, an unanswerable reply to the babbling and blaspheming heretics." Indeed I shall not presume to answer it; but cannot help blaming him for not giving us some certain rule, whereby to judge of a man's true meaning, since it may not, according to him, be always conveyed to us by his words, however plain and explicit. Without such a rule, we may question the definitions both of the popes and the councils, nay, and maintain, in spite of all their decrees, the doctrine diametrically opposite to that, which they seem to have established by their definitions and decrees, however worded.

Bellarmine's answer is, in other words, the same with that of Baronius. For, according to him, Gelasius, by saying that the substance of the bread and wine remained, meant no more than that "it remained in appearance, or that it only appeared to remain."[1] But neither he, nor his fellow-champion, seem to have been aware, that thus they make the pope, instead of combating the Eutychians, against whom he writes, supply them with an unanswerable argument in favor of their doctrine; namely, that as in the eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remained indeed in appearance, but was really and truly changed into the body and blood of Christ; so, in the mystery of the incarnation, the human nature of Christ remained indeed in appearance, but was really and truly absorbed and changed into the Divinity. Cardinal Alan, more ingenuous than either of the other two cardinals, candidly owns it to have been the opinion of pope Gelasius, and likewise of Theodoret, that the substance of the bread and wine remained in the eucharist. He calls it indeed an erroneous opinion, choosing rather to charge the pope with an error, than the church, since he could, by no means, reconcile such opposite doctrines.[2] But Baronius and Bellarmine were bound to maintain the infallibility both of the pope and the church, and therefore attempted, with the success we have seen, to reconcile them, in spite of all contradiction. The passage in Theodoret, to which cardinal Alan alludes, was, no doubt, the following: "After sanctification," he speaks of the eucharist, "the mystical symbols do not depart from their own nature; but *remain* still in their *former substance*, and figure, and form, and may be seen and touched just as before."[3] This passage Baronius and Bellarmine explain in the same manner as they have done that of Gelasius; namely, that by "the substance" Theodoret meant things very different from the substance, the accidents; that he spoke improperly, though he

[1] Bar. ad. ann. 496. n. 2, 3, & seq.

[1] Bell. de Euch. l. 2. c. 27.
[2] Card. Alan. de Euch. Sacrament. l. 1. c. 35.
[3] Theod. Dial. 1. t. 4. p. 17.

Gelasius' decree concerning the canonical books of the scripture. Changes the foundation on which the primacy had hitherto stood. The passage "thou art Peter," &c. has no kind of connection with the primacy.

has nowhere declared, that "he does not pique himself upon the propriety of words;" in short, that he said one thing, and meant another. But I should be glad to know in what other terms Gelasius and Theodoret could have expressed themselves, had they really believed, that the "symbols remained in their substance."

To the other writings of Gelasius we may add the decree which he published concerning the canonical and apocryphal books of the scripture, and the primacy of the Roman see. For that decree was drawn up by him, and only approved by the council that was held at Rome in 494, and consisted of seventy bishops. He there places among the canonical books those which we reject as apocryphal, and which the church rejected in St. Jerom's time.[1] He mentions but one book of the Maccabees, and that he makes canonical, as his predecessor Innocent had done. But both these books were afterwards declared apocryphal by pope Gregory the Great;[2] and such they were deemed by many learned men among the Roman catholics themselves, till they were anew declared canonical by the council of Trent, probably "because they are of great force againt heretics, purgatory being nowhere so expressly mentioned as in the Maccabees;" which is the reason a Roman catholic writer has given why they ought to be admitted into the canon.[3]

As to the primacy of the Roman see, it was now high time for the popes to think of changing the foundation on which it had hitherto stood, the dignity of the imperial city, and the decrees of councils. The city of Constantinople was now superior in dignity to that of Rome. It was the sole imperial city in the whole Christian world; and Rome only the metropolis of a small kingdom, the kingdom of Italy. The councils had all founded the pre-eminence, honors, and privileges granted by them to the see of Rome, on the dignity of the city, and the regard and respect that was due to the metropolis and seat of the empire.[4] That foundation was now withdrawn; and Gelasius did not know but as two oecumenical councils (of Constantinople and Chalcedon) had placed the rival see next in dignity to the see of Rome, a third might, upon the same principle, raise it even above the see of Rome, as it had been already raised above those of Alexandria and Antioch. To prevent this, and lay a new foundation, that could not be removed, as being independent of councils, and at the same time might support the primacy, whatever became of the city, he enacted the present decree, boldly declaring, as if all records had been destroyed, and men knew nothing of what had happened but a few years before, "That it was not to any councils, or the decrees of any, that the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church owed her primacy, but to the words of our Savior, saying in the Gospel, "thou art Peter," &c., and thereby building the church upon him, as upon a rock that nothing could shake; that the Roman church, not having spot or wrinkle, was consecrated, and exalted above all other churches, by the presence, as well as by the death, martyrdom, and glorious triumph of the two chief apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, who suffered at Rome under Nero, not at different times, as the heretics say, but at the same time, and on the same day; and that the Roman church is the first church, because founded by the first apostle, the church of Alexandria the second, because founded by his disciple St. Mark in his name, and that of Antioch the third, because St. Peter dwelt there before he came to Rome, and in that city the faithful were first distinguished with the name of Christians."[1]

That the sees were ranked according to the dignity of the cities, without any kind of regard to their founders, has been unanswerably demonstrated in several places of this work;[2] and no truth (if in history there is any truth) can be better attested. I shall therefore only observe, with respect to the present remarkable decree, 1. That the fathers are greatly divided among themselves about the true meaning of the passage, "Thou art Peter," &c. on which Gelasius pretends to found the "primacy," and the divines of the church of Rome the "supremacy," of the Roman see. Some of the fathers, by the "rock," on which the church was to be built, understand St. Peter's faith, and not his person; others neither his faith nor his person, but Christ himself; and some the other apostles, as well as St. Peter, who are therefore in scripture all called foundations. In the first sense, that passage is interpreted by St. Hilarius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenalis of Jerusalem, nay, and by some of the popes themselves, namely, Gregory the Great, Felix III., Nicholas I., and John VIII.[3] And truly this interpretation seems the most natural. St. Peter had said before, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;" our Savior answer, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock," on this faith, of which thou hast now made profession, "I will build my church," &c. However, St. Jerome understood that passage in the second sense; and Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Basil, and Theodoret, in the third. But in none of these senses has it, as is evident, any kind of connection with the primacy or the supremacy of St. Peter, and his pretended see.

II. In that decree Gelasius brands those

[1] Hier. in Prolog. Gal.
[2] Greg. Moral. in Job. l. 19. c. 17.
[3] Jul. Rieger de Lib. Canon. p. 80. [4] See p. 222.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1260.
[2] See p. 49, & seq. & supra, p. 221.
[3] See Barrow, Pope's Suprem. p. 86, 87. Du Pin, dissert. 4. p. 304—313.

There is no certainty that St. Peter and St. Paul suffered in the same year. Gelasius takes no notice of St. Peter's having founded the see of Antioch; and why.

with the name of heretics, who pretended St. Peter and St. Paul to have suffered at different times. Was this a matter of such mighty moment as to be made an article of faith? But that they did suffer at different times, though on the same day; that St. Peter suffered a year before St. Paul; was the opinion not only of Prudentius,[1] Strator,[2] and St. Nilus,[3] but of St. Austin, nay, and a common tradition in his time.[4]

III. It is remarkable, that Gelasius, in ranking, as he does, the three patriarchal sees, according to the relation they had to St. Peter, takes no notice of that apostle's having founded the see of Antioch; though that it was founded by him, nay, that he sat at Antioch several years, was an opinion so universally received at this very time, that it had been deemed a kind of heresy to dispute it.(*) But that the pope craftily dissembled for the present, contenting himself with only saying, that St. Peter dwelt at Antioch before he came to Rome, and alleging that as a reason why the see of Antioch was the third in rank and dignity. Had he owned it to have been founded by St. Peter, he could have given no reason, without recurring to the dignity of the cities, why it was placed, though founded by that apostle himself, after the see of Alexandria, founded only by a disciple of his. Of this he seems to have been well aware, and therefore to have industriously avoided all mention of the founder of that see, as if it had been consecrated, and raised to the third rank, only by the presence of St. Peter. Besides, had he here made St. Peter the founder of the see of Antioch, his method of reasoning had appeared as absurd as it really was; for he had then reasoned thus: The see of Rome is the first, because founded by St. Peter, and consecrated by the presence and the death of that apostle; the see of Alexandria is the second, because founded by a disciple of St. Peter, and in St. Peter's name, as he pretends, without any warrant; and that of Antioch, the third, because founded, not by a disciple of St. Peter, but by St. Peter himself, and consecrated by his sitting several years there.

Gelasius is said to have written some other tracts, on different subjects;[1] but none of his works are now extant, besides those I have mentioned, and a Sacramentarium, which passes under his name, and was printed at Rome, in 1680, from a manuscript, thought then to be nine hundred years old. His style is elevated, but obscure, and in some places absolutely unintelligible. In his writings is a great deal of false reasoning, as Du Pin has observed;[2] and he often supposes, for certain, what is absolutely groundless, or very ill grounded.

[1] Prud. de Mart. 12. p. 144.
[2] Strat. l. 2. p. 700. [3] Phot. c. 276.
[4] Aug. serm. 296. c. 7.

(*) St. Chrysostom writes, that St. Peter continued at Antioch a long time. (a) That long time pope Gregory the Great fixed to seven years; (b) and it is now the prevailing opinion in the church of Rome, that St. Peter governed the church of Antioch seven years, and the Roman twenty-five, or, as some will have it, only twenty-four years, five months, and twelve days. (c) The computation had been still more minute and exact, had they added to the number of the days that of the hours; and they might have done the one as well as the other. To confirm the prevailing opinion, especially as it owes its rise to a great pope, Eusebius has been made to write, in his Chronicle, that "St. Peter sat at Antioch seven years, and from thence travelled to Rome, where he resided five-and-twenty." I say, made to write; for that passage has been long looked upon, by all unprejudiced men, as an interpolation; and was therefore left out by Scaliger, in his Greek edition of Eusebius, (d) as absolutely inconsistent with chronology, and contradicting what the same author writes in his history, at least, with respect to the time St. Peter is said to have resided at Rome. For he there tells us, that St. Peter, having preached the gospel in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, &c. at last, or in the end, being at Rome, he was there put to death. (e) Whether he would have thus expressed himself, had he believed St. Peter to have resided five-and-twenty years at Rome, I leave the reader to judge. No pope has yet attained to the supposed years of pope Peter; and if we credit the prophecy of an unknown prophet, "non videbis annos Petri," none ever will. Adrian, chosen in 772, was, I think, the nearest, in years, to St. Peter. For he sat twenty-three years, ten months, and seventeen days. In our time Clement XI. held the papal dignity twenty years, three months, and twenty-six days; and, in the last years of his life, that he might not yet be under any apprehension from the prophecy, it began to be interpreted as including the seven years St. Peter had sat at Antioch, as well as the twenty-five he had sat at Rome. The church of Rome celebrates the festival of St. Peter's chair, at Antioch, on the 22d of February. But I have shown elsewhere, (f) that St. Peter was never bishop of Antioch.

(a) Chrys. t. 1. hom. 42. (b) Greg. l. 6. ep. 37.
(c) Panvin. in chron. Rom. Pont. et alii.
(d) Lug. Bat. 1606. (e) Euseb. hist. l. 3. c. 1.
(f) See p. 173, in the notes.

[1] Gennad. de Scrip. Eccles. c. 14.
[2] Du Pin, ubi supra.

Anatasius chosen. The western churches enjoy a profound tranquillity. In the east the emperor declares against the council of Chalcedon; and orders Euphemius, who stood up in defence of that council, to be murdered. Euphemius escapes; but is condemned and deposed by a council. His blameless life and sufferings availed him nothing, in the opinion of Baronius; and why.

ANASTASIUS II. FORTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANASTASIUS.]

IN the room of Gelasius was unanimously chosen Anastasius, the second of that name, a native of Rome, and the son of a Roman citizen, named Peter;[1] which is all we know of him before his election. He was ordained on the 28th of November, as some pretend, or the 25th of December, as others will have it. At this time reigned a profound tranquillity in the western or Latin church, the western provinces being, for the most part, subject to Arian princes, who did not concern themselves about the council of Chalcedon, or the doctrine of the two natures. But, in the east, the emperor Anastasius had openly declared against that council ever since the year 494, and spared no pains to gain over to his party, such of the bishops as still stood up in defence of its famous, or, as he styled it, unintelligible decree. Palladius of Antioch, and Athanasius of Alexandria, readily joined him, anathematizing the doctrine of two natures, and, with the doctrine, those who had defined it, and all who held it. But Euphemius of Constantinople, who was at the head of the catholic party, as they styled themselves, could neither be allured by promises, nor awed by threats, into a compliance with the emperor's will. Since all other means therefore proved ineffectual, the death of the obstinate and refractory priest, as they called him at court, was resolved on at last; and a person was hired, with a large sum, to murder him. The assassin first met him at the door of the vestry; and there, though he was attended by others, discharged a blow at his head with a scymetar. But the defender of the church, who was taller than the bishop, received the blow on his head; and, in the mean time, an ecclesiastic, with the bolt of the door, the first thing that offered, laid the assassin dead at his feet.[2] Another attempt was made on the bishop's life, on occasion of his going to officiate in a church on the neighboring mountain. But the assassins missing their blow a second time, the emperor resolved to discharge them, and employ the bishops of the opposite party, in their room, promising himself better success from them, in the temper they were in at that time, than from any assassins he could hire. And they answered his expectation; for he having assembled in council all the bishops, who were then in Constantinople, and charged Euphemius, before them, with several crimes, they declared him, without any farther examination or inquiry, unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and deposed him accordingly. This sentence occasioned an insurrection; but the populace, having no stylites to head or encourage them, were soon quelled, and Euphemius was conveyed into exile, where he died in 515, or, as some write, was murdered, by an order from the emperor.[1] No man ever deserved better of the catholic faith than Euphemius, if the faith of Chalcedon was the catholic faith. Had he to his extraordinary zeal for that faith, which cost him the loss of his see, if not of his life, added the merit of gratifying the revengeful spirit of the popes, by striking the name of Acacius out of the diptychs, we should now see him honored as a saint of the first class, how prejudicial soever his complaisance to them might have proved to the catholic cause. But as he could not be prevailed upon to sacrifice the catholic interest in the east, and at the same time prostitute his own conscience to their revenge and ambition, he has not been thought worthy of a place in the calendar, either among the confessors or the martyrs. Baronius indeed owns that his sufferings entitled him to that honor; but adds, that, as he did not deserve, by deposing Acacius after his death, to be admitted to the communion of the Roman church, out of which there is no true confession of faith, no true martyrdom, the unhappy wretch forfeited every other merit, was himself deposed by a just judgment of God; and though he died in defence of the true faith, departed inglorious.[2] Thus does that profane and venal writer impiously place the chief, or rather the only, merit and duty of a good bishop, in gratifying the revenge, the ambition, and the other ungodly passions of his high pontiffs. This was, by his own confession, the only merit Euphemius wanted. He had, but a little before, acknowledged him to have been not only orthodox in his belief, but the pillar of the orthodox faith, and a most zealous defender of the council of Chalcedon; nay, and to have been, on that account, deservedly honored and revered by all the orthodox; insomuch that not to communicate with him, was declaring against the council of Chalcedon.[3] But the want of that merit no other could supply; and therefore the unhappy wretch,

[1] Marcell. chron. Bolland. t. 1. p. 35.
[2] Theod. Lect. p. 559. Theoph. p. 119, 120.

[1] Theod. Let. p. 559. Marcell. chron. Concil. t. 4. p. 1413. Surius 11 Decemb. p. 230.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 495. n. 21—23.
[3] Idem ad ann. 492. n. 7. 9. 26. 46. et ad ann. 489. n. 3.

Macedonius is chosen in his room. The new pope desirous of putting an end to the present disturbances. He sends legates into the east, and writes to the emperor. He allows the orders conferred by Acacius to be valid.

with all his other merits, departed inglorious. But if there is no true confession of faith out of the communion of the Roman church, why did not Baronius, in virtue of the commission or full power granted him to reform the calendar, that is, to saint or unsaint whom he pleased, drive from heaven the two great saints Meletius and Flavianus,[1] both bishops of Antioch, and the other saints I have mentioned above,[2] who all died out of the communion of the Roman church? If Euphemius did not deserve a place in heaven, they of course ought to have forfeited theirs.

In the room of Euphemius was chosen, by the clergy and people of Constantinople, Macedonius, a presbyter of that church, no less zealously attached to the council of Chalcedon than Euphemius himself. He did not write to the pope, as his predecessor had done, to acquaint him with his promotion, or to beg his communion, concluding from the inflexible obstinacy and the haughty behaviour of the two last popes, that it would be in vain for him to attempt a reconciliation with Rome, upon any other terms but those which they had so peremptorily required, and he was absolutely determined not to grant. But the new pope was more peaceably inclined than either of his two immediate predecessors, and sincerely desirous of putting an end to the present unhappy division. It grieved him to quarrel about a matter of so very small moment, and to live, as it were, in a state of enmity with men, who professed the same faith with him, and suffered so much to support and maintain it. But, on the other hand, he was unwilling to yield, and at the same time sensible that they could not, without disobliging the emperor, and thereby exposing both themselves and their cause to the utmost danger. He resolved therefore to try, in the first place, whether the emperor might not be prevailed upon to suffer the name of Acacius to be omitted in the diptychs. With this view he determined, without loss of time, to despatch a solemn legation to the court of Constantinople; though his predecessor Gelasius had rejected, with great scorn and haughtiness, the proposal, made to him by Euphemius, of sending legates, as if he despaired of, or were indifferent about, the success of their negotiations. The persons he employed on this occasion were Cresconius of Todi, and Germanus of Capua, both men of uncommon parts, and great moderation. By them he wrote a most humble, submissive and respectful letter to the emperor, with this address: "To my most glorious and most clement son, Anastasius Augustus, bishop Anastasius." However, he takes care, from the very beginning, to let him know, what it was now of more importance than ever the emperors should be all well apprized of: namely, that the Roman see held the first place in the catholic church, and held it by divine appointment, our Lord, saying to St. Peter, "Thou art Peter," &c., words, which we shall hear echoed, after Gelasius, by all the popes, and on all occasions. Throughout the whole letter he expresses a most earnest desire of seeing tranquillity restored to the church, in his days; and as the name of Acacius was the only subject of the quarrel between the two churches, and the only obstruction to the wished-for union, he does not imperiously require, as his predecessors had done, but begs, in the most humble terms, it may be omitted; that our Savior's coat, without seam, woven from the top throughout, meaning the church, may not be rent, for a matter of so very little moment, for the sake of a dead man's name. He adds, that the Roman church ought not to be blamed for requiring his name to be expunged, since she had condemned him; but that neither the sentence of the apostolic see, nor any thing else, it was in the power of men to do, to the prejudice of his memory, were undoubted proofs of his having been guilty before God; that the Roman church, indeed, had condemned him for crimes as certain as human evidence could make them; but, after all, that men acted as men, and there was but one judgment infallible, that of God, who searches the hearts.

The Greeks apprehended, and it was consonant to reason they should, that if they acknowledged Acacius to have been lawfully deposed, they must of course own the orders he had conferred, after his deposition, to be null. For, by the sentence of Felix, he was divested of all episcopal power; and not even the name of bishop was left him.[1] To remove this apprehension, which engaged in the cause of Acacius all whom he had ordained, the pope declares, by the present letter, the orders conferred by him, as well as the sacraments which he had administered after his condemnation, to be valid; which was, in effect, reversing the sentence of his predecessor, or rather declaring it to have been null from the beginning. He expresses all along the greatest regard and respect for the imperial dignity, never addressing the emperor, but with the titles of "your highness, your serenity, your piety, clemency," &c., and, opposing to them, when he speaks of himself, "my lowness," or "my obscurity."[2](*)

[1] See p. 90. et 101.

[2] See p. 285.

[1] See p. 275.

[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1278—1280.

(*) I cannot help being a little surprised at the mighty commendations the pope bestows, in this letter, on the emperor's divine wisdom, for so he styles it, on his exemplary piety, and extraordinary zeal for the true faith; telling him that, while he was yet a private man, he had not yielded, as was known by certain fame, to the best bishops, in the observance of the rules, which the fathers had prescribed to the church; and that he did not doubt but the growth of his piety had kept pace with that of his dignity. How can we account for his thus extolling the wisdom, piety, and zeal of a man, who, at this very time, was persecuting

The distracted state of the church of Alexandria. The legates are well received by the emperor; who chooses rather to confer with the patrician Festus, than with them. He is for a reconciliation, but thinks Rome ought to yield. Festus takes upon him to persuade the pope to yield, and to receive the henoticon. The pope disposed to yield. He places greater confidence in Festus than in his own legates.

The pope does not forget, in his letter, the distracted state of the church of Alexandria, rent at this time into three different parties or factions, under the Eutychian bishop Athanasius, who had succeeded Mongus in 490. One party was satisfied with the henoticon alone; another to the henoticon added the decree of Chalcedon, and the doctrine of the two natures, while a third anathematized the henoticon, as well as the decree of Chalcedon, and all who held either. Anastasius therefore earnestly entreats the emperor to employ his wisdom, his divine admonitions, and the authority, with which it has pleased God to vest him, as his vicar upon earth, in bringing back that church to the unity of the faith.[1]

With this letter, written in a style so very different from that which latter popes have used to the emperors, and so exactly like that they have assumed to themselves, the legates set out for Constantinople, in the beginning of the present year, 497, and with them Festus, the patrician, despatched by king Theodoric, upon some affairs of state, to that court. On their arrival at Constantinople, they were all received with particular marks of respect and esteem by the emperor, who expressed great satisfaction at his finding the new pope so well disposed, and so sincerely inclined to a reconciliation. However, as he was determined not to suffer the name of Acacius to be omitted in the diptychs, lest the bishops of Rome should thence take occasion to triumph over those of the imperial city, he would not hear the legates on that subject; but had several private conferences with Festus, whom he found better acquainted with the pope's real sentiments, than the legates themselves. To him he represented, that as it was, by the pope's own confession, a matter of very small moment, whether the name of Acacius was mentioned or omitted at the altar, it reflected no small disgrace on the Christian name, to see one-half of the Christians divided from, nay, at open enmity, and declared war, with the other, for what was deemed by both a mere trifle, while they all owned mutual charity, and brotherly love, to be the foundation of every virtue, and to have been more warmly recommended than any other virtue by the divine founder of the religion they professed; that it was not the honor of the see of Rome, or of the see of Constantinople, but of the Christian religion, that was at stake; that, not to perpetuate so fatal a division, the one ought to yield to the other, and the only subject of contention should be, which should yield the first to the other; that, in his opinion indeed, the Roman see ought to yield, since by that see the war was begun, and the mischiefs occasioned by so destructive a war could by no other means be better atoned for. Festus seems to have been entirely of the emperor's opinion; and therefore, as he was well apprised of the good disposition of the pope, and his sincere desire of peace, he privately promised to persuade him, on his return to Rome, not only to connive at the name of Acacius being kept in the diptychs, but even to receive and sign the henoticon.[1] And indeed if what is said of this pope by the bibliothecarian, be true, namely, that, at this very time, he admitted to his communion a deacon of Thessalonica, named Photinus, most zealously attached to the memory of Acacius,[2] it is not to be doubted but Festus would have made his promise good, at least with respect to the name of the bishop. I am sensible, that the evidence of the bibliothecarian ought not to be rashly admitted. But from the whole conduct of this good pope it is manifest, that he had nothing so much at heart as to put an end to the present troubles, almost upon any terms; and, on the other hand, it is certain, that the above-mentioned deacon was despatched at this very time to Rome, by Andrew of Thessalonica, whom Gelasius had excluded from his communion, because he would not condemn Acacius; and that he was well received by the pope.[3] Baronius himself owns this "aspersion" to have been cast on the memory of the pope, soon after his decease. He calls it an "aspersion," because it is, according to his principles, aspersing a pope, to say, that to heal a schism, and save the church from impending ruin, he abated, in the least, of the pretensions of his see, or departed from the measures, however dangerous or prejudicial, which his predecessors had pursued. Upon the whole, the bibliothecarian was better informed of this, than he seems to have been of most other distant transactions. And what he adds, is highly probable, namely, that the pope had resolved with himself to suffer the name of Acacius to be kept in the diptychs, if he could by no other means bring back the Greeks to the communion of Rome.[4] This resolution, however secret, he must have communicated to Festus; else that patrician had never made the promise he did to the emperor. And truly the pope seems to have placed greater confidence in him, than in his own legates,

[1] Concil. ibid.

all who professed the faith, that was believed at Rome to be the only true faith; who, before his accession to the empire, had frequented schismatical assemblies, and had even raised some disturbances in the church, for which Euphemius had threatened to cause him to be shaved, that is, to be shut up in a monastery; and would not consent to his election till he had promised, upon oath, to take the decree of Chalcedon for the rule of his faith, and given him that promise, in his own hand-writing, to be lodged in the archives of the church? (a) Was the pope unacquainted with transactions, which the whole world knew? Or did he hope by such commendations to flatter the emperor into a compliance with his request.

(a) Theod. Lect. p. 58. Evagr. l. 3. c. 12. Vict. Tun. in chron.

[1] Theoph. p. 123. Theodor. Lect. p. 560. Niceph. l. 16.
[2] Anast. Biblioth. in Anast.
[3] Concil. t. 4. p. 1184. [4] Anast. Bib. in Anast.

The condescension of the pope gives offence to the Roman clergy. Deputies sent from the church of Alexandria, to negotiate a reconciliation with Rome;—[Year of Christ, 498.] The contents of the memorial, which they presented to the legates. Their confession of faith. The legates not satisfied with it, but receive it.

not caring perhaps to disclose his real sentiments so freely to them as to him, or, apprehending that, as they were bishops, and consequently not a little prejudiced, though the most moderate he could choose, against the see of Constantinople, and in favor of the see of Rome, they would be more apt to stand upon punctilio than an unprejudiced layman, and might for the sake of some trifle, for some idle claim or pretension, obstruct the great work for which they were sent. It is not to be doubted, but Festus had a private commission, and private instructions from the pope, concerning the present important affair, though historians speak of him as only employed by king Theodoric in civil affairs. For the emperor, as we have seen, chose to treat with him, and not with the legates; and the deputies from the church of Alexandria, in the memorial, which we shall soon see them present to the legates, name Festus even before them.

The bibliothecarian writes, that so much condescension in the pope, and particularly his communicating with the Acacian deacon, gave great offence to the Roman clergy.[1] No one can doubt but it did, most of the ecclesiastics of Rome being for maintaining, at all events, the dignity and grandeur of a see, in which every low clerk among them flattered himself then, as they all do now, that he should sit one day himself. But that they should have carried their resentment against the good pope to such a height, as to separate themselves from his communion,[2] is too remarkable an event to have escaped the notice of the contemporary historians, or to be credited upon the bare testimony of a writer of the 9th century, often guilty of great mistakes with respect to facts much less remote from his own time.

The arrival of the legates at Constantinople, and the peaceable disposition of the pope, were no sooner known at Alexandria, than it was determined there, that deputies should be sent, in the name of that church to negotiate a reconciliation with Rome. The persons employed on this occasion were Dioscorus and Cheremon, the former a presbyter, and afterwards bishop of that city, and the latter only a reader. On their arrival at Constantinople they presented a memorial to Festus, and the two legates thus addressed: "To the most glorious and most excellent patrician Festus, and to the venerable bishops Cresconius and Germanus, sent, together with him, on a legation from the city of Rome to the most clement and amiable emperor, in Christ, Anastasius, Dioscorus presbyter, and Cheremon reader, *responsales*, or nuncios, of the venerable church of Alexandria." They begin their memorial with a long apology, to justify the conduct of the church of Alexandria, in separating herself from the communion of Rome. This separation was entirely owing, according to their account, to a false translation of pope Leo's letter, concerning the two natures, done by Theodoret, and plainly containing the blasphemous tenet of the wicked Nestorius. From the Greek translation they had judged of the Latin original; and thence concluding the errors, which the Nestorian translator had inserted, to be the doctrine of the Roman church, they had thereupon separated themselves, as it was their duty to do, from her communion. But having been lately informed by the deacon Photinus, that the original letter, which he had seen at Rome, contained nothing but what was entirely agreeable to the definitions of Nice, and that the present bishop of that city had condemned, in his presence, the errors which had given offence to the church of Alexandria, the said church, desirous of renewing her communion with the catholic church of the city of Rome, had chosen them to negotiate the so long wished for reconciliation. From this part of the memorial it is manifest, as we may observe here, by the way, that the Egyptians were utter strangers to the infallibility of the pope, or the Roman church; nay, that the pope himself was as great a stranger to that prerogative as they. For, if he had pretended to be infallible, no man can imagine, that the Alexandrians would have supposed him fallible, as they plainly do, at the very time they were striving to gain his good will, and in a memorial artfully calculated for that purpose. We know what kind of reception such a memorial would meet with now, though nothing was then objected against it by either of the legates.

To the memorial the deputies added a confession of the faith professed at that time by the church of Alexandria. In that confession they received the definitions of Nice, confirmed by the councils of Constantinople, and the first of Ephesus; acknowledged the Son of God to be true man; and ended with anathematizing, according to the charity that prevailed in those days, Eutyches, and with him all who held now, or ever had held, in what place or council soever, opinions or doctrines differing from theirs.[1] The legates were not at all pleased with this confession, no mention being there made of the council of Chalcedon; and Christ being only acknowledged to be true God, and true man, without any declaration whether they believed him to be only "of two natures," or both "of and in two natures." However, they received it, such as it was; and promised to deliver it to the pope on their return to Rome. But his holiness, they added, will insist on your erasing the names of Dioscorus, Ælurus, and Mongus out of the roll of your bishops, as a preliminary to the peace for which you are suing. The deputies replied, that, if their confession

[1] Anast. Ibid. [2] Idem. ibid.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1283—1285.

The pope dies before the return of his legates. Why he has not been sainted. Aspersions cast on his memory. His death not a judgment. He is not free from all blame. Clovis, the first Christian king of the Franks, converted in his time.

of faith was approved at Rome, they would make it appear, that those three holy archbishops had held that, and no other faith; and consequently, that the mentioning or suppressing their names depended on the reception which that confession should meet with.[1] It is remarkably ridiculous, that, in the end of their memorial, they tell the legates, that they have kept a copy of it by them, to be produced in judgment on the last day, should Rome neglect to concur with them in re-establishing the peace of the catholic church.

The legates continued at Constantinople till the month of September of the present year 498, when they set out from that city, together with Festus, on their return to Italy. But the pope died before they reached Rome; which was a great disappointment and mortification to Festus, who, depending on his inclination to peace, and the confidence the pope reposed in him, had entertained hopes of seeing the ancient harmony soon restored between the east and the west, and of being himself instrumental in so great a work. As Anastasius was a lover of peace, an enemy to all strife and contention, free from ambition, now the chief merit of a pope, and ready to sacrifice even the pretensions of his see to the welfare of the church, I need not tell the reader, that he has not been thought worthy of a place in the calendar. And it must be owned, the church could not, without the greatest inconsistency, have conferred the honor of saintship upon him, after she had bestowed it on his two immediate predecessors, Gelasius and Felix. For, if it was deemed meritorious in them to have kindled the flame of discord by a haughty behaviour, his striving, by a quite contrary conduct, to extinguish that flame, could not be thought meritorious in him. Some, and the bibliothecarian, with his transcriber Platina, among the rest, have even endeavored to blacken his character, and asperse his memory, as if he had been cut off by a sudden death,(*) which they style a just judgment, that he might not have time to put in execution the wicked design he had formed, to the irreparable prejudice of the catholic faith. To read those authors, one would think, that this good pope was the most wicked of men; that he designed nothing less than utterly to extirpate the Christian religion; and, by turning Manichee, or embracing some other detestable sect, introduce all their abominations into the church. But the wicked design he had formed is reduced, in the end, to this: that he had determined to suffer the name of Acacius to stand among the names of other bishops, if he could by no other means heal the divisions which had prevailed so long among the Christian bishops. One would hardly think men endued with the least share of common sense, or in the least acquainted with the doctrine of the gospel, capable of entertaining such absurd and antichristian notions. However, Baronius seems to fall in with them, and to think, that Anastasius was cut off in the very beginning of his pontificate, lest he should, by an unseasonable condescension, and a mistaken zeal for the unity of the faith, have defeated the measures, which his predecessors had so steadily pursued;[1] that is, lest it should ever be said, that a pope had yielded, and, by a Christian condescension, repaired the mischief which his predecessors had done. Anastasius enjoyed the pontificate, as Baronius observes, a very short time. But had he only cast his eye on the catalogue of the popes, he would have found many there, threescore at least, who did not enjoy it so long as he, and some of them entirely answering the character, which the annalist seems to have drawn to himself, of a good pope. And might not we with better reason construe their death into a judgment for their pride and presumption, than he does that of Anastasius for his Christian condescension and moderation? But, after all, I will not take upon me to justify the conduct of Anastasius in every respect, and clear him from all kind of blame. In his letter to the emperor, he owned it to be a matter of very small moment, a mere trifle, whether the name of Acacius was omitted, or mentioned. Why then did he require it at all to be omitted? Why did he delay concluding an affair of the utmost importance for the sake of a trifle?

As to the writings of Anastasius, besides the letter he wrote to the emperor, which I have mentioned above, there is one from him to Clovis, king of the Franks, congratulating that prince on his conversion to the Christian religion. For Clovis, the first Christian king of the Franks, was baptized on Christmas day, 496, the very day, according to some, on which the pope was ordained.[2] But neither the pope nor the church had great reason to be proud of the new convert. He changed his religion, not his manners; or, if he changed his manners, it was for the worse, having been guilty of far more enormous crimes, or more cruel, treacherous, and unnatural murders, after his conversion, than he had ever committed while he was still a pagan. But he was a zealous catholic, built some churches, presented St. Peter with a crown of gold enriched with precious stones; and therefore has been highly commended, even as a religious prince, by almost all the ecclesiastical writers of those times; as if his zeal for the faith, and liberality to the church,

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1283—1285.

(*) "Ferunt divino nutu hominem subito morbo correptum interiisse. Sunt qui dicant eum in latrinam effudisse intestina, dum necessitati naturæ obtemperat," says Platina, speaking of the death of this pope. (a)

(a) Plat. in Anast.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 497. n. 28.

[2] Flottemanville annal. politic. Eccles. ad ann. 496. n. 18.

Clovis' conversion owing rather to motives of policy, than religion. Schism in the Roman church. Symmachus and Laurentius chosen on the same day; which occasions a civil war in the city. Both recur to king Theodoric; who adjudges the see to Symmachus.

could, in their opinion, have fully atoned for the most barbarous assassinations that are recorded in history.(*) A French historian, of no mean character, seems to ascribe the conversion of that prince to motives of policy, not of religion; as if he had embraced the catholic faith chiefly with a view to engage the affections of the Gauls, whom he had already subdued, and, at the same time, recommend himself to the rest of that nation, who lived in subjection to the Burgundians and Goths, but were not at all pleased with their new masters, because they professed and countenanced the Arian doctrine.[1](*)

Some fragments of another letter, from Anastasius to one Ursicinus, concerning the Incarnation, have been published by Baluzius, in his new collection of councils. The letters of this pope are chiefly made up of passages out of the old and new Testament, which are not always properly applied.

SYMMACHUS, FIFTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANASTASIUS.]

[Year of Christ 498.] THE death of Anastasius was attended with a great schism in the Roman church. Symmachus, a native of Sardinia, the son of one Fortunatus, and deacon of the Roman church, was chosen in the basilic of Constantine; and, on the same day, was chosen in the basilic of St. Mary, Laurentius, a Roman, and arch-presbyter of that church. The senate, as well as the people and clergy, was divided on this occasion, some of the senators heading the one party, and some the other. Laurentius was powerfully supported by the patrician Festus, who is even said to have bribed, with large sums, those who chose him, not doubting but he should be able to persuade the new pope, if his party prevailed, to receive the henoticon, agreeably to the promise which he had made to the emperor. A civil war being thus kindled within the walls of the city, skirmishes happened daily in the streets; and, as Paulus Diaconus expresses it, murders, robberies, and other infinite evils, were, during this confusion, perpetrated at Rome.[1] To put an end to these evils, it was agreed, among the leading men of both parties, that the two competitors should repair to Ravenna, should plead their cause there before king Theodoric, and stand to his judgment. Unhappy times! exclaims here Baronius, when the high pontiff was forced to plead his cause at the tribunal of an Arian prince.[2] But Theodoric, though an Arian, was one of the best, as well as the wisest princes that ever swayed a sceptre, was the high pontiff's lord and sovereign, and, as such, had the same right to decide the dispute between Laurentius and Symmachus, as the emperor Honorius had to compose the difference, that arose in his time, between Eulalius and Boniface.[3] The king received the two competitors with the same marks of respect and friendship, heard both with the same attention and patience, and, when they had done pleading, ordered him to be put in possession of the disputed see, who should be found, upon an impartial inquiry, to have had the greater number of votes, or to have been ordained the first. Both these circumstances concurred in favor of Symmachus, who was thereupon declared lawful pope, and placed by the king's order on the papal chair.[4]

The good king was not satisfied with having put an end, as he believed, to the present schism, and the evils attending it: but, de-

(*) The royal proselyte seems to have been but very indifferently instructed in the principles of the Christian religion. For, we are told, that St. Remigius, bishop of Rheims, by whom he was baptized, having preached a sermon to him, after his baptism, on the passion and sufferings of our Savior, the king, in hearing him, cried out aloud, "If I had been there with my Franks, that should never have happened." (a)

It was to anoint this king at his baptism, that the famous oil is said to have been sent from heaven, with which the French kings are now anointed at their coronation. But of that oil no mention is made by Gregory of Tours, a great believer and relater of miracles, in the account he gives us of the baptism of Clovis: a plain proof, that, in his time, the latter end of the 6th century, that fable was not yet invented. It was first related by Hincmar, bishop of Rheims, who lived two hundred years after Gregory, and three hundred after the time in which the miracle is supposed to have happened; but nevertheless he describes it, with all its circumstances, even the minutest, as if it had happened in his own time, and he had been present when it happened. (b)

(a) Hist. Fran. epit. c. 22. (b) Hinc. in vit. Remig.

[1] Paul. Diac. l. 17. Greg. Dial. l. 4. c. 40.

[1] Mezeray, Abregé Chronol. ad ann. 496.

(*) It is observable, that Clovis was, at this time, the only catholic prince in the known world, as the word catholic was then understood. Anastasius, emperor of the east, was a professed Eutychian. Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths in Italy; Alaric, king of the Visigoths, master of all Spain, and of the third part of Gaul; the kings of the Burgundians, Suevians, and Vandals, in Gaul, Spain, and Africa; were all zealous followers of Arius. As for the other kings of the Franks settled in Gaul, they were still pagans. Clovis was not only the sole catholic prince at this time in the world; but the first king that ever embraced the catholic religion; which has procured to the French king the title of the "most Christian," and that of "the eldest son of the church." But were we to compare the conduct and actions of Clovis, the catholic, with those of the Arian king Theodoric, such a comparison would no ways redound to the honor of the catholic faith.

[2] Bar. ad ann. 498. [3] See p. 163.

[4] Theod. Lect. l. 2. Niceph. l. 17. c. 36.

The king summons a council. Regulations made by this council concerning the election of the bishop of Rome. The quarrel between the bishops of Arles and Vienne revived. Symmachus annuls what his predecessor had done in favor of the latter. The reason he alleges for so doing, false in the opinion of the popes themselves. The pope subject to temporal princes, before he was himself a temporal prince.

sirous to guard against the like evils for the time to come, he ordered a council to meet at Rome, with a strict charge to the bishops who composed it, to make such regulations as might seem to them, in their wisdom, capable of preventing all competitions and cabals, and effectually restraining the ambition of aspiring and worldly-minded men. Theodoric knew, without all doubt, that the external government of the church belonged of right to him; that he had succeeded the Roman emperors in this, as well as in all their other rights; and consequently, that he could, after their example, enact such laws relating to the ecclesiastical polity, as he thought the most conducive to the public good. But such was the moderation of that prince, such the regard he had for the clergy, the catholic clergy, that he chose rather to lend, in a manner, his power to them, than exercise it himself. The council met, pursuant to the king's order, on the first of March, 499, when the following regulations were proposed by Symmachus, and unanimously agreed to by the seventy-two bishops, who composed that assembly. 1. That, if any presbyter, deacon, or clerk, should, in the pope's life-time, and without his knowledge, presume to engage his vote, against a new election, by word of mouth, by oath, or in writing, he should be excommunicated and deposed. 2. That if the pope should die suddenly, and not have time to give any directions concerning the election of his successor,(*) he should be deemed lawfully chosen, who had either the whole body, or the major part of the clergy on his side. This was confining the election of the pope to the clergy, and excluding the laity from having any share in the choice of their bishop; at least rendering their concurrence unnecessary, and quite insignificant. 3. By the present council, rewards were promised to such as should discover the intrigues, cabals, or designs, that might thenceforth be privately carried on by ambitious men, in defiance of the regulations now agreed to. This decree was signed by seventy-two bishops, sixty-seven presbyters, and five deacons. Among the presbyters Cælius Laurentius, the competitor of Symmachus, signed the first.[1]

The old quarrel between the bishops of Arles and Vienne, about jurisdiction, was, it seems, revived in the time of Anastasius; and that pope had favored the latter. The bishop of Arles, therefore, no sooner heard of the election of Symmachus, than he applied to him, representing the regulations made by his predecessor, as innovations utterly inconsistent with the decisions of Leo. Symmachus answered him by a letter, dated the 29th of September, 499, and, in that letter, declared all Anastasius had done to the prejudice of the see of Arles, to be null, because no bishop, says he, has a power to make regulations repugnant to those which his predecessors have made. A doctrine, to which Anastasius was a stranger; "and therefore did," says Symmachus, "what he ought not to have done, let the necessity be ever so urgent (quod non oportebat sub qualibet necessitate)." But to that doctrine Boniface, and Leo himself, were as great strangers as Anastasius, even with respect to the regulations concerning the pretensions of the two rival sees of Arles and Vienne. For both those popes revoked, and the latter by a more equitable sentence, as he declared, the extravagant privileges, which, to the prejudice of the see of Vienne, had been granted by their predecessor Zosimus to that of Arles.[1] It is now, notwithstanding the declaration of Symmachus, the current doctrine maintained by all true papists, and followed, in practice, by the popes themselves, that the sitting pope may abrogate every decree made by those who sate before him; nay, if he pleases, all their regulations, statutes, and laws. This doctrine they ground on what they lay down as a first principle, that "the pope is above all laws; that no law can be binding with respect to him, to whom an unlimited power was granted of loosening or binding whatever he thought fit to loosen or bind." The only person to whom, in their opinion, the pope can be said to be subject, is his confessor.[2] For the pope, though infallible, has not yet been thought impeccable; and consequently has as much occasion for a confessor as any other sinner. But the confessor, says Bellarmine, acts only as an instrument in the hand of God; and therefore the obedience, which the pope is bound to yield to him, is, in truth, yielded to God alone.[3] Thus does he, at once, absolutely overset, by his method of reasoning, what he had, with infinite labor and pains, been striving to establish, the papal independency on every human creature. For if the pope is obliged to yield obedience to his confessor, because his confessor acts as an instrument in the hand of God; he was, for the same reason, obliged to yield obedience to the temporal princes, before he was himself a temporal prince, since they acted not only as instruments in the hand of God, but, by the pope's own confession, as God's vicars upon earth.

The pope, in his letter to the bishop of Arles, gives another reason why the privileges, granted by his predecessor to the see

(*) It was customary for the pope to name, on his death-bed, the person, whom he thought the best qualified to succeed him, and recommend him to the people and clergy. This custom obtained not only at Rome, but in many other places; and great regard was every where paid to the recommendation of the dying bishop. Baronius observes, that the popes used to recommend; but that none, besides St. Peter, ever presumed to appoint his successor.(a) I see no reason why they should not: if they inherited all St. Peter's power, they could not think it a crime to do what he had done.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 499. n. 2.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1312. Theod. Lect. l. 2.

[1] See p. 165. [2] Vide Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 19.
[3] Bellar. ibid.

Symmachus will have all popes to adhere to the laws and measures of their predecessors. The pope is charged with several crimes. The war rekindled in Rome, and dreadful disorders committed. Paschasius, a great saint, sides with Laurentius. The partisans of Laurentius recur to the king, and demand a visitor.

of Vienne, should be revoked, namely, because it is a matter of the utmost importance to the Christian religion, that the bishops, especially the bishops of Rome, who are the vicars of the most blessed Peter, should agree in their opinion and judgment of things; that the one should not abrogate, upon any consideration, what the other has established; but that all, who come after, should steadily adhere to the laws, that have been made by those who preceded. That it was a maxim with most of the popes, to maintain, right or wrong, what their predecessors had done, without being under any concern about the consequences, is what I have had frequent occasion to observe in the course of this history. But nevertheless we are obliged to Symmachus for having so ingenuously owned it. There is in this letter another notion worthy of notice. The pope there compares the priesthood to the Trinity. For as there is a trinity of persons, says he, and only one Godhead, one undivided power; so there are many bishops, but only one priesthood. From thence he concludes, that bishops should all act with one mind, one heart, and one will. But that bishops all have, or originally had, the same power, had been, perhaps, a more natural inference from the comparison, if it would hold in any respect.

Symmachus was soon diverted from attending to the affairs of the churches abroad, by the disturbances, that, in the beginning of the present year, 500, were revived with more violence than ever at home. The pope was charged with several heinous crimes by the patrician Festus, and a senator, named Probinus, both zealous partisans of Laurentius; and witnesses were sent to make the charge good, before the king, at Ravenna. This gave occasion to the rekindling of the war between the two parties in Rome; and several priests, many clerks, and a great number of citizens, fell daily in the battles, that were fought in the different parts of the city.[1] No regard was shown, by either party, to rank or dignity; and not even the sacred virgins were spared by the enraged multitude, in their fury. Ennodius, a notorious flatterer of of the popes, who lived at this time, supposes all those, who died in the cause of Symmachus, to have been enrolled in the register of the court of heaven,[2] though guilty of the same excesses as those are said to have been, who died in the cause of Laurentius. Baronius, we may be sure, falls in with him. The most inveterate enemy Symmachus had, was one Paschasius, deacon of the Roman church, and a great saint. Indeed the saints of the Romish calendar, generally speaking, were the worst of enemies, the most implacable, and, as they commonly had the mob at their back, the most to be dreaded. Paschasius could never be prevailed upon to abandon Laurentius; and great part of the populace, believing him to be true pope, whom a man of Paschasius' character acknowledged for such, could never be persuaded to own any other, so long as Paschasius lived.[1] But the saint, if we may believe pope Gregory the Great, paid dear for his obstinacy, after his death.(*)

It was now no longer common enmity, but rage and madness, that armed the two parties against each other; and Rome, perhaps, had never seen, in the election of her pagan magistrates, such scenes of horror as she now beheld, in the election of her Christian bishop. The senators therefore, Probinus and Festus, despatched, in the end, an express to the king at Ravenna, acquainting him with the murders, and other excesses, that were daily committed, with impunity, not only in the streets, but in the churches themselves; and, at the same time, entreating him to send them a visitor, with an unlimited power, to try Symmachus on the indictment which was lodged against him, and to govern the Roman

[1] Paul. Diac. l. 4. c. 40. Niceph. l. 6. c. 35.
[2] Enod. in Apol.

[1] Greg. dialog. l. 4. c. 40.

(*) Paschasius was, according to the character pope Gregory has drawn of him, a man of extraordinary sanctity, entirely given to works of charity, a cherisher of the poor, and despiser of himself. But, in the dispute between Symmachus and Laurentius, he stood by the latter, says the pope; and, not yielding when the others had all yielded, continued in the same mind to the day of his death. He died, adds Gregory, in the time of Symmachus; and a demoniac was delivered by only touching the dalmatic that covered his coffin. Long after his death Germanus of Capua being come to Angulum, to use, as had been prescribed to him by the physicians, the hot baths of that place; at his first entering them, who should he see standing there, in the midst of the hot steam, but the deacon Paschasius? The bishop, surprised and terrified at such a strange sight, asked the deacon what business he had there? Alas! answered he, I am confined to this painful place for no other fault, but that of siding with Laurentius against Symmachus. But pray for me, I entreat you; and if you do not find me here on your return, you may conclude, that your prayer has been heard. The holy man prayed, and returned a few days after; but the deacon was gone; and he saw him no more. It was not out of malice, continues the pope, but ignorance, that he sinned; and therefore he could be cleansed from his sin, even after his death. His plentiful alms procured him his pardon, when there was no more room for meritorious works.(a) Baronius betrays here a strong inclination to contradict the pope, that he may have the satisfaction of damning the poor deacon, with all his good works, because he did not own Symmachus to have been lawfully chosen. The obstinate deacon, says he, lived separated from the church, (that is, from the pope, who to him is the whole church); and in this all agree, that none, who lived separated from the church upon earth, can be admitted into heaven. This is pleading hard for his damnation. But, on the other hand, not daring to disbelieve or question even an old woman's story, when gravely related by a pope, he owns Paschasius to have been saved, because he repented, and died in the communion of Symmachus; without which all his good works would have stood him in no stead. But when did he repent? On the day of his death, says the annalist, pope Gregory telling us, in express terms, that Paschasius stood by Laurentius, and continued in that mind *till* the day of his death, which plainly implies, that he changed his mind on that day. An interpretation worthy, indeed, of Baronius, but unworthy of an answer.(b)

(a) Greg. dialog. l. 4 c. 40.
(b) Bar. ad. ann. 498. p. 538, D.

The king complies with the request of the partisans of Laurentius. The visitor heightens the animosities with his rash conduct. The king resolves to repair to Rome in person. How received there by the people and clergy. His obliging behavior and generosity to all. The happiness of Italy under Theodoric.

churches, as if the see were vacant, till his innocence was made to appear. This they proposed to the king as the most effectual means, that occurred to them, of saving the lives of thousands of citizens, and the city itself from utter ruin. These senators, at least, as we may observe by the way, owned the king to be the head of the church, and to be vested as such, though a heretic, with a power not only to try, but to condemn, and depose the pope himself, were he found unworthy of the papal dignity. The king approved the expedient which the senators suggested; named Peter, bishop of Altino, visitor of the Roman church; and sent him to Rome, with that character, and the powers attending it. But that prelate proved, very unluckily, a violent party-man, entirely addicted to the cause of Laurentius, and an avowed enemy to his rival Symmachus. Instead therefore of waiting on the latter, at his arrival in the city, pursuant to the instructions the king had given him, he deprived him of the administration before he had either heard or seen him, and took possession of all the effects belonging to the church. Thus, says Ennodius the pope's panegyrist, was he, who supported the poor, reduced himself to the most abject and mean state of poverty. Thus was slavery seen in dominion, and dominion in slavery.[1]

The visitor, instead of allaying, heightened the animosities, with his rash and precipitate conduct. The partisans of Symmachus, with the senator Faustus at their head, grew quite outrageous; and the friends of Laurentius were not at all backward in retaliating upon them the outrages they committed. The good king therefore, greatly affected with the melancholy accounts that were daily transmitted to him by his officers in the city, and quite at a loss what remedy he should next apply to the raging evil, resolved in the end (so much had he the welfare of his subjects at heart) to repair to Rome in person, not doubting but his presence would keep both parties in awe, and put an end, since nothing else could, to so destructive a war. This resolution he is said to have taken the more readily, as he had never yet seen that once so famous metropolis of the world, now the metropolis of his new kingdom. His intention was no sooner known at Rome, than the rage of the parties began to subside; hostilities ceased, and the only emulation that now prevailed was, who should, by the most distinguishing marks of affection and duty, testify their gratitude to so benevolent a prince. As he approached the city, he was met by the senate, by the pope, who had not yet set up for the sovereign of princes, by the clergy, and by numberless crowds of the people. He made his entry, amidst the loud acclamations of the multitude, with such pomp and magnificence as Rome had not seen for many ages. He was welcomed in the senate, by the famous Boetius, who, on that occasion, made an eloquent speech, setting forth the eminent virtues of the prince, and the happiness of the people, who had the good fortune to live under his mild administration. From the senate he proceeded to the circus, and there, in a speech to the people, expressed his sincere desire of their welfare, exhorted them to peace and concord, confirmed all the privileges that had ever been granted them by the emperors, and assured them of his protection and favor. He continued six months at Rome, and during that time diverted the people with magnificent sports, gave frequent entertainments to the senate, heard the complaints of all who applied to him, and redressed their grievances, when he found their complaints to be just. At his departure he ordered a hundred thousand bushels of corn to be distributed yearly among the poor of the city; and appointed a large sum to be paid, likewise yearly, out of the exchequer, to keep the walls in repair, and other decayed buildings. Before he set out, on his return to Ravenna, he took his leave of the senate, and on that occasion expressed a great desire to fix his residence at Rome: but your safety, he added, and that of the state, oblige me to reside, as my predecessors have done, at Ravenna, being there near at hand, and ready to stop the barbarians, who on that side only can break into my kingdom, and disturb that peace, which I have spared no pains to procure you, and sincerely wish you, and the rest of my subjects, may long enjoy.[1]

The high commendations, which the contemporary writers, though zealous catholics, and some of them now honored as saints, have bestowed on Theodoric, though a follower of Arius, are a convincing proof, that he made good what he promised to the natives of Italy, when he first took upon him the title of king of that country, namely. That his conduct should be such as to make them all wish they had come sooner under the government of the Goths. He retained the same laws, the same magistrates, the same polity, and the same distribution of provinces, that had been established by his predecessors the emperors; nay, and obliged the Goths themselves, who dwelt in Italy, to conform to the same laws and polity; which was obliging the conquerors to submit to the laws of the conquered. He left to the Goths some of their own laws; but by those laws were only decided suits and disputes between Goth and Goth; all other suits, whether between Romans and Romans, or Romans and Goths, being determined by the Roman laws only. The good king did not impose a single new tax or tribute on the people, during the whole time of his long reign; but contented himself with those that had been levied by the emperors; with this difference, that he was more ready than the

[1] Ennod. in Apolog.

[1] Anony. Val. Ennod. de Theod. et in apolog.

Theodoric grants full liberty to the Goths, of professing the catholic faith. His concern for the welfare of the church. The Arian Goths, patterns of every Christian virtue.

best of them had ever been, to remit them on occasion of any public calamity; saying, it was better that one should suffer than many; that public calamities were sent to punish the sins of the prince, as well as those of the people; and that where the guilt was common, the punishment too ought to be common.[1] He left every man in the full enjoyment of his ancient property; and, not satisfied with appointing men of great learning, and unblemished characters, to administer justice, he often heard causes himself; and, in giving sentence, was never known to have swerved from the strictest laws and rules of equity.[2] As to religion, Theodoric held, as the Goths all did, the tenets of Arius, that nation having been first instructed in the Christian religion by Arian teachers, sent them by the emperor Valens. But he allowed his subjects to profess, without molestation, the faith of Nice; nay, and gave full liberty to the Goths themselves to renounce, if they thought it more pleasing to God, the doctrine of Arius, and embrace, in its room, the catholic faith. For granting this liberty, as he was himself an Arian, he is as much commended by the catholic writers, as he would have been censured by them, had he been a catholic, and allowed his subjects to abjure, if they thought that more pleasing to God, the catholic faith, and embrace in its stead, the doctrine of Arius. To this general toleration in Theodoric was entirely owing the profound tranquillity, which the church enjoyed at this time in Italy, while a general confusion reigned in the east, because the emperor would oblige his subjects to profess the doctrine which he professed, and, when he thought fit to change his opinion, to change theirs together with him. Theodoric did not, it seems, think the difference in point of doctrine, between the Arians and catholics would justify his disturbing the peace of his subjects about it. No catholic prince ever showed greater concern for the welfare of the church, than this Goth, this stranger, barbarian, heretic, Arian, as Baronius is pleased to style him. None ever took more care to provide her with good governors, no one having been preferred, in his time, to the episcopal dignity, as Cassiodorus assures us,[3] but men of known probity, and worthy of the rank to which they were raised. As Theodoric was, according to Ennodius, on account of his moderation, temperance, chastity, which that writer calls sacerdotal modesty, and his other eminent virtues, the pattern of a perfect king; so were the Goths, in his reign, true patterns of every Christian virtue, more especially of chastity. "What the Romans," that is, the natives of Italy, who were still called Romans, "have polluted with fornication," says Salvianus,[1] "the barbarians have purified with their chastity. We, who are good catholics, love uncleanness; they, who are heretics, abhor and detest it; we hate purity, and avoid it; they admire and embrace it." A mortifying comparison to the catholics of those days; the rather, as it was made by a catholic bishop.(*)

[1] Grot. in Proleg. ad hist. Goth. Cassiodor. var. l. 4. ep. 50. et l. 2. ep. 37.

[2] Cassiodor. l. 8. ep. 14. et l. 9. ep. 15. Salvian. de gubern. Dei, l. 5.

[3] Cassidor. l. 8. ep. 14.

[1] Salvian. l. 5. de gubern. Dei.

(*) The only thing that the enemies of Theodoric have been able to lay to his charge, is the death of the famous Boetius, and his father-in-law Symmachus, whom he is said to have sentenced to death, and caused to be executed, as guilty of high treason, upon the deposition of persons known by all, and by himself, to be men of impious characters. He behaved, it must be owned, on that occasion, very differently from what he had done on all others. But, if we attend to the circumstances and state of affairs at that time, we shall not perhaps find him to have been quite so guilty as some have endeavored to make him appear. For, in the first place, he did not condemn the two senators upon the deposition of those infamous men, as is generally supposed; but only confined them to the city of Pavia, to prevent them, by that means, from putting their treasonable designs in execution, if they had formed any. It was during his confinement that Boetius wrote his excellent book De Consolatione. In the mean time the enemies they both had at court, especially Boetius, who till that time had been the chief favorite there, spared no pains to prejudice the king against them, as men of great interest and power in the senate, extremely popular, and, at the same time, disaffected to his person and government. The king was advanced in years, being then in the seventy-second of his age, and, as old kings often are, grown jealous of his power. His grandson Athalaric, whom he had appointed to succeed him, was yet a child; and his daughter, Amalasuntha, the mother of that child, the only person who could be safely trusted with the administration, during a minority. In these circumstances they persuaded the king, that he could by no other means secure the crown to young Athalaric, and prevent the disturbances which might be raised during his minority, but by removing those out of the way, who were alone capable of raising them. Thus was the fatal sentence extorted at last; but, it was no sooner put in execution, than the king, reflecting coolly on his rash conduct, for such it certainly was, and thereupon apprehending that the death of the supposed criminals might be rather owing to the jealousy of their enemies and rivals at court, than to any guilt or demerit of their own, was affected with such sorrow, that it may be said to have equalled the injustice of the sentence; nay, his grief was so great, according to Procopius, a writer not at all favorable to the Goths, that it in a manner distracted him, and he did not long outlive those whom he had so unjustly put to death; that being, as the historian adds, the first and last wrong any of his subjects had ever received at his hands. (*a*) Some have attempted to make Boetius a martyr, as if the treason of which he was arraigned, had served only as a pretence with the Arian king, who wanted to condemn him for the book he wrote on the Trinity, and inscribed to Symmachus. But nothing is more certain, than that Theodoric favored the orthodox no less than those of his own persuasion, and allowed to all full liberty of professing which of the two opinions they thought best. Besides, the religion of Boetius was rather Platonic than Christian, as Grotius well observes; and the treaties he wrote savors more of the doctrine of that philosopher, than it does of the religion of Christ. (*b*) Had Theodoric been a catholic, the death of Boetius would, probably, have been overlooked, or excused, if not justified by those very writers, who have taken most pains to exaggerate the injustice of that sentence. Clovis was guilty, after his conversion, of the most enormous excesses of injustice and cruelty, as I have observed above; and yet, as he was a catholic, those very excesses have not only been excused by the ecclesiastical writers, who flourished at that time, but impiously represented,

(*a*) Procop. hist. Goth. p. 232.

(*b*) Grot. in Proleg. ad hist. Goth.

Theodoric assembles a council, to try the pope. A battle between the friends of Laurentius and Symmachus. Symmachus wounded. He pleads the danger he was in, and refuses to appear. The bishops and the king receive the excuse. He is acquitted by the council. The friends of Laurentius protest against ths decree of the council. The notions of ths pope's independency on councils first broached.

It was either during his stay in the city, or soon after his return to Ravenna, that Theodoric summoned all the bishops in his dominions to meet at Rome, in order to examine the charge brought against Symmachus. The pope indeed had been accused at his tribunal; but the king chose rather to have him tried by an assembly of bishops, than to try him himself, not being so well acquainted as they with the canons and laws of the church. In compliance with the king's order, the bishops repaired to Rome, from all parts of Italy, and met, for the first time, in the month of July of the year 501, when the pope, presenting himself before them, desired that, before anything else was transacted, the visitor, who had been appointed contrary to the canons, might be removed, and the effects restored to him, which belonged to the church; and had been seized by the visitor. The bishops were inclined to favor the pope, and comply with his demand; but the king, whom they first consulted by deputies, sent for that purpose to Ravenna, would not allow anything to be done in his favor, till he had cleared himself from the crimes laid to his charge. Upon the return therefore of the deputies the bishops met again, on the 1st of September, with a design to examine the charge, and hear both the pope, and those who accused him. To their judgment Symmachus pretended to submit; and accordingly set out from the church of St. Peter, for the palace of Sessorius, where the bishops were assembled; but attended and guarded by such crowds, as were capable of awing the judges, as well as the witnesses. Of this the enemies of Symmachus were aware; and therefore endeavored to disperse them; but, meeting with resistance, a battle ensued, in which some were killed on both sides, and many wounded. Among the latter was the pope himself; and he would hardly have escaped with his life, had not three of the king's officers hastened to his rescue, and guarded him back, amidst showers of stones, to the church of St. Peter.[1] The danger to which he found himself exposed on this occasion, he pleaded as an excuse for not appearing before the council, though three times summoned; and the bishops, most of them being favorable to him, were not only satisfied with that excuse, but sent deputies to inform the king of what had passed, and at the same time to represent to him, that the pope could not venture abroad, without endangering his life; that his enemies were more than ever incensed against him, and only wanted an opportunity of treating him as they had already treated many of his friends; that in these circumstances the king indeed might by his authority, but they could not by the canons and laws of the church, oblige him to appear before them. The king answered, that the council knew best what they could, and what they could not do; that as for himself, he would not meddle with ecclesiastical matters, but left them to be settled by the holy bishops, to whose judgment and decisions he should always pay the greatest regard; that, with respect to the cause of Symmachus, he had assembled them to judge it; but yet left them at full liberty to judge it, or not, provided they could by any other means put a stop to the present calamities, and restore the wished-for tranquillity to the city of Rome.[1] With this answer the deputies returned; and, upon their return, the bishops assembled the third and last time, on the 21st, or, as we read in some manuscripts, on the 13th of October. In that session, after a long and warm debate between the friends of Symmachus, and those of Laurentius, a very remarkable decree was issued, and signed by the former, seventy-two in number. For, by that decree, they not only acquitted Symmachus from all the crimes laid to his charge, without so much as hearing those who accused him, but commanded all, on pain of excommunication, to acquiesce in their judgment, to submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him, now that he was absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God, for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome.[2] But those of the opposite party were so far from acquiescing in such a sentence, that, on the contrary, they published a protest, or manifesto, against "the synod," as they styled it, "of the incongruous absolution," setting forth the reasons that had induced them to disagree with their brethren, and made them still look upon Symmachus as guilty, notwithstanding the judgment given by the major part in his favor. These were, 1. Because most of the bishops, who assisted at the council, were evidently biassed in his favor, and came, as was well known, with a design to absolve him, whether guilty or innocent. 2. Because his accusers had not been heard; and as no judge could condemn a man without hearing him, so none could absolve him without hearing those who accused him. 3. Because the pope had, under various pretences, refused to appear before his judges, though four times summoned; and a person arraigned, who refuses to apppear, when lawfully summoned, ought rather to be condemned than absolved.

It was on this occasion that the wild notions were first broached, which now prevail, concerning the independency of the pope upon councils. For the friends of Symmachus,

by St. Gregory of Tours, as actions pleasing to God; (a) and in the same light, perhaps, would the death of Boetius and Symmachus have been set forth by the catholic writers, had Theodoric been a catholic, and as generous as Clovis to the church, and the clergy.

(a) Greg. Tur. l. 2. c. 39, 40.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1326.

[1] Concil. ibid.

[2] Concil. ibid. p. 1340.

The notions of the pope's independency on councils unanswerably confuted as soon as broached. Disagreement between the ancient and modern flatterers of the popes. The notion of the pope's independency broached at this time, and not before.

apprehending he might be found guilty, if fairly tried, and therefore unwilling to try him, pretended, in the council, that "no assembly of bishops had a power to judge the pope;" and that "he was accountable for his actions to God alone. These notions, though now received and maintained, in a manner, as articles of faith, by all true papists, appeared then, that is, in the beginning of the sixth century, so very absurd, that their having been advanced in the present council was alleged, by the bishops of the opposite party, as an argument to convince the world, that such a council could be of no authority, nor could it deserve any kind of regard. Was not the present council, say they in their manifesto, assembled to judge the pope? Did not those very men, who will not allow any assembly of bishops to have the power of judging the pope, summon him to appear before them, in order to be judged? Should the pope be guilty of the most enormous excesses, is no man, no assembly of men, to reprove, censure, or control him? Has he, among the other privileges derived to him from St. Peter, that of committing all crimes with impunity?[1] Ennodius, afterwards bishop of Pavia, undertook to answer these troublesome queries, but with what success I shall leave the reader to judge. He allows a council to have the power of judging the pope, when the pope, of his own accord, submits to be judged by it; which, he says, was the present case. But, in that particular, he disagrees with the popish divines of the later ages. For, according to them, the judging of the pope is reserved, by divine right, to God alone; and hence it follows, that as the pope cannot renounce what he holds by divine right, he cannot consent to be judged by any but God?[2] As Ennodius was a stranger to that right, he might have let us know by what other the pope was exempted from being judged, without his consent, by a council. As to the other question, the apologist, exceeding all bounds of modesty, will not allow that, with respect to the pope, there ever can be room for reproof, censure, or control; for "the papal dignity," says he, "either finds or makes saints, all who are raised to it." It seems he thought it less absurd to make the pope impeccable, than to own, that he might be guilty of as great excesses as other men; and nevertheless that no power upon earth could restrain or control him. But that he is not impeccable, long experience has taught us; and therefore the modern flatterers of the popes have found themselves obliged to abandon Ennodius, and maintain what, to that writer, appeared more absurd even than the papal impeccability; namely, that the pope, as the successor of St. Peter, and God's vicar upon earth, may abandon himself to all manner of wickedness with impunity, and without control. Should he attempt to destroy the church, we are, indeed, in that case, allowed, by Bellarmine, to remonstrate, with due reverence and respect, against such an attempt, modestly to reprove him; nay, and to repel force by force, could the church by no other means be saved from ruin; but in no other case must we presume to find fault with his holiness, or resist him.[1] To suppose such an unlimited and uncontrollable power of doing evil to be of God's appointment, is absolute blasphemy.

Some writers, unwilling to own the opinion that the pope could be judged by none but God, to be of so early a date as the sixth century, have taken a great deal of pains to interpret the words of Ennodius in a very different sense.[2] But they are too plain and explicit to admit of any other: "God was willing," says he, "that the causes of other men should be determined by men; but as for the bishop of the Roman see, he has, without question, reserved him to his own judgment.[3](*)

The beginning of the sixth century is no early date; many false and heretical doctrines, many unwarrantable and idolatrous practices, had begun to prevail in the church long before that time; and the popish writers, sensible that the doctrine of the papal independency upon councils might be justly deemed a novelty, had it never been heard of till then, pretend it to have been defined by a grand council in the second, consisting of no fewer than three hundred bishops, brought down by them from the clouds, for that purpose.[4] However, that opinion was not first broached by Ennodius, as is generally supposed. It was first started by the friends of Symmachus, in this council, to serve a present purpose, to justify their absolving him without a trial. The friends of Laurentius protested against it; and it was in answer to their protest, and to maintain what the council had advanced, that Ennodius wrote his apology.(†)

Symmachus, being absolved in the manner I have related, and "restored to his authority

[1] Ennod. Apol. p. 312.
[2] Vide Bellar. de sum. Pont. l. 2. c. 18.

[1] Bellar. ubi supra.
[2] See De Lannoy. t. I. ep. 9. [3] Ennod. in apol.
(*) Aliorum hominum causas Deus voluit per homines terminari; sed Romanæ sedis præsulem suo, sine quæstione, reservavit arbitrio.
[4] See p. 39.
(†) It is observable, that, little more than a century before the time of Symmachus, the bishops of Italy, however partial to, and depending upon, the pope, were so far from exempting him from the jurisdiction of a council, or pretending he could be judged by none but God, that, on the contrary, being assembled in council at Rome in the year 378, they presented a petition to the emperor Gratian, as I have related elsewhere, (*a*) begging it as a favor, that the bishop of Rome might not be judged by the civil magistrate, but either by a council, or by the emperor himself. They did not therefore know then, that the pope was to be judged by God alone. And if they did not know it then, that is, in the end of the fourth century, by what new revelation was it discovered to them in the beginning of the sixth?
(*a*) See p. 98.

The law made by Odoacer, concerning the election of the pope, and against alienations, revoked. Why revoked, with respect to the election of the pope. In the times of the Goths no bishops chosen in Italy, without the approbation of the sovereign. In the east bishops often nominated by the emperors. The pope not lawful pope till his election was confirmed by the emperor. Why the law of Odoacer, with respect to the alienations, declared null.

both within and without the city,"(*) began anew to exercise the functions of his office, and the following year, 502, held a great council at Rome, consisting of eighty bishops, thirty-seven presbyters, and four deacons. In this council was read, examined, and declared null, the law, which had been made a few years before by the præfectus prætorio, Basilius, in the name of Odoacer, then master of Italy.[1] By that law the election of a new bishop of Rome was not to be made without the knowledge, consent, and approbation of the sovereign; and the bishop, as well as the other ministers, were restrained from alienating the estates that belonged to the church. The first of these regulations was made, at the earnest request of pope Simplicius on his death-bed; and the second was thought necessary to prevent the ecclesiastics from enriching themselves at the expense of the poor. What induced the bishops of the present council to declare both these regulations null, was, with respect to the first, because, if no bishops were to be chosen without the consent and approbation of the sovereign, the sovereign would thereby become the absolute master of all elections; which is there declared derogatory from the undoubted right of the bishops, and the clergy. Not a word of the people, though, not many years before, their concurrence was thought so necessary, that pope Leo pretended the ordination of a bishop to be null, who had neither been proposed nor approved by them.[2] In the earliest ages of Christianity, when the princes were yet pagans, and more inclined to destroy than promote the true faith, the people and clergy chose, and indeed were obliged to choose, their own ministers. At this practice the emperors connived, after they had embraced the Christian religion, so long as elections were quietly carried on; but when they began to be attended with seditions, and popular tumults, which endangered the tranquillity of the state, and often ended in violence and bloodshed, the princes, who till then had little concerned themselves with the choice of the ministry, thought it high time to interpose their authority. In Italy the Gothic princes left the elections to the people and clergy; but, adhering to the law of Odoacer, would suffer none to be ordained without their approbation. The approving or confirming of those, who were chosen for the sees of Rome, Ravenna, and Milan, they reserved to themselves; but the confirming of others they left to their ministers, who were to be present at all elections, in order to prevent disturbances, and awe, with their presence, the riotous mob. In the east, the emperors not only made several laws for the better regulating of elections; but when great disputes and disturbances were apprehended, they even nominated the person themselves, without consulting either the people or clergy. Thus was Nectarius appointed bishop of Constantinople by Theodosius the elder; Nestorius and Proclus by Theodosius the younger; and many other instances of the like nature occur in history.[1] And it is to be observed, that none of the fathers, who lived in those days, ever questioned the emperor's right even of nominating whom he pleased; which they certainly would have done, as they were of all men the most tenacious of their rights, had they apprehended such a right to be lodged in them, and not in the sovereign. They objected indeed against Nectarius, as a person not duly qualified for so eminent a station, he being yet a catechumen. But the emperor persisting in his choice, they yielded; and the person, whom he had named, was, at the same time, baptized and ordained.[2] The law of Odoacer, though declared null in the council held by Symmachus this year at Rome, was not only adopted by the Gothic kings, his successors in the kingdom of Italy, but by those too of Gaul and Spain; nay, and by the catholic emperors of the east, at least, with respect to the pope, after they had driven out the Goths, and united that kingdom to their empire. For so late as the very latter end of the sixth century, the pope, by what majority soever chosen, was not thought to be true and lawful pope, till his election was approved and confirmed by the emperor. Hence Gregory the Great, chosen in 590, but desirous to decline that dignity, wrote to the emperor Mauritius, entreating him to refuse his consent, that the electors might thereby be obliged to lay aside all thoughts of him, and choose another.[3] Nay, till the emperor's confirmation was obtained, the person chosen was not even styled bishop, but elect, and still yielded the first place in the church to the arch-priest.

As to the other article of the above-mentioned law, forbidding the estates of the church to be alienated, it was judged by the council good in itself, but, at the same time, declared null, because made by a layman; and the laity were not to meddle, nor any ways concern themselves, with the estates or goods of the church. Here the council, in order to exclude the laity from having any share in the administration or disposal of the estates and goods of the church, confines the church to the clergy alone. But by the church was meant, in the primitive times, the

(*) The words of the sentence were: "according to the command of the prince, who gives us this power, we restore him (the pope) to all authority, both within and without the city. (a) This was owning the power of absolving the pope to be derived to them from the king; and, consequently, the king to be above the pope; and to be, though an Arian, the supreme head of the church, in his own dominions.

(a) Concil. t. 4. p. 1340.

[1] See p. 271. [2] Leo, ep. 12. ad Anast. Thessalon.

[1] Soz. l. 7. c. 8. Socrat. l. 7. c. 29. et c. 40. Marca de Concord. l. 8. c. 9.

[2] Soz. ibid. [3] Jo. Diac. in vit. Greg. l. 3. c. 29

What was given to the church, was given to the whole congregation of the faithful. Alienations, when first forbidden, and why. No alienations allowed now, but upon an evident advantage. The pope restrained by the present council from alienating the goods of the Roman church. The emperor and the pope libel one another. The pope did not excommunicate the emperor.

whole congregation of the faithful; and to the whole congregation of the faithful was thought to belong whatever was given or bequeathed to the church. Why then were not the laity as well as the clergy to concern themselves with the goods, that belonged to them, as well as to the clergy? Besides, the estates of the church were destined to maintain the poor, the helpless orphans, and indigent widows, as well as the clergy. Hence it follows, that the laity, at least the civil magistrate, or the sovereign, had a power to make such laws as they thought expedient or necessary, to prevent the waste of such estates, and restrain the clergy from alienating them, and enriching themselves with the patrimony of the poor, who would thereby either be left quite destitute, or be turned over again to the laity. The bishops, after the administration of the goods that belonged to the church, was committed to them, were at full liberty not only to dispose of the revenues, but to sell or alienate the estates themselves, for the maintenance of the ministers of the altar, and the relief of the poor; and that liberty they enjoyed till the year 470, when the abuses, which began to prevail in the church of Constantinople, obliged the emperor Leo to forbid all sorts of alienations in that church.[1] Thirteen years after, Odoacer, moved, no doubt, by the same reasons as Leo was, made the like prohibition with respect to the Roman church. The law of Leo was extended by the present emperor Anastasius, and about this very time, to all the churches subject to the see of Constantinople;[2] and the emperor Justinian, in 535, made a general edict, comprehending all the churches within the limits of the empire, by which alienations were forbidden, upon any considerations whatever, unless it were to support the poor in times of famine, or to redeem from slavery the Christian captives; and in either of these cases St. Ambrose thought it incumbent on the clergy not only to part with their estates, but even with the sacred utensils, and consecrated vessels.[3] But neither was excepted in the many canons, that in process of time were made by the councils against alienations; which are therefore now understood to be forbidden, let the necessity be ever so urgent, unless upon an evident advantage; that is, an evident injustice, which some conscientious canonists have defined to be a third part, and others a fourth, of the value. It is deemed in the church of Rome the highest Christian perfection for a man to sell his possessions and goods, and give to the poor. But, in the mean time, she will not herself part with a single possession, unless she gains by the bargain, to give to the poor, however distressed. Thus the laws against alienations, which were begun in favor of the laity, against the clergy, are now turned, in favor of the clergy, against the laity.

The present council, having abrogated the law of Odoacer, because made without due authority, issued another to the same effect, forbidding the bishop, and other ministers of the Roman church, to alienate the goods of the said church, declaring such contracts void and null, and excommunicating all, who should consent or agree to them.[1] They did not, it seems, know, that the pope was above all control; that he was to be governed by no other law but his own will; and consequently that no council, though consisting of all the bishops of the earth, could make canons, that were binding with respect to him, much less a national council: nay, the pope himself seems to have been yet unacquainted with his paramount authority, since he did not object against that decree, but signed it with the rest.

In the mean time the emperor Anastasius, who had employed all his interest at Rome in behalf of Laurentius, being informed that the opposite party had prevailed in the end, and that Symmachus was in quiet possession of the disputed see, was so piqued at his disappointment, that, forgetful of his dignity, he wrote an invective against the new pope, which we may justly style a libel. His libel the pope answered under the title of "an apology," addressed to him in a very different style from that which his predecessors had used in addressing the emperors. Anastasius had reproached him with his unlawful and uncanonical election; had charged him with Manicheism; and upbraided him with arrogance in presuming even to excommunicate an emperor. The pope replied, that the validity of his election had never been questioned, had he been more favorable to the memory of Acacius, or less zealous for the catholic faith. The charge of Manicheism he retorts against the emperor; and, besides, taxes him with countenancing heretics of all denominations, and wreaking his vengeance on those alone, whom alone he ought to protect. As to his having excommunicated the emperor, he declares, that he has no otherwise excommunicated him, than by excommunicating Acacius, as his predecessors had done, and all who communicated with his memory. "We do not excommunicate you," says he, "but Acacius. Withdraw from him, and you withdraw from his excommunication. If you continue to communicate with his memory, we do not excommunicate you: you excommunicate yourself."[2](*) He treats the emperor,

[1] Cod. 14. de sacrasanct. Eccles.
[2] Cod. de sacrasanct. Eccles. leg. 17.
[3] Vide S. Thom. ii. 2, quæst. 185.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1266. [2] Concil. ibid. et seq.

(*) "We do not excommunicate you," says the pope; but Baronius maintains, that the pope did excommunicate him. "It is certain," says the annalist, "that the cause of the heretical emperor being examined in the council," meaning the council held in 502, "the pope excommunicated the impious Anastasius, with

The pope prefers the episcopal to the imperial dignity. The apology of Ennodius approved by the pope, and a council. Another council held at Rome, and all excommunicated by it, who should seize the estates of the church. Great disturbances in the east. The mob rise in Constantinople, in defence of the two natures. Macedonius, the orthodox bishop, driven out by the emperor; and Timotheus, an Eutychian, placed in his room.

throughout the whole apology, or rather libel, with the utmost contempt; he has even the assurance to tell him, that the successor of St. Peter is, at least, as great as an emperor; and his saying no more was, according to Baronius,[1] owing to his modesty. He compares the episcopal with the imperial dignity; and concludes a bishop to be as much above an emperor, as the heavenly things, which the bishop administers and dispenses, are above all the trash of the earth, which alone the greatest among the emperors have a power to dispose of. He pretends, by the "higher powers," to be meant the spiritual powers; and that to them chiefly every soul ought to be subject. He reminds the emperor, that, after all, he is but a man; that his laws are to be obeyed no farther than they are agreeable to the laws of God; exhorts him to honor God in his ministers, that they, in their turn, might honor God in him; and concludes with advising him to separate himself from the enemies of the church, and the true faith, and steadily adhere to the see of St. Peter.[2]

The following year, 503, the pope held another council at Rome, to confirm the acts of the council that had absolved him, and restored him to his dignity. To the bishops of that assembly, who were all Italians, was read the apology of Ennodius, which I have mentioned above; a piece filled perhaps with more fulsome flattery, with more false and absurd maxims, than any that has been published since that time. However, the bishops, lost to all sense of shame, not only extolled it with the highest commendations, as it were, in emulation of one another, but ordered it to be inserted among the acts of the council, and to be deemed of as much authority as the council itself, or any decree made by the council. The pope, not satisfied with that mark of honor, the greatest that had been yet bestowed on any work, commanded it, with the unanimons consent of the bishops, to be placed among the decrees of the apostolic see, and to be held by all as one of them.[1]

The following year, 504, another council was held at Rome, and a decree made, at the motion of the pope, anathematizing, and excluding from the communion of the faithful, all who had seized, or for the future should seize, hold, or appropriate to themselves, the goods or estates of the church: and this decree was declared to extend even to those who held such estates by grants from the crown.[2]

As to the affairs of the east, all was there in the utmost confusion; and the disturbances in the church were attended with no less disturbances in the state. The emperor, not satisfied with obliging the bishops to receive the henoticon, which they all did to a man, required them besides to anathematize the council of Chalcedon, and the doctrine of the two natures. With this order Macedonius of Constantinople refused to comply; and the emperor, having attempted in vain to gain him over to the Eutychian party, resolved, at last, to proceed to violence, and drive him from his see. But the bishop had the mob on his side; and the mob, ever zealous for the church, or for what they call the church, no sooner heard of the emperor's resolution, than, rising, "in defence of the true faith," with the superiors of the orthodox monks at their head, they surrounded the imperial palace, and, threatening to set fire to it, cried aloud for another emperor; for a catholic, in the room of a heretic; for a Christian, instead of a Manichee. The emperor endeavored to appease them; but the tumult increasing, and the multitude growing more and more outrageous, he was in the end obliged to send for Macedonius, to be publicly reconciled with him, and solemnly promise, that he never would hurt him.[3] But he did not think himself bound to stand to a promise which had been thus extorted; and not long after Macedonius was seized, in the night, by his order, and conveyed to Chalcedon. The next morning the mob and the monks, missing their bishop, attempted to rise; but were prevented from assembling, by the numerous bodies of troops which the emperor had caused to be placed in the different streets of the city.[4] In the room of Macedonius was named by the emperor and installed, the very next day, one Timotheus, presbyter of that church, who, to testify his gratitude to Anastasius, began his episcopacy with anathematizing, in an assembly of bishops, convened for that purpose, the council of Chalcedon, and separating himself from all who did not anathematize with him the doctrine of that council.

---

the unanimous consent of all the bishops, who composed that assembly."(a) To prove this he alleges the very passage that evidently proves the contrary; the very words of the pope declaring, that he had not excommunicated the emperor; but by the leaving out of one letter only, so altered as to make him declare, that he had. The words are; "Dicis quod, mecum conspirante Senatu, excommunicaverim te. Ista quidem *nego*, sed rationabiliter factum a decessoribus meis sine dubio subsequor."(b) "You say, that I excommunicated you by the joint consent of the senate. that indeed I *deny*; but I certainly follow what was, with good reason, done by my predecessors." Baronius, instead of "ista quidem *nego*," "that indeed I *deny*;" reads "ista quidem *ego*," "that indeed I did;" so that, according to him, the passage must be thus understood; "You say, that I excommunicated you, &c. That I did, indeed; but I follow what was done by my predecessors," that is, I do what my predecessors have done before me: and yet the annalist does not even pretend the emperor to have been excommunicated by any of the predecessors of Symmachus.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 502. n. 30.
(b) Concil. t. 4. p. 1298.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 503. n. 24. [2] Concil. ib. p. 1297—1299.
[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1364. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1390.
[3] Theod. Lect. p. 562. Theophan. p. 132.
[4] Theod. Lect. p. 563. Theoph. p. 133. Evagr. l. 3. c. 32.

The emperor attempts an alteration in the public service; which occasions great disturbances at Constantinople. The orthodox prevail, with the assistance of the monks. The Eutychians massacred without mercy. The emperor withdraws from the city.

The emperor, having now the patriarch on his side, undertook, at whose instigation is not well known, to make an alteration in the public service of the church. The alteration was of no consequence in itself; but it supplied the leading men of the catholic party with a plausible pretence to stir up the populace, and revenge, by their means, the deposition and exile of their late bishop, now confined to Euchaita, an inhospitable place in the province of Pontus. The alteration was made in the Trisagion,(*) "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us;" which was used by the church to declare her faith in the trinity.(†) With these words only it was sung in all the churches of the east, till the year 477, when the famous Petrus Fullo, while he was bishop of Antioch, caused the following words to be added to it, "Who was crucified for us;" with a design, as was pretended, of introducing the heresy of the Theopaschites, who held, or rather were said by their adversaries to hold, that the divine nature, and consequently the whole Trinity, had suffered on the cross. With the same design was the emperor now charged; and there wanted no more to alarm the populace, and kindle a war between the two parties within the walls of the city, both affecting in all public places to sing the Trisagion, the Eutychians with, and the orthodox without, the addition. From singing they came generally to blows; and many battles were fought, not only in the streets, and the squares, but in the churches themselves, where the service seldom ended without bloodshed and murders. The parties were pretty well matched, the Eutychians having the soldiery on their side, with the great men at court, and all their dependants; and the orthodox the far greater part of the populace. The monks, who were very numerous in Constantinople, had kept for some time quiet in their cells.

But the two parties being furiously engaged, on a day of public thanksgiving, while the one sung the Eutychian Trisagion, (for so it was called, with the addition), and the other the orthodox, an army of monks unexpectedly appeared, armed with clubs and stones, and singing, as they advanced, "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us." The orthodox were almost overpowered, and ready to give ground; but, resuming their courage, at the appearance of such an army come to their relief, they fell upon their adversaries with fresh fury, and, in conjunction with the monks, put them to flight, and pursued them all over the city, massacreing, without mercy, every Eutychian who had the misfortune to fall into their hands. By this victory the orthodox party became absolute masters of the city, and there was no kind of cruelty, which they did not commit. They chose the great square of Constantine for their place of arms, and, having caused the keys of the city to be brought thither, with the standards and colors of the troops, they detached parties into the different quarters of the town, with orders to murder, without distinction of rank or sex, all who had joined the emperor "in making war on the Trinity," to pillage, and pull down, or burn their houses, and spare none who did not anathematize the impious addition, and all who approved it. This order produced a general massacre; for it was executed with a cruelty hardly to be conceived; and in the space of three days ten thousand Eutychians were inhumanly murdered; their houses were plundered and burned, and with them great part of the city. They wreaked chiefly their vengeance on the friends and favorites of the emperor, and, among the rest, on a harmless hermit, and a sacred virgin, whom Anastasius had in great veneration, and frequently consulted. Them therefore they not only murdered in a most barbarous manner, but, tying their bodies together, they dragged them through the chief streets of the city, singing, in the mean time, as they did in all the disorders they committed, the orthodox Trisagion, and crying aloud, "Thus may all perish, who favor the enemy of the Trinity," meaning the emperor, "or are favored by him!"

Anastasius, alarmed at their death, and the unheard of cruelties that were daily practised on his other friends by the enraged multitude, thought it advisable to quit the city, and withdraw from their fury, lest the fate of his friends should prove, in the end, to be his own. He withdrew accordingly, and lay concealed in the neighborhood of Constantinople, till news was brought him, that, in his absence, they had torn all his pictures, pulled down his statues, and, construing his flight into a resignation, were ready to proclaim another emperor in his room. In that extremity, the only means that occurred to him of saving both his life, and the empire, was to return to

(*) This hymn was called the Trisagion, because the word "holy" is thrice repeated. Its original form was, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts. Heaven and earth are full of thy glory, who are blessed for ever. Amen." Thus it is in the constitutions; (a) and thus it was sung, according to Chrysostom, (b) by the seraphims in Isaiah. However, the church thought fit to change that form into this, "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us:" and in this form it was used by the fathers of Chalcedon, in the condemnation of Dioscorus. (c) This change is supposed to have been made by Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, in 446, and to have been approved, if not suggested, by the emperor Theodosius the younger.

(a) Const. l. 8. c. 12. (b) Chrys. Hom. 6. in Seraph.
(c) Concil. Chal. Act. 1. Damascen. de Orthod. fide, l. 3. c. 10.

(†) The words "Holy God" were applied to the Father, "Holy Mighty" to the Son, and "Holy Immortal" to the Holy Ghost. (d) As Fullo was suspected of having added the above-mentioned words, in order to introduce the opinion of Theopaschites, that no room might be left for that heresy, Calendion, the successor of Fullo in the see of Antioch, placed the words, "Christ our King," before those which his predecessor had added. (e) It had been well for the Christian religion, that they had all contented themselves with the words of the scripture, without presuming to add to them any of their own.
(d) Damascen. ubi supra. (e) Theodor. Lect. l. 2. p. 566.

The emperor returns, and appeases the people. The Eutychians fare no better at Antioch. They quarrel only about words, and in the end all agree.

the city, to show himself to the populace in the quality of a suppliant, and, by pretending to yield and submit, try to appease their anger, and raise their compassion. With this view he left the place of his retirement, and, repairing to the city, appeared unexpectedly in the circus, like a private person, without the crown, or any other ensigns of empire. The populace no sooner heard that the emperor was in the circus, than, quitting their camp, in the square of Constantine, they marched thither, in a kind of procession, singing, as usual, the orthodox Trisagion, with a cross, and the book of the gospels, carried before them, as if sedition, rebellion, and the most enormous disorders and cruelties, were authorized by that book, by the gospel of peace. Upon their arrival, the emperor caused it to be proclaimed by the heralds, that, since his good people did not approve of his conduct, he was ready to quit the empire, and desired they would name the person to whom he should resign it. The multitude demanded, with loud cries, that, in the first place, Marinus, the præfectus prætorio, and Plato, governor of the city, might be thrown to the wild beasts, as the chief authors of the present disturbances. The emperor promised, upon oath, to punish them according to their deserts, to redress the grievances, which his loving subjects had but too much reason to complain of, and to take care, that in time to come, if they thought fit to continue him in power, no room should be left for the like, or any other complaints. The populace, though incensed against the emperor beyond expression, had begun to relent, at only seeing him without the badges of his dignity; and now his speech, though he had so often deceived them, softened them to such a degree, that, compassion taking place of revenge, they broke out, all at once, into loud acclamations, desired him, with one voice, to resume the diadem, wished him a long and prosperous reign, and promising to put an end to the present troubles, and to raise none for the future, they returned, all quiet, and satisfied, to their different habitations and callings.[1]

Constantinople was not the only city that felt the dreadful effects of the zeal of the populace for what they called the church, and the orthodox faith. At Antioch the old quarrel was revived concerning the nature of Christ, and the whole city divided into two opposite parties or factions. The one maintained Christ to be "of and in two natures," while the other allowed him to be "of," but would not admit him to be "in two natures." The populace on either side were wrought up, by their leaders, to a pitch of madness and fury against each other, not sparing either friends or relations, whom they only suspected to differ in opinion from themselves. But the orthodox, that is, the sticklers for the "of" and the "in," prevailed in the end; and how cruelly they used their victory, the Orontes bears witness, says the historian, the Orontes quite choked up with the bodies of the Eutychians they slew, without distinction or mercy.[1] What would the pagans have thought of the Christian religion, had such mortal feuds prevailed in their time, among those who professed it! So destructive a war between Christians and Christians would have supplied them with more copious matter for reproachful reflections, for sarcasm and satire, than that, which one of their poets[2] has so well described between the inhabitants of Ombos and Tentyris, in order to expose to ridicule and contempt both their religion and them. The two rival cities adored different deities, and the deities whom the one adored, the other abhorred, and sought to destroy; which, in some degree, might excuse, allowing for the superstition and ignorance that prevailed in those days, the irreconcileable hatred they bore to each other. But the Christians adored the same God; frequented the same places of worship; and only disagreed about words and sounds, the meaning of which, if they had any meaning, neither party well understood, nor even pretended to understand. The union of the two natures they called an "ineffable mystery," that is, a mystery which could not be expressed; and yet massacred all who did not agree with their way of expressing it. The adding of those words to the Trisagion, "who was crucified for us," occasioned the dreadful disorders we have seen at Constantinople. And yet that addition, when it came afterwards to be coolly examined, was found to be orthodox, and was received as such, with one consent, by all the churches in the east, except that of Constantinople, which continued to reject it, for no other reason but because it was there rejected at first. As for heresy, it was so far from implying any, that Avitus, metropolitan of Vienne in Gaul, who flourished at this time, and was one of the most learned men of the age, in his account of the massacre at Constantinople, mistakes the Eutychians for the orthodox, and the orthodox for the Eutychians. For he supposes the disputed words to be the original words of the Trisagion, and the two parties to have quarrelled because the Eutychians would, and the orthodox would not, suppress them.[3] The good bishop, being at a great distance, was misinformed; and, from the subject of the dispute, could not well know which was the Eutychian, and which the orthodox party. But when he and his brethren in the west understood, that the above-mentioned words had been added, not by the orthodox, but the Eutychians, they all agreed in condemning what they had approved before, and approv-

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 44. Theoph. an. p. 136. Cedren. p. 369. Zonar. p. 44. Marc. chron. Chron. Alex.

[1] Evagr. l. 3. c. 32. See P. Doucin. Hist. du Nestorianis. l. 3. c. 320.

[2] Juvenal. Satir. 15.

[3] Avit. ep. 3. p. 20.

The orthodox bishops recur to the pope; [Year of Christ, 512.] Who does not even condescend to answer their letter. They recur to their brethren in Gaul. The Arian king of the Burgundians writes to the emperor in their behalf.

ing what they had condemned; a plain indication, that they were swayed merely by party zeal, and determined to disapprove, right or wrong, whatever the opposite party should recommend or approve.

In the east the orthodox bishops, shocked at the disorders that were daily committed by the contending parties, not only at Antioch and Constantinople, but in most other cities of the empire, and not able to restrain the fury of the populace, resolved in the end to recur to the pope, and implore his assistance; the rather, as the emperor, forgetful of his promise, had begun anew to persecute, and, under various pretences, drive from their sees, all who did not anathematize the council of Chalcedon. They wrote therefore a long letter to Symmachus, laying before him the unhappy state of the catholic faith in the east, acquainting him with the evils which many of them had suffered, and they had all reason to apprehend from the emperor, for their inviolable attachment to the doctrine of Chalcedon, and earnestly entreating him to allow them, in their distress, the comfort of being admitted to the communion of the successor of St. Peter, and being owned by him, and their other brethren in the west, for true members of that church which they had hitherto defended, and continued to defend, at the peril of their lives. As for their keeping the name of Acacius in the diptychs, they conjured the pope not to insist on their erasing it, at least for the present, since that would inevitably occasion a division among the orthodox themselves, and the least division or misunderstanding among them would prove fatal, at so critical a juncture, to the catholic interest all over the east. They ended their letter with a confession of faith, declaring, that they anathematized both Nestorius and Eutyches; that they received the decree of Chalcedon, with the letter of Leo, concerning the two natures; and entirely agreed in their belief with the Roman, and all other churches in the west.[1] But their agreeing in belief stood them in no stead, so long as they continued to mention at the altar the name of a man whom the apostolic see had condemned and deposed. Symmachus allowed their faith to be entirely orthodox; but, at the same time, was so provoked at their refusing to "obey the decrees of St. Peter," nay, and pretending "to justify their disobedience," that he would not even return an answer to their letter. He acted therein agreeably to the declaration he had made the year before, in a letter which he wrote to the bishops of Illyricum; namely, That, treading in the footsteps of his holy predecessors, he was unalterably determined to receive none to his communion, who did not previously anathematize Acacius, and all who communicated with his memory; and consequently that it was in vain for those who refused to comply with that condition, to recur to him, or expect any kind of relief from his see, since they had rendered themselves, by their obstinacy, altogether unworthy of his care and protection.[1] This Baronius calls an inflexible zeal, in the holy pontiff, for the catholic faith; though he could not but know, that the holy pontiff was insisting on terms which the bishops could not agree to, without exposing the catholic faith to the utmost danger; and, consequently, that, in them, it was "inflexible zeal" not to comply, and, in him, an inflexible and criminal obstinacy to require their compliance.

It was not to the pope alone that the eastern bishops had recourse in their distress; they applied, at the same time, to the catholic bishops in Gaul, and probably to those of the other provinces in the west. What reception their letters met with from their brethren, I find nowhere recorded. But Gundebald the Arian king of the Burgundians in Gaul, hearing, on that occasion, of the persecution they suffered, for the sake of their faith, and pitying their condition, thought himself bound, in common humanity, to employ his good offices in their behalf. As there reigned therefore, at that time, an entire harmony between the kings of the Burgundians and the emperors of the east, Gundebald not only wrote to Anastasius, recommending the persecuted bishops to his favor, but ordered Avitus of Vienne, whom he held in great esteem for his piety and learning, to collect, from scripture, such passages as he thought the most proper to prove the catholic, and confute the Eutychian doctrine, in order to be sent to the emperor, and dispersed all over the east.[2] It was in compliance with this order that Avitus wrote his treatise on the incarnation; a work greatly commended by all the ancients, especially by Gregory of Tours.[3] Thus was the defence of the catholic cause, when abandoned by the pope, on a mere punctilio, zealously undertaken by an Arian prince. It is true the endeavors of the good king were not attended with the success he expected, the emperor being highly provoked against the orthodox for the disorders they had lately committed, and the opposite parties too exasperated against each other, to hearken either to scripture or reason. However it was no small encouragement and satisfaction to the orthodox prelates, under persecution, to find, that they were thought worthy of relief and compassion, even by a heretic, while they were judged by the pope, unaffected with their sufferings, unworthy of both, and, as such, left by him, without resource, to the mercy of their enemies.

Symmachus concerned himself no more with the affairs of the east; but, leaving the orthodox there to shift for themselves, in the

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1305—1308.

[1] Concil. ibid. p. 1303. [2] Avit. ep. 2. p. 7.
[3] Greg. Tur. hist. Franc. l. 2. c. 4.

Some regulations made by Symmachus ; [Year of Christ, 513.] He confirms the privileges of the see of Arles. Symmachus dies, and is sainted. The cellulani or syncelli first introduced in the west. Symmachus probably guilty of the crime laid to his charge. The wealth of the Roman church at this time.

best manner they could, applied himself to the restoring of the ecclesiastical discipline in the west, which, during the long wars between the barbarians and Romans, had been utterly neglected, and was almost entirely forgotten in the provinces most distant from Rome. With this view he made several regulations concerning ordinations, and the qualifications of those who were to be ordained, against alienations, simony, and the marrying of virgins, or widows, who professed celibacy, and had lived for a considerable time in that state. He excommunicates those who marry them, though they, weary of that state, and, through human frailty, repenting they had ever embraced it, should consent to be married.[1] Such marriages were not yet deemed null, as they are now, but only unlawful.

The following year, 514, the old animosities being revived between the bishops of the two rival cities, Arles and Vienne, about jurisdiction and power, the pope confirmed to the former all the privileges his see had enjoyed ever since the time of Leo. His letter to the bishop of Arles is dated the 11th of July of the present year; and he died a few days after, having governed the Roman church, according to the most probable opinion, fifteen years, and eight months, wanting four days. He is said to have been buried in the church of St. Peter; and there his ashes are believed to remain to this day, and are yearly exposed, on the 19th of July, to public adoration. But what extraordinary merit entitled him to so great an honor, is no easy matter to determine. He was arraigned, as we have seen, at the tribunal of king Theodoric, as guilty of an enormous crime, and unworthy of the dignity to which he was raised. The writers of those times have all avoided, and industriously, it seems, specifying the crime. But it is generally supposed to have been adultery, or some other crime of that nature. For, at this time, and on this occasion, a decree was issued by the metropolitan of Milan, which most of the metropolitans in the west approved and received, commanding all bishops, presbyters, and deacons, within their respective jurisdictions, to keep constantly with them, night and day, at home and abroad, a clerk of reputation and character, as a witness of their actions, and ordering those who were not able to maintain such a clerk, or spy on their conduct, to serve others in that capacity. These clerks were called, by the Latins, camerarii and cellulani, because they kept night and day in the same cell, or chamber, with the persons whose conduct they watched; and by the Greeks, syncelli; for that custom obtained in the east, long before it took place in the west. But whatever was the crime laid to the charge of Symmachus, his innocence does not appear so "plainly" and "undeniably" to me, as it does to Baronius. Nor did it appear so to king Theodoric ; else he had cleared him himself, and not ordered, as he did, all the bishops in his dominions to assemble in council, to try a person, of whose innocence he was fully satisfied. It is to be observed, that the council was convened by the king, after he had heard the evidences, as well as the pleaders, on both sides; and consequently, that he did not think the charge altogether groundless, as Baronius is pleased to style it. It is true, he was absolved by a great majority in the council, as the annalist takes care to observe. But that majority was evidently biassed in his favor, and acted contrary to the known laws of justice. For though they had assembled on purpose to try him, they absolved him without a trial, without so much as hearing those who accused him; and their having thus absolved him may be better alleged as a proof of his guilt, than his innocence. It shows at least, that even his friends were not quite satisfied of his innocence : for, if they had, they would have been glad to make it appear to the world by a fair trial, that no room might be left for slander and calumny. Symmachus himself declined, under various pretences, appearing before his judges, though three times summoned. And what, but his being conscious to himself of his guilt, could render him so averse to the only means of clearing himself, and confounding his enemies ?

The Roman church was, it seems, at this time, in a flourishing condition as to wealth. For from Rome were yearly sent over very considerable sums into Africa, for the relief of the catholics there, most cruelly persecuted by Trasamund, the Arian king of the Vandals; nay, Symmachus is said not only to have supplied with the necessaries of life, but to have maintained, suitably to their rank, no fewer than two hundred and twenty bishops, whom the king had stripped of all their effects, and sent into exile. He was as charitable to them, as he was uncharitable to the catholic bishops in the east; though they all suffered in the same cause, and some of the latter as much under an Eutychian, as the former under an Arian prince.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1309.

Hormisdas chosen. Vitalianus revolts. The emperor obliged to submit, and upon what terms. The emperor writes to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 515.] The pope's answer.

HORMISDAS, FIFTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANASTASIUS, JUSTIN, THEODORIC, *king of Italy*.]

[Year of Christ, 514.] IN the room of Symmachus was unanimously chosen, after the see had been vacant seven days only, Cælius Hormisdas or Hormisda, a native of Frusino, in Campania, the son of Justus, deacon of the Roman church, and, in the late schism, one of the most zealous partisans of Symmachus.[1] He was a married man, and had a son, whom we shall see, a few years hence, raised to the papal dignity.

He had not been long in possession of the see, when, to his great joy and surprise, he received a letter from the emperor; though, looking upon him as one out of the pale of the church, he had not yet even thought of acquainting him, as was usual, with his promotion. This extraordinary and unexpected condescension in the emperor was not owing to any regard he had for the new pope, as he pretended, but merely to force and compulsion. For Vitalianus, by birth a Scythian, and commander in chief of the imperial cavalry, being animated with the zeal, which prevailed at this time among the orthodox, and touched with compassion for the exiled bishops, took up arms in their defence; and, having surprised and killed the imperial general Cyril, whom he found asleep between two courtesans, and thereby made himself master, without opposition, of Thrace, Scythia, and Mysia, advanced, at the head of a numerous army of Bulgarians and Hunns, to the very gates of Constantinople. At his approach the orthodox in the city began to rise, and seemed strongly inclined to renew the enormous disorders they had lately committed. The emperor, therefore, mindful of the late massacre, and conscious to himself of his having acted in direct opposition to the promise he made to the people on that occasion, resolved to prevent, by an agreement with the rebels, the greater evils, which he had reason to apprehend from the enraged multitude. With this view he sent out, in great haste, some of the chief men in the senate, with an unlimited power to conclude a peace with the rebels on the best terms they could procure. A peace was accordingly procured, on the following terms: I. That the emperor should immediately issue the proper orders for putting an effectual stop to the persecution of the orthodox, and allow his subjects to profess the faith of Chalcedon without molestation. II. That he should restore the exiled bishops to their sees, especially Macedonius of Constantinople, and Flavianus of Antioch. III. That he should call an oecumenical council, invite the pope to it, and suffer, without interposing his authority, the decrees made against those who maintained the two natures, to be impartially examined by the bishops. These articles being signed, and sworn to, by the emperor, by the whole senate, and by all the magistrates of the city, Vitalianus set at liberty the prisoners he had taken, and Hypatius, the emperor's nephew, among the rest, disbanded his troops, and withdrew to his government.[1] It was in compliance with the articles of this treaty, that the emperor wrote to the pope, begging his apostleship to concur with him in restoring to the church the wished for unity, and composing the disturbances which, under pretence of religion, had been raised in the east. He ascribes his long silence to the sourness and obstinacy of the preceding popes, and his breaking it now to the opinion he entertained, grounded on public fame, of the moderation and goodness of Hormisdas. This letter was addressed "to the most holy and most religious archbishop and patriarch Hormisdas."[2] It was carried by Patricius, a man of rank, who left Constantinople on the 12th of January, 515, and, arriving at Rome on the 1st of April, delivered it, with two others, to the pope, the one from Vitalian, probably acquainting him with the above-mentioned treaty; for this letter has not reached our times; and another from Dorotheus of Thessalonica, conjuring him not to neglect so favorable an opportunity of healing the divisions that had reigned so long in the church, and assuring him, that he had nothing so much at heart as to see the heretics condemned, and that honor and regard paid to the apostolic see, that was due to the throne of St. Peter.

The emperor's letter Hormisdas answered three days after he received it, but, suspecting his sincerity, in a very few words, and those well guarded. He returned thanks to God for inspiring the emperor with the resolution of breaking, at last, his long silence; expressed great joy at the hopes he gave him of seeing again the church in peace and unity: and because the emperor had taxed the popes, his predecessors, with sourness and obstinacy, he commends them for their zeal and steadiness in maintaining, as guardians of the true faith, the ancient doctrine of the catholic church. He closes his letter with promising to write more at length, when he shall be better informed of the present state of affairs in the east. In his answer to Dorotheus of

[1] Cassiodor. chron. lib. Pontif.

[1] Marcell. chron. Cedren. in compend. hist. Anast.
[2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1420.

The emperor writes a second letter to the pope, inviting him to a council, which he had appointed to meet. The pope sends four legates into the east. Their private instructions.

Thessalonica, he praises his zeal, and exhorts him to contribute, so far as in him lay, towards the reuniting of the two churches.[1]

The emperor wrote, soon after, a second letter to the pope, to acquaint him, that he had appointed a council to meet at Heraclea in Thrace, on the 15th of July, of the present year, and to beg he would assist at it in person, with some bishops at least of the churches committed to his care. This the pope declined, but promised to send proper persons into the east, to act in his name; and despatched accordingly, not to Heraclea, where the council was appointed to meet, but to Constantinople, four persons of known abilities, with the character of legates from the apostolic see. These were Ennodius, of whom I have spoken above, lately raised to the bishopric of Pavia, Fortunatus likewise bishop, but of what city is not well known, Venantius presbyter, and Vitalis deacon of the Roman church, with a notary named Hilarus. The private instructions which the pope gave them in writing, at their departure, deserve particular notice. They are very minute; and were delivered in the following words: "When you arrive in Greece, if the bishops come out to meet you, receive them with the respect that is due to their rank. If they offer to lodge you, accept their offer, that the laity may not think you averse to an union; but if they invite you to their tables, you must desire them to excuse your not communicating with them at their common tables, till they have communicated with you at the mystic table; neither provisions, nor any thing else, must you accept at their hands, besides the necessary carriages to pursue your journey, saying, you want nothing, you covet nothing, but their good will. On your arrival at Constantinople, repair straight to the lodging which the emperor shall appoint; and, till you have been admitted to him, admit none but those who come from him. After you have waited on the emperor, you may see the orthodox of our communion, and those who are zealous for the union; but be on your guard, use here the utmost precaution, and try, but with great address, to discover the true designs and views of the court. When you deliver our letter to the emperor, you shall address him thus: Your father greets you, prays God daily for you, and daily recommends you to the intercession of the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul; that he who has inspired you to advise with his holiness about the unity of the church, may soon complete what he has begun. Say no more, till he has read the letter; and then add: The pope has likewise written to your servant Vitalian, in answer to a letter, which, with your permission, Vitalian wrote to your holy father the pope; but we are commanded not to deliver it without your leave. Should the emperor ask for it, your answer must be; Your holy father the pope has not commanded us to deliver it to you, and we dare do nothing without his command; but send with us what person soever you shall think fit to choose, and the letter shall be read in his presence. If the emperor betrays any suspicion of your being charged with a private commission, or private orders for Vitalian, answer; Far be it from us! that is not our custom; that would be sinning against God, whose cause we are sent to defend and maintain. The legation of the holy pope contains nothing of that nature; his request is well known to all; he requires no more, than that the constitutions of the fathers be inviolably observed, and the heretics driven out of the church. Should the emperor reply, for these purposes I have ordered a council to meet, and invited the pope to it; thank God, the author of so good a disposition; and, at the same time, let him know, that he can by no other means re-establish the unity of the church, but by treading in the foot-steps of his predecessors Marcian and Leo, that is, by receiving the definitions of Chalcedon, and the letter of pope Leo. Should he answer, we receive both; return anew thanks to God, and, kissing his breast, say, we now find, that you are favored by God: that is the catholic faith; and without that faith none are orthodox. If he pretends the Greek bishops to be orthodox, and to observe the maxims of the fathers, ask him, why then do such divisions reign among them? Here you must put him in mind of the last day, of the account he is to give to the Judge of all men; you must beg, pray, entreat, and, mixing tears with your prayers and entreaties, say, the faith of Chalcedon is the faith of St. Peter, and on the faith of St. Peter, the church was built. Should the emperor say, I receive the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo; and desire you to communicate with him; you must insist, but with great respect and humility, on his first making it known by a public act, that he receives the doctrine which is held and taught by the apostolic see. If memorials are presented to you against any bishops, receive the memorials, but refer the judging of the bishops to the apostolic see. If the emperor declares in writing, that he receives the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo, his declaration must be published in all the provinces of the empire, and one of you must attend those who are charged to publish it. It is the custom at Constantinople, that all bishops be introduced to the emperor by the bishop of that city. With this custom you must not comply, nor even suffer Timotheus to be present at your audience. Should the emperor desire it, say, we are commanded by your holy father, to suffer no bishop to be present. If he persists, and still requires Timotheus to be present, tell him, that, among your other orders, you have some relating to Timotheus himself, which you must not disclose in his presence.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1424.

Terms required by the pope to assist in person at the council. His letter to the emperor. The legates well received at Constantinople. The emperor remonstrates against the extravagant demands of the pope. He sends a solemn embassy to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 516.] Employs laymen, and why. Writes by them to the pope, and the Roman senate.

This you must unalterably stand to, and avoid entering at all on the subject of your legation, till the emperor command Timotheus to withdraw.!"

To these instructions the pope added the terms on which, and no other, he would assist in person at the intended council. These were: I. That, before he left Rome, the emperor should receive, and, by a declaration under his own hand, notify to all the bishops in his dominions, that he received, the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo. II. That the like declarations should be made and signed by all the bishops in the east, in the presence of the people; and that they should, at the same time, anathematize Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Ælurus, Petrus Mongus, Petrus Fullo, Acacius, and all their confederates; that is, all who had any ways disobliged the apostolic see. III. That the bishops, who communicated with the Roman church, and had been deposed or banished on that account, should be restored to their sees. IV. That such bishops as had persecuted the orthodox, or had been accused of heresy, should be sent to Rome to be judged there.[2] Most exorbitant demands! To require that such bishops as had been arrayed of heresy in the east, or had persecuted those, who, in the present schism, had sided with the Roman see, should be sent to Rome to be tried by that see, is what it had not yet come into the thoughts of the most assuming popes to suggest or propose. But Hormisdas knew to what straits Anastasius was reduced by his rebellious subjects of the orthodox party; and, taking advantage of his distress, raised his demands accordingly. He did not doubt but the emperor, to extricate himself out of the present difficulties, and fix on his head the tottering crown, would agree to any terms.

Besides these articles, and the private instructions, the pope delivered to the legates a letter for the emperor, to acquaint him, that though it was an unprecedented thing to summon the pope to a council held out of Rome (which it certainly was not, and we have seen several instances of it in the preceding centuries); yet he was willing to comply with the summons, provided the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo, were previously received by all, and the heretics, meaning Acacius, and the others I have mentioned, were by all anathematized and condemned; that is, he was ready to assist at the council, provided all points were settled to his satisfaction before the council met, for the settling of which the council was to meet. The pope's letter is dated the 11th of August, 515. The legates left Rome the next day, and, meeting with no obstructions in their journey, arrived, in a very short time, at Constantinople. The emperor received them with all possible marks of distinction: for he was now sincerely desirous of putting an end to the disturbances of the church, which he found by experience to be unavoidably attended with greater disturbances in the state, and of spending the small remains of his life, for he was in the eighty-fifth year of his age, in peace and repose. However, he was startled at the extravagant demands of the pope, and remonstrated against them in the strongest terms, especially against the anathematizing of Acacius, telling the legates, he did not doubt but that point would be settled in the council to the satisfaction of both parties, and begging they would not insist on its being settled without the concurrence of the bishops. The legates pleaded the peremptory orders of the apostolic see, which they durst not disobey; and the emperor, finding it was in vain for him to apply to them, wrote himself a most obliging letter to the pope, declaring, that he received both the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo, and assuring his apostleship, that, as the memory of Acacius was greatly revered by the people of Constantinople, the suppressing of it in the diptychs would occasion greater disturbances, than any that had yet happened in that city. He added, that he did not think it right to drive the living out of the church on account of the dead; but submitted his judgment to the decision of the council, which he had appointed to meet.[1]

The emperor was not satisfied with only writing to the pope. That no room might be left to question his sincerity, he sent, the following year, a solemn embassy to the apostolic see, employing, on that occasion, two persons of great rank and distinction; namely, Theopompus, "comes domesticorum," or captain of his guards, and Severianus, count of the imperial consistory, both distinguished with the title of clarissimus. He chose two laymen, not because he thought the business, on which they were sent, to be of little or no importance, as a late writer pretends,[2] angry at the emperor's reposing greater confidence in the laity than in the clergy; but probably, because he knew the ecclesiastics to be all strongly biassed to the one side or the other, and consequently less capable of managing an affair of that nature with due moderation and temper. The embassadors were charged to assure the pope, that their master was sincerely inclined to a reconciliation; and to dissuade his holiness, if by any means they could, from requiring the name of Acacius to be suppressed in the diptychs, at least till the council met, since it was chiefly to settle that point it had been appointed to meet. To the same purpose the emperor wrote two letters, the one to the pope, and the other to the Roman senate. In his letter to the senate, he

[1] Vide Bar. ad ann. 515. [2] Bar. ibid.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1432.
[2] Fleuri Hist. Eccles. l. 31. n. 23.

The embassadors ill received at Rome. The pope's disobliging answer to the emperor's letter. He insists on the name of Acacius being erased. The emperor obliged by the obstinacy of the pope to lay aside all thoughts of a reconciliation. The pope sends a second legation into the east;—[Year of Christ, 517.] He writes to the emperor, and to many others. The confession of faith, which he required all to sign.

entreats them, with great earnestness, to interpose their good offices not only with the venerable pope, but with their most glorious king Theodoric, that the members of both republics may, after so long a separation, be again happily united.[1](*)

The embassadors arrived safe at Rome, but met there with a very different reception from that which the pope's legates had met with at Constantinople. For Hormisdas, highly offended at the emperor's employing laymen, and not ecclesiastics, in ecclesiastical affairs, and still more at the embassadors endeavoring to divert him, pursuant to their instructions, from insisting on the name of Acacius being struck out of the diptychs, at least as a preliminary article to his assisting at the council, dismissed them after a short audience, and would see them no more; pretending that they had not been sent to negotiate a reconciliation, but to defend even in Rome, the Eutychian heresy; nay, and to gain over, if possible, the pope himself to that party. He condescended, however, to return by them an answer to the emperor's letter; but it was only to tell him, in a few words, that he might have saved himself the trouble of writing to the senate, since he could not doubt but the apostolic see was ready to receive, without the interposition either of the king, or the senate, and embrace with great joy, such as returned to the unity of the church, provided they first anathematized all heretics, and all the abetters of heresy. He forebore mentioning Acacius in particular; but the senate let the emperor know, in their answer to his letter, that the name of that prelate was the only obstruction to the wished-for reconciliation; that the pope peremptorily insisted on its being omitted at the altar; and that, notwithstanding the sincere and most ardent desire his holiness had of completing so great and glorious a work, he would hearken to no other terms till that was complied with. With these letters the embassadors returned to Constantinople; and the emperor, despairing of ever being able to prevail upon the pope to moderate his demands, or even to suffer them to be examined by an oecumenical council, thought it was to no purpose to assemble one. He therefore dismissed the bishops, about two hundred in number, who were already come to Heraclea, countermanded the rest, who were on their journey to that place; and, loudly complaining, as he well might, of the unparalleled obstinacy of the pope, laid aside all thoughts of a reconciliation. However, his thus standing up in defence of Acacius, whose memory was held in great veneration at Constantinople, reinstated him in the favor of the people, the orthodox people, no less offended than he at the inflexibility of the pope; insomuch that, presuming on the affection, and the gratitude, they showed him, he divested Vitalian, this very year, of all his power, and, without the least disturbance, appointed Rufinus, a zealous Acacian, to command in his room.

The conduct of Hormisdas on this occasion was displeasing even to those who were the most zealous for the union. They thought that the unity of the church, for which he pretended so much zeal, being at stake, he might have gratified the emperor so far as to have connived at their keeping the name of Acacius in the diptychs till the council met, and not obstinately insisted on its being struck out, as a preliminary article to the meeting of the council, or to his assisting at it with the western bishops. The pope, therefore, to justify his conduct, and at the same time to try anew whether he could not convince the emperor, and the bishops in those parts, of the reasonableness of his demand with respect to the name of Acacius, and prevail upon them to comply with it, for he was unalterably determined not to yield, resolved to send a second legation into the east; and on this occasion too he employed Ennodius, who had already given so many proofs of his inviolable attachment to the Roman see, and with him Peregrinus of Misenum, a prelate of great learning and address. By them the pope wrote anew to the emperor, to the orthodox bishops, to the clergy, monks, and people of Constantinople; nay, and even condescended to write to Timotheus, the Eutychian bishop of that city, and to the other bishops who did not communicate with Rome. These letters were chiefly filled with invectives against Acacius, as a heretic, as an abetter of heresy, as the sole author of all the evils that had happened to the church, as one altogether unworthy of being ranked among the catholic bishops; and the burden of all was, that his name must not be suffered to remain in the diptychs.[1] With these letters, the pope delivered to the legates a confession of faith, to be made, in their presence, by all who should return to the communion of Rome; and they were strictly enjoined to receive none who did not sign it, without the least alteration, either in the sense or the words. By that confession they were, 1. To anathematize all heretics in general, and those in particular, who have been mentioned above, together with Acacius. 2. To receive the council of Chalcedon, the letter of Leo on the incarnation, and all the letters which that pope had

[1] Inter Epist. Hormisd. l. I. Epist. Rom. Pont.

(*) His letter to the pope was thus directed; "Anastasius Augustus Hormisdæ Papæ, per Theopompum and Severianum VV. CC.;" and thus that to the senate; "Imperator Cæsar Flavius Anastasius, Pius, Felix, Victor, semper Augustus, Germanicus inclytus, Alemannicus inclytus, Francicus inclytus, Sarmaticus inclytus, Pater, Patriæ, proconsulibus, consulibus, prætoribus, tribunis plebis, senatuique suo salutem dicit." It begins, "Si vos liberique vestri valetis, bene est: Ego exercitusque meus valemus.

[1] Hormisd. ep. 11. 17, 18, 19, 20.

The emperor provoked at the terms proposed by the legates. The emperor's letter to the pope. The pope attempts in vain to stir up the mob against him. Several monks massacred for their attachment to Rome and the council of Chalcedon. They recur to the pope; their flattering letter to him. Anastasius dies; and Justin is raised to the empire in his room;—[Year of Christ, 518.]

written on the Christian religion; though most of the orientals, probably all, were utter strangers to those letters, and the doctrine they contained. 3. They were to declare, that they conformed, and would conform in all things, to the apostolic see; that they received all the constitutions of the Roman church, and would suppress, at the altar, the names of those who had died out of the communion of the catholic church, that is, (for so it was explained in the confession), of those, who, at their death, had disagreed in opinion with the apostolic see.[1] This was obliging all, who would communicate with Rome, to promise an entire submission and obedience to the ordinances of that see, and to own all, who died out of the communion of Rome, to die out of the communion of the catholic church; which, he could not but know, none even of the orthodox party would agree to, as matters then stood.

The emperor heard with great joy, that the pope was sending a second legation into the east, concluding from thence, that, in the end, he had thought it advisable to moderate his demands, at least, so far as to refer the decision of the dispute about the name of Acacius to be determined by an oecumenical council. Dissembling, therefore, the reception his embassadors had met with at Rome, he received the legates in the most obliging manner, respecting in them the dignity and holiness of him who sent them. But when he found, to his great disappointment, that Hormisdas was still inflexible, and unalterably bent on carrying his point; nay, that instead of abating, he had raised his demands, he was provoked to such a degree, that he ordered the legates forthwith to depart the palace, charging two officers, Heliodorus and Demetrius, with the soldiers under their command, to attend them to a vessel, and see them conveyed out of his dominions, without suffering them any where to set foot on shore. By them, however, he returned an answer to the pope's letter; but it was only to reproach him with pride, obstinacy, and presumption; and to compare his haughty and imperious behavior with that of the meek and humble Jesus. He closes his letter with these words: "We shall give you no farther trouble, it being in vain for us to pray or entreat you, since you are obstinately determined not to hearken to our prayers and entreaties: we can bear to be despised and affronted; but we will not be commanded."[2] This letter is dated the 11th of July, 517. The pope, apprehending, as he well might, that the emperor would never submit to his terms, had delivered to the legates, at their departure, several copies of a protest, which, in that case, they were to make, and disperse all over the east. The protest was calculated chiefly to inflame the mob against the emperor, and oblige him, by that means to comply. But the bishops, to whom the copies were conveyed by the monks, the emissaries of Rome, offended at the unchristian conduct of the pope, instead of publishing them, sent them all to Constantinople.

The monks, in several places, paid dear for their attachment to Rome, especially in the province of the second Syria. For, having taken upon them there to preach the doctrine of Chalcedon, Severus of Antioch, a zealous Eutychian, to whose patriarchal see that province was subject, caused their monasteries to be set on fire, and three hundred and fifty of them to be inhumanly massacred by a band of ruffians, hired for that purpose. Thus he retaliated on them the cruelties, which, at their instigation, had been practised by the orthodox a few years before on those of his party. Of this barbarous treatment the monks sent two of their body to complain to the emperor, and implore his protection. But Anastasius looked now upon the monks, and other friends of Rome, as his avowed enemies; and therefore, instead of revenging the death of their slain brethren, or granting them his protection, he drove the deputies, with reproachful language, from his presence, and ordered them forthwith to quit the city. In this extremity the monks resolved to recur to Hormisdas; and despatched accordingly the same deputies to Rome, with a flattering letter, in the form of a memorial, for the pope, styling him, in the address, "the most holy and blessed patriarch of the whole world;" and entreating him, in the letter, as "the successor of the prince of the apostles," as "the head of all," to rise up, and manfully exert the power of loosening and binding, with which he was vested, in defence of the oppressed faith, of the blasphemed fathers, of the every where anathematized council of Chalcedon. They concluded with recommending themselves to the protection of his holiness; and with cursing, in order to earn it, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Petrus Fullo, Petrus Mongus, Acacius, and all who presumed to defend them.[1] This memorial the pope answered by a long letter, addressed not to the monks only, but to all the orthodox in the east, exhorting them to adhere steadily to the true faith, the faith of Chalcedon, and bear with resignation and patience the evils they suffered, till it should please God to relieve them.[2]

They were relieved soon after; for the pope's letter was dated the 10th of February, and on the 9th of the following July died Anastasius;(*) and Justin, then præfectus præ-

[1] Apud Bar. ad ann. 517. p. 689, 690.
[2] Inter Hormisd. Epist. post Ep. 20. Vid. Bar. ad ann. 517. p. 693, 694.

[1] Inter Ep. Hormisd. ante Ep. 22. [2] Homisd. Ep. 21.
(*) Some write, that a violent storm arising, the dread and terror with which he was seized, put an

The populace oblige the patriarch to receive the council of Chalcedon; and to assemble a council which receives that of Chalcedon, and deposes Severus of Antioch.

torio, was proclaimed emperor in his room.(*) This change in the state was attended with a far greater change in the church. The new emperor, though quite illiterate, was a most zealous stickler for the doctrine of the two natures, and prejudiced, even to bigotry, in favor of the council of Chalcedon. The news of his promotion was therefore received by the orthodox, throughout the empire, with demonstrations of joy not to be expressed. On this occasion the people of Constantinople distinguished themselves, by their zeal for the catholic faith, above the rest. For, impatient to see their adversaries humbled at last, and the impious heresy of the Manichees (for they were made to believe, that the Eutychians and the Manichees held the same doctrine) utterly extirpated, while the emperor was assisting, after his election, at divine service, which was performed with great solemnity by the patriarch, attended by several bishops, and his numerous clergy, they unexpectedly broke out into loud and repeated acclamations, "Long live the emperor, the new Constantine! Long live the empress,(*) the new Helena! Long live the patriarch, worthy of the Trinity!"(†) In the midst of these acclamations, they shut the doors of the church; and then declared, with one voice, that, since it had pleased heaven to give them, in the room of a Manichee, a Christian emperor, they would suffer none to depart till the patriarch had publicly received the council of Chalcedon, had publicly anathematized all who rejected that holy synod, namely, the new Judas, Severus of Antioch, and had replaced in the diptychs, the names of his two predecessors, Euphemius and Macedonius, with that of Leo, bishop of Rome, which had been erased by the wicked Timotheus. The patriarch was obliged to grant them all they required. But the populace, not yet satisfied, returned the next day, and, repeating the same acclamations, demanded Amantius, the late emperor's great chamberlain, and the chief author of the persecution against the orthodox, to be forthwith driven out of the palace, and the exiled bishops restored to their sees. The patriarch promised to acquaint the emperor, who was not present that day, with their request, and, besides, to cause whatever had been done by him alone the day before to be confirmed by a council. A council was accordingly assembled, and in great haste, in four day's time, to gratify the impatient and riotous multitude. It was composed of the bishops who happened to be then in Constantinople, or in that neighborhood, in all forty or forty-three, many of them declared Eutychians. However, the council of Chalcedon was by all unanimously received; the names of Euphemius, Macedonius, and Leo, were replaced in the diptychs; Severus of Antioch, the most inveterate enemy the orthodox had, was anathematized, deposed, and divest-

end to his life.(a) Others suppose him to have been killed by a flash of lightning.(b) He died, according to some,(c) in the 88th year of his age; according to others, in the 91st;(d) having reigned twenty-seven years, two months, and twenty-nine days. Baronius construes his death into a judgment, chiefly for his arrogance, in presuming to tell the high pontiff, in plain terms, that he would not be commanded.(e) We are told by a writer of those times,(f) that the death of Anastasius was revealed, the minute it happened, to St. Elias, bishop of Jerusalem, who was then in exile, at a great distance from Constantinople; and that the saint immediately imparted the news to three monks, who were come to visit him, adding, that he himself should outlive the emperor only ten days, having been summoned to appear, the tenth day from the time of his death, as an evidence at the dreadful tribunal against him. The historian adds, that St. Elias died at the precise time he had foretold; and Baronius, concluding from thence, that the emperor was damned (for he does not question the truth of that tale), closes his sixth volume with the following words: "As the children of Israel, exulting with joy, sung the praises of God, when they had safely passed the Red sea, in which Pharaoh and his whole army were drowned, let us in like manner exult, and sing, with the church, a song of victory, having happily ended this volume, in which we have seen, at last, the wicked emperor judged, damned, and thrust down to hell." A proper subject indeed for a song! Pope Nicolas I. ranks Anastasius with Nero, Dioclesian, and Constantius, among the persecutors of the church.(g)

(a) Theod. p. 505. Marc. chron.
(b) Zonar. p. 47. (c) Theod. Lect. Vict. Tun.
(d) Chron. Alex. (e) Bar. ad ann. 518. p. 704.
(f) Cyrill. apud Cotel. t. 3. Monument. Eccl. Græc. c. 60. (g) Nic. ep. ad Michael. Imper.

(*) Justin was a native of Bederiana, a city on the borders of Thrace and Illyricum.(a) He was descended of an obscure and mean family, and employed in his youth in keeping cattle, and tilling the ground. He afterwards listed himself among the guards of the emperor Leo; and having, on several occasions, given signal proofs of an extraordinary valor, he was raised, by Leo, from the low station of a common soldier, to the post of Tribune, and by Anastasius to the office of præfectus prætorio.(b) Evagrius writes, that the eunuch Amantius, the deceased emperor's great chamberlain, having intrusted Justin with large sums, to purchase the votes of the soldiery for Theocritus, the eunuch's intimate friend, Justin distributed the money in his own name; and, having, by that means, secured the army to his interest, he was by them, upon the death of Anastasius, proclaimed emperor.(c) He was quite illiterate; could neither read nor write; nor was he capable, if Procopius is to be credited,(d) of despatching business of any kind, without the assistance of others. The person, whom he chiefly employed, and in whom he reposed the greatest trust, was Proclus, his quæstor, whom we may suppose to have been a zealous catholic, since the new emperor, who was, in great measure, swayed by him, showed so much zeal for the catholic faith.

(a) Procop. Hist. Arcan. c. 6. (b) Idem ibid.
(c) Evagr. l. 4. c. 2. (d) Procop. ubi supra.

(*) The name of the present empress was Euphemia. She was by birth a barbarian, and once a slave. Justin bought her while he was yet a private man, and kept her many years as his concubine.(a) He afterwards married her; and, when raised to the empire, honored her with the title of Augusta; but would have her first to quit her original and barbarous name, that of Lupicina, and take a Roman in its room. He chose the name of Euphemia, to show, as is supposed, the great regard he had for the council of Chalcedon which was held in the church of that martyr.

(a) Procop. Hist. Arcan. c. 6.

(†) John, surnamed Cappadox, probably because a native of Cappadocia, was at this time bishop of Constantinople, having been chosen this very year in the room of Timotheus the Eutychian. He had all along professed the doctrine of Chalcedon; but yet did not scruple, notwithstanding the praise now bestowed on him by the populace, to anathematize that council, when he found that Anastasius (for he was chosen some months before his death) would not suffer him to be ordained till he had anathematized it.(a)

(a) Vict. Tun.

The emperor confirms the acts of the council, and commands all bishops to receive that of Chalcedon, on pain of deposition. Amantius, the late emperor's great chamberlain, executed. Sentence pronounced against Severus, who makes his escape. The council of Chalcedon received by all. The emperor, desirous of putting an end to the schism, writes to the pope; and desires him to despatch Legates into the east. The pope insists on the same terms.

ed of all episcopal power and authority; and the bishops, who had been banished for defending the catholic faith, were ordered to be restored to their sees, when it should please the emperor to recal them from exile.[1]

The acts of the council were immediately communicated to the emperor, who not only approved and confirmed them, but issued an edict, commanding all bishops, within his dominions, to receive publicly, in the presence of the clergy and people, the council of Chalcedon, on pain of forfeiting their sees. By the same edict he restored to their rank, honors, and dignities, such as had been deposed, or sent into exile, for standing up in defence of the doctrine defined by that holy synod. A few days after, another edict appeared, excluding heretics of all denominations, namely the Eutychians, from all employments, both civil and military. The late emperor, however addicted to the Eutychian party, made no distinction, in the disposal of employments, between the orthodox and the Eutychians. Justin himself was known to be a zealous catholic; but that did not disqualify him, with an Eutychian emperor, from being raised to the first employments. The publication of these edicts was followed by the execution of Amantius, and such of the Eutychians, as were the most obnoxious to the orthodox party. The general Vitalian, whom Athanasius had discharged, was recalled to court, and restored to his post. As for Severus of Antioch, who had signalized himself above all of his party, by his hatred to the orthodox, and his abhorrence of the doctrine of the two natures, anathematizing daily those who had introduced such a tenet into the church, the emperor ordered him to be apprehended, and his tongue to be cut out. But, before the sentence could be put in execution, he made his escape, and got safe into Egypt, where he was kindly received, and carefully concealed, by Timotheus, the Eutychian bishop of Alexandria.[2]

The above-mentioned edicts were no sooner published in the provinces, than councils were every where assembled, and synodical letters sent up from all quarters to Constantinople, fraught with invectives, curses, and anathemas, against all who presumed to dispute the authority of the holy council of Chalcedon. They were now all convinced, that the doctrine of the two natures was the only true doctrine, and, as such, they received it, declaring the opposite dogma, which, in the late emperor's time, most of them had held, and zealously defended, to be a blasphemy against heaven, and pronouncing all, who countenanced it, enemies to God and his church.[3]

I do not know of a single bishop, who chose rather to forfeit his see, than renounce his opinion: the imperial edicts carried with them such a conviction, as none could withstand.

Justin, having thus united the eastern bishops among themselves, (for none durst now utter a single word against the council of Chalcedon, or the two natures), undertook, in the next place, to unite them with their brethren in the west, coveting nothing so much as the glory of putting an end to the unhappy divisions, that, to the disgrace of the Christian name and religion, had so long prevailed in the catholic church. He therefore wrote a most kind and obliging letter to Hormisdas, acquainting him with his promotion, with the sincere and ardent desire he had of seeing all, who professed the same faith, united in the same communion; and, at the same time, entreating him in his own name, as well as in the name of the bishop of the imperial city, and other well disposed prelates, to send legates into the east, capable of forwarding and accomplishing so desirable a work. With the emperor's letter, and others, to the same purpose, from John of Constantinople, from the synod, which was then sitting in that city, from other bishops, and from count Justinian, the emperor's nephew and successor in the empire, was despatched to Rome Gratus, a person of distinction, and honored with the title of clarissimus. On his arrival in that city, he was immediately introduced to the pope, who received him, as we may well imagine, and read the letters he brought, with inexpressible joy. He concluded, from the earnest desire they all expressed of seeing the unity of the church restored, and all schisms and divisions banished for ever from the kingdom of Christ, that they were disposed to purchase such valuable blessings upon any terms. Resolved therefore to improve such a disposition to the advantage of his see, he answered immediately the emperor's letter, and that of the patriarch, commending their zeal, and assuring them, that if they, on their side, were ready, as he hoped they were, to remove the cause of discord, he was ready on his to concur with them in establishing concord; that is, he was ready to establish concord on his own terms, and no other.[1] He does not mention Acacius in his letter to the emperor; but in that to the patriarch he tells him, that all he has done, and all he can do, to procure the peace of the church, would prove in the end but lost labor, unless he is resolved to anathematize the impious Acacius, to erase his name out of the sacred register, and subscribe the articles annexed to the letter he sends him. The articles were those I have mentioned above, which seemed so very unrea-

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 178.
[2] Procop. Hist. Arcan. c. 6. Evagr. l. 4. c. 4. Cyril. in vit. Sab. c. 60.
[3] Synod. in Anth. Act. I.

[1] Hormisd. ep. 23, 24.

The pope sends legates anew into the east. Their instructions;—[Year of Christ, 519.] Writes by them a great number of letters. The legates received every where with great demonstrations of joy. Great respect paid them at Constantinople. The patriarch remonstrates against the extravagant demands of the pope. But the emperor obliges him to comply with them.

sonable to the late emperor, that he drove the legates from his presence, and ordered them to quit his dominions, for daring to propose them.

The following year Hormisdas, in compliance with the emperor's request, sent a third legation into the east, consisting of two bishops, Germanus and John, one presbyter named Blandus, and two deacons, Felix and Dioscorus. Their instructions were: 1. To receive none to their communion, who had not first signed the above-mentioned articles. 2. Not to see the bishop of Constantinople, even should the emperor desire them to see him, till he had declared, that he received the articles, and was ready to sign them, without any kind of restriction or explication. 3. To cause not only the name of Acacius to be put out of the diptychs, but those likewise of his successors, Euphemius and Macedonius not excepted; since they too died out of the communion of Rome, though they died in exile, and in defence of the orthodox faith. 4. If the bishop of Constantinople should comply with every thing that is required of him, to insist on his acquainting therewith, by a circular letter, signed by him, all the bishops under his jurisdiction, and exhort them to follow his example.[1] With these instructions the pope delivered to the legates a great number of letters; for by them he wrote to the emperor, to the empress, to the bishop of Constantinople, to Theodosius, his archdeacon, and the rest of the clergy, to Justinian, to Celer and Patricius, both men of great power and interest at court, to the præfectus prætorio, residing at Thessalonica, through which city the legates were to pass; and, lastly, to Anastasia and Palmatia, two women of distinction, and both zealous advocates, even in the late emperor's time, for the doctrine of the two natures. The purport of all these letters was to exhort those, to whom they were addressed, to be assisting to the legates in bringing to a happy issue the great business on which they were sent; to convince them, that the Roman church, founded on the faith of St. Peter, could not, without contaminating herself, communicate with those who had contaminated themselves by communicating with heretics, till she was well satisfied that they sincerely renounced such a communion; and that they could by no other means satisfy her as to that important point, but by professing the faith which she professed, and condemning those whom she condemned.[2]

With these letters the legates set out for Constantinople; and, being met, at their landing in Greece, and attended on their journey, by the two counts Stephanus and Laurentius, sent by the emperor for that purpose, they were every where received with loud acclamations, and, as they expressed it in their letter to the pope, in a kind of triumph. The bishops and clergy of the cities, through which they passed, readily signed the articles of union prescribed by Rome, however derogatory to their own rights; anathematized Acacius; struck his name, as well as the names of his successors, out of the diptychs; and were thereupon admitted by the legates to their communion, and by them declared united again in communion and faith to the see of St. Peter. As they approached Constantinople, they were met by Justinian, by the general Vitalian, by Pompeius, a man of great interest at court, and by several other persons of the first rank, and attended by them into the city. The next day they waited on the emperor, who received them in the most obliging manner; and, after expressing the earnest desire he had of putting an end to so long a schism, and seeing all good Christians, especially the prelates of the church, united among themselves in the bonds of charity, desired them to consult the patriarch, and settle with him the terms of union, that no room might be left, on either side, for new disputes. The legates replied, agreeably to their instructions, that the blessed pope Hormisdas had settled the terms, which therefore must not be altered, nor even disputed, since they were strictly enjoined by his holiness to admit none to the communion of the apostolic see, who did not receive them without the least alteration. The bishop of Constantinople had already received the council of Chalcedon; and now agreed to strike the name of Acacius out of the diptychs, which was all the predecessors of Hormisdas had required. But to insist on his erasing likewise the names of Euphemius and Macedonius, who had suffered a most cruel persecution, the loss of their sees, and exile, in defence of the catholic faith; to oblige him to receive not only the letter of Leo on the incarnation, but all the letters written by that pope on the Christian religion; and, besides, to promise that he would conform in all things to the apostolic see, and look upon those who died out of the communion of the Roman, as dying out of the communion of the catholic church; seemed to him the height of presumption in the bishop of Rome. Against these articles, therefore, he warmly remonstrated, as artfully calculated to subject, rather than to unite, the see of Constantinople to that of Rome. But the legates were inflexible; and, on the other hand, the emperor was determined, out of his great zeal for the unity of the church, to agree to any terms rather than to suffer so scandalous a division to continue among the Christian bishops. Finding therefore that the legates would not yield, he declared, that the patriarch should; and accordingly, having first caused the articles to be approved by the

[1] Extat inter. epist. Hormisd.
[2] Hormisd. ep. 30—41.

Remarkable instance of the patriarch's policy and address. The names of Acacius, and his successors, with those of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius, struck out of the diptychs. The schism ended, and the two churches entirely reconciled. In this division the popes the schismatics, and not the Greeks.

Senate, he commanded him to receive them. The patriarch still objected against them, as derogatory to the rights and liberties of his see, and highly injurious to the memory of his two holy predecessors, Euphemius and Macedonius, whose names were written in the book of life. But the emperor, who was utterly unacquainted with the laws, discipline, and practice of the church, being deaf to all remonstrances, the patriarch was in the end obliged to yield, and promised accordingly to comply with the terms prescribed by the pope; but, at the same time, begged, that instead of signing the articles as they had been drawn up and worded at Rome, he might be allowed to write a letter to the same purpose, addressed to his holiness. His view therein was to avoid certain expressions in the articles, which seemed to import some kind of authority in the see of Rome over that of Constantinople. This occasioned great disputes; but it was agreed at last, that the patriarch should sign the articles, without the least alteration, addition, exception, or limitation; but that he should be allowed to premise a preamble, addressed to Hormisdas, in the form of a letter. Pursuant to this agreement, he signed the articles; but took care, in the preamble, which he first prefixed to them, that no room should be left for the present pope, or his successors, to claim, from his having signed them, any kind of authority or jurisdiction over him, or his successors. For he addressed him with no other title but that of brother, and fellow-minister, which evidently excludes all kind of subjection; and whereas the pope magnified the see of Rome, and seemed to exalt it above other sees, as the throne of the first apostle, the patriarch declared in his letter that "he held the two holy churches of old and new Rome to be one and the same church;" which was equalling the two churches, and disowning all superiority in the one to the other. He was a match for the pope.

The articles being thus signed by the patriarch, the name of Acacius, and with his, the names of the other bishops, who had succeeded him in the see of Constantinople ever since the beginning of the schism to the present time, namely, of Fravitas, Euphemius, Macedonius, and Timotheus, were all, without distinction between Eutychian and orthodox, struck out of the diptychs; nay, to complete the vengeance of the apostolic see, and extend it to all indiscriminately, who had any ways disobliged their holiness, the names of the two emperors Anastasius and Zeno were, at the request of the legates, cancelled, together with those of the bishops. And now the legates, having obtained all they were enjoined to require, declared, in the name of the blessed pope, Hormisdas, the two sees united again in charity and faith. They then attended the patriarch to the great church; assisted at divine service performed by him with great solemnity, the emperor, the empress, the whole court, and the senate, being present; and, to seal the union, received with him, and probably at his hands, the holy eucharist. Thus ended the first great schism between the churches of Constantinople and Rome, after it had lasted thirty-five years.

The Roman catholic writers have taken unwearied pains, in the account they give us of that fatal division, to lay the whole blame on the Greeks, and not only to excuse, but set forth the conduct of the popes, from the beginning of the schism, to the reconciliation of the two churches, as highly commendable, as altogether worthy of the "successors of St. Peter, of the vicars of Christ upon earth." But none of them have yet been able to show, and we may well defy them, with all their art and eloquence, ever to show, what evil would have accrued to the faith, the church, or the Christian religion, from the name of Acacius, the subject of the dispute, being kept in the diptychs, or what good would have accrued from its being erased. For, to say with the popes, that to keep his name in the roll of the catholic bishops was contaminating the catholic faith, because he had contaminated himself by communicating with contaminated persons, and contaminated all who communicated with him, as those, who communicated with him, contaminated all who communicated with them, and so *in infinitum*, is confounding the reader with words jumbled together without any meaning. But if the retaining that name could be attended with no evil affecting the faith, or the church; if the cancelling it would be attended with no good thence arising to either; it would have been quite inexcusable in the popes to have excommunicated the Greeks for retaining it, even though they had not been able to allege any reason why they retained it. But they had very substantial reasons; and their acting otherwise than they did, would have been attended as they often remonstrated, with infinite evils, and in all likelihood with the utter ruin of the catholic faith in the empire of the east.[2] What must we therefore think of the popes obstinately insisting on the Greeks yielding, even in these circumstances, to their will, and separating themselves from their communion, because they would not? Did they act therein as the successors of St. Peter, as the vicars of Christ? To say they did, is absolute blasphemy. From what has been said it is manifest, that the popes were the schismatics, with those who adhered to them; and not the Greeks, though generally stigmatized with that name; they alone being schismatics, agreeably to the definition of St. Cyprian, received by all, who, without just cause, separate themselves, as I have shown

[1] Relat. Legat. inter Epist. Hormisd. t. 1. Epist. summ. Pont.

[2] See p. 282. 284.

The emperor orders the articles, sent from Rome, to be signed by the other patriarchs. They are signed by the patriarch of Antioch. The patriarch of Alexandria refuses to sign them. Occasion great disturbances at Thessalonica. One of the legates wounded, and in great danger of his life. The pope requires the bishop of Thessalonica to be sent to Rome. But he is tried at Constantinople, and suffered to return to his see.

the popes to have done, from the rest of their brethren.

The emperor was not satisfied with causing the articles, sent from Rome, to be received and signed by the patriarch of Constantinople; but, to complete the union between the east and the west, resolved, out of the abundance of his zeal for the unity of the church, to oblige the other two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and the metropolitan of Thessalonica, to sign the same articles. Paul, who, on the flight of Severus from Antioch, had been substituted in his room, obeyed with great readiness, being a most zealous catholic, but, in other respects, a disgrace to his order; insomuch that the catholics themselves, offended at his lewdness, and scandalous life, obliged him to resign. He was succeeded by Euphrasius, who began his episcopacy with anathematizing the council of Chalcedon, and striking out of the diptychs the names of all the bishops, who had assisted at that assembly, and with them the names of the popes from Leo to Hormisdas. But the governor of the province having let him know, that, unless he recanted, the imperial edict must be put in execution, commanding all, who did not receive the council and doctrine of Chalcedon, to be driven from their sees, he repented what he had done, received the council, anathematized all who did not receive it, replaced in the diptychs the names, which he had erased a few days before, and, signing the articles, was readmitted to the communion of Rome.[1] Timotheus, bishop of Alexandria, who had lately succeeded Dioscorus the younger in that see, bid, in a manner, defiance to the emperor, boldly declaring, that he would anathematize, to his last breath, the council of Chalcedon, together with Leo, and all his letters; that he scorned to receive laws of the bishops of Rome; and that he would neither be taught nor directed by them. As the people of Alexandria were extremely devoted to their bishop, ever ready to revolt, and most zealously attached to the doctrine of Eutychus, which they believed to be, and it would be no easy task to prove it was not, the genuine doctrine of their patriarch Cyril, the emperor thought it advisable to dissemble for the present, and patiently wait till an opportunity offered of bringing back the Egyptians, by gentle methods, to the unity of the church. To Thessalonica was despatched from Constantinople one of the legates, John the bishop, with several ecclesiastics in his retinue; and count Licinius, a person of great distinction, was appointed by the emperor to attend them. But the terms of union seemed so very unreasonable to Dorotheus, metropolitan and bishop of that city, that while the legate was reading them in a public assembly, he could not forbear snatching them out of his hand, and tearing them in his presence. There wanted no more to raise the populace, who, falling upon the legate, and those who were with him, killed his host, and two of his ecclesiastics, wounded him dangerously in three places, and would have put an end to his life, had not Count Licinius brought, in great haste, the soldiery to his rescue, and conveyed him, well guarded, to one of the churches; and there he continued, not daring to appear abroad, till the emperor, informed of what had happened, sent for Dorotheus to Constantinople.[1] The other legates, who had remained in that city, took care to acquaint the pope, as soon as they could, with the inhuman treatment their colleague had met with, laying the whole blame on Dorotheus, and one of his presbyters, named Aristides, as if the populace had been underhand stirred up by them. The pope, highly provoked "at the insult offered to St. Peter and himself in the person of his legate," answered their letter as soon as he received it, enjoining them to use all the interest they had with the most religious emperor, and his ministers, that Dorotheus might not be suffered to return to Thessalonica, that his see might be declared vacant, and he sent to Rome, together with the presbyter Aristides, to have their doubts resolved there, and to be instructed by the apostolic see, since they would not hearken to the instructions of its legates.[2] Rome was certainly the most proper place men, who questioned the papal authority could be sent to, to be at the same time, instructed and convinced; and nowhere else would all their doubts have been more quickly resolved. But the emperor, without hearkening to the legates, ordered Dorotheus to be tried at Constantinople; and all his punishment was, to be sent to Heraclea, whence he was suffered, after a few days confinement, to return to his see. Baronius, who thinks he ought at least to have been confined for life to Oasis, the most inhospitable place of the whole empire, cries out here; Is it possible, that justice, under an emperor, who takes his name from justice, should be thus sold and betrayed in the cause of the holy pontiff! For the legates pretended, that Dorotheus had bribed his judges, having carried with him to Constantinople, say they in the relation they sent to Rome, such sums as were capable of corrupting not only men, but the angels themselves.[3] They thought, it seems, that no man could withstand the temptation of money; and indeed that few could, at least of those who were sent from Rome, we have seen already, and shall see hereafter, on several occasions. The emperor allowed Dorotheus to return to his see, as I have related; but it was upon condition, that he should appease the pope, and send for that purpose a solemn legation to

[1] Theoph. ad ann. 513.

[1] Suggest. Legat. inter epist. Hormisd.
[2] Hormisd. ep. 57. [3] Suggest. Legat. ubi supra.

He sends a solemn legation to Rome, and is reconciled to that see;—[Year of Christ, 520.] The greater part of the bishops refuse to strike out of the diptychs the names of the orthodox bishops. Justinian recurs to the pope, begging he would not insist on their names being erased. His sentiments concerning persecution. The emperor and the patriarch write to the same purpose. The patriarch's letter accompanied with a present. The pope in his answer, insists on their names being erased;—[Year of Christ, 521.]

Rome. With this condition the metropolitan complied, the following year, 520, and, at the same time, wrote to the pope, styling him, in the address, "the most holy and blessed father and fellow-minister," and in the letter, "in all things most blessed, and thrice blessed father, in every respect perfect," &c. But, however lavish of his praises, he took care to avoid all expressions that could be construed into any kind of subjection, or even submission; for, instead of descending to apologies and excuses, he arraigned the legates, who had accused him, of slander and calumny, declaring, that he was so far from having been any ways concerned in the late riot, as they had maliciously suggested, that, on the contrary, to save the life of the venerable bishop, he had even exposed his own.[1] This was certainly false, if what the legates wrote to the pope was true. But the emperor being satisfied, the pope was obliged to be satisfied too. Dorotheus probably signed on this occasion the articles of union, and was reconciled to Rome.

The two patriarchs, of Constantinople and Antioch, had, in compliance with the articles sent from Rome, struck out of the diptychs the name of Acacius, and, together with his, the names of the orthodox bishops, who had died out of the communion of Rome, as I have related above; and their example was readily followed, with respect to the name of Acacius. But, as to the names of the other bishops, the far greater part peremptorily refused to erase them, saying, that they had rather live for ever separated from Rome, than thus stigmatize the memory of so many eminent prelates, who had deserved so well of the catholic faith, who were no less orthodox than the pope himself, and had given more convincing proofs of their orthodoxy than he had ever occasion to give. The bishops were backed by their clergy; and the people, joining both, began to mutiny, to exclaim against the pope, to complain of the emperor, for gratifying him in so unreasonable a demand, and, making the cause of the catholic bishops the catholic cause, to look upon all, who were for suppressing their names, as friends to Eutyches, and enemies to the church. The emperor, count Justinian, his nephew, and Epiphanius the new patriarch, who had succeeded in the beginnnig of this year, to John the Cappadocian, alarmed at the general discontent that reigned among the people as well as the clergy, and dreading the effects of the popular zeal, instead of using violence with the refractory bishops, which they knew would be attended with a great deal of bloodshed, and might, in the end, cost the emperor the loss of his crown, resolved to recur to the pope, and try whether they could not prevail upon him to be satisfied with their erasing the name of Acacius alone. With this view Justinian wrote to Rome the first, acquainting the pope, that neither the people, the clergy, nor the bishops, though threatened with exile, nay, and with fire and sword, could be induced to omit, at divine service, the names of so many holy catholic prelates; and, at the same time, conjuring his holiness, as he tendered the welfare of the church, and the peace of the state, not to insist on that point, since he would thereby involve both in a new war, and more dangerous troubles than either had hitherto felt. "Your holiness," says he in his letter, "ought to consider the nature of things, and the difference of times; and, being satisfied with the condemnation of Acacius, of Dioscorus, of Timotheus Ælurus, Petrus Mongus, and Petrus Fullo, end at last this obstinate contest. *It is not by persecution and bloodshed, but sacerdotal patience, that men are to be gained to God: by striving to gain souls, we often destroy both bodies and souls: it is by mildness and lenity alone that old errors can be corrected.*"[1] How much Christian blood would have been saved, had the popes, or the emperors themselves, hearkened to this excellent lesson!

The patriarch, and the emperor, both wrote pressing letters to the same purpose. The patriarch accompanied his with a rich present to the pope, consisting of a chalice of gold, adorned with a great number of jewels, of a patin likewise of gold, another chalice of silver, and two silk veils. The emperor, in his letter, assures the pope, that he has spared no pains in causing the terms of union, prescribed by the apostolic see, to be received by all; but that upon some he cannot prevail, either by persuasions or menaces, to condemn those after their death, in whom they placed their greatest glory while they were living; that their obstinacy is proof against all dangers, and death itself; that he is extremely grieved to find the great work of an entire reconciliation, which he had so much at heart, thus retarded; but, on the other side, is no less unwilling to proceed to violence, and shed the blood of his innocent subjects; and therefore does not doubt but his apostleship, rather than oblige him to turn persecutor, will connive, for the present, at the names of the orthodox bishops being kept in the diptychs, and be satisfied with their condemning the memory of Acacius alone; the rather, as his holy predecessor Anastasius had required no more, to receive all to his communion, who professed the same faith.[2] But the pope was deaf to all remonstrances and reasons. He still insisted on the condemnation, not only of Acacius, but of all who had communicated

[1] Inter ep. Hormisd.

[1] Inter Epist. Hormisd.
[2] Inter Epist. Hormisd. l. 1. Epist. Rom. Pont.

The pope encourages persecution. His principles adopted by the church of Rome. The emperor allows the names of the catholic bishops to be kept in the diptychs, in spite of the pope. New disputes in the church; whether one of the Trinity, or one person of the Trinity, should be said to have suffered on the cross.

with him, or his memory; and because the emperor had shown himself, in his letter, utterly averse to persecution and bloodshed, he strove, in his answer, to reconcile him to both. "Many things," says he, "which we naturally detest and abhor, are, in some cases, necessary remedies; and then, our health being at stake, we are not to consult, but strive to overcome, our natural aversion. In sickness, we are apt to complain of the remedies that are prescribed for our cure, and hate those who prescribe them. But would it be good natured or friendly in a physician to forbear applying what he knows to be conducive to health, out of compassion, or through fear of causing a momentary pain? It is cruelty to spare, and compassion to cure, let the remedies, that work the cure, be ever so painful."[1] Thus did the pope, in direct opposition to the doctrine of the gospel, endeavor to extinguish in the emperor all sense of humanity; nay, and to convince him, that he could by no other means better show himself a kind and benevolent prince, than by shedding the blood of his innocent people. These antichristian principles have ever since been maintained, as is but too well known, by the church of Rome; and, in compliance with them, the popes have never failed, when it was in their power, to encourage persecution, and stir up the popish princes to persecute, and pursue with fire and sword, their protestant subjects. To these principles are owing the racks, the dungeons, and the unrelenting torments of the inquisition; it being highly meritorious with the ministers of that infernal tribunal to rack the body, without mercy, for the good of the soul, and highly criminal for any of them to show compassion, let the torments be ever so exquisite, when they are, as they say, become necessary remedies for the cure of the soul. As the church of Rome has adopted these maxims, she can never renounce them; and it is quite surprising, that some protestants, either misled themselves, or wanting to mislead others, should pretend, that, in some degree, she has renounced them already, and is become more indulgent, than she has been in former times, to those who dissent from her. Are not her prisons filled, at this very time, with those whom she styles heretics, or only suspects of what she calls heresy? Are not her racks still daily employed in extorting confessions? Does she any where suffer, where her power prevails, doctrines to be taught or professed, disagreeing in the least with those, which she professes and teaches? On what, then, can the opinion be founded, of her having begun of late to abate of her former severity? Let her discharge her inquisitors, shut up her inquisitions, grant liberty of conscience where she dares to refuse it; and then, but not till then, we shall, with these her protestant friends, acknowledge her lenity.

The emperor, though so great a bigot, was so far from hearkening to the suggestions of the pope, that, on the contrary, greatly offended at his obstinacy, and more at his principles, he joined, in the end, his subjects against him; and, commending them for the regard they paid to the memory of their catholic pastors, allowed them, without giving himself any farther trouble about the consent of his holiness, to keep all their names in the diptychs. The pope, finding he could not prevail, thought it advisable to dissemble; and wrote accordingly to the patriarch, empowering him to receive all to the communion of Rome, who, anathematizing Acacius, and the others mentioned above, condemned their memories.[1] As no mention was made, in that letter, of the orthodox bishops, the patriarch obliged none to erase their names; nay, he replaced in the diptychs, with the approbation of the emperor, the names of Euphemius and Macedonius, which his predecessor had cancelled; and the pope, by not disapproving, tacitly approved, what he had done. And thus was an entire reconciliation at last brought about, we may say, in spite of the pope. It is observable, that several among the bishops, who had communicated with Acacius, or his memory, and were, on that score, thought by the present pope unworthy of a place in the catalogue of bishops, have by his successors been judged worthy of a place in the calendar of saints: they now invoke at the altar the names which he thought would have contaminated the whole church, had they only been mentioned at the altar; and therefore would have involved both the church and the state in the utmost confusion to have them suppressed, had the emperor been as bloody-minded as he.

The east and the west were now happily reconciled, after so long and obstinate a division. But the church was not suffered to enjoy the peace and tranquillity, which she had reason to expect from that reconciliation. New disputes arose daily among her members; and one, which had been already carried on for some time, remained still undecided. The dispute was, whether "one of the Trinity," or "one person of the Trinity," should be said to have "suffered in the flesh?" The proposition, "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," some Scythian monks maintained to be orthodox; and the other, "one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," to import absolute heresy. But, on the other side, a deacon, named Victor, pretended the former proposition to import absolute heresy, and the latter alone to be orthodox. Both the monks and the deacon received the council of Chalcedon, acknowledged two natures in

[1] Hormisd. Ep. 75.

[1] Hormisd. Ep. 77.

Whether one of the Trinity, or one person of the Trinity, should be said to have suffered on the cross, was condemned by some. The proposition, one of the Trinity, &c., condemned by the legates of the pope. The monks who maintained it, appeal to the pope, who condemns the proposition, and uses them ill. The pope writes against the monks;—[Year of Christ, 522.] His letter is answered by one of them. Not one writer offers to defend the pope.

Christ, in opposition to Eutyches, and, in opposition to Nestorius, only one person. But nevertheless, by a long chain of unintelligible inferences, the monks strove to convince the deacon, that he was a rank Nestorian; and the deacon strove, in his turn, to convince them, by the same method of reasoning, that they were rank Eutychians, and Arians into the bargain. Besides, the deacon pretended, that the word "one," without the addition of "person," referred only to the divine substance or nature; and consequently, that to say, "one of the Trinity suffered," was as much as to say, "one of the natures of the Trinity suffered;" which was evidently supposing, that, in the Trinity, there were more natures than one. On this great stress was laid by one Trisolius, a presbyter, who lived at this time, and seems to have been well versed in all the subtleties and cavils of logic, the only knowledge, if it deserves that name, which was now in request. For, in a letter he wrote to Faustus, a Roman senator, he reasons thus: "In the Trinity," says he, "there are not three Gods, but one God in three persons. Now the word 'one' necessarily imports the nature; and hence it follows, that the two propositions, 'one of the Trinity suffered,' and 'one of the three Divine natures,' or 'three Gods, suffered,' must, of course, be synonymous." But neither will that writer allow the other proposition to be orthodox, "one person of the Trinity suffered," since it might be concluded from thence, that the Divine nature had suffered. "That error, indeed," adds he, "you avoid by adding, 'in the flesh;' but you thereby confound the two natures; and, flying from the Theopaschites, fall in with the Eutychians." He concludes with advising Faustus to shun all expressions alike, that have neither been used by the oecumenical councils, nor by the fathers in their writings approved by the councils. They had all now forgotten, that there was such a book as the scripture.

The monks, finding themselves arraigned of heresy, had recourse to the legates of the pope, who were then at Constantinople; for the dispute began in 519, and the legates, having several times heard both Victor and them, instead of reconciling them, and showing that their meaning was the same, and their disagreement only about words, gave sentence in favor of the former. The monks did not acquiesce in their judgment, as we may well imagine; but, highly provoked, to use their expressions, at the rashness, partiality, and ignorance, of the legates, in condemning what they did not, or would not understand, they despatched four of their fraternity to Rome, to complain of them to the pope, and to get the proposition approved by him, which they had condemned. But the pope, informed by his legates of what had passed at Constantinople, not only confirmed the sentence they had given, but kept the deputies of the monks a whole year, in a manner, prisoners, at Rome, to convince them by that means, since he could by no other, of their error. Some write, that he drove them at last out of the city, as incorrigible heretics; while others tell us, that, to the great disappointment of the pope, they made their escape in the night. However that be, they found means, before they left the city, to paste up, in several public places, their confession of faith, comprised in twelve articles, with as many anathemas against all, the pope not excepted, who did not receive it. This exasperated the pope to such a degree, that, in his answer to a letter which he received, at this time, from Possessor, an African bishop, who had been driven from his see by the Arians, and resided at Constantinople, he inveighed against the monks in the most abusive terms, taxing them with pride, arrogance, and obstinacy; and painting them as the worst of men, as enemies to the church, as disturbers of the public peace, as slanderers, lyers, and, above all, as instruments employed by the enemy of truth, to banish all truth, to establish error in its room, and sow among the wheat the poisonous seeds of diabolical tares.[1] As copies of this letter were dispersed by Possessor all over the east, Maxentius, one of the monks, and the most learned among them, undertook to answer it; and, in his answer, he treats the pope worse, if possible, than he had treated the monks. He begins with declaring, that he does not believe the piece, he answers, to have been written by Hormisdas, or by any other Christian bishop, it being wholly made up of errors, contradictions, calumnies, and lies. He then inveighs against the legates of the pope, against Possessor, and most of all against the author of the letter, as not a disguised, but an open and avowed heretic; proves, and indeed unanswerably, the proposition, "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, to be entirely orthodox, as it was understood by him and his brethren, and explained by them to the pope; justifies the conduct of the monks; and concludes with these words: "the author of this letter, whether it was really written by Homisdas or falsely ascribed to him, is without all doubt, a heretic, since he will not allow Christ the Son of God to be one of the Trinity." It is remarkable, that though copies of this letter were dispersed over the whole Christian world, though the pope, who was there charged with heresy, had many friends both in the east and the west, not one of them offered to undertake his defence, or pretended to justify his condemning the above-mentioned proposition, as it was explained by the monks, often declaring, that they thereby meant no more,

[1] Apud Bar ad ann. 520. p. 58. et Hormisd. ep. 70

Hormisdas dies. It was not owing to him that the council of Chalcedon was received, nor that an end was put to the schism. His character. Letters falsely ascribed to him. He appoints the bishops of Tarragon and Seville his vicars in Spain.

than that "Christ who was one of the persons of the Trinity, suffered in the flesh." Nay, Hormisdas had the mortification to see, before he died, the bishops of the east, all to a man, and likewise the catholic bishops of Africa, with St. Fulgentius at their head, that is, the far greater part of the church, engaged in defence of the monks, and condemning with them all, who did not admit the expression, which he had condemned. Had he lived but a few years longer, he would have seen that expression adopted by the whole catholic church, and those anthematized by the whole catholic church, who did not approve and receive it, as I shall have occasion to relate hereafter.

But he died the following year, 523, on the 6th of August, having held the chair nine years, and eleven days; and on that day his relics are still exposed to public adoration, in the church of St. Peter, where he is supposed to have been buried. What entitled him to that honor was, as is said, his extraordinary and truly apostolical zeal in causing the council of Chalcedon to be every where received, and in healing the divisions which had reigned so long in the church. But the council of Chalcedon was received, from the beginning, by all in the west; and its being as universally received in the east was entirely owing, as we have seen, to the decree which Justin issued, of his own motion, as soon as he ascended the imperial throne. As to the divisions of the church, they were healed indeed in his time; but what extraordinary merit Hormisdas had in healing them, and reconciling the two churches, it would be no easy matter to determine. He made no advances towards a reconciliation; he could by no means be induced, notwithstanding his boasted zeal for the unity and peace of the church, to abate, in the least, of the pretensions of his see, for the sake of either; nay, he insisted on terms far more unreasonable, than the most assuming among his predecessors had presumed to require. It is true, they were complied with at last; and peace was restored. But that was not owing to any zeal or condescension in him, but to the zeal, and, in some degree, to the weakness, of the emperor, who, pitying the unhappy condition of the church, thus miserably rent by her own prelates, chose rather to gratify the pope in all his demands, however unreasonable, than to suffer one half of the church to continue any longer disunited from the other, to the great danger of both. It is observable, that of the five popes, who governed the Roman church during this schism, one only has been denied the honor of saintship, namely, pope Anastasius, the only one among them, who showed himself inclined to sacrifice the pretensions of his see to the welfare of the church.[1] I leave the reader to conclude from thence what kind of merit was rewarded with that honor in the rest.

Hormisdas was a man of uncommon parts, of great policy and address, as appears from his whole conduct; but of a most haughty, vindictive, and imperious temper, and, to the eternal infamy of his name and memory, the first Christian bishop, who, in matters of conscience, dared openly to countenance, nay, and to sanctify, slaughter and bloodshed. As for his writings, of the many letters he wrote, seventy-nine have reached our times. The learned Du Pin, misled by Baronius, counts eighty;[1] but the strength and energy with which Hormisdas expresses himself in the other letters, though they all savor of the barbarism of the age, evidently prove that to St. Remigius, appointing him vicar of the apostolic see, in the new converted kingdom of Clovis, to be suppositious:[2] besides, in that letter, Clovis is supposed to be still living; and nothing is more certain, than that he died on the 27th of November, 511, that is, two years and eight months before the election of Hormisdas.[3] Hence, it is manifest, that the letter, which Clovis is said to have written to this pope, acknowledging him for the supreme head of the church, and which Baronius displays and comments with great pomp and flourish of words, is likewise a barefaced forgery. The far greater part of the letters of Hormisdas relates to the affairs of the east. But that he did not suffer his attention to be so engrossed by them, as to neglect the opportunities that offered of maintaining and improving the authority usurped by his predecessors in the west, appears from his letters to John of Tarragon, and Salustius of Seville. For, being consulted by them about some points of discipline, he thence took occasion to appoint them his vicars, the former for the Hither, and the latter for the Farther Spain; empowering them to assemble in council the bishops of the provinces, over which they were set, to compose their differences, and to see that the canons were every where punctually observed. This power he granted them, on condition of their recurring to him in all matters of moment; that is, on condition of their acting in an entire dependence upon him, and his see.[4] Thus, by their means, he extended his power and authority over all the provinces and bishops of Spain. The institution of vicars was, of all the devices that the most refined policy could invent or suggest, the best calculated for the establishing of the papal authority; the bishops of the first sees, who were the most capable of effectually opposing the encroachments of Rome, being thereby engaged, in gratitude as well as by interest, to support and defend them.

In the time of Hormisdas, many rich pre-

[1] See p. 294.

[1] Du Pin, Biblioth. des Aut. Eccl. t. 4. in Hormisd.
[2] Vide Pagi ad ann. 514. n. 5.
[3] Idem, n. 7. [4] Hormisd. ep 24, 25, 26.

King Theodoric sends presents to the church of St. Peter. In the primitive times presents not accepted from heretics. John chosen. The emperor Justin issues an edict against heretics of all denominations. Issues another edict, commanding the Arians to deliver up their churches to the catholics;—[Year of Christ, 524.] The Arians implore the protection of king Theodoric.

sents are said to have been made to the church of St. Peter by the emperor Justin, and others. Among the rest king Theodoric sent, if the bibliothecarian is to be credited,[1] two silver candlesticks, weighing seventy pounds. In the earliest times the church, at least the Roman church, would receive nothing from heretics; nay, in the second century, about the year 170, she even returned to Marcian five hundred drachmas of gold, which he had given, when she found that he held heterodox doctrines, lest she should be polluted with the money of a heretic. This Baronius remembered; and therefore, that we may not imagine the Roman church to have been less pure in the sixth than she was in the second century, he takes care to inform us, that the gift of the heretical and Arian king was not received by her as an offering, but only as a present, which she might accept, even at the hands of an infidel, without the least danger of being thereby defiled or polluted.[1] Had this distinction been known to the church in Marcian's time, she might have safely kept his five hundred drachmas. However, it was not first broached by Baronius; but had been used, long before his time, by the canonists, pretending, the better to gratify the avarice of the clergy, that by the canons forbidding donations and legacies to be accepted from public sinners, from infamous women, or from those who were at variance with their relations, nothing else was meant, than that such donations and legacies should not be accepted as oblations, but only as presents or gifts.[2] This distinction has proved very serviceable to the church of Rome; it being well known, that she owes the far greater part of her present wealth to the bounty of those, whose donations and legacies she was, by her canons, enjoined to reject.

JOHN, FIFTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTIN, THEODORIC, *king of Italy*.]

[Year of Christ 523.] Hormisdas was succeeded by John, surnamed Cateline, ordained on the 13th of August, after a vacancy of seven days. He was a native of Tuscany, the son of one Constantius, and presbyter of the Roman church;[2] which is all we know of him before his election. His pontificate was short and unhappy; and the calamities that befel him were owing to the indiscreet zeal of the emperor Justin. For that prince, not satisfied with having put an end to the schism, undertook, in the next place, to clear his dominions from heretics, as he styled them, of all denominations. He began with the Manichees, who, taking advantage of the general confusion that reigned in the church, during the late disputes between the Eutychian and orthodox parties, had perverted, unobserved, great numbers of both to their impious tenets. Against them therefore the emperor issued an edict, in the sixth year of his reign, that is, in 523, commanding them to be put to death without mercy, wherever they should be discovered, and convicted.[3] This edict was attended with no bad consequences; the Manichees being universally abhorred and detested, on account of the execrable principles, and immoral practices of that infamous sect. But the zeal of Justin, savoring not a little of enthusiasm, did not suffer him to stop here. The following year, 524, he enacted another edict, ordering the Arians, who were very numerous in the east, to deliver up all their churches to the catholic bishops, and the catholic bishops to consecrate them anew. The Arians had been allowed, by the emperors, the free and open exercise of their religion; had contented themselves with worshipping God in their own way, without ever attempting to bring over any, either orthodox or Eutychian, to their persuasion; were as good subjects as the best of the catholics; and, on all occasions, had served, with as much zeal and fidelity as they, their prince and their country. Being therefore conscious to themselves, that they had given no occasion to such an edict, nor offence to their fellow-subjects, or their sovereign, they often and warmly remonstrated against the treatment which they so undeservedly met with. But the emperor was not to be moved, and the catholics were already in possession of most of their churches. In this distress, none of their friends at court daring to speak a word in their favor, they resolved to recur to king Theodoric, whom they all knew to be a zealous Arian, though, by a principle of toleration, he no less favored his catholic, than he did his Arian subjects. He was the only prince in the world whose interposition and good offices they thought would be of some weight with the emperor; and to him they privately despatched some of their chief men, with letters, in the name of all, to acquaint him with the evils, which they so

[1] Anast. in Hormisd. [2] Evagr. Lib. Pont. [3] Cod. Just. leg. 12.

[1] Vide Bar. ad ann. 523.
[2] Vide Can. 93. apud Gratian. dist. 90. et Mendos. in hunc locum.

Theodoric writes to the emperor in their behalf; the emperor pays no regard to his letters. The king sends for the pope to Ravenna. His speech to the pope. He sends him with the character of his ambassador, to divert the emperor from the persecution he had begun.

unjustly suffered, and the far greater evils, which they had reason to apprehend, unless, touched with compassion, he interposed in their behalf, and espoused their cause as his own, since the holy religion, which was common to both, and for which they suffered, made it his own. The king received the deputies in the most obliging manner, assured them of his good offices, and wrote, without delay, most pressing letters to the emperor, and all the great men at court, in their favor. But no kind of regard was paid to his letters; the persecution continued, and the Arians were every where driven from their churches, and in some places, by the over-zealous catholics, out of the cities. This Theodoric could not brook; and resolved to resent it in a proper manner. The first thing that occurred to him, was to retaliate on the catholics in the west all the severities that were practised on the Arians in the east. But as he was a prince of a most humane disposition, and besides an enemy, by principle, to all persecution, he could not prevail upon himself to proceed to such extremities, till all other means he could think of had proved ineffectual. He thought of many; weighed and examined many; and at last fixed upon one, which he apprehended could not fail of the wished-for success. He knew what weight the advice and counsels of the pope had with the emperor; how much the emperor deferred to the judgment of the bishop of Rome, in all matters of religion and conscience; and therefore did not doubt but the persecution would soon be at an end, could the pope, by any means, be prevailed upon to espouse the cause of the persecuted Arians, and, disapproving the measures which the emperor was pursuing, employ his counsel and authority to divert him from them.

The king was sensible, that it was only by menaces, by force, and compulsion, that the pope could be brought to act such a part; and resolved, accordingly, to employ them at once, that no room might be left for delays and excuses. Having therefore sent for him to Ravenna, he complained to him, with great warmth, of the unchristian spirit and proceedings of the emperor; remonstrated against the violences that were daily practised on the catholics in the east, meaning the Arians, which he hoped no Christian bishop would ever countenance or approve; strove to convince the pope of the injustice of the late edict; and, comparing the happy situation of the heretics, meaning the catholics in his dominions, with the unhappy condition of the catholics in those of the emperor, he added; "But I must let you know, that I am determined not to sit as an idle spectator on such an occasion. I am, you know, and I have often declared it, an enemy to all kind of persecution; I have suffered not only the inhabitants of Italy, but even my Goths, to embrace and profess, undisturbed, which of the two religions they thought the most pleasing to God; and, in the distribution of my favors, have hitherto made no distinction between catholic and heretic. But if the emperor does not change his measures, I must change mine. Men of other religions the emperor may treat as he pleases, though every man has a right to serve his Creator in the manner which he thinks the most acceptable to him. But as for those, who profess the same holy religion which I profess, and believe to be the only true religion, I think myself bound to employ the power which it has pleased God to put into my hands, for their defence and protection. If the emperor therefore does not think fit to revoke the edict, which he has lately issued against those of my persuasion, it is my firm resolution to issue the like edict against those of his; and to see it every where executed with the same rigor. Those who do not profess the faith of Nice, are heretics to him; and those who do, are heretics to me. Whatever can excuse or justify his severity to the former, will excuse and justify mine to the latter. But the emperor," continued the king, "has none about him, who dare freely and openly speak what they think, or to whom he would hearken, if they did. But the great veneration, which he professes for your see, leaves no room to doubt, but he would hearken to you. I will therefore have you to repair forthwith to Constantinople, and there to remonstrate, both in my name and your own, against the violent measures, in which that court has so rashly engaged. It is in your power to divert the emperor from them; and till you have, nay, till the catholics are restored to the free exercise of their religion, and to all the churches, from which they have been driven, you must not think of returning to Italy."[1] An anonymous writer, who flourished at this time, adds, that Theodoric likewise insisted on the emperor's allowing those to return to the catholic faith (the Arian), whom he had by any kind of violence obliged to abjure it; that the pope promised to do all that lay in his power to procure the revocation of the edict, and the restitution of the churches; but as for those who had already changed their religion, he assured the king, that the emperor would, upon no consideration whatever, suffer them to change it anew; and that, as to himself, he could not, in conscience, take upon him to suggest it, nor would he be charged with such a commission. The king, says the anonymous writer, was greatly provoked at this speech, and, in the transport of his passion, ordered the pope to be immediately conveyed on board a vessel, and the vessel to put to sea.[2] However that be, certain it is, that the pope undertook the embassy, not out of any

[1] Theoph. ad ann. 524. Marcell. in chron.
[2] Anonym. Val. p. 59.

The pope received with extraordinary marks of honor at Constantinople ;—[Year of Christ, 525.] An instance of his pride. The emperor revokes the edict against the Arians. The pope nevertheless imprisoned by the king on his return to Ravenna. Several conjectures concerning the motives of the king's indignation. The most probable conjecture.

kindness to the Arians, with which he has been by some unjustly reproached, but to divert the storm that threatened the catholics in the king's dominions. With him were joined, in the same commission, five other bishops, and four senators, all men of the first rank. A most splendid embassy.

On his arrival at Constantinople, he was received with the most extraordinary marks of honor, by persons of all condition and ranks. The nobility and clergy went out to meet him ; and he made his entry amidst the loud acclamation of numberless crowds, that flocked from all parts, to see the first bishop of the catholic church ; who had never before been seen in the east. The emperor, says the anonymous writer, quoted above, met him, among the rest, and could not have honored St. Peter himself more than he did him. The bibliothecarian adds, that Justin bowed down to the very ground before the vicar of the blessed Peter, and, coveting the honor of being crowned by him, received at his hands the imperial diadem.[1] I will not quarrel with the bibliothecarian about the bow ; but that the emperor, though now in the eighth year of his reign, had not been yet crowned, is highly improbable ; and if he was crowned before, it is no less improbable, that he should now desire to be crowned anew. The patriarch invited the pope to perform divine service in the great church, together with him. But he would neither accept the invitation, nor even see the patriarch, till he agreed not only to yield him the first place, but to seat him on a kind of throne above himself. It is observable, that the pope alleged no other reason, why he should be allowed this mark of distinction, than because he was bishop of Rome, or of the first city, "quia Romanus esset pontifex.[2] The patriarch indulged him in every thing he required, and they celebrated Easter together, with extraordinary pomp and solemnity. Authors observe, that the pope officiated in the Latin tongue, according to the rites of the Latin church ; and admitted all to his communion but Timotheus, the Eutychian patriarch of Alexandria, who happened to be then at Constantinople.[3]

As to the subject of the embassy, all authors agree, that the emperor, yielding to the reasons alleged by the pope, and the other embassadors, revoked his edict, restored to the Arians all their churches, and allowed them the same liberty of conscience which they had enjoyed before the edict was issued.[4] The embassadors therefore, taking leave of the emperor, set out from Constantinople on their return to Ravenna, in the latter end of this, or the beginning of the following year. On their arrival they were immediately introduced to the king, who was so far from being satisfied with the account they gave him of their embassy, that, on the contrary, he expressed against them all the greatest indignation, and ordered them to be conveyed from the palace to the public jail.[1] What could provoke, to so great a degree, a prince of Theodoric's moderation and temper, none of the many contemporary historians have thought fit to let us know ; none even of those who relate this very event. Their silence has left room for the conjectures of the moderns; and many have been offered, some favorable to the pope, and some quite otherwise, according to the disposition and bias of the different writers. Baronius would make us believe, that the pope, in imitation of the famous Regulus, sacrificed himself on this occasion, advising the emperor by no means to grant what he was sent to demand in the king's name. But he therein contradicts all the contemporary writers to a man ;[2] and, besides, makes the pope a mad enthusiast, instead of a second Regulus. The Roman hero only sacrificed himself, whereas the pope could not sacrifice himself without sacrificing, at the same time, the far greater part of the innocent catholics in the west, who were either subject to king Theodoric, or to other Arian princes, in alliance with him. A protestant writer of some note[3] is of opinion, that the pope, swelled and elated with the extraordinary honors paid him at Constantinople, assumed, on his return, such airs of authority as the king could not bear in a vassal. But thus that writer only accounts for the severe treatment the pope met with, and it is certain, that the other embassadors, bishops as well as senators, were treated with no less severity than he. Others arraign them all of high treason; and truly the chief men of Rome were suspected, at this very time, of carrying on a treasonable correspondence with the court of Constantinople, and machinating the ruin of the Gothic empire in Italy. The king, say these writers, probably took umbrage at the uncommon kindness shewn them at Constantinople; and perhaps had some intimation of their having encouraged the emperor to take advantage of the king's old age, or the minority of his grandson, to deliver Italy from the dominion of the Arian Goths, and reunite it to the empire. This conjecture many have adopted, as of all the most plausible, and, considering the present situation of affairs, the best grounded. But from the anonymous writer, quoted above, we may yet perhaps account, on a better foundation, for the king's wrath and resentment against his embassadors. They were strictly enjoined by Theodoric, as he informs us, to insist with the emperor on his

[1] Anast. in Joann. [2] Theoph. ubi supra.
[3] Theoph. Marcell. in Chron. Niceph. Calist.
[4] Theoph. ibid. Marcell. Chron. Auct. Miscell. l. 15. ad Ann. 6. Just. Chron. Vet. Pontif. Anonym. Vales. &c.

[1] Idem Auct. [2] Vide Auct. supra citatos.
[3] Heydegger. Hist. Papat. in Joan.

The pope dies in prison;—[Year of Christ, 526.] Great disturbances and divisions about the election of a new pope. As the parties could not agree, Theodoric names one, Felix III. The pope, and the other bishops of Italy, henceforth chosen by the people and clergy; but not ordained till confirmed by the king.

declaring those, who through fear or compulsion had quitted the Arians, free to return to them, and resume unmolested their ancient religion. This the king thought a just and reasonable demand; nothing more being thereby required, as he well expressed it, than that men might be allowed to pull off a mask, which fear, prevailing in some over conscience, obliged them to wear. With that demand, however, the bigotted emperor did not comply; and to his not having complied with it we may, I think, with better reason, ascribe the indignation of the king, and the treatment the embassadors met with, than to any other provocation. For Theodoric well knew, that the emperor would have granted them that, as he had done their other demands, had they urged it as they ought, and as they were by him expressly commanded to do. It was therefore, most probably, their disobedience to the express command of their sovereign, that provoked his wrath, and brought indifferently on them all, as they were all joined in the same commission, the woful effects of his royal displeasure. What became of the others, we know not; but the pope died in prison on the 18th of May of the following year 526.[1] His body was translated from Ravenna to Rome, and deposited in the basilic of St. Peter, where he is honored to this day as a martyr; but whether he deserved that honor, I leave the reader to judge. Two letters are ascribed to this pope; but they are now both universally rejected, even by the Roman catholic writers, as inconsistent with chronology, with history, and with common sense,[2] though quoted by Baronius as genuine. (*)

FELIX III., FIFTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTIN, JUSTINIAN, THEODORIC, ATHALARIC, *kings of Italy*.]

[Year of Christ, 526.] THE death of John was attended with great disturbances in the Roman church. Many candidates appeared for the vacant see, and the whole city, the senate as well as the people and clergy, was divided into parties and factions, the papal dignity being now as eagerly sought for, and often obtained by the same methods and arts, as the consular was in the times of the heathens. As the contending parties could not agree among themselves, Theodoric, apprehending that their disagreement might prove, in the end, as fatal to Rome, as it had proved in the dispute between Laurentius and Symmachus,[1] thought it incumbent upon him to interpose his authority; and interposed it accordingly, naming one, whom none of the parties had proposed, that none might complain of his favoring one party more than another. The person he named was Felix, by birth a Samnite, the son of Castorius, an ecclesiastic of a most exemplary life, and owned by men of all parties to be, in every respect, worthy of the episcopal dignity. The king had nothing in view but the public welfare; and therefore chose one, whom the electors, having their private interest in view, and their private ends to serve, had all overlooked. But, notwithstanding the extraordinary merit of Felix, all parties joined against him to a man, as unduly chosen, since neither the senate, the people, nor the clergy, had had any share in his election. The king could not but know, that what he had done was not without a precedent; that some of the catholic emperors, to prevent disturbances, had appointed, of their own authority, the bishop of Constantinople, the first bishop of the east; and that none had ever presumed to question their authority.[3] However, being unwilling to quarrel with his people he condescended to come to the following agreement with them; namely, that they should acknowledge Felix for lawful bishop of the city of Rome; but that in time to come they should be allowed to choose whom they pleased; that the king should confirm, or not confirm, as he thought fit, the person whom they had chosen; that he should not be deemed lawful bishop, nor be ordained, by what majority soever chosen, till confirmed by him; and that for his confirmation he should pay a certain sum, to be distributed to the poor.[4] In this manner the popes, and with them all the other bishops of Italy, for the agreement extended to all, continued to

[1] See p. 296, et seq.

[1] Anonym. Vales. Anast. Marcell. chron.

[2] See Du Pin, Nouvelle Bibl. des Aut. Eccles. tom. 4. p. 99. et Pagi ad ann. 526. n. 3.

(*) Of this pope Gregory the Great relates, that, being distressed, on his landing at Corinth, in his way to Constantinople, for want of a gentle horse to pursue his journey, a man of distinction lent him that which his wife used to ride; but on condition that he sent him back when he had reached a certain place. The pope sent him back accordingly; but he might as well have kept him; for the horse, knowing his rider, and proud of so great an honor, could never afterwards be brought to debase himself so as to carry so mean a burden as a woman; and the husband, moved with the miracle, returned him to the pope (*a*). This miracle, as well as the cure of a blind man, said by the same writer to have been performed by this pope, in the sight of the whole people of Constantinople (*b*), has escaped all the contemporary historians.

(*a*) Greg. Mag. dial. b. 3. c. 2.

(*b*) Idem ibid.

[3] See p. 303.

[4] Cassiod. l. 8. c. 15.

The choice of popes and bishops by the people reasonable and necessary; but Theodoric is damned for it, by Baronius. Theodoric dies, and is succeeded in his Italian dominions by his grandson Athalaric; and by his grandson Amalaric in the countries which he possessed in Gaul. Particulars of his death, as related by different authors. A strange tale, related by pope Gregory, concerning the punishment of Theodoric after his death.

be chosen, not only under the Gothic kings, the successors of Theodoric, but under the Greek emperors too, so long as they remained masters of that country. The people and clergy elected; the decree of the election was sent to the king, or the emperor; and if he confirmed it, the person elected was then, and not till then, ordained or consecrated. Theodoric had no other view, as he declared, in requiring the person elected to be confirmed by him, than to prevent the election from falling on men unworthy of the high station to which they were chosen, or on such as were disaffected to the government, or suspected of maintaining a secret correspondence with the enemies of the state. However, Baronius, thinking it a sacrilegious profanation for secular princes to interfere, on any consideration whatever, in the election of the high pontiff, inveighs here against Theodoric, as a cruel barbarian, as a barbarous tyrant, as an impious Arian; and, having exaggerated with all his eloquence, and bewailed the deplorable condition of the Roman church, reduced by that heretic to a state of slavery, he comforts himself in the end, and dries up his tears with the pious thought, that the author of such a calamity died soon after, and was eternally damned; nay, with him, this good cardinal damns, in the transport of his zeal, all who have followed, or shall follow, his example;[1] that is, all, or almost all, the Christian princes and emperors, from the time of Theodoric to the present. For they all have concerned themselves, and still do, more than Theodoric ever did, in the election of the pope. And truly, if the pope is the universal bishop, they have, nay, the whole Christian world has, the same right to concern themselves in his election, as the people of particular cities formerly had to concern themselves in the election of their particular bishops.

The Roman senate having acquiesced, as well as the people and clergy, in the abovementioned agreement, Felix was owned by all for lawful bishop, and ordained accordingly, on the 12th of July, 526, the see having been vacant from the 18th of May, to that time. In the very beginning of the present pontificate, that is, on the 30th of August, died king Theodoric; and was succeeded, as he had no male issue of his own, by his two grandsons. To Athalaric, the son of his daughter Amalasuntha, he bequeathed his Italian dominions; and to Amalaric, his grandson by his daughter Teudetusa, and king of the Visigoths in Spain, the Gallic provinces lying between the Durance, the Alps, and the Mediterranean, which he had formerly taken from the Burgundians. But Athalaric, or rather Amalasuntha, who governed during his minority, being unwilling to yield that whole country, it was agreed between her and Amalaric, that the Ostrogoths should hold the country between the Rhone and the Alps; and the Visigoths that which lay on the opposite side of that river, extending to the confines of the Franks. Amalasuntha kept the city of Arles, standing on an island formed by the Rhone; but remitted the tribute, which the Visigoths paid to the Ostrogoths, and restored to them the rich furniture of their kings, which her father had conveyed from Carcassone to Ravenna.[1]

As to the particulars of Theodoric's death, the anonymous writer, who lived at this very time, tells us, that he died of a flux, the same death which Arius, the author of his religion, had died of before him; for that writer was a most zealous catholic, and gives Theodoric no quarters.[2] Procopius writes, that not long after the death of Symmachus, whom he had caused to be beheaded,[3] the head of a large fish being served up while he was at supper, the injustice of that sentence occurring to his mind, he fancied the head of the fish to be the head of Symmachus, threatening him in a ghastly manner. Seized therefore with fear and horror, he was carried from the table to his bed chamber, where, reflecting anew on his cruelty and injustice both to Symmachus and Boetius, he died of grief; this being the first and last wrong, says that writer, though no ways partial to the Goths, any of his subjects had ever received from him.[4] The head of this fish Baronius compares to the hand that appeared to Belshazzar, writing his doom on the wall,[5] and seems no more to question the one than the other. However, Jornandes takes no notice of that apparition or imagination; but says, that Theodoric died of old age; and he is on that account censured by the annalist as an unfaithful and partial historian. But in what manner soever Theodoric died, Baronius absolutely insists on his having been damned after his death; and, to put it out of all doubt that he was, he alleges the authority of a pope, who believed it, of no less a pope than Gregory the Great. Gregory indeed did not know it by any revelation that was made to him; but learnt it of one Julianus: Julianus learnt it of his wife's grandfather; and his wife's grandfather of a holy hermit, who saw him cast down into hell. For Julianus' wife's grandfather, as the story is related by Gregory, in his Dialogues,[6] having been obliged by stress of weather to put in at the island of Lipari, as he was returning from Sicily to Rome, took that opportunity to visit, with some of his company, a hermit, renowned for his sanctity, who lived there. The hermit, in discoursing with them, asked

[1] Bar. ad ann. 526. p. 116.

[1] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. c. 13.
[2] Anonym. Vales.
[3] See p. 300.
[4] Procop. Hist. Goth. l. 1. p. 232.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 526. p. 116.
[6] Greg. Mag. Dial. l. 4. c. 6.

Theodoric quite illiterate. The emperor Justin dies; and is succeeded by Justinian;—[Year of Christ, 527.] Athalaric orders all suits at law with the Roman clergy to be heard first by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 528.] The clergy forbidden by the canons to recur to lay judges.

them, whether they knew that king Theodoric was dead? Theodoric dead! replied they, God forbid! we left him alive, and have heard nothing of his death. But I tell you, answered the hermit, that Theodoric is dead: I saw him yesterday, at the hour of *none*, brought hither between pope John and the patrician Symmachus, and by them thrust down Vulcan's boiling pot, meaning the vulcano, or burning mountain of the island of Lipari. They, who were come to visit the holy man, adds, Gregory, amazed and terrified at so dreadful a vision, set down with great care, the day; and, on their return to Italy, found that Theodoric died the very day in which his death and punishment were revealed to the servant of God. Gregory concludes, very gravely, that as Theodoric had killed pope John by keeping him in prison, and Symmachus with the sword, he was justly cast into fire, after his death, by those whom, in his life-time, he had unjustly condemned. But how came Boetius to be forgotten on this occasion? He too had been put to death by Theodoric, and no less unjustly than either John or Symmachus. Such were the tales that now prevailed, and were as universally believed as the gospel itself; nay, they took place of the gospel.

Theodoric was, according to some authors, quite illiterate; and could not even write the letters of his own name, which he therefore caused to be cut on a thin plate of gold. This plate, say they, he placed on the paper; and his hand being directed by the letters, which were cut quite through, signed his name.[1] But this is not at all consistent with what we read in Ennodius; namely, that his predecessors had preferred ignorance to learning; but that he had shewn himself the patron and encourager of letters; that under him learning flourished in all its branches; and that he not only admired and rewarded it in others, but thought it an ornament worthy of himself.[2] Such commendations, uttered, as they were, in a panegyric pronounced before the king, would have been deemed a satire rather than a panegyric, had he been altogether illiterate. However, he discountenanced learning in his Goths, if what the great men among them alleged against the learned, or, as they styled it, unbecoming education of Athalaric, was true; namely, that Theodoric had never suffered the children of the brave Goths to be sent to schools, to be awed there by the contemptible pedants, saying, that they, who had trembled, when children, at the sight of a rod, would tremble, when men, at the sight of a sword or a spear.[3]

The following year, 527, died, on the first of August, the emperor Justin; and was succeeded by his nephew, Justinian, whom he had taken for his partner in the empire four months before. His death was owing to a mortification occasioned by a wound, which he had formerly received in the foot.[1]

Of the present pope we know but very little. He probably performed nothing worthy of notice. In his time a deacon of the Roman church having been delivered up, by the secular judge, to his creditor, who kept him confined, and a presbyter of the same church treated with great severity for a small debt, Felix presented, in his own name, and in the name of the whole Roman clergy, a memorial to king Athalaric, complaining of the usage their brethren had met with, as not only unjust in itself, but derogatory to a custom, which had long obtained in their church, that the ecclesiastics should be summoned before the bishop, and the cause be heard and determined by him, to prevent their being diverted by vexatious suits from discharging, as they ought, the functions of their office. The king received their memorial, and soon after issued an edict, commanding all, who had, or should have demands, in time to come, on any ecclesiastic belonging to the Roman church, to apply first to the bishop, who would either hear and determine the cause himself, or appoint proper persons to act in his room. If he declined or delayed doing either, the plaintiff was then allowed to recur to the lay-tribunals. But if he first had recourse to them, he was to lose his suit, and to forfeit besides ten pounds of gold, which the officers of the exchequer, were immediately to levy, and the bishop was to distribute, at his discretion, to the poor.[2] This privilege the king granted to the Roman clergy only, in honor of the apostolic see, as he declared in his edict; and as it was confined to them, no distinction was made, in virtue of the present decree, between the ecclesiastics belonging to other churches and the laity. The present edict related only to civil cases; for in criminal actions the clergy did not yet enjoy any kind of privilege or exemption.

Long before the time of Athalaric the clergy were forbidden, by their own laws, the laws or canons of the church, to recur to lay judges in the controversies that arose among themselves; and forbidden, in criminal causes, on pain of being degraded, and, in pecuniary, of loosing what they had gained by the action.[3] But, if the controversy happened to be between a clergyman and a layman, the layman was allowed by a law of the emperor Valentinian, to choose his court, and oblige the clergyman to plead before the secular judge.[4] This law was now revoked, with respect to

[1] Vales. in Excerpt.
[2] Ennod. Panegyr. Theod. p. 290.
[3] Procop. de Bell. Goth. l. 1.

[1] Procop. Hist. Arcan. c. 9. Evagr. l. 4. c. 9. Marcell. chron. Chron. Alex.
[2] Cassiodor. l. 8. c. 24.
[3] Concil. Chalced. c. 9. Conc. Carth. 3. c. 9. Conc. Venetic. c. 9. Conc. Cabillon. c. 11. Conc. Matiscon. c. 5. Conc. Milev. c. 19.
[4] Valentin. Novel. 12. in Cod. Theod.

The Arian Goths more favorable to the clergy than any of the catholic emperors. The clergy exempt from the jurisdiction of secular courts, in criminal causes purely ecclesiastical, but in no others. The clergy not exempt, by Divine right, from the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate.

the Roman church, by Athalaric's obliging the laymen, in all suits at law with the ecclesiastics, to bring their action first before the bishop. He did not, however, oblige them to acquiesce in the judgment of the bishop; and his not requiring them to acquiesce in it, was allowing them to appeal from the judgment of the bishop to that of a secular court. At this time Alaric, king of the Visigoths in Gaul, enacted a law still more favorable to the clergy, than that of Athalaric. For by his law no layman was to sue an ecclesiastic in a secular court, nor was an ecclesiastic to answer any action brought against him there, without the permission of the bishop.[1] Thus did the Arian Goths, though represented by some fanatical writers of those times, as enemies to God and his church, prove better friends to the clergy, than any of the catholic emperors who had gone before them. The privilege granted by Athalaric to the Roman clergy only, the emperor Justinian extended to all ecclesiastics; but, upon condition, that if the layman declared in the term of ten days, that he did not acquiesce in the judgment of the bishop, the cause should be re-examined by the ordinary judge. If his sentence agreed with that of the bishop, no farther appeal was allowed. If it did not agree, room was left for appealing to the illustrious powers, that is, to the præfectus prætorio of the diocess, or to the extraordinary judges of the emperor's own appointing.[2]

As for criminal causes, the clergy were exempt, by the laws of the Roman empire, from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, in all causes purely ecclesiastical, that is, in such as related to crimes that were committed against the faith, against the canons, discipline, and good order of the church; and were punishable with ecclesiastical censures. Crimes of that nature were left, by the constitutions of several emperors, to the cognizance of the bishops, and the synods of each diocess or province.[3] But in no other criminal cause did the clergy yet enjoy, or even claim, any kind of privilege or exemption. They were all, as members of the civil society, the pope himself not excepted, indiscriminately tried, and condemned, or absolved, by the civil magistrate.

It is now the doctrine of the church of Rome, and has been defined by the council of Trent, that the clergy are exempt, by Divine right, from the power of the civil magistrate, or the jurisdiction of secular princes;[4] a doctrine, perhaps, of all that are taught or held by that church, the most indisputably repugnant to the doctrine of the scripture, and the fathers, as well as to the practice of all antiquity. St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, recommends it as an indispensable obligation incumbent on "every soul," to "be subject unto the higher powers;" and declares, that "whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God;" and that, "they who resist shall receive to themselves damnation;"[1] which is declaring all, without distinction or exception, bound, on pain of damnation, to be subject to the superior powers. The apostle speaks here of the "minister of God," who "beareth the sword;" and consequently of the civil, not of the ecclesiastical powers, as he has been ridiculously understood by some of the popes, pretending that, by the above-mentioned words, he inculcates obedience and subjection to the bishop, especially to the first bishop, his holiness the pope.[2] St. Peter seems to have been as great a stranger as St. Paul to the immunity of the clergy, or their exemption from the secular courts. For he too exhorts all Christians, the clergy not excepted, to "submit themselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him."[3] The words of the two apostles having been understood and explained by all the fathers, and even some of the popes, as extending to the clergy as well as the laity. "The words of St. Paul, '*let every soul*,' &c. were spoken to all," says Chrysostom, "to the priests, and the monks, as well as to the laymen. Whoever you be, whether an apostle, an evangelist, or a prophet, you are subject to the higher powers."[4] "Power over all men," says pope Gregory the Great, has been granted by heaven to my lords, [the emperors], and I am subject to command;"[5] and St. Bernard, writing many ages after to the archbishop of Sens, puts him thus in mind of the obedience and subjection which the clergy owe, as well as the laity, to secular princes: "If every soul must be subject to the higher powers, yours must be subject with the rest. Who has excepted you? Whoever studies to except you, studies to deceive you."[6] With these the other fathers all agree;[7] and it is quite surprising, that, in opposition to a doctrine so universally taught by them, the council of Trent should have defined "the immunity of the church, and ecclesiastical persons, to have been instituted by Divine ordination." As to the practice of the church, no one can be so little conversant in ecclesiastical history, or so great a stranger to the imperial laws, as not to know, that for many ages no kind of immunity or exemption was enjoyed by the clergy in criminal causes, not relating to matters of religion; but that they were all tried

[1] Conc. Agath. c. 32. [2] Novel. 83. 123.
[3] Cod. Theod. l. 6. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 12. Ibid. leg. 23. Ibid. l. 16. tit. 12. leg. 3. Ibid. tit. 11. l. 1. Valentin. Novel. 12. Justin. Novel. 83.
[4] See Bellar. de Cler. l. 1. c. 28.

[1] Paul. ep. ad Rom. c. 13. [2] See p. 305.
[3] Pet. ep. 1. c. 2: ver. 13.
[4] Chrys. hom. 23. in epist. ad Roman.
[5] Greg. l. 2. ep. 62. [6] Bernard. ep. 42.
[7] Vide Iren. l. 5. c. 20. Just. in Apol. 2. Tertull. de Idololat. Greg. Naz. orat. ad Præsid. irat. et popul. pertimesc. Ambros. in Luc. l. 4. c. 5. August. in Joan. tract. 6. &c.

Felix dies. Two chosen at the same time, Boniface and Dioscorus. Dioscorus dies. Is excommunicated by his rival, after his death. Decree of the Roman senate against simoniacal contracts. The pope confirms the decrees of some Gallican bishops, condemning the semi-Pelagian doctrine. [Year of Christ, 531.]—He proposes to alter the manner of election, and appoint his successor.

in the same manner, and by the same judges, as the laity. As none of them ever objected against the power and jurisdiction of the civil magistrate, we may well conclude them to have been all alike utterly unacquainted with the "Divine ordination" discovered and defined by the council of Trent.

As we find very little recorded of the present pope, Baronius is willing to apply to him an old epitaph on one of his name, commending him for his generosity to the poor, his compassion for the afflicted, his godly pride joined to a humble piety, and his having increased the wealth of the apostolic see, "sedis apostolicæ crescere fecit opes." An extraordinary merit indeed! Felix died on the 18th of September, 530, having presided in the Roman church four years, two months and six days. Of the three letters that are ascribed to him, one only is allowed by the critics to be genuine, that which he wrote to Cæsarius of Arles, forbidding any to be raised to the priesthood, who had not served the church in the inferior degrees.

BONIFACE II. FIFTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN, ATHALARIC, *king of Italy*.]

[Year of Christ, 530.] The death of Felix was attended with the usual disturbances, in spite of all the precautions the governor of Rome, and the other officers of the king, could use to prevent them; and the whole city was divided into two opposite parties. By the one was chosen Boniface, the second of that name, by birth a Roman, but the son of a Goth, named Sigisvultius; and by the other the deacon Dioscorus, formerly employed by pope Hormisdas in the embassy he sent to the emperor Justin. Both were chosen, and both ordained, on the same day, the 21st of September; Boniface in the basilic of Julius, and Dioscorus in that of Constantine. As both had powerful friends, and neither would yield, the city was threatened with as great calamities as it had ever felt on such an occasion. But Providence intervened; and while the contending parties were preparing for war, peace was unexpectedly re-established by the death of Dioscorus.[1]

Boniface, being now in quiet possession of the papal chair, began his pontificate with wreaking his vengence on the memory of his deceased competitor, whom he solemnly excommunicated, as guilty of simony, when he could not clear himself from that charge, nor retort it on him, as perhaps he otherwise might. The sentence of excommunication Boniface caused to be signed by several deacons, presbyters, and bishops; and placed it, thus signed, in the archives of the Roman church, that the name of Dioscorus might be cursed and execrable to all posterity. But, some years after, pope Agapetus, thinking his predecessor had therein been actuated more by passion and revenge, than zeal, absolved Dioscorus, and caused the sentence of excommunication to be burnt in the church.[2]

As through the corruption of the people, and the ambition of the Roman clergy, the papal chair was now, as soon as vacant, and often before, exposed, in a manner, to public sale, the Roman senate, to provide some remedy against the reigning evil, passed a decree, declaring null and execrable all promises, bargains, and contracts, by whomsoever, or for whomsoever, made with a view to engage suffrages in the election of the pope; and excluding for ever from having any share in the election such as should be found to have been directly or indirectly concerned, either for themselves, or for others, in contracts or bargains of that nature.[1] The anathemas of the church already began, it seems, to be looked upon as *bruta fulmina*, both by the people and the clergy.

In the latter end of the late pontificate Cæsarius of Arles had presided at a council in Gaul, the second of Orange, in which was condemned the doctrine of the semi-Pelagians, denying the necessity of preventing grace with respect to the beginning of faith. At the breaking up of the council, which only consisted of thirteen bishops met by chance, on occasion of the consecration of a church, Cæsarius wrote to Felix, entreating him to confirm, with the authority of the apostolic see, the doctrine which he and his colleagues had defined. But Felix being dead before the letter reached Rome, it was delivered to Boniface, who, as he had lived long in great intimacy with Cæsarius, immediately answered it, declaring the doctrine, which the council had defined, to be entirely agreeable to that of the church, and the fathers.[2]

The following year the pope held a council in the basilic of St. Peter, on a very extraordinary occasion. He proposed to alter the manner of election, and, in defiance of the known laws of the church, and the decrees of his predecessors, to appoint himself a successor. But, not thinking it advisable to

[1] Anast. in Bonif. II. [2] Idem ibid.

[1] Cassiod. l. 9. ep. 15. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 1691.

The pope owns himself guilty of high treason, and burns the decree he had made. The bishop of Larissa, deposed by the patriarch of Constantinople, recurs to the pope. Council held at Rome on this occasion. Jurisdiction of the popes with respect to Illyricum.

attempt such an innovation without the concurrence of a council, he assembled the neighboring bishops and the Roman clergy, acquainted them with his resolution, and, at the same time, required them to pass a decree, empowering him to name whom he pleased to succeed him. Such a proposal surprised the whole assembly; and they all opposed it, especially the Roman clergy, to whom elections had begun of late to prove a most gainful traffic. But they opposed it in vain. The pope was determined; and the council, finding they could by no possible means divert him from his resolution, yielded at last; and not only passed the decree, and signed it, but, at his request, or rather command, bound themselves, by a solemn oath, to acknowledge, upon his demise, for lawful pope, the person whom he should name. When they had all taken this oath, the pope approached the shrine of St. Peter, and there named for his successor to the throne of that apostle, one Vigilius, a deacon of the Roman church, whom we shall have frequent occasion to mention hereafter. Such a conduct in the pope, so plainly repugnant to the laws both of the church and the state, is generally thought to have been owing to the suggestions of the deacon; and indeed with a great deal of reason. For Vigilius was a man of great craft, and an unbounded ambition; and we shall soon see him raised to the throne of St. Peter, by means still more uncanonical.

But the above-mentioned decree never took place. The pope, soon after repenting, or rather, made to repent what he had done, convened a second council, at which assisted, besides the bishops, and the Roman clergy, the whole Roman senate in a body; and, in the presence of that numerous assembly, the pope first owned himself guilty of high treason, and then not only revoked, the bishops and clergy readily concurring with him, but burned the decree, which he had extorted from them a very few months before.[1] Was this new manner of electing the high pontiff suggested by the Holy Ghost! The pope owned himself guilty of high treason; and so he certainly was, the king being excluded by that decree, as well as the people and clergy, from having any share in the election; whereas by the agreement, made in the late reign, no person was to be deemed lawful bishop, till confirmed by him. It was therefore, in all likelihood, by the king's order, that the pope assembled this second council, that he owned his guilt in so solemn and public a manner, and revoked the decree.

The same year the pope assembled a third council, consisting of four bishops, and forty presbyters, of the Roman church. It was convened to hear and examine the complaints of Stephen, bishop of Larissa, and metropolitan of Thessaly, who, pretending to have been unjustly deposed by Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople, had despatched to Rome one of his suffragans, Theodosius of Echinus, to implore the protection of the apostolic see. The council met, for the first time, on the 7th of December, when Theodosius, appearing before them, presented to Boniface a memorial or request from Stephen, setting forth, that he had been canonically chosen, ordained, and installed; that, nevertheless, Probianus, of Demetrias, conspiring against him, he knew not why, with some other bishops, who had all signed the decree of his ordination, had persuaded the patriarch that his election was uncanonical; that thereupon the patriarch had suspended him from the functions of his office, and forbidden the bishops and clergy of Thessaly to communicate with him, without deigning to hear what he had to offer in his defence; that he had appealed to the apostolic see, but nevertheless had been carried by force to Constantinople, where he would have been imprisoned, had he not been bailed by his friends; that the patriarch, having assembled in council the bishops, who happened to be then at Constantinople, had obliged him to appear before them; that he, indeed, had protested against their authority, maintaining that, agreeably to a custom which obtained in his province, he ought to be judged at Rome, and that it was a crying injustice in them to usurp the authority which Christ and his church had given, and custom had confirmed, to the see of St. Peter; but that such remonstrances had only served to provoke the patriarch (and no wonder they did); who, without hearkening to them, or paying the least regard to his protest, had not only judged and condemned him, but delivered him up to the defenders of the church, who kept him confined, and, as it were, in prison. The metropolitan of Larissa closes his request with exhorting the pope to exert his authority in defence of his just rights, openly invaded by the patriarch of Constantinople, who, if his holiness were not on his guard, would soon subject all Illyricum to his see.

On the 9th of December was held the second session of the present council, when the same Theodosius of Echinus presented another memorial in favor of his metropolitan, signed by himself, and three other suffragans, remonstrating, at the same time, "that, abstracting from the primacy which empowered the apostolic see to receive appeals from all parts of the world, the venerable prelates of that see had always claimed a special jurisdiction over the provinces of Illyricum." To prove that, he produced all the letters which the popes had written to their vicars the bishops of Thessalonica, from the time of Damasus, the first who usurped that jurisdiction, down to the time of Leo.[1] The other acts of this council have not reached our times; but

[1] Anast. in Bonif. II.

[1] Concil. t. 4. p. 1691.

Boniface dies. His letter to Eulalius, and the request of the pretended bishop, barefaced forgeries. Great contests during the vacancy. Simoniacal practices. John chosen at last. The edict made by the senate is confirmed by the king, and set up before the porch of St. Peter.

from a letter of pope Agapetus, chosen four years after, it appears, that the patriarch of Constantinople maintained the judgment which he had given; that Stephen was not restored, notwithstanding his appeal to the apostolic see; but that one Achilles was ordained in his room.[1] The patriarch was not, it seems, so fully convinced as Stephen and Theodosius pretended to be, that the jurisdiction exercised by the popes over Illyricum was given them by Christ, or that they were empowered, by the primacy of their see, to receive appeals from all parts of the world. And truly the primacy was originally understood to import no more, and did import no more, than rank, honor, or precedency. But from honor to power the passage is easy; and the popes wanted neither the means nor the inclination of improving it into power. The bishops of Constantinople had been long striving to subject the provinces of Illyricum to their see; and indeed not without success, as we may observe here by the way, since the bishops of Thessaly, in the case before us, had recourse not to Rome, but to Constantinople, summoning their metropolitan to answer there for his illegal election, and thereby acknowledging the authority of that see both over him and them. Damasus was the first bishop of Rome, who assumed any kind of jurisdiction or power over Illyricum; but the power which he had assumed, and his successors had continued to exercise ever since his time, having never been authorized either by the imperial laws, or the laws of the church, the bishop of Constantinople thought, that, as those provinces were subject to the eastern empire, they ought, agreeably to the principles of the ecclesiastical polity, which conformed to the civil, to be rather subject to his see, than to that of Rome. This occasioned endless disputes between the two rival sees, till Leo Isauricus adjudged Illyricum to that of Constantinople, and, with Illyricum, all the provinces that belonged to the empire.

The following year, 532, died Boniface, on the 17th of October, having governed the Roman church two years and twenty-six days. The letter, which this pope is said to have written to Eulalius, bishop of Alexandria, is now rejected by all, even by Baronius, as a barefaced forgery. No bishop of that name ever governed the church of Alexandria; and, besides, the letter is supposed to have been written in the reign of Justin, who died on the first of August, 527, whereas Boniface was not raised to the episcopal dignity till the 21st of September, 530. The sticklers for the papal supremacy laid once great stress on a request of the same pretended bishop of Alexandria, wherein he excommunicates all his predecessors, who had invaded, and all his successors who should invade, the rights and privileges of the apostolic see. But that piece too they are now obliged to condemn, as the work of an impostor. Such forgeries were of great use in the ages of darkness and monkery; and the edifice, which was then built upon them, stands to this day.

JOHN II. FIFTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN, ATHALARIC, THEODATUS, *kings of Italy.*]

[Year of Christ, 532.] The death of Boniface was attended with the usual commotions in the city; and many aspired to the vacant dignity, sparing neither pains nor money to attain it. For, in spite of the many laws both ecclesiastic and civil, simony still reigned without mask or disguise; votes were publicly bought and sold; and, notwithstanding the decree lately issued by the senate, money was offered to the senators themselves; nay, the lands of the church were mortgaged by some, and the sacred utensils pawned by others, or publicly sold for ready money.[2] The contest lasted from the 17th of October to the 31st of December, when John, surnamed Mercurius, was preferred in the end to all his competitors, merely in consideration of his extraordinary merit, as we are to suppose, notwithstanding the corruption of the people, and the sums that were offered them by the other candidates. He was a native of Rome, the son of one Projectus, and presbyter of the Roman church.[1] So very scandalous were the practices which had openly prevailed during the vacancy, that the defender of the church, the more effectually to prevent the like abuses in time to come, thought himself obliged to apply to the king, to an Arian king. He applied accordingly, with tears in his eyes ("flebili allegatione"); and Athalaric, at his request, issued an edict, confirming, by his royal authority, the decree which the senate had made, on the like occasion, two years before.[2] This edict the king addressed to the pope, requiring him to notify it to "all the patriarchs," that is, to all the bishops of the chief cities of Italy; for so they were all styled by the Goths. He wrote at the same time to Salvantius, then governor of the city, commanding him to make it known, without delay, to the Roman senate and peo-

[1] Agapet. Ep. 4. [2] Cassiod. l. 9. Ep. 15.

[1] Lib. Pontif. [2] See p. 331.

Justinian issues a severe edict against all who dissented from the church. His persecuting the heretics, owing to avarice, not to zeal.

ple; to cause it to be engraved on tables of marble, and to be set up, thus engraved, before the porch of the church of St. Peter, as a public monument;[1] a monument that greatly redounded to the honor of the Arian prince, and no less to the shame and disgrace of the catholic people and clergy of Rome. Baronius pretends it was by the pope's command the offender applied to the king. I should be glad to know of whom he had that intelligence; for neither by the king in his ordinance, nor by any writer before the annalist's time, is the pope said to have been any ways concerned in procuring the above-mentioned edict.

While the Arian king was striving, by the most just and equitable laws, to clear the church from all simony in the west, the catholic emperor was employing the most unjust and unchristian means of clearing her from all heresies in the east, that of persecution, and the most cruel persecution any Christian emperor had yet set on foot, or countenanced. For by an edict which he issued to unite all men in one faith, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, such as did not, in the term of three months, embrace and profess the catholic faith, were declared infamous, and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving any thing by will, and their estates confiscated, whether real or personal. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the catholic faith; but many, however, withstood them; and against such as did, the imperial edict was executed with the utmost rigor. Great numbers were driven from their habitations with their wives and children, stripped and naked. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of the little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred, by the catholic peasants, or the soldiery, who guarded the passes. The Montanists(*) in Phrygia, retiring with all their wealth to their churches, set them on fire, and consumed in the flames themselves, their wealth, and their churches. The Jews, who were very numerous in Samaria, openly revolted; and, ranging themselves under the banner of one Julian, a noted robber, whom they chose for their king, and their leader, engaged the imperial troops in the field; but, after a most obstinate and bloody dispute, were utterly defeated, with the loss, if Procopius is to be credited, of one hundred thousand men.[1] All who outlived so dreadful a slaughter, readily embraced the Christian religion, and were baptized soon after the battle. And the Christian religion, says the historian,[2] they profess to this day, when governors are sent them from Constantinople, whose faith and integrity are proof against bribes: but when they are governed, as they often are, by men of a different character, they purchase, with money, the liberty of blaspheming Christ, and openly profess the religion of their fathers. Such are, and such ever will be, conversions that are owing, not to conviction, but to penal laws or persecution.

Justinian formerly declared, as we have seen, against persecution,[3] opposing, with a truly Christian spirit and zeal, one of the popes, by whom it was countenanced. On that occasion he strongly recommended persuasion and lenity, as the only effectual means of gaining men; and loudly condemned all force and violence, as calculated not to

[1] Cassiod. l. 9. Ep. 15.

(*) The Montanists, so called from Montanus the founder of their sect, who lived about the latter end of the second century, administered baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of Montanus, who pretended to be the Holy Ghost; and had two prophetesses to attend him, Priscilla and Maximilla; and their names too they sometimes added, in administering baptism, to the names of the Father and the Son.(a) This baptism they believed to be valid even after death; and therefore baptized after death such as had not received baptism in their lifetime.(b) They condemned second marriages, as no better than adultery, acknowledge one matrimony, as they did one God, and stigmatizing the catholics, who acknowledged more, with the name of psychici, or carnal men.(c) They likewise denied it to be lawful for a Christian to fly in time of persecution, or to bear arms in defence of the empire.(d) The ancient fathers were all, or almost all, so far Montanists, as to think second marriages, in some degree, criminal. For they not only excluded Digamists from holy orders, but obliged them to perform one or two years penance, and to abstain, in the mean time, from the Eucharist.(a) As all "cannot contain," and God and nature have provided no other remedy against incontinence but marriage, it thence follows, in common sense, that marriage may, and even ought to be repeated, as often as necessity requires. The aversion, which the fathers had to second marriages, was in great measure owing to the high opinion they entertained of celibacy, which they thought the most refined state of Christian perfection; and to that notion was likewise owing their discountenancing a married state, and decrying matrimony in general. "Though I will not positively pronounce," says Origen;(b) "yet I suppose there are some actions of man, which, however free from sin, are not worthy to be honored with the presence of the Holy Ghost. For instance, lawful marriage is not sinful; yet, when conjugal acts are performed, the Holy Ghost will not be present, though he be a prophet who performs them." St. Hierom, the great patron of celibacy, goes farther; for he condemns, in some places, marriage, as absolutely sinful. "If it be good," says he, "for a man not to touch a woman, then it is evil to touch her. For nothing is contrary to good, but evil. While I perform the duty of a husband, I do not the duty of a Christian. For he commands we should always pray: If so, we must never serve the ends of matrimony; for, as often as we do, we cannot pray. I suppose that the end of matrimony is eternal death. The earth indeed is filled by marriage, but heaven by virginity. As the apostle permits not those, who are already married, to put away their wives, so he forbids virgins to marry [which is absolutely false.] Marriage is permitted only as a remedy against lust; it being more tolerable to be prostituted to one man, than to many." Thus Hierom.(c) By what heretic was ever marriage more disparaged? It was upon such prejudices, such errors, and misinterpretations of scripture, that marriage was thought unbecoming those, who administered holy things, and celibacy was enjoined.

(a) Basil. Ep. Can. 1. c. 1. Theophylact. in Luc. xxiv.
(b) Philostr. de Hæres. c. 2.
(c) Tertul. de Monogam. c. 1.
(d) Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. 11.

(a) Concil. Neocæs. Can. 7. Concil. Laod. Can. 31. Basil. Can. 4.
(b) Orig. Hom. 6. in Num. (c) Hier in Jovin. l. 1.

[1] Procop. Hist. Arcan. c. 11.
[2] Auct. Chron. Alex.
[3] See p. 320.

The dispute about the expression, "one of the Trinity," condemned by some monks. Both apply to the pope. &c. revived; which is maintained by the emperor, and The emperor accompanies his letter to the pope with a present for St. Peter.

gain the souls, but to destroy both the souls and the bodies.[1] And truly he was a man of too good sense not to be convinced of so plain a truth; and his acting now in direct opposition to it, could only be owing to the motive to which it is ascribed by a contemporary historian, employed by him on several occasions, and well acquainted with his temper and views.[2] He was engaged in many great works, had formed vast designs, but wanted money; while the Jews, and those whom he styled heretics, especially the Arians, were possessed of immense wealth. And it was, according to that writer, to his want of money, and their wealth, that his zeal was owing for "uniting all men in one faith,"[3] It is certain, at least, that his coffers, which had been drained by the Persian war, were filled anew by this edict; and he was enabled to carry on his works, and at the same time to engage in an expensive war with the Vandals, whom he drove in the end quite out of Africa. It is observable, that, men being narrowly watched on occasion of this edict, and informers encouraged to accuse such as did not conform to the belief and worship of the catholic church, many persons of the first rank, many who were in great favor at court, and even some of the chief officers of the empire, were found to be still addicted to the superstition of the gentiles, and to worship Jupiter in private, while they conformed in public to the Christian rites.[4] They were perhaps estranged, and no wonder they were, from the Christian religion, by the eternal quarrels, and mortal feuds, that reigned among the Christians, and were utterly unknown to the gentiles. Perhaps they put off their conversion till the Christians had agreed among themselves what they were, and they were not, to believe; which indeed was taking a long term, or rather putting it off *sine die*. I might add, that the Christian worship was now become no less idolatrous than that of the gentiles, who therefore chose to retain their own, there being no material difference between the one and the other, between their worshipping the ancient heroes, or the modern saints: and as to the articles of belief, they were now, by the cavils and subtilties of the contending parties, rendered quite unintelligible to the Christians themselves.

The following year 533, was revived with great warmth in the east, the dispute about the expression, "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh." That expression having been condemned by pope Hormisdas, as we have seen above,[5] the monks, known at Constantinople by the name of acœmetæ, (*) acquiescing in his judgment argued thus; if one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, one of the Trinity was not born of the Virgin Mary, who therefore ought no longer to be styled the mother of God. On the other hand, the Origenist reasoned thus; if one of the Trinity did not suffer, Christ, who suffered, was not one of the Trinity; which was the doctrine of the present Origenists. Against both the emperor, who took great delight in such disputes, and was as well acquainted with the doctrine of the church as any man of his age, maintained the Virgin Mary to be properly and truly the mother of God, and Christ to be, in the strictest sense, "one of the Trinity;" nay, and declared all to be heretics who denied the one or the other. The monks, alarmed, and not without reason, at their being stigmatized with the name of heretics by the emperor, after the edict, which he had lately issued against heretics of all denominations, despatched, without delay, two of their body to Rome, to engage the new pope in the defence of a doctrine, which was evidently grounded upon, and undeniably deducible from, that which one of his holy predecessors had defined. This their deputies were to represent; and, putting the pope in mind of the saying of the apostle, "If I build again the things which I destroy, I make myself a transgressor,"[1] urge the disgrace which the Roman church would bring on herself, by approving at one time what she condemned at another.

The emperor no sooner heard, that the monks were applying, than he too resolved to apply to the pope. Having therefore drawn up a long creed, or confession of faith, containing the disputed article among the rest, "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," he despatched two bishops with it to Rome, Hypatius of Ephesus, and Demetrius of Philippi. At the same time he wrote a very obliging letter to the pope, congratulating him on his election, assuring him, that the faith contained in the confession he sent him, was the faith of the whole eastern church, and entreating him to declare, in his answer, that he received to his communion all who professed that faith, and none who did not. To add weight to his letter, he accompanied it with a present for St. Peter, consisting of several chalices, and other vessels of gold, enriched with precious stones. The deputies of the monks, and the two bishops sent by the emperor, arrived at Rome about the same time; and the pope heard both; but, being quite at a loss what to determine, wisely declined, for

[1] See p. 320. [2] Procop. ubi supra. [3] Idem ibid. [4] Procop. ubi supra. Chron. Alex. [5] See p. 321.

(*) They were called acœmetæ, that is, watchers, from their being constantly employed, both night and day, in divine service. For they divided themselves into three classes; and, succeeding each other at a stated hour, they thus continued a perpetual course of divine service without intermission, by night or by day. They were also called Studitæ, and their chief monastery at Constantinople Studium, from Studius, a Roman of great wealth and distinction, who renouncing the world, embraced their manner of life, and built that monastery. Most of them held the doctrine of Nestorius, and would not allow the Virgin Mary to be called truly and properly the mother of God.(a)

(a) Niceph. l. 15. c. 23.

[1] Ad Galat. c. 2: v. 18.

The pope consults the Roman clergy, and other men of learning. He declares the expression orthodox which his predecessor had declared heretical;—[Year of Christ, 534.] Justinian paid great regard to the pope, when he agreed in opinion with him. The pope is consulted by the Gallican bishops. He dies.

the present, returning an answer to either. He was sensible, that he could not condemn the doctrine of the monks, without admitting the expression, which his predecessor had rejected as repugnant to the catholic faith. But, on the other hand, he was unwilling to disoblige Justinian, and well apprised of the consequences which he had reason to apprehend from his condemning a doctrine that was held by all the bishops of the east, and the emperor himself, as an article of faith. Being thus perplexed and undetermined, he consulted, in the first place, the Roman clergy, assembled by him for that purpose; but them he found divided in their opinions, some advising him to reject, and others thinking he ought to receive the confession of Justinian. The former alleged, that it contained the very expression which his predecessor Hormisdas had condemned in the Scythian monks; and the latter, that such an expression, when used by Justinian, who anathematized in his confession Eutyches, Nestorius, and all other heretics, [which, by the way, the Scythian monks did too, and in the most solemn manner,] could import no kind of heresy, though it might, when used by these monks. The pope, finding his own clergy could not agree among themselves, resolved to consult those of other churches. Had he known, that all private opinions would be over-ruled, in the end, by the unerring direction of the Holy Ghost, he would not have given himself so much trouble about them. At this time flourished Ferrandus, deacon of the church of Carthage, one of the most learned men of the age, and famous to this day, for his collection of canons. He was therefore consulted among the first by Anatolius, deacon of the Roman church, no doubt at the desire of the pope; and the answer, which he returned, was entirely agreeable to that which St. Fulgentius, whose disciple he was, and the other African bishops, had formerly returned to the Scythian monks, when consulted by them. For he not only approved the controverted expression, "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh;" but strove to prove, with all the metaphysical subtilties and distinctions that could be expected from a modern schoolman, that the Divinity itself might be said to have suffered in the flesh.[1] With Ferrandus agreed, as to the expression, "one of the Trinity," &c. all the learned men of the age; all declared it entirely orthodox, nay, and taxed with heresy such as denied it. The pope, therefore, moved by their agreement, assembled anew the Roman clergy, with the neighboring bishops; and, having received in their presence, and with their approbation, the confession of Justinian, approved the controverted expression, as quite agreeable to the apostolic doctrine, and pronounced those separated from his communion, who should thenceforth presume to dispute it. With this judgment he acquainted the emperor, by a letter dated the 25th of March, and the Roman senate by another, which he wrote about the same time, warning them not to communicate with the monks acœmetæ.[1] Thus was the same proposition condemned by one pope, as "repugnant, without all doubt, to the catholic faith," as "containing the poisonous seeds of diabolical tares;"[2] and approved by another as "quite agreeable to the apostolic doctrine." The advocates for infallibility have spared no pains, as we may well imagine, to reconcile such contradictory definitions. In order to that, they pretend the above-mentioned expression not to have been condemned by Hormisdas as heretical, but only as an expression that was new, that *might* imply some heresy, that had never been used by the fathers or councils; and nothing else, that I know of, has yet been offered by any of them on this subject. But whether the words of Hormisdas, which I have quoted above, import no more, I leave every reader to judge.

Baronius in commenting the letter which Justinian wrote on this occasion to the pope, makes long descants on the extraordinary deference which he paid to his holiness. But that little or no account ought to be made of that extraordinary deference, will soon appear. Justinian indeed paid great deference to the pope, as well as to all other bishops, when they agreed with him; but none at all, when they did not; thinking himself at least as well qualified as the best of them, and so he certainly was, to decide controversies concerning the faith; and we shall soon see him entering the lists with his holiness himself.

The same year, 534, the pope received letters from Cæsarius of Arles, and some other bishops of Gaul, consulting him about the punishment they should inflict on Contumeliosus of Riez, accused before them, and guilty, by his own confession, of some sin of uncleanness. On this occasion the pope wrote three letters, one to Cæsarius in particular, another to the other bishops, and a third to the clergy of Riez, authorizing them (for he interposed his authority, though they had only asked his advice) to suspend the guilty bishop from all episcopal and sacerdotal functions, to shut him up in a monastery for life, and to appoint a visitor to officiate in his room, till another bishop was chosen.[3] These letters are dated the 7th of April, of the present year; and of this pope nothing else occurs in history that is worthy of notice, till the time of his death, which happened on the 27th of May of the following year, 535, after he had sat two years, four months, and twenty-six days.[4] The letter, long supposed to have been written by him to one Valerius, is now allowed by all to be the work of the impostor Isidorus Mercator.

[1] Ferrand. ep. ad Anat.

[1] Liberat. c. 21. & l. 8. c. de summ. Trin.
[2] Suggest. Dios. inter Ep. Hormisd. See p. 322.
[3] Apud Bar. ad ann. 534. p. 222.
[4] Vide Pagi ad hunc Ann. n. 2.

Agapetus chosen. He excommunicates the monks denying the expression "one of the Trinity," &c. The emperor advises the pope to receive the Arian clergy in the rank they held before. The pope refuses to admit them. It was not repugnant to the canons.

AGAPETUS, FIFTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN, THEODATUS, *king of Italy*.]

[Year of Christ, 535.] The election of the new pope was made without the least dispute or disturbance; which was, no doubt, owing to the edict Athalaric had caused to be set up before the porch of the church of St. Peter. In the room of the deceased pope was chosen, and ordained on the 3d of June, Agapetus, a native of Rome, archdeacon of the Roman church, and the son of Gordianus, presbyter of the same church.[1]

Justinian was no sooner informed of the election of Agapetus, than he wrote to him, by the presbyter Heraclius, a most obliging and respectful letter, congratulating him on his promotion, and, at the same time begging him to confirm the confession of faith, which his predecessor had approved, and to exclude from his communion, as avowed heretics, the monks, who refused to admit the proposition, "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh." The pope readily complied with his request, declared that expression entirely orthodox, and excluded from the communion of the apostolic see, and the catholic church, the unhappy monks, and all who, with them, should presume to dispute it. However, he took care to let the emperor know, that he approved his confession, as being agreeable to the doctrine of the fathers, though he could not help thinking it unbecoming in a layman to dictate in matters of faith.[2] This reproach Justinian dissembled, and wrote soon after another letter to the pope, suggesting to his holiness (for neither the wars, in which he was constantly engaged, nor the affairs of state, could divert him from intermeddling in ecclesiastical matters), that it would greatly facilitate, in his opinion the conversion of the Arian clergy, were they suffered to keep the same rank in the church, which they held among those of their sect. In the same letter he allows the cause of Stephen of Larissa, condemned and deposed by the patriarch Epiphanius,[3] to be judged anew by the pope; but on condition, that he sent legates into the east, to judge it there. Lastly, he begs it as a favor, that his holiness would be pleased to appoint the bishop of Justiniana Prima(*) his vicar for Illyricum; which dignity had been hitherto enjoyed by the bishop of Thessalonica. His complaisance to the pope may be well ascribed to the desire he had of obtaining that favor. But the pope would not grant it; nor would he allow the converted Arians to keep their former rank, or to be admitted in any other, among the catholic clergy, both being forbidden, said he, with respect to them, as well as to all other heretics, by the canons of the church, and the rules of the fathers. Both indeed were repugnant to the practice of the Roman church; but neither was forbidden by the canons. "It is the custom of our church," says pope Innocent, "to grant only lay communion to those who return from hereties, and not to admit any of them even to the lowest order of the clergy."[1] But as to the canons of the church and the rules of the fathers, those of the great council of Nice allowed the Novatians to retain, in the church, the same rank, whether sacerdotal or episcopal, which they held among those of their sect.[2] In the year 397, the same indulgence was granted by the African fathers to the Donatists, that they might thereby be encouraged to return to the unity of the church;[3] nay, long before that time, in the year 313, it had been determined, in a council held at Rome under pope Melchiades, that the Donatists should, upon their return to the church, enjoy the same dignities and honors which they enjoyed before.[4] The third oecumenical council, that of Ephesus, made a decree with respect to the Massalian heretics, that if any of their clergy would return to the church, and anathematize, in writing, their former errors, they should continue in the same station which they were in before.[5] Agreeably to the decrees of these councils, the first of Orleans, held in 511, allowed the converted Arians to be admitted among the clergy, in whatever rank it should please the bishop to place them.[6] The bishops, who composed that assembly, seem to have been better acquainted than the pope with the canons of the church, and the rules of the fathers. The pope, perhaps, alluded to one of the canons of the council of Eliberis in Spain, forbidding heretics, from whatever heresy they came, to be ordained, and commanding those to be degraded, who had already been ordained.[7] But that regulation was understood to have been revoked by the subsequent councils, especially by the oecumenical councils of Nice and Ephesus. For the council of Eliberis was held, according to

[1] Liberat. Brev. c. 21. Lib. Pontif.
[2] Inter ep. Agap. t. 1. ep. Rom. Pont. & Agap. ep. 6.
[3] See p. 332.

(*) That city was anciently called Prævalis, and afterwards Acrida; but as it stood near the village where Justinian was born, he honored it with his own name. It became afterwards a patriarchal see; and the five provinces of the Dacian diocess, with the two Pannonia's, in the diocess of West Illyricum, were subjected to it.(a) It was called "Justiniana," with the addition of "Prima," to distinguish it from four other cities bearing the same name.

(a) Just. Novel. 131. c. 3.

[1] Innoc. ep. 22. [2] Con. Nic. can. 8.
[3] Cod. Can. Afr. can. 48. et 58.
[4] August. ep. 50. ad Bonifac.
[5] Conc. Eph. act. 7. decret. cont. Massalian.
[6] Conc. Aurel. 1. c. 12. [7] Conc. Elib. can. 51.

The pope sends legates into the east, to re-examine the cause of the bishop of Larissa. The issue of that affair uncertain. The African bishops consult the pope. His answer to them. Justinian attempts the reduction of Italy. The state of affairs in Italy, at this time.

the most probable opinion, about the year 305, that is, twenty years before that of Nice.

As to the affair of the bishop of Larissa, Agapetas promises to send legates to try his cause; and, in the mean time, at the request of the emperor, admits Achilles to his communion, who had been ordained in the room of the deposed bishop; but will not allow him to exercise any episcopal functions, till he is farther informed by his legates. He complains of the patriarch for having ordained the new bishop without the privity of the apostolic see, though he had done it by the emperor's order, it being incumbent upon him, says the pope, on such an occasion, to put the emperor in mind of the regard which was due to that see.[1]

With this letter the pope despatched to Constantinople a presbyter of the Roman church, and soon after five bishops, with the character of his legates, to re-examine the cause of the metropolitan of Larissa.[2] But, as to the issue of that affair, authors have left us quite in the dark.

About the same time the pope received a letter from the bishops of Africa, who, being delivered, at last, from the yoke of the Vandals, by the valor and conduct of the famous Belisarius, had met at Carthage, to the number of two hundred and twenty-seven, with a design to re-establish the ancient discipline, which had been utterly neglected during the long and cruel persecution they had suffered under the Arian kings of that nation.(*) The letter was addressed to John; but he being dead, it was delivered to Agapetus, his successor. The African fathers, desirous of regulating their conduct by the judgment of the apostolic see, wanted to know whether they should suffer the Arian clergy, who returned to the church, to remain in their former stations, or should only receive them to lay communion. By the same letter they begged, that the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, as well as the other ecclesiastics of Africa, who should travel into countries beyond sea, without the permission of their superiors, might be treated as heretics. Their view in this was to prevent their clergy from recurring, on every slight occasion, to the pope; which had been formerly the cause of endless disputes between Rome and Africa. Agapetus, however, granted them their request; and, as to the Arian clergy, he returned to the Africans the same answer which he had given to Justinian; but advises them to allow the ecclesiastics of that sect, who renounced their errors, a competent maintenance out of the revenues of the church.[1]

In the mean time the emperor Justinian, encouraged by the surprising success that had attended his arms in the reduction of Africa, resolved, in the next place, to attempt that of Italy, the death of Amalasuntha supplying him with a no less plausible pretence for making war on the Goths, and driving them out of Italy, than the deposing of Hilderic had offered him for making war on the Vandals, and driving them out of Africa. Theodoric bequeathed his Italian dominions to his grandson Athalaric, as I have related above. But, he being under age, his mother Amalasuntha took upon her the administration during his minority. She was the daughter of Theodoric, by Audefleda, the sister of Clovis, king of the Franks; and is highly commended, by all the writers of those times, for her piety, religion, wisdom, and learning. Theodatus, who succeeded Athalaric, in a letter which he wrote to the Roman senate, styles her the glory of princes, the flower and ornament of her family, the Solomon of women, a princess endowed with every good quality becoming her sex, well versed in the Greek, in the Latin, and in many other languages, and thoroughly acquainted with every branch of learning.[2] However, the Gothic lords were greatly dissatisfied with her, chiefly on account of her bringing up the young king, her son, not among military, but learned men; an education, said they, not at all becoming the leader of such an active and warlike nation as that of the Goths. This they spoke like true Goths, not knowing that the greatest

[1] Agap. ep. 4. [2] Concil. t. 5. p. 11.

(*) The Vandals or Wandals, originally a Gothic nation, (*a*) and so called from the Gothic word Wandelen, which signifies to wander, (*b*) abandoned Spain, which they had entered, with the Suevians and Alans, in the year 409, and, crossing the straits of Gibraltar, as they are now called, landed in Africa in the month of May, 429, and in one year made themselves masters of all the cities of Africa, except Carthage, and Cirtha, and Hippo. (*c*) In the year 439, they took Carthage by surprise, and soon after reduced all Africa, which they kept till the time of Justinian, in spite of all the efforts used by the emperors of the east as well as the west, to rescue that wealthy country out of their hands. But Justinian recovered it, after two years war, by the conduct and bravery of Belisarius, whom he employed in that expedition. The first year, 533, Belisarius defeated Gelimer, the last king of the African Vandals, in a pitched battle; and made himself master of several cities, among the rest of Carthage itself, after it had been held by the barbarians ninety-five years. The following year, 534, he reduced the other cities of Africa, with the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, Majorca, Minorca, and whatever else belonged to the Vandals, either on the continent, or in the islands. The Vandals not only professed, like the other Gothic nations, the doctrine of Arius, but bore an irreconcilable hatred to the catholics, who were therefore more cruelly persecuted by some of their kings, especially by Genseric, Hunneric, and Trasamund, than the Arians ever had been by the catholic emperors. The bishops suffered the most; for they were, in all four hundred and sixty-six, driven from their sees, and either confined to the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, to cut wood there, or shut up in prisons, where they perished with famine. This persecution is minutely described, in five books, by Victor, bishop of Vitis, who was himself one of the sufferers. (*d*) After his death the bishops were recalled by Hilderic, a prince of a humane disposition, and a friend to the catholics. But he was soon driven from the throne by Gelimer; and it was under color of maintaining his right against the usurper, that Justinian made war on the Vandals, to whom Africa had been yielded for ever by the emperor Zeno.

(*a*) Procop. bell. Vand. l. 1. c. 2.
(*b*) Matth. Præt. in Orbe Goth.
(*c*) Auct. vit. S. August.
(*d*) Vict. Vit. de persecut. Vandal.

[1] Agap. ep. 2. [2] Cassiod. l. 10. ep. 4.

Athalaric dies; and is succeeded by Theodatus; who puts Amalasuntha to death. Justinian, to revenge her death, makes war on the Goths. Theodatus sends the pope, with the character of his embassador, to sue for peace;—[Year of Christ, 536.] The poverty of the Roman church, at this time. Miracles said to have been wrought by Agapetus. The king changes his mind, as to the terms of peace.

generals the world can boast of were men of learning. Amalasuntha nevertheless, not thinking it safe to disoblige them, removed the men of learning, whom she had placed about the young king, and suffered him to be brought up by the Goths, after the Gothic manner. But she had soon occasion to repent of her complaisance to them; for the youth, now free from all restraint, none of the Goths daring to reprove him, soon contracted, by his debaucheries and riotous life, a lingering distemper, of which he died in the year 534, the eighth of his reign.

Upon his death, Amalasuntha, well apprised that the Goths would not suffer a woman to rule over them, sent in great haste for Theodatus, the son of Amalafreda, sister to Theodoric, who, at that time, led a private life in Tuscany; recommended him to the Goths, as descended from the royal family, that of the Amali; and prevailed upon them to acknowledge him for their king. As Theodatus was utterly unacquainted both with civil and military matters, timorous, indolent, and wholly addicted to the study of the Platonic philosophy, she did not doubt but he would be satisfied with the title of king, and suffer her to enjoy the same power which she had exercised during the minority of her son. But the unhappy princess was soon made sensible of her mistake. For the new king, jealous of his authority, had no sooner ascended the throne, than he caused her to be conveyed from Ravenna into Tuscany; and there confined her to an island in the lake of Bolsena, where she was soon after strangled, by his order, in the bath.[1](*) As she had always lived in great friendship and amity with Justinian, who was extremely desirous of reuniting Italy to the empire, and had, at this time, a victorious army on foot, with a very able and experienced general at their head, he thought no other pretence could better justify, in the eyes of the world, his making war on the Goths, than that of revenging the death of his friend and ally. Under color, therefore of revenging it, he ordered Belisarius to make a descent upon Sicily, and, at the same time, Mundus, commander of the troops in Illyricum, to march into Dalmatia, which was subject to the Goths, and attempt the reduction of Salonæ, the better to open a passage into Italy. Mundus made himself master of Salonæ, and Belisarius, landing without opposition in Sicily, reduced that island with more expedition than he himself expected.[2] Theodatus, alarmed at the surprising success of the emperor's arms, resolved, as he was an utter stranger to military affairs, to sue for peace, and oblige the pope to interpose his mediation, as the most effectual means of obtaining it. He commanded him accordingly to repair to Constantinople, with proposals for an accommodation; threatening to destroy the city of Rome, and to put the whole people to the sword, as well as the senate, if he did not succeed in his negotiation, and divert the emperor from pursuing the war. Agapetus was far advanced in years; but nevertheless, not daring to decline the commission, set out, without delay, in the very beginning of the following year, 536. It is observable, that the Roman church, which we have hitherto seen abounding in wealth above all the churches of the Christian world, was reduced at this time to so great a poverty, that the pope was obliged to pawn, with the king's treasurer, the sacred vessels, for ready money, wherewithal to defray the charges of his journey; which the king no sooner knew, than he ordered them to be restored.[1] The writers of these times tell us, that, in the late elections, some of the candidates had engaged to pay large sums, in case they were chosen; nay, that to purchase votes they did not even scruple to mortgage the lands and revenues of the church. Had any such simoniacs ever been chosen, we might easily account for the present poverty of that church. But as we are assured by Baronius, that none of them ever were chosen, we are quite at a loss how to account for it. Pope Agapetus had neither gold nor silver, as Baronius observes, no more than his predecessor Peter; but was as rich as that apostle in miraculous gifts; and these he displayed at his first landing in Greece, by curing a man from his birth both cripple and dumb, who, at his command, stood up and spoke. A greater miracle than that which was, at the gate of the temple, wrought by St. Peter! With this, and many other wondrous transactions, posterity would have been utterly unacquainted but for pope Gregory,[2] who has collected, with great care, all the events of that nature, which had escaped the knowledge of the writers, who flourished at the time when they are supposed to have happened.

Agapetus arrived at Constantinople about the 20th of February, and was received by the emperor, and the great men at court, with all the respect that was due to the first bishop of the catholic church. As to the affair, on which he was sent, he had no occasion to mention it either to the emperor or his ministers; the king having, upon some advantages gained by his troops in Dalmatia, changed his mind with respect to the terms of peace, which he had enjoined the pope to propose. But matters of a different nature, and more suitable to his profession, kept Agapetus still at Constanti-

[1] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. c. 4. Jornand. de reb. Get. c. 59.

(*) Procopius writes that Theodatus caused her to be put to death, at the instigation of the empress Theodora, jealous of the uncommon regard the emperor seemed to have for her.(a)

(a) Procop. anec.

[2] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. c. 5.

[1] Cassiod. var. ep. l. 2. ep. 2. [2] Greg. l. 3. Dialog. c. 3.

The pope refuses to communicate with Anthimus of Constantinople; and why. Quarrels with the emperor; who threatens him; but he is not intimidated with his threats. The emperor is reconciled to him. Anthimus sent into exile, and Mennas chosen in his room. The conduct of the pope on this occasion, no proof of his supremacy.

nople. The preceding year died, on the 5th of June, Epiphanius patriarch of Constantinople; and in his room was preferred, by the interest of the empress Theodora, Anthimus, translated from the see of Trapezus or Trebisond to that of the imperial city. As translations were prohibited by the canons, and, besides, the new patriarch was violently suspected of Eutychianism, the empress, by whom he was patronized, being known to countenance that doctrine and party, the pope refused to communicate with him till he returned to his former see, and, anathematizing Eutyches, publicly received the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo. On the other hand, the empress spared no pains to engage the bishops in the defence of Anthimus; and many she did engage, either by promises, or the money, which she is said to have plentifully distributed among them on that occasion.[1] These, at her instigation, not only persuaded the emperor, that the faith of Anthimus was altogether orthodox; but, pretending to suspect that of the pope, painted him as one who was no enemy, so far as they could judge, to the doctrine of Nestorius. Upon this imputation the emperor, at the next audience, examined the pope very narrowly about his faith; and found it, to his great satisfaction, entirely agreeable to his own, and that of the church. However, as he entertained as good an opinion of the faith of Anthimus, he did all that lay in his power to prevail upon the pope to communicate with him.

But Agapetus was inflexible. He promised, indeed, to admit the pretended patriarch to his communion, as bishop of Trebisond, provided he first received the council of Chalcedon, and anathematized Eutyches, with all who adhered to him. But, at the same time, declared, that, as he had been raised to the see of Constantinople, in defiance of the canons, he neither could, nor ever would, acknowledge him for lawful bishop of that city. "I will have you to acknowledge him for lawful bishop of Constantinople," replied the emperor, with a threatening voice, provoked at the peremptoriness of the pope. "Acknowledge him this moment, or this moment I drive you from hence into exile." At these words the pope lifted up his eyes to heaven, "I expected," said he, with great coolness, "to see a most religious and Christian emperor; and therefore cheerfully undertook, in my old age, so long and painful a journey. But I find, to my great disappointment and surprise, that I have to deal with a new Diocle-sian." Then turning to the emperor, "but know, sir," he added, "that I dread not your anger; I fear not your menaces; dispose of me as you please; I shall think it the greatest happiness to lay down my life in so good a cause." Had the emperor been a new Diocle-sian, the pope would have paid dear for the liberty he took. But Justinian was so far from resenting it, as he might, and perhaps ought to have done, that, applauding his firmness and intrepidity, he was that moment reconciled to him, and treated him ever after with the greatest respect, and even veneration. The pope, seeing the emperor thus appeased, and disposed to hear what he had to object against Anthimus, assured him, that the bishop of Trebisond was no catholic, but a known enemy to the catholic faith, and the council of Chalcedon; that none could recommend him, but such as were enemies to both; and that he was therefore greatly surprised to find his cause was so warmly espoused by so religious and catholic a prince. "But that you may not think, he added, that I thus arraign him of heresy without just reason and grounds, let Anthimus himself be sent for; let him be asked, in your presence, whether he acknowledges two natures in Christ." The emperor approved the motion: Anthimus was immediately sent for; was interrogated both by the pope and the emperor, concerning the mystery of the incarnation. But to their interrogations he only returned indirect, evasive, and equivocal answers; nor could he ever be brought to own, in plain terms, two natures in Christ. The emperor therefore, no longer questioning the truth of what he had been told by Agapetus, ordered the new patriarch to be immediately removed: and he was removed accordingly; none of his friends venturing to interpose in his behalf. In his room was chosen, and, at the request of the emperor, ordained by the pope, Mennas or Menas, who, on several occasions had distinguished himself by his zeal for the catholic faith, and the council of Chalcedon.[1] "Thus did the high pontiff, using the plenitude of his power, and exerting that authority, which raises him above the canons, depose the first bishop of the east, and substitute another in his room, without the concurrence of a council, though the concurrence of a council was required by the canons." With this epiphonema Baronius closes his account of the present transaction, set forth by him in a very different light from that, in which it has been placed by the contemporary writers.[2] For, according to their account, neither was Anthimus deposed, nor Mennas substituted in his room, nor any other power exerted or exercised on this occasion, by the high pontiff, but that which was common to him with all other bishops, at least with all the patriarchs, and which they might have exerted and exercised as well as he. As Anthimus was suspected of heresy; as he had been translated without cause, from one church to an-

[1] Zonar. Ann. part. 3. in Justinian.

[1] Syn. Constantin. sub Men. Act. 1. Liberat. in Breviar. c. 21, 22. Vigil. ep. 2. Niceph. l. 17. c. 19. Evagr. l. 4. c. 11.

[2] Bar. ad ann. 536. p. 262.

The pope ascribes to himself the deposing of Anthimus; his vanity. Two memorials presented to him, against the leading men of the Eutychian party; the purport of these memorials.

other, contrary to the canons; every patriarch had a right to exclude him from his communion, till he purged himself from that suspicion, and returned to his former see; and the high pontiff did no more. It was therefore at his remonstrances only, and by his influence, not by his authority, that the new patriarch was driven from his see.

That from the conduct of the pope, on this occasion, nothing can be concluded in favor of the supremacy, is owned even by a Jesuit, and a Jesuit of no mean character,[1] notwithstanding the great stress that is laid on it by his brother Bellarmine, by Baronius, and by most other Roman catholic writers. "Anthimus, says that Jesuit, was not, properly speaking, deposed. Deposition supposes a lawful or canonical election; which that of the pretended patriarch was not. As he had not therefore been yet acknowledged by the first see, the bishop of that see had no occasion to assemble a council, in order to deny his communion. In such circumstances every patriarch had a power to act in the same manner as the pope acted; and in the same manner they did act, when they knew, or only suspected, the election of their pretended colleague to be uncanonical." If every patriarch had a power to act in the same manner as the pope acted, in what did the pope exert his "plenitude of power," his paramount authority? As for the substitution of Mennas, he was no ways at all concerned in it, Mennas having been chosen, as we read in the acts of a council that was held soon after, by "the suffrages of the emperor, of the clergy, of the nobles, and the people.[2] The new patriarch was indeed ordained by the pope. But that any other bishop might have done as well as he; and his having been preferred therein to other bishops was looked upon by all, and is expressed by Liberatus, as a favor. "The pope," says that writer,[3] "by the emperor's favor, ordained Mennas, consecrating him with his own hand."

The pope immediately notified the deposition of Anthimus, and election of Mennas, by a circular letter, to all the bishops, who had communicated with the former; and in that letter he had the vanity to boast, that "the heretical bishop had been deposed by the apostolic authority, with the concurrence and help of the most religious emperor." He there bestows great commendations on the new patriarch; takes care to let the bishops know, that he had ordained him; and modestly adds, that his having been ordained by him contributed much to his dignity, seeing he was the first eastern bishop who, since the time of St. Peter, had had the honor of being consecrated by any who sat in the same chair. As he had received ordination at his hands, the pope flatters himself, that he will prove in no respect inferior to any ordained in those parts by St. Peter himself.[1] So great was his modesty!

While Agapetus continued at Constantinople, two memorials were presented to him, worthy of notice; the one in the name of the bishops and clergy of the oriental diocese, and Jerusalem; the other in the name of the monks of the same diocese, of Jerusalem, and of Constantinople. The first was thus addressed: "To our most holy lord, and most blessed father of fathers, Agapetus, archbishop of the Romans, and patriarch, the bishops of the oriental diocese, and those who dwell in the holy places of Christ our Lord, with the ambasiatores,(*) and other clerks,(†) assembled in this royal city." That of the monks was addressed thus: "To Agapetus, our most holy lord, most blessed archbishop of ancient Rome, and œcumenical patriarch, Marianus, presbyter and primate of the monasteries of the royal city, with the other archimandrites, or abbots, of the same city, of Jerusalem, and of the oriental diocese assembled in the same synod.(‡)

The purport of both memorials is the same. They entreat the pope to apprise the emperor, with whom he had succeeded so well against Anthimus, of the incredible mischief that was done daily at Constantinople by the followers of Eutyches, especially by Severus, who had been formerly driven from the see of Antioch by the emperor Justin, as an incorrigible heretic, and the most inveterate enemy the

[1] P. Doucin. hist. du Nest. p. 380.
[2] Syn. Const. sub Menn. [3] Liberat. Brev. c. 21.

[1] Const. Synod. sub Men. Act. 1. et Agapet. ep. 5.

(*) Ambasiator was the Latin word, in those times, for resident; and answered the Greek word apocrisarius. For bishops not being allowed to be long absent from their churches, without the emperor's special leave or command, they kept a kind of residents in the imperial city, to act in behalf of them and their churches. These residents are frequently mentioned by the ecclesiastical writers, and styled by them apocrisarii or responsales. (*a*) In process of time the emperors gave the name of apocrisarii to their own embassadors; so that it became common to all residents and legates, by whomsoever employed. (*b*)

(*a*) Liberat. Brev. c. 12. Evagr. l. 4. c. 38. Justin. Novel. 6. c. 2. et. Nov. 79. c. 1.

(*b*) Suicer. Thesaur. com. 1. p. 456.

(†) By the word clerici, clerks, seem to be meant here, all ecclesiastical orders below the episcopal, though that word is frequently used to denote the inferior orders, that is, the several orders below those of the bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Thus the third council of Carthage, (*a*) St. Ambrose, (*b*) Hilarius, (*c*) and Epiphanius, (*d*) speak of the clerici or clerks as distinct from the bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

(*a*) Concil. Carth. 3. t. 15.

(*b*) Ambros. de dignit. Sacerd. c. 3.

(*c*) Pseud. Ambros. in Eph. 4.

(*d*) Ephiphan. hæres. 68.

(‡) It is quite surprising, that the Roman catholic writers should lay any stress on these high-sounding titles; nothing being better known than that, for many ages, those of blessed, most blessed, holy, most holy, were given indifferently to all bishops. They then imported real sanctity or holiness of life; but now that the popes have appropriated them to themselves, they no longer denote virtue or holiness, but grandeur and power. As for the title of œcumenical, Justinian styles Mennas, Epiphanius, and Anthimus, archbishops, and œcumenical patriarchs, in several of his rescripts; (*a*) and Leo bestows the same titles on Stephen, in ten laws, one after the other. (*b*)

(*a*) Justin. Novel. 7. 16. 42.

(*b*) Leo Imp. Constit. Novel. 1, 2, 3, &c.

Agapetus dies. His pompous obsequies. He is sainted. His letter to Cæsarius of Arles. He thinks the decrees of a national synod binding, even with respect to him.

orthodox had.[1] From these memorials it appears, that the Eutychian party was anew become formidable in the east; that they were not only countenanced by the empress Theodora, but by several persons, both men and women, of the first rank, by some of the emperor's chief ministers; nay, and by several bishops; that Severus, though proscribed by Justin, and condemned to have his tongue cut out, now publicly appeared at Constantinople, and there publicly preached, with great success, the doctrine of Eutyches; that his disciples, namely, Petrus of Apamea, Zoaras, and Isaacius, a Persian, had erected, in the city and suburbs of Constantinople, altars and baptisteries in opposition to the altars and baptisteries of the catholics; that they held unlawful assemblies, gained daily great numbers of followers, raised frequent disturbances, and even strove to drive the catholics from their churches, and appropriate them to those of their sect. Both the bishops and the monks charge Isaacius with having first struck, and afterwards defaced, torn, and thrown into the fire, a picture of the emperor, blaspheming his name, and calling him a heretic. The monks, entreating the pope to provide a remedy against the prevailing evils, tell him, that as St. Peter went from the east to Rome, to oppose the wicked attempts and designs of Simon the magician; so was his holiness sent by Heaven from Rome into the east, to defeat the no less wicked views and artifices of Severus, Petrus, Zoaras, and Isaacius, and bring them to confusion, with all their friends and abetters.[2]

The pope was indisposed and confined to his bed, when he received the memorials. He perused them, however, and sent them to the emperor. But, in the mean time, his illness increasing, he died a few days after, according to the most probable opinion, on the 22d of April of the present year, 536, having presided in the Roman see ten months and nineteen days. His obsequies were performed with such pomp and magnificence, with such a concourse of people of all ranks and professions, as had never before been seen at Constantinople. The ceremony is described, and in a style that does not at all savor of the barbarism of the age, by an anonymous writer, who seems to have been an eye-witness of all the particulars he relates.[3](*)

When the funeral rites were ended, the body of the deceased pontiff was conveyed, in a leaden coffin, to Rome, and there deposited in the basilic of St. Peter. He is greatly commended by the contemporary writers, especially by the above-mentioned anonymous author, by Liberatus, and by the fathers of the council that was held at Constantinople soon after his death.[1] He is now honored as a saint by the Greeks as well as the Latins, his festival being kept by the former on the 17th of April, and by the latter on the 22d of September, perhaps the day on which his remains were translated to Rome.[2](*)

Besides the letters of the present pope, which I have already mentioned, he wrote one in 535, in answer to a letter from Cæsarius of Arles, applying to him in behalf of the poor in Gaul. For the Roman church, as she abounded in wealth above all other churches, used, on several occasions, to contribute considerable sums for the relief of the poor of other churches, and their indigent clergy.[3] But at this time she was quite destitute of money, as we have seen; and, as for her lands and possessions, Agapetus tells the primate of Arles, that the venerable decrees of the fathers, forbidding alienations on any consideration whatever, are so peremptory and express, that they can by no means be dispensed with. "You must not ascribe," says he, "our not complying with your request to avarice, or any temporal view. It is not the love of money, but the strict account, which we are to give the last day, that restrains us from granting what you demand, *we being bound, as we shall answer it on that day, inviolably to observe whatever the authority of a synod has decreed.*"[4] The synod which the pope speaks of, was but a national synod, held in Italy, under Symmachus;[5] and if he thought himself bound in conscience to observe inviolably the canons and decrees of a national council, it cannot be doubted, but he thought himself bound to observe, with the same strictness,

[1] See p. 316. [2] Syn. Constant. sub Menna, Act. 2. [3] Biblioth. Vatican. lib. num. 1538. apud Regist. S. Greg. p. 194. Vide Bar. ad ann. 536. p. 271.

(*) The author has transcribed, verbatim, a passage from the letter, which St. Jerom wrote to Aletius, on occasion of the obsequies of Ruffina; whence we may probably conclude him to have belonged to the Latin church, and to have written in that language.

[1] Liberat. c. 21. Concil. sub Menn.

[2] Vide Pagi ad hunc ann. n. 10.

(*) Of this pope, Sophronius relates, that the inhabitants of a city, which he calls Rumellum, having, out of mere spite and malice, accused their bishop, as if he sacrilegiously used the sacred vessels at his table, the pope, without any farther inquiry, despatched two of his clerks, with orders to bring the bishop to Rome, bound, and on foot. The clerks obeyed, and the bishop was, on his arrival immediately conveyed to prison, without so much as being heard by his judge, or suffered to appear before him. But he had not been long thus confined, when his innocence was revealed in a vision to the pope, and the vision was confirmed by a most stupendous miracle, wrought in the sight of the whole city of Rome; as is related at length by the above-mentioned writer.(*a*) This tale, however improbable and absurd in all its circumstances, however injurious to the memory of Agapetus, Baronius pretends to believe; and thence concludes, that though the pope, as, after all, he is but a man, may, like other men, be at first imposed upon, and swayed by false informations; yet Providence will interpose in the end, and even prevent him, by the greatest of miracles, if necessary, from judging wrong and unjustly.(*b*) This is ascribing to the pope a more extensive infallibility than any pope has yet claimed; an infallibility even with respect to private causes, that have no kind of relation to faith, or to doctrine. It was, no doubt, for the sake of this inference, that Baronius adopted so ridiculous and senseless a tale; and it is only upon such tales that this or any other infallibility can be grounded.

(*a*) Prat. Spirituale, c. 150.

(*b*) Bar. ad. ann. 536. p. 273.

[3] See p. 14. et p. 310. [4] Agapet. ep. 6. [5] See p. 304.

Council held at Constantinople, under Mennas; in which are deposed, and anathematized, the leading men of the Eutychian party.

the canons and decrees of the oecumenical councils, and, consequently, that he was an utter stranger to the boasted "plenitude of power, and paramount authority, raising him above all the decrees and canons of the church," with which we have seen him above vested by Baronius.(*) As for the letter, said to have been written by this pope to Anthimus, it is now rejected by all as spurious.

As the removal of Anthimus from the see of Constantinople was chiefly owing to the influence of Agapetus, and the interest he had with the emperor, his death was no sooner known to those of the Eutychian party, than they began anew, being countenanced by the empress, to exert all their interest and power in favor of the deposed patriarch, pretending that he still retained his dignity, since he could not, agreeably to the canons, be condemned or removed without the concurrence of a council. That no room might therefore be left for such a plea, Mennas, the new patriarch, assembled a council, in great haste, consisting of the bishops, who were then at Constantinople, and in that neighborhood, in all fifty-five. At that assembly presided Mennas, having on his right hand the five legates, whom Agapetus had sent to Constantinople the year before, with twenty-five other bishops; and twenty-three on his left. Baronius will have the legates to have presided in conjunction with the patriarch.[1] But that Mennas alone presided, is manifest from the authentic acts of the council, which is there said to have been held "in the imperial city of New Rome, our most holy lord, and most blessed archbishop and patriarch Mennas presiding, and the pope's legates, with the other bishops, sitting and hearing together with him, considentibus ei, et coaudientibus." As nothing is there said of the pope's legates, but what is said of the other bishops, either the legates did not preside, or the other bishops all presided as well as they. In this council were read several memorials, containing heavy complaints against Anthimus, Severus, Petrus of Apamea, Zoaras, and their followers: Anthimus was several times summoned to appear; and upon his not appearing, divested

(*) By the decree of the council, held under Symmachus, as it is quoted by Agapetus, the alienating of lands or immoveable possessions belonging to the Roman church, was forbidden in all cases, without exception. But, by the more Christian and equitable laws of the emperors, forbidding alienations, two cases were always excepted; namely, when by no other means the poor could be relieved in time of famine, nor the captives be redeemed from slavery. In either of these cases it was lawful, nay, and agreeable to what had been practised by the greatest saints, to sell or pawn even the sacred utensils, and consecrated vessels of the church. Thus St. Ambrose did not scruple to melt down the communion-plate of the church of Milan, to redeem some captives, who otherwise must have continued in slavery; and, when the Arians charged him, on that account, with sacrilege, he wrote, in answer to that charge, an excellent apology, which has reached our times and is well worth the perusal of every reader. "Is it not better," says he there, among other things, "that the plate should be melted by the bishop to maintain the poor, when they can be maintained by no other means, than that it should become the spoil and plunder of a sacrilegious enemy? Will not the Lord thus expostulate with us? Why did you suffer so many helpless persons to die with hunger, when you had gold to relieve and support them? Why were so many captives carried away, and sold without ransom? Why were so many suffered to be slain by the enemy? It had been better to have preserved the vessels of living men, than lifeless metals. To this what answer can be returned? Should one say, I was afraid lest the temple of God should want its ornaments; Christ will anwer: 'My sacraments require no gold, nor do they please me the more for being ministered in gold, as they are not to be bought with gold. The ornament of my sacraments is the redemption of captives; and those alone are precious vessels, that redeem souls from death." The saint concludes, that though it would be highly criminal for a man to convert the sacred vessels to his own private use, yet it is so far from being a crime, that he looks upon it as an obligation incumbent upon him, and his brethren, to prefer the living temples of God to the unnecessary ornaments of the material buildings.(a) Of the same opinion were St. Austin,(b) Acacius of Amida,(c) Cyril of Jerusalem,(d) Deogratias of Carthage,(e) and others without number; who are all greatly commended by the contemporary catholic writers, for parting with the ornaments and the sacred vessels of their churches, to redeem the captives from slavery. The emperor Justinian, in his law against sacrilege, forbids the church-plate, vestments, or any other gifts, to be sold or pawned; but adds, "except in case of captivity or famine, the lives or souls of men being preferable to any vessels or vestments whatever."(f) Were the ruling men of the church of Rome of the same opinion; were they persuaded, that the souls of men are preferable to any vessels or vestments; we should not see such an immense profusion of rich and unnecessary ornaments in their churches, while their streets are crowded with so many miserable objects, and many thousands of Christian captives suffer, among the infidels, the most tyrannical bondage. Baronius observes here, that though the pope be, by the prerogative of his primacy, the common father of all the poor throughout the Christian world, though he was entreated by a saint (Cæsareus of Arles, sainted for the deference he paid to the Roman see), to relieve them; yet, as he could not relieve them without alienating the goods of the church, he inviolably adhered to the decree forbidding such alienations; that all future popes might learn of him, how inflexible and steady they should be with respect to that point;(a) that is, in other words, that all future popes might learn of him to be cruel to the poor, and suffer them to perish rather than to part even with the superfluous ornaments of the church to relieve them. A Christian lesson indeed! Had St. Ambrose or St. Austin lived in the time of this pope, they would have thought the title of "the father of the poor" but ill bestowed on him.

Theodorus Lector writes, that, in his time, about the year 520, the Roman church had not yet any immoveable possessions, it being, according to him, the custom of that church, when any such were left to her, to sell them immediately, and divide the money, accruing from the sale, into three shares; one of which was appropriated to the fabric, another was given to the bishop, and the third was distributed among the rest of the clergy.(b) This custom continued, in the opinion of Valesius, to obtain at Rome till near the time of pope Gregory the Great. But that both he and Theodorus were mistaken, appears from the decree of the council held at Rome in 502, as it is here quoted by Agapetus: "Let it be lawful for none, from this day forward, to sell or alienate any farm, how large soever, or how small soever, that belongs to the church," &c.(c) are the words of the decree. That the decree relates to the Roman church alone, is evident from the context; and, on the other hand, we cannot suppose the council would have made such a decree, had no farm or lands belonged to that church.

(a) Ambr. de Offic. l. 2. c. 28.
(b) Possid. Vit. Aug. c. 24. (c) Socrat. l. 7. c. 24.
(d) Theodoret. l. 2. c. 27.
(e) Vict. de persec. Vandal. l. 1.
(f) Codex Just. l. 1. tit. 2. de sacrosanct. Eccles. leg. 21.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 535. p. 256.
(b) Theodor. Lect. Collectan. l. 2. p. 567.
(c) Agapet. ep. 6. [1] Bar. ad ann. 536. p. 274.

The leading men of the Eutychian party, banished by the emperor. Silverius chosen. Whether his election was owing to simony and violence. Belisarius pursues his conquests in Italy. Theodatus deposed, and Vitiges chosen in his room. Rome taken by Belisarius.

by the council of the episcopal dignity, and declared unworthy of the name of a Christian.[1] As for Severus, and Petrus of Apamea, they were charged with several enormous crimes, and thereupon degraded and anathematized by all the fathers of the council, agreeably to the sentence, which had been formerly pronounced against them by Euphemius patriarch of Constantinople, and his council.[2] The present council met, for the first time, on the 2d of May; and broke up on the 4th of June, when they acquainted the emperor with the judgment they had given; who thereupon issued an edict, dated the 6th of August, ordering their judgment to be put in execution, and, at the same time, banishing Anthimus, Severus, Petrus of Apamea, Zoaras, and their followers, from Constantinople, and all the other great cities, condemning their books to the flames, forbidding all persons to keep them by them, and all transcribers to copy them, on pain of having their hand cut off.[1] This law was addressed, "To Mennas, the most holy and most blessed archbishop, and universal patriarch."(*) By this edict peace was restored for a while to the church of Constantinople.

SILVERIUS, FIFTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN,—THEODATUS, VITIGES, *kings of Italy.*]

[Year of Christ, 536.] Upon the death of Agapetus was ordained in his room, on the 8th of June, after a vacancy of forty-seven days,[3] Silverius, the son of pope Hormisdas, begotten, as Baronius assures us, in lawful wedlock.[4] The bibliothecarian writes, that he purchased his dignity of king Theodatus, who, in consideration of the sum Silverius paid him, named him, without consulting the people or clergy, and commanded all, on pain of death, to receive and acknowledge him for lawful bishop.[5] But Liberatus, who lived at this very time, takes no kind of notice of any violence used by the king, or any simony practised by Silverius. "The city of Rome, says that writer, hearing of the decease of Agapetus, chose the subdeacon Silverius, the son of pope Hormisdas, to be ordained in his room."[6] It was probably to justify the intrusion of Vigilius, which we shall soon have occasion to speak of, that the election of Silverius was said to have been owing to violence and simony. However that be, certain it is, that he was acknowledged by all for lawful bishop of Rome.

In the mean time Belisarius pursued his conquests. Having reduced the island of Sicily, almost without opposition, he passed over, without loss of time, from Messina to Reggio, which opened its gates to him. From Reggio he bent his march straight to Rome. The city of Naples refused to admit him; but was forced to surrender after a twenty days siege.[7] The Goths, alarmed at the surrender of that important place, and ascribing, as they well might, the surprising success that attended the imperial arms, to the inactivity and cowardice of their king, met at Regeta, a place distant two hundred and eighty furlongs from Rome, and there deposed Theodatus and raised to the throne, in his room, Vitiges, an officer renowned for his valor and experience in war. The new king began his reign with causing Theodatus to be put to death, lest he should raise disturbances, or occasion divisions, among the Goths, at so critical a juncture. Belisarius in the mean time advanced; and Vitiges, not thinking himself in a condition to defend the city against his victorious army, left four thousand chosen troops in it, and withdrew with the rest to Ravenna, having first exhorted pope Silverius, and the senate, says Procopius, to continue steady in their allegiance to the Goths, who had deserved so well of them and their city. But he was no sooner gone than the senate, at the persuasion of the pope, invited Belisarius to come, and take possession of the city; which he did accordingly; the Goths, who could not make head at the same time against the enemy without, and the citizens within the walls, retiring by the Flaminian, while the Romans entered by the Asinarian gate. Thus was the city of Rome reunited to the empire, on the 10th of December of the present year, 536, after it had been separated from it threescore years.[2] Belisarius sent immediately the keys of the gates to Constantinople, as a token of his victory, and, together with them, Leuderis the Gothic governor of the city, who had chosen rather to remain, and be taken prisoner, than to abandon his post, and fly with the rest of his countrymen.[3]

The taking of Rome by Belisarius offered

[1] Syn. Constant. sub Menna, Act. 1, 2, 3, 4.
[2] Ibid. Act. 5. [3] Vide Pagi ad ann. 536. n. 16.
[4] Bar. ad hunc ann. p. 536, C.
[5] Anast. in Silver. [6] Liberat. Brev. 22.
[7] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. c. 8, 9. et 10.

[1] Justin. Novel. 42.
(*) In some Latin editions of the councils, the word "universal" has been left out here, and wherever else it was added to the title of the bishop of Constantinople. The Latins charged the Greeks with having foisted it in, and the Greeks the Latins with having designedly left it out. It is now no longer doubted, but the Latins were therein guilty of unfair dealing, and not the Greeks.
[2] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. c. 14. Evagr. l. 4. c. 19. Vide Pagi ad ann. 537. n. 4. [3] Idem ibid.

The empress strives to gain over the pope to the Eutychian party; but in vain. She resolves to have Silverius deposed, and Vigilius chosen in his room. Vigilius agrees to the terms proposed by her;—[Year of Christ, 537.] Belisarius ordered, by the empress, to depose Silverius, and to place Vigilius in his room. Rome besieged by Vitiges.

a favorable opportunity to the empress Theodora, of executing a design, which she had formed in favor of Anthimus, and those of his party, whom the writers of these times distinguish by the name of Acephali.(*) For to that party the empress was most zealously attached; and did not despair, notwithstanding the sentence of the late council, and the imperial edict issued to confirm it, of being able to reinstate them in the emperor's favor. As Justinian paid an extraordinary deference to the bishop of Rome, the most effectual means that occurred to her of compassing her design, was, to persuade the pope, if by any means she could, to receive Anthimus, and the other Acephali, to his communion, and exclude Mennas from it, with all who adhered to him. With this view she wrote to Silverius, earnestly entreating, or rather commanding him, to acknowledge Anthimus for lawful bishop, or to repair to Constantinople, and there re-examine his cause on the spot. This letter gave the pope the greatest uneasiness: he was well acquainted with the violent temper of the empress; he knew how dangerous a thing it was to disoblige or provoke her; and therefore often sighed in reading the letter; and when he had read it, turning to his friends, "I am now sensible," said he, "that this cause will, in the end cost me my life." However, to that letter he returned an answer, without delay, letting the empress know, in a few words, that he could not, and that she must not flatter herself he ever would, re-establish a condemned heretic. From this answer the empress concluded, that nothing was to be expected from Silverius. But yet she did not abandon the attempt, nor despair of success. The deacon Vigilius, whom I have mentioned above,[1] was still at Constantinople, whither he had attended pope Agapetus. He was a man of excellent parts, and great address, but ambitious beyond measure, and ready to trample under foot not only the canons or laws of the church, but every principle of honor, virtue, or religion, that stood in the way of his ambition. The empress, therefore, who was no stranger to his character, resolved, upon the receipt of Silverius' letter, to have the pope deposed, and the deacon, who had long aspired to the papal dignity, and who she well knew would stick at nothing to earn it, chosen in his room. She sent for him accordingly, and, after a short preamble on the base and undeserved treatment Anthimus, and those of his party, had met with, she let the deacon know, that now her servant Belisarius was master of Rome, it was in her power to dispose of the Roman see to whom she pleased; that she was determined Silverius should be removed, and that she would cause him to be substituted in his room, provided he would engage and promise, in writing, to condemn the council of Chalcedon, to receive to his communion Anthimus, Severus, Theodosius the Eutychian bishop of Alexandria, with all who were of the same persuasion, and approve, by his letters, their tenets and doctrine. If you agree to these terms, said the empress, I will transmit, by you, an order for Belisarius, enjoining him to drive out Silverius, to place you on his see; and will present you besides with seven hundred pieces of gold. To these terms Vigilius agreed, without the least hesitation; and, having thereupon received the promised order for Belisarius, set out immediately, from Constantinople, on his return to Italy; where he no sooner landed, than, repairing to Rome, where Belisarius then was,(*) he delivered to him the order from the empress; and, at the same time, to engage the general to act in the affair with more expedition and earnestness, promised to pay him, as soon as Silverius was deposed, and he installed in his room, two hundred pieces of gold, out of the seven which he was to receive.[1] The bibliothecarian writes, that Belisarius betrayed at first some reluctancy to execute the empress' order; but that he soon stifled all remorse, and quieted his conscience, saying, the empress commands, and it is my duty to obey: he who seeks the ruin of Silverius, meaning Vigilius, shall answer it on the last day, and not I.[2] He was, it seems, a better general than a casuist.

Rome was, at this time, besieged by the Goths, and Belisarius in it. For Vitiges, returning from Ravenna, whither he had retired the year before, to levy new forces, advanced to the city, and, in the month of March of the present year, invested it with an army of one

(*) The Acephali were first heard of in Egypt, about the year 482. When Petrus Mongus, bishop of Alexandria, received the henoticon of Zeno, by which he was to anathematize the council of Chalcedon, only with respect to the perplexing article of the two natures, (a) some of his clergy, out of the irreconcileable hatred they bore to that council, continued to anathematize it without limitation or restriction; and, rejecting the henoticon, separated themselves from their patriarch, because he had received it. They were a kind of more rigid Eutychians, distinguished, as they had, at first, no particular leader or head, with the name of Acephali; which, in process of time, was extended to all who did not receive the council of Chalcedon. (b) Pope Hormisdas, in a letter, which he wrote to the presbyters, deacons, and the archimandritæ of the second Syria, taxes the Acephali with holding the opposite errors of Nestorius and Eutyches; (c) and Nicephorius writes, that they acknowledged but one nature in Christ, with the Eutychians; and two substances, with the Nestorians. (d)

(a) See p. 269.
(b) Vide Leont. de Sect. Act. 5. et Synod. Constantinop. sub Menn. Act. 5.
(c) Syn. Constantinop. sub Menn. ibid.
(d) Niceph. Callist. l. 18. c. 45. [1] See p. 332.

(*) Liberatus supposes Belisarius to have been, at this time, in Ravenna, and master of that city. But he was therein certainly mistaken; it being manifest from Procopius, and others, that Ravenna was not reduced by the Greeks, till two years after, that is, till the year 539, the fifth of the Gothic war, and the thirteenth of the reign of Justinian. (a)

(a) Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 2. c. 30. Continuat. Marcell. et Marius, ad ann. 539.
[1] Liberat. c. 22. [2] Anast in Silver.

The pope falsely arraigned of high treason. Belisarius strives, at first, to save him. The firmness and constancy of Silverius. He is seized by Belisarius, and sent into exile. Anastasius' account of the event.

hundred and fifty thousand men strong. The gallant behavior of the Romans, as well as the Goths, and the many feats that were performed by both, during the siege, which lasted a year and nine days,(*) are described at length by Procopius,[1] but quite foreign to the subject of the present history. The siege supplied Vigilius, and those of his party, with matter for a plausible charge against Silverius. For by them the pope was arraigned of high treason, and a letter was produced, which they pretended to have been written by him, inviting the king of the Goths into the city by the Asinarian gate, which the pope there promised to have opened at his approach. This Belisarius knew to be a malicious and bare-faced calumny, and even discovered the persons by whom the letter was forged, namely, Marcus, a lawyer, and Julianus, a soldier of the guards, both, without all doubt, suborned by Vigilius. As he was not, therefore, quite lost to all sense of honor and religion, his conscience began anew to reproach him, and he could not prevail upon himself to condemn a man, of whose innocence he was so fully convinced in his own mind. But, on the other hand, Vigilius, quite free from all scruples of that kind, and impatient to see himself placed on the throne of St. Peter, was daily putting him in mind of the order he had brought from the empress, and pressing him to obey her commands, as he tendered her protection and favor. Belisarius, however, without hearkening to him, or being moved by the promise, which he often renewed, of paying him two hundred pieces of gold on his installation, resolved first to try whether he could not persuade Silverius to comply with the demands of the empress, and thereby redeem himself from the guilt of condemning an innocent person; for he was determined, at all events, to keep fair with the empress, knowing how great an ascendant she had over her husband. Having therefore privately sent for the pope, he acquainted him with the order he had received; told him, that, notwithstanding the charge of treason that was brought against him, he might still prevent the execution of that order; and, earnestly entreating him to comply with the will of the empress, assured him that he could by no other means avoid the loss of his see, and the other calamities with which he was threatened. But all was in vain: the pope continued firm in his resolution, declaring anew, with great intrepidity, that he never would condemn the council of Chalcedon, nor receive any of the Acephali to his communion. However, upon his being dismissed by Belisarius, he thought it advisable to take sanctuary in some of the basilics, and retired accordingly to that of the martyr St. Sabina. He apprehended that the general, finding he could not prevail upon him to yield, might seize him; and, to make room for Vigilius, either put him to death, or convey him into exile. And that, indeed, Belisarius now designed; and his design he soon put in execution. For having, a few days after, artfully drawn the pope from his sanctuary, he caused him to be seized, and to be privately conveyed to Patara, a city of Lycia. Thus Liberatus.[1]

The bibliothecarian, in his account of this event, tells us that Belisarius would not hearken to those who first charged Silverius with a design of betraying the city to the enemy; but that, finding he was arraigned of the same treason by many others, he began to be under some apprehension, and thereupon sent for the pope to the Pincian palace, where the Greek general had taken up his quarters during the siege; that the pope, upon his entering the palace, was conducted, together with Vigilius, into an inner room, while the clergy, who attended him, were ordered to wait in the outward rooms; that he found there Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, sitting upon her bed, and Belisarius sitting at her feet; that Antonina, addressing him as soon as he entered the room, asked him what provocation her husband or she had given to him and the Romans, that he should think of betraying them into the hands of the Goths? "Dic, domine Silveri papa, quæ fecimus tibi et Romanis, ut tu velles nos in manus Gothorum tradere?" The pope was not allowed time to make any reply; for Antonina had not yet done speaking, when a subdeacon, entering the room, tore the pall off of his shoulders; and then, carrying him into another room, stript him there of the other badges of his dignity, and dressed him in the habit of a monk. In that attire he was shown to another subdeacon, who, hastening out, let the clergy know that the pope was deposed, and become a monk: "Quia dominus papa depositus est, et factus est monachus."[2] Procopius is here very concise; for he says no more, than that Silverius, bishop of Rome, being suspected as if he designed to betray the city to the Goths, Belisarius banished him immediately to Greece, and appointed one Vigilius in his room.[3](*)

(*) So long did Vitiges continue before Rome, pursuing the siege with great vigor, though all his attempts, and the many stratagems he made use of, to get into the city, were constantly defeated by the superior skill of the Greeks, and their general. But a party of the enemy having, in the mean time, made themselves masters of Rimini, which was distant but one day's journey from Ravenna, the taking of that city alarmed the king of the Goths to such a degree, that he immediately raised the siege, and, withdrawing from before Rome, marched straight to Rimini, with a design to recover, at all events, so important a place. But he was attended with no better success in the siege of Rimini, than he had been in that of Rome.

[1] Vide Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. a cap. 17. ad fin. et. l. 2. a cap. 1. ad cap. 11.

[1] Liberat. Breviar. c. 22. [2] Anast in Silver.

[3] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1. c. 25.

(*) I cannot help taking notice of two observations made here by Baronius. He observes, first, That Belisarius was less excusable in condemning the pope, than Pontius Pilate was in condemning Christ, the Greek general having only been threatened with the indignation of the empress, whereas the Roman president was threatened with that of the emperor him-

The time only assigned to each pope which he sat in the see. The letter of Silverius to Vigilius supposititious; and likewise that from Amator to Silverius. Vigilius chosen in the room of Silverius. Refuses to condemn the council of Chalcedon.

That Silverius, though driven from his see, and sent into exile, still continued to be true and lawful pope, or bishop of Rome, is past all dispute. And yet to him I find assigned, in all the ancient catalogues, that time only, which passed between his election and his expulsion; and indeed the ancients, generally speaking, reckon to each pope, as has been observed by Papebroke,[1] those years, months, or days only, which they sat in the see, and enjoyed their dignity. To conform to their style, I shall close the popedom of Silverius with his expulsion, and reckon the time he survived it, to that of Vigilius.

The letter Silverius is said to have written, after his expulsion, to Vigilius, reproaching him with the many heinous crimes, by which he had opened himself a way to the episcopal dignity, and cutting him off forever from the communion of the church, is evidently suppositious, though by Baronius and others quoted as genuine.[2] The decree of excommunication, contained in that letter, is signed not by Silverius alone, but by four other bishops, whom the pope is supposed to have assembled for that purpose. But that, from the time of his expulsion to the hour of his death, he had no opportunity of assembling bishops, issuing decrees, or thundering anathemas, will appear hereafter. Besides, the letter is entirely made up of phrases and sentences borrowed from the letters of other popes, especially from that of Felix to Acacius; and is dated under consuls, whom all chronologers agree not to have been consuls at the time it is supposed to have been written; nor indeed at any other, during the pontificate of Silverius. The letter from Amator of Autun to Silverius, after his expulsion, is still, if possible, a more barefaced forgery. For it is supposed to have been written in 539, whereas Amator died in 535, and was succeeded in that year by Aggripinus, who, in 538, assisted at the third council of Orange.[1] This letter too, as well as the answer Silverius is said to have made to it, consists entirely of passages taken from the letters of the popes Leo and Gregory, from the laws of Honorius and Arcadius, and from a letter of Boniface, bishop of Mentz.

[1] Papebr. Propyl. ad mens. Mart. in Vigil. dissert. 13.
[2] Habetur inter acta Silv. t. 2. Concil. et t. 2. Epist. Rom. Pont.

[1] Vide Pagi ad ann. 539. n. 4.

VIGILIUS, FIFTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN,—VITIGES, HILDEBALD, ERARIC, TOTILAS, TEIAS, *kings of Italy*.]

[Year of Christ, 537.] Silverius being driven from his see, in the manner we have seen, Belisarius ordered the people and clergy to proceed to a new election; and recommended Vigilius, who was accordingly chosen, and ordained on the 22d of November of the present year, 537. He was at this time deacon, or, as he is styled by some, archdeacon of the Roman church, by birth a Roman, and sprung from a noble family, his father having been distinguished with the consular dignity. He had promised to the empress, as has been observed above, to condemn the council of Chalcedon, to admit the Acephali to his communion, and to approve their doctrine. This promise Belisarius now challenged, not forgetting the two hundred pieces of gold, which he was to pay him, as soon as he found himself in possession of the see.(*) But Vigi-

self.(a) Belisarius was, no doubt, guilty of a very great crime; but to compare his guilt with that of Pontius Pilate, is absolute blasphemy. Besides, who does not see that Belisarius chiefly dreaded the indignation of the emperor, and that of the empress only so far as it might be attended with his? In the second place, the Annalist observes, That Belisarius, who had laid violent hands on the Lord's anointed, to gratify the empress, and rivet himself, by her means, in the emperor's favor, not only forfeited the favor he had bought so dear, but, by a just judgment, ended his life an object of the greatest compassion.(b) It is surprising he was not better informed. It is true, that in 563, a conspiracy was formed against Justinian; that Belisarius was accused, by some of the conspirators, of being privy to it; that, upon their deposition, his estate was confiscated, and he divested of all his honors.(c) But the same authors, who acquaint us with his disgrace, inform us that Justinian, being soon after convinced of his innocence, restored whatever had been taken from him, and received him anew into his favor.(d) Baronius seems even to credit the story of his eyes being put out by the emperor's order, and his being reduced, thus deprived of his sight, to beg in the streets of Constantinople;(e) as if the authority of a writer, of a poet, who wrote in the latter end of the twelfth century, could be of any weight, or could deserve the least regard, when it openly contradicts the concurring testimony of the contemporary historians, and all antiquity. For that story was first set abroad by Joannes Tzetzes, a Greek poet of the twelfth century,(f) in contradiction to all the contemporary writers; and from him it has been copied by the later historians. In the wall of the church belonging to the order of the cruciferi at Rome, is to be seen the following inscription, engraved on a stone:

"Hanc vir patricius Velisarius urbis amicus
Ob culpæ veniam condidit ecclesiam.
Hanc iccirro pedem sacram qui ponis in ædem,
Ut miseretur eum, sæpe precare Deum."

Under these is the following line:

"Janua hæc est templi domino defensa potenti."

That Belisarius built the church mentioned here, to atone for his having sacrilegiously treated the vicar of Christ in the manner we have seen, Baronius takes for granted. Might he not have built it to atone for his sins in general?

(a) Bar. ad ann. 538. p. 294, A. (b) Bar. ibid. B. (c) Theoph. ad ann. Alex. 555. Cedren. ad ann. Just. 36. (d) Theoph. Cedren. ibid. (e) Bar. ad ann. 561. p. 507. (f) Tzet. hist. 86

(*) I cannot help thinking Liberatus was mistaken with respect to that particular. For what temptation

The bishop of Patara espouses the cause of Silverius, and recurs to the emperor; who orders his cause to be tried anew. Silverius returns to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 538;]—but is there delivered up to Vigilius. Vigilius writes letters of communion to the chiefs of the Acephali. Anathematizes all who acknowledged two natures in Christ.

lius, says the historian, fearing the Romans, and restrained by his avarice, declined complying with either engagement.[1]

In the mean time Silverius, arriving at Patara, was there received with all possible marks of honor and esteem, by the bishop of the place; nay, the good prelate, not satisfied with paying him all the regard he could have expected, had he been still in possession of his see, thought himself bound, in common justice, to undertake his defence, or at least to lay his case before the emperor. With this view he repaired to Constantinople; and, having, in a private audience, acquainted Justinian with the base treatment which the first bishop of the catholic church had met with, earnestly begged he would interpose his authority, and order the cause to be tried anew. The emperor expressed no small surprise at the account the bishop gave him; for he was an utter stranger to what had passed, the plot having been laid by the empress, without his privity; and executed, unknown to him, by Belisarius, and his wife Antonina. He enquired into all the particulars; but, finding the bishop knew no more of the affairs of Silverius, than what he had learned of Silverius himself, he would not absolve or restore him. However, that he might have an opportunity, if he was really innocent, of making his innocence appear, he commanded him to be forthwith sent back to Italy, and his cause to be there examined anew. If he cleared himself from the treason laid to his charge, he was, by the emperor's order, to be restored to his former dignity; but, should he be found guilty, he was to be removed from the Roman to some other see. With this order Silverius set out for Italy, and, travelling with great expedition, arrived at Rome before Pelagius, whom the empress had sent to prevent his return, could reach that city.(*)

Vigilius was thunderstruck, as we may well imagine, at the unexpected and sudden arrival of the pope, and the order he brought from the emperor, not doubting but, should it take place, Silverius would be acquitted, and he be ignominiously driven from the see. He therefore left nothing unattempted to divert Belisarius from causing it to be put in execution. He applied chiefly to Antonina, who was in high favor with the empress, and had as great an ascendant over Belisarius, as Theodora had over Justinian. With her he urged the earnest desire the empress had of seeing the council of Chalcedon condemned by Rome, and the Acephali admitted to the communion of that see; and both, he said, the restoration of Silverius would, to her great disappointment, absolutely render impracticable. But were Silverius removed out of the way, and no room left to apprehend the disturbances which he might otherwise raise, and undoubtedly would, on such an occasion, he bound himself by the most solemn promises, to gratify the empress, and readily comply with all her demands. He had several private conferences, on this subject, with Antonina, who was determined, at all events, to bring about what the empress so earnestly desired; and the result of those conferences was, that Silverius should be delivered up to Vigilius; and that Vigilius, the moment he had him in his power, should write letters of communion to the leading men among the Acephali, should approve their doctrine, should condemn the council of Chalcedon, with the letter of Leo, and anathematize, as heretics, all who received or approved either. Pursuant to this agreement, Belisarius, though well apprised of the wicked designs of Vigilius, was nevertheless prevailed upon by Antonina to deliver the unhappy Silverius into his hands, with full power to dispose of him as he should think fit.[1]

Vigilius, having now nothing to fear from his rival, wrote, without delay, the promised letter of communion to Theodosius of Alexandria, to Anthimus of Constantinople, and to Severus of Antioch, the chiefs of the Eutychian party, declaring, that his and their faith was one and the same. He begged they would take no notice of his having written to them, but keep his letter concealed from the public, and rather pretend to distrust him. This letter he delivered to Antonina, and with it a confession of faith, to be privately conveyed by her to the empress, and the above-mentioned chiefs of the Eutychian party. In that confession, he condemned the council of Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo, rejecting the doctrine of the two natures; and anathematized all who acknowledged more than one nature, and one essence, in Christ;[2] which was anathematizing, as Facundus observes,[3] the whole catholic church. Binius and Baronius, unwilling it should be said, that even a nominal pope only, for such was Vigilius at this time, had thus condemned the catholic, and confirm the opposite doctrine, allege several reasons to prove that letter to have been forged by the Eutychians, and fathered by them upon Vigilius. But that Vigilius was capable of writing such a letter, neither Baronius nor Binius will, I believe, deny: and that he did write it, is positively affirmed by

could two hundred pieces of gold be to Belisarius, who was possessed of immense wealth, and had the treasures of the whole empire at his command and disposal?

[1] Liberat. c. 22.

(*) Pelagius was a deacon of the Roman church, and, at this time, the pope's nuncio, or apocrisarius, at the court of Constantinople; but, to ingratiate himself with the empress, he had, by the blackest treachery, joined her against the pope himself, and was privy to all her attempts in favor of the Acephali; which, however, did not prevent his being afterwards raised to the papal dignity, as we shall see some years hence.

[1] Liberat. c. 22. Victor. Tun. post consulat. Basil. anno. 2. Facund. lib. contr. Mocian.

[2] Liberat. ibid. [3] Facund lib. contr. Mocian.

Silverius confined to an inhospitable island, where he dies, or is murdered. He is now honored as a martyr. Vigilius not chosen anew, after the death of Silverius.

the contemporary writers Liberatus, Victor Tunnunensis, and Facundus,[1] whom we may well suppose to have been better acquainted with what happened in their own times, than Baronius or Binius, who lived a thousand years after.

As for the unfortunate Silverius, the usurper of his see no sooner had him in his power, than he delivered him over to two of his satellites, styled by him the defenders of the church, who immediately conveyed him into the abandoned and inhospitable island of Palmaria;(*) and used him there in so cruel and barbarous a manner, that he died in a very short time. Liberatus supposes him to have died of hunger, the necessary food for the support of his life having been denied him by those whom Vigilius had appointed to guard him.[2] But Procopius seems to insinuate as if he had been murdered by a person devoted to Antonina, named Eugenius, and at her instigation: and Alemannus observes, that Liberatus wrote what he heard, but Procopius what he saw.[3] His death happened on the 20th of June of the present year, 538,[4] after he had governed the Roman church, according to Anastasius, who assigns to Vigilius the time that passed between the deposition of Silverius and his death, one year, five months, and eleven days.[5](†) He is now honored by the church of Rome as a martyr: and, indeed, not undeservedly, if his suffering for the faith of Chalcedon could entitle him to that honor. However, it is only in the martyrologies of the latter times that his name is to be found.

From the death of Silverius the Roman catholic writers date the episcopacy of Vigilius, reckoning him thenceforth among the lawful popes, or bishops of Rome; and in that they all agree, though at variance among themselves, and quite at a loss how to make good his title or right to that see. Baronius,[1] Binius,[2] and Ferrandus,[3] tell us, that, upon the death of Silverius, Vigilius resigned the dignity he had usurped, and would not resume it, being conscious to himself of the nullity of his former election, till he was elected anew. But of this resignation, and the new election, not the least notice is taken, nor so much as a distant hint given, by any of the contemporary writers; they only produce Anastasius, saying, that the see of Silverius was vacant six days;[4] which, they say, could not be while Silverius was alive; for he was lawful pope so long as he lived: therefore after his death Vigilius resigned, and was chosen anew. But Anastasius speaks there of the vacancy, that happened after "Silverius had sat one year, five months, and eleven days," and consequently of the vacancy that ensued upon his expulsion; for just that time passed, according to Anastasius, between his ordination and his expulsion; whereas two years and twelve days passed, according to the same writer, between his ordination and his death. For he was ordained, as the biliothecarian informs us, on the 8th of June 536, was driven from the see on the 18th of November 537, and died on the 20th of June 538. And truly, that his expulsion was followed by a vacancy of some days, is manifest both from Procopius and Liberatus; of whom the former, after acquainting us, that Belisarius sent Silverius, bishop of the city, into exile, adds, "And a short time after he preferred Vigilius to the pontificate, in his room."[5] And the latter writes, that Silverius being deposed, Belisarius, the next day, called together the presbyters, the deacons, and the clerks, and commanded them to chose another pope.[6] Vigilius was therefore, in all likelihood, chosen the very next day, the 19th of November, and ordained on the 22d of the same month, which in 537, fell on a Sunday, the day on which bishops, especially those of Rome, were then commonly ordained.(*) That Anastasius speaks

---

[1] Liberat. Vict. Facund. ubi supra.

(*) Palmaria, Pontia or Pontiæ, and Pandataria, now Palmeruolo, Ponza, and Ventotiene, are three uninhabited islands, lying in the Mediterranean, over against the coast of Old Latium. To some of them were confined, in the times of the Roman emperors, such persons as they wanted to put to death without noise. Thus was Nero, the son of Germanicus, confined by Tiberius to the island of Ponza; (*a*) and Julia, by her father Augustus, to that of Pandataria. (*b*) Many such instances occur in history; and the unhappy exiles were doomed generally speaking, to die of hunger.

(*a*) Suet. in Tiber. c. 54. (*b*) Tacit. Annal. l. 1. c. 53.

[2] Liberat. c. 22.

[3] Aleman. in not. ad Hist. Arcan. c. 1.

[4] Vide Anast. in Sil. Orderic. l. 2. Luitprand. et Pagi ad ann. 540. n. 2, 3. [5] Anast. ibid.

(†) Baronius prolongs the pontificate of Silverius to the 20th of June, 540, reckoning to him the whole time he survived his deposition, and supposing his death not to have happened till the 20th of June of that year. (*a*) This supposition he founds on the letter I have mentioned above, from Silverius to Vigilius, dated the 20th of June, 539. For if it was written then, says the Annalist, and Vigilius died on the 20th of June, his death could not happen till the 20th of June of the following year. But that letter I have shown above to be supposititious. It is said to have been written by Silverius, in an assembly, consisting of four bishops, during his confinement in the island of Palmaria; as if those, to whose custody he was committed, would have suffered him to assemble any number of bishops, or he could have assembled them, and anathematized Vigilius, without their knowledge. Besides, by the date of that letter, Silverius must have lived two years, and upwards, in the island of Palmaria, whereas both Liberatus and Procopius speak of his death as happening soon after his arrival at the place of his exile.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 540. p. 319.

[1] Bar ad ann. 540 p. 319. [2] Bin. in Vigil.

[3] Ferr. traité de l'Eglise. c. 3. [4] Anast. in Silver.

[5] Procop. Bell. Goth. l. 1 c. 25. [6] Liberat. c. 22.

(*) In the copy of Anastasius, which Baronius perused, the see is said to have been vacant six days; but five only, in the Louvre edition. And five days passed between the expulsion of Silverius on the 18th of November, and the ordination of Vigilius, on the 22d of the same month, if we include the day on which the one was expelled, and the other ordained, which is not at all foreign to the style of Anastasius. For that writer frequently reckons in the vacancy of the see the day on which the pope died, and that on which his successor was ordained; nay, he sometimes assigns the day of the pope's death, both to his pontificate, and to the vacancy of the see; and to both he assigns here the day of the expulsion of Silverius, who otherwise would have sat one year, five months, and not eleven, but ten days only.

The want of a canonical election cannot be supplied by the consent and reception of the people and clergy. The ordination of Vigilius null, as well as his election.

of this vacancy, is owned even by most of the Roman catholic writers, and, among the rest, by the two learned critics Papebroke[1] and Pagi,[2] who therefore reject the whole story of the resignation and new election of Vigilius, not only as a mere fable, or a dream, but as quite unnecessary; the want of a canonical election being sufficiently supplied, according to them, by the consent and reception of the people and clergy of Rome, nay, of the whole church, receiving and acknowledging Vigilius for lawful pope.

But, first, the consent of the people and clergy of Rome was not free, but extorted by force. They were apprised, that Balisarius, who, in compliance with the command of the empress, had deposed Silverius, to make room for Vigilius, would never suffer them to think of any other; and therefore acknowledged, or rather obeyed Vigilius, not only after, but before the decease of Silverius, when no one will say he was true pope. Now bishops, who were neither chosen by the clergy, nor desired by the people, but imposed upon both, by the oppression of men in power, are declared by several canons of the Latin church, and by pope Leo the Great, to be no bishops.[3] II. If he is true and lawful pope, who is received and acknowledged as such by the church, those apostates and monsters, as Genebrard styles them,[4] were true popes, who possessed the chair in the ninth and tenth centuries, when "filthy and impudent whores," to use the words of Baronius,[5] "governed all at Rome; when they intruded their lovers and gallants into the see of St. Peter, disposed of bishoprics, and changed sees at their pleasure." The popes, thus intruded, were received, obeyed, and respected, by the whole church, no otherwise, says Baronius, than St. Peter himself, no one giving himself the trouble of enquiring into the lawfulness of their election.[6] And yet the writers of those times speak of them as intruders, usurpers, adulterers, and wolves in sheeps clothing; and Baronius himself owns, that the church was then without a pope.[7] He adds, that nevertheless she was not without a head; Christ, her invisible head, preserving her, amidst so many dangers, with his assistance alone, agreeably to his promise, that he will be with her even unto the end of the world. If, pursuant to that promise, he preserved her with his assistance alone, when she had no pope, he would in like manner have preserved her, though she had never again had a pope. What occasion therefore can there be for a pope at all, or for any other head of the church, but Christ?

III. A secret heretic, an infidel, an athiest, may be acknowledged and received by the church as a true pope; and some have, if a very eminent writer of the church of Rome may be credited.(*) Now, if such a man were true pope, he would of course be infallible, and consequently would teach with certainty what he himself did not believe; would be the spiritual head of the church, and yet no member of the church. And what can be conceived more absurd, more repugnant to reason and common sense, than that a heretic, an infidel, an athiest, should be infallible; that one, in whom there is no truth, should guide the church into the truth?

IV. The ordination of Vigilius was null, as well as the election. For, not to mention other irregularities, he was ordained into a full see, that is, into a see legally possessed by another; and the ordination of a man into a full see was always looked upon by the catholic church as absolutely null, and the person thus ordained, as no bishop, no more than if he had never received ordination. This St. Cyprian chiefly urged against the ordination of Novatian, who caused himself to be ordained bishop of Rome, after Cornelius had been lawfully chosen and ordained into that see. "Cornelius," says St. Cyprian, "was made bishop by the testimony of the clergy, and the suffrages of the people, when no one had been ordained before him, and the episcopal chair was empty. Whoever, after that, pretends to be bishop, has not the ordination of the church, whatever he may boast, or assume to himself. There cannot be a second bishop after the first; and therefore whoever is made a bishop after the first, is not a second bishop, but no bishop at all."[1] As Novatian was ordained into the Roman see, while it was lawfully possessed by Cornelius, so was Vigilius while it was lawfully possessed by Silverius: if therefore the ordination of the former was, on that account, null, the ordination of the latter must, of course, be null too. That this was not the private opinion of St. Cyprian only, as some have pretended, but the received opinion, and standing rule, of the catholic church, may be proved by innumerable instances. Thus was Valens declared, by the bishops of Italy, to be no bishop, as was Majorinus, the father of the Donatists, by those of Africa, for no other reason but because they had both been ordained into full sees; Valens into the see of Petavio, while Marcus, the lawful bishop, was still living; and Majorinus into that of Carthage, when it was legally filled by Cæci-

[1] Papebr. Propyl. ad. mens. Maium, in Vigil. Dissert. 13. [2] Pagi ad ann. 540. n. 4.
[3] Concil. Aurelian. 5. can. 11. Concil. Cabillon. 1. can. 10. Leo, ep. 92. ad Rustic. Narbon.
[4] Genebr. chron. ad ann. 901.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 908. [6] Idem ad ann. 892.
[7] Idem ad ann. 908.

(*) The most noble Picus of Mirandula, whose words I shall here transcribe: "We remember, says he, another ordained, and received for true pope, who, in the opinion of good men, neither was, nor could be, true pope, as he believed no God, and exceeded the utmost pitch of infidelity. It is affirmed he confessed, to some of his domestics, that he believed no God, even when he sat in the papal chair. And I have heard of another pope, who owned to one of his intimates, that he did not believe the immortality of the soul." (a)
(a) Picus Theor. 4.
[1] Cypr. ep. 52. al. 55. ad Anton.

Vigilius neither pope nor bishop. Whether an article of faith to believe, that every particular pope is a lawful pope. Whether a pope, who is not a true, be infallible.

lian.[1] The fathers of the council of Nice, for the same reason, pronounced all, whom Meletius of Lycopolis had ordained, in Egypt, for sees, that were not vacant at the time of their ordination, to be no bishops; and, at the same time, issued a decree, commanding them to be re-ordained before they were admitted to serve as bishops in the catholic church.[2] In like manner the fathers of the second oecumenical council, that of Constantinople, would not admit of the ordination of Maximus the cynic,[3] though he had been ordained by seven bishops, but unanimously declared, that he was no bishop, notwithstanding his theatrical and mock ordination; that he never should be a bishop; that the clerks, ordained by him, should in no degree whatever be received as true clerks, all that had been done to him, or by him, being absolutely void and null, "because he had intruded himself into a see, that of Constantinople, legally filled by another, by Nectarius."[4] I shall add but one instance more, that of the famous Timotheus Ælurus,[5] whose cause was the very same with that of Vigilius: for both usurped the sees of lawful bishops, and both were accessory to the death of the bishops, whose sees they usurped. Now the catholic bishops, who were consulted by the emperor Leo about the ordination of Ælurus (and, by a circular letter, he consulted all within the empire), agreed to a man in this; namely: That if Ælurus was guilty of the crimes laid to his charge, that is, if he had driven out the lawful bishop, to make room for himself, or was any ways concerned in his death, he neither was, nor ever could be, a bishop.[6] It is therefore, upon the whole, as plain, I think, as words and authorities can make it, that, according to the rules and discipline of the ancient church, a person ordained into a see legally possessed by another, was no bishop; and consequently that Vigilius, who was thus ordained, as we have seen, was no bishop. Hence it follows, first, that in Vigilius was evidently interrupted the so much boasted succession of the bishops of Rome: and, secondly, what is of far greater moment, that as he was no bishop, he could have no episcopal power or authority; and consequently, that the forty-six presbyters, and eighty-one bishops, whom he is said to have ordained, during his long pontificate, were, in truth, neither presbyters nor bishops. And who can say, that the present pope does not derive his ordination and authority from some of them? It is not, at least, certain that he does not; and consequently it is not certain, that he is a true bishop, and true pope. For no divine of the church of Rome will allow one to be true pope, who is no bishop, nor one, who has not been duly ordained, to be a true bishop, though he were received and acknowledged as such by the whole Christian world. Now, if it is not certain, that the present pope (and the same argument may be urged against any other) is a true bishop, and true pope, how can his definitions be certainly believed? Can a man certainly believe even what is contained in any of the books of scripture, unless he first certainly believes such books to be canonical? or so long as he doubts whether they be apocryphal or canonical?

This is a knotty point, and has reduced the popish divines to the greatest straits. To solve it, they take different ways. Suarez, Valentia, Arriaga, Raynaudus, Caspensis, Martinonus, and Rhodius, all divines of great note, maintain it can never happen, that an unlawful pope should possess the chair; and that it is an article of faith to believe every particular pope lawful. If that is not an article of faith, say they, and very justly, no faith can be founded on their decrees.[1] But, on the other hand, how can that be an article of faith, which so many instances, and that of Vigilius among the rest, evidently prove to be false? He possessed the chair eighteen years; was owned as lawful pope by the fifth general council, and the whole Christian world; and yet, that he was no lawful pope, has been evidently shown. Formosus held the chair five years and upwards; was by all received and obeyed as true pope; and nevertheless Stephen VII. declared, that he never was lawful pope; nay, that he was not even a bishop; and accordingly reordained all whom he had ordained. If it is therefore an article of faith, that every particular pope is a lawful pope; Stephen erred in faith, when he declared Formosus to have been no lawful one. Nicolas II. and Julius II. declared all elections, in which any kind of simony intervened, to be, ipso facto, null, and the person simoniacally elected, to be no pope, but an apostate, a thief, a robber, an heresiarch, a magician, a heathen, and a publican.[2] Hence it cannot be an article of faith, with respect to any particular pope, that he is true pope, and not a thief, a robber, an apostate, &c. unless it be likewise one that no kind of simony intervened in his election: and that no man can certainly know, and consequently no man can believe as an article of faith.

Others, aware of these difficulties, maintain, that it matters little whether he, who possesses the chair, be true pope or no; since his definitions and decrees will be no less infallible, if he is universally received as a true pope, than if he really were a true pope. "We affirm," says Duvall, "that a pope, esteemed for true, can never err; for God will not permit him to err, lest falsehood should be obtruded upon the church for truth."[3] But

[1] Concil. Aquilei. in ep. Synod. Concil. t. 2. p. 995. et Optat. l. 1. p. 42.
[2] Sacrat. l. 1. c. 9. Theodor. l. 1. c. 9.
[3] See p. 102.
[4] Concil. Constantin. can. 4. [5] See p. 234.
[6] Epist. Synod. ad Leon. Imper. ad calcem Concil. Chalced. part. 3. c. 38. et 55.

[1] Suarez de fide, disput. 10. sect. 5. Mart. de fide, disput. 5. sect. 6.
[2] Plat. in Nic. II. et Jul. II. apud Regnaud. p. 192.
[3] Duvall de potest. Pont. part 2. quæst. 5.

Vigilius answers a letter, from Profuturus of Braga, to Silverius. He writes to Theodebert, king of Austrasia, and to Cæsarius of Arles. The emperor congratulates Vigilius on his promotion;—[Year of Christ, 539.] The pope, in his letter to the emperor, confesses the faith, which he had anathematized in his letter to the empress. Some monks of Palestine apply to the pope's nuncio, and to Mennas, for the condemning of Origen; [Year of Christ, 541.]

this answer is liable, as Suarez well observes,[1] to the very difficulties which it is brought to solve. For, as it is not certain, that every particular pope is a true pope, neither is it certain, that an unlawful pope enjoys the privilege of infallibility: nay, the greatest divines of the church of Rome are of opinion, that he does not: "That prerogative," says Martinonus, "being granted to none but a true pope, to whom alone it was promised in Peter."[2] As it is not therefore certain, that any pope in particular is a lawful pope; nor is it certain, that an unlawful pope enjoys the privilege of infallibility; it evidently follows, that no faith can be founded on the definitions and decrees of any pope whatever; and consequently that their pretended infallibility can be of no kind of use or advantage to the church.

And now, to resume the thread of the history, and return to Vigilius. A few days after the death of Silverius, he answered a letter from Profuturus, bishop of Braga in Lusitania, to that pope, concerning certain points, which occasioned some disagreement among the bishops in those parts. Vigilius, in his answer, dated the 29th of June, 538, condemns those who abstain from certain meats, thinking them forbidden, or evil in themselves, as if they proceeded from an evil principle; which was the doctrine of the Manichees. II. He separates from his communion all who sung or used the lesser doxology, thus: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son Holy Ghost," since they could for no other reason suppress the conjunction, but because they believed the Son and the Holy Ghost to be one and the same person. III. He commands those who had been rebaptized by the Arians, or the Priscillianists, to be received, on their return to the church, by the imposition of hands used in the reconciliation of penitents, and not by the invocation of the Holy Ghost. Lastly, he declares, that there is no occasion to consecrate a church built on the foundations of one that had been consecrated.[3]

About the same time Vigilius, being consulted by Theodebert, king of Austrasia, about the penance that ought to be imposed upon a man who had married his brother's widow, wrote two letters on that occasion, the one to the king, and the other to Cæsarius of Arles. He exaggerates in both the enormity of the crime, which, he says, connot be expiated but by a long penance. However, he leaves it in the power of Cæsarius, who, as he was upon the spot, could better judge of the compunction of the penitent, to shorten or lengthen the time, as he should think proper; but he requires those, who were thus married, to be immediately parted.[1](*) Baronius supposes Theodebert to be the person who had married his brother's widow.[2] But it is certain, that Theodebert never had a brother.

In the mean time the emperor Justinian, hearing that Silverius was dead, and Vigilius was chosen in his room, but kept by Theodora quite in the dark, with respect to the circumstances attending the death of the one, and the election of the other, despatched to Rome the patrician Dominicus, to congratulate the new pope on his promotion, and, at the same time, to assure his holiness that he held, and ever would hold, the faith which had been established by the four general councils, and was contained in the letters of Leo. On this occasion Vigilius wrote a long letter to the emperor, commending his piety, approving his faith, and solemnly declaring that he himself professed the same faith, and had never professed any other. He had even the assurance to tell the emperor, that he defied his most inveterate enemies to charge him with having ever done or attempted any thing that was not entirely agreeable to the decrees of the œcumenical councils, and the constitutions of the apostolic see.[3] He wrote, at the same time, to the patriarch Mennas, commending him for the zeal he exerted in defence of the doctrine of Chalcedon, which he himself had lately condemned; and anathematizing, as detestable heretics, those whom not long before he had admitted to his communion, as united with him in one and the same faith.[4]

The following year, 540, nothing happened worthy of notice. But the year 541, is remarkable for the disturbances that began then, and produced, in the end, the fifth general

[1] Suar. de fide, disput. 10. sect. 6.
[2] Martin. de fide, disput. 9. sect. 6.
[3] Vigil. ep. 1. t. 5. Concil. p. 3111.

[1] Vigil. ep. 3. t. 5. Concil. p. 314.

(*) The marrying of a brother's widow was forbidden by the emperor Constantius, and the children of those, who were thus married, declared spurious and illegitimate. (*a*) That law was confirmed by Theodosius the younger; (*b*) and by the canons of the church such marriages were condemned as incestuous, and the contracting parties obliged to undergo public penance. Thus the council of Neocæsarea orders the woman, who marries two brothers, to remain excommunicated till she is thought to be at the point of death; and even then to be admitted to the sacrament, only upon condition, that she dissolves her marriage, and submits to a public penance, if she recovers. (*c*) St. Basil argues strongly against such marriages as incestuous and null, in an epistle to Diodorus Tarsensis, under whose name was forged a treatise in defence of them. (*d*) These laws and canons are all founded on the prohibition in Leviticus, "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife;" (*e*) and, "if a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing." (*f*) But that uncleanness the pope can now wipe off, in virtue of his dispensing power; and such marriages, though for many ages deemed incestuous and null, by the whole church, and the popes themselves, are now looked upon in that light, when contracted without a dispensation, which his holiness refuses to none, who are able to purchase it.

(*a*) Cod. Theod. l. 3. tit. 12. de incest. nup. leg. 2.
(*b*) Ibid. l. 4.
(*c*) Concil. Neocæsar. can. 2.
(*d*) Basil. ep. 197. (*e*) Levit. 18: 16. (*f*) Ibid 20: 21.

[2] Bar. ad ann. 538. p. 299.
[3] Vigil. ep. 4. [4] Idem, ep. 5.

Origen is condemned by the emperor, together with his doctrine. The particular propositions which were condemned. He orders all the patriarchs, and the pope himself, to receive his edict or constitution. The emperor resolves to proceed in the same manner against the Acephali;—[Year of Christ, 542;]—but is diverted from it by Theodorus of Cæsarea, and advised to condemn certain writings.

council. They began on the following occasion: some monks of Palestine, offended at certain propositions contained in the works of Origen, applied to Pelagius, the pope's apocrisarius or nuncio at the court of Constantinople, and likewise to Mennas, the patriarch, begging they would cause the works of that writer to be condemned, together with his memory, that people, looking upon him as a condemned heretic, might be thenceforth deterred from perusing his writings, or at least be on their guard when they perused them. This Pelagius and Mennas readily undertook, chiefly with a view, as Liberatus informs us,[1] to confound the Acephali, who were all great admirers of Origen, thinking he favored their doctrine, and, at the same time, avowed enemies to Mennas, and the other friends of Rome. As for the errors of Origen, they had been condemned long before, and with them Origen himself;[2] so that there could be no occasion to condemn them anew. However, Mennas and Pelagius having presented a memorial to Justinian, containing some of the most remarkable errors ascribed to Origen, the emperor, who embraced with great joy every opportunity of interfering in ecclesiastical matters, immediately issued, at their request, an edict or decree, condemning those errors, and together with them, Origen himself, and all who should presume to defend either him, or his wicked, blasphemous, and execrable doctrine. No pope, no council, could have defined, decided, and even anathematized, with more authority than the emperor assumes in that edict. The errors, which he condemns, and strives to confute from the scripture and the fathers, are, I. That, in the Trinity, the Father is greater than the Son, and the Son than the Holy Ghost. II. That the souls of men existed before the bodies, and were confined to the bodies by way of punishment for the sins they had committed while separated from them. III. That the soul of Christ existed, like other souls, and was united to the Word before the incarnation. IV. That the heavens, the sun, the moon, and the other stars, are all animated, nay, and endued with a rational soul. V. That, after the resurrection, all human bodies will be of a round figure. VI. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that as Christ has been crucified in this world to save mankind, so he is to be crucified in the next to save the devils. Each of these opinions Justinian undertakes to confute; and, to do him justice, he shows himself therein thoroughly acquainted with the doctrine of the church and the fathers, and well worthy of the high commendations which the contemporary writers have all bestowed on him as a divine. He paints Origen as a profane, heathenish, wicked, and blasphemous writer, as the first author of all heresies, as the common father of all heretics, as one who attempted to ingraft the Christian religion on the fables and dreams of the pagans. The edict he addressed to Mennas, "the most holy and most blessed archbishop of Constantinople, and patriarch;" and ends it with commanding him to assemble forthwith all the bishops, who were then at Constantinople, and the heads of the monasteries, to anathematize, jointly with them, Origen, his doctrine, and his followers, and to suffer no bishop to be thenceforth ordained, nor abbot appointed, within the limits of his jurisdiction, who had not first publicly received, without restriction or limitation, the present constitution.[1] The patriarchs were all strictly enjoined to receive it; and for that purpose duplicates of it were sent, by the emperor's order, to those of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and likewise to "the most holy and most blessed pope and patriarch of Old Rome, Vigilius." For the emperor required the pope to receive it, as well as the other patriarchs; which, in truth, was dictating to him, in matters of faith, as well as to the other patriarchs.

Origen and his followers being thus condemned, Justinian, out of his great zeal for the unity of the faith, for the peace and tranquillity of the church, resolved to proceed in the same manner against the Acephali; and oblige all patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops, and ecclesiastics in his dominions, publicly to anathematize the tenets of that sect, and publicly receive the decree of Chalcedon, establishing two natures in Christ, on pain of forfeiting their sees, and every other preferment they enjoyed in the church. To ward that blow, and, at the same time, to be revenged on Pelagius, on Mennas, and on the other sticklers for the council of Chalcedon, who had advised the emperor to condemn Origen, Theodorus, metropolitan of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who held that writer in great veneration, and was in his heart a zealous Eutychian, represented to Justinian, that the edict, which he designed to issue against the Acephali, would, in all likelihood, be attended with great disturbances, whereas he could assure him, that the Eutychians were all to a man disposed to receive the council of Chalcedon, upon certain terms which none could scruple to grant, who had the least spark of zeal for the unity of the faith, and the peace of the church. The terms, which, he said, they required, were, first, That Theodorus of Mopsuestia, whom he styled the master of Nestorius, should be anathematized, together with his writings. 2dly, That the books which Theodoret of Cyrus had published against St. Cyril, should be condemned. And, 3dly, That the letter should be condemned, which Ibas of Odessa had written

[1] Liberat. c. 23.

[2] See p. 310, et seq.

[1] Apud Bar. ann. 538. p. 300—312.

What those writings were which the emperor was advised to condemn. The design of Theodorus in advising him to condemn them. Justinian condemns them under the name of the "three chapters;" enjoins all patriarchs to receive his edict condemning them. The "three chapters" condemned by almost all the eastern bishops. The imperial edict is opposed by the western bishops.

to one Maris, a Persian, concerning the council of Ephesus, and condemnation of Nestorius. These writings, said Theodorus, give great offence to the Acephali; and their imagining them to have been approved by the council of Chalcedon, is what alone restrains them from receiving that council.

In the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, who was raised to that see in 394, were several expressions that seemed to favor the doctrine of Nestorius. But, as he wrote before that doctrine was condemned by the council of Ephesus, the council of Chalcedon would not condemn him as a heretic, the rather, as in other passages he seemed to acknowledge one person and two natures in Christ. Theodoret was employed by John of Antioch, his patriarch, to confute the impious doctrines of Cyril, as the patriarch styled them;[1] and the council of Chalcedon, satisfied with his condemning the tenets of Nestorius, did not oblige him to retract or condemn what he wrote on that occasion. Ibas succeeded Rabulas in the see of Edessa, about the year 430. While he was yet presbyter of that church, he wrote to one Maris, a Persian, and perhaps a bishop, in that neighborhood, acquainting him with the quarrel between Cyril and Nestorius, and the condemnation of the latter. In his letter he charged the fathers of Ephesus with rashness and precipitation, in giving sentence against Nestorius; found great fault with the doctrine, and more with the conduct of Cyril on that occasion; and reflecting, in the sharpest terms, on Rabulas, who had not long before anathematized Theodorus of Mopsuestia, as the first author of the Nestorian heresy, bestowed, in opposition to him, the highest encomiums on that writer. This letter was read in the council of Chalcedon; and some of the fathers of that assembly, upon hearing it, and finding Ibas there acknowledged one person and two natures in Christ, declared his faith to be entirely orthodox, without censuring the commendations he bestowed on the bishop of Mopsuestia, or requiring him to retract what he had written against Cyril and Rabulas.[2]

As none of these writers had been condemned, nor their writings censured, by the council of Chalcedon, to censure or condemn them afterwards, was, in some degree, censuring and condemning that council: and that the metropolitan of Cæsarea had in view, in engaging the emperor to condemn them. For Justinian readily fell in with the proposal, being fully satisfied, that he should thereby gain over the Acephali, as had been suggested by Theodorus, and not aware, says Liberatus,[3] of the views of the party, nor sufficiently on his guard against the craft and wiles of designing men. An edict was therefore immediately issued, condemning as "heretical," as "impious," "wicked," and "blasphemous," the three above-mentioned pieces, which became afterwards so famous under the name of "The Three Chapters," a name, says Liberatus,[1] for our sins, but too well known. The edict was entitled, "The emperor Justinian's confession of faith, addressed to the assembly of the catholic and apostolic church." It contains an exposition at large of the catholic faith, which the emperor proposes to the whole world, in order to unite all Christians in one belief. He begins with explaining the catholic faith concerning the Trinity; then passes to the mystery of the incarnation; and, having anathematized the various errors concerning that mystery, and those who broached or maintained them, namely, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and Eutyches, he adds to his other anathemas one against Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and his writings; another against the books which Theodoret wrote against Cyril; and the third against the letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian. He pretends that the writings which he condemns, were all condemned before by the council of Chalcedon; which was certainly false. Not satisfied with condemning the letter of Ibas, he anathematizes all who should maintain it, or any part of it, to be orthodox, which, in the opinion of Facundus, was evidently contradicting the council of Chalcedon, since the fathers of that assembly had, according to him, from that very letter, concluded the faith of Ibas to be orthodox.[2]

This edict alarmed the orthodox party, and much more the positive order sent by the emperor to all the patriarchs, enjoining them to receive it. Mennas of Constantinople, Zoilus of Alexandria, Ephrem of Antioch, and Peter of Jerusalem, remonstrated against it in the strongest terms, as highly injurious to the council of Chalcedon, and suggested by the Acephali with no other view, but to derogate from the authority of that council. But, finding the emperor would hearken to no remonstrances, they complied in the end, and chose rather to sign the edict, however injurious to the council of Chalcedon, than to forfeit their sees, and be driven into exile; for the emperor threatened with deposition and exile all, without distinction, who did not receive it. The example of the patriarchs was followed by the far greater part of their suffragans: so that the edict was, in a very short time, received, and the "three chapters" condemned, by almost all the bishops in the east. But in the west it met with no less vigorous than general opposition. Vigilius, and the other bishops of Italy, as well as those of Gaul and Africa, all declared unanimously against it, as evidently striking at what they called the very foundation of the catholic faith, the

[1] See p. 177. [2] Concil. t. 4. p. 680. Facund. l. 6. c. 1, 2.
[3] Liberat. in Breviar. prope fin.

[1] Liberat. in Breviar. prope fin.
[2] Facund. pro desens. cap. l. 1.

The pope ordered to repair to Constantinople. The bibliothecarian's account of his departure from Rome. He sends from Sicily a supply of corn to Rome, which is intercepted by the enemy;—[Year of Christ, 545.] He learns in Sicily, that a council had been held at Constantinople, and the "three chapters" had been condemned by it without him; but is prevailed upon by the emperor to pursue his journey. Arrives at Constantinople. He declares against the imperial edict, and excludes from his communion all who received it.

authority of councils. This opposition the emperor ascribed chiefly to Vigilius; and therefore sent him a preremptory order to repair, without delay, to Constantinople, not doubting but, having him once in his power, he should be able to prevail upon him, by some means or other, by force or persuasions, by threats or by promises, to acquiesce in the edict; which, he thought, would put an end to all opposition in the west. In compliance with this order, the pope set out for Constantinople, in the latter end of the present year, much against his will, says Victor Tununensis, foreseeing the storm that threatened him, and apprehending the displeasure of the emperor, if he did not yield, and the reproaches of the western bishops, if he did.

The bibliothecarian writes, that, at his departure, the Roman people, highly incensed against him on account of the death of Silverius, and his unheard-of cruelty, (for he charges him with having killed his own secretary in a transport of passion, and having caused his own sister's son to be whipped to death), pursued him with curses, and showers of stones, to the Tiber, where he embarked, crying out, "Hunger and pestilence go with thee! Evil hast thou done to us, and may evil overtake thee wherever thou art!"[1] But the authority of Anastasius is not to be relied on; for he tells us in the same place, that the empress, to be revenged on Vigilius for not communicating with the Acephali, agreeably to his promise, despatched one Anthimus with orders to apprehend him, and bring him prisoner to Constantinople; that he was accordingly seized in the church of St. Cæcilia, and, being put on board a vessel that lay in the Tiber, conveyed straight into the east. But Procopius,[2] Victor Tununensis,[3] and Facundus,[4] who lived at that very time, ascribe his journey to a positive order he received from the emperor.

As Rome was then closely besieged by the brave Totila king of the Goths, and reduced to great straits for want of provisions, the pope, in his way to Constantinople, landed in Sicily, with a design to send from thence a supply of corn to the distressed city. He sent accordingly a great number of vessels, laden with corn; but unluckily they fell all into the enemy's hands, and, with them, Valentinus, bishop of Silva Candida, now Santa Ruffina, in Tuscany, whom Vigilius had appointed to govern the Roman church in his absence, with the character of his vicar. The bishop was immediately carried to the king, who, having narrowly examined him, and found him in several instances inconsistent with himself, ordered both his hands to be cut off.[5]

[1] Anast. in Vigil.
[2] Procop. bell. Goth. l. 3. c. 15.
[3] Vict. Tun. ad ann. 544. [4] Facund. l. 4. c. 3.
[5] Procop. bel. Goth. l. 3. c. 15.

While Vigilius was still in Sicily, he received advice from Stephen, who had succeeded Pelagius with the character of nuncio from the apostolic see to the court of Constantinople, that a council had been held there, and the "three chapters" condemned by almost all the bishops, who were present. As it was to assist in person at a council, in which the subject of the dispute concerning the "three chapters" was, as the emperor pretended, to be impartially examined, that the pope had been summoned into the east, he was no less surprised than provoked to hear, that the council had met, and taken such a step, without his concurrence, or even his knowledge. Upon the first notice, therefore, of what had passed, he wrote to the emperor, begging, that whatever had been done in his absence, might be declared null; and at the same time to Mennas, who had presided at the council, and signed the imperial edict against the "three chapters," threatening to cut him off from his communion, if he did not withdraw his subscription. The emperor, in answer to his letter, assured the pope, that he had nothing in view but the purity of the faith, and the peace of the church; that, as to the affair of the "three chapters," he did not at all question, but were his holiness present, it would, by his means, be settled to the entire satisfaction of both parties; and therefore earnestly entreated him to pursue, without farther delays, his journey to the imperial city, where he had been long expected by a great number of holy bishops, and himself, all ready to concur with him in such measures, as should be judged the most proper to put an end to the present, and prevent all future disputes.

The pope, encouraged by the kind expressions the emperor used in his letter, set out from Sicily in the latter end of the year 546, and, arriving at Constantinople on the 25th of January, 547, was there received with uncommon marks of respect and esteem, both by Justinian and Theodora, flattering themselves, says Theophanes, that he might thus be gained over to their measures. But he had yet been but a few days in Constantinople, when he not only declared against the imperial edict condemning the "three chapters," as evidently derogating from the authority of the great council of Chalcedon, but excluded from his communion Mennas, and, with him, all the bishops who had signed or received it. This conduct in the pope obliged the emperor to change his. Having therefore sent for Vigilius to the imperial palace, and there, in a private conference, attempted, but in vain, to convince him, that the condemnation of the "three chapters" was no ways derogatory to the authority of the council of Chalcedon, he told him at last, in plain terms, that, since the impious doctrine of Nestorius was evidently

The pope yields to the menaces of the emperor; and condemns the "three chapters" in a council of seventy bishops, by a solemn decree styled judicatum;—[Year of Christ, 548.] What regard paid to that decree in the west. Condemned by the bishops of Illyricum. Vigilius excommunicated by the African bishops;—[Year of Christ, 550.] His own ecclesiastics separate themselves from his communion. Vigilius repents what he had done.

contained in the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret, and Ibas, he must either join the other patriarchs, who had all condemned them, or lay aside all thoughts of ever returning to Rome or Italy, where his presence would only serve to increase and maintain the misunderstanding that began to prevail between the east and the west. Of this violence the pope loudly complained, as more becoming a Dioclesian than a Christian prince; and at the same time let the emperor know, that though he might dispose of his person as he thought fit, his authority was not capable of restraint or control; and that no force or violence should ever induce him to prostitute that authority to the wicked views and designs of those, who were alike enemies to the council of Chalcedon, and the catholic faith. But the resolution and firmness, shown by Vigilius on this occasion, soon forsook him; and a few months after, the desire he had of returning to Rome prevailing over the regard he pretended to have for the council of Chalcedon, and the catholic faith, he not only readmitted to his communion the bishops who had signed the imperial edict, but, the following year, seeing nothing would satisfy the emperor but a solemn condemnation of the "three chapters," he solemnly condemned them in a council consisting of seventy bishops, assembled for that purpose in Constantinople. It was on that occasion he issued the famous decree styled "judicatum," containing the condemnation of the above-mentioned articles, and with it, a solemn declaration, that he did not thereby intend to derogate in the least from the authority of the council of Chalcedon, though he had till then maintained the condemnation of those articles to be evidently derogatory to the authority of that council.

The judicatum was a definitive sentence pronounced by the pope in a council, and approved by the far greater part of the bishops, who composed that assembly. And yet, of the many bishops in the west, who stood up in defence of the "three chapters" condemned there by the pope, not one acquiesced in that sentence, but all declared loudly against it; nay, Facundus, of Hermiana in Africa, who was then at Constantinople, taxed the pope, to his face, with perfidiousness, venality, and prevarication, with favoring the Acephali, and betraying underhand the catholic cause.[1] The bishops of Illyricum not only condemned the judicatum, in a very numerous synod assembled to examine that decree; but deposed Benenatus, metropolitan of Justiniana Prima, for pretending to defend it in opposition to the rest of his brethren.[2] The African bishops went still farther: for they, not satisfied with rejecting the judicatum, in a full council, as tending to establish the Eutychian heresy on the ruins of the catholic faith, separated themselves, with one consent, from the communion of the pope, nay, and declared him unworthy of the catholic communion, unless, returning to himself, he repented, and repaired, so far as in him lay, the mischief he had done.[1] Vigilius was, on this occasion, abandoned, and warmly opposed, even by some of his own ecclesiastics, whom he had brought with him in his retinue to Constantinople, namely, by the two deacons Rusticus and Sebastianus, by several subdeacons, by the defenders of the Roman church, and by his own secretary and notaries. These, separating themselves, with the two deacons at their head, from the communion of their bishop, wrote letters, in justification of their conduct, to their friends and correspondents in the different provinces of the west, especially in Italy, Gaul, and Africa, acquainting them with the fall, prevarication, and, as they styled it, apostacy, of Vigilius. At the same time the deacon Rusticus, who is said to have been one of the most learned men of the Roman church, published a treatise in defence of the "three chapters," filled with most bitter reflections on Vigilius, whom he painted there as a secret friend to the Acephali, as an enemy to the council of Chalcedon, as one who was ready to sacrifice both the church, and the faith, to the will of the emperor.[2]

The pope alarmed at so general an opposition, began to repent what he had done; and even to entertain some thoughts of revoking the judicatum, which had given so great offence to his colleagues in the west. But the emperor on the other hand was unalterably bent on the condemnation of the "three chapters;" had even written in defence of the judicatum, against the bishops of Africa and Illyricum; and had sent those among them into exile, who had distinguished themselves the most by their warmth in opposing it. Vigilius, therefore, not doubting but he should meet with the like, if not a more severe treatment, were he to revoke a decree, which the emperor seemed determined, at all events, to maintain, continued thundering anathemas against all who did not receive it; though he was, at this very time, firmly resolved, in his own mind, to revoke it, and only waited for a favorable opportunity of executing, without danger, the resolution he had taken. To his anathemas the bishops of the opposite party paid no kind of regard; but, retorting them upon him, separated themselves from his communion, and from the communion of all who did not anathematize both his judicatum and him. Thus was the whole church rent, to use the expression of Justinian, from east to west; the decree of the pope, which the emperor had flattered himself would have put an

[1] Facund. contr. Mocian. [2] Vict. Tunun. ad ann. 549.

[1] Vict. Tun. ad. ann. 550. [2] Concil. l. 1. n. 25. p. 1228.

Vigilius overreaches the emperor, and gets his judicatum revoked. A general council assembled by the emperor, at the request of the pope;—[Year of Christ, 551.] The western bishops decline assisting at the council; and likewise the pope. Justinian, by a new edict, condemns the "three chapters." His edict opposed by the pope, and the western bishops.

end to the dispute, serving only to increase the animosities that prevailed before, and render the two parties more averse to each other, and more irreconcilable. This Vigilius himself, who wanted only a plausible pretence to recall his decree, represented to the emperor in the strongest terms, adding, that, since the judicatum had been issued without the consent and approbation, and even without the knowledge, of the western bishops, they were not, after all, so greatly to blame for not receiving it; but, were the "three chapters" condemned in a general council, none would dare to oppose the sentence and judgment of such an assembly. He therefore advised the emperor to assemble one, as the only means of composing the present unhappy divisions, to summon the western bishops to it, especially those of Africa and Illyricum; and in the mean time, lest they should think themselves only summoned to approve or condemn what was already approved or condemned, to leave matters in the condition they were in before the imperial edict, and the judicatum, were published. The emperor, not suspecting in the least the sincerity of Vigilius, consented to the proposal as soon as it was offered; and it was agreed, that no regard should be had to any former determination concerning the points in dispute, but that the whole should be referred to the decision of a council, at which the western bishops should be present, those especially of Africa and Illyricum, who had signalized themselves above the rest in the defence of the "three chapters." The pope was well apprised, that the western bishops would not be easily prevailed upon to assist at a council held in Constantinople, where they could not but know, that they should be obliged in the end to submit to the will of the emperor; and, it was only to gain time, and for the sake of a pretence to get the judicatum, in the mean while, revoked, that he proposed the assembling of a council, at which the bishops both of the east and west should assist. Of this Justinian was not aware, and therefore, acquiescing in the proposal of Vigilius, summoned the bishops in the different provinces of the empire to meet, without delay, at Constantinople, and there determine, by their unbiassed suffrages, the present dispute. The eastern bishops met at the appointed time, and, with them some from Italy, but two only from Africa, and not one from Illyricum. The emperor waited some time, with great impatience, the arrival of other bishops from the west; but, finding they declined, under various pretences, complying with his summons, and at the same time apprehending he had been over-reached by the pope, in agreeing to refer the decision of the controversy to the judgment of a council, at which the bishops of Africa and Illyricum should be present, ordered those, who were then at Constantinople, and Vigilius among the rest, to assemble without them. This occasioned a warm dispute between the pope and the emperor, the pope pretending, that, by the terms of the agreement, the council was not to meet till the arrival of the western bishops; and the emperor, that he had fulfilled the agreement by summoning them to the council; that, since they had not thought fit to obey that summons, it was not reasonable, that those, who had, should be kept any longer at a distance from their sees. The pope declared, that, since the number of western bishops at Constantinople was yet so very inconsiderable, he would neither assist at the council, till others arrived, nor receive the decisions of such an assembly as the decisions of a council. His thus refusing to assist at the council without the western bishops, when he knew they could not be prevailed upon to come to it, convinced the emperor, that he designed to change sides, and that he only wanted to gain time, and had, with that view, proposed the assembling of a general council. Justinian therefore, not thinking himself bound to wait the decision of a council, pursuant to the late agreement between him and the pope, issued a new edict, and caused it to be set up in the great church, and other public places of the imperial city, condemning the "three chapters" in the strongest terms, and anathematizing all, without distinction, who should thenceforth presume to defend them. Against this edict Vigilius loudly exclaimed, as an open violation of the late agreement, as highly injurious to the authority of the apostolic see, and of the ecclesiastical order in general, to whom alone it belonged, as he pretended, to define and decide in all matters of faith and religion. Having therefore assembled both the Latin and Greek bishops, who were then at Constantinople, in the palace of Placidia, where he lodged during his stay in that city, he there solemnly protested, in their presence, against the imperial edict; earnestly entreated them to use what interest they had with the emperor to get it revoked, or, at least, suspended till the meeting of the council; and, lastly, exerting "the authority of St. Peter vested in him," declared all, who should sign, receive, or any ways approve it, suspended, the moment they did so, from the communion of the prime apostle, and that of his see. At the same time Dacius of Milan, who was present at that meeting, after inveighing with great warmth and liberty against the edict, as calculated to shake the very foundation of the catholic faith, the authority of oecumenical councils [as if the catholic faith had no better foundation], let his colleagues know, with great noise and bawling, "magna vociferatione," that they must either condemn and reject that edict, or renounce his communion, and not his only, but that of all their brethren in Gaul, Burgundy, Spain, Liguria, Æmilia, and Venetia.[1]

[1] Vigil. ep. Encyc. & Cler. Ital. ad legat. Childeb.

The pope flies to a sanctuary. The emperor orders him to be taken from thence; but he is rescued by the populace. A solemn deputation sent him by the emperor. He is prevailed upon to quit his asylum.

Of the many eastern bishops who were present, not one joined the pope but Zoilus of Alexandria, who was thereupon deposed the same day by an order from the emperor. As for Vigilius, he privately withdrew, as soon as the assembly broke up, from the palace of Placidia, and, with Dacius of Milan, took refuge in the church of St. Peter. But the emperor was too much provoked to pay any regard to the sacredness of the place; and therefore ordered the prætor, whose province it was to apprehend thieves, robbers, murderers, and such like criminals, to seize on Vigilius even in the church, and drag him, as a common malefactor, from the altar itself, should he there take sanctuary, to the public gaol. In compliance with this order, the prætor entered the church at the head of a numerous band of his own men, supported by a body of regular troops, to awe the populace, and prevent the disturbances they might raise on such an extraordinary occasion. The prætor no sooner appeared, than the pope, who expected no such visit, not thinking the emperor would have come to such extremities, flew, in great consternation, to the shrine of the martyr St. Sergius, and embracing the pillars that supported the altar over the shrine, continued there, while the ecclesiastics, who attended him, strove to divert the prætor from so wicked an attempt, from laying violent hands on the first bishop of the catholic church, at the very shrine and altar of so renowned a martyr and saint. But the prætor, not hearkening to them, ordered his men to seize the refractory bishop, who, seizing him accordingly, some by the feet, others by the hair, and some by the beard, strove to force him from his sanctuary. But as the pope, who was a man of an uncommon size, and of strength in proportion to his size, in spite of all their efforts, still kept his hold, the pillars gave way, and the altar fell down. In the mean time the populace, who are commonly on the side of those who suffer, whether guilty or innocent, flocking to the church at the noise, and touched with compassion in seeing a bishop so cruelly used, without any regard to his rank and character, fell on the prætor with such fury, that, not being duly supported by the soldiery, he was glad to save himself by flight, and leave the pope safe in his asylum.[1] This proved a great disappointment to the emperor, who was resolved to employ arguments, which, he well knew, Vigilius was not a man to have long withstood, had he had him in his power.

The emperor being informed of what had passed, sent, the next day, a solemn deputation to the pope, consisting of several persons of the first rank, among whom were Belisarius, and Justin, the emperor's own nephew, and afterwards his successor in the empire. These were to persuade the pope to quit his asylum, and return to the palace of Placidia; to promise upon oath, in the emperor's name, that, if he returned of his own accord, he should meet with no ill treatment; but to let him know, at the same time, that, if he did not return upon such assurance, neither the church, where he had taken shelter, nor the turbulent and rebellious mob, in whom he seemed chiefly to confide, would screen him from the punishment due to his treasonable obstinacy and disobedience. Vigilius thought it advisable to comply, nay, and to acquiesce in the form of the oath, which the deputies were to take, as it was worded by the emperor, though he was well apprised that it might be easily eluded, and scarce afforded him any kind of safety.(*) He had accordingly no sooner quitted his asylum, than the emperor

[1] Vigil. & Cler. Ital. ad legat. Childeb. Theoph. ad ann. 544. & 547.

(*) This oath the deputies took, in the emperor's name, touching the keys of St. Peter (what keys I know not), and a cross, in which was inclosed a piece of the holy cross, and swearing by them. (a) To swear by any creature whatever, either in heaven or on earth, was looked upon, in the time of Optatus, that is, towards the latter end of the fourth century, as rank idolatry. For that writer charges the Donatists with impiety, sacrilege, and idolatry, in swearing by Donatus, and the martyrs of their sect, whereas men, says he, ought to swear by God alone; and to swear by a creature, is transferring to a creature the worship which is due to none but to God. (b) But what was deemed impiety, sacrilege, and idolatry, in the time of Optatus, became afterwards the common practice of the church, men swearing sometimes only by angels and saints, or the relics of saints; and sometimes by God and the saints; but seldom or never by God alone. In one of Justinian's novels, we have the form of the oath which he obliged all governors of provinces to take, when they first entered upon their office. It was as follows: "I swear by God Almighty, and his only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, and the most holy glorious mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary, and by the four gospels, which I hold in my hand, and by the holy archangels Michael and Gabriel, that I will keep a pure conscience, and pay faithful and true allegiance to their most sacred majesties Justinian, and Theodora his consort, who have put me into this office. And I swear by the same oath, that I neither gave, nor will give, nor promised to give, any thing whatever to any one, for his patronage and interest in procuring me this administration; but as I received it without bribery, so I will execute it with purity, and be satisfied with the public salary that is appointed me." (c) "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God," says Moses, (d) "and shalt serve him only, and swear by his name." "How shall I be favorable unto thee?" says God by the prophet Jeremiah; (e) "thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by those who are no gods." To swear, therefore, "by those who are no gods," by saints, by relics, by the cross, is forsaking God, and bestowing on creatures the worship that is due to him alone. However, men are allowed, by the catechism of Trent, (f) to swear by the cross and the relics of saints; and in the church of Rome, few oaths are now administered in the name of God alone. When the emperors came to Rome to take the imperial diadem at the pope's hands, the following oath was tendered them: "I, king of the Romans, swear by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the wood of the cross, and by these relics." &c. In this oath, the wood of the cross and the relics of saints, are placed in the same rank with the Trinity, and are consequently honored with the same divine worship. This kind of idolatry seems to have crept into the church in the time of Justinian, the above-mentioned oath, which he obliged all governors of provinces to take, being the first of that nature which I find to have been allowed by the church.

(a) Vigil. ep. 7. t. 1. Epist. Rom. Pont.
(b) Optat. l. 3. p. 65. 69. & l. 2. p. 58.
(c) Justin. Novel. 9. (d) Deut. 6: 13.
(e) Jer. 5: 9.
(f) In secund. Præcept. Decal. p. 267.

Vigilius is ill used by the emperor, and in a manner kept prisoner; but makes his escape, and gets safe to Chalcedon. Is invited by a solemn deputation from the emperor, to return to Constantinople. He returns, upon the emperor's revoking his edict. Is entreated by the bishop of Constantinople to assist at the council.

began anew to insist, with threats and menaces, on his receiving the edict against the "three chapters," or, at least, admitting those to his communion who received it. Vigilius could not be prevailed upon to do either: and the evils he suffered on that account, notwithstanding the oath which the emperor had taken, were, as he informs us, quite inexpressible.[1] The bibliothecarian writes, that he was one day dragged through the chief streets of Constantinople, with a rope about his neck; that, another day, one of the emperor's officers, striking him on the face, reproached him with the murder of his predecessor, and of the son of a widow, whom he beat, or caused to be beaten to death; that he himself was once beaten almost to death by the ministers of the emperor's cruelty and revenge, and carried, in that condition, to the public gaol, where he was kept for some time upon bread and water.[2] But with these particulars the contemporary writers seem to have been utterly unacquainted; though they all agree, that he was treated with great severity; insomuch that the emperor, apprehending he might be tempted, by the evil treatment he met with, to return to his asylum, and there, as he had the mob on his side, bid him defiance, ordered sentries to be placed round the palace where he lodged, and all the avenues to it to be carefully guarded night and day by regular troops. The sight of the troops alarmed the pope to such a degree, that, looking upon every day as the last of his life, he resolved, at all events, to attempt an escape. He attempted it soon after; and climbing, by the favor of a dark night, over a wall that was building, but was not yet raised to its due height, got safe and unobserved to the sea side. There he embarked on a small vessel, and crossing over to Chalcedon, on the opposite shore, took sanctuary in the church of the martyr St. Euphemia, the most revered asylum of all the east.[3]

The emperor was greatly disturbed at the flight of Vigilius; the rather, as he could not doubt but the pope, mindful of the ill usage he had met with, would be more upon his guard, and be hardly prevailed upon to put himself again in his power. However he despatched to Chalcedon the same persons whom he had employed in the former deputation, to treat with him about his return to Constantinople, charging them to agree to the terms, with respect to his safety, which he himself should require. But Vigilius, finding himself now in a place where he could apprehend no violence, because it would not have been safe for the emperor, or his ministers, to have used any; and, on the other hand, knowing, by experience, how little he could depend on the faith of the Grecks; told the deputies, that they attempted in vain to entice him, with fair words and promises, from his asylum; that there he was safe, and there he was determined to continue, till the scandal was removed, which had raised such disturbances in the church; that is, till the imperial edict condemning the "three chapters" was revoked, and the decision of the dispute concerning them was left entire to the unbiassed judgment of a general council, pursuant to the former agreement between him and the emperor. Justinian thought it the height of insolence in the pope to require him to revoke an edict which he had but lately issued, and caused to be set up, with great solemnity, in all the public places of the imperial city. However, as he was extremely desirous, that the council should meet, not doubting but the "three chapters" would be condemned by the far greater part of the bishops who composed it, he yielded at last; revoked the edict; and, that no pretence might be left for the pope, and the western bishops, to absent themselves from the council, declared anew, void and null, whatever had been done, till that time, for or against the points in dispute.[1]

With that declaration the pope pretended to be satisfied; and therefore leaving Chalcedon towards the latter end of the present year, 552, he returned at last to Constantinople. There he received, a few days after his arrival, a letter from Eutychius, who had succeeded the patriarch Mennas, deceased some months before, containing a confession of his faith, lest his orthodoxy should be called in question, and, at the same time, earnestly entreating the pope, that, since it was absolutely necessary, for the peace and unity of the church, that the present controversy concerning the "three chapters" should be determined in an assembly of bishops, his holiness would be pleased to concur with his brethren in determining it, and thereby put a speedy end to the fatal divisions that had already but too long prevailed among the bishops, who professed the same faith and religion. That no room might be left for disputes about place or precedency, Eutychius generously yielded the first place to the pope, telling him, in his letter, that his holiness should preside; that the controverted points should be fairly and impartially examined; and that, the four holy gospels being placed in the midst of the assembly, nothing should be determined but what was agreeable to the definitions and doctrine of the four oecumenical councils; not of the four gospels, which indeed were allowed a place in all councils, but were scarce ever consulted, or opened. This letter was addressed by Eutychius, "To the most holy and most blessed Vigilius, his fellow-bishop;" and signed by him, and three other patriarchs: namely, Apollinaris, who had been intruded into the see of Alexandria, in

[1] Vigil. ep. 7. [2] Anast. & Platin. in Vigil. [3] Vigil. ubi supra.

[1] Vigil. ep. Encyclic. ep. 7.

Vigilius consents to the assembling of a council, and promises to assist at it in person. He proposes to the emperor the deciding of the controversy by an equal number of Greek and Latin bishops; which the emperor agrees to. The eastern bishops refuse to stand to that agreement. The emperor, without any regard to that agreement, orders the council to meet.

the room of Zoilus, by Domnus of Antioch, and by Elias of Thessalonica.

To that proposal Vigilius agreed, by a letter dated the 8th of January, 553, and addressed, "To his well beloved brother Eutychius, and the bishops under his jurisdiction." But, at the same time, he represented to the emperor, that were he to assist, and even to preside, at a council, consisting chiefly of eastern bishops, it was greatly to be apprehended, that his brethren in the west would not acquiesce in the decrees and decisions of such an assembly. He therefore advised him, if he was truly desirous of seeing the present dispute determined, to the entire satisfaction of both parties, to cause it to be determined by an equal number of both. Vigilius was well apprized, that the western bishops were no less unalterable in their resolution to defend, than the eastern bishops were in theirs to condemn the "three chapters;" and, consequently, were they both in equal numbers, there would be a majority on neither side, and the question would remain still undecided; truth and the Holy Ghost being, in all councils, supposed to be on the side of the majority, but not more on the one than on the other, so long as the division was equal.(*) Justinian, suffering himself to be over-reached a second time by the pope, embraced his advice; and it was agreed between them, that an equal number of Greek and Latin bishops should meet some time before Easter, which, in 553, fell on the 20th of April; and that the controversy should be finally decided by them alone.[1]

This agreement was no sooner notified to the eastern bishops, than they all, to a man, protested against it, remonstrating, in a memorial, which, on that occasion, they presented to the emperor, that matters of faith and religion concerned all bishops alike, and, consequently, that all alike had a right to be consulted in such matters, and to deliver their opinion; that many of them were come, for that purpose alone, from the most distant provinces of the empire; that, since the western bishops had been summoned, as well as they, it was highly unreasonable, to say no more, in the bishop of Rome, to think of excluding from the council his fellow-bishops in the east, who had obeyed the summons, because his brethren in the west had not thought fit to obey it; that there was then at Constantinople a far greater number of western bishops than had yet been present at any of the four preceding councils; that, at the council of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops, not one of the Latins was present, besides the legates of pope Leo; that the council of Nice, the most revered of all, was composed of Greeks alone;(*) that the Latins being very few in number, fifteen in all, a council consisting of them, and an equal number of Greeks, would not deserve the name of an oecumenical council; and, lastly, that were the members on both sides equal, the controversy would remain undecided, it being well known, that the Latins were unalterably determined to defend the "three chapters," in opposition to the Greeks, who condemned them.[1]

These reasons Justinian could not withstand; and therefore, without any regard to the agreement between him and the pope, he ordered all the bishops, who were then at Constantinople, to meet on the 5th of May,(†) in the secretarium(‡) of the patriarch. To

(*) Had the pope been really persuaded, that whatever is defined by the majority of a council must be truth, he would never have taken so much pains, nor used so many shifts, to avoid the sentence of a council consisting chiefly of Greeks. He saw, it is true, a majority on the other side; but that was only a majority of private judgments, which must have changed, if they were wrong, and the council was infallible. The successors of Vigilius seem to have no more believed the infallibility of councils than he. For we find them striving, in all oecumenical councils, to gain a majority by such means as leave no room to doubt of their supposing the Holy Ghost to be quite out of the question. Thus, for instance, in the council of Trent, a council of the greatest authority in the church of Rome, care was taken, that the Italian bishops should be sent thither in such numbers as might carry every question against all the rest. If any accession of bishops came from France, or other places beyond the mountains, others were sent, on whom the pope could depend, to secure a majority still on his side. Thus were there, at last, in that council one hundred and eighty-seven Italians, and only eighty-three of other nations. The Italians all voted, as is well known, according to the directions they received from Rome, not doubting but they should receive there a suitable reward for their good behavior; which gave occasion to the profane saying, that "the Holy Ghost was sent from Rome to Trent in a budget." Had the popes really believed, that all private opinions and engagements would be over-ruled by the infallible spirit of councils, by the unerring direction of the Holy Ghost, and consequently, that the bishops, who composed those councils, could not, like Balaam, speak any other word but what God put in their mouths, whatever might have been promised or given them, their holinesses would have learned, from the example of Balak, to be wiser than to have thus wasted their treasures to so little purpose, to receive, perhaps, a curse instead of a blessing.

[1] Vigil. ep. 8. et Coll. prima quint. Synod.

(*) The Greeks were therein certainly mistaken; for at the council of Nice were present the two Roman presbyters Vitus and Vicentius, with the character of the pope's legates; and, besides them, the famous Osius of Cordova, who distinguished himself above all the rest, (a) and is said, by some, to have presided at that assembly; at least, his name is placed the first in the subscriptions, even before the names of the pope's legates. (b)

(a) Euseb. vit. Constantin. l. 3. c. 8.

(b) Concil. t. 2. p. 50. Socrat. l. 1. c. 13.

[1] Vigil. in. Constit. ad Justinian.

(†) The council was appointed to meet, according to the printed copies, "ad IV. Nonas Maii;" but, in two ancient manuscripts, we read, "Die III. Nonas Maias," that is, on the 5th of May, which in 553, fell on a Monday. And truly Monday was, generally speaking, the day on which councils were opened, and the sessions begun, the bishops who were to compose them, having, with great solemnity, performed divine service the preceding Sunday. Thus the council of Nice began to sit on the 14th of June; the first of Constantinople, on the 24th of May; that of Ephesus on the 22d of June; and that of Chalcedon on the 8th of October; which, in the years those councils were held, fell all on Mondays. (a)

(a) Vide Garner. Dissert. de Quint. Syn. General. c. 5.

(‡) The secretum or secretarium was a large and capacious building, adjoining to the church, where the consistory or tribunal of the church was kept. Secre-

The council meets. The emperor's letter to the fathers assembled. General councils assembled only by the emperor. The emperor complains of the conduct of the pope.

Vigilius he sent some persons of the first rank, to acquaint him with what was "unanswerably objected," by the Greeks, against his proposal; to convince his holiness of the unreasonableness of it; and to persuade him to concur with the other catholic bishops in restoring peace and tranquillity to the church. But the pope wanted only a pretence to absent himself from the council, being well apprised, that the "three chapters" would be condemned by a great majority of the bishops who composed it. Deaf therefore to all reason, he told the deputies, without offering to answer the objections of the Greeks, that he was ready to assist at the council, on the terms agreed to by him and the emperor; that he neither would nor could, on any other; but should, in due time, acquaint Justinian in particular with his real sentiments concerning the points in dispute.[1]

In the mean time the day, fixed for the meeting of the council, being come, the eastern bishops met, pursuant to the emperor's order, at the appointed place, in all 165; while those from the west assembled apart, with the pope, in the palace of Placidia. At the council, the first place was allotted to Eutychius of Constantinople, the second to Apollinaris of Alexandria, the third to Domnus of Antioch, the fourth to the deputies of the bishop of Jerusalem; and the rest were all ranked according to the dignity of their sees. When they were all seated, Diodorus, archdeacon, and primicerius notariorum, or chief of the notaries,(*) let the fathers know, that Theodorus the Silentiarius,(†) sent by the emperor to the council, attended at the door. Hereupon Eutychius having ordered him to be admitted, he presented a letter from the emperor, addressed to "the most religious bishops, assembled in council in the royal city of Constantinople," which was immediately read. The letter begins thus: "It has ever been the care and study of pious and orthodox emperors to cut off heresies, as they sprung up, by assembling in council the catholic bishops, and to keep the church of God in peace and tranquillity, by causing the right faith to be sincerely preached by her ministers." To prove this, he instances the four general councils, assembled by his religious predecessors "Constantine, Theodosius the elder, Theodosius the younger, and Marcian." Not a word here of the pope; and no wonder, since it was not known till many ages after, till the time of the Lateran council, under Leo X., "that he alone had a right to assemble, translate, and dissolve councils at his pleasure." That council even defined it to be evident, that such a right was vested in the pope alone, "manifeste constat;"[1] whereas it is undeniably evident, if history may be relied on, that the first six general councils were all assembled by the emperors; nay, Baronius himself owns, that the second and the fifth, i. e. the present council, were assembled against the will of the popes Damasus and Vigilius.[2] And indeed, that the present council was assembled against the will of the pope, is manifest from what has been said. In the next place, the emperor acquaints the fathers of the council with the steps he has taken to check the growth of the Nestorian heresy, which, he says, some have lately attempted to introduce into the church, not indeed under the name of Nestorius, which alone would have proved a sufficient antidote against his poisonous tenets, but as the doctrine of Theodorus of Mopsuestia; recommending, at the same time, and for the same purpose, the writings of Theodoret against St. Cyril, and the impious letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian, which they pretend to have been approved by the council of Chalcedon. He adds, that concerning these "three chapters" he had already consulted an assembly of catholic bishops, who had all condemned them; but nevertheless, as they were still obstinately maintained by some, he had convened a greater number of prelates, that by them the dispute might at last be finally determined, and the church suffered to enjoy that peace, which he had so long been striving to procure. With respect to Vigilius, the emperor told the council, that his holiness, having, on his arrival at Constantinople, examined, with great attention, the above-mentioned chapters, had solemnly condemned them, even in writing; and relates the very terms, in which he condemned them, transcribed from his judicatum. His words are: "Since, in the writings that have been put into our hands, under the name of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, many things are found repugnant to the true faith, we, following the advice of St. Paul, prove all, hold fast that which is good, do anathematize the said Theodorus, who was bishop of Mopsuestia, with all his writings, and all who defend him. We likewise anathematize the impious letter, which Ibas is said to have written to Maris the Persian, as inconsistent with the true Christian faith, and with it all who defend it, or maintain it to be agreeable to the doctrine of the catholic church. We anathematize too the writings of Theodoret against those of St.

tum and secretarium were known names for the courts of the civil magistrate, and borrowed, without all doubt, of them, by the ecclesiastics. We read of several councils held in the secretarium of such a church or basilic; and find the sessions sometimes called secretaria, from the place where they were held.

[1] Vigil. in Cons. ad Just. et Coll. prim. Quint. Synod.

(*) The chief business of the notaries was to write the acts of the councils, and set down the heads of the disputes or debates that happened during the sessions, as well as of the speeches that were made on either side. It was likewise their province to recite all instruments, allegations, petitions, and whatever else of the like nature was offered or read in the council.

(†) The silentiarii were a civil magistrate, in the emperor's palace, whose business it was to keep peace there. They are joined, in the Theodosian code, with the decuriones.(a) Some think they were called silentiarii, because they were allowed to enter the emperor's private chamber, named "silentium;" and that they answered to our lords of the bed-chamber.

(a) Cod. Theod. l. 6. tit. 23

[1] Concil. Lateran. Sess. 11. [2] Bar. ad ann. 553.

The pope invited to the council by a most solemn deputation. He excuses himself from assisting at it. The reasons he alleged. His proposal, and the bishops' answer. The council examines the points in dispute, without the pope. The pope, in a council of western bishops, issues his constitution, in defence of the "three chapters."

Cyril." Vigilius, continues the emperor, not satisfied with thus condemning the "three chapters," in the most solemn manner, anathematized, excommunicated, and deposed two of his own deacons, Rusticus and Sebastianus, for presuming to defend them. But his holiness, adds Justinian, has lately changed his mind, and now he defends what he formerly condemned; the above-mentioned writings were once, in his opinion, repugnant, but are now entirely agreeable, to the catholic faith. He closes his letter with exhorting the bishops assembled to examine those writings, and declaring, in a long confession of faith, that he receives the definitions of the four preceding councils, and with them the doctrine that has been taught by the fathers, the holy doctors of the church.[1] The doctrine of the fathers, and the councils, was now the only standard of the Christian faith.

The emperor's letter being read, Theodorus was ordered to withdraw; and then were read the letter of Eutychius to the pope, and his answer, whereby he consented to the meeting of the council, and promised to assist at it in person. As he nevertheless did not appear, the fathers agreed to acquaint him, by a solemn deputation, that the council was met; and, putting him in mind of his promise, invite and even press him to concur with the rest of his brethren, in restoring the wished-for tranquillity, both to the church and the state. Pursuant to this agreement, the three patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, with twenty metropolitans, were appointed to attend the pope in the palace of Placidia, and invite him to the council; the most honorable and solemn deputation that had ever before, or has ever since, been sent to a pope. The bishops flattered themselves, that, by thus gratifying the pride of the pope, they should more effectually induce him to comply with their request, than by any arguments they could use or allege. But Vigilius being, or pretending to be, indisposed, told them, that he was not then in a condition to assist at the council; but should let them know, the next day, what he thought of their assembly. Hereupon the deputies, returning to the council, made their report; and the assembly was adjourned to the next day.[2]

The following day, the 6th of May, the council met again, when the same deputies were sent anew to the pope, for his answer; and the answer he gave them was, that he did not choose to assist at a council consisting of so many Greeks, and so small a number of Latin bishops. The deputies replied, that it was he who first proposed to the emperor the assembling of a council; that he had lately consented to the assembling of one, and even promised in writing, to assist at it in person; and it was to challenge that promise they were sent by the council. As to the number of the Latin bishops, they owned it to be small, if compared with that of the Greeks; but added, that still it exceeded the number of the Latin bishops that had yet assisted at any general council. Vigilius answered, that the Greeks were all prejudiced against the "three chapters," and resolved to condemn them; that therefore the numbers on both sides ought to be equal; that the present controversy might be as well determined by a small as by a great number of bishops, by the three patriarchs, and a fourth bishop of their party on the one side, and himself and three Latin bishops on the other. Against that proposal the deputies remonstrated as above; namely, that thus the dispute would still remain undecided; that an assembly consisting of eight bishops only, would not deserve the name of an oecumenical council; nor would their decisions be received as the decisions of an oecumenical council; that, as to the supposed prejudice of the Greeks against the "three chapters," the followers of Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, might, under the like pretence, have declined assisting at the councils that condemned their doctrine, or refused to submit to their decisions. To that the pope made no reply; but promised, in the space of twenty days, to return a final answer, and acquaint the council with his real sentiments concerning the controverted articles.[1]

With this answer the deputies acquainted the council, on the 8th of May, the day on which they met the third time; when it was unanimously resolved by all who were present, that since the pope could by no means be prevailed upon to assist at their assembly, and could therein have no other view but to prevent them from coming to any determination, the cause should be determined without him.(*) This resolution being approved by the emperor, the fathers, in the following sessions, held on the 9th, the 17th, and the 19th of May, examined, with great attention, the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret against Cyril, and the letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian; and, with one voice, declared them to contain the "impious" and "execrable" doctrine of Nestorius. In the mean time Vigilius, finding he attempted in vain to put a stop to the proceedings of the council, by absenting himself from it, resolved to interpose his authority, and, by openly undertaking the defence of the "three chapters," restrain the eastern bishops from condemning them. Having therefore assembled all the western bishops, who were then at Constantinople, sixteen besides himself, with the arch-

[1] Syn. Quint. Coll. 1. [2] Synod. Quint. ibid.

[1] Synod. Quint. Coll. 1.

(*) If the pope, says cardinal Cusanus, (a) being invited, does neither come nor send to a synod; the synod, in that case, may and ought to provide for the peace and safety of the church without him.

(a) Lib. 2. de Concil. ord. Cath. c. 2.

The constitution sent by the pope to the emperor, and by the emperor to the council. Read there, with several other pieces. His judicatum and constitution compared.

deacon, and two deacons of the Roman church, he issued, in conjunction with them, a "constitution, statute, decree, definition, or definitive sentence," for so he styles it, declaring his and their opinion concerning the present controversy. For this "constitution," which, in the annals of Baronius, takes up no fewer than twenty-eight pages in folio, we are indebted to that writer, who copied it from a very ancient manuscript, lodged in the Vatican. It is dated the 14th of May, 553, and addressed by Vigilius, bishop, "to his most glorious and most clement son, Justinian. The pope begins it with confuting and condemning, as heretical, blasphemous, and repugnant to the doctrine of the councils and the fathers, sixty propositions, taken out of the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and condemned by the present council, in their fourth session. But as to the person of Theodorus, Vigilius declares it unlawful to condemn any man after his death, who, not having been condemned in his lifetime, had died in the communion of the church. "As it is not lawful," says the pope, "to judge persons who are dead, and are found not to have been condemned while they lived, we dare not condemn Theodorus of Mopsuestia, nor will we allow him to be condemned by others." With respect to the second chapter, concerning the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, Vigilius declares, that, seeing those writings had not been condemned either by Cyril himself, or by the council of Chalcedon, to condemn them now would be "contrary and evidently repugnant to the judgment of that holy council;" and therefore forbids any doctrines or opinions whatever to be censured or anathematized under the name of Theodoret. Concerning the third chapter, the letter of Ibas, the pope expresses himself thus: "As the fathers of Chalcedon pronounced the letter of Ibas to be orthodox, and thence concluded his faith to be right, and truly catholic, we, following in all things the judgment of those holy fathers, do pronounce, declare, and define, by this our present constitution, the said letter of the venerable Ibas, bishop of Edessa, to be truly orthodox; and therefore will by no means condemn it ourselves, or suffer it to be condemned by others." This constitution the pope closes with the following remarkable words: "These things being thus settled by us, with all care, diligence, and circumspection, we ordain and decree, statuimus et decernimus, that henceforth it shall be lawful for no person in holy orders, however dignified or distinguished, to write, speak, or teach anything touching these "three chapters," contrary to what we have, by our present constitution, taught and decreed; nor shall it be lawful for any one, after this our present definition, to move any question about them. But if any thing relating to them be said, done, or written, or shall hereafter be said, done, or written, contrary to what we have here taught and decreed, we declare it null, by the authority of the apostolic see, in which, by the grace of God, we now preside.[1]

This was not a private instruction, but, as I have observed above, a constitution, a decree, a definitive sentence or judgment, delivered by the pope, speaking "ex cathedra," as a public direction, in matters of faith, to the whole Christian world, "universo orbi catholico;" and as such it was signed by the pope himself, and by nearly as many other bishops as were present at some sessions of the council of Trent.(*) The constitution, thus signed, was sent by the pope to the emperor, and by the emperor, as soon as he had perused it, to the council. But Justinian, to oppose Vigilius to Vigilius himself, and prevent the fathers of the assembly from paying, as some perhaps might, any kind of regard to his judgment, however express and definitive, took care to send, at the same time, a copy of his judicatum, wherein he approved the condemnation of the "three chapters," and condemned them himself in the strongest terms; and with it copies of three other pieces, to be all publicly read in the council. These were copies, or rather translations into Greek, of the sentence of excommunication and deposition, which Vigilius had formerly pronounced against his two deacons Rusticus and Sebastianus, for "presuming to find fault with the judicatum, and to defend the 'three chapters,' condemned by the authority of the apostolic see;" and of the two letters which he wrote on that occasion to Valentinianus of Tomi, and Aurelianus of Arles, to justify his conduct, and convince those prelates, that, by condemning the "three chapters," he had done nothing but what was entirely consistent with the doctrine, and noways derogatory to the authority of the holy council of Chalcedon.[2] These papers were all read in the seventh session, held on the 26th of May; and, at the same time, were compared the passages in the pope's judicatum, condemning the "three chapters," with others in his constitution, defending them, namely: "We anathematize Theodorus, who was bishop of Mopsuestia, with all his writings, and all who defend them; we dare not condemn Theodorus of Mopsuestia, nor will we allow him to be condemned by others: we anathematize the writings of Theodoret against

[1] Bar. ad ann. 553. p. 427—455.

(*) "Juvante deo, et per ipsius gratiam, Vigilius episcopus sanctæ ecclesiæ catholicæ urbis Romæ huic constituto nostro subscripsi. Joannes episcopus ecclesiæ marsorum huic constituto consentiens subscripsi. Zachæus episcopus ecclesiæ scyllacenæ huic constituto consentiens subscripsi." Thus signed all the other bishops, and the three Roman deacons. Among the bishops was Valentinus of Silva Candida, whose hands Totila had ordered to be cut off; and for him signed Zachæus of Scyllatium or Squillaci, in the following words: "Zachæus episcopus rogatus a fratre Valentino episcopo Silvæ Candidæ, ipso præsente, et consentiente, et mihi dictante, huic constituto pro ipso subscripsi."

[2] Synod. Quint. Coll. 7.

Other writings, showing that Vigilius had solemnly promised to condemn the "three chapters." The council proceeds to a final determination of the dispute. Their judgment concerning the "three chapters" in general; and concerning each of the "three chapters" in particular.

those of St. Cyril; we forbid any doctrines or opinions whatever to be censured or anathematized under the name of Theodoret: we anathematize the impious letter which Ibas is said to have written to Maris, the Persian, as inconsistent with the true Christian faith, and with it all who defend it, or maintain it to be agreeable to the doctrine of the catholic church; we pronounce, declare, and define, by this our present constitution, the letter of the venerable Ibas, bishop of Edessa, to be truly orthodox; and therefore will by no means condemn it ourselves, nor suffer it to be condemned by others."

Baluzius, in his New Collection of Councils, has published, from an ancient manuscript, some other pieces, which he supposes to have been likewise read in the present session. These are two letters from Vigilius to Justinian, and to the empress Theodora, wherein the pope declared that he neither was, nor ever had been, a heretic, or a favorer of heretics; and that he therefore condemned and anathematized the impious letter of Ibas, the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, and the person as well as the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia. In the manuscript copy of his letter to the empress were these words: "And I believe there is in Christ but one will, or one operation."(*) These letters were written in 547, the year Vigilius arrived at Constantinople.[1] With them Baluzius had published, from the same manuscript, the form of a solemn oath, which Vigilius took in the presence of Theodorus of Cæsarea, and the patrician Cethegus, binding himself by that oath to anathematize the "three chapters" himself, and to engage, so far as in him lay, the other bishops to anathematize them, as repugnant to the faith of the catholic church, and the council of Chalcedon. This oath, dated the 15th of August, 550, is mentioned by Theophanes,[1] by Facundus,[2] and the emperor, in a letter, which he wrote on the 14th of July, 553, to the three patriarchs, and the other bishops, charging his holiness with a breach of the most solemn oath a Christian could take.(*)

On the 2d of June the council met again, when, after a summary repetition of every thing that had passed from their first meeting, on the 5th of May, till that time, the fathers unanimously agreed to proceed, without farther delay, to a final determination, or, as they styled it, a definitive sentence, that all men might know what was truly agreeable, and what repugnant, in the present dispute, to the faith of the catholic church, and the council of Chalcedon. Having therefore premised a confession of faith, declaring, that they received the four preceding councils, and condemned both the errors and persons, whom those holy councils had condemned, they first delivered their judgment concerning the "three chapters" in general, and in the following terms: "We anathematize the 'three chapters,' the defenders of the said 'three chapters,' and all who have hitherto written, who now write, or shall write hereafter, in defence of them, or presume to say (as Vigilius did in his constitution), that the impious doctrine they contain was approved and authorized by the holy fathers, and the council of Chalcedon." After this general sentence, the council proceeds to condemn each of the "three chapters" severally, and in particular, thus: "If any one defends the impious Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and does not anathematize both him, and his impious writings, let him be accursed. If any one defends the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, and does not anathematize the said writings, let him be accursed. If any one defends the impious epistle of Ibas to Maris the Persian, which denies God to have been born of the Virgin Mary, which taxes Cyril with heresy, which condemns the holy council of Ephesus, defends Theodorus, and his disciple Nestorius, with their impious writings; if any one does not anathematize

(*) When these letters were read in the sixth general council, the pope's legates pretended the words. "And I believe," &c., to have been added by the Monothelites, maintaining that there was in Christ but one will, or one operation. Hereupon the Greek and Latin copies of the fifth council being called for, and carefully examined, the above-mentioned letters were not found in the Latin; but it appeared that they had been added by the patriarch Paul, with the words, "And I believe," &c., to the Greek copy, which was lodged in the archives of the Patriarchal church of Constantinople. Baronius will have both those letters to have been forged. But that they were not, is manifest from Theophanes, (*a*) from Facundus, (*b*) and from the words of Justinian, in his letter to the three patriarchs, and the other bishops of the council. (*c*) Besides, the pope's legates, at the sixth council, allowed the letters themselves to be genuine; and only maintained the words favoring the doctrine of the Monothelites, not to be his, but to have been afterwards added to his letter. And truly I am inclined to think that they were not his; but were added by Paul of Constantinople, to support, by the authority of Vigilius, the doctrine of the Monothelites, which he himself professed, and zealously defended. For to alter, falsify, and interpolate the writings of the ancients, and make them say what they never dreamt, is a practice that began to prevail, in the earliest times, among the catholics, as well as among those whom they styled heretics. Daillé, in his excellent treatise on the right use of the fathers, supposes the abovementioned letters of Vigilius to Justinian and Theodora to have been forged; because they were not originally inserted in the acts of the fifth council. (*d*) But from their not having originally had a place there, we can only conclude that they were not read in that council.

(*a*) Theoph. ubi supra. (*b*) Facund. ubi supra.
(*c*) See note (*) next column.
(*d*) Daillé, du vrai usage des Peres, c. 3.

[1] Theoph. ad ann. Incarn. secund. Alexandrin. 539. Facund. l. contr. Mucian. Vide Baluz. Nova Collect. Concil. p. 1546.

[1] Theoph. ad ann. Incarn. secund Alexandrin. 539.
[2] Facund. l. contr. Mucian.

(*) "Religiosissimus papa antiquioris Romæ," says Justinian, in that letter, "cum hæc examinâsset, the 'three chapters,' et condemnavit, et satisfactionem in scriptis exposuit tam nobis quam piæ recordationis tunc conjugi nostræ. . . . Sed et sacramenta terribilia in scriptis juravit, ut in eadem permaneret voluntate in condemnatione et anathemate prædictorum trium capitulorum," &c. (*a*)

(*a*) Vide Baluz. Nova Coll. Concil. in præfat. ad Acta Concil. v. n. 2. et p. 1544.

The reasons on which the pope's constitution was grounded, confuted by the council. Whether a man may be anathematized after his death. Theodorus of Mopsuestia did not die in the communion of the church, as the pope had asserted.

that epistle, those who defend it, and all who maintain it, or any part of it, to be right, let him be accursed."[1] Such was the sentence of the council; and, when it was read, the fathers, to confirm it, joining all as one man, cried out aloud, "Let Theodorus be accursed; let him be accursed, who does not accurse Theodorus, we all accurse Theodorus, and his writings. Let the impious writings of Theodoret against Cyril be accursed; let him be accursed, who does not accurse them. We all accurse the impious epistle of Ibas; if any one defends that epistle, or any part of it, if any one does not accurse it, and all who defend it, let him be accursed."[2] Thus did the council not only reverse, with one consent, the judgment of the pope, but anathematize and accurse all who did not anathematize and accurse what the pope had defined, speaking ex cathedra, and thence instructing the whole Christian world.

The fathers of the council, not satisfied with thus condemning the "three chapters," in direct opposition to the definitive sentence of the pope, undertook to confute, one by one, the reasons and arguments on which his definitive sentence was grounded. These were, with respect to the first chapter, the condemnation of Theodorus: I. That no man ought to be condemned after his death; the power of "loosing and binding," or absolving and condemning, having been granted to the church only with respect to those who are "on earth," or among the living, agreeably to the words of our Savior, "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c. II. Theodorus died in the peace and communion of the church; and none, who thus die, ought to be condemned after their death. III. Theodorus was not condemned by former fathers and councils; and therefore must not be condemned now.[3] In answer to these reasons, the council first declares, and defines, "That a man may be lawfully condemned after his death;" adding, "And those who say he may not (which Vigilius did in his constitution), show no kind of regard to the word of God, to the doctrine of the apostles, to the tradition of the fathers." They then allege several arguments, calculated to prove, from the practice of the preceding councils, and the doctrine of the fathers, the definition of the pope to be false and erroneous, and their own to be true, namely: I. Because the council of Constantinople, the second oecumenical council, condemned and anathematized, by name, Arius and Macedonius, though both dead long before: pope Damasus, and the council of Sardica, anathematized the bishops who had departed from the faith of Nice, whether dead or alive: the council of Chalcedon condemned Domnus of Antioch, after his death, because he had spoken contemptuously of St. Cyril, and his writings. Having thus proved the definition of the pope repugnant to the practice, and consequently to the doctrine, of the universal church, as represented by general councils; they show it, in the next place, no less inconsistent with the doctrine and practice of some particular churches, namely, of the African, and the Roman church herself. To that purpose they produce the canon of an African council, commanding those who bequeathed their estates to heretics, to be anathematized even after their death; and put his holiness in mind of the sentence of excommunication, which one of his predecessors, Boniface II. had solemnly pronounced, but twenty-three years before, against Dioscorus, his deceased competitor, causing it to be signed by several deacons, presbyters, and bishops, and to be placed, thus signed, in the archives of the Roman church:[1] "And this," say the fathers of the council, "all, who live at Rome, know to be true;" which was saying, that the pope knew it to be true, though he had defined the contrary. To the authority of the councils they add that of the fathers, especially of St. Austin, saying of Cæcilianus of Carthage, dead an hundred years before, that were he found guilty of the crimes, which the Donatists laid to his charge, he would still anathematize him.[2] As to the words of our Savior, alleged by Vigilius to prove, that the church has the power of binding and loosening those only, who are on earth, or among the living, the council explodes his interpretation of that passage; and will have the words on earth to refer to the party that loosens or binds, not to the party that is loosened or bound, thus; "Whatever ye shall bind or loose, while you are on earth," &c.(*)

To the second reason of Vigilius, in defence of Theodorus, namely, that he died in the peace and communion of the church, the fathers returned the following answer: "It is said by some, that Theodorus died in the peace and communion of the church; but to say so, is a lie and a calumny against the church, mendacium est et calumnia adversus ecclesiam; for he alone dies in the peace and communion of the church, who holds the doctrine of the church till his death; which Theodorus certainly did not, as is evident from the blasphemies that he uttered." To

[1] Synod. Quint. Col. 8. [2] Synod. Quint. ibid.
[3] Constit. Vigil. apud Bar. ad ann. 553. n. 179.

[1] See p. 331. [2] Aug. ep. ad Bonif.

(*) The council does not mean, that the church can readily bind or loose a man after his death: that her censures or absolution can render his condition in the other world worse or better; but only that, upon any new discovery of his guilt or innocence, he may be excluded from, or admitted to communion, even after his death; that is, his name may be struck out of the diptychs, or placed in them, be omitted or mentioned in the prayers and oblations of the church. "Let him be anathematized after death, let not his name be written or recorded among the priests of God," are the words of the decree, in the African code, against a bishop who should bequeath his effects or estate to a heretic. This was the only method of binding or loosening, condemning or absolving, men after death, that was ever practised in the church.

The pope grossly mistaken with respect to the writings of Theodoret. Whether the letter of Ibas was approved by the council of Chalcedon. The pope refusing, at first, to sign the decrees of the council; is sent into exile.

confute the third and last reason of Vigilius against the condemning of Theodorus, namely, that he was not condemned by former fathers and councils, they quote several passages from the fathers, especially from Proclus of Constantinople, and Cyril, speaking of him as an avowed heretic, as one whose blasphemies exceeded even those of the Jews and the Pagans. As to councils, they allege the decree of the first of Ephesus, condemning the doctrine of Nestorius, and all who had held, till that time, or should thenceforth hold, the same doctrine; which was condemning, though not by name, Theodorus, who not only held, but was the first who taught that doctrine.(*)

Concerning the "second chapter," the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, the pope would not condemn those writings himself, nor suffer them to be condemned by others, under the name of Theodoret, "because they were not his, but had been fathered upon him by his enemies." But that pope was therein grossly mistaken, that the writings against Cyril, under the name of Theodoret, were truly his, was undeniably proved by the fathers of the council from the acts of the council of Chalcedon, and the concurring testimony of all the contemporary writers, nay, and from the testimony of Theodoret himself, owning those writings, in the several letters he wrote on that occasion to the friends of Nestorius, and his own. The whole assembly expressed the greatest surprise at the pope's denying, or even questioning a truth, that was so well known, and might so easily be made to appear. And indeed none had ever questioned it before him, nor has it ever been questioned since his time.

As for the third and last chapter, the letter of Ibas, the pope, in his constitution, pronounced, declared, and defined that letter to be orthodox, "because it was approved by the council of Chalcedon." On the other hand, the fathers of the present council pronounced, declared, and defined, in their turn, that whole letter, and every part of it, to be heretical, to be blasphemous, to be repugnant to the definition of the council of Chalcedon; "Tota epistola hæretica est, tota epistola blasphema est, contraria est per omnia definitioni," &c.[1] Here they distinguish the private judgment of some of the holy bishops, assembled in the city of Chalcedon, from the public judgment of the whole council, or of the greater part of the venerable prelates, who composed it. They own the letter was approved by two or three bishops, who were present at that great and numerous assembly; but, at the same time, take the liberty to reprove his holiness, and in very sharp terms, as one who argued with all the craft and subtlety of an heretic, "astutia hæretica," in presuming to pass upon them the private opinion of a few, for the public definition or judgment of a whole council. And truly, that the letter of Ibas was not approved by the council of Chalcedon, as was boldly asserted by the pope in his constitution, sufficiently appears from the acts of that council. When it was read there, Eunomius of Nicomedia found fault with some expressions it contained, reflecting on the conduct of Cyril, and the other bishops of the council of Ephesus. But as Ibas seemed to acknowledge two natures, and one person, in Christ, the legates of Pope Leo, and with them Maximus of Antioch, declared that, in their opinion, the very letter of Ibas was a sufficient proof of the orthodoxy of his faith. Juvenalis of Jerusalem spoke much to the same purpose. The other bishops neither approved nor disapproved that letter; but only required Ibas, after it was read, to anathematize Nestorius, and all who held the same doctrine; which he readily did, and was thereupon restored to his see, from which he had been driven by Dioscorus, in the second council of Ephesus. It cannot therefore be said, as the fathers of the present council observe, that the letter of Ibas was approved, by the council of Chalcedon, but only that it was approved in some degree, by two or three of the bishops, who were present at that council.

The "three chapters" being thus condemned, in the strongest terms, by the unanimous consent of all the bishops who composed that assembly, and the arguments offered by the pope in defence of the said "chapters," unanswerably confuted, the emperor caused copies of the acts to be sent to Vigilius; and, at the same time, let him know, that he must either agree with his brethren, and condemn what they had condemned, or forfeit his see, and be sent into exile. The pope answered, that the emperor might dispose of him as he thought fit: but, as he could not sign the acts and decrees of such an assembly without renouncing the holy faith of Chalcedon, he was ready to suffer, and suffer with joy, both exile and death, in so good a cause. This answer was no sooner known to the emperor, than he caused the pope to be seized, and conveyed, under a strong guard, to Proconnesus, an inhospitable island in the Propontis.[1] The other bishops in the west, who refused to sign the condemnation of the "three chapters," and were subjects of the empire, met with no better treatment than the pope, being all driven,

(*) Vigilus positively affirms, that Theodorus was not condemned by the council of Ephesus. "I have perused," says he, "the acts of that council with the greatest care and attention, diligentissima investigatione; but could find nothing there concerning the condemnation of Theodorus."(a) But pope Pelagius, chosen in 557, affirms, and no less positively, that Theodorus was condemned by the council of Ephesus. "The holy Ephesine synod," says that pope, "condemned Theodorus after his death." He adds, that an impious creed, which he had composed, being read in that council, the fathers anathematized both the creed and its author.(b)

(a) Vigil. Constit. ap. Bar. n. 173.
(b) Pelag. ep. 7.

[1] Synod. Quint. Collat. 6.

[1] Anast. in Vigil. Liberat. Brev. c. 22.

The pope changes his opinion the fourth time concerning the "three chapters." He condemns them in his letter to the patriarch; and afterwards by a solemn constitution;—[Year of Christ, 554.]

without mercy, from their sees, and sent into different exiles. Among these the two African bishops, Victor Tunnunensis, and Facundus of Hermiana, distinguished themselves above the rest. Victor was first confined to an abandoned place in Egypt, and thence sent for to Constantinople. But as he still continued, in spite of all the threats and promises the emperor could use, to defend the "three chapters," he was never suffered to return to his see, but shut up for life in a monastery. Facundus wrote no fewer than twelve books in defence of the condemned chapters, all interspersed with most bitter invectives against Justinian, for presuming, though only a layman, to interfere in matters of faith and religion.(*) However, by abandoning his see, and keeping himself concealed, he had the good luck to escape the punishment, with which he was, by the provoked emperor, deservedly threatened. These two, and, after their example, for they were both leading men, several other bishops in the west, especially in Africa, stood up, to the last, in defence of the "three chapters," choosing rather to be driven from their sees, to be stripped of all their effects, and to perish with famine in the deserts, than to condemn those articles, or communicate with any who condemned them. But Vigilius was a man of a very different temper, and had already changed his opinion three times in the present dispute. He first defended the controverted points, as entirely agreeable to the doctrine of Chalcedon; then condemned them as entirely repugnant to that doctrine; and again, after examining them "with all possible care and attention, omni undique cautela atque diligentia," he declared them anew, nay, and defined them "ex cathedra," entirely agreeable to the same doctrine. No wonder therefore, if, in the present circumstances, he changed his opinion once more. He soon grew sick of his abode in the island of Proconnesus; the emperor had not only caused his name to be struck out of the diptychs, as the name of a condemned and deposed heretic, but was actually soliciting the Roman people and clergy to choose another pope in his room: he knew the emperor was not to be moved, and that nothing but an entire compliance with his will could redeem him from so painful an exile. As for his brethren in the west, he had already forfeited their good opinion, and with them brought into the utmost contempt, by his former changes, both himself and his see. In these circumstances he first wrote a most submissive letter to the patriarch Eutychius, owning that, in opposing, as he had hitherto done, the rest of his brethren, he had been guilty of a breach of that union and concord which ought to prevail among the true followers of Christ, especially the ecclesiastics and bishops. He adds, that as, upon examining the "three chapters" with more care and attention (he had already examined them "with all possible care and attention,") he was fully convinced, that they had been deservedly condemned, so he was not ashamed openly to acknowledge it, and own, that he had done wrong to defend them, imitating therein the example of St. Austin, who was not ashamed, when he discovered the truth, to condemn and retract whatever he had written against it. He then relates the chief errors which, with the help of the air of Proconnesus, he had lately discovered in the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret, and Ibas; and concludes thus: "We make it known to the whole catholic church, that we condemn and anathematize all heresies and heretics, namely, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and his impious writings; the writings of Theodoret against St. Cyril, and the council of Ephesus; and the letter to Maris the Persian, which is said to have been written by Ibas. We likewise anathematize all who shall presume to defend the said 'three chapters,' or shall think them capable of being maintained or defended. We acknowledge for our colleagues and brethren, those who have condemned them; and by these presents annul whatever has been done, said, or written, by us, or by others, to defend them.[1] This letter is dated from the island of Proconnesus, the 8th of December of the present year; so that the pope had scarce been five months there when he wrote it, having, in so short a time, more plainly discovered the truth in that island, than he had done in seven whole years at Rome and Constantinople; for so long had the present controversy lasted.

The emperor was not satisfied with that letter; but insisted on the pope's condemning the "three chapters," as repugnant to the doctrine of Chalcedon, no less solemnly than he had approved them before, as agreeable to that doctrine. This Vigilius at first strove to decline; but, finding the emperor unalterably

(*) In his ninth book is a remarkable passage concerning the eucharist, which has put all the Roman catholic divines to a stand. Facundus undertakes there to explain, in a catholic sense, all the propositions that, in the various and almost innumerable works of Theodorus, had been condemned as heretical, and this among the rest, "Christ was the adopted Son of God." To prove that proposition capable of a catholic meaning, he argues thus: "Christ received the sacrament, or sign of adoption, which may be called the adoption itself, as the faithful, receiving the sacrament, or the signs of the body and blood of Christ, are said to receive his body and his blood; not that properly the bread is his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain in themselves the mysteries of both." (a) Would Facundus have ever argued thus, had it been then believed by the church, that the faithful received in the eucharist the true and real body of Christ, his true and real blood; or had the fathers, saying, "We receive the body and blood of Christ," been then understood by the church, as the church of Rome now understands them? That writer shows here in what sense the body and blood of Christ are said to be received by the faithful. And who ever undertook to show in what sense a thing is said to be received, which is really and truly received?

(a) Facund. in defen. Trium Cap. l. 9.

[1] Balus. Nova. Collect. Concil. p. 595.

A council may be lawful and oecumenical, without the presence or approbation of the pope. If the pope is infallible, both parts of a contradiction may be true.

bent on his condemning those articles by a solemn constitution, as he had by a solemn constitution formerly approved them, he issued one soon after, that is, on the 23d of February, 554, which was so well received both by the emperor and the patriarch, that he was immediately released from his exile, and recalled to Constantinople. In that constitution he points out, and confutes, the many execrable blasphemies, as he styles them, contained in the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret, and in the letter which is said to have been written by Ibas;(*) alleges a great many reasons to prove, that the letter of Ibas was condemned by the council of Chalcedon, as heretical and blasphemous; the very letter, which, in his former constitution, he had declared and maintained to have been approved, by that council, as catholic and orthodox; answers one by one the arguments, which, in his other constitution, he had offered in defence of that letter; and concludes thus: "We therefore anathematize and condemn the three above-mentioned impious chapters; namely, the letter which Ibas is said to have written to Maris the Persian, as containing the execrable blasphemies, which I have above pointed out; the impious Theodorus of Mopsuestia, with his detestable writings; and what Theodoret impiously wrote against Cyril, and the council of Ephesus. As for what we or others may, at any time, have said or written in defence of the said three impious chapters, we declare the whole, by the authority of this our present constitution, absolutely null."[1] This was the fourth and last change of Vigilius, in the famous dispute concerning the "three chapters." And now the emperor, satisfied with his conduct, not only received him with extraordinary marks of honor, on his return to Constantinople, but granted him, at last, the so much and so long wished-for liberty of returning to Rome.

I cannot dismiss this subject without some observations which naturally arise from it, and may probably have occurred to every reader. And, first, it is to be observed, that the present council was not convened by the pope, but by the emperor, against the will of the pope; that the pope neither assisted at it in person, nor by his legates. And yet this very council was received by the whole catholic church; has been approved by all the popes, who have governed the Roman church since the time of Vigilius to the present; and is ranked, by all the Roman catholic divines, among the lawful and oecumenical councils. Hence it evidently follows, that a council may be lawful and oecumenical, may determine and define, censure and condemn, without the consent or concurrence of the pope. But the present council, says Baronius,[1] was neither lawful nor oecumenical; it did not even deserve the name of a private synod;[2] it was no council at all, till Vigilius approved it; it was his approbation, his last constitution, that raised it to the rank of a lawful and oecumenical council;[3] which is as much as to say, that while it was in being, it was no council at all; but when it was no more, it then became a council, a lawful and oecumenical council; for it was not approved by the pope till five months after it was dissolved, and the bishops, who had composed it, were all returned to their sees. The surprising virtue of papal power, to change thus the nature of things, and make them be when they have no being, what they never were while they had a being.

2dly. The pope defined, as we have seen, the controverted articles to be, and defined them not to be, repugnant to the doctrine of the catholic church, and the council of Chalcedon; and both he defined ex cathedra. If therefore the pope is infallible, if what he defines ex cathedra is infallibly true, two contradictory propositions may be infallibly true. That the pope erred on this occasion, is owned even by the most sanguine sticklers for his infallibility. But he did not err, say they, in matters of faith, since the dispute was not concerning matters of faith. It is certain, says Baronius, it is evident, it is demonstrable, that the controversy concerning the "three chapters" was no controversy concerning the faith.[4] The chief controversy was, whether the doctrine contained in the works of the three often-mentioned writers was orthodox or heretical, was agreeable or repugnant to the doctrine of Chalcedon, and the belief of the church. If that was not, I should be glad to

(*) In the present constitution Vigilius will not allow Ibas to have been the author of that letter, though in his former constitution he had approved it as written by him; and indeed it is agreed to have been his by all but the annalist, who, finding his high pontiff had thus contradicted himself, thought, perhaps, that he could not do less than contradict himself too. For, having positively affirmed, I believe in more than twenty places, that Ibas was, without all doubt, the author of that letter; that it is manifest from the tenth session of the council of Chalcedon, that Ibas wrote the controverted letter; that Ibas himself, who of all men knew best whether it was his or not, owned it; (a) after having thus, I say, positively affirmed that letter to have been written by Ibas, while the pope thought so; he no less positively affirms, when the pope thought otherwise, the disputed letter not to have been written by Ibas; nay, that it was found by the council of Chalcedon, as is manifest from the public acts of that council, not to be his. (b) Upon the whole, when the pope thought Ibas was the author of that epistle, it was certainly written by him; it was manifest from the acts of the council, that it was his: when the pope thought Ibas was not the author of that letter, it certainly was not written by him; it was manifest from the acts of the council, that it was not his. There was no occasion either for the pope or the cardinal to trouble themselves about the author of that piece, since the dispute was not about its author, but the doctrine it contained.

(a) Bar. ad Ann. 448. n. 71. 77. et ad ann. 553. n. 191, 192, 193. 196, 197, &c.

(b) Idem ad ann. 432. n. 71.

[1] Baluz. Nova Collect. Concil. p. 1551. Evagr. l. 4. c. 38. Phot. ep. ad Mich. Bulg. Princ. Zonar. l. 4. Cedren. ad ann. 25. Justin. Euthym. Panopl. part. 2. tit. 24. in append. Niceph. l. 17. c. 27. Liberat. c. 22.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 553. n. 224.

[2] Idem ibid. n. 219. [3] Idem. ibid.

[4] Bar. ad ann. 547. n. 30. et ad ann. 553. n. 231.

The pope's infallibility not known in the sixth century. One pope may contradict another in matters of faith. He obtains of the emperor several privileges for the people of Italy. Vigilius dies;—[Year of Christ, 555.] His character, while anti-pope, by Baronius.

know what other ever was, or could be truly called, a controversy concerning the faith. Baronius himself owned it was a controversy concerning the faith, when he was not yet apprised, that he could by no other means defend the chimerical prerogative of infallibility, but by denying it was a controversy concerning the faith. For, speaking of the imperial edict condemning the "three chapters," he inveighs against the emperor, and in a most abusive dialect, for taking upon him to issue edicts, to make laws, and to dictate to the bishops, "in matters of faith and religion;"[1] and that edict he constantly styles a "decree of faith," "decretum fidei."[2] If the emperor's decree was a "decree of faith," or about "matters of faith and religion," the pope's decree was surely so too; and consequently, if the pope erred, and that he did err is as certain as that both parts of a contradiction cannot be true, he erred, even according to Baronius, in matters of faith and religion.

3dly, The whole church was, at this time, "rent," as Justinian expressed it, "from east to west;" that is, was divided into two opposite parties, the one condemning, and the other defending, the "three chapters." But by neither was the pope acknowledged for an infallible judge in the dispute, that occasioned this division: not by the former; for they continued to condemn those chapters, when the pope defended them: not by the latter; for they continued to defend the same chapters, when the pope condemned them; nay, and separated themselves from his communion, because he condemned them. I defy the popish writers to name a single bishop, either in the east or the west, who changed opinion upon the pope's changing his; that is, a single bishop, who, so late as the middle of the sixth century, owned the pope for an infallible judge in matters of faith.

4thly, In the present dispute, Vigilius contradicted himself, again and again, as we have seen. Now, as the same pope may contradict himself in matters of faith, why may not one pope contradict another? Why may not one pope retract the sentence of another, as well as the same pope his own? If he may, how can a man, in common sense, receive the decrees of any particular pope as infallibly true, till he is sure, which he never can be, that no other pope will ever retract them?

But to return to Vigilius: released from his exile, and recalled to Constantinople, he was impatient, as we may well imagine, to quit the east, where he had made so contemptible a figure, notwithstanding the extraordinary honors that were paid him there upon his recantation. However, as he was, at the same time, sensible, that his last change would greatly disoblige the people and clergy of Rome, all zealous defenders of the "three chapters," he did not leave Constantinople till he had obtained of the emperor a constitution, with several grants, privileges, and exemptions, not for the Romans only, but for the inhabitants of Italy in general, that country being then reduced to a most deplorable condition, by the war between the Goths and the Greeks, which had been carried on, without intermission, from the year 535, to the present 554, when the reduction of Italy was completed by Narses. With that constitution, dated the 13th of August, Vigilius embarked, after a seven years' absence, on his return to Rome, not doubting but the ample privileges, which he had procured for the people of Italy, would sufficiently atone with them for his late conduct. But he had not the so much wished for satisfaction of seeing Rome or Italy again. For, being taken in the voyage with a violent fit of the stone, a complaint to which he had been long subject, he put in at Syracuse; and, not being able ever after to bear the least motion, he continued there to his death, which happened not long after; that is, some time before the 11th of April of the following year 555, for on that day his successor, Pelagius I. was ordained, as we shall see hereafter. As to the month, or the day of the month, in which he died, neither is mentioned by the contemporary writers. The bibliothecarian supposes him to have governed the Roman church seventeen years, six months, and twenty-six days.[1] But as Vigilius was ordained on the 22d of November, 537, his computation must be certainly false. The body of the deceased pope was conveyed from Syracuse to Rome, and there interred in the church of St. Marcellus, on the Salarian way.

Of Vigilius I find, in Baronius, two different characters; the one of the anti-pope Vigilius, the other of pope Vigilius; for he was anti-pope, as we have seen, before he was pope. While anti-pope, he was not only ambitious, beyond all measure, says the annalist, but quite mad with ambition; a second Lucifer, striving to ascend into heaven, and exalt his throne above the stars; but by the weight of his enormous sacrileges, and heinous crimes, brought down to hell; a schismatic, a simoniac, a murderer, not the successor of Simon Peter, but of Simon Magus, not the vicar of Christ, but an antichrist, an idol set up in the temple of God, the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, a wolf, a thief, a robber;[2] but yet a good catholic, "homo revera catholicus,"[3] and known for such to the people and clergy of Rome, who therefore raised him, by divine inspiration, to the pontifical throne, "Divinitus inspirato consilio evehunt ipsum in pontificium thronum."[4] Baronius speaks here of the election, which he supposes to have happened upon the death of Silverius, and which he

[1] Bar. ad ann. 546. n. 41. 43. 50.
[2] Id. loc. cit. et alibi.

[1] Anast. in Vigil.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 538. n. 9. 17, 18, 19, 20.
[3] Idem ad ann. 540. n. 8. [4] Idem ad ann. 540. n. 7, 8.

Vigilius, character by the same writer, when, according to him, lawful pope. Baronius gives him elsewhere a very different character. He is sainted and unsainted. The conduct of Pelagius, while nuncio to Silverius, and to Vigilius, at the court of Constantinople.

elsewhere[1] ascribes, not to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but to the powerful influence of the empress Theodora, and her servant Belisarius. For, speaking there of this imaginary election, he tells us, that Vigilius resigned the papal dignity, not with a design to quit it, but to act, as it were, a part in a comedy, and to make the world believe, that he really did what he never intended to do. The crafty man, says he, came down from the throne; but was first well assured, that by means of Belisarius, he should soon reascend it. The electors did not choose him on account of his piety, his virtue, or any episcopal qualifications, which they discovered in him; for he was quite destitute of all merit and virtue, and sullied with the blackest crimes.[2]

Such was Vigilius while yet an intruder, and an anti-pope. But no sooner was he placed, by what the annalist calls a "lawful election,"(*) on the throne of St. Peter, than God gave him another heart, and he was turned, at once, into another man, having nothing in view, nothing at heart, but the welfare of the catholic church, and the purity of the catholic faith. However profligate and abandoned before his election, he was suddenly after it indued with every virtue, that could be required in the successor of St. Peter, in the vicar of Christ upon earth; it being the peculiar privilege of the apostolic see, to change even wicked men, who are raised to it, immediately into saints, "Quos iniquos accepit, solet mox reddere sanctos."[3] A valuable privilege indeed! but, very unfortunately, the quite contrary has happened; for some who had good characters when raised to that see, have become very bad men after their exaltation, by a natural effect of the pride and ambition attending great power. Among the other eminent virtues of pope Vigilius, the annalist admires and extols his firmness and constancy, even in the dispute about the "three chapters;" which, if said by any but a Baronius or a Bellarmine, would be justly looked upon as satire or irony. It is true, says Baronius, in that dispute, he changed his opinion, he condemned what he had approved, and approved what he had condemned; but that was no more a mark of inconstancy in him, than the like change was in St. Paul, who condemned circumcision, and yet circumcised Timothy.[1] Baronius could not but see the wide difference there is between an immutable doctrine of faith, which must ever be true, and a mutable ceremony, which in some circumstances may be expedient, and not in others. The annalist adds, that Vigilius, though now a saint, was nevertheless punished by Heaven for his former crimes; for, having hastened the death of his holy predecessor, by confining him to an island, he died himself,[2] by a just judgment of God, in an island; as if it were a judgment upon a man to die in an island.

But how can we reconcile what that writer says of the sudden and miraculous change of Vigilius, with what he tells us elsewhere? namely, that it never more evidently appeared, than in the time of Vigilius, that the boat of St. Peter was immediately steered either by that apostle, or by him, whose vicar he was; since he, who then sat at the helm, was either asleep, though the wind was boisterous, or, if he watched, it was only to consult his own safety, without any concern about that of the vessel.[3] And indeed, that such was his true character, sufficiently appears from his whole conduct. However, in process of time, a place was allowed him in some martyrologies;[4] and he was once honored by several churches as a saint and a martyr. But he has been long since unsainted; and Baronius himself has not thought him worthy of a place in the Roman calendar.

PELAGIUS, FIFTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN.]

[Year of Christ, 555.] Vigilius was succeeded by Pelagius, a native of Rome, and the son of one John, formerly vicar to the præfectus prætorio.[5] He was first employed by Silverius, and sent by that pope to Constantinople, with the character of his apocrisarius, or nuncio; but betraying him, in the manner we have related above,[6] he seconded the wicked attempt of Vigilius, the usurper of his see. In the famous dispute concern-

[1] Bar. ad ann. 540. n. 5. [2] Idem. ibid. n. 7.

(*) Baronius tells us elsewhere, that Vigilius was, by the sacred laws of the church, incapable of being ever preferred to the episcopal dignity; and that, when he was proposed by Belisarius to the people and clergy of Rome, they could not think, without horror, of placing on the throne of St. Peter a man sullied with so many crimes, anathematized by his holy predecessor, and excluded by the canons from every preferment in the church. (Bar. ad ann. 540. n. 7.) If so, how could his election ever be lawful, an election made in defiance of the sacred laws and canons of the church? And how could Baronius pretend it was made by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?

[3] Bar. ad ann. 540. n. 15.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 553. n. 235.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 555. n. 1.
[3] Idem. Ibid.
[4] Calend. Vet. Trevir. 31. Januar.
[5] Lib. Pont.
[6] See p. 348, note (†)

The emperor promises to raise Pelagius to the papal dignity. The people instead of choosing him, separate themselves from his communion. He is illegally chosen, and ordained. He recurs to the emperor, who supports him in his usurpation. Narses prevails on the nobility and clergy to acknowledge him for their bishop. Pelagius writes to the bishops of Tuscany, in favor of the council;—[Year of Christ, 556.]

ing the "three chapters," he adhered to Vigilius in all his changes, condemning or approving those articles as the pope condemned or approved them. With him he was banished for rejecting the fifth council; but recanting, when the pope recanted, he was with him released from his exile, and recalled to Constantinople. He attended Vigilius on his return from the imperial city; and, the pope dying in the island of Sicily, he hastened to Rome, the emperor having promised to raise him to that see, if he survived Vigilius, upon his engaging to cause the fifth council to be universally received in the west. But, arriving at Rome, he found both the people and clergy incensed against him, to such a degree, on account of his having approved the last constitution of Vigilius, that, instead of choosing him for their bishop, they all separated themselves, with one consent, from his communion. Pelagius, however, knowing he had the emperor on his side, resolved to cause himself to be ordained in defiance of the canons, as well as the electors.(*)

Having therefore applied to the bishops, without consulting either the people or the clergy, he prevailed upon two, John of Perusia, and Bonus of Ferentinum, to perform the function: but, to the everlasting glory of the Italian prelates, a third could not be found in all Italy, who would be any ways concerned in so illegal an ordination. In his room therefore was substituted, by a new breach of the canons,(†) one Andrew, a presbyter of Ostia:(‡) and by the above-mentioned bishops, and that presbyter, was Pelagius ordained bishop of Rome.[1](§)

But, the people of Rome, highly provoked at his thus obtruding himself upon them, to show their resentment, separated themselves anew from his communion, declaring that, as he was not elected by them, but had, by an open breach of the canons, and against their consent, seized on the see, they would never acknowledge him for their lawful bishop. In these circumstances Pelagius had no other resource but to recur to the emperor; and to him he applied, without delay, acquainting him with his unhappy situation, and ascribing the hatred, which the Romans bore him, to his having approved the late council, and joined the eastern bishops in condemning the "three chapters." He renewed, on that occasion, the promise he had made of causing the fifth council to be universally received in the west: and there wanted no more to engage the emperor in his favor, who not only confirmed him, without any further inquiry, but wrote to Narses, who, having completed the reduction of Italy, governed that country with an absolute sway, commanding him to support the new pope with all his interest and power. In compliance with the emperor's command, Narses spared no pains to reconcile the people of Rome with their bishop, and succeeded therein so far as to gain over, in a very short time, the greater part of the nobility and clergy. Their acknowledging Pelagius for their lawful bishop was urged against those who did not, as a lawful election; so that, Narses interposing his authority, they were, in the end, all prevailed upon to acquiesce.[1]

Pelagius, finding himself now in the quiet possession of his see, undertook, with great zeal, the work which the emperor, to whom alone he was indebted for his dignity, had so much at heart. As the bishops of Tuscany were the nearest to Rome, and the most of all incensed against the pope, on account of his receiving the fifth council, having, on that score, even erased his name out of the diptychs; to them he wrote, in the first place, alleging several arguments to convince them, that the constitution of Vigilius, condemning the "three chapters," was no ways derogatory to the decrees or faith of Chalcedon. He adds, that the apostolic sees had all received that constitution; and, consequently, that such as did not receive it, ought to be deemed schismatics; the church being founded, according to St. Austin, on the apostolic sees, and the unity, so much recommended by the fathers, consisting in the union of the other churches with them.[2] Pelagius does not pretend, as we may observe here by the way, the church to have been founded on the see of Rome alone; nor that see alone to be the

(*) The canons of several councils forbid a bishop to be obtruded on the people, against their consent.

(†) The council of Nice requires all the bishops of the province to assist at the ordination of a new bishop. But adds, if they cannot all conveniently attend, three shall be sufficient, provided the metropolitan, and the rest, send their consent in writing.(a) Ordination performed by fewer than three was always deemed illegal; nay, the first council of Orange commands both the ordaining bishop, and the ordained, to be deposed:(b) and the council of Riez actually deposed Armentarius, because he had not been ordained by three bishops.(c) The fathers of that assembly even seem to have looked upon such an ordination as null: "Ordinationem," say they, "quam canones irritam definiunt, nos quoque vacuandam esse censuimus; in qua, prætermissa trium præsentia, &c. prorsus nihil, quod episcopum faceret, ostensum est."(d) But it must be allowed, that ordination, though performed by two bishops only, or even by one, was never deemed null by the church.

(a) Con. Nicen. can. 4.
(b) Con. 1. Arausiac. can. 21.
(c) Con. Reien. can. 1. (d) Con. Reien. ibid.

(‡) The bishop of Rome was, from the earliest times, as he still is, consecrated by the bishop of Ostia. But the present bishop of that city declining to consecrate one, who thus obtruded himself on the people, contrary to the known laws of the church, it was thought expedient to bring a presbyter, at least, from Ostia; and from thence was brought accordingly the above-mentioned presbyter.

[1] Lib Pont. Anast. Biblioth.

(§) It appears from his epitaph,(a) and is agreed on all hands, that he was ordained on the 11th of April. As to the year, concerning which there has been some dispute, it is manifest, from his letter to the bishops of Tuscany, dated the 15th of February, 556, that he was then pope; and consequently, that if he was ordained on the 11th of April, it was on the 11th of April of the preceding year, 555.

(a) Apud Bar. ann. 559. p. 494.

[1] Lib. Pont. [2] Pelag. ep. 6.

The fifth council rejected by almost all the western bishops. Pelagius writes a circular letter, addressed to the whole church. He strives to stir up Narses against the dissenting bishops. The great moderation of that general. The pope exhorts him anew to use force and violence; but in vain.

centre of unity. He closes his letter with a confession of faith, declaring, that he receives the first four councils, with the doctrine contained in the letter of Leo; and, laying before them the evils attending a schism, or misunderstanding, among the prelates of the church, he advises them, if they still question the orthodoxy of his faith, to send some of their brethren to Rome, assuring them, they will be thus fully satisfied, that his faith and theirs is one and the same.[1] The answer of the Tuscan bishops to this letter, if they returned any, has not reached our times. But from history it appears, that, apprehending the decree of the fifth council, condemning the "three chapters," to be inconsistent with the faith of Chalcedon, they continued for many years separated from the bishops of Rome, who received it.

It was not only by the bishops of Tuscany that the fifth council was rejected, though approved by the Roman church, and the pope. Those too of Liguria and Venetia in Italy, the bishops of Illyricum, Gaul, Spain, and even of Ireland, declared loudly against the decree of that assembly; nay, the Italian bishops, and likewise the Irish, censuring the conduct of the pope, in the sharpest terms, as if he had betrayed the faith, to engage the emperor in his favor, in case of a vacancy, separated themselves from his communion.[2] As for the bishops of Africa, they had, with one consent, renounced the communion of Rome, ever since the year 550, when they excommunicated Vigilius, for condemning the "three chapters," by his famous judicatum.[3]

Pelagius, finding himself thus abandoned by almost all the bishops in the west, as if he had condemned doctrines, which the council of Chalcedon had defined, to remove that suspicion, wrote a circular letter, addressed to the whole church, solemnly declaring, that he approved the first four oecumenical councils; that he held the doctrine which they had defined; anathematized all, who had been anathematized by them; and received those whom they received; namely, the two catholic bishops Theodoret and Ibas.[4] But this declaration, however solemn, did not satisfy the dissenting bishops. They still continued to defend the "three chapters," anathematizing, as betrayers of the faith of Chalcedon, all who presumed, or should ever presume, to condemn them. The pope, therefore, finding he could by no other means overcome the obstinacy of the refractory and schismatic bishops, as he styled them, resolved, in the end, to recur to the secular power; and accordingly wrote several very pressing letters to Narses, recommending to that general the unity of the church, and exhorting him to restrain, by his authority, those whom the authority of St. Peter, and his see, could not restrain, or bring to a sense of their duty. Narses, though a great warrior, was a man of a mild disposition, of great moderation, and, in matters of religion, utterly averse to persecution and violence. Unwilling therefore to exert his authority, he strove, by gentle methods, by entreaties and persuasion, to gain over the Italian bishops, who were subjects of the empire. This method of acting was agreeable to the temper of the general, but not of the bishop; who, finding it was not attended with the wished for success, wrote anew to Narses, encouraging him to change his conduct, and employ some more effectual means than entreaties and persuasion, to bring to reason the public disturbers of the tranquillity of the empire. "Be not alarmed," says he, "at the idle talk of some, crying out against persecution, and reproaching the church, as if she delighted in cruelty, when she punishes evil with wholesome severities, or procures the salvation of souls. He alone persecutes, who forces to evil: but to restrain men from doing evil, or to punish them because they have done it, is not persecution, or cruelty, but love of mankind. Now that schism, or a separation from the apostolic sees, is an evil, no man can deny; and that schismatics may and ought to be punished, even by the secular power, is manifest both from the canons of the church, and the scripture." In what part of the scripture it is said, that those who separate themselves from the apostolic sees, may and ought to be punished by the secular power, the pope did not think fit to let us know. He closes his letter with exhorting Narses to cause the heads of the schism to be apprehended, and sent, under a strong guard, to Constantinople; assuring him, that he need not scruple to use violence, if it may be so called, in the present case, seeing the civil power is allowed, nay, and required by the canons, not only to apprehend, but to send into exile, and confine to painful prisons, those who, dissenting from their brethren, disturb the tranquillity of the church.[1] Might not the Arians, the Nestorians, and the Eutychians, have justified, by the same principles, and method of reasoning, used here by the pope, all the cruelties they practised on the catholics, when they prevailed, and had the civil power on their side?

Narses was no less desirous than the pope, of seeing an end put to the schism, being well apprised, that Justinian had nothing more at heart, and that his effecting it would rivet him forever in the emperor's forever. However, instead of hearkening to the suggestions of the pope, he still pursued his former conduct; acting therein more like a bishop than a soldier, while the bishop acted more like a soldier than a bishop. Some bishops of Tuscany, and some of Liguria, were, in the end, prevailed upon by Narses to renew their commu-

[1] Pelag. ep. 6.
[2] See p. 356.
[3] Greg. Mag. l. 2. epist. c. 36.
[4] Pelag. ep. 7.

[1] Pelag. ep. 3.

Some bishops persuaded by Narses to renew their communion with Rome. The bishops of Istria separate themselves from the communion of the pope, and excommunicate Narses;—[Year of Christ, 557.] The pope takes thence an opportunity of stirring him up anew against them. Childebert, king of the Franks suspects the faith of the pope; who sends to the king an ample confession of his faith. Several other letters written in different years by Pelagius.

nion with Rome; but could by no means be persuaded to receive the fifth council, and condemn the "three chapters," condemned, as they said, by the predecessor of Pelagius, and Pelagius himself, merely to gratify the emperor, and redeem themselves from exile, and the hardships they suffered. As for the bishops of Istria, having assembled about this time a council in Aquilea, at which presided Paulinus bishop of that city, they declared all to a man in favor of the "three chapters," rejected the council which had condemned them, separated themselves from the communion of the pope, and, at the same time, excommunicated Narses for concurring with him, and striving to establish a faith different from that which was established at Chalcedon. Of this Pelagius was no sooner informed, than he wrote anew to Narses, exhorting him to revenge the affront, which the schismatics had offered to him, and, in him, to the emperor, whom he represented. To deter others from attempts of the like nature, and teach them the respect that is due to the see of the prime apostle, and the majesty of the empire, he advises Narses to send Paulinus prisoner to Constantinople, to drive all the rest from their sees, and banish them the province. He complains of Paulinus in particular, not only as a schismatic, but as one, who, having been unduly ordained, ought not to be looked upon, nor ought to be treated, as a lawful bishop, but as an intruder. "By a custom, says he, which has long obtained, the bishops of Aquilea and Milan ordained each other: but the ceremony was to be performed in the church of the ordained, that no room might be left for the ordainer to claim any superiority or jurisdiction over the other; and, at the same time, he might be well assured, that the person, whom he ordained, was acceptable to the people. This custom, continues the pope, was not observed in the ordination of Paulinus, the pretended bishop of Aquilea. He was not ordained in his own church, but in that of Milan; and therefore must not be looked upon as a lawful bishop, but only as an intruder, and an usurper."[1] What the pope urges here against the ordination of Paulinus, might have been unanswerably urged against his own. If the bishop of Aquilea was to be looked upon only as an intruder and an usurper, because the above-mentioned custom was not observed in his ordination, ought not Pelagius himself, with much more reason, to have been looked upon as an intruder and an usurper, seeing he had been ordained contrary to a more ancient custom, a custom established and strictly enjoined by an express canon of the most revered council that ever was held in the church;[2] nay, and against the consent and declared will of the whole people? But not remembering his own illegal ordination, or thinking Narses did not remember it, he had even the assurance to tell that general, it was incumbent upon him to see that the customs and laws of the church were as punctually complied with as those of the empire, and to punish all who presumed to transgress them within the bounds of his jurisdiction: that the bishops of Aquilea and Milan were both guilty of a notorious transgression of the said laws; which he cannot connive at, without betraying the trust reposed in him by the most religious emperor; nor, in so flagrant a case, do less than remove both bishops from their sees, and send them prisoners to Constantinople.[1] Thus Pelagius; but yet the two bishops kept possession of their sees to the day of their death. And truly, had Narses been persuaded by the pope, that it was incumbent upon him to proceed, with so much severity, against those who presumed to transgress the customs and laws of the church within the bounds of his jurisdiction, he must have begun with his holiness himself, whom he well knew to be the most notorious transgressor of all.

In the mean time a report being spread all over Gaul, that the pope, by approving the fifth council, condemned the doctrine which had been defined and established in the council of Chalcedon, Childebert, king of the Franks, dispatched one Ruffinus to Rome, to acquaint Pelagius with that report, and, at the same time, to require a confession of his faith. Were an embassador now sent to Rome on such an errand, he would there meet with a very indifferent reception: but, as the popes had not yet begun to think themselves infallible, Pelagius, though a man of no meek spirit, instead of resenting it in the king, that he should have thus questioned the orthodoxy of his faith, received his embassador with uncommon marks of respect and esteem; and, in compliance with his demand, drew up, signed, and sent into Gaul, an ample confession of his faith, solemnly declaring, that he not only received, but was ready to defend, even at the expense of his life, the holy faith of Chalcedon; that he anathematized all who did not hold the same faith, as well as the doctrine contained in the letter of Leo; and that nothing had been defined in the fifth council, but what was entirely agreeable to that faith and doctrine.[2] This confession the king immediately communicated to the Gallican bishops. But they, not satisfied with it, still continued, in spite of the pope's repeated protestations, to defend the "three chapters;" and it was not till many years after that the fifth council was universally received in Gaul.

Several other letters, or fragments of letters, have reached our times, written, in different

[1] Pelag. ep. 5. [2] See note (*) p. 371.

[1] See note (*) p. 371. [2] Pelag. ep. 10.

Pelagius dies:—Year of Christ, 560. John III. chosen, after a vacancy of four months. What occasioned these long vacancies.

years, by Pelagius to Narses, to Childebert, to Sabaudus of Arles, and others. In one to Sabaudus, he appoints that prelate his vicar, vesting him with the metropolitan jurisdiction, not only over the provinces that were subject to Childebert, but all Gaul.[1] In his letters to Narses, he complains of several bishops, whom he charges with incest, with murder, with adultery, and other heinous crimes, which, he says, it is the duty of the civil magistrate to punish, since the church could not, with all the severity such enormities deserved.[2] In another letter he acquaints the person to whom he writes, that the people of Syracuse, which see was immediately subject to that of Rome, having chosen one for their bishop, who was married, and had children, he had refused to ordain him; but finding the people, after they had been a whole year without a bishop, were still determined to choose no other, he had, in the end, thought it adviseable to ordain the person, whom they had chosen; but it was upon condition that he should not misapply the goods of the church, nor bequeath the least share of them, at his death, to his wife, or his children.[3]

This letter, and another concerning the building of new churches, which the pope will not allow to be built on ground where any person whatever has been buried, seem to have been written in 558, and most authors suppose Pelagius to have died the following year. But from his epitaph it appears, that he governed the Roman church four years, ten months, and eighteen days;[1] and, consequently, as he was ordained on the eleventh of April 555,[2] that his death must have happened on the first of March 560. He had the mortification to see the authority of the Roman church universally disregarded, and brought to the lowest ebb, even in the west, the bishops of Gaul, Spain, Africa, Ireland and Italy, continuing, in spite of all his efforts, of his repeated protestations, and decisions, to condemn and reject a council, which he had approved and received; nay, and to suspect the orthodoxy of his faith, because he received it.[3](*) Pelagius is said, in the pontificals, to have died when he had just laid the foundation of the famous church in Rome, dedicated to the two apostles St. Philip and St. James.

JOHN III., SIXTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN, JUSTIN *the younger*.]

[Year of Christ, 560.] Pelagius being dead, John, the third of that name, the son of Anastasius, a person of no small distinction in Rome, was chosen to succeed him, and ordained on the 18th of July, which, in 560, fell on a Sunday, after the see had been vacant four months, and seventeen days.[4] These long vacancies are ascribed, by some, to the intrigues of the candidates, or pretenders to the papal dignity. But what seems chiefly to have occasioned them, was, that the elect, by what number soever elected, could not be ordained till his election was approved and confirmed by the emperor; so that the emperor was to be acquainted with the election, was to issue a decree confirming it, and that decree was to be sent to the exarch of Ravenna,(*) and notified by him to the Roman people; which, in those times, could seldom be done till several months after the election, on account of the irruptions of the barbarians, and the wars in Italy. In the mean time the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the primicerius, or chief of the notaries, supplying the room of the pope, transacted all business, and disposed of the revenues of the see, as they thought fit. It was their province to acquaint the emperor, the exarch, the judges, and likewise the bishop of Ravenna, with the decease of the pope, as soon as it happened, and afterwards with the election of his successor; nor did they resign their charge, till they received the imperial decree confirming the election. Their thus waiting till the will of

[1] Pelag. ep. 15. [2] Idem, epist. 4.
[3] Idem, ep. 11. et frag. 1. tom. 5. Concil. p. 805.
[4] Lib. Pontif.

(†) The provinces of Italy had, ever since the time of Constantine the Great, been governed by Consulares Correctores, and Præsides, no alteration in the government having been made either by the emperors who succeeded Constantine, or by the kings of the Goths. But the Goths being driven out by Narses, and all Italy united anew to the empire, Longinus, who was sent to succeed that general, suppressed the ancient magistrates; and, in their room, placed, in each city of note a governor, whom he distinguished with the title of duke. For himself, he assumed the title of exarch, which was given by the Greeks to those who presided over a diocese, and, consequently, over the many provinces of which the diocese was composed. The same title was adopted by the successors of Longinus, who, residing, as he had done, at Ravenna, were thence styled exarches of Ravenna. They governed Italy with an absolute authority, placing and displacing the dukes at their pleasure; and to them the people had recourse in all matters of moment. They maintained the power and authority of the emperors in Italy for the space of one hundred and eighty-three years, that is, from the year 568, when Longinus was sent into that country, to the year 751, when Eutychius, the last exarch, was driven out, and Ravenna was taken by Astulphus, king of the Lombards, as we shall have occasion to relate hereafter.

[1] Apud Bar. ad Ann. 559. p. 494.
[2] See p. 371. note (2) [3] Lib. Pontif.

(*) Did those bishops believe him infallible? It is evident they did not; nor, indeed, did he himself: else he would not have failed, as we may well suppose, to plead that prerogative, or at least, to mention it, on so urgent an occasion.

Whether the papal dignity be conferred by an election alone. Nothing recorded of this pope worthy of notice. The eastern bishops at variance about the "corruptibility and incorruptibility" of the body of Christ. The first rise and progress of this dispute.

the emperor was known, often occasioned a considerable delay in the ordination or consecration of the pope. But how long soever the delay was, the elect did not, in the mean time, exercise any authority as true and lawful pope, nor was he looked upon as such, but still yielded the first place in the church to the archpriest.(*) Hence it appears, that the papal dignity, whatever power or jurisdiction it imports, was not then thought to be conferred by election alone, but by election and consecration. It was on this consideration that the ancient writers have not allowed a place, in the catalogue of the popes, to Stephen, who was chosen in 782, but died before he could be consecrated. But in the year 1059, Nicholas II. decreed, That if the pope could not be consecrated, he should nevertheless exercise his authority as true and lawful pope, in governing the Roman church, and disposing of the goods of the holy see.[1] However it was still disputed in the 13th century, whether the pope had a power to issue bulls before his consecration; and many maintained, that he had no such power. But Clement V. put an end to the dispute in 1306, by a bull, forbidding, on pain of excommunication, any such question to be brought into debate;[2] and it is now a settled point in the schools, that the pope receives all papal authority from his election alone.(†)

But to return to the present pope. He held the see thirteen years, wanting a few days; and yet I find nothing recorded of him by the contemporary writers, that is worthy of notice. In the west affairs continued in the same situation, in which his predecessor had left them, some bishops there receiving, but the far greater part continuing still to condemn, the fifth council, and all who received it. What pains the pope took to heal these divisions, to unite the bishops among themselves, and with his see, we know not, nor indeed whether he took any; for of the several letters that are ascribed to him, not one is allowed, by the learned, to be genuine.

In the east the fifth council was universally received; but yet the ecclesiastics were there too at variance among themselves, with respect to another point, and no less divided than their brethren in the west. The state enjoyed often a settled peace, but the church scarce ever. The point at present in dispute was, "whether the body of Christ was, before he rose from the dead, corruptible or incorruptible." This important question had occasioned, some years before, great dissensions and divisions among the Eutychians, and even a schism in that party, some of them obstinately maintaining, that the body of Christ was, and others, no less obstinately, that it was not, subject to corruption. The question was first moved, about the year 531, by some monks of Egypt, a set of men, who, indulging themselves, for want of a better employment, in speculations of that nature, took particular delight in communicating them to the world, and seeing the ecclesiastics as well as the laity engaged in disputes and quarrels about them. For such was the humor, such the temper of men in those days, more especially of the ecclesiastics, that every conceit, however absurd, however impertinent and idle, was looked upon by them, on account of some far-fetched deductions and consequences, as a matter of the utmost importance to the faith, as the subject of a serious dispute and inquiry. And indeed what else but idle conceits, but trifling, absurd, and impertinent speculations, calculated only to confound our belief, and, by multiplying mysteries, render the Christian religion quite unintelligible, was the subject of most of the disputes; for the determining of which, after they had long rent the church into irreconcilable parties and factions, bishops were summoned, as we have often seen, from all parts of the Christian world, and general councils assembled?

Of the rise and progress of the present controversy, the contemporary writers deliver us the following account: a monk of Egypt, repairing to Severus,[1] the famous Eutychian bishop of Antioch, who had been obliged to quit the see he had usurped, and take refuge in Alexandria, asked him, whether he thought the body of Christ was "corruptible" or "incorruptible" before his resurrection. Severus answered, after a short pause, that the fathers had all believed it "corruptible;" and that his faith was the same with theirs. The monk, not satisfied with that answer, being perhaps himself of a different opinion, or wanting to divide the leading men of that party among themselves, for the good of the church, went straight from Severus to Julian, the Eutychian bishop of Halicarnassus, who had been likewise forced to abandon his see, and fly into Egypt, and asked him the same question. Julian returned answer, that the fathers had all believed the body of Christ to have been, from its conception, "incorrupt-

(*) Thus John IV. being elected pope, while he was archdeacon, signed nevertheless, in the second place, and after the archpriest, the letter, which the Roman clergy wrote to the Scots before his election was confirmed by the emperor, styling himself only deacon, with the addition of elect, "Joannes Diaconus, et in nomine dei electus." (a)

(a) Bed. l. 2. c. 19. Epist. 15. Martini Pap. et Lib. diurn. Rom. Pont. tit 1.

[1] Gratian. dist. 23. can. *in nomine Domini.*

[2] Extravag. com. l. 5. c. 4. tit. 10.

(†) This opinion the modern writers are all bound to maintain, and consequently to place the above-mentioned Stephen, though never consecrated, in the catalogue of the popes; which has occasioned a disagreement between them and the ancients, in the number of the Stephens, and the manner of numbering them. For thus Stephen, styled the second by the ancients, is reckoned the third by the moderns; the third is called the fourth; and, in the same manner, the rest to the ninth, whom the moderns call the tenth; with great confusion in history, and contradiction among writers.

See p. 316.

The Eutychians divided among themselves about the dispute. Justinian issues an edict in favor of the "incorruptibility;" which is opposed by the greater part of the catholic bishops.—[Year of Christ, 565.]

ible," and that he durst not hold a doctrine that was not held by them. Neither bishop recurred to, nor ever once thought of the scripture, as if there had been no such book, or they had never heard of it. The fathers held the place of the inspired writers with the heterodox as well as the catholics, and were alone consulted by both, in all doubts and disputes about the faith.

The monk had acquainted Julian with the answer of Severus, and now, returning to Severus, acquainted him with the answer of Julian; and there wanted no more to set the two chiefs at variance, and kindle a war in that party. Both bishops were zealous defenders of the doctrine of Eutyches; and having, on that account, been driven from their sees, they had hitherto lived, as fellow-sufferers for the same cause, in the greatest friendship and intimacy. But Severus, who was a man of a most haughty and imperious temper, impatient of all contradiction, and highly conceited of himself and his talents, no sooner understood that Julian had presumed to contradict him, than, looking upon him no longer as a friend, but as his antagonist, he published a writing to prove, that the fathers had all believed the body of Christ to have been "incorruptible;" and that nothing but the grossest ignorance could excuse those from heresy who maintained the contrary opinion. This writing was immediately answered by Julian with another, to prove, that the fathers had all believed the body of Christ to have been "incorruptible;" and that it was not only rank heresy, but downright blasphemy, to maintain the contrary opinion.(*) War being thus declared, the whole party were divided at once into two opposite factions, some siding with Severus, and some with Julian. The opinion of Severus was warmly espoused by Timotheus, then bishop of Alexandria, and a most zealous Eutychian; and the opinion of Julian by a deacon of the same church, named Themistius, who likewise professed the doctrine of Eutyches, and had no less distinguished himself by his zeal in defending it, than by his parts, and his learning. The leading men being thus divided, from them the division soon passed to the rest of the clergy, and from the clergy to the laity; nay, and to the riotous multitude; which occasioned endless disturbances, and threw the whole city into the utmost confusion. In the mean time Timotheus died; and the two parties not agreeing about the election of his successor, Theodosius, who maintained the "corruptibility," was chosen by the one, and Gaianus, who denied it, by the other. Thus were their animosities heightened to such a degree, that had not the civil power interposed, a bloody war had been kindled in the bowels of the city. For the populace on either side had already begun to look upon each other as declared heretics, as "avowed enemies to the human nature of Christ;" and some battles were fought, not only in the streets and the squares, but in the churches themselves. This schism or division among the Eutychians was not confined to Alexandria or Egypt alone, but soon extended to Constantinople, to Antioch, and to all the other cities in the east.[1]

As for the catholics, they at first wisely declined engaging in the dispute, and would, in all likelihood, have continued neuter, had not Justinian, who took particular delight in disputes of that nature, drawn them into the quarrel. For the emperor, not satisfied with declaring for the "incorruptibility," and warmly espousing the cause of those who maintained it, undertook this year to have that opinion universally approved and received by the church. With that view, he published an edict, declaring the body of Christ to have been "incorruptible," agreeably to the doctrine of the fathers, and requiring all to teach, hold, and believe, what they had taught, held, and believed. As this edict was peremptory, and no room was now left for the neutrality, which the catholic bishops had hitherto observed, the division, which had so miserably rent the Eutychian party, was at once introduced among them; some of them readily complying, while others could by no means be prevailed upon to comply, with the commands of the emperor. Among the latter were the two patriarchs, Eutychius of Constantinople, and Anastasius of Antioch, who, boldly opposing the imperial definition, or edict, as utterly inconsistent with the faith of the church and the fathers, drew after them

(*) The dispute was not concerning the mortality or immortality of the body of Christ; nor whether it could be resolved into the principles, of which it was originally composed? but whether it required nourishment like other bodies, and could not naturally subsist without food, drink, and sleep? Whether Christ suffered hunger and thirst, by "nature," or only because he *chose* to suffer them? The defenders of the "corruptibility" maintained Christ to have been, by his nature, hungry, thirsty, wearied, &c. to have slept, and used nourishment, to satisfy those natural appetites, and to have divested himself of that "corruptibility" at his resurrection. On the other hand, the asserters of the "incorruptibility" would not allow Christ to have used any kind of nourishment, or to have rested, because he was "by nature" hungry, thirsty, or tired, but because he chose to be so, eating before his passion, in the same manner as he did after his resurrection, not because he wanted food, but only to show that he was a true and real man. That Christ really and truly suffered hunger, thirst, weariness, &c. both parties allowed; and only disagreed with respect to the manner in which he suffered them; the one maintaining, that he suffered them in the same manner as we do, by the natural constitution of his body; and the other, that he suffered them only by choice; insomuch that had he abstained from all food, yet he had not been hungry, unless he had chosen to be so. These were styled "incorruptícolæ" or "aphthartodocitæ," "phantasiastæ," and "Gaianitæ," from one Gaianus, whom they chose for bishop of Alexandria, their antagonists being distinguished with the names of "corrupticolæ," and "Theodosiani," from one Theodosius, chosen by them, in opposition to Gaianus, (*a*) as the reader will find in the following page.

(*a*) Liberat. Brev. c. 19. Leont. de sectis, act. 5. Niceph. l. 17. c. 29.

[1] Liberat. Breviar. c. 19. Leont. de sect. act. 5. Niceph. l. 17. c. 29.

Eutychius of Constantinople seized, and deposed by the emperor, for opposing his edict. He is tried by a council, and sent into exile. The emperor resolves to proceed in the same manner against Anastasius of Antioch, but is prevented by death.

the far greater part of the catholic bishops. These, well apprised of the dissensions and divisions which such an edict would inevitably raise in the church, jointly applied to the emperor, earnestly entreating him to revoke it, and refer the decision of the dispute to the judgment of a council. But Justinian, instead of hearkening to their remonstrances, or the reasons they alleged to convince him, that the doctrine of the "incorruptibility" was repugnant to the belief of the church, issued a new edict confirming the former, and commanding all bishops to receive it, on pain of forfeiting their sees, and being driven into exile. This last edict was no sooner published than several bishops, ready to teach any doctrine rather than to part with their sees, shifting sides, began publicly to defend the opinion which they had hitherto anathematized, and anathematize that which they had hitherto defended. Thus, in a very short time, would the imperial decree have been universally received, and the doctrine of the "incorruptibility" established in the east, had not the two patriarchs withstood the emperor with great firmness and constancy; and by the writings they daily published encouraged some of their brethren to follow their example, even at the expence of forfeiting their sees. On them, therefore, Justinian resolved to wreak his vengeance; and, beginning with Eutychius, he ordered him to be apprehended by a band of soldiers; and he was apprehended accordingly, even in the imperial palace, after he had performed divine service in a chapel, which the emperor had lately built there. From the palace he was conveyed, under a strong guard, as a public malefactor, to a monastery in the neighborhood of Chalcedon, and there kept eight days, strictly guarded, and most cruelly used by the soldiery. In the mean time the emperor, looking upon him as a heretic, and consequently as one who had forfeited the episcopal dignity, appointed in his room Joannes Exscholasticus, a zealous stickler for the "incorruptibility," and then apocrisarius or nuncio, at the imperial court, from the bishop of Antioch. By the new patriarch was assembled, in great haste, pursuant to the emperor's order, a council at Constantinople, to judge Eutychius late bishop of that city. He was accordingly summoned to appear before that assembly, and clear himself from the crimes which they pretended to have been laid to his charge. But with that summons Eutychius was so far from complying, that he excommunicated on the spot both those who came with it, and those who sent them. The council therefore, having summoned him three times, agreeably to the canons, declared him, upon his not obeying their third summons, guilty of the crimes with which he was charged; and he was immediately delivered up to the soldiery, and carried by them to an island in the Propontis, known by the name of the Prince's Island. There he passed three weeks, treated, the whole time with the utmost barbarity, by the soldiers appointed to guard him. From thence he was conveyed to Amasea, the metropolis of Helenopontus, where he was confined for life to the monastery, in which he had been educated, and was afterwards archimandrita or abbot.[1](*)

One of the chief and most zealous defenders of the corruptibility being thus removed, the emperor, in the next place, resolved to proceed, with the same severity, against the other, Anastasius of Antioch, a prelate no less conspicuous for his piety than his learning. Having therefore first attempted anew, but attempted in vain, to bring the patriarch over to his opinion by fair means, he at last let him know, that if he did not, within a limited time, sign the edict establishing the catholic doctrine of incorruptibility, he must expect no better treatment than his brother of Constantinople had met with. Anastasius, well apprised of the inflexibility of the emperor, who was never known to have quitted an opinion, which he had once taken up, began to prepare for exile; and on that occasion wrote an exhortatory discourse, or oration, to the Antiochians, encouraging them to maintain, even at the expense of their lives, the catholic doctrine of corruptibility. His zeal had cost him dear, had Justinian only lived a few days longer. But Providence interposed, says Evagrius,[2] and at the same time a period was put to the life of the emperor, and to his wicked attempts on the servants of God, and the catholic church. Justinian died on the 14th of November, 565, in the 83d year of his age, having reigned 38 years, 7 months, and 13 days.(†) Of all the emperors he concerned

[1] Eustath. in vit. Eutych. c. 5. Theoph. ad ann. 564. Cedren. ad ann. Justiniani 38.

(*) However, upon the death of Joannes Scholasticus, or Exscholasticus, which happened in 577, he was recalled to Constantinople, by the emperors Justinus the Younger, and Tiberius Constantinus, and restored to his see, which he held to his death, that is, to the year 582. (a) He is now honored as a saint, both by the Greeks and the Latins; and the reader will find, in Baronius, a very particular account of the many miracles he is supposed to have wrought. (b)

(a) Theophan. ad ann. Alex. 569.

(b) Apud Bar. ad ann. 564. p. 525—527.

[2] Evagr. l. 4. c. 40.

(†) Zonaras gives him the following character: "He was easy of access; and no less ready to hear informers than to punish offenders. He coveted money, but spent it as idly, as he had acquired it unjustly. As he was thus ever indigent, the surest means of earning his favor was to suggest new methods of acquiring new wealth." He is highly commended by all the contemporary writers, even by those who, in other respects, seem to have been prejudiced against him, for his uncommon parts, and extraordinary knowledge, especially in divinity, in philosophy, in jurisprudence, in architecture, and even in music, a hymn, which he composed, and set to music, being sung to this day in the Greek churches. (a) However, Baronius will have him to have been quite illiterate, and often inveighs against him for presuming

(a) Vide Aleman. in notis ad hist. Arcan. procop. c. 18.

The emperor acted, during the whole time of his reign, as the supreme head and governor of the church. He is succeeded by Justin the Younger. The wise measures he took to restore peace to the church.

himself the most in ecclesiastical matters, as appears from his Novellæ, which contain so many edicts relating to the discipline of the church, that he is reckoned among the ecclesiastical writers. He enacted several laws concerning the ordination of bishops, their age, qualifications, residence, privileges, &c. He regulated the convocation of councils, and prescribed their time; issued several orders concerning the manners and conduct of the clergy, of the monks, and the sacred virgins; enforced the observance of the canons; established the penalties, no less than deposition and degradation, to be inflicted on the metropolitans, bishops, and other ecclesiastics, who should transgress them; and finally restrained the bishops, no bishop excepted, from excommunicating, without a just cause; that is, without a cause specified in the canons, and till the crime was fully proved.[1] In short, he acted, in every respect, as the supreme head and governor of the church; and the laws he enacted as such, were received both in the east and the west, by the bishops of Constantinople as well as by those of Rome, without the least opposition or complaint, as appears from Gregory the Great,[2] from Hincmarus,[3] and others.(*)

In the room of Justinian was proclaimed, and crowned, on the 14th of November, by the patriarch Joannes Exscholasticus, Justin the Younger, the son of Dulcissimus, by Vigilantia, the deceased emperor's sister. As the bishops and clergy were, at the time of his accession, every where at variance in the east, about the corruptibility and incorruptibility of the body of Christ; in the west, about the "three chapters;" and the church was reduced, by their disagreement and feuds, to a most deplorable condition, the pastors being more intent on cursing each other than instructing their flocks, the first care of the new emperor was to reconcile them, if possible, and, banishing all discord, establish that peace in its room, which Christ left to his disciples, as his last legacy, before he returned to his Father. Justin was well apprised, that the points which occasioned such warm disputes, which thus divided the Christian prelates, and rent the church into parties and factions, were no

to dictate in matters of religion, though he could not so much as read the title of the bible. Into this gross mistake the annalist was led by an incorrect copy of the Lexicon of Suidas, printed at Milan, which alone he seems to have perused. For in that copy the name of Justinian is put, by an error of the press, instead of the name of Justin, who was quite illiterate, as I have elsewhere observed from Procopius.(a) Had Baronius consulted any of the several manuscript copies of Suidas, lodged in the Vatican library, he had found in them the name of Justin, where we read that of Justinian in the Milan edition.

In points of religion, however uncertain and disputable, he was no less positive, obstinate, and peremptory, than the popes themselves, treating all as heretics, the pope himself not excepted, who differed from him, without hearkening to any reasons or arguments against the opinion which he had once embraced. He was a match for the popes; and though the rest of the world often yielded to them for the sake of peace, Justinian never would; nay, we have seen one of the popes obliged to yield to him, and condemn the opinion which he had once maintained.(b)

Justinian was engaged in war with some nation or other, during the greater part of his reign. But his wars he managed abroad by his lieutenants, especially by the two renowned commanders Belisarius and Narses, while he employed his whole time at home in disputing about matters of religion, or in building. Of his religious disputes we have spoken already; and as to his buildings, they were almost without number; for he is said to have restored no fewer than 150 cities, which he found entirely ruined, or very much decayed, to have erected castles in every province of the empire, and to have filled with churches and hospitals, not only Constantinople, but all the east. But of all the churches he built, that called Sancta Sophia and Magna was by far the most expensive and magnificent. It was begun by Constantine the Great, and finished 34 years after, by his son Constantius, but burnt down, and entirely consumed in 532, the sixth year of the reign of Justinian, who the same year undertook to rebuild it, or rather to build another far more magnificent in its room. The foundation of the new church was laid on the 23d of February, 532, and the whole edifice completed and dedicated on the 28th of December, 537. It is celebrated by all the writers, who speak of the buildings of Justinian, as the glory and wonder of the world, insomuch that the emperor himself, when he had finished it, was heard to say, νενίκηκά σε, Σολομών, "I have outdone thee, Solomon." In this church particular notice is taken by the ancients of the holy table, composed according to Cedrenus,(c) of gold, silver, precious stones, metals, and all sorts of materials, which either the earth or the sea could afford, melted and mixed together. Round it was the following inscription, written by Justinian himself: "We thy servants, Justinian and Theodora, offer unto thee thy own gifts, which we beseech thee favorably to accept, O Son and Word of God, who wast made flesh, and crucified, for our sake. Keep us in the true orthodox faith; and this empire, which thou hast committed to our trust, augment and preserve to thy own glory, by the intercession of the holy mother of God and Virgin Mary. It appears from the last words of this inscription, that in the sixth century the prayers of saints were thought available, though we meet with very few instances, even in that age, of any addressed to them. Of the wonderful works and buildings of Justinian the reader will find a very minute and particular account in Evagrius,(d) Procopius,(e) and Agathias.(f) I shall only observe here, that he neither hoarded up, nor applied to the gratification of any unlawful inclination, the exorbitant sums which he levied on his subjects, but employed them either in carrying on his great works, or in paying his numerous forces; so that they may be said to have returned to the public. Justinian may deservedly be called the last Roman emperor; for in him the majesty of the empire seemed to revive; but it soon vanished again, and fell to decay.

(a) See p. 315. Note (*) (b) See p. 367, 368.
(c) Cedren. hist. compend. ad ann. 32. Justini.
(d) Evagr. l. 4. c. 31.
(e) Procop. de Ædific. Justin. l. 1. c. 1.
(f) Agath. l. 5.

[1] Novel. 5, 6, 7. 22. 120. 123, &c.
[2] Greg. l. 2. ep. 54. [3] Hincmar. opusc. c. 17.

(*) Justinian is greatly commended, even by some of the popes, notwithstanding the little regard he paid to the decisions and judgment of their see. Pope Gregory the Great constantly styles him an emperor of pious or blessed memory; (a) and pope Agatho, in the two letters he wrote to the emperors Tiberius and Heraclius, prefers him to Theodosius the Great, to Marcian, and all the emperors who reigned before him, for his true piety, for his zeal in maintaining the purity of the catholic faith, and his care of the ecclesiastical discipline; and adds, that his memory ought ever to be revered by all the nations of the Christian world.(b) However, Evagrius gravely tells us, that he was damned, "ad supplicia justo dei judicio apud inferos luenda profectus est;" (c) and Baronius seems strongly inclined to believe him, because that writer lived in the time of Justinian; (d) whereas, those who commend him, lived after; and consequently could not be so well informed as he, of what happened to the emperor in the other world.

(a) Greg. l. 2. ep. 10. l. 3. ep. 4. l. 7. ep. 126.
(b) Extant in Synod. sexta, Act. 4.
(c) Evagr. l 3. c. 1. (d) Bar. ad ann. 565. p. 531.

With that view he publishes an edict;—[Year of Christ, 566.] Peace restored in the east by his edict. Two Gallican bishops, deposed by a council, recur to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 570];—their crimes. The two bishops well received at Rome, and there declared innocent, and restored by the king. The conduct of the pope, how resented by the Gallican bishops.

articles of the catholic faith, but impertinent speculations of idle men, which every Christian might receive or reject, belive or disbelieve, without deserving the name of heretic, or being in the least suspected of heresy. Instead therefore of declaring for either of the contending parties, or persecuting either, as his predecessor had unadvisedly done, he issued an edict, containing and explaining the indisputable articles of the Christian faith, and anathematizing, as heretics, all who did not receive them; but, at the same time, declaring every man free, with respect to the disputable articles, to hold and profess that opinion, or doctrine, which should appear to him to be the best grounded. The emperor, after exhorting all Christians to peace and concord, observes, in the end of his edict, that it was about words only they frequently quarrelled, nay, that a single syllable had set them at variance, and given occasion to long disputes. He probably alluded to the syllables "of" and "in,"[1] about which the dispute had lasted, in his time, above one hundred years, and was not yet ended, nor likely to end. Justin closes his edict with strictly forbidding all disputes of that nature, those especially concerning the corruptibility or incorruptibility of the body of Christ, and the "three chapters," the church being divided in the east by the one, and in the west by the other.[2]

The emperor, not satisfied with issuing that edict, despatched Photinus, the son-in-law of Belisarius, into Egypt, where the dispute about the corruptibility and incorruptibility had first begun, and was carried on with most warmth, charging him to settle, if by any means he could, those churches in peace; and vesting him, for that purpose, with an unlimited power, says Theophanes, over all persons and things.[3] But that power Photinus had no occasion to exert; the imperial edict was received, without the least opposition, not in Egypt only, but in all the provinces of the east, and thereby an end put at once to all further disputes, both parties being, in their hearts, desirous of peace, as Theophanes observes, though neither could ever be prevailed upon to yield to the other.

The dispute about the corruptibility and incorruptibility was, it seems, entirely confined to the east: for I do not find, that either the pope, or any of the western bishops, were ever concerned in that controversy, or were ever consulted by the contending parties about it. An undeniable proof, that the pope was not looked upon, by either party, as an unerring judge in matters of faith and religion. Of the present pope not the least mention is made by the ancient writers, from the time of his election till the year 570, the eleventh of his pontificate, when he is said to have restored two Gallican bishops deposed by a council. These were Salonius and Sagittarius, two brothers, the former bishop of Ebredunum, or Ambrun, the latter of Vapuncum, or Gap. They were accused by one of their brethren, Victor, bishop of Augusta Tricastinorum, now St. Paul de Trois Chateaux, of several most enormous crimes, of murders, adulteries, robberies, &c. having even attacked that prelate, at the head of a band of ruffians, on his birthday, which he designed to have passed in innocent mirth with his friends, and used him in a most barbarous manner, beaten his domestics, plundered his house, and carried off the utensils, as well as the provisions, which the good bishop had prepared for the entertainment. These crimes being proved, by a great number of witnesses, before a council, which king Guntram ordered to meet at Lyons, to try the two criminals, they were both declared guilty, and both deposed, by the unanimous suffrages of all the bishops who composed that assembly. From that sentence they begged leave of the king to appeal to the pope; and, having obtained it, they both repaired immediately to Rome, not doubting but the merit of appealing to the apostolic see would sufficiently atone, in the eyes of his holiness, for all the crimes with which they were charged. Nor indeed were they mistaken: the pope not only received them kindly, but declared them, upon their own testimony, without further inquiry, unjustly deposed; and wrote to the king, desiring they might be restored to their sees. The king knew they were guilty, and had added, to their other crimes, that of imposing on the pope himself; but nevertheless, to gratify his holiness, he restored them, after a sharp and severe reprimand, to their former rank. The Gallican bishops were not so complaisant as the king: for they, without the least regard to the judgment of the pope, or his see, not only excluded the two bishops from their communion, since they could not exclude them from their sees, but proceeded, with the same severity, against Victor their accuser, who, upon their return from Rome, had re-admitted them to his communion, without the consent and approbation of his brethren.[1] "It is the prerogative of the Roman church only," says Baronius, "to restore a bishop deposed by a synod, without the concurrence and consent of a more numerous synod."[2] But what synod has hitherto acknowledged such a prerogative? What synod has hitherto acquiesced in the judgment of the Roman church, or the pope, absolving or restoring those whom they had condemned or deposed? That such a prerogative was not, at this time, that is, in the latter end of the sixth century, yet ac-

[1] See p. 213.
[2] Evagr. l. 5. c. 4. et Card. Noris. in dissert. de Syn. quinta, paragr. 2.
[3] Theophan. ad ann. l. Justini.

[1] Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. l. 5. c. 20.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 449.

The two bishops, guilty of new crimes, are condemned again, and deposed. John III. dies;—[Year of Christ, 573.] Benedict chosen. The origin of the Lombards. Justinian invites them to settle in Pannonia. They are invited by Narses into Italy.

knowledged even in the west, the case before us sufficiently shows.

The two bishops, depending on the protection and favor of the pope, instead of reforming their lives, abandoned themselves, on their return from Rome, to all manner of wickedness, without restraint or control, spending their whole time in riotous banquets and revels, with the debauched youth and lewd women; nay, quitting the cross, and taking the sword and the helmet in its room, they served in the war between the Burgundians and Lombards; and, in a battle, killed several of the latter with their own hands. This conduct their brethren could no longer bear; and therefore, assembling at Châlon, they condemned them anew, and confined them for life to a monastry there,[1] to prevent their recurring again to Rome, and being patronized by the pope in their wickedness.

Of this pope no farther mention is made till the time of his death, which happened in 573, after he had presided in the Roman church twelve years, eleven months, and twenty-six days. He was buried, according to the bibliothecarian, in the basilic of St. Peter. The letter said to have been written by him to the bishops of Gaul and Germany, and quoted as genuine by Turrianus[2] and Bellarmine,[3] is now rejected by all, even by Baronius,[4] as a mere forgery.

BENEDICT, SIXTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTIN *the Younger*, TIBERIUS CONSTANTINUS,—ALBOINUS, *king of the Lombards in Italy.*]

[Year of Christ 574.] In the room of the deceased pope was chosen and ordained, on the 3d of June, 574, after a vacancy of ten months and twenty-one days, Benedict, known to the Greeks by the name of Bonosus, a Roman by birth, and the son of one Boniface;[1] which is all we know of him. The long vacancy that preceded his election, was, no doubt, owing to the distracted state of Italy, invaded at that time, and most miserably harassed, by a new northern nation, that of the Longobards, or Lombards.(*) As we shall have frequent occasion to speak of that people, their history being, so long as they continued in Italy, that is, for the space of two hundred years and upwards, inseparably interwoven with the history of the popes, it will be necessary to premise a brief account of their origin, of their first arrival in Italy, and the surprising success of their arms there.

The Lombards were, as is agreed on all hands, a Gothic nation;[2] and, consequently, came originally from the peninsula of Scandinavia,(†) a country rightly styled, by Jornandes, "officina gentium," and "vagina nationum:"[3] for thence issued those numerous swarms of people, who, for want of room at home, overspread, and stocked with inhabitants, the most remote, as well as the neighboring kingdoms. The Lombards having, after they left Scandinavia, long wandered in quest of new seats, and often shifted them,[5] settled at last in Noricum and Pannonia,(*) under Audohinus their tenth king, those provinces being granted them by the emperor Justinian, in the year 527, the first of his reign.[6] Procopius adds, that the emperor presented them, at the same time, with a very considerable sum of money,[7] no doubt to keep them quiet. They continued in their new settlements for the space of forty-two years, that is, from the year 527, to 568, when they were persuaded by the famous Narses to quit Pannonia, and, marching into Italy, attempt the conquest of that more fruitful country. This memorable event is thus related by the historians, who lived the nearest to those times. The emperor Justinian, to reward, in the best manner he could, the eminent services of Narses, to whose valor and conduct he owed the recovery of Italy, appointed him to govern that country as a province of the eastern empire, with an absolute power. That trust Narses discharged to the general satisfaction of all good men, employing the power with which he was vested, to promote the welfare and happiness of the people committed to his care. Under him the laws

[1] Lib. Pontif.

(*) They were so called from their long beards, as Paulus Diaconus informs us,(a) who was himself originally a Lombard, but born in Italy. He was deacon of the church of Aquilea, and is thence called Paulus Diaconus, but his true name was Paul Warnefrid. He flourished in the latter end of the eighth century.

(a) Paul. Diac. l. 1. c. 9.

[2] Paul. Diac. l. 1. c. 2. et Grot. In Proleg. in Hist. Goth.

(†) Scandinavia, or, as Isaac Vossius will have it, Scandinovia,(a) comprised the present Sweden, Norway, Lapland, and Finnmark. It was thought by the ancients to be an island; but it is now well known to be a peninsula.

(a) Isaac Voss. in Mel. l. 3. c. 6.

[3] Jornand. Rer. Goth. p. 83.

[1] Idem ibid. l. 4. c. 36. et l. 5. c. 27.

[2] Turrian. pro ep. Pont. l. 2. c. 20.

[3] Bellar. de Cler. l. 1. c. 17.

[4] Bar. ad ann. 572. p. 575.

[5] See Paul. Diac. de Gest. Longob. l. 1, et 2.

(*) Pannonia comprised then part of Hungary, of Austria, of Stiria, and of Carniola; and Noricum all Carinthia, with part of Austria, of Stiria, of Carniola, of Tirol, and of Bavaria.

[6] Idem de Gest. Lomb. l. 1. c. 22.

[7] Procop. de Bell. Goth. l. 3. c. 32.

What provoked Narses to invite the Lombards into Italy. They quit Pannonia, and set out for Italy.

were again duly executed, agriculture was encouraged, trade revived, and the cities, after an eighteen years uninterrupted war, restored, in a very short time, to their former splendor. But what can secure even the best of men against slander and obloquy? Narses, though he governed by law, though he never invaded any man's property, was nevertheless painted to the new emperor Justin, by some who envied his power, and probably wanted to succeed him, as an arbitrary and lawless tyrant, as one who abused his authority to oppress the people, and enrich himself with the spoils of the plundered provinces. To these suggestions the emperor hearkened, and, without giving himself the trouble of enquiring whether so heavy a charge was well or ill grounded, recalled Narses, after he had governed Italy, with great reputation, for the space of sixteen years, and appointed Longinus to govern it, with the same power, in his room.(*) Had Narses thought his enemies would have stopped here, he would, in all likelihood, have dissembled the injustice done him, and, quietly retiring, enjoyed, with his friends, the great wealth which he had lawfully acquired. But apprehending, from the malice of his enemies, as well as from a late instance of Justin's cruelty to a man of an unblemished character, and extraordinary merit,(†) both his life and his fortune to be in danger, he resolved to secure the one and the other, at the expence of the emperor, and the whole empire. With this view, instead of returning to Constantinople, he withdrew to Naples, where he was greatly beloved and esteemed, and from thence privately despatched some trusty messengers to Alboinus, king of the Lombards, with whom he was well acquainted, inviting him into Italy, and assuring him, that he would find the passes into that country all open and unguarded.(*) The Lombard king, transported with joy at such an invitation, and the opportunity it offered of invading a country so much preferable, in every respect, to his own, began to prepare, without loss of time, for the intended expedition. In the first place he persuaded the Saxons, his old allies, to join and assist him with a body of twenty thousand men, promising to share with them his future conquests. He applied next to the Bulgarians, Sarmatians, Sueves, and other nations, receiving from each of them powerful supplies of men, all determined to lose their lives, or better their fortunes. Having thus assembled a very numerous and formidable army, he concluded an agreement with his neighbors the Hunns, in virtue of which they were to hold Pannonia, should he succeed in his attempt upon Italy; but to restore it, if he miscarried. The treaty being signed by the chief men of both nations, the Hunns entered Pannonia, which, from them, to this day, is called Hungary, and, at the same time, the Lombards marched out with their wives, their children, and all their effects, bending their route towards Italy. They began their march in the month of April, the day after

(*) As Narses was an eunuch, the empress Sophia is said to have sent him word, on this occasion, that his employment at Constantinople should be to distribute, in the apartment of her women, the portion of wool, which each of them was to spin. To which insulting message Narses is reported to have returned answer, "That he would weave a web, which it would never be in her power to undo." (a)

(a) Paul. Diac. de Gest. Longobard. l. 1. c. 5.

(†) This was Justin, cousin to the present emperor, and one who had signalized himself in war, and discharged with great reputation, the first employments of the empire. While it was yet uncertain which of his two nephews Justinian might appoint to succeed him, they agreed, that he, whom the emperor judged the less worthy of that honor, should acquiesce in his judgment, and the other should, on that consideration, treat him as the first person of the empire after himself. This agreement was faithfully complied with by Justin; but the emperor, jealous of the eminent virtues, and great popularity, of one, who, by his birth, had as good a claim to the empire as himself, instead of fulfilling the engagement on his side, caused the innocent Justin, after repeated protestations of kindness and friendship, to be barbarously assassinated in his bed. The historian adds, that the groundless fears of the emperor, and his wife Sophia, were not quite removed, till the head of the unhappy Justin was brought from Alexandria, where he was murdered, to Constantinople; and that, when it was shown to them there, they both spurned it, in a most barbarous and insulting manner, on the ground. (a) Narses therefore acted wisely in not repairing to Constantinople where he might have met with the like treatment.

(a) Evagr. l. 5. c. 2.

(*) This account, though vouched by all the historians who speak of the irruption of the Lombards into Italy, Baronius rejects as a mere fable, (a) pretending, that Narses was recalled by Justinian; and that, in the reign of Justin, he continued at court in great reputation and favor. To prove this, the annalist alleges the authority of a contemporary writer, an African poet, named Corippus, who was actually at Constantinople when Justin was crowned; and there saw Narses attending him, in great state, on that occasion; and likewise on another, when he gave audience to the embassadors of the Avares. But that it was another Narses, and not the betrayer of Italy, whom Corippus saw in the emperor's retinue, on the two above-mentioned occasions, and who, it seems, was a chief part of the show, no man can dispute, who attends the least to the words of the poet. His words are:

"Armiger interea, domini vestigia lustrans,
Eminet excelsus super omnia vertice Narses
Agmina, et augustam cultu præfulgurat aulam,
Comptus cæsarie, formaque insignis et ore, &c. (b)

How could Baronius think, that the person, whom the poet describes here and elsewhere (c) as a tall, strong, comely young man, with fine hair nicely dressed, &c., was an old eunuch! The eunuch Narses was at least three score in the beginning of Justin's reign; and would then, I believe, have thought it a very absurd compliment from a poet, who, after his so many warlike exploits, had only commended him for his tall stature, his comely countenance, his graceful person, and his fine locks, if he had any. There was, at this very time, another Narses, captain of the guards, and one of the emperor Justin's chief favorites; and him, no doubt, Corippus described in the lines quoted above. He was young, and being probably handsome, and vain of his person, the poet made that the subject of his panegyric, for want of a better. However, he signalized himself afterwards in war above all the commanders of his time, especially in the war which the emperor Mauricius waged with the Persians. To that nation his name became so formidable, that it was commonly used, if Theophylactus is to be credited, all over Persia, to frighten the children into a compliance with the will of their mothers and nurses. (d)

(a) Bar. ad ann. 567. p. 555.
(b) Coripp. in laud. Justin. l. 3.
(c) Lib. 4. prope sin.
(d) Theophyl. in Hist. Maurician.

The Lombards enter Italy without opposition, and make themselves masters of Aquilea and Friuli. Several other places reduced, and Alboinus their king proclaimed king of Italy. Benedict dies. A letter falsely ascribed to him. Pelagius II. chosen. He despatches one to Constantinople, to excuse to the emperor his having been ordained without his consent The Lombards commit dreadful ravages in Italy.

Easter, which fell that year on the first day of that month, in the fourth year of the emperor Justin the Younger, the ninth of John III. bishop of Rome, and of the Christian era, the 568th. They marched through Istria; and finding, as they arrived on the borders of Italy, the passes unguarded, they entered that country without the least opposition, and, without the least opposition made themselves masters of the two important places, Aquilea and Forum Julii, now Friuli, most of the inhabitants taking refuge, as they had no regular troops to support them, in the neighboring islands of the Adriatic. In these two cities, and their territories, the Lombards passed the first winter after their arrival in Italy, Alboinus not thinking it advisable, as his troops were not a little fatigued with their long March, to advance that year farther into the country. The following year, 569, they began early to move forward; and, the imperial troops not daring to face them, they reduced, that summer, the following cities and towns; Trivigi, Oderzo, Monte Selce, Vicenza, Verona, and Trent. The third campaign proved no less successful than the two former; for, entering Liguria, upon the return of the spring, they brought under subjection the far greater part of that country, with the cities of Brescia, Bergamo, Lodi, Como, and Milan itself, the metropolis of Liguria. Upon the reduction of that city, Alboinus was, with loud acclamations, proclaimed king of Italy by the Lombards, and the whole army; and from that year, the year 570, historians date the beginning of the kingdom of the Lombards in that country. Thus far of a people, whom I shall have frequent occasion to mention in the sequel of this history, and with whom it was therefore necessary the reader should, in some degree, be acquainted. The account I have here delivered of them is vouched by the best and most unexceptionable writers.[1]

And now to return to the present pope: he died on the 30th of July, 578, having governed the Roman church four years, one month, and twenty-eight days.[2] He is said by the bibliothecarian to have died of grief in seeing the success of the Lombards, and the dreadful ravages they committed in Italy.[3] The letter on the "mystery of the Trinity," to one David, a Spanish bishop, ascribed to this pope, is now, by all but Baronius, allowed to be spurious, being dated, besides many other marks of forgery,[4] under consuls, when there were no more consuls. In the same year, on the 5th of October, died the emperor Justin, and was succeeded by Tiberius, a native of Thrace, but a person of extraordinary merit.

PELAGIUS II., SIXTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[TIBERIUS CONSTANTINUS, MAURICIUS,—ALBOINUS, CLEPHAS, AUTHARIS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 578.] Benedict was succeeded, after a vacancy of four months, by Pelagius, the second of that name, the son of Winigild, and a native of Rome, but of Gothic extraction.[1] As the Lombards were, at this time, masters of the far greater part of Italy, and kept Rome itself closely besieged, the elect was ordained before his election could be confirmed by the emperor. But the siege was no sooner raised, than the new pope despatched Gregory, then deacon of the Roman church, and afterwards his successor in that see, to excuse to the emperor what had been done, and beg he would confirm what the unhappy state of the city, at that juncture, had made necessary.[2]

Pelagius had the misfortune to govern the church in the most calamitous times Italy had yet seen. The Lombards committed everywhere such dreadful ravages, spread everywhere such desolation and terror, that they were generally looked upon, by the holy men of those days, as the instruments of divine vengeance employed by provoked justice to depopulate Italy, and there extirpate the whole race of mankind; nay, it was revealed to some saints, if they or pope Gregory may be credited, that the Lombards were the forerunners of the last day, and that the end of the world was at hand.[5] Gregory himself saw swords, and spears, and armies, and battles, in the air, and the whole heaven streaming with human blood.[6] By these dreams and visions of saints, the credulous multitude were terrified to such a degree, that, instead of uniting against the common enemy, in their mutual defence, they abandoned themselves to despair, and let the barbarians plunder, burn, and destroy, without restraint or control.

Such was, at this time, the state of the

[1] Lib. Pont. Anast. Plat. &c.
[2] Paul. Diacon. l. 3. c. 2.

[1] Paul. Dial. de Gest. Longobard. l. 2. c. 1. 5, 6, 7. Fredegar. in Epit. c. 65. Procop. de Bell. Goth. l. 3. c. 33. Sigebert. Marian. Scot. Hermannus Contractus, Grotius Histor. ignot. Monachi Cassinen. apud Camil. Pel. Hist. Princ. Longobard.
[2] Orderic. l. 2. Regino. Luitprandus, &c. et. passim. Catal. Rom. Pont. [3] Bibliothec. in Benedict.
[4] See Pagi ad ann. 577. n. 2.
[5] Greg. Hom. I. Evang. et Dial. l. 3. c. 38. [6] Idem ib.

The church still divided about the "three chapters." Elias of Aquilea a zealous stickler for them. The pope, to gain him, approves his transferring his see from that city to Grado;—[Year of Christ, 579.] The pope's legate proposes an agreement between the two sees; which is rejected.

empire in the west; and that of the church was not much better. The old division or schism about the "three chapters" still prevailed, some bishops condemning those chapters, and receiving the council that condemned them; while the far greater part of their brethren in Italy, in Gaul, in Spain, in Africa, and in Ireland, continued to defend them, and to reject that council. Pope Vigilius, in whose time the dispute was unhappily moved,[1] first defended the controverted articles, and then condemned them—defended them anew, and anew condemned them, as has been related above.[2] His successor, Pelagius I. changed his mind, before he was pope, as often as he:[3] but being afterwards raised to the papal dignity by the emperor Justinian, upon his engaging to cause the fifth council, condemning the "three chapters," to be universally received in the west, he left nothing unattempted to make good his engagement, recurring, for that purpose, even to the secular power.[4] But he had the mortification to see his authority contemned in Italy itself, and all his endeavors prove unsuccessful. Of the two succeeding popes, John III. and Benedict I., we know very little: if they attempted, as perhaps they might, to unite the bishops among themselves, and with their see, their authority was no more regarded than that of their two predecessors; for they left matters in the same condition they found them. However, the present pope, not in the least discouraged by the unsuccessful attempts of his predecessors, undertook, with great zeal, "to unite all catholic pastors in one mind, and establish by their union, a lasting peace in the church; that is, in other words, to persuade all catholic pastors to acquiesce, with one mind, in the judgment of his see; for upon what other terms has any, however trifling, dispute been yet ended, and peace established in the church?

Pelagius had yet taken no steps towards uniting the catholic pastors among themselves, or with his see, when a favorable opportunity offered, and he readily embraced it, of obliging one of the most zealous defenders of the "three chapters" in all Italy, Elias, metropolitan—or, as he was commonly styled, patriarch of Aquilea. He was, as his two immediate predecessors had been before him, at the head of the bishops in those parts, who defended the "three chapters," and condemned the fifth council. However he thought it adviseable to recur to the pope on the following occasion: Paulinus, who held the see of Aquilea, when the Lombards broke first into Italy, leaving that city at the approach of so formidable an army, took refuge in the neighboring island of Grado, carrying with him the most valuable ornaments, and all the sacred utensils of his church. There he continued to reside, and after him his two successors, Probinus and Elias, not thinking themselves safe among the new comers, who were yet either pagans or Arians, and expecting to see the church soon delivered, as well as the state, from so cruel a bondage. But the abandoned condition of Italy, and the great advantages daily gained by the enemy, leaving no farther room to hope for a change, Elias resolved to transfer, with the consent of his suffragans, the metropolitan or patriarchal see from Aquilea to Grado, where he had built a church to the honor of the martyr Euphemia. But apprehending the pope might resent his taking such a step without first imparting it to him, and suing for the approbation of his see, to prevent all disputes, he wrote to Pelagius acquainting him with his design, and begging his holiness to approve and confirm it with the authority of the apostolic see. The pope immediately complied with his request, and in the most obliging manner; hoping by that means to render him less averse to a reconciliation between the two sees. Besides, Pelagius wisely considered, that the patriarch of Aquilea, living under the empire, might be more easily prevailed upon, or even forced, to submit to Rome, than if he were subject to the Lombards, who, as they were not catholics, but either pagans or Arians, would hardly suffer any force or compulsion to be used in matters of religion. Elias no sooner received the pope's answer, than he assembled his suffragans in the island of Grado; and there a decree was, with one consent, issued by them, transferring the patriarchal see from Aquilea to the town of Grado, in the island of that name. In that council Laurentius, a Roman presbyter, whom Pelagius had sent to assist at it in his name, produced a letter, whereby the pope confirmed for ever, to the town of Grado, the dignity and rank of a metropolis, with respect to the provinces of Istria and Venetia, and all the churches then subject to the see of Aquilea.[1]

As the patriarch as well as his suffragans expressed great satisfaction at the obliging behavior of the pope on that occasion, the legate Laurentius took thence an opportunity, pursuant to his instructions, of proposing an agreement between the two sees. Having therefore endeavored to persuade the fathers of that assembly, that the dispute was only about persons, and, in no respect about matters of faith, he warmly exhorted them, as they tendered the welfare and the peace of the church, to submit their judgment to that of the first see, rather than to foment and maintain, by an inexcusable obstinacy, so scandalous a division among the catholic prelates. What answer the council returned to the legate we know not; nor indeed whether they returned any; but certain it is, that, far from submitting their judgment to that of the

[1] See p. 354.
[2] See p. 335, et seq.
[3] See p. 371.
[4] See p. 372.

[1] Vide Card. Noris in Chron. Aquileiens. Dand. hist. Venet. & Ughell. tom. 5. Ital. Sacræ.

The Lombards pursue with great success the conquest of Italy. The pope applies to the emperor for relief, but in vain; and likewise to Guntram, king of Burgundy;—[Year of Christ, 581.]—but could not prevail on him to make war on the Lombards. Tiberius dies, and Mauricius is raised to the empire in his room;—[Year of Christ, 582;]—who, the following year, at the request of the pope, sends into Italy a supply of men and money. The faithless conduct of Childebert, king of the Franks, on this occasion.

first see, they confirmed, with one voice, the decree they had issued in 557, approving the "three chapters," and condemning the fifth council;[1] so that the pope gained nothing in the end by his complaisance.

From this time to the year 584, the deplorable situation of the affairs of the state allowed the pope no leisure to attend to those of the church. The Lombards pursued the conquest of Italy without interruption, the exarch Longinus not daring, with the few troops he had, to face them in the field. They had reduced the strong and important city of Ticinum or Pavia,(*) after a three years' siege; and, having made it the metropolis of their new kingdom, had from thence extended their conquests over the provinces of Venetia, Liguria, Æmilia, Hetruria, and Umbria, and threatened Rome itself with a second visit. The pope therefore expecting daily to see them again at the gates of the city, despatched, in great haste, to Constantinople, Sebastianus, his fellow bishop, as he styles him, and Honoratus, a notary, to lay before the emperor Tiberius, jointly with Gregory, nuncio from the apostolic see to that court, the defenceless state of Italy, most miserably harassed by the worst of barbarians, and to solicit an immediate supply of men and of money, without which Rome itself would, in a very short time, be inevitably lost.[2] The emperor heard their complaints, expressed great concern at the evils his good subjects suffered in Italy, and wished it were in his power to relieve them; but added, that for the present he had neither men nor money to spare, but rather wanted both to carry on, with success, the war, in which he was engaged with the Persians.

Pelagius, finding Italy thus abandoned by the emperor, and, in a manner, given up to the Lombards, resolved to try whether he might not prevail on some other prince to undertake the defence of that country. At this time reigned in Burgundy Guntram, a prince no less famous for his religion and piety, than his known attachment to the bishops of Rome, and their see. To him therefore Pelagius resolved to apply; and wrote accordingly, not immediately to the king, but to Aunacharius, bishop of Auxerre, in whom the king reposed an entire confidence, exhorting and earnestly entreating him to persuade, by all means, the most pious and religious prince to renounce the alliance, which, it seems, he had lately concluded with the Lombards, and, turning his arms against them, divert that wicked and perfidious nation from completing the ruin of Italy, and destruction of Rome.[3] What was the issue of this application is nowhere recorded; but as the Lombards pursued undisturbed the conquest of Italy, we may well conclude, that it proved ineffectual. The good king perhaps was of opinion, that faith was to be kept even with pagans and heretics; and consequently could not be persuaded, either by the pope or the bishop, to make war, unprovoked, on a people, with whom he had but very lately pawned his royal word to live in friendship and amity.

The following year died the emperor Tiberius; and in his room was raised to the empire Mauricius, who had married his daughter Constantia. The death of the one, and promotion of the other, were no sooner known in Italy, than Pelagius, wholly intent on preserving Rome from falling into the hands of the enemy, wrote again, without loss of time, to his nuncio Gregory, charging him to represent to the new emperor, in the strongest terms, the lamentable state of affairs in Italy, and apprise him, that nothing but an immediate supply of men and money could save that unhappy country, and Rome itself, from utter destruction. Mauricius hearkened to the remonstrances of the pope, and his nuncio; and an order was immediately issued, discharging the exarch Longinus, who was not thought equal to so great a trust, and appointing Zamaragdus, a person well skilled in military affairs, to command in his room. With the new exarch was sent into Italy a considerable reinforcement of chosen troops, and a large supply of money to defray the charges of the war. Mauricius was sensible, that the exarch was not, with those troops alone, the only ones that could be spared from the Persian war, by any means in a condition to withstand the numerous forces of the enemy; and therefore, to make a diversion, and oblige the Lombards to divide their strength, he despatched embassadors into Gaul, to engage, with the offer of a considerable sum, Childebert, king of the Franks, to join in the war against the Lombards, and fall upon them on the one side, while the exarch attacked them on the other. The king was pleased with the proposal; and, having received the promised sum, 50,000 solidi, he began to make great preparations for the intended expedition into Italy. The preparations he made alarmed the Lombards; but Autharis, their king, apprehending that as Childebert had been prevailed upon with money to make war, he might, in like manner, be prevailed upon to make peace, despatched embassadors into Gaul, to let him know, that if, in the present war, he would only engage to stand neuter, which could be attended with no expense, the king of Italy was ready to pay him the same sum, which the emperor had paid him, to engage in an expensive war. There wanted no more to make the faithless king abandon his new friends: he agreed, at

[1] Vide Card. Noris, &c. ubi supra, et p. 424.

(*) Alboinus, finding the city of Pavia well garrisoned, and supplied with great plenty of provisions, had left part of his army before it, to carry on the siege, while he pursued the conquest of Italy with the rest.

[2] Pelag. ep. 5. [3] Pelag. ep. 4.

A truce between the Greeks and Lombards;—[Year of Christ, 584.] The pope attempts anew a reconciliation between the sees of Aquilea and Rome. His letter to the bishops of Istria. The pope's method of reasoning to prove that he had not erred in condemning the "three chapters."

once, to the proposal; promised to observe a strict neutrality; received the money; disbanded his army; and left his Greek allies to shift for themselves. He afterwards received, in the most unpolite and disobliging manner, the embassadors sent by the emperor to urge the performance of the promise he had made, or the restitution of the money he had received; and dismissed them without so much as deigning to return them an answer.[1] This proved a great disappointment to the exarch, who thereupon resolved, as he had not a sufficient force to carry on the war by himself, to try whether he might not amuse the enemy with a pretence of negotiation, till farther supplies could be sent him from the east. With this view he proposed a cessation of arms: and the proposal was no sooner made than agreed to by the king,[2] who, like a wise prince, wanted to settle the affairs of his kingdom, and establish peace and good order in the countries he had conquered, before he engaged in any new conquests.

And now hostilities being, on both sides, for awhile suspended, and a free intercourse allowed between the cities that were, and those that were not, subject to the Lombards, the pope, without loss of time, laid hold of that opportunity to attempt a new reconciliation between the sees of Aquilea and Rome. He despatched accordingly, as soon as the passes were opened, Redemptus, bishop of Ferentino, and Quodvultdeus, abbot of the monastery of St. Peter, in Rome, with a letter to Elias of Aquilea, or Grado, and the other bishops of Istria: "Pelagius, bishop of the holy catholic church of the city of Rome, to his beloved brethren Elias, and the other bishops of Istria," was the address of the letter. As for the contents, it was chiefly made up of such passages of scripture as seemed most to recommend concord and unity, and most to discountenance all strife and contention. The pope there warmly exhorts them, with the apostle St. Paul, "not to strive about words to no profit; to shun profane and vain babblings; to avoid foolish and unlearned questions, &c.;"[3] which was plainly declaring, that, in his opinion, the present dispute, the dispute about the "three chapters" (for the determining of which a general council had been convened; and about which the bishops had now quarreled for the space of forty-two years, notwithstanding the determination of that council), was, after all, but an idle, foolish, impertinent question.

But what, in the present letter, deserves more particularly to be observed, is, that the pope there, to satisfy the Istrian bishops, that he had not erred from the faith in condemning the "three chapters," alleges several passages of scripture, showing that St. Peter could not err; that the faith of St. Peter was never to fail, never to be shaken or changed. "Consider," says he, "that, as truth cannot lie, the faith of St. Peter can never be shaken, can never be changed. Upon him did our Savior promise to build his church; and against the church built upon him the gates of hell were never to prevail. When satan desired to have the apostles, that he might sift them as wheat, our Savior prayed for St. Peter alone, that his faith might not fail, but that he might be converted, and might strengthen his brethren." From St. Peter the pope passes to himself; adding, as if all that is said in scripture of the faith of St. Peter had been said of his own, "and yet some, at the instigation of the devil, have presumed to question the orthodoxy of *my* belief; and think, that my faith has failed. But the enemy will continue sowing tares among the wheat to the end of the world," &c.

Here the pope supposes two things; 1st, That, in the above-mentioned texts, was contained a promise to St. Peter, that his faith should never fail, or that he should never err in matters of faith: and, 2dly, That the promise made to St. Peter extended to all who were to succeed that apostle in the see of Rome, to the end of the world; else what connexion between the faith of St. Peter, and the faith of a pope, who lived so many ages after St. Peter? That St. Peter was not to err in matters of faith, or, in other words, that he was infallible, I am willing to grant; though that might not, perhaps, be so easily made to appear from the passages here quoted by the pope for that purpose. But what proof or argument of the infallibility of the pope is the infallibility of St. Peter? The other apostles were all, at least, as infallible as St. Peter; and yet it is not pretended that they, or any of them, were succeeded by infallible bishops in the sees they founded. In them infallibility was, like the gift of tongues, and miracles, and prophecy, a personal prerogative, that died with them. And what proof from scripture, that it did not die with St. Peter, as it did with them? That it was granted to St. Peter and his successors for ever, his successors in the see of Rome, and not in the see of Antioch, though acknowledged by all for the elder sister?(*)

[1] Greg. Turon. l. 6. c. 42. Paul. Diac. l. 3. c. 17.
[2] Pelag. ep. 1, ad Episc. Istriæ.
[3] 2 Tim. 2: 14. 16. 23.

(*) The texts quoted here by the pope, "thou art Peter," &c. and, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," &c. are the only texts of scripture which have yet been produced to prove that unlimited grant. But as to the first, it was so understood and interpreted by the fathers, as to import no kind of privilege or prerogative peculiar either to St. Peter, or his successors, as has been shown elsewhere.(a) On the other text Bellarmine lays great stress, and reasons thus: Our Savior prayed for St. Peter in particular, I have prayed for thee; ergo, he obtained something in particular for St. Peter. And what else could it be, but that he, as a private person, should never err from the true faith; and that, as pope, he should never teach, nor should his successors in that office ever teach, doctrines repugnant to the true faith? ergo, St. Peter was infallible, and the pope is as infallible as he.(b) This is no argument; but a senseless, absurd, and groundless conjecture, better calculated

(a) See p. 289. (b) Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 3. c. 3.

To this letter the Istrian bishops returned answer, that the pope, in condemning the "three chapters," had plainly condemned the faith, and the doctrine, of the fathers of Chalcedon; that they had separated themselves from his communion on that score, and could not in conscience return to it, till the scandal was removed, which had given so just cause to their separation. They did not, it seems, agree with the pope in the explanation of his texts from scripture; nor could they discover any kind of connexion between the faith of St. Peter and his. They too alleged several texts, not from the scripture, but the fathers, telling the pope, with intolerable insolence and pride, says Baronius, that if he perused them with the least degree of attention, he would be fully convinced, that his faith was not the same with the faith of those great lights of the church.[1] The pope received, with great kindness, the messengers who brought the letter; and, having perused it, proposed a conference on the subject in dispute: but they let him know, that they were strictly enjoined to avoid all disputes; and that they had no other business at Rome, but to deliver the letter. Pelagius, therefore, having caused the letter to be carefully examined by some of the most learned of his clergy, answered it, agreeably to their report, by another, in the following terms:

"It gives me the greatest concern, beloved brethren, to find you so swayed by prepossession and prejudice, as not to attend to what you say. Your quotations are not just; and the passages you quote, are either foreign to the subject, or wrested to a meaning very different from that of the authors. What was said by one father you ascribe to another; and seem to 'understand neither what you say, nor whereof you affirm.' But far be it from me to impute this to any evil design, or any low craft. It is the common enemy that has deceived you."

He then enlarges on the evils that necessarily attend a misunderstanding or division among the catholic bishops; exhorts them, with great tenderness, to return to the unity of the church; and again proposes a conference, to be held at Rome, or, if more convenient for them, at Ravenna, which, he flatters himself, would end both to their satisfaction and his.[2]

This letter was attended with no better success than the former. The Istrian bishops, instead of hearkening to the exhortations of the pope, or agreeing to the proposal of a con-

to show that the papal infallibility cannot be proved from scripture, than to prove it from scripture. Our Savior, it is true, prayed for St. Peter in particular, not that he might not at any time err from the true faith; but, foreseeing that he was to err, and deny him, that he might not quite lose the faith, but, returning to himself, repent of his sin, and confirm his brethren. Thus was the text understood by almost all of the fathers; (a) and the few, who explain it in a different sense, will have Christ to have prayed that the faith of the church universal might never fail; (b) and therefore that the church universal is infallible, may be concluded from the text in the latter sense; but in neither sense does it prove St. Peter's infallibility, much less that of the pope's, even allowing them to be the successors of St. Peter in the see of Rome, which they certainly were not. (c) But several popes, adds Bellarmine, (d) have pronounced, declared, and defined themselves to be infallible; and to them it behoves us to give an entire credit, since none can be so well acquainted as they, with their own prerogatives, and those of their see. He then brings in several popes to witness their own infallibility; namely, Lucius I., Felix I., Leo the Great, Agatho, &c. But the testimonies of the first two, the one chosen in 252, and the other in 269, are quoted from pieces which are now rejected by all, as unquestionably spurious; and as to the testimony of Leo, it is quite foreign to the purpose. His words are: "Our Lord took particular care of Peter, and prayed particularly for him, as if the steadiness of the rest depended upon that of their prince. In Peter, therefore, was confirmed the fortitude of all; and thus was the divine grace dispensed, that the firmness, which Christ granted to Peter, might, by Peter, be communicated to the other apostles." (e) Here Leo only says, that our Savior prayed for Peter in particular, that, his faith not failing, the other apostles might, by him, be confirmed in theirs; or that the firmness obtained for Peter, in virtue of that prayer, might, by him, be communicated to the other apostles. And how to conclude from thence, that Leo believed himself, and the other bishops of Rome, to be infallible, Bellarmine himself seems to have been at a loss; and therefore, having only added, "here Leo acknowledges that privilege," the privilege of infallibility, as if we were to take it upon his word that he did, he passes from Leo to pope Agatho, chosen in the latter end of the seventh century. (f) As for the present pope, his letter was not yet come to light when Bellarmine wrote; else he had not failed to allege his testimony before the testimony of Agatho, as he lived near an hundred years before that pope. But as the passages he quotes from the writings of the preceding popes are evidently forged, or quite foreign to the purpose he could, at most, have concluded, from the letter of Pelagius, that the popes first began, in the latter end of the sixth century, to pretend to infallibility; and that, however well acquainted with their other prerogatives, they were nevertheless, for the space of near 600 years, utterly unacquainted with that which they now look upon as the most valuable of all. I say, at most; for some protestant divines, unwilling to allow the bishops of Rome to have begun so early to claim that privilege, have interpreted the words of Pelagius, quoted above, as implying no such claim or pretension. And truly it must be owned, that if, in this letter, the pope arrogated to himself that prerogative, he plainly renounced it in another, which he wrote this very year to the same bishops, as shall be soon made to appear. But, after all, it matters little whether that pretension was first heard of in the sixth or in the sixteenth century, it being no less absurd to suppose, that the popes, had they believed themselves vested with so valuable a prerogative, would have concealed it from the world six hundred years, than that they would have kept it concealed sixteen hundred. As for the word infallibility, it was never heard of till the twelfth century, when it was invented, by the schoolmen, to express that unaccountable privilege: an "unfortunate word," says a Roman catholic writer; (g) and so it is indeed, being often employed to vouch the greatest absurdities; and to stand alone against scripture, and authority, and reason, and common sense.

It was not to confute the senseless and absurd notion of papal infallibility, that I have employed this note; but to show, on the first insinuation that occurred of such an extraordinary doctrine, that the principles, upon which it was originally grounded, and rests to this day, are no less absurd, and want no less to be proved, than the doctrine itself. But what are not men capable of maintaining, when they have once forsaken truth, and prostituted their consciences and pens to their own private interest, or to the ambition of others?

(a) Vide Launois Epist. ad Jacob. Bevilaquam, Epist. Tom. 5.
(b) Idem ibid. (c) See p. 2. et seq. (d) Bellar. ibid.
(e) Leo. Serm. 3. de Assumpt. sua.
(f) Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 3. c. 3.
(g) Mumford. Cath. Scripturist.

[1] Vide Bar. ad ann. 586. p. 662.
[2] Pelag. Ep. 5.

Pelagius' answer to the bishops' reply. He owns the fallibility of his see. The pope recurs to force.

ference, wrote a long letter in defence of the "three chapters," maintaining, that nothing but an inexcusable ignorance, or a criminal prejudice, could excuse those from heresy, who condemned them; and treating his holiness, throughout their letter, with great haughtiness and contempt. The arguments, on which they seem to have laid the greatest stress, were these: I. The council of Chalcedon declared the faith of Theodoret and Ibas[1] to be orthodox, though well acquainted with their writings; and therefore to condemn those writings, was evidently striking at the authority of that great council. II. All the chief bishops of the Latin provinces long opposed the condemnation of the "three chapters," and none with more zeal than pope Vigilius, who indeed changed his opinion at last. But were they to change their opinion, because he had changed his? Were they too, like a "reed shaken with the wind," to yield to every blast?

This letter Pelagius answered with another, called by Gregory his successor a "tome," or book; and indeed its length well entitled it to that name; for, in the annals of Baronius, it takes up no fewer than fourteen pages in folio. The pope there strives to prove, that nothing was defined, by the council of Chalcedon, concerning the "three chapters;" which therefore another council might condemn, without derogating in the least from the authority of that great and venerable assembly. To the other argument, namely, that Vigilius, and the chief bishops of the Latin provinces, had long opposed the condemnation of the "three chapters," the pope returns the following answer, which, as it deserves particular notice, I shall give in his own words: "It is no wonder," says he, "that the Latin bishops, who were not acquainted with the Greek tongue, should not at first have agreed to condemn writings, which they did not understand. But the more obstinately they opposed the truth before they knew it, the more readily ought we to follow their example, and, with them, cheerfully embrace it. Had they yielded at once, had they at once condemned what they defended, their change might be well ascribed to inconstancy. But they long stood up in defence of that cause; they suffered even confinement and exile, before they could be prevailed upon to forsake it. And what else could induce them, at last, to yield, and forsake it? Nothing, my beloved brethren, nothing, surely, but truth and conviction. The apostle St. Paul long opposed the truth of the gospel; but, being once convinced, he was so far from thinking his former opposition could be well brought as an argument against the truth he had embraced, that he urged it as an unanswerable argument in favor of a faith which had thus triumphed over the combined force of education and prejudice. In like manner St. Peter, a greater apostle than St. Paul, long maintained the necessity of circumcision, subjecting the converted gentiles to that Jewish and antiquated ceremony. But, being convinced by St. Paul, that 'he walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel,' he changed his opinion; and, in the council of Jerusalem, none opposed, with more warmth than he, the laying such a 'yoke upon the neck of the disciples.'[1] If the prime apostle held one doctrine while he was seeking after truth, and another after he had found it; if he changed his opinion as soon as he was made sensible of his error; why should a change of opinion be condemned in this see, while the like change is, by the whole church, commended and applauded in its founder?" Here the pope evidently owns, as Maimbourg has well observed,[2] the fallibility of his see; and consequently retracts, what, in his former letter, he had artfully insinuated concerning its infallibility, and what probably might have given offence to the Istrian bishops. But to waive that; the comparison between Vigilius changing his opinion, and the two apostles changing theirs, is quite unconclusive; since no one can doubt, but, in them, the change was owing to conviction alone; whereas, in Vigilius, it was evidently the effect of the severe treatment he met with before he changed his opinion, and from which he could only redeem himself by changing it.[3] His changing, therefore, and condemning what he approved before, was no argument of the truth, nor, indeed, of conviction in him; no more than the like change was in the apostate Christians offering incense to Jupiter, to deliver themselves from death, or from the torments they suffered.

The remaining part of this long letter the pope employs in proving from the fathers, that men may be anathematized after their death;[4] and showing, from several passages out of the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, of Theodoret, and of Ibas, that their writings contained heretical doctrines, and consequently well deserved to be condemned. He ends with exhorting anew the Istrian bishops to return to the unity of the catholic church.[5]

This, and the two preceding letters, are generally thought to have been penned by Gregory the Great, at this time deacon of the Roman church, and secretary to Pelagius. However that be, they made no kind of impression on the minds of those, to whom they were written. The Istrian bishops still continued to defend the chapters in dispute, and to decline all communication with Rome. The pope therefore, finding that gentle methods all proved ineffectual, resolved to change his conduct, and employ force, where reason and arguments could not prevail. He wrote accordingly to the exarch Zamaragdus, stirring him up against the Istrian prelates, whom he

[1] See p. 354.

[1] See acts, c. 15: v. 7. 11.
[2] Maimb. Traité Histoir. des Prerogat. d el'Egl. de Rome, c. 7.
[3] See p. 367. [4] See p. 363. [5] Pelag. ep. 6.

Four bishops seized by the exarch, and carried to Ravenna. Forced to condemn the "three chapter;" but declare for them anew. John of Constantinople causes the title of universal bishop to be confirmed to him by a council;—[Year of Christ, 588.] The bishops of Constantinople had a lawful claim to that title. The pope takes the alarm.

painted, in his letter, as incorrigible disturbers of the peace of the empire, as well as the church. The exarch, instead of checking the persecuting spirit of this pope, as his predecessor Narses had done that of the first pope of the same name,[1] gave way to it; and, passing over to Grado, ordered Severus, who had succeeded Elias in that see, and three other bishops who were then with him, to be seized, and carried prisoners to Ravenna. The bishops, warned of that order, fled for refuge to the great church. But the exarch, without any regard to the sacredness of the place, went, in person, to drag them from thence, and returned, with his prisoners, in a kind of triumph, to Ravenna, the place of his residence. What treatment they met with there, is not recorded: but, whatever it was, they bore it for a whole twelvemonth; but, yielding at last, they admitted to their communion the bishop of the place, who had long defended, and now condemned, the three famous chapters. The exarch required no more; and they were immediately allowed to return to their sees. But, as their conversion was owing to force and compulsion, which can only make hypocrites, and, on their return, their brethren, and even the people, declined their communion, Zamaragdus was no sooner removed, and Romanus, a man of a more humane temper, sent to succeed him, than they declared anew for the "three chapters," and separated themselves from the communion of all who condemned them.[2](*)

From this time I find no farther mention made of Pelagius till the year 588, when he appears again upon the stage on the following remarkable occasion. Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, being accused of incest, and several other crimes, before the governor of the east, appealed from him to the emperor Mauricius, who, receiving his appeal, immediately summoned the patriarchs, all the senators of the imperial city, and the metropolitans,(†) to hear and determine the cause. Before that august assembly Gregory appeared, the witnesses were examined, the pleaders on both sides were heard, Evagrius, to whom we are indebted for this account, pleading for Gregory; and, after the trial had lasted near a whole day, sentence was given in favor of the patriarch, who returned, with great honor, to his see, while his accuser was condemned first to be severely racked, then to be led with infamy through all the chief streets of the city, and, when he had been thus shown to the populace, to be sent into exile for life.[1]

By this great council was confirmed to John of Constantinople, surnamed the Faster, and, it seems, upon his own application, the title of oecumenical or universal bishop, to be enjoyed by him, and his successors in that see. I say confirmed; for the bishops of Constantinople had, long before this time, a lawful claim to that title. The emperor Leo styled Stephen archbishop and universal patriarch, in ten laws, one after the other;[2] and the same title was given by Justinian to Menas, to Epiphanius, and to Anthemius;[3] so that it may be called a vulgar error in history to date the original of that title from the time of Pelagius, or his successor Gregory. That title was not attended with any accession of power; nor does it appear, that the present patriarch aimed at any, in suing for the decree that confirmed it; much less that he aspired, in virtue of that title, as the popes pretended he did, to universal jurisdiction, or to an unlimited power over the whole church. For, had the other patriarchs and metropolitans, who were present at the council, entertained the least suspicion of any such view or design in their brother of Constantinople, it is not to be believed, that they would have agreed, so readily as they did, to a decree raising him to such a height of authority and power, at the expense of their own. But the bishops of Rome, ever jealous even of the shadow of any new addition to the honor or power of their old rival, and never more jealous than at this very time, when the glory of their see was daily decaying with that of their city, not only took the alarm themselves on this occasion, but endeavored to alarm the whole Christian world against their antagonist, as if he intended to engross all ecclesiastical power to himself and his see. Pelagius, no less disturbed and concerned, than if the whole of the catholic faith had been at stake, or the council had condemned some fundamental article of the Christian religion, immediately declared, by the authority, and in the name, of St. Peter, all and every act of that assembly absolutely null, except the sentence in favor of Gregory. At the same time he despatched, in great haste, messengers to Constantinople, with letters to the patriarch, and to his nuncio at that court. Neither of these letters has reached our times;(*) but

[1] See p. 372.

[2] Paul. Diac. de Gest. Longob. l. 3. c. 12.

(*) Paulus Diaconus is here guilty of a gross mistake, which has been adopted by a very eminent writer.(a) For the deacon supposes the pope to have defended, and the Istrian bishops to have condemned, the "three chapters;" whereas the quite contrary happened.

(a) Sigon. de Reg. Ital. l. 4.

(†) They are constantly thus named; the patriarchs in the first place, the senators after them, and the metropolitans after the senators.

[1] Evagr. l. 6. c. 7.

[2] Leo Imp. Constit. Novel. 2, 3, &c.

[3] Justin. Novel. 7. 16. 42.

(*) But, in the room of that which the pope wrote to the patriarch, some impostor has given us one of his own, magnifying, beyond all bounds, the prerogatives of the Roman see. But no two styles were ever more different, than the style of this piece, and that of the genuine letters of Pelagius; and, besides, it is, in great measure, made up of whole sentences taken verbatim from the writings of the popes Celestine, Leo, Innocent, Gregory, and Martin I. However, Baronius, not questioning its authenticity, urges it, in

Pelagius dies;—[Year of Christ, 590.] Spurious pieces ascribed to him. Six decrees ascribed to Pelagius. The Goths in Spain embrace the catholic faith.

from those of pope Gregory it appears, that Pelagius, in his letter to the patriarch, reproached him, in very sharp terms, with pride and ambition, styling his attempt wicked, detestable, diabolical, and threatening to separate himself from his communion, if he did not forthwith relinquish the antichristian title he had impiously assumed. In his letter to the nuncio, he strictly enjoined him not to communicate, nor assist, on any pretence or occasion whatever, at divine service, with the bishop of Constantinople, till he had publicly renounced the title which he had usurped in the pride of his heart, and at the instigation of the devil, to the great debasement of the rest of his brethren.[1]

Pelagius was prevented by death from proceeding any farther in this affair. He died on the 8th of February of the following year 590, having held the see eleven years, two months, and ten days. In the month of November of the preceding year, the Tyber, overflowing its banks, laid under water great part of the city, and the adjacent country. The inundation was followed by an epidemical distemper, called, by the historians, pestis inguinaria, which made a dreadful havoc of the inhabitants; and Pelagius was one of the first who died of it. Besides the letter which I have taken notice of above, three others of this pope, namely, one to an archbishop named Benignus; another to the bishops of Campania and Italy; and a third to the bishops of Germany and Gaul; are now generally rejected as spurious, though generally received as genuine in the time of Baronius. The whole drift of these, and indeed of most other forged pieces, is, to magnify the merit of St. Peter, the dignity of his see, the power of his successors. It is to me matter of great surprise, that the men of sense and learning among the Roman catholics, who have often been the first to detect the forgery of such pieces, should nevertheless continue to maintain that power and authority, which they cannot but know were chiefly owing to these glaring forgeries. But they will find it no easy task to keep up the edifice, when the foundation is once undermined. In Ivo of Chartres, and in Gratian, are six decrees, ascribed to Pelagius, and looked upon, by some able critics, as ancient and genuine. By one of these the pope allows a man to be ordained deacon, who, after the death of his wife, has had children by a slave, but has not married her. This he owns to be forbidden by the laws of the church; but thinks those laws may be dispensed with, by reason of the great want of ecclesiastics. The slave he orders to be shut up in a monastery, and to live there in continence and retirement. By another of these decrees he forbids the bishops of Sicily, who were immediately subject to the Roman see, to exact more than two solidi, a very small sum, from each parish of their respective dioceses.(*) The other four decrees are concerning subjects of no great moment, or such as we have had occasion to mention elsewhere.

The last year of the pontificate of Pelagius II., the year 589, is memorable, in the annals of the church, for the conversion of the Goths in Spain, who, having professed the doctrine of Arius for the space of 213 years,(†) were at last, in that year, induced by their king Recaredus, to renounce that doctrine, and embrace the catholic faith. On so remarkable an occasion the king assembled a council, the third of Toledo, consisting of seventy-three bishops; and, being present in person, ordered, after a short harangue, his confession of faith to be read, signed by him and his queen; and likewise the confession of the bishops, and other ecclesiastics of the Gothic nation; receiving the three general councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Chalcedon, and anathematizing the doctrine of Arius, and all who maintained or professed it.[1] This was matter of great triumph to the catholic party.(‡)

a most insulting manner, against the protestants, to prove the unlimited power and jurisdiction of the popes, which, indeed, are there very plainly asserted.(a) As if that could be any argument of the pope's being really vested with such a jurisdiction, should we even allow the letter to be genuine: but, waiving that, it is now by all, without exception, owned to be spurious.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 587. p. 683.

[1] Greg. l. 4. Ep. 38. et l. 7. Ep. 69.

(*) The unjust demands of the Sicilian bishops gave probably occasion to this decree. By a law of the African church, a bishop, who oppressed his people with unjust demands, or unreasonable exactions, was to be punished with the loss of that part of his diocess, or people, who had reason to complain of such oppression.(a)

(a) Aug. Ep. 261.

(†) The Goths, whom the emperor Valens had allowed to settle in Thrace, being desirous of renouncing their idolatry, and embracing the Christian faith, applied to him, in the year 376, for proper persons to instruct them in the mysteries of that religion. The emperor readily complied with their request: but, being himself a most zealous stickler for the doctrine of Arius, he sent none to them but men of his own persuasion; so that the Gothic nation became, at the same time, both Christian and Arian;(a) and the doctrine which they learned of their first instructors, they zealously maintained, from that time, the year 376, to the present, 589.

(a) Isidor. in Chron. Goth. Soz. l. 6. c. 37. Theodoret. l. 4. c. 37.

[1] Abbas Biclar. ad ann. 8. Mauri. et Cardinal. de Aguire in Notitia Concil. Hisp. p. 95.

(‡) That we may not think the pope had no share in the glory of so remarkable a transaction as the conversion of a whole nation, Baronius lets us know, that the council, in which the Goths abjured the blasphemies of Arius, "was not assembled without the privity, consent, and authority of Pelagius;"(a) and that Leander, bishop of Seville, "assisted at it with the character of the pope's legate."(b) But of all this there is not a single word, not a distant hint, in any of the ancient writers. By them it is only said, that the council met by the king's order, præcepto regis.(c) And as for Leander, if he assisted at the council as the pope's legate; that is more than Isidorus, who wrote the life of that prelate, and takes no notice of his legatine dignity, seems to have known, or indeed Leander himself, who, in the speech he made on that occasion, in praise of the catholic church, never once mentioned either the pope, or his see; which would have been an unpardonable instance of ingratitude and disrespect, had Pelagius distinguished him with that character,

(a) Bar. ad ann. 589. p. 698. (b) Idem. ibid.

(c) Abbas Biclar. ubi supra. Isidor. in vit. Leandri.

The ancestors and family of Gregory. His education. Distinguishes himself in the senate, and is made governor of Rome. How he employed his great wealth. He embraces the monastic life.

GREGORY, SIXTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAURICIUS, PHOCAS,—AUTHARIS, AGILULPHUS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 590.] Pelagius was succeeded by Gregory, commonly surnamed the Great. He was the great-grandson of another pope, Felix II.[1] descended of a senatorian family, and one of the most wealthy and illustrious families in the city of Rome. His father Gordianus, his mother Silvia, and his father's two sisters, Tarsilla and Æmiliana, were not more conspicuous for their birth, than for their religion and Christian piety. Silvia, and the two sisters, have now a place in the calendar of Saints; an honor that has been denied to Gordianus himself, though he seems to have had as good a title to it as any of them. Gregory had an education suitable to his rank; was early imbued, by his parents, with the principles of honor, of morality, of religion, and brought up, says the author of his life,[2] as a saint among saints. He applied himself, from his tender years, to the study of letters; and with such success, that none at Rome excelled him, as Gregory of Tours, his contemporary, bears witness,[3] in the knowledge of grammar, rhetoric, and logic. As he was entitled, by his birth, to the first employments of the state, which could not then be well discharged without a thorough knowledge of the Roman jurisprudence, he addicted himself early to that branch of learning: and how well he was acquainted with the laws that obtained in his time, sufficiently appears from his writings. He soon distinguished himself in the senate; and, being recommended to Justin the Younger by the uncommon talents he displayed there, but still more by his known integrity, and love of justice, he was raised by that emperor to the high post of governor of Rome, as the person the best qualified, at that time, to govern, defend, and relieve the city, surrounded on all sides by a victorious and implacable enemy.(*) He acquitted himself in that employment to the entire satisfaction of the emperor, as well as of the senate and people of Rome; and practised himself, when vested with power, the excellent rules which, in his writings, he recommends to others: yet his present grandeur, the power he enjoyed, the applause he met with from all ranks of people, the desire or ambition of rising still higher, the hurry of business, and the constant cares attending his employment, had begun to efface, before he was aware, the religious sentiments which he had imbibed from his cradle. Returning therefore to himself, he often reflected on the vanity of all worldly greatness, on the emptiness of all worldly pleasures, and the danger to which he was exposed, of miscarrying in the only affair of real importance, while he suffered his attention to be wholly engrossed by temporal objects. By these thoughts, as he frequently indulged himself in them, he was brought, by degrees, to an entire contempt of every thing this world could offer; insomuch that, his father dying, he reserved to himself but a very small share of the immense wealth that came to him by his death, employing the rest in charitable uses, and in founding monasteries, agreeably to the superstition of the times. Of these he founded, and endowed, no fewer than six in Sicily, and one in Rome, dedicated to St. Andrew, where he took himself the monastic habit, as he had long panted after retirement and solitude, and bid adieu to the world, and all its allurments.(†) But would not the uncommon talents of that great and good man have been far better employed in promoting the welfare of his fellow creatures, and the good of the society to which he belonged? Nay, was not his case the same with that of the servant in the gospel, who "went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money?" But the monastic life now began to be deemed in the west, as it had been long before in the east, the highway to heaven: and no wonder that, upon such a persuasion, men of all ranks and conditions crowded to monasteries; especially in an age

above the rest of his brethren; or had the pope, I may add, any ways contributed to the conversion of the Gothic nation.

In the same year, 589, was convened by king Recaredus, another council at Narbonne, consisting of several bishops, which I cannot help taking notice of here, on account of their first canon, forbidding ecclesiastics to use, in their dress, the scarlet color, "that color being," as is there said, "a badge of worldly pomp and grandeur, and more properly belonging to laymen in authority, than to professors of religion, whose inward devotion ought to show itself by their outward dress and attire." What would these venerable prelates think or say, were they to lift up their heads, and see a consistory at Rome, with the cardinals, and the pope himself, all gorgeously arrayed in scarlet robes! But, in them, that color contains a kind of mystery; for they are said to have chosen it, that they, and all who beheld them, might thereby be put in mind of the blood of the martyrs, and encouraged, when called upon, to follow their example.

[1] See p. 272. [2] Joan. Diac. in Vit. Greg. c. 1.

[3] Greg. Turon. Hist. l. 10. c. 1.

(*) In what year that dignity was conferred on him, we know not; but certain it is, that he held it in 573.—See Pagi ad ann. 531. n. 3, 4.

(†) To what order he belonged, is a question that has been long disputed by the monks of different orders, and which I shall leave them to determine; only observing here, that F. Gallon, a priest of the oratory founded by St. Philip of Neri in Rome, has, in opposition to the Benedictines, pretending St. Gregory to have been of their order, taxed those monks with having forged, and ascribed to popes, emperors, and kings, many deeds, containing donations of large possessions, nay, and of whole cities. Their great and famous monastery of Monte Cassino, in the kingdom of Naples, has been, according to that learned writer, for many ages, a very mint of false pieces.(a)

(a) Gall. Apologeticus lib. advers. Constant. Bellot.

Gregory becomes the pattern of monastic life. Is taken from his monastery by pope Pelagius; ordained deacon; and sent, with the character of nuncio, to Constantinople. His conduct there. His dispute with the patriarch. The prudent conduct of the emperor on that occasion. Gregory recalled from Constantinople. On his return to Rome he retires again to his monastery.

when superstition bore down common sense, and the gospel had been made to give room to a new revelation, monkish visions, dreams, and romances.

Gregory, now a monk, became a true pattern of a monastic life, and of every virtue becoming that profession, banishing from his mind all thoughts of the world, and abandoning himself wholly to meditation and prayer. He lived only upon legumes, and so sparingly even upon them, that, his constitution being thereby quite broken, his indiscreet abstinence would have cost him his life, had he not, with great difficulty, been persuaded by his friends to moderate the rigor of his fasts. He had not enjoyed his retreat many years, (how many is very uncertain,(*) and not at all material,) when he was obliged to quit it, or, to use his own expression, when he was driven from a quiet and safe harbor into the open and boisterous sea.[1] This happened on the following occasion. Pope Benedict dying, Pelagius was chosen to succeed him, and ordained, as I have related above,[2] before his election was confirmed by the emperor.[3] As that was contrary to a custom established by law, and inviolably observed ever since the time of Theodoric the Goth,[4] the new pope could think of no person in Rome so well qualified as Gregory to excuse it to the emperor, and, at the same time, to solicit some relief in behalf of the inhabitants of Italy, whom his predecessor had, in a manner, abandoned to the fury of the Lombards. Having therefore taken him, we may say, by force, from his monastery, he ordained him deacon, and sent him, with the character of his nuncio, to the court of Constantinople, none but deacons being then employed in that office. There Gregory not only satisfied the emperor Tiberius as to the ordination of Pelagius, but became, in a very short time, one of his chief favorites. He was no less beloved and respected by Mauricius, the successor of Tiberius, than he was by Tiberius; nay, his prudent, obliging, and modest behavior, gained him the esteem and affection, not only of the emperors, but of all the great men at court, and even of the bishops, who, notwithstanding the jealousy which they generally entertained of the pope's nuncio, could not help loving Gregory, and assisting him wherever it lay in their power. However, he quarrelled, or rather had a dispute, with Eutychius of Constantinople, on the following occasion. As idle and impertinent speculations were then greatly in vogue, such speculations as are now the whole employment and business of the schoolmen, the patriarch started the question, whether, after the resurrection, our bodies were to be palpable, or not? that is, whether they were, or were not, to be capable of being felt and perceived; Eutychius himself declared for the negative, maintaining, in a writing which he published to prove the truth of the resurrection, that our bodies were to rise as subtle as the wind, or the air. That doctrine Gregory vigorously opposed, as savoring, in his opinion, of origenism; and who knows what dreadful consequences would have attended even so trifling a dispute, had not the emperor Tiberius wisely interposed, before any parties or factions could be formed? But the emperor was no sooner informed of the difference between the patriarch and the nuncio, than he commanded both to attend him, and dispute, in his presence, the point that occasioned their disagreement. They obeyed; and Gregory prevailing, or the emperor, at least, thinking he prevailed, the patriarch was ordered to acquiesce, and his book to be immediately committed to the flames.[1] Thus was determined at once, by the prudent conduct of the emperor, a controversy that, otherwise, might have occasioned, as several other questions of no greater moment had done, a schism in the church, and the assembling of a general council to heal and remove it. Had the other emperors acted, in like cases, with the same judgment and prudence, few general councils, if any, had ever been assembled, and the Christian religion would have remained as plain and intelligible as we find it in the scriptures.

Gregory continued at Constantinople from the year 579, to the year 584, when the pope, wanting his assistance, besides the never-failing assistance of the Holy Ghost, to combat those who still maintained the "three chapters," in contradiction to the apostolic see, recalled him, and sent one Laurentius to the imperial court in his room. On his return he brought with him an arm of the apostle St. Andrew, and the head of St. Luke; the bodies of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and Timothy, having been discovered at Constantinople some years before.[2](*)

The pope received his nuncio, on his arrival at Rome, with the greatest demonstrations of friendship and esteem, declaring himself entirely satisfied with his negotiations, and the whole tenor of his conduct, during his stay in the imperial city. The satisfaction which the pope expressed, encouraged

(*) All we know for certain is, that in 573, he was still governor of Rome; and that he was ordained deacon, and sent to Constantinople, in 579.

[1] Greg. in Præf. ad Leandr. [2] See p. 380.
[3] See p. 327. [4] See p. 382.

[1] Greg. Moral. l. 14. c. 29.

[2] Procop. de Ædific. Justin. l. 1.

(*) The arm of St. Andrew is still exposed to public adoration in St. Gregory's monastery, the monastery of St. Andrew in Rome, now in the possession of the Comaldulenses; and the same honors are still paid to the head of St. Luke, in the church of St. Peter. The bodies of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and of Timothy, are said by Jerom, (a) and Philostorgius, to have been translated to Constantinople by the emperor Constantius. Timothy is styled an apostle both by Philostorgius, and by Procopius.

(a) Hier. in Vigil, et lib. de Script. Eccles. Philostorg. l. 3. c. 2.

Gregory is chosen abbot. He exacts with great severity the observance of the rules. He is chosen pope. He declines that dignity, and writes to the emperor. His letter intercepted. His election is confirmed by the emperor.

Gregory to beg, as the greatest reward his holiness could confer, or his small services deserve, that he might be allowed to return to his monastery, and there spend in peace and retirement, the remainder of his days. This Gregory begged with so much earnestness, that the pope could not help granting him his request. However, he employed him as his secretary, on some urgent occasions, even in his retreat; and the three letters to the Istrian bishops, of which I have spoken above, are commonly thought to have been penned by him.

Soon after his return to the monastery, he was appointed abbot; and in that office he exacted of his monks as strict an observance of the minutest rules, as he practised himself. Of his excessive severity in that particular he gives us himself the following instance: "A monk of his monastery, named Justus, who had practised physic, while a layman, and (after embracing the monastic life) had attended Gregory night and day, during his long illness, being himself taken ill, discovered, at the point of death, to his brother, a layman, that he had three pieces of gold concealed in his cell. Some monks overheard him, and thereupon rummaging his cell, found, after a long search, which nothing could escape, the three pieces concealed in a medicament. and brought them to Gregory. As, by the laws of the monastery, no monk was to possess any thing whatever in private, the abbot, to bring the dying monk to a due sense of his crime, and, at the same time, to deter the rest, by his punishment, from following so pernicious an example, strictly forbid the other monks to afford him any kind of comfort or relief in the agonies of death, or even to approach him. Not satisfied with that, I may call it inhuman severity, he required the brother of the unhappy monk to let him know, that he died avoided, detested, and abhorred, by all his brethren. He did not even stop here; but, exceeding all bounds, ordered the body of the deceased, as soon as he expired, to be thrown on a dunghill, and with it the three pieces of gold, all the monks crying out, aloud, 'Thy money perish with thee!' "[1]

While Gregory was thus governing his monastery, without the least apprehension of his being ever obliged to quit it again, Pelagius died; and, upon his death, Gregory was immediately elected in his room, by the joint suffrages of the senate, the clergy, and the people, as a man, or rather as an angel in the shape of a man, sent down from heaven to comfort, assist, and relieve the city, at that time miserably distressed without by a barbarous enemy, and visited within by a dreadful famine, and a more dreadful plague. The election of Gregory was received with loud acclamations by all except Gregory himself, who, thunderstruck at the news, and not able to prevail on the electors to name any other, wrote, without loss of time, to the emperor Mauricius, earnestly entreating him, as he would answer it the last day, not to confirm his election, but to command the people of Rome to choose another, there being none among the Roman clergy that were not better qualified than he to discharge the duties of so important an office. But his letter the governor of Rome intercepted, and, keeping it by him, sent the decree of the election to Mauricius, accompanied with a letter, begging him, in the name of the people, the clergy, and the senate of Rome, to confirm the election of a person, whom they had unanimously chosen, as the most capable of all, to provide for the safety both of the church and the empire, in the present times of general distress and calamity.[1] In the mean while Gregory, persuaded that the emperor would not confer on him, against his will, a dignity that was so ambitiously courted by others, continued at Rome, employed not only in the government of his monastery, but in exciting the people, by his sermons or homilies, to sorrow and compunction for their sins, and in ordering litanies, or public prayers, and processions, to appease the wrath of heaven, and avert the grievous calamities, which had already nearly depopulated the city.(*) But while Gregory was thus wholly intent on these pious exercises, the answer of the emperor to the governor's letter was at last brought to Rome; an answer entirely agreeable to the expectation and wishes of the people. For Mauricius, who had frequently conversed with Gregory at Constantinople, and was well acquainted with his talents, not only confirmed his election, but congratulated the Roman

[1] Greg. Dial. l. 4. c. 55.

[1] Joan. Diac. in vit. Greg. l. 1. c. 39, 40. Greg. Tur. hist. Franc. l. 11. c. 1.

(*) We learn from an ancient tradition, that, when the last procession arrived at the monument of the emperor Adrian, in their way to the church of St. Peter, an angel appeared to Gregory on the summit of that edifice, sheathing his sword, as a token that the Divine vengeance was now satisfied, and the calamities were ended. Upon this tradition the monument of Adrian, when afterwards turned into a castle, was called "the castle of the holy angel, castle sant' angelo; and in the place where the angel was supposed to have appeared, was erected, and is still to be seen, the statue of an angel, in the attitude of sheathing a sword. But this tradition is no better grounded than most other traditions, it being manifest from the letters written by Gregory, when he was pope, that is, several months after the time of the supposed apparition, that then both the plague and the famine still continued to rage in the city; and that to them new calamities were added,—for, by a violent storm of wind, many houses in the city were blown down, and the inhabitants crushed in the ruins. Besides, while the inhabitants could not set foot out of the gates, without danger of being murdered, or carried into captivity, by the Lombards, the garrison within, quarreling among themselves, filled the city with blood and slaughter. (a)

In the infectious distemper which prevailed at this time in Rome, sneezing was deemed a mortal symptom; and hence the custom of blessing those who sneeze, is said to have its original.

(a) Greg. l. 1. ep. 2. et. dialog. l. 2. c. 15.

Gregory flies from the city, and lies concealed. He is discovered, brought back, and ordained. He sends his confession of faith to the other patriarchs. He strives to reunite the Istrian bishops to his see. The emperor, at his request, orders them to attend a council to be held at Rome. They refuse to comply with the order.

people on the choice they had made. But Gregory, trembling at the very thought of taking upon him a charge, to which he believed himself unequal, and of such infinite moment as made every neglect highly criminal, however small in itself, resolved, at all events, to decline it. The only expedient that now occurred to him, which he thought might be attended with success, was to betake himself to flight, and, lying concealed, quite tire the patience of the people, and oblige them, by that means, to proceed to a new election. He fled accordingly, and escaping, in disguise, the vigilance of the guards at the gate, whom the governor had ordered to stop him, should he offer to go out, he reached a forest, without being discovered; and there kept himself concealed in a cave.[1] Great example, says here F. Maimbourg, an example that ought to check and confound the unbridled ambition of those who, though no-ways equal to that great man in doctrine, holiness, or parts, yet, by their scandalous intrigues, offer a kind of violence to the Holy Ghost, to raise themselves, by means that are merely human, and quite uncanonical, even to the first place in the church.[2] Gregory, in spite of all the care and precaution he could use, was soon discovered, was brought back in triumph by the people, carried straight to the church of St. Peter, and there immediately ordained, to prevent him from making his escape a second time. This happened on the 3d of September, the see having been vacant ever since the 8th of February of the present year.

Gregory was no sooner ordained than he drew up, and sent, according to custom, a confession of his faith to the other patriarchs; namely, to the patriarchs of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Jerusalem, whom he names in that order: which was owning the patriarch of Constantinople to be superior in rank and dignity to all other patriarchs in the east; a point, which his predecessors had all warmly disputed.(*) In his confession he professes to receive the first four councils, as the four books of the holy gospel, to reverence the fifth, and to condemn, the "three chapters." He adds, "whoever presumes to loosen the persons, whom the councils have bound, or bind those whom the councils have loosened, destroys himself, and not them."[3] A plain declaration, that he knew of no authority in the church superior to that of a council. I cannot help observing here, that the confession before us is the first I have met with, in which mention is made of the gospels; and, that even there they are only mentioned to be put upon the level with the councils; nay, Gregory, agreeably to the theology of the times, seems to raise the four councils above the four gospels; for, having named both, he adds, "and on these, the four councils, rests, as on a square stone, the structure of the holy faith; and they are the rule of every man's actions and life. Whoever therefore does not hold this solid foundation, though he may appear to be a stone, he lies nevertheless out of the building."[1] But the foundation of our faith was laid long before any of these councils were heard of, and "other foundation can no man lay,"[2] nor no assembly of men.

The new pope, having thus satisfied the bishops of the chief sees as to the orthodoxy of his faith, undertook, in the next place, to heal the divisions that still reigned in the church, on account of the "three chapters." Several bishops in Italy, and some in Spain and Gaul, had, in the end, been persuaded to condemn those chapters, or at least, for the sake of concord and peace, to communicate with those who condemned them. But the bishops of Istria had not yet been prevailed upon to do either. They all, to a man, still continued to maintain that cause with more zeal and resolution than ever. With them therefore Gregory resolved to begin, notwithstanding the bad success that had hitherto attended the repeated attempts of his predecessors to gain them. The most effectual means that occurred to him, of compassing his design, was to appoint a council to meet at Rome, and apply to the emperor for an order to oblige the Istrian bishops to attend it; for he was well apprised, that nothing but an express and peremptory order from the emperor could bring them to Rome. He applied accordingly, by his nuncio, for that order; obtained it; and, sending it, as soon as it reached him, to Severus, the metropolitan of Istria, summoned both him and his suffragans to Rome, to settle there the points in dispute, agreeably to the declared will of the emperor.[3] The order and summons Severus immediately notified to the other bishops, who thereupon assembling in two different places, the subjects of the empire in one, and those of the Lombards in another, (for the Lombards, who were masters of several of those cities, would not suffer their subjects to assemble with those of the empire), it was agreed by both councils, that a memorial should, in the name of all, be presented to the emperor, and that none should be allowed to repair to Rome till they received his answer. Pursuant to this resolution, three petitions were drawn up, two in the name of the two councils, and one in that of Severus alone. They all modestly

[1] Greg. Turen. l. 10. c. 1. Joan. Diac. in vit. Greg. l. 1. c. 44.
[2] Maimb. Hist. du Pontif. de S. Greg.
(*) The patriarchs are thus named in all the manuscript copies of Gregory's letter. And yet Baronius will have the patriarch of Constantinople to have been indebted, for that honor, not to the pope, but to the ignorant transcribers, perverting the order, in which the patriarchs were ranked by the pope.(a) A subterfuge worthy indeed of Baronius!
(a) Bar. ad ann. 591. p. 19.
[3] Greg. l. 1. ep. 24.

[1] Greg. l. 1. ep. 24.
[2] 1 Corinth. 3: 11.
[3] Greg. l. 1. ep. 16.

The Istrian bishops prevail upon the emperor to revoke his former order. Gregory strives to raise a persecution against the Donatists in Africa;—[Year of Christ, 591.] He writes to the African bishops, and the exarch.

complained of the order obliging them to repair to Rome, which they said had been surreptitiously obtained by their enemies; declared, that they held and professed the very doctrine, which they had been taught by pope Vigilius, and which that pope had required all to hold and maintain on pain of excommunication; begged they might not be obliged to take the pope for their judge, who was a party, that being repugnant to the sacred laws of the empire; assured the emperor, that, should they either condemn the "three chapters," or communicate with the pope, who condemned them, their people would all decline their communion, and no longer hearken to the voice of their pastors. They concluded with promising to satisfy the emperor as to the purity of their faith, as soon as the state of affairs in Italy allowed them some respite.[1]

With these three memorials they immediately despatched some of their ecclesiastics to the emperor, who, moved with the reasons they alleged, and apprehending, that violence of any kind, at this juncture, might incline those prelates to favor the Lombards, who did not concern themselves with questions of that nature, revoked his former order; and, at the same time wrote to Gregory, notifying it to him in the following terms. "As your holiness is well acquainted with the present state and confusion of affairs in Italy, and sensible, that we must, in prudence, comply with the times, we *command your holiness* to give no farther trouble to the Istrian bishops, but allow them to live undisturbed, till it shall please God to settle these parts in peace and tranquillity.[2](*).

[1] Apud Bar. ad ann. 590. p. 12, 13, 14.

[2] Bar. ibid. p. 14, 15. vide Card. Noris. in disser. de Syn. Quint. c. 9.

(*) The words, "We command," Baronius cannot brook, styling them the dialect of a tyrant, when directed to the high pontiff, whom even kings and emperors ought only to court or entreat, and none but tyrants would presume to command. (*a*) But Gregory himself was not of that opinion; for, speaking of this very order, in a letter to John of Ravenna, he calls it "a command laid on him by the most pious princes," (*b*) meaning Mauricius, and his son Theodosius, who had been lately crowned, though only five years old. Gregory was not at all pleased with that order, as we may well imagine, since the measures, which he had concerted for re-uniting the Istrian bishops to his see, were thereby entirely defeated; and therefore he tells the bishop of Ravenna, in the same letter, that he proposed writing anew to his most serene lords, on the same subject. But he nowhere gives the least intimation, as if he thought, that the emperor had not the same right to command him as the meanest of his subjects. Gregory seems to have been rather too complaisant to princes, and men in power, and to have had more of the courtier than was becoming the character of a bishop. But Baronius plainly shows, in several places of his voluminous work, that he was utterly unacquainted with that part of Gregory's character; which may be ascribed to the annalist's supposing him to have been the author of the "Comment on the Seven Penitential Psalms," a work quite unworthy of him, but well worthy of its true author Gregory VII. by whom it is generally thought to have been dictated, or penned, during the quarrel between that pope and the emperor Henry IV. about investitures. The utter contempt there shown of the imperial dignity, and the bitter invectives against the emperor, well suit the pride, temper, and character, of that haughty and imperious pope.

(*a*) Bar. ad ann. 590. p. 15. (*b*) Greg. l. 2. ep. 32.

Mauritius wrote, at the same time, to the exarch Romanus, enjoining him to take care, that no kind of violence was offered by the pope to the Istrian bishops. Thus were the measures, which Gregory had concerted for the re-union of those bishops, all at once utterly defeated.

The zeal of Gregory was attended with better success against the Donatists, who were still a numerous sect in the province of Africa, where they first appeared in the time of Constantine the Great, as I have related elsewhere.[1] Many bloody edicts were issued against them by the successors of that emperor, and put in execution with the utmost severity. But what was anciently said of the Christians, "sanguis martyrum semen Christianorum," may be said, with as much truth, of men of every sect, or religion. The Donatists lived at this time in Africa, undisturbed by the catholics, and gave no kind of disturbance to them. They had their own places of worship, and were suffered to worship publicly in them; had their own presbyters, their own bishops, and a hierarchy like that of the catholics. But the harmony that reigned between them and the catholics was displeasing to Gregory; and being as great an enemy to toleration as any of his predecessors, he undertook to disturb it on the following occasion: In the province of Numidia the senior bishop, in what city soever he resided, enjoyed, by a very ancient custom, the dignity of metropolitan, and all the privileges attending that dignity.[2] At this time a Donatist bishop happened to be the senior in that province, who thereupon pleading the ancient custom, assumed the title of metropolitan or primate of Numidia. As he was far advanced in years, the catholic bishops all acquiesced, apprehending greater evils from their opposing his pretensions, than any that could possibly arise from their complying with them, and suffering him to hold that dignity for the remaining part of his life, which could not be long. But Gregory took the alarm, and laying hold of that opportunity, spared no pains to arm the civil as well as the ecclesiastical power against the Donatists in general; and all who favored them. With that view he immediately despatched messengers with letters to the bishops of Numidia, and to Gennadius exarch or governor of Africa. He exhorted the bishops to love one another, to join as one man against the enemies of the faith, to abrogate, by all means, the custom of choosing their primate according to his seniority, and without any regard to his merit; and requires them, as they will answer it on the last day, not to suffer a heretic to be preferred to those, who have been born and brought up in the bosom

[1] See p. 42. et seq. [2] See p. 50, 51.

Gregory suffered no violence to be offered to the Jews. He is inconsistent with himself. Nothing can warrant persecution either against Jews or heretics. He strives to convert the Jews with promises of rewards.

of the church.[1] In his letter to the exarch, he extols his courage, his warlike exploits, and the many victories he had gained; encourages him to fight the battles of the church with as much resolution and intrepidity as he had fought those of the state; to defend the faith with as much ardor and zeal as he had defended the empire; and to bring under the yoke of righteousness the proud necks of the rebellious heretics, who, were it in their power, would extinguish the very name of the catholic faith. He closes his letter with entreating Gennadius to exert his whole power and authority in defeating the bold and unheard-of attempt of the heretical bishop, and in praying God to add new strength to his arm, and sharpen his mind, like the point of a piercing sword, with a holy ardor and zeal for the true faith.[2] With these letters the pope prevailed on the exarch and bishops to exclude the Donatist from the dignity, to which he aspired. But, from the letters he wrote at different times, it appears, that he could never succeed in his attempt to interrupt or disturb the Christian harmony, that reigned in Africa between the catholic and Donatist parties.[3]

Gregory was more complaisant to the Jews than he was to the Donatists, or to those whom he styled heretics; to the Jews he would suffer no violence to be offered, as appears from the letters which he wrote this very year to three different bishops, namely, Virgilius of Arles, Theodorus of Marseilles, and Peter of Tarracina.[4] The latter had driven the Jews from their synagogue; and the two Gallican bishops had ordered such of them, as would not be baptized, and confess Christ, to quit the countries subject to their sees. With that argument, when all other arguments had proved ineffectual, Avitus of Clermont had, a few years before, converted all the Jews in his diocese. He allowed them but three days to choose, whether they would be driven from the diocese, or received into the church. That proved the illuminating argument; for the third day, says very gravely Gregory of Tours, their eyes were opened, they saw the truth, embraced it, and were all baptized to a man.[5] But that method of preaching the gospel the pope condemned in the strongest terms, "because conversions owing to force are never sincere; and such as are thus converted, scarce ever fail to return to their vomit when the force is removed that wrought their conversion."[6] Who would believe these, and the two preceding letters to have been written by one and the same person! nay, in one and the same year! In his preceding letters the pope declares as strongly for compulsion, as he here declares against it. There he encourages, and here he condemns, all persecution. It is true he speaks, in his former letters, of heretics, and, in these, of the Jews. But does not the reason he urges against compulsion with respect to the Jews, equally hold good against persecution with respect to heretics? If "conversions owing to force are never sincere," what matters it whether they, who are thus forced, be Jews, gentiles, or heretics? Will they not, all alike, be apt to return to their vomit, when they can with safety? What therefore can warrant persecution against heretics, that does not warrant it equally against the Jews? Or rather, what can, in reason or common sense, warrant persecution against either? It is the present doctrine of the church of Rome, that heretics of all denominations may be "compelled to come in;" and that doctrine she has constantly practised when it was in her power, as the world but too well knows. However, she distinguishes between heretics who were, and heretics who were not, born and brought up in her bosom. With the latter, who are only heretics, the faggot and the halter are the last argument; but the first with the former, who are, in her eye, both heretics and rebels; as if it were rebellion, and rebellion punishable with death, for a man to be persuaded, right or wrong, that another church is more pure in her doctrine and morals, than that in which he was brought up; and thereupon betake himself to the other, in compliance with the dictates of his conscience. But that absurd, tyrannical, and anti-christian notion, has been already sufficiently exposed and exploded by a very ingenious modern writer.[1] I shall therefore only observe here, that though Gregory would not allow force or compulsion to be used with the Jews, yet he was for employing, even with them, other methods besides conviction and reason. For, being informed, that the Jews, living on the patrimony of St. Peter(*)

[1] Greg. l. 1. ep. 75. [2] Idem. l. 1. ep. 72.
[3] Idem l. 2. ep. 33. l. 4. ep. 36. et l. 5. ep. 63.
[4] Greg. l. 1. ep. 45. et ep. 34.
[5] Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. l 5. c. 11.
[6] Greg. ubi supra.

[1] Mr. Bayle Dict. Crit. Art. Greg. Rem. (E).

(*) The Roman church, and likewise the churches of Milan, of Ravenna, and of other great cities, possessed estates, not only within the limits of their own districts, but in other countries, bequeathed to them by senators, and other persons of rank and distinction, who lived in those cities. In the letters of Gregory mention is made of an estate, in the island of Sicily, belonging to the church of Ravenna; and of one, in the same island, that belonged to the church of Milan. The Roman church, by far the most wealthy of all, possessed considerable estates, not only in Calabria, in Abruzzo, in Lucania, and in other provinces of Italy; but in Sicily, in France, in Africa, in the Cottian Alps, and in most other countries. These church estates were called patrimonies, a word that imports, properly speaking, an estate descending to a person from his ancestors, or a family estate. The demesnes, or the private estate of the prince, were likewise called by the name of patrimony, but with the addition of the epithet, "sacrum, sacrum patrimonium," to distinguish it from the patrimonies of private men, as appears from several places of the twelfth Book of the Code. In like manner the church, to distinguish, and, at the same time, the better to secure her estates, called them by the name of the saint which each particular church held in most veneration. Thus the estate of the church of Milan was called the patrimony of St. Ambrose; that of Ravenna the patrimony of St. Apollinaris; and that of the Roman church the patrimony of St. Peter.

Gregory's system quite inconsistent with itself, and with reason. A general decay of discipline prevails among the clergy. His zeal in reclaiming the monk named Venantius. Regulations concerning the monks.

in Sicily, could by no reason or arguments be convinced, that Christ was the promised Messiah, he wrote to the deacon Cyprian, his steward in that island, ordering him to acquaint those Jews, with a circular letter in his name, that to such of them as became Christians, one-third should be remitted of the taxes they paid to the Roman church.[1] But are not conversions, owing to rewards, as likely to be insincere as conversions owing to force? And had not Gregory as much reason, at least, to suspect the one as the other? I say at least, it being well known, that many have yielded to the allurement of rewards and promises, after they had manfully withstood the whole power of force, and braved death itself, with all the terrors attending it. The pope therefore acted very inconsistently in approving the one, and disapproving the other: he ought, in reason and good sense, to have approved neither, or both. Gregory adds, that if the conversion of those, who are thus gained, should prove insincere, their children, nevertheless, will be baptized, and brought up as true Christians, in the bosom of the church.[2] If so, why should he be against force and compulsion; since the children would be equally baptized, and brought up as true Christians in the bosom of the church, were force and compulsion used with their parents? If, for the sake of the children, rewards may be employed in the conversion of the parents, why may not force? Will not the gaining of the children justify the one as well as the other? For as to such conversions, whether owing to hope or fear, Gregory himself seems to have thought them alike insincere. But he meant well, and the disinterestedness he showed in rewarding the converted Jews, was, it must be owned, worthy of a Christian bishop; and, on that score at least, he well deserves to be praised and commended.

The zeal of Gregory was more usefully employed, and with better success, in reforming the clergy, than in converting the Jews, or the heretics. He found, on his accession to the papal chair, a general decay among the ecclesiastics, not only of discipline, but of Christian piety and morals. Great numbers of monks, sick of a monastic life, and availing themselves of the distracted state of Italy, and the general confusion that reigned there, quitted their monasteries, returned to the world, and married. The bishops, neglecting their flocks, abandoned themselves to all manner of lewdness and debauchery; and their example was, it seems, followed by the inferior clergy. The pope spared no pains to persuade the monks to return to their monasteries, as appears from the letters he wrote in this and the following years to several monks, who, suffering themselves, as he expresses it, to be seduced by the enemy of mankind, had, at his instigation, resumed the liberty which they had once so meritoriously sacrificed to the welfare of their souls.[1] He seems to have been chiefly concerned for a monk named Venantius, a person of great distinction; for he was descended from the Decian family, was possessed of great wealth, and had discharged some of the chief employments of the empire; among the rest, that of chancellor of Italy. But, growing tired of the world, he left it, and, in a fit of the enthusiasm that then prevailed, betook himself to a monastery; where he had not been long, before he grew still more tired of the monastery, quitted it, and returned to the world. But Gregory never ceased importuning him by letters, by messages, by his friends, and acquaintance, to quit the world again, and repair to the monastery; and, being informed, that he lay dangerously ill at Syracuse, he charged the bishop of the place to attend him with great assiduity and care, and leave nothing unattempted to overcome his obstinacy, and prevail on him to atone for his crime, by resuming the monastic habit at least in the last moments of his life.[2] But all was in vain, Venantius probably thinking it could little avail him to die a monk, when he had lived a layman. As Gregory had been himself a monk, he was not satisfied with striving to reclaim those who had abandoned their profession; but, to prevent others from following their example, he undertook, with no less judgment than zeal, to restore their decayed discipline. With that view he issued the following regulations, and would allow them in no case whatever to be dispensed with: 1st, That none, under eighteen years of age, should be admitted into a monastery.[3] 2d, That they should not be allowed to take the monastic habit till after a two years' probation, or, as it is now called, noviciate.[4] 3d, That a monk, forsaking his order, and returning to the world, should be shut up, and closely confined for life.[5] 4th, That monks should not be allowed to wander about the country, nor even to go out of their monasteries, but upon urgent occasions, the abbot himself not excepted.[6] 5th, That when a monk is obliged, on an urgent occasion, to go out of his monastery, he should not go alone, since it may well be presumed, that he, who has not with him a witness of his actions, does not live well, "qui sine teste ambulat, non recte vivit."[7] These regulations had the wished-for effect; and the general reformation, which they produced, would have continued even to our days, had they been as strictly maintained by the successors of Gregory, as they were by Gregory himself. But they were neglected by the succeeding popes; and the same disorders pre-

[1] Greg. l. 4. Ep. 6. [2] Idem ibid.

[1] Greg. l. 1. ep. 33. 38, 39, 40.
[2] Idem ibid. ep. 33. et l. 9. ep. 31.
[3] Idem, l. 1. ep. 41.
[4] Idem, l. 4. ep. 44. et l. 8. ep. 23.
[5] Idem, l. 12. ep. 20. et l. 1. ep. 33. 40.
[6] Idem, l. 1. ep. 4. l. 6. ep. 32. l. 7. ep. 36. l. 2. ep. 3.
[7] Idem, l. 10. ep. 22.

Gregory strives to reform the clergy. He punishes some, and reprimands others. Simony and incontinence prevail among ecclesiastics of all orders. Forbids his own clergy to accept any thing for the functions of their office. He strives to reclaim the incontinent clergy.

vailed again. The two first regulations, the most essential of all, are now quite out of date, and the monasteries are thereby filled with boys and children; who, repenting, when they attain to the years of discretion, the choice they made, but not being allowed to quit their monasteries, and return to the world, bring the world into their monasteries, leading more debauched lives there, than perhaps they would have done in the world.

Gregory had no less at heart the reformation of the clergy, than that of the monks; and undertook the one with no less zeal than the other. Some bishops he found guilty of most enormous excesses, and deposed them; others he only rebuked or threatened, according to the nature and quality of their crimes. Among the former were Demetrius of Naples, Agatho of Lipari, and Paul of Doclea in Dalmatia. Demetrius was convicted of so many heinous crimes, as Gregory himself informs us,[1] that, had not justice been tempered with mercy, he must have suffered, by the laws both of God and man, a most cruel and most ignominious death. Agatho was, it seems, no less guilty than Demetrius;[2] and as for Paul, he was degraded for a corporal sin, as Gregory calls it,[3] that is, for fornication or adultery. But, instead of acquiescing in the sentence, he broke into the church with a band of soldiers, seized on the sacred utensils, and beat the bishop, who had been substituted in his room, till he was ready to expire. The pope therefore caused him to be shut up in a monastery for life, to be excluded from the sacred mysteries till he was at the point of death, and to be then only admitted to lay-communion. Andrew of Taranto had kept a concubine before he was ordained bishop; but him the pope only advised and exhorted to resign, provided he was conscious to himself of his having had any commerce with her after he was raised to the episcopal dignity.[4] He would not suffer a deacon, though chosen by the people, to be ordained bishop, because he had a young daughter; and, consequently, had not long enough observed the celibacy prescribed by the canons.[5] He did not even spare the archdeacon Laurentius, his own nuncio at the court of Constantinople; whom he recalled, and deposed, having found him guilty of several crimes, besides pride and ambition.[6]

Simony and incontinence seem to have prevailed among the clergy in Gregory's time, as much, perhaps, as they have done ever since; and the pope spared no pains to cleanse the sanctuary from the one and the other, and restore the sacred order to its ancient lustre. To put a stop to the simony that reigned then every where barefaced, and without any of those colors and pretences that now disguise it, he began with the bishops, and other ecclesiastics, who were immediately subject to his see, strictly forbidding them to exact any price, reward, or acknowledgment, or to accept of any, for the functions of their office, namely, for ordinations, marriages, christenings, or burials.[1] What he required of others, he observed himself with such strictness, as even to refuse the presents, which, agreeably to a custom that had obtained for some time, were annually sent to the bishop of Rome, by all his suffragans; nay, Felix of Messina being informed, that the pope complained of the weakness of his stomach, and having thereupon sent him a small present of Palmatian wine, thought to have a particular virtue against complaints of that nature, Gregory could not be prevailed upon to taste it, but caused it to be sold, and sent to the bishop the money accruing from the sale, thanking him for his kindness, but letting him know at the same time, that he accepted of no presents, however small, from any of his brethren.[2] To banish the prevailing simony, and all simoniacal practices, from the churches, that were not under the immediate jurisdiction of his see, the pope wrote a great number of letters to the bishops, to the kings and princes, and to all men in power, earnestly entreating them to assemble councils, and jointly to concert such measures as might put an effectual stop to an evil, that reflected so much disgrace on the ecclesiastical order, and on the holy religion, which they taught or professed.[3] He did not require all bishops to conform to his regulations, but, trusting to their judgment and discretion, left them at liberty to issue such laws as, in the present case, should appear to them the most proper, and the most likely to answer the end for which they were issued.

As to the incontinence of the clergy, the natural effect of imposed celibacy, the pope left no remedy he could think of untried to cure that evil, but the only remedy that could at once have effectually cured it, marriage. In Sicily the law of celibacy had been extended to the subdeacons, only three years before this time; that is, in 588, and Gregory himself thought it very hard that such a burden should have been laid upon them. For he thus speaks of it in one of his letters: "Three years since, the subdeacons of all the churches of Sicily were commanded to abstain from their wives, agreeably to the custom of the Roman church; but to me it seems hard and unmeet, that he who is not accustomed to such continence, and never promised to live chaste, should be compelled to separate from his wife, and be thereby driven to what is worse."[4] The pope was, as appears from his last words, well apprised, that such as had

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 3.
[2] Idem, l. 2. ep. 49.
[3] Idem, l. 8. ep. 11.
[4] Idem ibid. ep. 44. 45.
[5] In init. l. 2. epistolar. Greg.
[6] Idem l. 2. ep. 53.

[1] Idem l. 3. ep. 24. l. 4. ep. 44. 55, 56. l. 7. p. 4. 56. 110.
[2] Idem. l. 1. ep. 64.
[3] Idem l. 4. ep. 55. l. 5. ep. 11. l. 9. ep. 40. l. 11. ep. 48. l. 10. ep. 32. &c.
[4] Idem l. 1. ep. 42.

Gregory enforces the law of celibacy, with respect to the subdeacons. He writes to the bishops and princes, to restrain the licentiousness of the clergy. The Lombards embrace the catholic faith.

not promised to live chaste, were in great danger of being driven by a forced celibacy to what was worse, that is, as the world but too well knows, too all manner of uncleanness. And yet, instead of abrogating that law, as he ought to have done, and some protestant writers have thought he did, he enforced the observance of it, obliging the subdeacons, who were married, to quit their wives, or their office.[1] It were to be wished the present church of Rome would even allow of that alternative. If she did, many conscientious ecclesiastics of her communion would willingly quit their office to save their souls. But even that refuge is now denied; and no other alternative left them, but to contain, if they can—or to burn, if they cannot.(*) As to those ecclesiastics, who, at the time of their ordination, had promised to live chaste, Gregory exacted of them the performance of their promise, with the utmost severity. His own clergy he obliged to banish all women from their houses, excepting their mothers, their sisters, and the wives they had married before their ordination, charging them to govern their wives chastely, and to converse with them so as to leave no room for the least suspicion of any matrimonial commerce between them, "ut nulla prorsus suspicio esse possit mutuæ commixtionis."[1](*) It appears from the letters of Gregory, that, in most other countries, where the law of celibacy had taken place, many ecclesiastics either kept concubines, or, what was, it seems, deemed as great a crime, lived with their wives in the same manner after their ordination, as they had done before it. To remove that scandal, the pope wrote to the bishops, to the different kings and princes, exhorting them to restrain, with wholesome severities, the licentiousness of the incontinent clergy in their respective dominions, lest the evil, which they did not prevent when they could, should be imputed to them.[2] But his endeavors proved all unsuccessful; the evil he complained of still prevailed; and will prevail till the cause is removed to which it is owing, till the clergy are either allowed to marry, or cease to be men.

The conversion of the Lombards, which happened this year, proved of no small comfort and relief to the pope, amidst his cares and anxiety for the welfare of the church. The conversion of that nation was thus happily brought about. King Autharis dying without issue, and dangerous divisions arising among the Lombards about the choice of his successor, it was proposed by some, and agreed to by all, that the person whom Theudelinda, the deceased king's widow, chose for her husband, should be acknowledged by the whole nation for lawful king. So great an opinion did they all entertain of her prudence

[1] Greg. l. 3. ep. 34.

(*) "If they cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn:" says the apostle St. Paul. (*a*) But no, says the church of Rome, excepting her clergy from that general command, if they cannot contain, let them fast, let them watch, let them cover their bodies with hair-cloths, let them whip themselves, let them, with St. Benedict, roll themselves naked upon thorns; or, with St. Francis, in the snow; and if nature still remains unsubdued, if the inbred fire continues still unextinguished and alive, let them burn; "for it is better to burn than to marry." This, in effect, is the doctrine of the church of Rome, though she, to palliate and disguise it, pretends continency to be attainable by all men; and consequently, that there is a "medium" between marriage and burning. But that continency is not attainable by all men, and consequently that, in some, there is no medium between marriage and burning, is evident, beyond contradiction, from the words of the apostle, quoted above, and from what he says in the preceding verse: "For I would that all men were even as myself;" that is, continent. "But every man hath his proper gift of God; one after this manner, and another after that," &c. (*b*) The same doctrine was taught, in express terms, by our Savior himself, when, to the apostle's saying, "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry," he answered, "all men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given;" and "he that is able to receive it, let him receive it." (*c*) Agreeably to the doctrine of the apostle, and that of our Savior himself, so plainly delivered to his apostles, for our instruction, many of the fathers, and among the rest the great patron and admirer of virginity, Jerom, were of opinion, that perpetual continence was not in our power, and consequently could not be imposed upon any man; (*d*) much less can it be imposed upon a whole order of men, made up of all nations, ages, constitutions, and humors. As for the argument of the council of Trent, that "God will not deny this gift to those who rightly ask it, as having promised not to suffer us to be tempted above what we are able;" (*e*) it is quite impertinent; since God has provided us with an easy and natural remedy against all temptations of that nature, which, if we scorn to use, and out of pride or ostentation, recur to others of our own choosing, the evils thence arising lie at our own doors, since God has nowhere promised an extraordinary assistance to those, who neglect the ordinary means of salvation, which he, in his infinite wisdom, has been pleased to appoint. From what has been said it is manifest, that some cannot contain; and that for them the apostle knew of no other remedy but marriage, and accordingly commanded them to marry. If therefore any are to be found among the Romish clergy, who cannot contain, as there certainly must, in so numerous a body of men, that church, by imposing celibacy, as she does, on all of that order, without distinction, commands some to abstain from marriage, who are commanded by the apostle to marry.

(*a*) 1 Cor. 7: 9. (*b*) Ibid. 7. (*c*) Matt. 19: 11, 12.
(*d*) Hier. adv. Jovin. l. 1. c. 21.
(*e*) Con. Trid. Sess. 24. can. 9.

[1] Greg. l. 1. ep. 50.

(*) St. Bernard, a saint of the first rate in the Romish calendar, thought it more impossible (if that can be), for a man to cohabit thus with any woman, than to raise up the dead:

"Cum fœmina semper habitare,
Et cum fœmina nunquam peccare,
Majus est quam mortuos resuscitare,"

is a famous saying of his. Of that truth the patrons of celibacy were well apprised long before Bernard's time; and the clergy were, on that consideration, forbidden to cohabit, or even converse, with their wives, or with any other woman whatever, except their mothers, their own sisters, or the sisters of their fathers or their mothers; and to them too the prohibition was extended in some countries, several ecclesiastics having been found guilty of incest with their own sisters, as was declared by the two councils of Metz and Mentz, both assembled in the year 888, to check the unbridled lust of the unmarried clergy. By these councils the prohibition was extended to all women whatever; (*a*) and Riculfus of Soissons not satisfied with confirming their canons, in the famous constitutions, which he published the next year, declared it unlawful for a clergyman to converse in private with any woman, or even to speak to a woman without a witness. (*b*)

(*a*) Can. 10. et 5. (*b*) Concil. t. 9. p. 416.

[2] Greg. l. 1. ep. 50. l. 3. ep. 26. l. 7. ep. 39. l. 9. ep. 64. l. 11. ep. 42, 43, &c.

Agilulph repairs and endows several monasteries and churches. Gregory receives a letter from the bishops of Ireland;—[Year of Christ, 592.] Gregory's answer to their letter.

and discretion; and she, to show herself worthy of the confidence they reposed in her, having first consulted the chief lords, and the wisest men of the kingdom, by their advice, bestowed both herself and the crown on Agilulph, duke of Turin,(*) a person of extraordinary merit, and nearly related to the late king. Theudelinda was the daughter of Garibald, king of the Boioarians or Bavarians; and, being a woman of great piety, and a zealous catholic, the first favor she begged of her new husband, and she begged it with the greatest earnestness, was, that he would, for her sake, and the sake of his own soul, renounce the errors in which he was brought up, and profess, with her, the catholic faith. Agilulph was bred an Arian; but gratitude prevailing in him over education, he readily complied with the request of the queen, and became, at once, a zealous catholic; nay, and a zealous apostle of his new religion, or rather of the religion of his wife. For, not satisfied with embracing it himself, he persuaded many of the chief lords of the kingdom to follow his example; and theirs was followed by the greater part of the people, some of them renouncing paganism, and others the doctrine of Arius, to embrace the fashionable religion, the religion of the king, and the court. Agilulph, now a catholic, was easily prevailed upon by the queen to rebuild the churches and monasteries, which his Lombards had destroyed, while yet pagans or Arians, to endow them with considerable possessions, and to recall the catholic bishops, whom his predecessors had driven from their sees.[1] As the conversion of the Lombards, if we may so call it, was entirely owing to Theudelinda, the pope, not satisfied with bestowing on her the highest encomiums, sent her, as a small acknowledgement of the eminent service she had rendered to the church, the four books of his dialogues; a present not at all proper for a person of her good sense, and extraordinary parts, had not the prevailing superstition and credulity of the times brought down the best understandings to a level with the meanest.

The following year Gregory received a letter from the bishops of Ireland, complaining to him of a persecution they suffered, and bore, as appears from the pope's answer, with great firmness and constancy. But as their letter has not reached our times, we know neither by whom, nor on what occasion, that persecution was raised. The bishops of that island still continued to defend the "three chapters," in opposition to the see of Rome; and in this very letter ascribed the irruption of the Lombards into Italy, and the many evils, which Gregory and his predecessors had suffered since that irruption, to their having condemned those chapters, and received the council that condemned them. The pope congratulates them, in his answer to their letter, on their Christian patience and constancy, under the evils they suffered. But, at the same time, he lets them know, that they have no occasion to glory in the persecution they suffered, since it is not what a man suffers, but the cause for which he suffers, that makes him a true martyr; and that neither their constancy, nor any other virtue, will avail them, or be rewarded hereafter, so long as they continue obstinately separated from the catholic church. He therefore exhorts them to return; assures them, that nothing was defined or decreed, by the fifth council, repugnant to the faith of Chalcedon; and, as to the evils, which he or his predecessors had suffered by the irruption of the Lombards, he thinks they ought by no means to be construed into a judgment, but should rather be looked upon as an incontestable proof, that those who suffered them were favored by heaven, agreeably to the saying of the apostle, "whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."[2] The same text might, at this juncture, have been alleged with as good reason by the Irish prelates, as an incontestable proof, that they too, though zealous defenders of the "three chapters," were favored by heaven. In every dispute, however trifling, we find

(*) The Lombard dukes, of whom we shall have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel of this history, were originally only governors of cities, and bore that title no longer than the king thought fit to continue them in their respective governments. They were instituted by Alboinus, the first king of the Lombards in Italy, in imitation of the Greeks, who had lately adopted that form of government, as I have observed above. (a) Alboinus was succeeded by Clephas, whose cruelty gave the Lombards such an aversion to royal power, that, upon his death, they agreed to abolish the monarchical form of government, and to live thenceforth subject to their dukes, who by that means became so many petty kings. Thus the dukes governed, for the space of ten years, each of them (and they were in all thirty-six), exercising an absolute and uncontrolled authority in his own city, and its district. But in the year 585, the nation being greatly alarmed at an alliance concluded between the Franks and the Greeks against them, and apprehending, that they should not be able to withstand two such powerful enemies, so long as they continued divided into so many petty kingdoms, they resolved to restore their ancient form of government; and accordingly assembling in Pavia, raised Autharis, with one voice, to the throne. The new king allowed the dukes to continue in their governments, but reserved to himself the supreme authority and dominion. Though he could have removed them at his pleasure, yet he deprived none of their dukedoms, unless guilty of treason; nor did he give them to others, but when their male issue failed. And such was the origin of fiefs in Italy. (b) These tenures were introduced by the Franks into Gaul, some years before the reign of Autharis. (c) But all laws concerning them are owing to the Lombards, who reduced them to a certain and regular form. And hence sprung up a new body of laws, which were called "feudal laws," and are still, in some provinces of Italy, the chief part of the jurisprudence.

I cannot help taking notice here of the unaccountable ignorance of some Italian civilians; namely, Baldo, Alessandro, and Francesco di Corte; who, speaking of these laws, tells us, that they were made by certain kings called Lombards, that is, Apulians, who came originally from Sardinia, and settled first in Romagna, and afterwards in Apulia.

(a) See p. 376. note (†).

(b) Paul. Diac. l. 3. c. 8. Sigon. de reg. Ital. l. 1. Regin. l. 1. p. 517. (c) Greg. Tur. l. 4. c. 24.

[1] Paul. Diac. l. 3. c. 18. et l. 6. c. 2.

[2] Hebr. 12: 6.

Gregory exhorts them to condem the "three chapters;" but in vain. The supremacy of the pope not acknowledged at this time in Ireland, nor his infallibility. Gregory a vigorous asserter of the pretended rights of his see. He absolves and restores the bishop of Thebes, condemned and deposed by the provincial bishops, and their primate.

heaven constantly brought into the quarrel, and made to side with both parties. The pope adds, that Italy, and Rome itself, were as miserably harassed by the Heruli and the Goths, before the "three chapters" were condemned, as either has been since by the Lombards; and consequently, that the calamities brought upon both by the latter, ought not to be deemed a punishment from heaven for their having condemned those chapters.[1] With this letter the pope sent into Ireland that which his predecessor, or rather he himself, wrote, in the name of his predecessor, to the bishops of Istria;[2] exhorting them to peruse it with attention, and flattering himself, that if they can divest themselves of all prepossession and prejudice, they will thereby be fully satisfied of the purity of his faith, and return to the unity of the church.[3] That the Irish were reclaimed by these letters from the schism, and brought back to the unity of the church, Baronius takes for granted.[4] But that in 614, they still continued to defend the "three chapters," is evident from the letter, which the famous Irish monk Columbanus wrote, in that year, to pope Boniface IV. For in that letter Columbanus supposes Vigilius, who condemned those chapters, to have died a heretic, and wonders that his name had not been struck out of the catalogue of the popes. He finds great fault with Boniface for condemning the same chapters, wishes he would change his opinion, and exhorts him to assemble a council, in order to clear himself, and his see, from all suspicion of heresy. "If it is true," says he, in the close of his long letter, "that you have swerved from the true faith, you complain, without reason, of your children, who oppose you, and even exclude you from their communion. In that case they have a right to do so, though they become thereby the head, and you," to use the monk's own words, "are turned into the tail, filii vestri in caput conversi sunt, vos vero in caudam.(*) From this letter it evidently appears, as we may observe here by the way, that so late as the seventh century the popes were not thought, even by those whom they now worship as saints, incapable of erring in matters of faith; nor of being deposed, if they erred.

The same year Gregory had several opportunities of exerting the authority, which his predecessors had usurped; and he exerted it accordingly, with as much resolution and vigor as the most ambitious among them. For though he never attempted to extend his authority by any new usurpations, or encroachments on the rights of his brethren, even of those who were immediately subject to his see; though he never exercised or claimed any new jurisdiction or power; yet he was a most zealous asserter of that, which his predecessors had exercised, or, at any time, claimed. He often declared, that he had rather lose his life than suffer the see of St. Peter to forfeit any of the previleges it had ever enjoyed, or the prime apostle to be any ways injured, or robbed of his rights. It was the common plea in all disputes among bishops about power and pre-eminence, that should they yield, and abate of their claims and pretensions, they would thereby injure the apostles or saints, who had founded their sees; as if the chief care of their founders in heaven were to see them aggrandized on the earth. It has ever been, even from the earliest times, a maxim with the popes, never to part with any power or jurisdiction which their predecessors had acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it; nor to give up the least privilege, which any of their predecessors, right or wrong, ever had claimed. From that maxim no pope has hitherto swerved; no, not Gregory himself, however conscientious, just, and scrupulously religious, in other respects. Thus he maintained and asserted, with as much resolution and vigor, as any of his predecessors ever had done, the pretended right of receiving appeals from all parts of the Christian world, of re-examining the causes that had been judged and determined by the metropolitans, or the provincial synods, and reversing their sentence or judgment by the authority of St. Peter. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the case of Hadrianus of Thebes, in Thessaly: Hadrianus was charged with several crimes before his metropolitan, the bishop of Larissa; and condemned by him in a synod, consisting of all the bishops of the province. From that sentence he appealed to the emperor, who referred the whole affair to John of Justiniana Prima, primate of all Illyricum. The primate re-examined the cause, heard the witnesses, and, upon their deposition, though Hadrianus excepted against them, confirmed the sentence, which the metropolitan had given. The bishop of Thebes did not yet acquiesce; but from the primate appealed to the pope, though no farther appeal was allowed by the canons, except to a general council. Gregory, however, received the appeal, examined the cause himself, and, finding, upon a strict and impartial examination, the proceedings of the primate, as well as the metropolitan, to have been both illegal and uncanonical, he not only declared them null, and absolved the bishop, but exempted

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 36.
[2] See p. 386, 387.
[3] Greg. ubi supra.
[4] Bar. ad ann. 592 p. 37.

(*) This letter was first published by the learned primate of Ireland, archbishop Usher, and afterwards by father Fleming, an Irish Franciscan at Louvain, with other pieces ascribed to Columbanus. They have been since allowed a place in the Bibliotheca veterum Patrum, printed at Lions.(a) Had Baronius seen this letter, he would have been tempted to strike the name of Columbanus out of the calendar of saints; for he was vested, by Gregory XIII., with a full power of sainting and unsainting whom he pleased, as I have observed elsewhere.(b)

(a) Biblioth. vet. Patr. t. 12. Edit. Lugdun.
(b) See p. 124.

The pope commands the bishop of Salona to restore his archdeacon, on pain of excommunication and deposition, and is obeyed. He opposes the election of Maximus, the new bishop of Salona; which is approved by the emperor. The pope summons Maximus to Rome, to give an account there of his ordination; who pays no regard to the summons. The emperor interposes, and the pope acquiesces in his will; but summons Maximus to Rome, to clear himself from simony, and other crimes.

him from the jurisdiction of his metropolitan, whom he commanded, on pain of excommunication, to restore forthwith to the bishop of Thebes all the effects of his church.[1] As to the primate, the pope, not satisfied with rebuking him very severely, as the more guilty of the two, ordered him to reinstate the bishop of Thebes in his see; suspended him from the holy communion, for the space of thirty days; and threatened to proceed against him with all the rigor his contumacy deserved, if he did not punctually fulfil the penance imposed on him by the authority of the prince of the apostles.[2]

The same year Gregory was informed, that Natalis of Salona, in Dalmatia, had removed Honoratus, his archdeacon, for no other reason but because he would not deliver up to him the sacred utensils, knowing that he designed to dispose of them to his relations, with whom he passed his whole time in revels and banquets: upon that information the pope wrote to Natalis, requiring him to restore the archdeacon, on pain of excommunication, and threatening even to divest him of the episcopal dignity, if he did not.[3] With this order the pope acquainted all the bishops of Dalmatia, the bishop of Salona being the metropolitan of that province.[4] These letters had the wished-for effect. Natalis not only restored the archdeacon, in compliance with the command of the pope, but, hearkening to his friendly admonitions, reformed his manners, and strove to repair, by a regular and exemplary life, the scandal he had given.[5] But he died the same year, and his successor in the see of Salona did not think himself obliged to pay the like deference and regard to the commands or admonitions of the pope, notwithstanding the authority which the predecessors of Gregory had claimed ever since the time of pope Damasus,[6] and often exercised over the province of Dalmatia, and other provinces of west Illyricum.

The person chosen in the room of Natalis was Maximus, presbyter of that church, but one who led a very irregular and scandalous life, and besides was charged with simony, having been preferred, as was said, not for his merit, but his money, to his competitor the archdeacon Honoratus, whom Gregory had warmly recommended. The pope therefore no sooner heard of his election than he declared it null; and, at the same time, wrote to the clergy of Salona, forbidding them, by the authority, and in the name of St. Peter, to choose a bishop without the knowledge and consent of the apostolic see. But in the mean time was brought to Salona the decree of the emperor, to whom Maximus and his friends had applied, confirming his election. Gregory did not, it seems, at all apprehend that the emperor would have interfered in the affair; and therefore was greatly concerned and mortified to hear that he had. For it was a maxim with him, from which he was on no occasion known to have ever departed, to remonstrate, and always with the greatest respect and submission, against the orders of the emperors, when he thought them prejudicial to the interests of his see; to exhort, beg, and entreat the emperors to revoke them; but never directly to oppose, as many of his arrogant predecessors had done, any orders or injunctions coming from "his most serene, and most religious lords," as he constantly styled them. In the present case he wrote to Maximus, suspending him, and those who had ordained him, from all the functions of their office, till he was assured by persons, on whose faith he could depend, that the empeperor had truly confirmed his election. At the same time he summoned Maximus to Rome, to give there an account of his ordination. That summons the pope caused to be set up in Salona; but Maximus ordered it to be taken down, and publicly tore it, saying, that his ordination was in every respect legal; and that if the pope, upon any misrepresentation, excepted against it, the cause ought, by the canons, to be tried on the spot. He did not even answer the pope's letter, but, recurring again to his friends at Constantinople, obtained, by their means, an order from the emperor, commanding the pope to give no father trouble to the bishop of Salona concerning his ordination. Against that order Gregory remonstrated in the strongest terms, and with the greatest respect, declaring, in his letter to the emperor, that were it to cost him his life, it should never be said, that the see of St. Peter had suffered any diminution of its power and authority through his indolence or neglect. However, when he found the emperor was not to be moved by any exhortations, entreaties, or reasons, he acquiesced in his will, and thenceforth never once mentioned the ordination of Maximus, comforting himself with the thought, that he had done his duty as a bishop, without being any ways wanting in his duty as a subject. But Maximus was charged with simony, with sacrilege, with many other crimes; and Gregory thought so heavy a charge against a bishop ought not to pass unexamined, that he might have an opportunity of clearing himself, if innocent; or might suffer, if guilty, the punishment that was due to his crimes by the laws of the church, and the empire. He therefore summoned Maximus to Rome a second time, to answer there the charge that was brought against him; and, at the same time, let the empress know (for he found the emperor greatly prejudiced in favor of Maximus,) that the bishop of Salona being charged with many enormous

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 7.
[2] Idem ibid. ep. 6.
[3] Idem ibid. ep. 14.
[4] Idem ibid. ep. 15, 16, 17.
[5] Idem, l. 2. ep. 38. 32.
[6] See p. 104.

Gregory excommunicates Maximus for not obeying the summons. The pope falsely accused by Maximus to the emperor, as if he had been accessory to the death of a bishop. Gregory's account of the bishop's death. He abates of his first demands, and is reconciled with Maximus.

crimes, he thought it his indispensable duty to proceed against him with all the severity of the law, if he did not, in compliance with the summons he had sent him, appear at Rome, and clear himself from the excesses, of which he was arraigned, to the great disgrace of the whole episcopal order. But to this summons Maximus paid no greater regard than he had done to the former, justifying his conduct with the same plea he had used before, namely, that all ecclesiastics, more especially bishops, of what crimes soever accused, were, agreeably to the canons, to be tried on the spot. The plea was undoubtedly just; the bishops of Rome having been only allowed, even by the three famous canons of Sardica, to order, upon an appeal to them from the bishops of the province, the cause to be re-examined on the spot, by the neighboring bishops, and to send or appoint legates to assist at that judgment, in their name. The council of Sardica, which consisted only of western bishops,[1] was a council of very little, or rather of no authority at all in the church, as I have had frequent occasion to observe; and besides, these three canons were tacitly revoked, as were indeed most of the canons of that council concerning the ecclesiastical discipline, by the canons and decrees of subsequent councils inconsistent with them.[2] However, the popes not only maintained the power, which was granted them by that council; but, extending it beyond all bounds, took upon them to summon bishops to Rome, nay, and to summon them to be judged there, before they were judged by the provincial bishops. This power Gregory claimed, lest the see of St. Peter should lose any of its rights, or suffer any diminution of its authority, in his days; and because Maximus would acknowledge no such authority, nor obey the summons, he thundered at last the sentence of excommunication against him, against the bishops who had espoused his cause or interest, and all who should thenceforth communicate with him or them. But Maximus still continued, in defiance of the pope, to exercise the functions of his office, and the other bishops to communicate with him, as if no such sentence had ever been issued. Their common plea was, that bishops were, agreeably to the canons, to be tried on the spot; to which Maximus added another, that could surely be of no weight with any who were in the least acquainted with Gregory; namely, that the pope was a man of a cruel temper; that he had caused a bishop, named Malcus, to be imprisoned for debt, and to be soon after murdered in prison; and that he had good reason to apprehend the like fate would attend him, should he obey the summons, and repair to Rome. This Gregory looked upon at first only as an idle report, which he thought no man could ever believe. But being informed, that Maximus had despatched one of his ecclesiastics to Constantinople, on purpose to acquaint the emperor with it, and to allege it as a reason why he did comply with the summons calling him to Rome, he thought it incumbent upon him to inform the emperor of the true state of the case, that his innocence might, at the same time, be made to appear, and no farther room might be left for Maximus to plead any danger, or apprehension of danger, from his obeying the summons. He wrote accordingly to his nuncio at Constantinople, desiring him to let his lords know, in a few words, that if he, their servant, had not been averse from shedding the blood even of the Lombards, that nation would this day have no king, no dukes, no counts, but would be divided among themselves, and involved in the utmost confusion; but that, "as he feared God, he would be accessory to the death of no man whatever." Gregory had (if he is to be credited, and who will not credit him?) an opportunity of destroying almost the whole nation of the Lombards; and they, probably, were still pagans or heretics, when that opportunity offered. But the good man was averse from shedding the blood even of pagans and heretics; and therefore would not avail himself of it. "He feared God, and therefore would be accessory to the death of no man whatever." Have his successors all thus feared God? Have they all entertained such humane, such truly Christian notions? It were to be wished they had! What scenes of cruelty would have been thereby prevented? Scenes of bloodshed and slaughter, which reflect disgrace on human nature itself; or rather on that religion, which has divested human nature of all its humanity, and taught its votaries to thirst after the blood of those who profess any other.

As to the death of Malcus, the pope gives his nuncio the following account of it in a few words: the bishop, says he, was neither imprisoned, nor any otherwise ill used; but having been tried for a debt, and adjudged to pay it, he was invited, after the trial, by Boniface the notary, to his house, where he dined, and was friendly entertained, but died that night a sudden death. The pope desires his nuncio to acquaint the emperor with these particulars; but Mauricius was now grown sick of that dispute; and, being determined to give himself no farther trouble about it, he wrote to exarch Callinicus to accommodate matters, in the best manner he could, between the two bishops. By his means an accommodation was at last brought about; and it was agreed, that the affair should be referred entire to Marinianus bishop of Ravenna; and that Maximus should repair to that city, and submit to his judgment. Pursuant to this agreement, Maximus repaired to the appointed place; and, having there first publicly asked the pope's pardon, as was enjoined him by

[1] See p. 56. [2] See p. 100.

The bishop of Constantinople causes two presbyters to be beaten with cudgels;—[Year of Christ, 593.] Gregory disapproves that kind of punishment, and writes to the patriarch; who resents his concerning himself with the affairs of his church. Gregory's reply. The two presbyters absolved at Rome. What was at this time heresy at Constantinople, was the catholic faith at Rome.

Marinianus, and afterwards cleared himself from the charge of simony, by an oath of purgation, taken at the tomb of St. Apollinaris, the tutelar saint of that church, a letter from the pope was delivered to him by his legate Castorius; and by that letter the pope acknowleged him for lawful bishop, and received him as such to his communion.[1] This affair cost Gregory no fewer than seventeen letters. Had Gregory been a man of the temper which I have had occasion to observe in most of his predecessors, the quarrel had not been so easily ended. For what other pope, among the many whose actions I have hitherto described, would have ever been prevailed upon, as Gregory was, to abate of his first demands? What other could have ever been brought to consent, that a bishop, whom he had summoned over and over to Rome, to be judged there, and who had made as little account of him and his summons, as Maximus made of Gregory and his; what other pope, I say, would have consented, as Gregory did, that such a bishop should be judged any where else but at Rome, or by any other judge but himself? He was as jealous of the privileges, and what he called the rights of his see, as any of his predecessors; but had too much at heart the peace and welfare of the church, to sacrifice either, as some of them had done, to a mere punctilio.

Gregory thought it incumbent upon him, as the first bishop of the catholic church, not only to punish the guilty, but to relieve the innocent, by whomsoever oppressed; and reverse the judgment of any other bishop whatever, when it was found to be evidently unjust, and repugnant to the canons. Several instances occur of his acting agreeably to that notion; but the following is, perhaps, of all the most remarkable, and the most worthy of notice. Two ecclesiastics, namely, John, presbyter of the church of Chalcedon, and Anastasius, a monk of Isauria, and likewise presbyter, being both accused of heresy to John of Constantinople, the patriarch appointed judges to try them, not being at leisure himself to attend to that cause. They were tried accordingly; and not only by their judges found guilty of the charge, but punished with uncommon severity. For Anastasius, who appeared, it seems, to them the more guilty of the two, was, by their order, most inhumanly beaten, not with rods, which, in some cases, was allowed, but what had never been practised before, with cudgels. Of this Gregory was no sooner informed, than he wrote to the patriarch, to complain of his introducing into the church a new kind of punishment, repugnant to the canons, as well as the practice of all former times. To this letter the patriarch returned no answer, piqued at the pope's concerning himself at all with the affairs of his church. Gregory therefore wrote a second letter on the same subject: and that the patriarch answered, but in such terms, that the pope suspected it to have been written by some layman, in his name, and without his knowledge. As that letter has not reached our times [and few pieces of that kind have], I will indulge no conjectures about it. The pope, in his reply, complains of the harsh and affronting terms used by his most holy brother of Constantinople, for so he styles him; tells him, that if that letter was truly written by him, he is greatly mistaken in the opinion he has hitherto entertained of him; and exhorts him either to restore the two presbyters, who, he says, have not been judged according to the canons, or to judge them according to the form of ecclesiastical judgments prescribed by the canons. He closes his letter with the following words: "If you do neither, we will not quarrel with you; but, if they come to us, we will not reject them. Your fraternity knows what is said in the canons of bishops, who cause themselves to be feared with blows; we are pastors, and not executioners. You cannot be a stranger to what an excellent preacher said; preach the word, &c., reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine.[1] But to recur to blows, and, with blows, require men to believe, is a new and unheard-of method of preaching, *nova atque inaudita prædicatio, quæ verberibus exigit fidem.*"[2] What would Gregory have said, had any bishop preached in his days, as his successors have preached since, and still preach, where their cruelty has free scope, not with blows only, but with racks and halters, with fire and fagot?

The two presbyters withdrew, after their trial, from Constantinople to Rome, where their cause was re-examined by Gregory; and, their innocence plainly appearing, both were absolved.[3] How these proceedings were relished by the patriarch, we may judge from his having resented, in the manner he did, the pope's intermeddling at all in that affair. It appeared on occasion of these trials, and it is a thing well worthy of our notice, that what, at this time, was deemed heresy at Constantinople, was received as sound doctrine at Rome; and what was deemed heresy at Rome, was received as sound doctrine at Constantinople. This strange disagreement between the two churches, in matters of faith, was owing to their disagreeing, in a most unaccountable manner, about one of their councils, the standard of their faith. The first council of Ephesus was universally received by the church, and the second universally condemned and rejected. But the church of Con-

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 20. l. 3. ep. 15. 20. 25. 33. l. 4. ep. 4. 20. 34. l. 5. ep. 3, 4. 8. l. 6. ep. 17. l. 7. ep. 1. 12. 60. 81, 82.

[1] Ad Tim. ep. 2: c. 4. v. 2. [2] Greg. l. 2. ep. 52.
[3] Greg. l. 5. ep. 15, 16, 17.

We cannot depend upon councils, nor their creeds or decrees. Nothing left but the scriptures to build our faith upon.

stantinople received, as the first, that which the Roman church rejected, as the second; and the Roman church received, as the first, that which the other rejected as the second. In this both agreed, that the doctrine of the first was catholic, and that of the second heretical. But as they did not agree which was the first, and which the second; nay, as what was the first with the one, was the second with the other; it thence necessarily followed, that what was sound doctrine with the one, was rank heresy with the other. Thus was the presbyter Anastasius condemned at Constantinople as a heretic, because he condemned the doctrine of their first Ephesine council, and received that of their second; whereas he was, on that very score, absolved at Rome as a good catholic.[1] On the same occasion it likewise appeared, that the council of Chalcedon had been either interpolated at Constantinople, or curtailed at Rome; for some passages were in the one copy, that could not be found in the other; and that a decree had been inserted into some of the copies of the council of Ephesus, confirming the doctrine of Pelagius.[2] How these points were adjusted, we know not; nor does it indeed much concern us to know, who take not the councils for the standard of our faith, but the scriptures. And that we have good reason to do so, sufficiently appears from what has been said. For if the first two bishops, and the first two churches of the Christian world, disagreed, in the manner we have seen, about one of their councils; if what was deemed by the one a conventicle of heretics, was looked upon by the other as a lawful assembly of catholic bishops; and, in consequence thereof, what was rejected by the one as rank heresy, was received by the other as the true catholic doctrine; if the first two bishops, I say, of the church thus disagreed about one of their councils, not much above a century and a half after it was held; how can we, after thirteen whole centuries, be sure, that the definitions and decrees of some conventicle of heretics have not been imposed upon us for the decrees and definitions of one or other of the oecumenical and received councils? What certainty can we have, that some of the doctrines which are recommended to us under the venerable names of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, or Chalcedon, are not the very doctrines, which the fathers of those great assemblies anathematized, condemned, and proscribed? We are so far from knowing for certain they are not, that we have good reason to believe some of them are. For if the councils were corrupted, curtailed, interpolated, as we have seen, in Gregory's time [and they were so long before]; if a decree was then found to have been foisted into one of them, establishing a condemned heresy; may we not well suppose the like attempts to have been made since? nay, that such attempts have been made, and often, is well known to all who are the least conversant in the history of the church. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in his preface to the eighth council, reproached the Greeks, eight hundred years ago, with having corrupted not only the council of Ephesus, but all the other councils, except that of Nice; and that charge the Greeks returned upon the Latins, adding, that they had not even spared the council of Nice, but attempted to pass upon the world the decrees of Sardica for the decrees of that council.[1] In the council of Florence, one John, a friar, asserted, that of all the copies of the council of Nice, one only had escaped the corruptions of the Arians, which, he said, was, on that account, kept with all possible care under lock and key at Rome.[2] But if what he added was true, namely, that the above-mentioned canons of Sardica were to be found in that copy, it had not the good luck to escape the corruptions of the popes, as it did those of the Arians. But that Phœnix no one ever heard of before, nor has it ever been heard of since. The Nicene symbol has not been suffered to pass unaltered and uncorrupted, no more than the Nicene council. For the Greeks pretend the words, "and the Son," in the article concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, to have been added by the Latins; and, on the other hand, the Latins will have them to have been struck out by the Greeks. And thus it happens in our days as it did in Gregory's; what is heresy with the one, is the true catholic faith with the other. In all these disputes, ancient manuscripts have been produced on either side; but none have yet appeared, which the one or the other has not arraigned of forgery. What then have we left, in this uncertainty concerning the authenticity of the councils, of their decrees, creeds, definitions, &c., to build our faith upon, but the scriptures? to build upon any other foundation whatever, is building, like the foolish man in the gospel,[3] on the sand. Those sacred writings have been always preserved in the church with the greatest care, were learnt by all nations, translated into all languages, received and read by Christians of all persuasions, whether catholics, heretics, schismatics, Greeks, Latins, &c. so that, in them, any alteration of moment would have been immediately discovered, and would have alarmed the whole Christian world. But the councils were translated into few languages, were known to few, were read by few, and by very few understood; which gave a favorable opportunity to designing men of interpolating or curtailing them, as it best served the interest of their cause.

But to return to Gregory. Though he claimed and exercised, in the manner we have seen, whatever power or authority his pre-

[1] Greg. l. 1. ep. 14, 15, 16. et l. 6. ep. 31.
[2] Idem, l. 7. ep. 48.

[1] See p. 167, & seq. [2] Con. Flor. Sess. 20.
[3] Mat. c. 7 : v. 26.

The emperor issues an order to forbid any soldier to turn monk. The pope remonstrates against that order. His letter to the emperor. He owns himself subject to the emperor, and bound to obey his commands.

decessors had claimed and usurped over his colleagues; yet he thought himself no less liable to be commanded by the emperor, and no less bound to obey his commands, even in ecclesiastical matters, than the meanest of his subjects. Of this the present year supplies us with the following instance. The emperor Mauricius, finding his army was greatly reduced by his constant wars with the Persians on the one side, and the Lombards on the other; and, besides, that many, preferring the lazy and indolent life of a monk to the toilsome life of a soldier, betook themselves daily to monasteries; issued an edict, forbidding any, who were enrolled in the service, or marked in the hand, in manu signati, (for the soldiers, it seems, wore then a particular mark in one of their hands), to quit the army, under the pretence of embracing a monastic life, till the time of their warfare was expired. This edict the emperor transmitted to the pope, commanding him to publish it in all the countries subject to the empire in the west; for it was the province of the bishop of Rome to publish, in the west, all edicts and laws concerning religious matters or persons, as it was the province of the bishop of Constantinople to publish them in the east. The law was in itself both just and necessary; but nevertheless the pope, prepossessed with the highest opinion of a monastic life, which he looked upon as a sure way for all, and for many as the only way to heaven, was greatly grieved and concerned to find a whole order of men debarred from embracing, when they pleased, so happy a state. He therefore resolved to remonstrate against the new law; but, being indisposed, as he often was, when he received it, and not in a condition to write to the emperor, he thought he should be wanting in his duty, as a good subject, if he did not immediately publish it: and he published it accordingly. Having thus discharged the duty of a good subject, he thought it incumbent upon him to discharge, in the next place, that of a good bishop. As therefore he apprehended the above-mentioned law to be of a very pernicious tendency, he wrote to the emperor, as soon as his health allowed him, to remonstrate against it; and the letter he wrote, I shall exhibit in his own words; for we shall have frequent occasion, in the sequel of the present history, to compare it with the letters of other popes to kings, princes, and emperors.

"Your late constitution has given me, I ingeniously own it to my lords, [meaning Mauricius and his son Theodosius], the greatest uneasiness, seeing the way to heaven is thereby shut up to many, and what has been hitherto lawful, is thereby made henceforth unlawful. Many there are, indeed, who can lead a religious life in a secular habit; but there are many too, who cannot be saved unless they leave all they have. But what am I, who thus address my lords? I am but dust; I am but a worm. But nevertheless, as I apprehend the law to be displeasing to God, the author of all things, I cannot conceal from my lords what I think. Power was given to my lords *over all men*, that such as desire to live well might be helped and encouraged; that the way to heaven might be widened, and the earthly kingdom might be made subservient to the kingdom of heaven. But alas! none, engaged in an earthly warfare are now allowed to enter into the service of our Lord Jesus Christ, till they have served their time, or are discharged for their indispositions or weakness. Hearken not to me, but to Christ, who speaks by the least of his servants, and yours. You were a notary; but I raised you to the post of captain of the guards; I preferred you to the dignity of Cæsar; I placed you on the imperial throne, and not only made you emperor, but the father of emperors. I gave you power over my priests, and you withdraw your soldiers from my service. Answer, I beseech you, answer, most pious lord, your servant. What answer will you return to your Lord, when he thus upbraids you on the last day? You will say, perhaps, that the conversion of the soldiers, who quit the service to embrace a monastic life is not sincere. But I, your unworthy servant, know of many converted soldiers, who this day work miracles in their monasteries. And will you forbid by law the conversion of such men? I beg my most pious lord will enquire by what emperor such a law was first issued;(*) and that he will afterwards consider with himself, whether it ought to have been issued. It is indeed matter of great grief and sorrow, that men should be withheld from leaving the world, when the end of the world is at hand.(†) For the heavens and the earth will be soon involved in a general conflagration, the elements will soon be dissolved, and the tremendous Judge will appear, attended by the whole heavenly host. I therefore earnestly beg and entreat you, by the same tremendous Judge, that you will, at least, mitigate the rigor of your law, lest the many tears, fasts, alms of my lord, should, in the end, loose both their merit and reward. The army of my lords will not be thereby weakened, but rather strengthened, in proportion as the number is increased of those, who pray for them, and the good success of their armies. I indeed, who am subject to command, *ego quidem jussioni subjectus*,

(*) Julian was the first who issued such a law. But Gregory forbore naming him in his letter to the emperor, lest he should seem to reproach him with treading in the footsteps of that apostate. However, he named him, in a letter which he wrote on this occasion to Theodorus, the emperor's physician, and chief favorite.

(†) An opinion prevailed among the fathers, that the Roman empire was to last as long as the world. Hence, when they apprehended the empire to be in danger from any extraordinary calamity, especially from the irruptions of the barbarians, they concluded the end of the world was at hand. (a)

(a) Greg. l. 2. ep. 62. l. 3. ep. 44. l. 7. ep. 128.

Gregory's letter to Theodorus on the same subject. Mistake of a late writer concerning the doctrine of the church of England. The imperial law not revoked. Two forged bulls produced in favor of the papal supremacy.

have caused the said law to be transmitted into different parts of the world; but, as I apprehend it to be displeasing to God, I could not help acquainting therewith my most serene lords. And now I have on both sides discharged my duty: on the one I have yielded obedience to the emperor, and, on the other, spoken my mind with openness and freedom."[1]

This letter the pope did not send to his nuncio at the court of Constantinople, to be delivered by him to the emperor, as was usual, but to Theodorus, the emperor's physician, and great favorite; entreating him, by another letter, to deliver it privately, and to speak on that occasion, which he could do more freely than on any other, what his zeal for the welfare of the emperor, and the good of religion, would suggest. He begins his letter thus: "My tongue cannot well express the many benefits which I have received of the Almighty, and of my most serene lord the emperor: and in what other manner can I acknowledge them, but by loving the very ground he treads?" He then acquaints Theodorus with the law, complains of it, and adds: "it seems very unreasonable to me, that the emperor should forbid his soldiers to serve Him, of whom he has received the power of ruling not only over the soldiers, but over the priests too: *qui dominari eum non solum militibus, sed etiam sacerdotibus concessit.*"[2] Here the pope acknowledges the emperor, and in the plainest terms, for the supreme head of the church, if we allow him to have been the supreme head of the army; for he owns the same power to have been given him by God over the priests, or the church, that was given him over the soldiers, or the army. From both these letters it is evident beyond contradiction, that Gregory knew of no power upon earth, neither secular nor ecclesiastic, above the power of the emperor; that he thought himself, notwithstanding his primacy, subject to the commands of the emperor, "ego quidem jussioni subjectus;" and that he looked upon it as his duty to obey them, even when they appeared to him unreasonable. And was not that acknowledging the same supremacy in the emperor, which the church of England acknowledges in the king? Had a late writer of no mean character[3] been in the least acquainted with the true doctrine of the church of England, he would not have thought it repugnant to common sense, that she should acknowledge the king for her head; nor would he have more thought it a solecism, that the supremacy in the church should fall to the distaff, than the supremacy in the state, the church being in the state, as Optatus Milevitanus expresses it, and not the state in the church; whence it necessarily follows, that whoever is supreme in the state, must, of course, be supreme in the church. Some writers are of opinion, that Mauricius, hearkening to the remonstrances of the pope, revoked the law he had issued.[1] But that opinion is entirely groundless, as has been shown by a very able writer.[2]

In opposition to the two above-mentioned letters, the advocates for the papal supremacy produce two decrees, or, as they style them, bulls, which they suppose to have been issued by Gregory, the one in favor of the monks of St. Medard at Soissons, and the other of an hospital at Autun. In both the pope is made to excommunicate, and even to depose, any king, bishop, or judge, who should presume to infringe either, or transgress the commands of the apostolic see. Hence they conclude, that though Gregory thought it advisable, on some occasions, humbly to submit to the will of the emperor, yet, on others, he exerted the power which he knew to have been by Christ entailed on his see, "over all things and persons." If he knew of any such entail, it must have been after he wrote to the emperor; for in that letter he owned a power to have been granted to him "over all things and persons," himself not excepted. But no man can peruse either of these bulls, without being fully satisfied that both have been forged, and very undeservedly fathered upon Gregory. For who can believe, that a man of his meek spirit, that one, who entertained so mean an opinion of himself, and paid, on all occasions, the greatest deference and regard to the higher powers, should have expressed himself thus? "If any king, bishop, or judge, shall presume to infringe the decrees of our apostolic authority, or transgress this our command, let him be deprived of his honor and dignity; let him be cut off from the communion of the church; let him be loaded with all the anathemas and curses that have been thundered against infidels and heretics since the creation of the world to the present time; let him for ever be damned in the bottom of hell, in inferno inferiori, with Judas the betrayer of our Lord." Does this profane and anti-christian dialect suit with the spirit, with the style, or the character of Gregory?(*)

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 62. [2] Idem ibid. ep. 65.
[3] Pietro Giannoni Istor. Civil. di Nap. l. 1. c. 11.

[1] Vide Marca de Concord. l. 2. c. 11.
[2] Flottemanville annal. ad ann. 593.

(*) I might add, that the decree in favor of the monastery of St. Medard, is signed by some bishops who never existed, by others who existed no more when that decree is supposed to have been made, and by some, who, at that time, were not yet ordained bishops, namely, by Austin of Canterbury, and Mellitus of London. Dominicus of Carthage, and Eulogius of Alexandria, are made to sign it among the rest, though it does not appear from history, that either ever was at Rome. King Thierry too is brought in to sign it, though he was not yet king, he being then, that is, in 593, only one or two years old, and his father Childebert still living. The pope, in his subscription, styles himself "the servant of the servants of God;" but is made to add, "though exalted by the pontifical dignity of the holy Roman see." But that both bulls or decrees are a most palpable, impudent, and bare-faced forgery, has been, I may say, demonstrated by

Dreadful ravages committed by the provoked Lombards. Proposals for a peace offered by Gregory to the king of the Lombards; but not approved by the exarch. The emperor dissatisfied with the conduct of the pope;—[Year of Christ, 595.] His letter to the emperor on that occasion.

The following year the good pope was wholly employed in procuring some relief for the inhabitants of Italy, most miserably harassed by the Lombards on the one side, and by the imperial officers on the other. The exarch Romans had concluded a peace with Agilulph; but the king being obliged, soon after the conclusion of the peace, to turn his arms against some of his dukes, who had revolted, the exarch, laying hold of that opportunity, broke unexpectedly into the territories of the Lombards, surprised some of their cities, and returned to Ravenna, loaded with booty. Agilulph, provoked at that breach of faith, invaded in his turn the territories of the Greeks, namely, the exarchate, and the dukedom of Rome,(*) and there continued several months, laying them every where waste with fire and sword. The many calamities, which the unhappy people suffered on that occasion, are pathetically described by Gregory in his letters and homilies; for, like a good pastor, he strove to improve to the advantage of his flock every opportunity that offered, exhorting them to mend their lives, and repent of their sins, the true source of all their calamities. "Now," says he in one of his homilies, "we hear nothing around us but lamentations and groans; now we see nothing, to what side soever we turn our eyes, but objects of compassion and horror. Our castles are dismantled and destroyed; our cities lie buried in their ruins; our lands lie untilled, and our most populous places are now become deserts. Few inhabitants now remain; and of the few, who still remain, some are daily murdered, others are carried into captivity, and some appear daily before us, whose hands have been cut off by the merciless enemy. To what a deplorable condition Rome is reduced, Rome once the mistress of the world, we all know, we all see and feel."[1] The catholic religion, which the Lombards and their king had lately embraced, produced, it seems, no great change of manners either in them, or in him. Gregory, to put a stop to so destructive a war, which had now lasted twenty-six years, caused proposals for a peace to be made to Agilulph, who seemed inclined to agree to them, not finding himself then in a condition to lay siege either to Rome or Ravenna, both cities being defended by strong and numerous garrisons. But the exarch, who reaped great advantages from the war, and was not affected, as Gregory was, with the miseries of the people, would hearken to no terms whatever; nay, he complained to the emperor of the conduct of the pope, as if his holiness had suffered himself to be overreached by the politic and crafty king of the Lombards. The emperor, giving an entire credit to the exarch, wrote to Gregory, declaring himself, in his letter, greatly dissatisfied with his conduct, and styling him a simple and unprovident man for depending on the faith of Agilulph, who, he said, wanted only a short respite to refresh his harassed army, that he might afterwards pursue the war with new vigor, and better success. That treatment the pope resented, but within the bounds of his usual modesty and respect in addressing the emperor. "My lords," says he in answer to the emperor's letter, "designed to have spared me, but in truth they have not spared me, in laying on me their most serene commands, and reproaching me with my conduct. For they call me a simple man, that is, in more courtly terms, a fool. Simplicity without prudence is foolishness; and therefore my most serene lords, calling me a simple man, and, at the same time, charging me with want of prudence in my late negotiations with the king of the Lombards, call me a fool, and think I have acted as a fool. But it is not for myself that I am concerned, nor should I take any notice of my being thus derided and despised, were I not sensible that the public welfare is at stake. My advice is rejected and disregarded; and, in the mean time, the enemy becomes daily more formidable, and more outrageous. Agilulph has advanced to the very gates of the city. I myself have seen Romans carried off, with ropes

two eminent critics,(a) to whom I refer the reader. I shall only observe here, that the decree in favor of the hospital was forged before the time of Gregory VI. For that pope, of all popes the most assuming and arrogant, quotes it to justify his having excommunicated and deposed Henry IV., as if this good pope had decreed, that kings and princes should be excommunicated and deposed for much less crimes than those the emperor was guilty of, whom he had excommunicated and deposed. "If the blessed Gregory," says he, in a letter to the Bishop of Mentz, "though a man of a most meek spirit, decreed, that kings, who transgressed his statutes only concerning an hospital, should be deposed, excommunicated, and damned in the last judgment, who will blame us for having excommunicated and deposed Henry, not only a despiser of the apostolic judgments, but a most wicked plunderer, a most outrageous destroyer, of the church herself? None surely will blame us for so doing, but such as are as wicked as he." (b) The other instances, alleged by that pope to ascertain the deposing power, are no better grounded than this; and hence the seditious and anti-Christian doctrine concerning that power which his successors held, and sometimes practised, was justly, and, agreeably to history, styled by the church of Liege, the schism,(c) and by Sigebert, the heresy of Hildebrand.(d) The pretended decree of Gregory, in behalf of the monastery of St. Medard, was not, it seems, yet forged, when Gregory VII. excommunicated the emperor; else he would not have failed to quote that, as he did the other.

(a) Launois in Diss. de Princ. St. Medard. et Du Pin de antiq. Eccl. Discip. Dissert. 7.

(b) Greg. VII. l. 8. ep. 21. et l. 4. ep. 2. 23.

(c) Eccles. Leod. apud Bin. t. 7. p. 521.

(d) Sigebert. chron. ad ann. 1008.

(*) The rest of Italy, except the city of Naples, and some other maritime cities, was at this time in the hands of the Lombards. Autharis, the predecessor of Agilulph, had reduced Samnium, with the city of Beneventum, and the greater part of Campania; nay, he is said to have advanced even to Rhegium, on the farthest point of Italy, and, riding into the sea, to have struck with his spear a pillar that stood there, saying, "thus far shall the bounds of the Lombards extend." A pillar was still standing there in the time of Paulus Diaconus, known by the name of Autharis' pillar.(a)

(a) Paul. Diac. l. 3. c. 16.

[1] Greg. in Ezech. hom. 18. et l. 4. ep. 35. 38.

Gregory complains to the empress of the cruelty and avarice of the imperial ministers. Alarmed at the title of universal bishop, assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory writes to his nuncio, at the imperial court; who cannot persuade the patriarch to relinquish it. Writes again to his nuncio.

about their necks, like so many dogs, to be sent into Gaul, and sold there. I do not complain, most pious lord, of your entertaining a bad opinion of me; my sins deserve it, and I hope it will, in some degree, atone for them. But let me advise you not to confide in all indifferently, nor hearken to all; let facts have more weight with you than words."[1]

The emperor's letter has not reached our times; but, from Gregory's answer, it appears, that Mauricius was strangely prejudiced against the pope; and that he wrote to him in very sharp, not to say abusive terms, reproaching him not only with simplicity, but even with want of veracity. But that treatment, however undeserved, Gregory resented no otherwise than in the manner we have seen. He thenceforth, indeed, forbore writing to the emperor concerning the affairs of Italy; but frequently complained to the empress Constantina of the cruelty and avarice of the imperial officers. In one of his letters, he tells her, that Stephen, who had been sent from Constantinople to guard the coasts of Sicily, committed such rapines in that island, so many acts of violence, as could hardly be contained in a large volume; that the inhabitants of the countries, which were still subject to the empire, suffered more from the officers, who were sent to defend them, than from the enemy, who came to attack them; that the Corsicans in particular were loaded with such taxes as obliged them even to sell their children, to raise money, by that means, for the collectors; that they thereupon repaired, in great numbers, to the Lombards in Italy, leaving the island almost quite destitute of inhabitants. He adds, that the emperor's ministers had all combined to defend each other, though guilty of the greatest extortions; and therefore defeated all his endeavors for concluding a peace with the Lombards, which they well knew would leave no farther room for the heavy taxes, with which they enriched themselves under the pretence of carrying on the war. He closes his letter with earnestly entreating the empress to acquaint his most pious lord with these grievances, that, by speedily redressing them, he may avert the judgments, which must otherwise fall upon him, and his family.[2] But Constantina either did not think it advisable to lay the complaints of Gregory before the emperor; or if she did, he hearkened no more to her than to him. The pope was attended with better success in his application to queen Theudelinda, who, at his request, prevailed on the king to withdraw his troops from the territories of Rome, and lay aside all thoughts of besieging that city.

But the unhappy state of Italy was not the only thing that engaged, at this time, the thoughts and attention of the pope. The bishop of Constantinople was now distinguished, all over the east, with the pompous title of oecumenical or universal patriarch; and Gregory found that he had so styled himself over and over again, in a judgment which he had lately given against a presbyter arraigned of heresy, and which, at the request of the pope, he had transmitted to Rome. At this Gregory took the alarm, and forgetting all other cares, as if the church, the faith, the Christian religion, were in imminent danger, he despatched, in great haste, a messenger, with letters to Sabinianus, his nuncio at Constantinople, charging him, as he tendered "the liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free," to use his utmost endeavors with the emperor, with the empress, and above all, with the bishop himself, his beloved brother, to divert him from ever more using the proud, the profane, the anti-christian title of universal bishop, which he had assumed, in the pride of his heart, to the great debasement of the whole episcopal order. The nuncio, in compliance with his orders, left nothing unattempted, which he thought could make any impression on the patriarch, assuring him that, unless he relinquished the odious title, which had given so great an offence to the pope, he would find in him a formidable antagonist, not to say an irreconcileable enemy.[1] But the patriarch was not a man to be easily frightened; and therefore told the nuncio, that indeed he was sorry his most holy brother of Rome should have taken any umbrage at so inoffensive a title, since he could have no just reason to take any; but as it had been bestowed, and bestowed by so great a council,[2] not on him alone, but on him and his successors, it was not in his power to resign it, nor would his successors stand to his resignation, if he should. As for the emperor and the empress, they declared, that they would be no ways concerned in that affair. However, the emperor wrote, on this occasion, to Gregory; but it was only to exhort him to live in peace with the bishop of the imperial city, lest a misunderstanding between them in particular should be attended with a general misunderstanding between the east and the west.[3]

The pope received, at the same time, the emperor's letter, and an answer from his nuncio, informing him, that he had by no means been able to prevail on the patriarch to quit his new title, and that he seemed disposed to maintain it at all events. The pope was greatly concerned at the obstinacy of the patriarch, as he styled it; but more to find, that the emperor had at all interfered in the quarrel. He therefore wrote again, without loss of time, to his nuncio, ordering him to renew his remonstrances with the patriarch, and, if he still found him inflexible, to separate himself from his communion, that the see of St. Peter might not seem to connive at his pride and ambition. As to his living in peace

[1] Greg. l. 4. ep. 31. [2] Idem l. 4. ep. 33.

[1] Greg. l. 4. ep. 39. [2] See p. 388. [3] Greg. l. 4. ep. 39.

The title of universal bishop heretical, in the opinion of Gregory. He writes to the patriarch. The title of universal bishop anti-christian, blasphemous, infernal, diabolical. Christ alone head of the whole church. The pope writes to the emperor, and the empress against the patriarch.

with his most holy brother and colleague, agreeably to the desire of the emperor, he declares, that he has nothing more at heart; and that would "his most serene lord" only oblige his beloved brother, as in justice he ought, to renounce his new title, he would have thereby the merit of establishing a lasting peace between the two sees, and preventing the evils, which he seemed to apprehend from their disagreement. He closes his letter with the following remarkable words: "It is very hard, that, after we have parted with our silver, our gold, our slaves, and even our garments, for the public welfare, we should be obliged to part with our faith too; for to agree to that impious title is parting with our faith[1]:" so that the title of universal bishop was, according to Gregory, heretical in itself; and, in his opinion, none could either assume it, or acknowledge it in another, without apostatizing from the faith. Sabinianus, the pope's nuncio, communicated to the patriarch the contents of this letter, as soon as he received it. But the patriarch was so far from yielding, that, on the contrary, he loudly complained of the pope for thus opposing, with so much warmth, a title which none but himself thought, or could think, in the least derogatory to the authority of any other bishop or patriarch. Hereupon the nuncio, pursuant to the express order of the pope, renounced his communion.

Gregory, finding the endeavors of his nuncio proved all unsuccessful, resolved to write no more to him, but immediately to the patriarch himself; which, he said, he had hitherto declined, lest he should be obliged to find fault with a man, of whose sanctity and virtue he had ever entertained the highest opinion. He wrote to him accordingly a long letter, loading the title of "universal patriarch" or "bishop" with all the names of reproach and ignominy he could think of; calling it "vain, ambitious, profane, impious, execrable, anti-christian, blasphemous, infernal, diabolical;" and applying to him who assumed it, what was said by the prophet Isaiah of Lucifer:[2] "Whom you do imitate," says he, "in assuming that arrogant title? Whom but him, who, swelled with pride, exalted himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" It was then, in the opinion of Gregory, imitating Lucifer, for any bishop to exalt himself above his brethren, and pretend all other bishops to be subject to him, and himself to be subject to none. And has not this been, for many ages, the avowed pretension and claim of the popes? "We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff," is a decree issued by Boniface VIII. four hundred and fifty years ago.[3] "The apostle Peter," continues Gregory, "was the first member of the universal church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the head of particular congregations: but all were members of the church under one head,(*) and none would ever be called 'universal.'" The meaning of Gregory is obvious; namely, that the apostles themselves, though heads of particular congregations or churches, were nevertheless members of the church universal, and none of them ever pretended to be the head of the whole church, or to have power and authority over the whole church, that being peculiar to Christ alone. This agrees with what he had said before, addressing himself to the patriarch; namely, "If none of the apostles would be called universal, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, the head of the church universal? You, who, by arrogating that name, strive to subject all his members to yourself?" For it was not the bare title of "universal bishop" that thus alarmed Gregory, but the "universal" power and authority; which he apprehended his rival aimed at in assuming that title. The pope adds: "But this is the time which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed with the plague, and the sword; all things, that have been predicted, are now accomplished; the king of pride, (that is), antichrist, is at hand; and, what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him;(†) for they, who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness, are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition."[1] Here the pope treats the bishop of Constantinople as the fore-runner of antichrist, for taking upon him the title of "universal bishop," a title, which he pretends to have been rejected by one of his predecessors, though offered to him, and in him to all the bishops of the apostolic see, by no less a council than that of Chalcedon. But that he was therein certainly mistaken, has been elsewhere shown.[2](‡)

The pope wrote, at the same time, to the emperor, and the empress Constantina, in-

[1] Greg. l. 4. ep. 39. [2] Isa. 14: 12, 13, &c.
[3] Extrav. com. l. 1. tit. 8. c. 1.

(*) In some printed copies, the name of Peter was added here, and the passage read thus: "All members of the church under one head Peter." An interpolation that would have well served the purpose, had not Gregory been thereby evidently made to contradict himself.(a) In the same passage most of the manuscript copies have, "Peter, the first of the apostles, was a member of the universal church;" and all the printed copies, "Peter, the apostle, was the first member," &c.

(a) Staplet. Princ. doctrin. l. 6. c. 7.

(†) All the ancient manuscripts have, "Sacerdotum ei præparatur exercitus." But in most of the printed copies the word "exercitus" has been changed into "exitus," as if the priests were not to join, but to oppose antichrist, and be destroyed by him.(a)

(a) See Thom. James, in vindic. Greg. p. 666.

[1] Greg. l. 4. ep. 32. [2] See p. 229.

(‡) Gregory received the first four councils, as the four gospels. How then could he think a title offered by one of them "blasphemous, heretical, infernal, diabolical?"

The pope is not actuated by zeal alone in opposing the title of universal bishop. He strives to engage the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch in the quarrel; but in vain. John of Constantinople dies;—[Year of Christ, 596;]—and is honored as a saint. Cyriacus, the new patriarch, writes to the pope.

veighing, throughout both letters, against his most holy brother (for so he styled him), as one who strove, by a most wicked attempt, to enthrall the whole church, as one equal in pride to Lucifer himself, as the forerunner of antichrist, &c., repeating here what he had written to the patriarch himself.[1] He begs the emperor, in the name of St. Peter, to control, by his authority, the unbounded ambition of a man, who, not satisfied with being bishop, affected to be called the sole bishop of the catholic church. It was therefore, according to Gregory's way of reasoning, all one to be called "universal bishop," and "sole bishop." He alleges several reasons to convince the emperor, that, in the church, there can be no "universal bishop;" and the following among the rest: "If there were an universal bishop, and he should err, the universal church would err with him:" which was evidently supposing every bishop, even an universal bishop, to be capable of erring. From his letter to the empress, it appears but too plainly, that, in thus opposing, with so much warmth, the title of "universal bishop," in his brother of Constantinople, and inveighing against that prelate, in the manner we have seen, for assuming it, he was actuated by jealousy as well as by zeal. For, in that letter, after declaiming, in the sharpest and most poignant terms, against the title, as quite anti-christian, against the patriarch, as a disturber of the peace, and the good order established by Christ in the church, against all who any-ways countenanced, encouraged, or upheld him, in so "impious" and "detestable" an attempt, he addresses the empress thus: "Though Gregory is guilty of many great sins, for which he well deserves thus to be punished, Peter is himself guilty of no sins, nor ought he to suffer for mine. I therefore, over and over again, beg, entreat, and conjure you, by the Almighty, not to forsake the virtuous steps of your ancestors, but, treading in them, to court and secure to yourself the protection and favor of that apostle, who is not to be robbed of the honor that is due to his merit, for the sins of one who has no merit, and who so unworthily serves him."[2] Here Gregory plainly shows, that after all, the honor and dignity of St. Peter, and his see, were at the bottom of the whole opposition.

The remonstrances of the pope made no more impression on the emperor, or the empress, than they had made on the patriarch himself; nay, Mauricius rather favored the patriarch, though he declined openly espousing his cause, thinking the title of universal bishop well suited the rank and the dignity of the bishop of the imperial city. Of this Gregory was well apprised; but yet, not despairing of success, and determined to leave nothing unattempted, which he thought could be attended with any, he wrote to the two other patriarchs, Eulogius of Alexandria, and Anastasius of Antioch, striving to alarm them, and persuade them to join, as in a common cause, against the bishop of Constantinople, who, he said, giving the reins to his unbounded ambition, had nothing less in his view than to degrade them, and engross to himself all ecclesiastical power and authority. But the two patriarchs were not alarmed; the bishop of Constantinople was already raised above them; and they were not so jealous of the power that was left them, as to be under any apprehension of its being usurped or invaded by their brother of Constantinople, at least in virtue of his new title. Besides, both patriarchs had signed and approved the decree, entailing the disputed title on John and his successors; and that they are, not improbably, supposed to have done it, that the bishop of Constantinople might be thereby encouraged to protect them, as well as his other brethren in the east, against the growing power, and daily encroachments of the bishop of Rome, backed and supported by his brethren in the west. Anastasius of Antioch even took the liberty to express no small surprise at the pope's being alarmed, to such an extraordinary degree, at a thing which, as it appeared to him, was of very little moment, and not at all worthy of the trouble which his holiness gave himself about it.

Most of these letters were written in the month of July, of the present year; and in the latter end of the same year, or the very beginning of the next, died Gregory's great antagonist, John of Constantinople; and, after a vacancy of some months, Cyriacus was chosen in his room. John is now honored by the Greek church as a saint; an honor to which he had at least as good a claim as the best of the popes, if what Nicephorus and Theophylactus write of him be true; namely, that though the son of a mechanic, he was raised to the patriarchal dignity for his eminent virtues; that he was a vigilant pastor, and so affected with the miseries of others, as to abridge himself even of the necessaries of life to relieve them; that he was very sparing in his diet; practised all sorts of austerities, but was chiefly remarkable for his abstinence, and the long fasts, which he frequently observed; whence he was surnamed "the faster." From Gregory's letters it appears, that he was not easily prevailed upon to accept the episcopal dignity; and that he had even attempted, as Gregory had done, to withdraw himself from it by flight. For the pope reproaches him with exercising the episcopal dignity, after he had attempted to save himself from it by flight, in such a manner as if he had courted it with the greatest ambition.[1]

Cyriacus was no sooner ordained, than he

[1] Greg. l. 4. ep. 32. 34. [2] Greg. l. 4. ep. 34.

[1] Greg. l. 4. ep. 38.

The pope receives Cyriacus to his communion. New ravages committed by the Lombards. The unbounded charity of Gregory, in relieving the poor, and redeeming the captives. A council held at Rome. Gregory undertakes the conversion of the Saxons in Britain.

sent, according to custom, his confession of faith to the pope, and to the bishops of the other great sees. His letter was accompanied with one from the bishops, who had ordained him, and another from the emperor himself; both filled with such commendations of the new patriarch, that they deserved to be called panegyrics rather than letters. The pope received the messengers, who brought these letters, with all possible marks of kindness and esteem, approved the confession of faith, received Cyriacus to his communion, and, congratulating, in his answer, both the emperor and the bishops, on the election of a person of so much merit, added to the praises, which they had bestowed on him, others of his own; for he had been intimately acquainted with him, while he was nuncio to Pelagius II. at the court of Constantinople.[1] In these letters he took no notice of the new title, as neither the bishops, nor the emperor, nor Cyriacus himself, had taken any notice of it in their letters to him. However, at this very time, when he received the new patriarch to his communion, and owned his faith to be, in every respect, orthodox, he wrote to Sabinianus, his nuncio at Constantinople, not to communicate, nor assist with him at divine service, till he renounced for ever the proud and impious title, which his predecessor had wickedly assumed.[2]

The messengers made but a very short stay at Rome, as the winter approached, and the city was threatened with a siege. For Agilulph, the Lombard king, being desirous of a peace, that he might be at leisure to settle the affairs of his kingdom, and therefore provoked, beyond measure, at the exarch's rejecting the conditions he had offered, broke into the territories of the empire with more rage and fury than he had ever yet done, laid waste the Roman dukedom, overran Campania, burnt the towns, which he had formerly spared, reduced the city of Cortona, and carried with him into captivity the inhabitants of that, as well as all other places, which he could not have easily kept, as they lay at a great distance from Pavia, the royal seat of the Lombards.[3] This opened a large field to the charity of Gregory, who, pitying the condition of the unhappy captives, not only expended himself large sums on their ransom, and more than he could well spare, but, with his letters, encouraged other bishops to so charitable a work, even allowing them, on that occasion, to sell the sacred vessels and utensils.[4] In Rome the number of the poor was greatly increased, and the country having been far and near ravaged by the provoked Lombards, provisions of all kinds were sold at most exorbitant rates; insomuch that there were, as Gregory witnesses, no fewer than three thousand sacred virgins in the city, who had been obliged, though that winter proved very severe, to part with their garments, and the very coverings of their beds, for subsistence.[1] But of the many who thus suffered, whether under the pressures of thraldom or poverty, few there were who did not feel the comfortable effects of the pope's unbounded compassion and charity. As the revenues of his see, though at this time very considerable, were not alone sufficient to supply the wants of so many unhappy people, he took the liberty, on so pressing an occasion, to recur not only to the bishops his brethren, but to the great men, his friends, in the east as well as the west; and they all readily assisted him with large supplies; so that the poor were relieved, and great numbers of captives redeemed, though the most wicked Lombards, as he styles them, though now good catholics, exacted most exorbitant sums for their redemption.[2]

Gregory did not suffer his attention to be so engrossed by these works of charity, as to neglect any other duty of his pastoral office. For he held, this year, a council at Rome, where some canons were issued, none of any great moment concerning the ecclesiastical discipline.[3] It was in this year too, that, extending his care to the most distant kingdoms and people, he undertook to convert the Saxons, our ancestors, and sent, for that purpose, a company of missionaries, with Austin at their head, into Britain: an undertaking that ought ever to be remembered by the English with gratitude. When he first formed this design, or what first gave occasion to it, is not well known. Bede, in one place, ascribes it to a holy inspiration,[4] and in another to a generous compassion in Gregory at his seeing, several years before he was pope, some English children of a very graceful aspect, exposed to sale in the public market at Rome.[5] The latter opinion was adopted by Joannes Diaconus, in his life of Gregory, as it has been since by most other historians.(*)

[1] Greg. l. 6. ep. 5, 6, 7.
[2] Idem l. 5. ep. 29, 30. 60.
[3] Idem ibid. ep. 15.
[4] Idem ibid. ep. 13.

[1] Greg. l. 6. ep. 23.
[2] Idem l. 6. ep. 9. 21. 23.
[3] Concil. t. 5. p. 1198.
[4] Bed. Eccles. Hist. l. 1. c. 23.
[5] Bed. Eccles. Hist. l. 2. c. 1.

(*) But I cannot help thinking, with the learned archbishop Parker, (a) that the venerable historian was misinformed with respect to that particular. For though it is not to be questioned but the barbarous custom obtained among the English, of selling their children, when overstocked, not only before, but long after their conversion to the Christian religion; (b) yet it is not at all probable, that their parents, or others, would have been at the expense of sending them from Deira, or the kingdom of Northumberland, so far as Rome, with which city they had no kind of communication, or intercourse, when they had a much nearer market for the sale of their young slaves in France. For that they were commonly sold there, appears from a letter of Gregory to Candidus, the steward of the patrimony of St. Peter, in that country, wherein he requires him to buy such English slaves as were to be sold under the age of seventeen or eighteen, and send them to Rome, to be brought up there in the monasteries. As they were pagans, the pope desires they may be attended, in their journey, by a presbyter, to baptize them, should he find any of them in danger of dying on the road. (c)

What, most probably, prompted and encouraged

(a) Park. in Antiq. Britann. p. 34.
(b) Selden. Analect l. 2. (c) Greg. l. 5. ep. 10.

Austin sent into Britain; but a pusillanimous apostle. Cyriacus attempts to appease the pope without relinquishing the title of universal bishop;—[Year of Christ, 597.] Whoever calls himself universal bishop, the forerunner of antichrist. Gregory's answer to a letter from the bishop of Alexandria.

But whatever gave occasion to that undertaking, Austin, and his companions, all monks of Gregory's own order and monastery, the monastery of St. Andrew, set out from Rome this year, the 150th, says Bede, after the arrival of the Saxons in Britain.[1](*) Austin was not, it seems, so fond of propagating the gospel, and converting infidels to Christ, as to expose his own person, on that account, to any great danger: and for him England might have remained unconverted to this day. For, on his arrival in France, the faint-hearted missionary was so terrified at the character they gave him there of the English Saxons, so discouraged at his being unacquainted with their language, that, his zeal giving way to his fears, he left his company, and returning to Rome, remonstrated against the undertaking as absolutely impracticable; and begged the pope to excuse him from pursuing it. Gregory had more zeal than Austin; and it was well for England he had. Instead of yielding to the vain fears and apprehensions of the pusillanimous monk, he either removed or allayed them, and sent him back, with an encouraging letter to his brethren,[2] recommending him at the same time by letters no fewer than eleven, all dated the 23d of July of the present year, to the Gallican bishops, to the kings Theodoric and Theodebert, to queen Brunichild, and to a patrician named Arigius.[3] Austin, thus encouraged and recommended, returned to his company in France; and there I shall leave him for the present, to view Gregory, exerting his zeal, a zeal indeed of a very different nature, on another occasion.

The pope had ordered his nuncio at Constantinople, as has been related above, not to communicate with the new patriarch, unless he agreed to renounce the profane title of universal bishop. But to Cyriacus it seemed quite strange and unaccountable, that the pope should have approved of his confession of faith, as in every respect orthodox, should have received him to his communion as a catholic bishop, and yet ordered his nuncio not to communicate with him. He therefore despatched one to Rome, with the character of his apocrisarius or nuncio, to try whether he might not appease and satisfy the pope by some other means, than by relinquishing his title; for that he was no less determined to defend and maintain, than Gregory was to combat and oppose it. The pope received the apocrisarius in a most obliging manner, and even admitted him to his communion; but, at the same time, let him know, that he could not, and never would, approve of, or connive at, so scandalous, so profane, so blasphemous a title; that there could be no peace (for Cyriacus had, in his letter, exhorted him to peace and concord,) between him and his beloved brother, till the cause of their discord was removed; and that, if he could only prevail upon himself to part with the badge of pride, "typum superbiæ, which his predecessor had wickedly assumed, he would thereby establish an everlasting harmony between the two sees.[1] What he said to the apocrisarius he repeated in a letter, which he wrote soon after to the patriarch himself, and sent by the deacon Anatolius, appointed, at this time, to succeed Sabinianus in the office of nuncio, at the imperial court. In that letter he positively affirms that, "whoever calls himself universal bishop, or desires to be so called, in the pride of his heart, is the forerunner of antichrist; ego fidenter dico, quod quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua, antichristum præcurrit,"[2] are Gregory's own words; though Baronius has not thought fit to quote them, being well apprised, that they utterly overturn the system of the present controversy, as stated by him. But of this hereafter.

The pope answered, by the same deacon Anatolius, a letter, he had received from Eulogius of Alexandria, which had given him great satisfaction. It has not reached our times; but, from the pope's answer, it appears to have been filled with the most fulsome flattery. Gregory, however, was pleased with it so far as it extolled and magnified the dignity and prerogatives of the see of St. Peter. For he tells the patriarch, that the praises, which he has been pleased to bestow on the see of St. Peter, have been the more acceptable, as they came from one who held the same see, and who consequently could not pay the honor that was due to the see of Rome, without paying, at the same time, the

Gregory to attempt the conversion of the Saxons, or English, was his being informed, at this time, perhaps by Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert, king of Kent, perhaps by the French bishop Luidhard, who attended her, that the English nation were very desirous, "desideranter velle," of receiving the Christian faith. Of this good disposition in the English he speaks in his letter to the two brothers Thierry or Theodoric and Theodebert, kings of France; and complains to them of their priests and bishops, who, though the neighbors of the English, yet neglected them, as he had been informed, and took no care to second, with their exhortations, the desires of that nation. (*a*) Here the pope seems to intimate, as if those, whoever they were, who applied to him, had first applied to the Gallican bishops, and not to him, till their application to them had proved unsuccessful; which indeed is highly probable, if we suppose the application to have been made either by the queen, or the bishop, who were both of that nation. I shall only add here, that I have too great an opinion of the zeal of Gregory to believe, that, if he had formed the design of converting this nation so many years before he was pope, he would have delayed the execution of that design till the sixth year of his popedom, though he might have as well executed it in the first as the sixth.

(*a*) Greg. l. 5. ep. 58.

[1] Bed. l. 1. c. 22.

(*) It is to be observed, that Bede, in his computations, does not reckon, as all the other English historians do, from the year 449, in which the Saxons arrived in Britain, but from the year 447, in which they were invited into Britain. If therefore we either add two years to his numbers, or deduct two from the numbers of the other historians, we shall constantly find an entire agreement between them and him.

[2] Greg. l. 4. ep. 57.

[3] Idem l. 5. ep. 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59.

[1] Greg. l. 6. ep. 31. [2] Idem. l. 6. ep. 30.

The pope equals the sees of Alexandria and Antioch to the see of Rome. The bishop of Alexandria gives the title of universal bishop to the pope; who rejects it. Gregory takes the title of "the servant of the servants of God."

honor that was due to his own. Ought not his praises on that score to have been rather suspected? "Who does not know," continues the pope, "that the church was built and established on the firmness of the prince of the apostles, by whose very name is imported a rock, *Petrus a Petra vocatur?* Who does not know, that to him it was said, I will give unto thee the keys, &c. Feed my sheep, &c.(*) Hence, though there were several apostles, yet there is but one apostolic see, the see of the prince of the apostles, that has acquired great authority; and that see is in three places; in Rome, where he died; in Alexandria, where it was founded by his disciple St. Mark; and in Antioch, where he resided himself seven years.[1] These three, therefore, are but one see, and on that one see sit three bishops; who are but one in Him, who said, I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you."[2] Here the pope manifestly equals the sees of Alexandria and Antioch to that of Rome. But of them he entertained no jealousy, and the point he had in view was to humble his great rival the bishop of Constantinople; which he was sensible he could do by no other means more effectually, than by engaging the two other patriarchs in the present quarrel. He therefore very artfully made their sees and his but one see, them and himself but one bishop; that, looking upon the injury done, by the bishop of Constantinople, to him and his see, as done to them and their sees, they might join him as in a common cause, against a common rival.

Eulogius wrote, about this time, another, no less flattering letter, to the pope, wherein he even styled him "universal pope;" probably with a design to try whether he might not put an end to the quarrel between the two bishops, by giving to both the title, about which they quarrelled. This was no bad expedient; but the reasons alleged by the pope to prove it was "wicked, heretical, blasphemous, anti-christian, diabolical," in the bishop of Constantinople, equally proved, it was "wicked, heretical," &c., in himself. He therefore rejected it with great indignation, remonstrated against its being given to him, with as much warmth as he had ever remonstrated against its being given to the bishop of Constantinople, nay, and thought it an affront that it had ever been offered him. "If you give more to me," says the pope, in his answer to Eulogius, "than is due to me, you rob yourself of what is due to you. I choose to be distinguished by my manners, and not by titles. Nothing can redound to my honor that redounds to the dishonor of my brethren. I place my honor in maintaining them in theirs. If you call me 'universal pope,' you thereby own yourself to be no pope. Let no such titles therefore be mentioned, or ever heard, among us. Your holiness says, in your letter, that I commanded you. I commanded you! I know who you are, who I am. In rank you are my brother, in your manners my father. I therefore did not command; and beg you will henceforth ever forbear that word. I only pointed out to you what I thought it was right you should know."[1] The whole drift of this letter was, as the reader must have observed, to draw, and in a manner to soothe, the patriarch of Alexandria into the present dispute. But neither he, nor any other bishop joined him, at least, in the east; nay, as they had given the patriarch of Constantinople that title, they all, but the bishop of Alexandria, who would not concern himself in the quarrel, thought themselves bound to maintain and defend it.

Gregory therefore, being now at a loss whom next to recur to, for the emperor and empress both favored the patriarch, bethought himself of a new kind of opposition, which was to oppose to the lofty and proud title of "universal bishop" the meanest he could think of, flattering himself, that his rival might be thus brought to quit that title, or at least be ashamed ever to use it. With this view he took to himself the humble title of "The servant of the servants of God," which his successors have all retained, and use to this day, even when they command the "servants of God" as their lords and masters: "We the servant of the servants will and command," volumes et jubemus. But the word "servant" has no more meaning now at the beginning of a bull, than at the close of a letter; nor had it indeed more in the time of Gregory, who, notwithstanding all his protestations of humility, maintained the papal power as high as any of his predecessors; lowering it indeed in words, but not in facts. His humility therefore availed him nothing on the present occasion; the bishop of Constan-

(*) All the apostles received the keys of the kingdom of heaven.(a) What is said to Peter, is said to the apostles.(b) It was said to Peter alone, I will give thee, &c., but the keys were given to all the apostles.(c) When it is said to Peter, Feed my sheep, it is said to all.(d) Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c., upon this rock, which thou hast confessed, upon this rock, which thou hast known, saying, thou art Christ the Son of the living God, I will build my church; that is, upon myself, the Son of the living God, I will build my church; I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee. For the rock was Christ, and upon him Peter himself was built.(e) Thus were the passages, quoted by Gregory, understood by the fathers. But the popes, by often repeating them, and always interpreting them, as they related to St. Peter alone, brought the greater part of mankind to believe, that they were really to be so understood; that St. Peter alone had the keys, as he alone is painted with the keys; that St. Peter alone was the rock, the shepherd, who was to feed Christ's sheep, &c., and that the other apostles were no more than his deputies or curates. We shall see him hereafter, not only raised by the popes above all the other apostles, but by one of them, Boniface VIII., blasphemously exalted into the partnership of the undivided Trinity.(f)

(a) Hier. in Jovin. l. 14. (b) Ambros. in Psal. 38. (c) Optat. l. 7. (d) Aug. de Agon. Christi. (e) Aug. Serm. 13. de verbis Domini. (f) Sexti decret. l. I. tit. 6. c. 17.

[1] See p. 290, note (*). [2] John 14: 20.

[1] Greg. l. 7. ep. 36.

Austin arrives in Britain. His great success. The queen very instrumental in the conversion of this nation. The king converted. Gregory's negotiations with the Lombards unsuccessful. The pope alarmed at the news of a council to be held at Constantinople.

tinople still kept the controverted title; and the pope was obliged to acquiesce for the present.

To return now to the Roman missionaries: Having provided themselves with interpreters, they passed over, this year, from France into Britain; landed in the isle of Thanet; were there favorably heard by king Ethelbert, and allowed by him to preach the gospel in his kingdom. A proper habitation was assigned them in the city of Canterbury, where the court resided, and the queen had a chapel; and there they preached, they instructed, they wrought miracles, "that shone," says Gregory, upon the information of Austin, who wrought them, "like those of the apostles," and were attended with such success in their apostolic labors, that, before this year was ended, they converted more than ten thousand English, who were all baptized on Christmas day.[1] I only hint at these particulars, as they are already well known, and related at length by all our historians. But I cannot help observing, that though Austin and his companions were very instrumental in the conversion of the English nation, yet certainly the glory was not all theirs. Queen Bertha, as Bede styles her, or Aldiberga, as she is called by others, had a great share in that glory; and she deserves too well of this nation to be robbed of it. She was not only a Christian, but a most religious princess; and, if Gregory is to be credited, she had prepared the mind of the king for the reception of the faith, long before Austin set foot in this island.[2] As she was allowed, by the articles of her marriage, the free exercise of her religion, she had several chaplains to attend her, among whom was a bishop, and a chapel, where divine service was publicly performed.[3] It is therefore highly probable, considering the zeal of the queen for the Christian religion, that many of the English were converted before Austin or any other Roman missionaries were thought of: it is at least certain, from the letters of Gregory,[4] that many were desirous of being converted; and, on the other hand, it is quite improbable, that the queen, who had her own bishop and chaplains, would have suffered those, who desired to be converted, to continue in their idolatrous worship, and put off their conversion, till the arrival of missionaries from Rome. To me it appears more probable, that great numbers were converted; and that it was upon the queen's finding the "harvest was plenteous, and the laborers were few," that she applied first, as was natural, to the Franks or French, who were her countrymen, and at hand, and, being disappointed by them, to the pope. She therefore was the first author of this undertaking; and the success that attended it, was more owing to her example, protection, and influence, than to the miracles, or the preaching, of Austin. As for the king, he is said by Bede to have been converted this year;[1] but in this he was probably mistaken, since Gregory takes no notice of his conversion or baptism, in the account he gave to Eulogius of Alexandria, of the conversion of ten thousand English, baptized on Christmas day. The example of the king was followed by many of the nobles, and great multitudes of the people; nay, that it was chiefly out of complaisance to the king that most of them were converted, appears too plain from their returning to paganism, as soon as he died. The king forbid, at first, all violence and compulsion, as Bede expressly observes;[2] but that some kind of compulsion was afterwards used, perhaps when the Christian party began to prevail, is manifest from what the same historian writes elsewhere; namely, that the pagan worship being restored by Eadbald, those whom the fear of Ethelbert had brought to profess Christ, followed, agreeably to their inclination, the example of their new prince.[3] The Roman missionaries had no great occasion to boast of such proselytes; for the death of Ethelbert was attended with almost a general apostacy of the people, in spite of all the miracles the missionaries had wrought, or could work, to prevent it.

The following year was chiefly employed by the pope in negotiations with Agilulph king of the Lombards, and Arnulph the Lombard duke of Spoleti; but they all proved unsuccessful, the exarch, and the other imperial officers, who reaped great advantages from the war, refusing to hearken to any overtures of peace. On this occasion Gregory wrote to the bishops of Cagliari and Tarracina, desiring them to oblige their clergy to guard and defend the walls, and even to bear arms, and fight, when their assistance was required or wanted.[4] Thus did Gregory, says Baronius,[5] take upon him the care of the state, as well as the church; and his conduct was neither disapproved by the emperor, nor the exarch; they both therefore owned and revered a royal authority in the royal priesthood; an inference, that no man could ever have thought of but himself!

While Gregory was thus employed, he received letters from Constantinople, that gave him no less concern than the bad success of his negotiations with the Lombards. For by them he was informed, that the bishop of Constantinople, whose conduct we may very well imagine he narrowly watched, had appointed a grand council to meet in that city, and had summoned, with the consent and approbation of the emperor, all the bishops of the east to attend it. Upon this intelligence, the pope, apprehended the disputed title would

[1] Greg. l. 7. ep. 30. [2] Greg. l. 9. ep. 59.
[3] Bed. Eccles. hist. l. 1. c. 25. [4] Greg. l. 5. ep. 58, 59.

[1] Bed. l. 2. c. 5. [2] Bed. l. 1. c. 26.
[3] Idem l. 2. c. 5. [4] Greg. l. 7. ep. 2. 20.
[5] Bar. ad ann. 598. p. 118.

Gregory writes to the eastern bishops;—[Year of Christ, 599.] The pope afflicted with several infirmities;—[Year of Christ, 600.] Concludes a truce with the Lombards. Grants some exemptions to the monks. A new colony of monks sent into Britain. Gregory's letters to the king and the queen. The vanity of Austin.

be confirmed by that council, and that they were to assemble for that purpose, took the alarm; and, to prevent in time the execution of such a wicked and detestable design, wrote and despatched, in great haste, a circular letter to all the bishops in the east, earnestly entreating, praying, and conjuring them, not to suffer themselves to be over-reached by the craft and subtlety of designing men, nor to be brought, by any persuasions, allurments, rewards, or terrors to concur in so impious an attempt; but to defend and protect, with an apostolic firmness and constancy, the flock of Christ against the robber that sought to devour it. In the same letter he exhorts the bishops not only to be watchful, and upon their guard, that nothing be transacted in their assembly, directly or indirectly, relating to the confirmation of the perverse title, but that no decree be issued to the prejudice of any place or person whatever.[1] But the council, which thus alarmed the pope, never was held; nor should we have known, but from this letter, that it ever was thought of.

The pope was so afflicted this and the following year with the gout, and several other complaints to which he was subject, that, during the whole time, he was seldom in a condition to rise from his bed. "I have been now eleven months," says he in a letter to Italica, a woman of distinction, "confined both to my bed and my room, and so tormented with unrelenting pains, that life is become an unsufferable burden. Death alone can relieve me; and I expect it daily, but expect it in vain."[2] And, in a letter which he wrote the following year to Eulogius of Alexandria, "I have been now near two years," says he, "confined to my bed, and in constant torment and pain; I have seldom been able to rise, and perform divine service even on the holy and festival days; the racking gout has rarely allowed me so long a truce: I have been often forced, by the violence of the pain, to return to my bed, when I scarce had left it, and there to seek some relief from sighs, and from groans: my pain is at one time excessive, and less at another; but never so small as to leave me entirely, never so great as to kill me. Thus I am every day dying, and yet never die. But I am a great criminal, and, as such, deservedly shut up in so painful a prison. However, I daily cry out with the psalmist, 'Bring my soul out of prison, that I may give thanks unto thy name.'"[3] He was troubled with frequent returns of these complaints so long as he lived; but no pains, no infirmities, could ever divert him from any of the duties of his pastorial office, or in any degree lessen his attention to the affairs of the state as well as the church. For he not only wrote, in this and the preceding year, a great number of letters to the bishops of Spain, France, Italy, and Africa, concerning the ecclesiastical discipline, and the extirpating of several abuses that had crept into their respective churches; but, resuming his negotiations with the king of the Lombards, he prevailed upon him at last to agree to a truce from the month of September to the following April, to the unspeakable satisfaction of the Romans, and the other inhabitants of Italy.

The following year the pope held a council at Rome, consisting of twenty bishops, all immediately subject to his see, fourteen presbyters, and four deacons; and, by that council, was approved a constitution of Gregory in favor of the monks, who were thereby exempted, in some particular cases, from all subjection to the bishops.[1] This is the first instance of that nature we meet with in history; and it is evidently repugnant to the canons of Chalcedon, subjecting the monks, whether in cities, or the country, to the bishop of the diocese in which they lived, and pronouncing excommunication against those who should withdraw themselves from his jurisdiction.[2] But of the monks, and the exemptions and privileges granted them by the popes, in defiance of all the ancient canons, I shall hereafter have occasion to speak more at large.

The same year Gregory sent, at the request of Austin, a new colony of monks into Britain; and, laying hold of that opportunity, wrote to the kings and bishops of the Franks, to return them thanks for their good offices to Austin, and recommend the bearers to their protection and favor.[3] He wrote at the same time to queen Bertha, acknowledging the share she had in the conversion of the king;[4] and to the king himself, to congratulate him on his conversion, and to encourage him to abolish the worship of the idols in his dominions, to pull down their temples, and to strive, in imitation of Constantine, to promote piety and virtue among his subjects, by exhortations, menaces, caresses, and, above all, by example. He exhorts the king to hearken to the instructions of Austin, and to be instructed by him; and lets him know that the end of the world is at hand;[5] which Gregory seems to have firmly believed. These letters are all dated June, 601; but I can hardly believe, that, if the king had been converted in 597, as Bede supposes, the pope would have so long delayed congratulating him on his conversion. Either the king was not so early converted, or there is a mistake in the date of the letters.

In the account which Austin had sent to the pope, of the success of his labors in Britain, he had taken care to relate and magnify the miracles which God had been pleased to work by his hand. Gregory was pleased with the success; but, pitying the vanity of the man, he did not forget to furnish him, in

[1] Greg. l. 7. ep. 70. [2] Idem, l. 7. ep. 127.
[3] Idem, l. 8. ep. 35.

[1] Bar. ad ann. 601. p. 145, 146.
[2] Con. Chal. can. 4. et 8.
[3] Greg. l. 9. ep. 55, 56. 49, 50. 52.
[4] Idem ibid. ep. 59. [5] Idem ibid. ep. 60.

Gregory directs Austin to adopt the pagan ceremonies into the Christian worship. The evil consequences thereof. Serenus of Marseilles causes the images throughout his diocese to be pulled down, and broken.

his answer, with proper reflections to cure it.[1] However, as the pope was unwilling to give him the least discouragement, he extolled his labors, exhorted him to pursue the work which he had so happily begun, sent him the necessary helps and instructions to pursue it with success; and, at the same time, the resolution of the questions which Austin had proposed. The questions are too well known to be inserted here;[2] and they can only give us a very mean opinion of the abilities of this great apostle: and as to the instructions, they do not at all redound to the honor of Gregory. For, not satisfied with directing Austin not to destroy, but to reserve for the worship of God, the profane places where the pagan Saxons had worshiped their idols,(*) he would have him to treat the more profane usages, rites, and ceremonies of the pagans in the same manner, that is, not to abolish, but to sanctify them, by changing the end for which they were instituted, and introduce them, thus sanctified, into the Christian worship. This he specifies in a particular ceremony; "Whereas it is a custom," says he, "among the Saxons, to slay abundance of oxen, and sacrifice them to the devil; you must not abolish that custom, but appoint a new festival to be kept either on the day of the consecration of the churches, or on the birth-day of the saints whose reliques are deposited there; and on these days the Saxons may be allowed to make arbors round the temples changed into churches, to kill their oxen, and to feast as they did while they were still pagans; only they shall offer their thanks and praises, not to the devil, but to God."[3] This advice, absolutely irreconcilable with the purity of the gospel-worship, the pope founds on a pretended impossibility of weaning men at once from rites and ceremonies to which they have been long accustomed, and on the hopes of bringing the converts, in due time, by such an indulgence, to a better sense of their duty to God. Thus was the religion of the Saxons, our ancestors, so disfigured and corrupted with all the superstitions of paganism, at its first being planted among them, that it scarce deserved the name of Christianity, but was rather a mixture of Christianity and paganism, or Christianity and paganism moulded, as it were, into a third religion. What Gregory says may be true; namely, that by adopting the rites of the pagans, that is, by bringing the Christian religion as near as possible to paganism, the pagans were the more easily induced to embrace it; but it is likewise true, that they were the more easily persuaded to renounce it, and relapse into idolatry. And thus we may, perhaps, well account for the almost general apostasy that ensued upon the accession of Eadbald, who either had never embraced, or had abjured, the Christian religion. The multitude had, it seems, but a very superficial knowledge of their new religion; and the rites and ceremonies, which chiefly affected them, being the same in both religions, they did not discover any material difference between them; and therefore were as ready to renounce Christianity, and return to paganism, as they had been to renounce paganism, and embrace Christianity. The indulgence, that was granted to the Saxons in Britain, had been granted before, and for the same reasons, to the other northern nations that broke into the western empire. Those who brought them into the church, the more easily to win them, suffered them to bring along with them many of their idolatrous rites and usages, hoping, as Gregory did, they would in time be prevailed upon to give them up. But it happened quite otherwise. For those rites and ceremonies, however heathenish, instead of being ever given up by them, were, by degrees, adopted by the Christian inhabitants of the countries where the new-comers settled. And thus the half Christians, for they were no better, remained half Christians, while the true Christians became half pagans. Thus we may well account for the many errors and corruptions that overspread and disfigured the whole face of the church, after the irruption and conversion of the barbarous nations that broke into the empire in the fourth and fifth centuries. Their usages were first connived at, and afterwards adopted by the church. However, that these idolatrous rites and practices were not yet universally approved, even in the time of Gregory, appears from what we read at this very time of Serenus, the holy bishop of Marseilles.

The Franks, who had settled in the south of Gaul, had been indulged, at the time of their conversion, in the use of images; and that indulgence had insensibly brought them back to idolatry; for, turning the images of Christ into idols, they paid them the same kind of worship and adoration, after their conversion, which they had paid to their idols before their conversion. This Serenus could not bear; and therefore, to show his abhorrence of such abominations, and at the same time to prevent them in time to come, he caused all the images throughout his diocese to be pulled down, and to be cast out of the churches, and destroyed. That wise and zealous prelate was, it seems, even then, when the dangerous practice of setting up images was yet in its infancy, apprised of a truth, which all have now learnt by the experience of many ages, all, at least, who care to learn it; namely, that "images cannot be allowed, and idolatry prevented." However, this instance of his zeal for the purity of the Christian worship was very ill received at Rome.

[1] Greg. l. 9. ep. 58.

[2] See Rapin. Hist. of Eng. p. 67. Edit. Lond. Folio.

(*) In this Gregory was unaccountably inconsistent with himself; for, in his letter to the king, bearing the same date with this, he exhorted him to pull down the temples of the idols.

[3] Greg. l. 9. ep. 71. Bed. Eccles. hist. l. 1. c. 30.

Gregory disapproves of the conduct of Serenus. Images not to be worshipped. No images, nor pagan rites, allowed during the first three centuries. The great aversion of the Britons, the Scots, and the Picts, to the Roman missionaries, on what grounded.

And indeed Gregory acted therein consistently with himself; for, having directed Austin, this very year, to introduce the pagan rites and usages into the church, he could not but blame Serenus for thus excluding them; and he wrote to him accordingly, commending indeed his zeal "in not suffering any thing to be worshiped, that was made with hands," but at the same time blaming him for breaking them "to prevent their being worshiped, since they served the ignorant in the room of books, and instructed, by being seen, those who could not read."[1] Serenus was so surprised at this letter, and the frivolous reason therein alleged in favor of images, when his flock had been led by them into the grossest idolatry, that he could not believe it came from the pope. But Gregory soon wrote a second letter to him, wherein he again found great fault with his conduct, telling him, that to worship images was indeed a heinous crime, a crime that could never be allowed or connived at, but ought by all means to be forbidden and prevented; that he should therefore call his people together, and show them, from the testimonies of scripture, that it is not lawful to adore any thing that was made with hands, because it is written, "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God:" but, as to his casting them out of the churches, and breaking them, it was the effect of an inconsiderate and indiscreet zeal, which he could not help condemning: "Though images," says the pope, "were not set up in churches to be worshiped, yet they serve to instruct the ignorant; and it is one thing to adore an image, another to learn from an image what is to be adored."(*) But the reason on which the pope seems to have laid the chief stress, in censuring the conduct of Serenus, was, that, by breaking the images, and banishing them from the churches, he would prejudice the barbarians (that is, the Franks,) among whom he lived, against the Christian religion: so that it was chiefly to gratify the pagans, who were converted, to facilitate the conversion of the others, and to adapt the Christian religion to their ideas and notions, that the use of images, and many other rites of the pagan worship, were allowed in the church. But how different was this method of converting the pagans from that which the apostles pursued and their immediate successors, nay, and all apostolic men for the first three centuries after Christ? With them it was a principle, not to sanctify, but utterly to abolish, all pagan rites, all superstitious practices whatever, and introduce, in their room, a plainness and simplicity suited to the worship of God, "in spirit and truth." Upon that principle images of no kind were suffered in the churches, during the three first centuries, as is allowed by several Roman catholic writers, and shall be demonstrated in a more proper place; nay, it was not till the latter end of the fourth century that the pagan temples began to be converted into Christian churches. They had all, till then, been either shut up, or pulled down, the bishops of those times thinking it a great profanation to worship God even in the places where worship had been paid to the devil.(*) That primitive plainness and simplicity of worship was still retained, at the arrival of Austin, by the Britons, by the Scots, and the Picts, who were therefore so shocked at the many pagan superstitions and ceremonies introduced by that monk into the Saxon worship, that they looked upon it as no better than paganism, and avoided, as Bede informs us,[1] the communion of those who came from Rome to establish it, as they avoided the communion of the pagans: nay, so great was the aversion that the Scots in particular bore to all the Roman missionaries, that Dagamus, a bishop of that nation, not only declined sitting with them at the same table, but would not even lodge with them under the same roof.[2] I am well apprised, that this aversion is generally ascribed to their disagreeing with those who came from Rome, about the time of celebrating the Easter festival. But who can believe, that the bishops of these three nations, and the other men of piety and learning among them, would have treated the Roman missionaries, and their Saxon proselytes, as heathens or pagans, on account of that disagreement alone? The

[1] Greg. l. 7. ep. 110.

(*) "Images were not set up in churches to be worshiped," says Gregory: "images were set up in churches to have due honor and worship paid them there," says the council of Trent.(a) If therefore the doctrine of Trent is the true doctrine, the doctrine of the pope must, of course, be rank heresy, and Gregory the Great, after all, a rank heretic. It is true, the council will have due honor and worship to be paid to images, for the sake of those whom they represent, and not for their own.(b) But Gregory condemned, without distinction or limitation, all worship of images, as contrary to the second commandment; nay, and the use of them for any other purpose whatever, but that of instruction. Besides, it is notorious that, among the vulgar, scarce one in a thousand carries his worship beyond the image itself; and, consequently, that scarce one can be found in a thousand, who, in worshiping images, is not guilty of the grossest idolatry. The council of Trent defined images to be of great advantage to the faithful. But what advantage can, in any degree, atone for the idolatry of thousands? But of images, and image worship, I shall have occasion to speak at large in the following volume.

(a) Con. Trid. Sess. 25. (b) Con. Trid. ibid.

(*) The famous temple of Heliopolis, called Balanaium, was the first I can find in history to have been converted into a Christian church, about the year 391.(a) About twenty years after the magnificent temple of the Dea Cœlestis at Carthage was likewise turned into a church, with the following remarkable circumstance. It had been dedicated, when built, by one Aurelius, an heathen high priest, as appeared from the inscription on the frontispiece, "Aurelius pontifex dedicavit;" and one of the same name happening to be bishop of Carthage, the famous Aurelius, when it was given to the Christians, it was by him dedicated to the use and service of the Christian religion: so that the inscription "Aurelius pontifex dedicavit" served for the Christian, as it had done for the heathen pontiff, and was therefore left untouched.(b)

(a) Gothofred. Com. in Cod. Theodos. l. 16. tit. 10.
(b) Procop. de Promission. l. 3. c. 38.

[1] Bed. Eccl. Hist. l. 2. c. 20. [2] Idem ibid. c. 4.

Gregory subjects the British bishops to the jurisdiction of Austin. Great change of affairs in the state. The army revolts.

religion, which the Roman monks had preached and established, bore a great resemblance to paganism in its rites, ceremonies, and worship, as we have seen; and to nothing else can we more naturally recur, to account for its being looked upon by the Scots, the Britons, and the Picts, as no better than paganism.

With the above mentioned directions for changing the pagan into Christian usages, Gregory sent over to Austin a plan for the government of the English-Saxon church, or a model of the hierarchy which he was to establish among the Saxons in Britain. But as that plan or model was never complied with, I shall only observe here, that "the servant of the servants of God" assumed, on that occasion, an authority that cannot be easily reconciled with his repeated protestations of humility, and his boasted zeal for the observance of the canons. For, by that plan, the British bishops and clergy were subjected to the authority of Austin, as well as the English; the British, who had ever been absolutely independent on the bishop of Rome, and over whom he could of course neither exercise nor claim any kind of jurisdiction, without a manifest breach of the canons, and a barefaced invasion of the rights and liberties of that church.(*)

As for the English-Saxon church, he was at liberty to settle its hierarchy in what manner he pleased, the councils having confined their care to the churches that were already established, and left such as were not, to the wisdom, discretion, and zeal, of those whom God should choose to establish them.

In the month of November of the present year happened a great change of affairs in the state, from which the see of Rome reaped no small advantage, as I shall hereafter have occasion to relate. The emperor Mauricius was driven from the throne, and inhumanly murdered, and one Phocas, a centurion, raised to the empire in his room. Of this remarkable revolution historians give us the following account:—The Avares, a Scythian nation, dwelling on the banks of the Danube, who had broken into the empire, being obliged by a violent plague to return home, Chagan, their king, not choosing to be encumbered with the many prisoners he had taken, no fewer than twelve thousand, offered to set them at liberty for a very inconsiderable sum. But that offer Mauricius rejected, partly out of avarice, says Cedrenus, and partly out of hatred to the soldiers;(*) which so provoked the king of the

(*) The advocates indeed for the papal supremacy stiffly maintain the British church to have been originally subject to the bishops of Rome, and their see; but, as they do not allege a single authentic instance (and I defy them to allege any) of their having ever exercised, or even claimed, before the arrival of Austin, any power or jurisdiction whatever over that church, they might maintain, with as much color of truth, the grand Turk to have once exercised an absolute dominion and power over this island, and all its inhabitants. The known maxim, that things, which do not appear, are as if they did not exist, is perhaps in no case more unexceptionable than in this; for who can believe, that, had the popes thought their jurisdiction extended to the churches of Britain, they would never have exerted, nor have once offered to exert, that jurisdiction? As for the Britons, that they did not think Rome had any authority over them, sufficiently appears from their peremptorily refusing to receive for their archbishop, or primate, the person whom the pope had placed over them as their archbishop, or primate.(a) In what other manner could they disown the papal authority, at such a distance from Rome? It happened, therefore, to the British church as it did to several other churches that were not within the bounds of the four great patriarchates. Such churches were governed by their metropolitans, who were quite independent of any patriarchal or superior power, and therefore called by the Greeks Αυτοκέφαλοι. They regulated the affairs of their respective provinces, made canons, heard causes, determined disputes with their own synods, from which there was no appeal but to a general council. That power all metropolitans enjoyed before the patriarchal power was set up in the church; and such as were not within the limits of any patriarchate, continued to enjoy it after the establishing of that power. Thus the churches of Cyprus, of Iberia, now Georgia, of Armenia in the east,(b) and those of Gaul, of Spain, of Britain, in the west, all lying without the bounds of the patriarchates, which the councils had fixed when they appointed the patriarchs, owned no power or authority superior to that of their metropolitans, archbishops, or primates. It was therefore with good reason that the British bishops declared (if we allow the British manuscript quoted by Spelman to be genuine,) that they "were under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Caerleon on the Usk, who was under God (and under no other) their spiritual overseer." For this was truly their case; and the like answer would the bishops of Gaul, of Spain, of Africa, have returned in the like case; and those too of Cyprus, of Iberia, of Armenia, had the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, or Antioch, required obedience or subjection of them. I know that the Roman patriarchate, and the patriarchal power of the bishop of Rome, have, by some, been extended to all the provinces of the west. But that they were, in the time of Gregory, still confined to the suburbicarian provinces, only with the addition of west Illiricum, has been unanswerably proved by the learned Du Pin.(a) As therefore the councils, that established the patriarchal power, restrained that power within certain limits, at the same time that they established it, it could by no patriarch be extended farther, without an open breach of the canons and rules of those councils. The first council of Ephesus in particular, one of the four which Gregory received as the four gospels, on occasion of an attempt made by the patriarch of Antioch on the rights and liberties of the Cyprian churches, not only declared that province exempt from his jurisdiction, because it did not originally belong to him; but, to restrain the other patriarchs from invading the rights and privileges of the independent churches, at the same time decreed, that "no patriarch should seize upon any province that was not anciently under his jurisdiction."(b) Now, as Britain was not anciently under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, it is manifest, that Gregory could not pretend to any kind of authority over the British bishops and clergy, without an open breach of that canon, as well as of the canons of the other oecumenical councils ascertaining the limits of each patriarchate. Some, to justify the conduct of the pope, recur to the so often exploded pretension or claim to an universal jurisdiction by divine right. But that Gregory himself knew of no such jurisdiction, is evident, beyond all possible dispute, from his not only combating the title of universal bishop in the patriarch of Constantinople, but his rejecting it himself, in the manner we have seen.

(a) Bed. l. 2. c. 2.

(b) Balsam. in Con. Constant. 1. Can. 2. Con. Ephes. Act. 7. Brerewood Enquiry, c. 17. Chytræus de Stat. Eccles. Marca de Primat. p. 122.

(a) Du Pin de Antiq. Eccles. Discip. dissert. 1. p. 73, & seq.

(b) Concil. Ephes. 1 Act. 7. Decret. de Episc. Cypr.

(*) The greater part of them had been concerned in a mutiny at the beginning of Mauricius' reign: and probably their captivity was chiefly owing to their

The cause of the revolt in the army. Phocas proclaimed. Mauricius withdraws. Phocas received at Constantinople, and crowned. He disobliges the people. Mauricius dragged from his sanctuary, and murdered, with five of his children. Theodosius, the emperor's eldest son, and Peter, the emperor's brother, murdered; [Year of Christ, 602.]

barbarians, that he immediately ordered the captives to be all put to the sword. This occasioned a mutiny in the army, which however was quelled for the present. But the emperor, says the same writer, having, in the end of the campaign, to save the pay of the troops that had served on the Danube, ordered them to cross that river, and subsist, in the best manner they could, during the winter, in the enemy's country, that order produced a general mutiny; the soldiers betook themselves to their arms, seized on their officers, and, loading the emperor with reproaches and curses, declared him unworthy to command them, and, with repeated acclamations, proclaimed the centurion Phocas, who was at their head, emperor in his room. The revolt of the army, and the promotion of Phocas, were no sooner known at Constantinople, than the populace, ever fond of change, rising in a tumultuous manner, committed so many outrages, and uttered such threats against the unfortunate Mauricius, that, dreading the effects of their rage, he thought it adviseable to retire from the city. He embarked accordingly in the dead of the night, on a small vessel, with his wife and children, proposing to retire to some place of safety, probably to the church of St. Euphemia, at Chalcedon, a sanctuary held in great veneration all over the east. But he was driven back by contrary winds, and, being at the same time seized with a fit of the gout, he reached, with great difficulty, the church of the martyr Autonomus, about an hundred and fifty furlongs from Constantinople. In the mean time Phocas, well acquainted with the good disposition of the people of Constantinople towards him, advanced with long marches at the head of his army, and, being arrived at the Hebdomon, in the neighborhood of the city, he was there received by the governor, and the other ministers of state, by the senate, and by the clergy and the patriarch, who crowned him there the same day, the 23d of November, after he had made his confession of faith, and promised to maintain the peace, and the rights of the church. Being thus crowned, and acknowledged by all ranks of men, he entered Constantinople on the 25th of the same month, in a triumphal chariot, attended by the nobility, the clergy, the soldiery, and numberless multitudes of people crowding from all quarters of the city, to see their new prince, and testify, with their acclamations and good wishes, their common satisfaction and joy at the change. But what more inconstant and fickle than the multitude? What more uncertain and variable than their favor and affection? A few days after, the two opposite factions, the blue and the green, quarrelling at the public sports in the circus, while Phocas was present, his guards, in attempting to appease the tumult, happened to use very roughly a tribune of the blue faction, the chief author of the disturbance. There wanted no more to estrange the minds of that whole party from their new emperor, to change their acclamations into threats, and their loyalty into treason: Mauricius, they all cried out, "is not yet dead; he will do us justice." But the menaces of the cowardly and impotent vulgar served only to awake the jealousy of the blood-thirsty tyrant; and what slaughter and carnage did it not produce, when once awaked? Parties of soldiers were immediately sent all over the country, in search of Mauricius; and he was soon discovered, dragged from his sanctuary, and carried in triumph, by the insulting soldiery, over to Chalcedon. He had given no particular provocation to Phocas, who was quite unknown to him; and yet the tyrant, not satisfied with putting him to death, for his greater torment and grief, ordered five of his sons to be first inhumanly murdered before his face. Such a scene of unparalleled cruelty drew sighs and tears from all the spectators, but Mauricius himself, who beheld the death of his children quite undisturbed, without shedding a tear, without betraying the least mark of grief or concern; nay, he was so far from uttering any complaints, or repining at Providence, that the woman, who was charged with the care of his youngest son, yet an infant, having, with a design to save it, placed her own in its room, he would not suffer the kind fraud to take place, but discovered it to the executioners. During the whole time of that tragedy, the most shocking to the eyes of a parent that was ever exhibited, he continued in appearance quite unaffected, only repeating, as each of his children received the fatal blow, "just art thou, O Lord, and righteous in all thy judgments." Mauricius himself was beheaded the last; and their heads were all brought to Constantinople, and cast in a heap near the tribunal, where they lay till they became offensive, and then the tyrant suffered them to be buried with the bodies.[1]

Of the imperial family there still remained Theodosius, the eldest son of Mauricius, Peter, the emperor's brother, the empress Constantina, and three daughters. Theodosius had been despatched by his father into Persia, upon the first intelligence of the revolt of Phocas, to crave assistance of his friend Cosrhoes, whom he had lately restored to the throne of his ancestors. But, before the unhappy youth could reach the confines of that kingdom, he was overtaken, and put to death, by those whom the tyrant had despatched after him. Peter, the emperor's brother, underwent the same fate about the same time.[2]

cowardly behavior; for, in the late reign, the military discipline had been entirely neglected, and Mauricius spared no pains to restore it.

[1] Theophylact. l. 7. c. 1—17. et l. 8. c. 2. Cedren. ad ann. Phocæ l. Niceph. l. 18. c. 41. Evagr. l. 5. c. 23.

[2] Cedren. ibid. et lili.

The character of Mauricius. The character of Phocas. Phocas sends his own image, and that of his wife Leontia, to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 603.] How received there by the pope. Gregory's letter to the usurper. His answer to a letter from the usurper.

Of the fate of the empress, and her three daughters, I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

The ancients all speak of Mauricius as a prince commendable for many eminent virtues, and subject to very few vices. Some extol him, and, among the rest, Gregory himself, for the purity of his faith, and his uncommon generosity in relieving the distressed and the indigent;[1] others, for his great piety, his moderation, and the particular care he took to maintain peace and tranquillity in the church. Theophylactus, a contemporary writer, tells us, that he was a generous encourager of learning, and learned men; that he built a magnificent church at Tarsus in Cilicia, in honor of St. Paul; that he contributed a considerable sum towards repairing the aqueducts of Constantinople; nay, that he remitted to all his subjects the third part of the usual tributes.[2] However, he is generally taxed with avarice; and it was to that vice he owed all his misfortunes.

As to the usurper, I shall give his portrait and character from Cedrenus. He was, says that writer, of a middling stature, deformed, and of a terrible aspect: his hair was red, his eyebrows met, and one of his cheeks was marked with a scar, which, when he was in a passion, grew black and frightful: he was greatly addicted to wine and women, bloodthirsty, inexorable, bold in speech, a stranger to compassion, in his principles a heretic; and his wife Leontia was no better than he.[3]

When he had slaughtered the emperor, and his six sons, his next care was, to cause himself to be proclaimed and acknowledged for lawful emperor, throughout the empire; and, with that view, he sent, according to custom, his own image, and that of his wife Leontia, who had likewise been crowned, to all the chief cities, and, among the rest, to the city of Rome, where they were received, in the month of April of the present year, with loud acclamations, the Roman people being highly incensed against Mauricius, on account of the cruel exactions of the exarchs, and the other imperial ministers sent into Italy. But none, even among the populace, could express more satisfaction and joy on that occasion, than the pope. He received the images with all possible marks of respect and loyalty, caused them to be lodged in the oratory of the martyr St. Cæsarius, and immediately wrote letters to the new emperor, congratulating him on his accession to the imperial crown, which, he said, was effected by a particular providence, to deliver the people from the oppressions under which they had so long groaned. His letter begins thus: "Glory be to God in the highest, who, as it is written, 'changes times, and removes kings, and sets up kings;'[4] who has made known to all what he was pleased to speak by his prophet, 'The Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomsoever he will.'[1](*) Various are the changes, and many the vicissitudes, of human life, the Almighty giving sometimes, in his justice, princes to afflict his people, and sending sometimes, in his mercy, princes to comfort and relieve them. We have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty has chosen you, and placed you on the imperial throne, to banish, by your merciful disposition, all our afflictions and sorrows. Let the heavens therefore rejoice, let the earth leap for joy, let the whole people return thanks for so happy a change."(†) He then enumerates the abuses of the late administration, paints Mauricius as an absolute tyrant, and closes his letter with the following good wishes: "May the republic long enjoy these most happy times! May God, with his grace, direct your heart in every good thought, in every good deed! May the Holy Ghost, that dwells in your breast, ever guide and assist you, that you may, after a long course of years, pass from an earthly and temporal to an everlasting and heavenly kingdom!"[2]

Phocas had not yet received the pope's letter, when he wrote one to the pope, to complain, as appears from Gregory's answer, that, at his accession, he had found no nuncio in Constantinople from his see, and to desire him to send one. For Anatolius, the last nuncio, died during his nunciature, and none had been yet sent to succeed him. To the letter of Phocas, Gregory returned the following answer: "What thanks are we not bound to return to the Almighty, who has at last been pleased to deliver us from the yoke of slavery, and make us again enjoy the blessings of liberty under your empire! That your serenity has found no deacon of the apostolic see residing, according to custom, in the palace, was not owing to any neglect in me, but to the times, the late most unhappy and calamitous times, when the ministers of this church all declined the office that obliged them to reside in the palace, and were even afraid to approach it. But, now that they know it has pleased the Almighty, in his goodness and mercy, to place you on the throne, they fear no more, but exult and re-

[1] Greg. l. 8. ep. 2.
[2] Cedren. ad Phoc. ann. 1.
[2] Theophylact. l. 8. c. 13.
[4] Dan. c. 2: v. 21.

[1] Dan. c. 4: v. 25.

(*) When the bishops, who had ordained Cyriacus, in the letter they wrote to Gregory on that occasion, told him, that the new patriarch had appeared in the church like the sun, and that they had therefore all cried out with one voice, "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it;" (a) the pope found fault with them for having used the words of holy writ on so slight an occasion. (b)

(a) Psal. 118: ver. 24. (b) Greg. l. 6. ep. 7.

(†) "In the reign of Phocas," says Cedrenus, and with Cedrenus all other writers agree, "the unhappy people were overwhelmed with all manner of calamities both public and private. The air was infected, the earth became barren, the sea was frozen, and a general mortality ensued of men, beasts and fishes. (a)

(a) Cedren. ad. ann. Phoc. 1.

[2] Greg. l. 11. ep. 38.

joice, and, courting the office they declined before, fly to your feet with inexpressible joy." In the same letter the pope recommends the nuncio by whom it was sent, complains of the calamities which Italy suffered still, involved in a war that had already lasted thirty-five years, and thus closes his letter: "But we hope the Almighty, who has begun to relieve us, will complete what he has so happily begun; and that he, who has given us such pious lords, will deliver us from our cruel enemies. May the holy Trinity, therefore, grant you long life, that the later we have received the blessings that flow from your piety, the longer we may enjoy them!"[1]

At the same time the pope wrote to Leontia; and his letter to her is no less worthy of notice than his two preceding letters to her husband. "What tongue," says he, "can utter, what mind can conceive, the thanks we owe to God, who has placed you on the throne to ease us of the yoke with which we have been hitherto so cruelly galled? Let the angels give glory to God in heaven; let men return thanks to God upon earth; for the republic is relieved, and our sorrows are all banished. May the Almighty, who in his mercy has made you our emperors, make you likewise zealous defenders of the catholic faith! May he endow your minds with zeal and mercy; with zeal to punish what is committed against God; with mercy to bear and forgive what may be committed against yourselves! &c. May he grant to you, and to our most pious lord, a long reign, that the comforts and blessings we enjoy in it may be long! I should perhaps have entreated you to take under your particular protection the hitherto most greivously afflicted church of the apostle St. Peter. But as I know you love God, I need not ask you to do, what I am sure you are ready to do of your own accord. For the more you fear God, the more you must love his apostle, to whom it was said, 'Thou art Peter,' &c.; 'To thee I will give,' &c. I do not therefore doubt but you take care to oblige and bind him to you, by whom you desire to be loosened from your sins. May he therefore be the guardian of your empire; may he be your protector on earth; may he be your advocate in heaven, that after a long course of years you may enjoy, in the kingdom of heaven, the reward that is due to you there, for relieving your subjects from the burdens they groaned under, and rendering them happy upon earth!"[2]

Who would have expected such letters from a Christian bishop to an usurper, a tyrant, a murderer, a regicide? Who would not have thought Gregory, of all men, the most likely to reprove such a monster? of all men the least capable of becoming his panegyrist, of applauding him in his usurpation, murders, and tyranny? Gregory, I say, whose manners and whole conduct have hitherto appeared so irreproachable! But what virtue can be proof in a pope against the jealousy of a rival? What virtue can restrain a pope from employing even the most criminal methods to defeat all attempts that seem to have the least tendency towards lessening the honor and dignity of his see? For that it was with this view, with the view of engaging the tyrant and his wife, on his side, and by that means defeating the attempt of the patriarch to assume the title of universal bishop, that the pope commended, flattered, and extolled them in the manner we have seen, is manifest from his last letter. For there he lets Leontia know what he expected in return for the praises he bestowed upon her and her husband; what blessings they might both expect from St. Peter in heaven, provided they took under their particular protection his most grievously afflicted church upon earth; that is, provided they obliged the patriarch to quit the title, which the pope thought derogatory to the honor, dignity, and interest of his see, and therefore looked upon as a most grievous affliction. It was this the pope aimed at in becoming the panegyrist of an usurper and murderer. And does it not hence appear but too plain, that Gregory, however conscientious, just, and religious in his principles and conduct, when he did not apprehend the dignity or interest of his see to be concerned, acted upon very different notions and principles, when he apprehended they were concerned? For how can we reconcile with conscience, justice, or religion, his bestowing on the worst of tyrants the highest praises that can be bestowed on the best of princes? His courting the favor of a cruel and wicked usurper, by painting and reviling, as an absolute tyrant, the excellent prince, whose crown he had usurped? His ascribing (which I leave Baronius to excuse from blasphemy) to a particular providence the revolt of a rebellious subject, and his seizing the crown; though he opened himself a way to it by the murder of his lawful sovereign, and his six children, all the male issue of the imperial family? And, finally, his inviting all mankind, nay, and the angels of heaven, to rejoice with him, and return thanks to God for the good success of so wicked an attempt, perhaps the most wicked and cruel that is recorded in history? Gregory had often declared, that he was ready to sacrifice his life to the honor of his see; but whether he did not sacrifice, on this occasion, what ought to have been dearer to him than his life, or even the honor of his see, I leave the world to judge; and only observe here, that his reflecting, in the manner he did, on the memory of the unhappy Mauricius, was in him an instance of the utmost ingratitude, if what he himself formerly wrote, and frequently repeated, be true, namely, "that his tongue could not express the good he had received of the Almighty, and his lord the emperor; that he thought himself bound in gratitude to pray incessantly for the life of his most pious and most Christian lord; and that, in return for

[1] Greg. l. 11. ep. 45. [2] Greg. l. 11. ep. 46.

the goodness of his most religious lord to him, he could do no less than love the very ground which he trod."[1] Can any man compare these letters with those which he wrote not long after to the usurper, and his wife, and not arraign him of the utmost ingratitude?

While the pope was flattering Phocas in the manner we have seen, extolling his clemency, rejoicing, and inviting all mankind, and the angels of heaven, to rejoice with him, at the happiness of the people under his mild administration, the tyrant was raging with unheard-of cruelty against persons of all conditions and orders. But his first and chief care was to cut off the whole imperial family, root and branch, of which there still remained the empress Constantina, and her three daughters, who had fled for refuge to one of the churches of Constantinople. But from thence Phocas ordered them to be taken by force, and to be publicly executed. But they found in the patriarch Cyriacus a kind friend, and a generous protector, who, opposing, with great resolution and courage, the execution of that order, would suffer no kind of violence to be offered them in their asylum. From this time Phocas conceived an irreconcilable aversion to the patriarch, which we shall soon see the bishop of Rome artfully improving to the advantage of his see. He did not however care to disoblige the church in the very beginning of his reign; and therefore dissembling his resentment for the present, he applied to the empress herself, and, in the end, prevailed upon her with fair words, and repeated promises of safety, confirmed by the most solemn oaths, to quit her asylum. But the faithless tyrant no sooner had her in his power, than he first caused her, and her daughters, to be shut up in a monastery; and soon after to be conveyed to Chalcedon, and there to be executed, on the spot where her husband, and her five sons, had suffered, a few months before.[2](*) The imperial family being now entirely cut off, the blood-thirsty tyrant began to proceed, with the same inexorable cruelty, against all their friends, and all who had betrayed the least compassion for them, or had borne any civil or military employments in the late reign. Thus, throughout the empire, were men of the first rank and distinction either daily executed publicly, or privately massacred. Some were first inhumanly tortured; others had their hands and their feet cut off; and some were set up as marks for the raw soldiery to shoot at, in learning the exercise and use of the bow. The populace met with no better treatment than the nobility, great numbers of them being daily seized for speaking disrespectfully of the tyrant, and either killed by his guards on the spot, or tied up in sacks, and thrown into the sea, or dragged to prison, which by that means was so crowded, that they soon died, suffocated with stench and noisomeness of the place.[1] Thus Phocas continued to rage uncontroled so long as he reigned, though of such cruelties, unheard-of, at least, since the time of Nero, not the least notice is taken, nor so much as a distant hint given, in the many letters Gregory wrote to his friends in the east, as well as the west, during the sixteen months he lived after the usurpation of the tyrant; insomuch that had we no other character of Phocas, but that which we find in the letters of the pope, he would well deserve to be ranked among the best princes mentioned in history.

The following year Gregory was seized with so severe a fit of the gout, that he could not, without the utmost pain and agony, write, dictate, or even stir. However, in that condition, he received the embassadors, sent by Theudelinda, queen of the Lombards, with a letter, to acquaint him with the birth and baptism of her son Adaloaldus; and even answered her letter, congratulating her excellency, for so he styles her, on the birth of the young prince, and commending her zeal for the orthodox faith, in causing him to be baptized in the catholic church. By the same embassadors the queen sent to the pope a writing, drawn up by an abbot, named Secundinus, in defence of the "three chapters," which she begged the pope to answer, for her satisfaction, and the ease of her mind. For though Theudelinda communicated with the pope, she was not yet quite convinced that his see had not swerved from the faith of Chalcedon, that is, from the catholic faith, in condemning those chapters, and receiving the council that had condemned them. But Gregory was not then in a condition to answer the objections of Secundinus, or to remove the scruples of the queen. "Nothing," said he, in his letter to her, "but my present indisposition could have prevented me from complying immediately with your desire, and solving all the difficulties started by our most beloved son the abbot Secundinus. But I am so racked and tormented with the gout, that I cannot stir; as your embassadors can witness, who found me very much indisposed at their arrival, and leave me in great danger of my life at their departure. But if it pleases God to restore me to my health, I shall return a full answer to the writing of the abbot. In the

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 65. l. 7. ep. 48. l. 9. ep. 40.

[2] Theophyl. hist. miscell. l. 17. c. 40. Niceph. et alii ubi supra.

(*) In the Roman martyrology the emperor is supposed to have had three other daughters, Sopatra, Eustolia, and Romana, whose festival is kept on the 9th of November: (a) for they are worshiped as saints, though nobody knows why they were sainted. But as the contemporary historians all suppose the imperial family to have been entirely cut off in the empress Constantina, and the three daughters, who suffered with her, namely, Anastasia, Theoctiste, and Cleopatra, we may well rank the other three with St. Almachius, or St. Almanac, with St. Curandarum viarum, and many other such like saints, who never existed. Of the latter saint the reader will find an entertaining account in Ressendius. (b)

(a) Roman. Martyrolog. die 9 Novem.

(b) Ressendius, epist. ad Rebedium, p. 168.

[1] Glyc. Annal. Constantin. p. 70. Cedren. Niceph. et alii.

mean time I send you a copy of the council that was held under the emperor Justinian, of holy memory (of the fifth council,) that my beloved son Secundinus may be satisfied, in perusing it, that the apostolic see has been very unjustly and very undeservedly aspersed. Far be it from us ever to approve or receive any heretical doctrine, or ever to depart, in the least, from the letter of our predecessor, of holy memory, that is, of Leo. Whatever has been defined by the four councils, we receive; whatever has by them been condemned, we condemn."[1] With this letter the pope sent the following presents to the new-born prince, and his sister; namely, to the prince a cross, to wear at his neck, in which were enclosed a piece of the true cross,(*) and the gospels, in a Persian box; and to the princess three rings, with precious stones: and these he begged the queen herself to deliver, which, he said, would make amends for the smallness of the present.[2]

The pope promised to return a full answer to the writing of Secundinus, in favor of the "three chapters," if it pleased God to restore him to his health; but God was pleased to dispose of him otherwise. For his complaint, instead of abating, gained daily new strength; and he was quite worn out with labor and cares, it overcame him at last, and put an end to his life, on the 12th of March of the present year, after he had governed the Roman church thirteen years, six months, and ten days, including the day of his death. He was buried in one of the ancient porches of the church of St. Peter, and in that church his tomb is still to be seen under the altar of the apostle St. Andrew, whom he seems chiefly to have revered after his brother St. Peter.

Gregory was undoubtedly a man of extraordinary abilities, equal in parts to Leo the Great, and much superior to that pope in piety, religion and virtue, though his piety had a monkish turn, and in many instances seemed to degenerate into superstition. The ancients all commend him as a vigilant, active, and indefatigable pastor, as a restorer of the decayed discipline of the church, as a most zealous assertor of the observance of the canons, and, in short, as a man, whom Providence had raised to the episcopal dignity, that he might serve, in all future ages, for a pattern of every episcopal virtue. "Whom," says Isidorus, "can antiquity show equal to Gregory? Whom can antiquity compare to Gregory? He surpassed Antony in sanctity, Cyprian in eloquence, and Austin in knowledge and learning."[3] The other writers, who speak of him, seem to have all entertained as high an opinion of his eminent virtues as Isidore. And truly, if we consider him only as a bishop, we must own him to have been possessed, in a very eminent degree, of every virtue becoming that station and character. He was a stranger to all pride; treated all other bishops, even those who were immediately subject to his see, as his colleagues and brethren; owned himself subject to the temporal powers, and readily submitted to their will and commands; was in his disposition and temper mild, tractable, compassionate, disinterested; and an utter enemy to all pomp, grandeur, and show; abridged himself often even of the necessaries of life, to relieve the indigent, and redeem the captives, applying the whole revenue of his see to such charitable uses; in short, he spared no labor or pains to procure the temporal welfare, as well as the eternal, of the flock committed to his care. Hence, by some, he has been styled the last bishop of Rome; and indeed it may be said, with too much truth, that, of his many successors, none have taken so much care as he to acquit themselves, as they ought, of their episcopal charge; and, from his days to ours, none have been sainted but one, Pius V. who excommunicated our queen Elizabeth, of immortal memory. However, it must be owned, that the conduct of Gregory, as pope, or bishop of Rome, was not quite irreproachable. For he inviolably adhered, as I have observed above, to the principle common to all popes, from the earliest times to the latest; namely, never to part with any power which his predecessors had acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it. By that principle he was often led to transgress the canons of the church, at the very time he was asserting their authority, and to maintain and exercise a power which his predecessors had usurped, in open defiance of those sacred laws, at the very time he owned them for the standing measure of his own power, and of that of every other bishop. However, to do him justice, I do not find a single instance in history of his having ever abused that power; but many occur of his having employed and exerted it to the best purposes, to correct what had been done amiss by other bishops, to punish the guilty, whom they had absolved, or absolve the innocent, whom they had condemned. Upon the whole, had the revolution, of which I have spoken above, never happened, or had Gregory died before it happened, he would have had no superior, and scarce an equal, from the times of the apostles to the present. But the part he acted on that unhappy occasion, will be with all, who judge impartially of men and things, a stain on his character, which all his virtues, however eminent, will never wipe out. And what can we expect from other popes, when even a Gregory did not scruple to employ, and by employing to sanctify, in the opinion of his successors, the most criminal methods to support and maintain the dignity of his see?

[1] Greg. l. 12. ep. 7.

(*) Such quantities of wood, supposed to be the wood of the true cross, are now in the possession of private persons, or shown in the churches, that, were they all put together, they would make a burden too heavy for ten men to carry. Great numbers of them are therefore evidently false and counterfeit; and yet as they are all supposed to have touched the body of Christ, they are all worshiped with divine worship.

[2] Greg. l. 12. ep. 7. [3] Isidor. de vir. illust. c. 27.

Gregory's writings. Some of his writings greatly curtailed, or interpolated. His delivering the soul of Trajan out of hell, now deemed a fable. Sabinian chosen. His avarice renders him odious to the Roman people.

As for the writings of Gregory, no pope has left so many works behind him as he, from the foundation of the Roman see to the present times. His letters amount to eight hundred and forty; and, besides them, he wrote a comment on the book of Job, comprised in thirty-six books; a pastoral, or a treatise on the duties of a pastor, consisting of four parts, and, as it were, of four different treatises; twenty-two homilies on the prophet Ezekiel; forty homilies on the gospels; and four books of dialogues. The comment on the book of Job is commonly styled "Gregory's Morals on Job," being rather a collection of moral principles, than an exposition of the text. That work, and the pastoral, were anciently, and still are, reckoned among the best writings of the fathers. The pastoral, in particular, was held in such esteem by the Gallican church, that all bishops were obliged by the canons of that church, to be thoroughly acquainted with it, and punctually to observe the rules it contained; nay, and to remind them of that obligation, it was delivered into their hands at the time of their ordination. As for the dialogues, they are filled with miracles and stories so grossly absurd and fabulous, that it would be a reflection on the understanding and good sense of this great pope to think, that he really believed them; the rather as for many of them he had no better vouchers than old, doating, and ignorant people. He was the first who discovered purgatory, and it was by means of the apparitions and visions, which he relates in his dialogues, that he first discovered it: so that the church of Rome is probably indebted to some old man or old woman for one of the most profitable articles of her whole creed. In this work the pope observes, that greater discoveries were made, in his time, concerning the state of departed souls, than in all the preceding ages together, because the end of this world was at hand, and the nearer we came to the other, the more we discovered it. The apostles were six hundred years farther from the end of this world than Gregory, and consequently could not know so much of the other as he, and every old woman in his time.

The works, which I have hitherto mentioned, are by all allowed to be genuine. But the comments on the book of the Kings, on the seven penitential Psalms, and Solomon's Song, are thought by the best critics, to have been falsly ascribed to Gregory. As for the Sacramentarium, Antiphonarium, and Benedictionarium, they have been so curtailed in some places, and interpolated in others, that no man can know what in these pieces was, and was not, written by Gregory.[1] What Damascene gravely relates of this pope, namely, that he prayed the soul of the emperor Trajan out of hell, is now universally rejected as a fable, though, in that writer's time, that is, in the eighth century, it was universally believed, both in the east and the west:[2] so utterly unacquainted were men, in that and the next following ages, with the doctrine which we are taught in the gospels; even men of learning: for the delivery of Trajan's soul out of hell, by the prayers and intercession of Gregory, was firmly believed by Damascene himself, "whose great knowledge and erudition in all the learned sciences, nobody," says the learned Cave, "in his senses can deny."[3] But may we not, in matters of faith and religion, safely except against the authority of such learned men, for all their erudition and learning!

SABINIAN, SIXTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[PHOCAS,—AGILULPH, *and his son* ADALOALDUS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ 605.] In the room of Gregory was chosen, and ordained on the 13th of September, after a vacancy of six months and one day, the deacon Sabinian. For now the presbyters, who had nothing to recommend them but their merit, were commonly overlooked, and the deacons preferred, who, as they managed the temporalities of the church, had it in their power to supply, by other means, their want of merit. Sabinian was a native of Volterra in Tuscany, and the son of one Bonus. In the year 593 he was sent by Gregory to reside at the court of Constantinople, with the character of his nuncio to the emperor Mauricius; and was recalled in 597;[1] which is all we know of him before his election. He enjoyed his new dignity but a very short time; and rendered himself, even during the short time he enjoyed it, so odious to the Roman people, by his avarice, and cruelty to the poor, that they could not forbear abusing and reviling him, wherever he appeared, as quite unworthy of the honor to which they had raised him. Indeed he gave them sufficient provocation; for, a dreadful famine raging at this time in Rome, the new pope, unaffected with the miseries of the people, ordered the corn, which his predecessor used to distribute among the poor, to be sold at most exorbitant rates, 30 solidi a

[1] Greg. l. 2. ep. 52. et l. 6. ep. 24.

[1] See Du Pin. t. 5. art. Greg.
[2] Damas. in orat. de fidel. defunct.
[3] Cave hist. Liter. Vol. I. p. 624.

Sabinian reviles the memory of Gregory, and stirs up the populace against him, who attempt to destroy all his books. The manner in which they were saved. Sabinian dies;—[Year of Christ, 606.]—Boniface III. chosen. What chiefly recommended him to the Roman people and clergy.

bushel: and thus, while his granaries were full, great numbers of people perished daily with hunger under his eyes. To lessen the merit of Gregory's generosity and compassion for the poor, and at the same time, to excuse the opposite vices in himself, he omitted no opportunity to inveigh against that excellent man, loading his memory with all manner of reproaches, and charging him, in particular, with having wastefully spent, merely out of ostentation, and a desire of popular applause, the revenues of the church, the patrimony of the poor, and, by his prodigality, to have put it out of the power of his successor to afford them any relief in their present distress. No man would believe, that such groundless aspersions, such barefaced calumnies, could have ever been credited in Rome; that in all Rome one person could have been found so ungrateful as ever to forget the manifold obligations the whole city owed to their great benefactor. And yet he was scarce gone, when many, hearkening to the malicious invectives of his successor, began to revile his memory, as if their present calamities were all owing to him; nay, some there were who even suffered themselves to be wrought up, by the new pope, and his emissaries, to such a pitch of madness and fury against the man, whom they had but a few months before revered as a saint, that had they not been prevented by a pious and seasonable fraud, they had, out of hatred to him, destroyed all his works. For they had already gathered together all the copies of his writings they could find, after a diligent search, and brought them into the forum, to consign them there publicly to the flames. But Peter the deacon, a great admirer of Gregory and his writings, seasonably interposed, assuring the multitude, that whatever Gregory had written, was dictated to him by the Holy Ghost, whom he himself had frequently seen, in the shape of a dove, whispering the holy pontiff in the ear, at the time he was writing. The vision was believed, the fury of the populace was appeased, and the writings of Gregory were saved.[1] Upon the credit of that vision Gregory is painted to this day with a dove at his ear. The deacon had probably heard or read of the vision, or pious fraud, by which Julius Proculus saved the Roman senate, upon the death of Romulus, from falling a victim to the fury of the populace. Several writers are of opinion, that some of Gregory's works actually perished, and several, that none of them perished on that occasion.[2] However that be, it were much to be wished, for the reputation and credit of so great a man, that, if any of them perished, the whole four books of his dialogues had been in that number. As for the ingratitude of the Roman people to Gregory, it can only be matched by the ingratitude of Gregory to the unhappy Mauricius, of which it may deservedly be thought a just retaliation.

Sabinian had held the see but one year, five months, and nine days, when he died, or was killed, as Sigebert, and after him, Baronius, would make us believe, by his predecessor Gregory, who, having reproved him, say they, in three different apparitions, for his covetousness, but reproved him in vain, gave him, in a fourth apparition, so dreadful a blow on the head, that he died soon after.[3] His death happened on the 22d of February; and he was buried in the church of St. Peter. His body was not conveyed to that church in the usual pomp through the city, but privately over the fields, lest it should be insulted by the Roman people, satisfied at last, that the miseries they suffered were owing to his avarice, and not to the prodigality of Gregory.

BONIFACE III., SIXTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[PHOCAS,—AGILULPH, ADALOALDUS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ 607.] The death of Sabinian was followed by a vacancy that lasted (and yet no writer accounts for it), eleven months and twenty-six days; that is, from the 22d of February, 606, to the 19th of the same month, 607, when Boniface, the third of that name, was ordained, and placed in the chair. He too was a deacon of the Roman church; was a native of Rome, and was sent by Gregory, in the year 603, to Constantinople, with the character of his nuncio, to congratulate, in his name, Phocas and Leontia, on their accession to the imperial crown. His having been chosen by so great a pope to discharge that office, at so critical a juncture, leaves no room to question his address and abilities. Upon the death of Gregory, he returned to Rome; and Sabinian dying soon after his return, he was chosen to succeed him, as one who was not only well known to Phocas, but greatly favored both by him and his wife; for, by flattering the usurper, as Gregory had done, and conniving at his cruelties, if not applauding him in them, while

[1] Joan. Diac. in vit. S. Greg. l. 4. c. 69.
[2] Bar. ad ann. 604. Theoph. Raynaud. de bonis et malis libris, n. 582. Sigebert Gemblacen. de vir. illustr. c. 41. Trithem., &c.
[3] Sigebert. in Chron. Bar. ad ann. 605. p. 199.

Boniface prevails on Phocas to take the title of universal bishop from the bishop of Constantinople, and to grant it to him, and his successors. What imported by the edict of Phocas in favor of Boniface. The title granted by Phocas, improved by the pope into power. The origin of the papal supremacy.

the rest of mankind exclaimed against him as an outrageous tyrant, he had so insinuated himself into his good graces, as to become one of his chief favorites, or, as Sigebert writes, his only favorite, being the only person in the whole city of Constantinople, who approved, or could so dissemble as to make the tyrant believe he approved, of his conduct. For that merit alone he was chosen; and though he enjoyed his new dignity but a very short time, for he did not even live to the end of the year in which he was raised to it, yet it may truly be said, that to him alone the Roman see owes more than to all his predecessors together. For he no sooner found himself vested with the papal dignity, than, taking advantage of the partiality and favor of Phocas to him, and his aversion and hatred to the patriarch Cyriacus,(*) he not only prevailed on the tyrant to revoke the decree settling the title of "universal bishop" on the bishop of the imperial city; but obtained, what no man would believe could have ever come into the thoughts of a successor of Gregory to demand, were it not vouched by all the historians to a man;[1] but obtained, I say, a new decree, settling on himself, and his successors, that very title, which his immediate predecessor but one, and, of all his predecessors, the best and the greatest, had so often condemned in any bishop whatever, and rejected, with the utmost abhorrence, when offered to himself, as "vain, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, antichristian, heretical, diabolical." Boniface could not but know, that the controverted title had been thus stigmatized over and over again by two of his predecessors successively, Pelagius II.,[2] and Gregory; that whoever should give it to, or approve it in another, was declared by Gregory a heretic;[3] and that whoever should presume, in the pride of his heart, to take it to himself, was by the same great pope declared a "follower of satan, a rival of satan in pride, and the forerunner of antichrist."[4] All this Boniface well knew; but so inconceivably great was his ambition, so utterly unbridled was his desire of exalting his see, that, rather than to let slip the favorable opportunity that now offered, and might never offer again, of raising it higher than it had ever yet been, or, in the opinion of his own predecessors, ought ever to be, he chose to stand condemned, out of their mouths, as a "heretic," as a "follower of satan," as "a rival of satan in pride," as "the forerunner of antichrist." Had Gregory been allowed to return from the dead, how great would his surprise have been, how great his indignation, to find "the badge of pride" thus become, so soon after his death, the peculiar badge of his see, and "the mark of antichrist" the peculiar mark of his successors! I say, of his successors; for by them that "badge of pride," that "mark of antichrist," is borne to this day, in spite of all the names of reproach and ignominy with which it was branded by the most renowned and revered of all their predecessors.

As for the edict issued by Phocas on this occasion, it has not indeed reached our times. But that thereby the decree of the council of Constantinople in 588,[1] entailing the title of universal bishop on the bishop of Constantinople, and his successors, was revoked and annulled; that the said title was transferred from them to Boniface, and his successors, and the bishop of Rome declared the "head of the whole catholic church;" is what all the historians, whom I have quoted above, unanimously vouch. In the bishop of Constantinople the title of universal bishop is generally thought to have been no more than a badge of honor, or an honorary title, without any accession of power. And indeed it does not appear, as I observed above, that in virtue of that title he ever exercised or claimed any. But Boniface had scarce obtained it, when he took upon him to exercise an unanswerable jurisdiction and power to that time unknown and unheard of in the catholic church. For no sooner was the imperial edict, vesting him with the title of universal bishop, and declaring him "head of the church," brought to Rome, than, assembling a council in the basilic of St. Peter, consisting of seventy-two bishops, thirty-four presbyters, and all the deacons and inferior clergy of that city, he acted there as if he had not been vested with the title alone, though Phocas probably meant to grant him no more, but with all the power of an universal bishop, with all the authority of a supreme head, or rather absolute monarch of the church. For by a decree, which he issued in that council, it was pronounced, declared, and defined, that no election of a bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the people and clergy, approved by the prince, or lord of the city, and confirmed by the pope interposing his authority in the following terms; "we will and command, volumus et jubemus."[2] The imperial edict therefore, if we may so call the edict of an usurper, and a tyrant, was not, as the popish writers pretend, a bare confirmation of the primacy of the see of Rome; but the grant of a new title, which the pope immediately improved into a power, answering that title. And thus was the power of the pope as universal bishop, as "head of the church," or in

(*) The patriarch had been so impolitic as to pity, and take into his protection, the abandoned empress Constantina, with her three innocent daughters; which the tyrant, a stranger to all generosity, humanity, and compassion, could never forgive. (a)

(a) See p. 422.

[1] Paul. Diac. de gest. Longobard. l. 4. c. 11. Anast. et Platin. in Bonif. III. Sigebert. in Chron. Otho Frising. chron. l. 5. c. 8. Rhegi. chron. l. 1. Albo-Floriac. Marian. Scot. Martin. Polon. Ursperg in Phoc. Naucler. Sabell. Ennead. 8. l. 7, &c.

[2] See p. 389. [3] See p. 409. [4] See p. 412.

[1] See p. 388. [2] Anast. Platina, &c. in Bonif. III.

The claim of the bishop of Constantinople to the title of universal bishop better grounded than that of the pope. That title assumed by the pope, in the same sense in which it was condemned by Gregory. Boniface dies.

other words the papal supremacy, first introduced. It owed its original to the worst of men; was procured by the basest means, by flattering a tyrant in liis wickedness and tyranny; and was in itself, if we stand to the judgment of Gregory the Great, "anti-christian, heretical, blasphemous, diabolical."

But, after all, the popes new title availed them very little for the present. For Phocas being killed three years after he had granted it, the bishop of Constantinople reassumed it, and would no more acknowledge the pope for universal bishop, than the pope acknowledged him. And indeed no man can doubt, but the bishops of Constantinople had a far better claim to that title than Boniface, or any of his successors. To the bishops of Constantinople it had been given by two lawful emperors, in no fewer than thirteen laws;[1] and had been confirmed to them by a council consisting of the two other great patriarchs, of all the senators of the imperial city, and all the chief bishops of the east, after they had enjoyed it undisturbed for the space of two hundred years, and upwards.[2] But as to Boniface, and his successors, they had no other right or claim to it, nor could they plead any other, but what was grounded on the late edict, that is, on the will of an usurper, and a lawless tyrant.

Baronius, Bellarmine, and the other popish writers, have spared no pains, no subtilties or distinctions, to prove that the title of universal bishop was condemned and rejected by Gregory, in quite a different sense from that in which it was assumed by Boniface, and is borne to this day by his successors. The name of universal bishop, say they, may be so understood as to import no more than a general care of the universal church, in the bishop who is distinguished with that title: and in that sense alone it was claimed by Boniface, and had never been condemned by Gregory. But besides that, it may have another very different meaning, and be so understood, as if the bishop, who is so styled, were the sole bishop of all the cities in christendom, and the other bishops were no longer true bishops, but only the vicars or curates of his holiness the universal bishop. In that sense alone, say they, it was condemned by Gregory, and never assumed by Boniface, or any of his successors.[3] A pitiful evasion indeed! which one would think had been rather calculated to expose than to defend the cause. For, I. Who can be so absurd as to imagine, that it could ever have come into the thoughts of any emperor to grant, of any bishop to accept, the title of universal bishop in that sense? To grant or accept it in that sense had not been heresy, but madness. II. The bishop of Constantinople styles himself to this day universal bishop; and yet he does not look upon other bishops only as his vicars or curates, but respects them as his colleagues and fellow bishops. III. No man can believe, that, when Eulogius of Alexandria offered the title of universal bishop to Gregory, he thereby designed to degrade himself, to resign the second place of honor in the church, and to become the pope's vicar, or his curate. And yet the pope rejected his offer with the greatest indignation, as I have related above.[1] IV. Gregory condemned that title because it exalted the bishop who assumed it, whether bishop of Rome or Constantinople, above his brethren; because it subjected all other bishops to him, while he himself was subject to none; and of a member made him the head of the church, and entitled him to a power over all its members, which was peculiar to Christ alone, and never assumed by any of the apostles, no, not by St. Peter himself.[2] These are the reasons of Gregory's irreconcilable aversion and abhorrence to the title of universal bishop. And from them it is manifest he condemned that title, as implying an universal power and jurisdiction over the church; and consequently in the very sense in which it was assumed by Boniface, and has been since notably improved by his successors, as the world well knows.

To return to Boniface: he died on the 10th of November of the present year, having enjoyed his dignity only eight months and twenty-two days. I will not construe his being so soon cut off into a judgment, for his anti-christian pride and ambition; though I might with much better reason than Baronius so construed the death of the good pope Anastasius, for his Christian moderation, notwithstanding that pope lived a whole year longer than Boniface.[3] Though Boniface deserved so well of the Roman see, that church has not however thought fit to distinguish him with the honor of saintship. And indeed she could not well have sainted him, and not bestowed the same honor on Phocas, the only merit he had being common to him with that tyrant.

It were to be wished the successors of Boniface had been satisfied with the title, which he procured them, and even with the power, of universal bishops. But no sooner had they brought that power to its highest pitch, than they began to extend their views, to join insensibly the temporal to the spiritual power; nor did their boundless ambition allow them, or the world, to enjoy any rest till they got themselves acknowledged for universal monarchs as well as universal bishops, as we shall see in the sequel of this history.

[1] See p. 388. [2] See p. 388.
[3] Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 31.

[1] See p. 413. [2] See p. 409. [3] See p. 295.

Boniface IV. chosen. He obtains the pantheon of Phocas, and turns it into a church. Mellitus, the first bishop of London, goes to Rome. Baronius' conjecture concerning the motive of his journey. Decree falsely ascribed to Boniface; and a letter to Ethelbert king of Kent. Boniface dies;—[Year of Christ. 615.]

BONIFACE IV., SIXTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[PHOCAS, HERACLIUS,—AGILULPH, ADALOALDUS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ 608.] Boniface III. died on the 20th of November, 607, and in his room was chosen, and ordained on the 25th of August, 608, Boniface, the fourth of that name, a native of Valeria, in the country of the Marsi, and the son of a physician named John.[1]

The new pope, availing himself of the partiality of Phocas to his see, begged of him the famous Pantheon;(*) and, having obtained it, (for the tyrant could refuse nothing to the popes, the only friends he had in the whole empire), he changed it into a church, substituting the Mother of God to the mother of the gods, and the Christian martyrs to the other pagan deities,[2] adored there before; so that only the names of the idols were altered.

The following year, the 8th of Phocas, and 610th of the Christian æra, Mellitus, the first bishop of London, went to Rome, as Bede informs us,[3] to settle with the pope some particular affairs of the English church. On that occasion Boniface called a council of the Italian bishops, at which the bishop of London assisted, and, when it broke up, returned to Britain with the decrees of that assembly; and letters from the pope to Laurentius, who had succeeded Austin in the see of Canterbury, to the English clergy, to king Ethelbert, and to the nation in general.[4] But none of these letters have reached our times; nor has Bede thought fit to let us know, what affairs Mellitus wanted to settle with the pope. However, Baronius conjectures the bishop of London to have undertaken that journey to know of Boniface, whether or not the consecration of the church of Westminster, performed by St. Peter in person, was to be deemed good and valid.[5] For St. Peter is said to have come down from heaven for that purpose; and I am unwilling to quarrel with the annalist about the truth of the fact, seeing it was attested by the very waterman, who conveyed the apostle over the Thames, in his way from heaven to Westminster, and was believed upon his testimony, first by the abbot Ealred,[1] whom Baronius calls a very credible historian, and afterwards by pope Nicholas II. But yet I cannot acquiesce in the conjecture of Baronius, and think that Mellitus would have taken so long and so troublesome a journey to know the opinion of the pope concerning that consecration, however extraordinary, since he might have known it without stirring from his see, at London as well as at Rome.

After the death of Baronius, Holstenius published a decree from a manuscript lodged in the Vatican, which he ascribes to Boniface, and pretends to have been issued by him in the above-mentioned council. In that decree an opinion is supposed to have prevailed in England, as if the monks were incapable of receiving ordination, or performing any sacerdotal or episcopal function, because dead to this world. That opinion is there condemned, and the monks are declared to be angels, and consequently the proper ministers of the word. That they are angels, is proved thus; they are covered, like the cherubims, with six wings, the cowl forming two, the arms of their cassock two, and its extremities two more; ergo they have six wings, and consequently are angels, cherubims, and proper ministers of the word.[2] How could a man of Holstenius' learning mistake such a piece, worthy only of an ignorant and stupid monk, for the decree of a council of bishops with the pope at their head! One must entertain a very mean opinion of pope Boniface, and the other Italian bishops of those days, to think them capable of reasoning in so ridiculous and absurd a manner. The letter from the pope to king Ethelbert, which the same writer published with the pretended decree, bears as visible marks of forgery as the decree itself, and is as universally rejected.[3] The pope is there made to excommunicate all who should presume to oppose the execution of that decree, even the successors of Ethelbert; and it was, without doubt, to vest in the popes such a power over kings, that the letter was forged.

No further mention is made of Boniface till the time of his death, which happened on the 7th of May, 615, after he had governed the

[1] Anast. Plat. &c. in Bonifac. IV.

(*) The Pantheon was built, as is well known, by M. Agrippa, the son-in-law of Augustus, in honor of Cybele, and all the other gods and goddesses; and thence it took its name. Boniface in purging it, as he is said to have done, from all filth of idolatry, followed without doubt, the directions which his predecessor Gregory had sent over to Austin, concerning the temples of the Saxons in Britain. These were, to cast out the images of the gods, to sprinkle the walls with holy water, to build altars, and furnish them with relics. (*a*) In the year 333, great numbers of temples were destroyed in Rome, and all parts of the empire, pursuant to a law issued that year by the emperor Constantine. (*b*) But the Pantheon was spared, probably on account of its stateliness and grandeur, and to this day it remains quite entire.

(*a*) Greg. 9. ep. 71. (*b*) Cod. Theodos. l. 9. tit. 17.

[2] Bed. l. 2. c. 4. Anast. Plat. in Bonifac. IV.

[3] Bed. ibid. [4] Idem ibid.

[5] Bar. ad ann. 610. p. 215.

[1] Ealred. in vit. Edward. Confess.

[2] Holsten. Collect. Rom. p. 242.

[3] See Du Pin, nouvelle Biblioth. l. 5. p. 36.

Phocas deposed and murdered. Deusdedit chosen in the room of Boniface. Dies, and is sainted by Baronius. His letter to Gordianus of Seville, spurious.

Roman church six years, eight months, and thirteen days. He has been sainted; but it would perhaps puzzle Baronius himself to tell us why, unless it was because he changed his house into a monastery, and richly endowed it;[1] or on account of the mighty commendations bestowed on him in his epitaph.[2] But were epitaphs to be depended on, few persons would be found who have any, and might not be sainted.

In the third year of the pontificate of Boniface, the see of Rome suffered a great loss by the deposition and death of Phocas, the chief author of its grandeur. For Heraclius, the son of Heraclius, governor of Africa, having, at the request of the people of that province, taken upon him the title of emperor, and in sight of Constantinople defeated the fleet, which the tyrant had armed, and sent out against him, the whole city declared in favor of the conqueror, as the deliverer and savior of the empire; and with loud acclamations proclaimed him emperor. Hereupon the tyrant, dreading, as he well might, the rage of the multitude, fled in great consternation to the palace; but one Phocius, whose wife he had debauched, pursuing him with a party of soldiers, forced the gates, seized him, and, having stripped him of the imperial robes, dragged him, in a black vest, to Heraclius, who commanded first his hands and his feet, and afterwards his head, to be cut off, to the unspeakable joy of all ranks and orders of men. His head was exposed on a pole, to the view and the insult of the populace; and the rest of his body delivered up to the soldiers, who burnt it in the forum. When Heraclius reproached him with his evil administration, he is said to have answered with great calmness, "If I have governed ill, it is incumbent upon you to govern better.[1]" Such was the end of this cruel and blood-thirsty tyrant, after he had insulted the empire, to use the expression of Cedrenus, eight years wanting some days.

DEUSDEDIT, SIXTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HERACLIUS,—AGILULPH, ADALOALDUS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 615.] In the room of Boniface was chosen, after a vacancy of five months and twelve days, Deusdedit, a native of Rome, and the son of Stephen, a subdeacon of that church. It is said, that in the time of this pope a dreadful leprosy raged at Rome, and that he cured one with a kiss, who was sorely afflicted with that distemper;[3] which is all we know of him. He died on the 8th of November, 618, having held the see three years and twenty days; for he was ordained on the 19th of October, 615. Baronius, in correcting the Roman martyrology, allowed him a place among the saints, because the church had anciently worshiped him as a saint. But Pagi and Papebroke assure us, that his name is not to be found in any of the more ancient martyrologies.

The letter, supposed to have been written by this pope to Gordianus, bishop of Seville, is a barefaced forgery; nothing being more certain in history, than that the famous Isidore was bishop of that city from the year 600, to 638, and consequently, during the whole time of Deusdedit's pontificate. In that letter the pope is made to declare, that, should a man and his wife stand sponsors to their own child, their marriage would be thereby annulled, and they at liberty to marry whom they pleased. A most easy, and most expeditious method of procuring a divorce! In St. Austin's time the parents were commonly sponsors for their own children; nay, an opinion then prevailed, that none but parents ought to be sponsors.[2] And hence it is manifest, that in those days the notion of spiritual relation was not yet broached, though the council of Trent has, on account of that imaginary relation, declared all marriages unlawful between the sponsors, as well as between them and their children, between the sponsor, and the father and the mother of the baptized, and between the baptizer and the baptized, or the father and the mother of the baptized.[3] It is to be observed, that dispensations for marriages within any degree whatever of spiritual relation, are easily obtained by all who can afford to pay for them.

[1] Anast. in Bonifac. IV.
[2] Apud Manlium in Monument. Vatican. Basilicæ.
[3] Plat. in Deusded.

[1] Niceph. l. 18. c. 26. Miscell. Ann. 7. Phoc. Cedren ad Ann. 1. Heracl. Theoph. Chron. Alexandr.
[2] Aug. ep. 23. ad Bonifac.
[3] Concil. Trid. Sess. 24. de refoe. matrimon.

Boniface V. chosen. He writes to Mellitus and Justus in England;—[Year of Christ, 620.] Sends the pall to Justus.

BONIFACE V., SIXTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HERACLIUS,—ADALOALDUS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 619.] Deusdedit was succeeded by Boniface, the fifth of that name, ordained on the 23d of December, 619, after the see had been vacant from the 8th of November, 618, to that time. He was a native of Campania, and a presbyter of the Roman church.[1] He had no sooner taken possession of the see, than he wrote, as Bede informs us,[2] to Mellitus, the successor of Laurentius in the see of Canterbury,(*) and to Justus, bishop of Rochester, exhorting them to pursue the great work, which they had so happily begun. But neither of these letters has reached our times. Of the actions of this pope no farther mention is made till the year 624, when he sent the pall(†) to Justus, who, in that year, had succeeded Mellitus in the see of Canterbury, and with the pall a letter to

[1] Anast. Plat. in Bonifac. V. [2] Bed. l. 2. c. 7.

(*) Mellitus, having been driven from his see, the see of London, by the pagan kings of the east Saxons, led a private life in the kingdom of Kent till the death of Laurentius, whom he succeeded in the see of Canterbury. He had converted great numbers of the east Saxons inhabiting Essex and Middlesex, with Seber their king; but Seber dying, the people relapsed into idolatry under his three sons, who had never embraced the Christian religion.(*a*) These new converts were, it seems, but very indifferently instructed: under Christian kings they were zealous Christians, and no less zealous pagans under pagan kings.

(*a*) Bed. l. 2. c. 5, et 6.

(†) The pall was originally part of the imperial habit, being a rich robe of state, very magnificent, and reaching quite to the ground. The bishops of Rome were allowed to wear it, they say, by Constantine the Great; and in process of time the same honor was granted by the emperors to other patriarchs.(*a*) Hence, when they were either driven from their sees, or voluntarily quitted them, they returned their palls to the emperors. Thus Anthimus of Constantinople, being expelled from his see, delivered up his pall to the emperor Justinian;(*b*) as Germanus did his to the emperor Leo, upon his quitting the same see in the controversy about the images.(*c*) When the popes first took upon them to grant that honorary badge, which they did before the pontificate of Gregory the Great, chosen in 590, they did not presume to do it till they had obtained leave of the emperor. Thus when queen Brunichild applied to that pope, desiring a pall might be sent to Syagrius of Autun, he dispatched a deacon to Constantinople on purpose to beg leave of the emperor Mauricius to comply with the request of the queen; and when he complied with it, he told her it was the emperor's pleasure, that a pall should be sent, and that he had sent it accordingly;(*d*) which was owning the pall to be a gift of the emperor. But the successors of Gregory, upon the declining of the empire, when the power of the emperors became quite precarious in the west, took upon them to bestow that mark of distinction, independently of them, and as a gift of their own. However, that it might no longer be deemed part of the imperial habit, which it was treasonable to wear without leave from the emperors, they changed its ancient form to the present. For it is not now, as it anciently was, a robe of state, but a white piece of woollen cloth about the breadth of a border, made round, and thrown over the shoulders. Upon that are two others of the same matter, and the same shape, the one falling down on the breast, and the other on the back; each of them having a red cross, with several crosses of the same color on the upper part, about the neck.

At what time the popes assumed the disposing of the pall, independently of the emperors, is not well known; but certain it is, that no bishop was obliged to apply to Rome for it till the year 742, when Boniface, the famous apostle of Germany, and bishop of Mentz, out of the abundance of his zeal for the grandeur and power of the pope, pursuaded the bishops of France and Germany to pass a decree obliging their metropolitans to apply to the pope for that ornament, and to promise, upon their receiving it, a canonical obedience to the commands of St. Peter. As that practice proved of all others the most favorable to the ambitious designs of the bishops of Rome, they spared no pains to impose it upon all metropolitans, issuing, with that view, decrees upon decrees concerning the nature, the virtue, and the necessity, of the pall, till they came, at length, to declare it unlawful for a metropolitan, archbishop, or primate, to exercise any branch of his power till he had received his pall from Rome; nay, in several decrees the metropolitical jurisdiction and power were said to be conferred by the pall;(*a*) which was making the pope the fountain of all ecclesiastical power and authority. That doctrine was, it seems, first broached in the ninth century. But Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, who lived in that age, opposed it among the rest, declaring to the pope himself, pope Nicholas I., that his pall had conferred no authority upon him, but what he was vested with by the canons of the catholic church, before he received it.(*b*) However, that opinion, though evidently repugnant to the practice and doctrine of all former ages, prevailed in the end; and the pall was declared by Innocent III., in the thirteenth century, to be "an ensign or token of the plenitude of the apostolic power," and said to communicate a competent share of that power to those who received it from their holinesses hands.

The new metropolitans were, to the time of Gregory VII. only required to send for their palls, and that within the space of three months after their ordination. But that pope, not satisfied with their sending, obliged all, who were not prevented by some lawful impediment, to come for them in person to Rome. By the same pope the promise of canonical obedience, which the metropolitans had made ever since the year 742, upon their receiving their palls, was changed into an oath of allegiance, such as vassals, by the feudal laws, were obliged to take to their princes.

As the ornament was originally designed only for an honorary acknowledgment of the merit of the person, to whom it was given, Gregory the Great, who perhaps bestowed more palls than any pope has done from his time to the present, not only would not receive himself the least fee or reward of the persons, on whom he bestowed them, but, to oblige his successors to act with the same disinterestedness, decreed in a council, which he held at Rome in 595, that the pall should be given gratis; and that nothing should be required, nothing received, or even expected, of those to whom it was given, agreeably to the command of our Savior, "freely ye have received, freely give."(*c*) What account the successors of Gregory have made of that law, the world but too well knows. Instead of complying with it, nay, and with the express command of our Savior, they soon began to act in direct opposition to both; insomuch that the pall, for which nothing was to be given, and nothing expected, became, in the end, one of the chief funds of their see. Exorbitant sums were exacted not only for the palls that were sent to presbyters, or private bishops, when

(*a*) De Marca de Concord. Sacerdot. et Imper. l. 6. c. 6.
(*b*) Vide Richer. Hist. Concil. l. 1. p. 723.
(*c*) Eutrop. Hist. Rom. l. 21. p. 296.
(*d*) Greg. l. 7. ep. 5.

(*a*) Decretal. l. 1. tit. 6. c. 4. et 28. et tit. 8. c. 3.
(*b*) De Marca, l. 6. c. 6.
(*c*) Greg. l. 7. ep. 5. et Concil. tom. 5. col. 1587. Edit. Lab.

The pope writes to Edwin, king of Northumberland, and to Edelberg his queen;—[Year of Christ, 625.] Sends presents to both. Boniface dies.

congratulate him on the success of his apostolical labors in Britain.[1]

At this time Christianity was confined, in Britain, to the kingdom of Kent, the east Saxons, whom Mellitus had converted, being returned to their idolatry. But the following year 625, a favorable opportunity offered of enlarging the pale of the church. Edwin, the pagan king of the Northumbrians, married Edelberg, the daughter of Ethelbert, and sister of Eadbald, king of Kent; and it was stipulated by the marriage articles, that the queen should be allowed the free exercise of the Christian religion, which she professed. Pursuant to that agreement, Edelberg took Paulinus with her into the north, who, on that occasion, was consecrated bishop by Justus. The pope was no sooner acquainted with the marriage, than thinking it might prove, in the end, of great advantage to the Christian religion, he laid hold of the opportunity, and wrote both to the king and the queen. In his letter to the king he showed him the absurdity and folly of the pagan worship; endeavoured to raise his mind to a just sense of the Divine Being; and warmly exhorted him to forsake his idols, the work of men's hands, and adore Him alone, who is in the heavens, who made the heavens and the earth, and all that is in them.[2] In his letter to the queen he encouraged her, with the promise of the kingdom of heaven, to leave nothing unattempted, which she could think capable of making any impression on the mind of the king, in favor of the Christian religion, and to acquaint him from time to time with the success of her pious endeavors.[3] With these letters the pope sent presents to both, which he called "the blessing of their protector St. Peter, the prince of the apostles;" namely, to the king, a linen vest adorned with gold, and an Ancyrian garment, an apparel held, it seems at that time, in great request; and to the queen, an ivory comb curiously gilt, and a silver mirror;[4] an improper present for a woman who was to perform the office of an apostle.

The pope did not live to the time, which God, in his wisdom, had prefixed for the conversion of Edwin. For the king was not baptized till the year 627, and Boniface died on the 22d of October of the present year 625, after he had presided in the Roman church five years, and ten months. Some constitutions are ascribed to him, but they relate to matters of small importance, and are not by all allowed to be genuine.

It was in the time of pope Boniface IV, in the seventh year of his pontificate, the fifth of the reign of Heraclius, and 614th of the Christian era, that the impostor Mahomet first published his law. He was born in the city of Mecca, in Arabia Fœlix, on the 12th of the month of Rabieus, or the 5th of our May, 570, set up for a prophet in the fortieth year of his age; and in the forty-fourth published his law. The law he published is reduced by Elmakin(*) to the following heads: he commanded all men, says that writer, to believe in God alone, to adore and worship God alone; he banished all worship of idols; enjoined circumcision; established the fast of the month Ramadan, cleanliness, prayers five times a day, pilgrimages to the temple of Mecca, and abstinence from blood and swines flesh; and on those who did not comply with these injunctions, he made war as on avowed enemies.[1] In the year 622, the fourth of pope Boniface Vth, and thirteenth of Heraclius, he publicly preached his doctrine in the city of Mecca, the place of his birth; but was obliged to save himself, by a precipitate flight, from the dangers that threatened him there. From that flight, which in 622, fell on a Friday, the 16th of July, the Mahometans begin their era, which they call Hegira, that is, Persecution. He was attended in most other places with better success; and, having gained great numbers of the Saracens, those chiefly, who still were pagans (and the greater part of that nation professed then no other religion), he caused himself to be acknowledged by them for their prince as well as their prophet. This happened in the year 627, the third of pope Honorius, the eighteenth of Heraclius, and the sixth of the Hegira, which in that year began on Friday the 6th of May.[2] He was vested with the sovereignty under a tree, says Elmakin; and lived five years after his inauguration, propagating his new religion by force of arms, and making war chiefly on the Jews, and the pagans. He died, according to the same writer, on the

raised to the archiepiscopal dignity; but likewise for those that were sent to archbishops, when translated from one archiepiscopal see to another. For by the canons an archbishop is not to carry his pall away with him, when translated, but to demand a new one; and his successor is not to make use of the pall which his predecessor had left, but apply to Rome for another. (a) But of the enormous abuses and exactions, to which the pall has given occasion, since the disposing of it was usurped by the popes, I shall have frequent opportunities to speak in the sequel of this history; and only observe here, that had the decree of the Roman council under Gregory been observed, and the pall been given freely, it would have been no more thought necessary in our days, than it was thought necessary in his.

(a) Decretal. l. 1. tit. 5. c. 4. et tit. 8. c. 3.

[1] Bed. l. 2. c. 8. [2] Bed. l. 2. c. 10.
[3] Bed. l. 2. c. 7. [4] Bed. l. 2. c. 7.

(*) Elmakin, is generally allowed to have been thoroughly acquainted with the affairs of the Saracens, and to have written with great exactness and candor. He wrote the history of that nation, and, besides, a general history of the world, from the creation to the time of Mahomet. (a) He was a Christian, but a Jacobite or Eutychian; and therefore bestows on those of that sect the name of Orthodox, distinguishing from them such as professed the doctrine of Chalcedon by the name of Melkites, that is, men who had no other religion but the religion of the emperor. That name was given soon after the council of Chalcedon to those, who, in compliance with the edict of the emperor, Marcian, received the decree of that emperor.

(a) Papebroke Hist: Chronolog. p. 34. Ecchelen. in Eutyche vindicato.

[1] Elmakin. in hist. Sarac. p. 67.
[2] Elmakin. ad ann. Hegiræ 6.

Honorius chosen. Adaloaldus, the catholic king of the Lombards, deposed;—[Year of Christ, 626.] The pope strives to get him restored; but in vain. First rise of the dispute concerning the will and operations in Christ;—[Year of Christ, 324.]

12th of the month Rabius or Rabieus, in the eleventh year of the Hegira,[1] and consequently on the 17th of our June 632, which in that year fell on a Monday. Before he died, he saw his doctrine almost universally received, and professed by the Arabs or Saracens; and at the time of his death he appointed four amirs, or great officers, to reduce such of the Christians as were of the race of the Arabs, and did not profess it.[2] He lived in peace with the Romans, without committing, or suffering his followers to commit, any kind of hostilities upon them, or in their territories; nay, satisfied with establishing his doctrine amongst his countrymen, he never attempted to seduce any of the subjects of the empire. Heraclius therefore had no right to make war upon him, or to prevent him from propagating his new religion, however detestable, among his countrymen, who had acknowledged him for their king, and over whom the emperor had no power or authority. This has not, it seems, been attended to by the ecclesiastical writers, who all impute the propagation of Mahometism to a criminal indolence, and an unpardonable neglect, in Heraclius; exclaiming against him for not making war on those who professed that religion, at the same time that they exclaim against Mahomet for making war on those who did not profess it. As to the tenets of that sect, they are generally known, and so very absurd in themselves, as to want no other confutation.

HONORIUS, SIXTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HERACLIUS.—ADALOALDUS, ARIOALDUS, ROTHARIS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 625.] Honorius, a native of Campania, and the son of Petronius, a person of distinction, was chosen in the room of Boniface, and ordained on the 27th of October of the present year, after a vacancy of five days only; the exarch, whom the emperor had empowered to confirm the election of the pope, happening to be then at Rome.[3] That power Heraclius had granted to the exarchs of Ravenna, his lieutenants in Italy, that the long vacancies, occasioned by the distance of the emperors, and the inconveniencies attending them, might be thereby removed.[4]

At this time the Lombards, masters of all Italy, except the exarchate of Ravenna, the dukedoms of Rome, Naples, Gaeta, and Amalsi, and the maritime cities of Apulia, Calabria, and Lucania, were at peace with the empire, but at war among themselves. For Adaloaldus having in a fit of lunacy, to which he is said to have been subject, caused twelve of the chief lords of the nation, to be put to death, the rest, thinking it incumbent upon them to provide for their own safety, as well as for that of the kingdom, deposed him, and raised to the throne Arioaldus, duke of Turin, who had married his sister.[5] But Arioaldus, though a person of an unblemished character and distinguished merit, was an Arian; and Adaloaldus not only a good catholic, but a great benefactor to the church. The pope, therefore, espousing the cause of the deposed king with great zeal, left nothing unattempted either with the Lombards or Romans, to get him restored. By his intrigues a civil war was kindled among the Lombards, that threatened the whole nation with utter destruction; some of them favoring the revolution, while others opposed it. Among the former were all the bishops beyond the Po, who, choosing rather to be governed by an Arian, than a lunatic, or madman, had endeavored, it seems, to gain over to their party a lord of great power and anthority in those parts. The pope, therefore, looking upon them as traitors and rebels to the church, as well as to the state, and finding they paid no kind of regard to his exhortations or menaces, wrote at last to the exarch, pressing him to join the lawful king with all the troops under his command, and, having restored him, to cause the bishops, who had favored the heretic, to be sent to Rome, that they might not escape the punishment, which was due to their rebellion and treachery.[1] But the exarch wisely declined engaging in that war; and Arioaldus, in spite of all the attempts and machinations of the pope, continued to reign over the Lombards as long as he lived.

Of Honorius nothing else occurs in history worthy of notice till the year, 634, when he first took part in a dispute, which, at that time, made a great noise in the east. The subject of it was, whether in Christ two wills (two operating wills), the one human, the other divine; and two operations (that is, two kinds of volitions, or acts of willing,) the one proceeding from his human, the other from his divine will; were to be admitted; or one will only, and one operation? Theodorus, bishop of Pharan in Palestine, was the first who gave occasion to that controversy,

[1] Elmakin. ad ann. Hegiræ 6. et ad ann. Hegiræ. 2.
[2] Theoph. ad ann. æræ. Alexandrin. 632.
[3] Vide Pagi ad ann. 625. n. 17. [4] Idem ibid.
[5] Paul Diac. l. 4. c. 5. Sigon. de regn. Ital. ad ann. 623.

[1] Paul. Diac. Sigon de regn. Ital. ed ann. 623. Fredegar, Staimoin. l. 4. c. 10.

The cause of the dispute concerning the will and operations in Christ. The Monothelite doctrine, or the doctrine of one will in Christ, defined by Sergius of Constantinople, in a council held in that city. The emperor, and Cyrus of Phasis, declare for that doctrine.

maintaining, that in Christ the humanity was so united to the divinity, that it did not act of itself, but that all actions proceeded from the word, and were to be ascribed to the word alone; which was supposing the human will in Christ to have been quite absorbed by the divine, the humanity to have been but a mere instrument of the divinity, and the operations to have been all divine. Of that opinion were Sergius and Cyrus, the former at this time patriarch of Constantinople, and the latter of Alexandria; and with them most of the bishops of their patriarchates, who were thence by the Greeks called Monothelites, that is, defenders of one will. Sergius was in his heart a Jacobite,(*) or Eutychian; and the doctrine of one will was entirely agreeable to the doctrine of one nature. As for Cyrus, he received the council of Chalcedon; acknowledged two natures in Christ; but did not think, it seems, the doctrine of one will repugnant to the doctrine of two natures. That opinion he first embraced on the following occasion.

The emperor Heraclius, who was a zealous stickler for the faith of Chalcedon, that is, of the two natures in Christ, and had nothing so much at heart as to see his subjects all united in the same faith, being informed, while he was, on occasion of the Persian war, in the city of Phasis, the metropolis of Lazica or Colchis, that the Eutychians were very numerous in those parts; and that one Paul, a follower of Severus,(†) and thence called by the writers of those times Paul the Severian, was there at the head of that party; he sent for him, flattering himself he might be gained over to the orthodox party, and an union, by his means, be brought about between the catholics and the Eutychians. Paul was as zealous a stickler for the doctrine of Eutyches, as Heraclius was for that of Chalcedon; but, being a man of great craft and address, in the conference which he had with the emperor, he allowed his arguments in favor of two natures to be of great weight; but pretended, at the same time, to be quite at a loss, whether he should admit two wills in Christ, and two operations, as well as two natures, or one will only, and one operation; alleging several reasons, which he said inclined him to think the doctrine of one will to have ever been the doctrine of the church, and the fathers. Cyrus was then bishop of the place; and him the emperor consulted, not caring to determine anything of himself, as he did not well comprehend the meaning of the terms, and was but very little acquainted with the doctrine of the fathers. But Cyrus was as much at a loss what to determine, as the emperor; who thereupon ordered him to write to Sergius, (not to the unerring judge of controversies at Rome); and, having acquainted him with the state of the question, require him, in his name, to deliver his opinion concerning it; and, in particular, to declare, whether he thought it could be gathered from the writings of the fathers, that in Christ there was but one will, and one operation. The gospels were not mentioned, nor so much as thought of; the writings of the fathers having thrust them quite out of doors.

Cyrus wrote, pursuant to the emperor's order;(*) and Sergius, well apprised, that were the doctrine of "one will" admitted, that of "two natures" could hardly be maintained, no sooner received his letter, than, to give the greater weight to his answer, he assembled a council, consisting, no doubt, of bishops, whom he knew to be of the same persuasion with himself; and by all it was with one voice declared, and defined, that "in Christ there was but one will, and one operation." This declaration and definition, as Sergius styled it, was immediately transmitted to Cyrus; and with it the copy of a letter establishing the doctrine of "one will," said to have been written by Mennas of Constantinople to pope Vigilius, and to have been approved by both; nay, and by the fifth council, as containing the true doctrine of the church, and the fathers.[1] The latter was forged on this occasion by Sergius himself, and inserted into the acts of the fifth council, as was afterwards made evidently to appear; neither the heterodox nor orthodox scrupling, in those days, to support with fraud and deceit, what they thought a good cause. However, as neither Cyrus nor the emperor entertained the least suspicion of the faith and sincerity of Sergius, they both fell into the snare; and not only declared, upon his authority, for the doctrine of "one will," and "one operation," but thenceforth spared no pains to get it universally received by the church. It met at first with little or no opposition; the catholic bishops not being, it seems, aware of the tendency of such a doctrine, or not choosing openly to combat an opinion, that had been defined by the patriarch of Constantinople at the head of a coun-

(*) Sergius was a native of Syria; and is said to have been born there of Jacobite parents, and, to have been himself, in his heart, a Jacobite, that is, an Eutychian. For in that province, as well as in Armenia, the Eutychians were known by the name of Jacobites, being so called from one Jacob or James, a Syrian monk, the first who introduced the doctrine of Eutyches into those provinces. It was first preached there in 536, and the Armenians and Syrians profess it to this day. (a)

(a) Phot. in ep. ad Zach. Armen. Patriarch. et Niceph. l. 8. c. 51.

(†) The Eutychians were divided into two sects, the one maintaining the doctrine of Severus concerning the "corruptibility," and the other that of Julian concerning the "incorruptibility" of the body of Christ, as has been related at length elsewhere. (a).

(a) See p. 375, et seq.

(*) The direction of the letter was, "To Sergius, the pastor of pastors, the father of fathers, the universal patriarch." For Phocas being deposed, and his acts all annulled, the bishops of Constantinople resumed the so long disputed title of "universal bishop," and retain it to this day.

[1] Vide Epist. Serg. ad Honor. apud Bar. ad An: 633.

Cyrus translated to the see of Alexandria, confirms it in a council held there. Sophronius opposes the definition of that council. But Sergius confirms it, and enjoins a general silence concerning it. He writes to the pope. The pope approves of his conduct, and declares for the doctrine of one will. Sophronius strives to get the doctrine of one will condemned at Rome.

cil, and was strongly recommended by the emperor. Cyrus distinguished himself above the rest by his zeal in promoting it; and, being, on that consideration, translated by the emperor from the see of Phasis to that of Alexandria, he undertook to establish it in that city and diocese. With that view, as well as with a design, as we are told, to unite the catholics and the Eutychians, who were nearly as numerous in Egypt as the catholics themselves, he convened a great council in the city of Alexandria on the 4th of May, 633. By that council an union was, in the end, brought about between the two parties. But one of the articles of their agreement, the seventh, was, that all men should profess and believe, that "in Christ there was one will only, and one theandric operation;" that is, one kind of operations or volitions proceeding from Christ as God, and as man. For in that dispute, by one operation or volition, as the philosophers style it, was always understood one kind of operations or volitions; the Monothelites allowing different operations in Christ, but pretending, that they were all of the same kind, that they all proceeded from the Divine will, which, they said, had absorbed the human will, in the same manner as the Divine nature had, in the system of the Eutychians and Theopaschites, quite absorbed the human nature.

At the council of Alexandria assisted, amongst the rest, a monk named Sophronius, who not only opposed, with great warmth, the seventh article of that assembly, as rank Eutychianism, and absolutely inconsistent with the doctrine of two natures; but, alleging many passages from the writings of the fathers to show, that they had all acknowledged two wills in Christ, and two operations, threw himself on the ground before Cyrus, begging, with tears in his eyes, that he would not lend his authority to the establishing of a doctrine so plainly repugnant to the doctrine of the church, and the fathers. As Cyrus paid no kind of regard to his repeated prayers, to his reasons and remonstrances, he repaired to Constantinople, as soon as the council broke up, to complain of him to the patriarch, as the author of a doctrine, which, he said, no man, who received the council of Chalcedon, could hold or defend. But the patriarch paid, as we may well imagine, no more regard to his complaints than Cyrus had done; nay, in a letter, which he wrote some time after to Cyrus, he not only commended him for his zeal in restoring the so long wished for tranquillity to the churches of Egypt, but confirmed the articles on which it was grounded, more especially the article establishing one will in Christ, and one operation. However, at the same time he enjoined a general silence concerning the article in dispute; pretending thereby to consult the welfare of the church, and restrain men, who seemed chiefly to delight in strife and contention, from disturbing the union and concord, which Cyrus had taken so much pains to establish, and had in the end so happily established. But his true design was to silence Sophronius, who was now raised to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, and had lately published a writing containing no fewer than six hundred passages out of the fathers, to show that they had all acknowledged two wills in Christ, and two operations, as well as two natures. To render that injunction more effectual, and pre-engage the pope on his side, he wrote, about the same time, a long letter to Honorius, to acquaint him with the state of the question; with the opposition, which the doctrine of the fathers, for so he styled the doctrine of one will, had met with from Sophronius; and with the motives, which he pretended had induced him to impose silence on both parties, on Cyrus as well as Sophronius; namely, to prevent the disturbances, which he was well apprised such a controversy would otherwise raise in the church. He begged the pope to let him know, whether he approved of his conduct, or not; if he did, to concur in the same measures with him; if he did not, to suggest what other more effectual means might occur to his holiness of maintaining the peace and tranquillity of the church. He added, that Cyrus had made it evidently appear from the writings of the fathers, that they had all held the doctrine of one will; and that Sophronius had not been able to produce the testimony of a single father, that seemed in the least to countenance the opposite doctrine.[1]

This letter Honorius immediately answered; and in his answer not only approved of the conduct of Sergius; but declared, in express terms, that he entirely agreed in opinion with him; that he acknowledged but one will in Christ; that none of the fathers had ever openly taught the doctrine of two wills; that as to the operations, no man was authorized either by the scriptures or the councils, to teach the doctrine of one operation, or that of two; that Christ, though true God, and true man, was one, and remaining one operated; but whether the operations should, on that score, be called two or one, was but a trifling and impertinent question, which he left the grammarians to determine. He added, that nevertheless, in matters of faith, we ought carefully to avoid both expressions; lest by using the one, we should be thought to acknowledge only one nature in Christ with the Eutychians, or to own two persons with the Nestorians by using the other.[2]

With this letter Honorius despatched two of his presbyters to Constantinople, who were scarce gone, when he received one from the

[1] Serg. Ep. ad Honor. apud Bar. ad An. 633. p. 314.—317. Syn. 6. Act. 12. Maximin. Ep. ad Petr. Illustr. et Concil. Lateran. Secret. 2.

[2] Concil. 6. Act. 12. et Bar. ibid. p. 317—320.

The pope requires Sophronius to observe the silence enjoined by Sergius. The pope condemns the expression of one opperation, and the expression of two. Honorius grants the title of metropolitan to Paulinus of York, and sends him a pall. He exhorts the Scots to conform to the use of the Roman church, in the celebration of Easter.

new patriarch of Jerusalem, containing a confession of his faith, a learned exposition of the belief of the church concerning the humanity of Christ, and a confutation of the doctrine taught by Sergius and Cyrus, which he maintained to be absolutely inconsistent with the definition of Chalcedon, and the doctrine of the fathers. This letter was delivered to Honorius by Stephen, bishop of Dora in Palestine, whom Sophronius had sent to Rome at the head of a solemn deputation, to acquaint the pope, by word of mouth, with the true state of the controversy, to maintain in his presence the catholic tenet of two wills in Christ, and two operations; and persuade him, if by any means he could, to reject and condemn the opposite doctrine. But the pope had already declared for one will, and approved of the conduct of Sergius in imposing silence both on Sophronius and Cyrus. Instead therefore of hearkening to the reasons or remonstrances of the deputies, and condemning the doctrine, which Sophronius had taken so much pains to confute, he exhorted them to live in peace and concord with their brethren, to observe the silence which Sergius had so wisely enjoined, and even obliged them, before they left Rome, to promise, in the name of their patriarch, that he would thenceforth forbear all mention of two wills in Christ, and two operations, provided Cyrus, in his turn, abstained from all mention of one will, and one operation.[1]

On this occasion the pope wrote a second letter to Sergius, to acquaint him with what had passed between him and the legates of Sophronius, and entreat him to take care, that the injunction, which he himself had thought fit to lay both on Sophronius and Cyrus, should by both be punctually complied with. In that letter he acknowledges one person in Christ, and two distinct natures; but condemns anew the expression of one operation, as well as the expression of two; as having no foundation, either in the councils, or the fathers.[2] He wrote, at the same time, to the other two patriarchs, Sophronius and Cyrus, exhorting them to observe the silence which Sergius had enjoined, and shun all idle disputes and questions, which neither the fathers nor councils had thought fit to determine. And thus far, for the present, of the doctrine of the Monothelites, and the part Honorius acted, when it was first heard of in the west. Of his whole conduct on that occasion, and the judgment which the fathers of the sixth council pronounced against him several years after his death, on account of his conduct, I shall speak in the history of that council, as in a more proper place.

The same year the pope wrote three other letters, namely, one to Edwin, king of Northumberland; another to Honorius of Canterbury,(*) and Paulinus of York; and a third to the Scotch nation. Edwin, having embraced the Christian religion, and laid the foundation of a church at York, where he was baptized, had begged the pope to grant the title of metropolitan to Paulinus, bishop of that city, and send him a pall. The pope, in his answer, acquaints the king that he has complied with his request, congratulates him on his conversion, exhorts him to continue steadfast in the faith he has embraced; and, unmindful of the scripture, recommends to his perusal the works of pope Gregory.[1] In his letter to the two bishops, he exhorts them to acquit themselves as they ought, of their ministry; and lets them know, that at the request of their respective kings (Eadbald and Edwin) he has sent to each of them a pall; and that, when either of them dies, he empowers the survivor, in consideration of their great distance from Rome, to ordain the person who shall be chosen to succeed the deceased, without any farther application to him, or his successors.[2] At this time the Scotch churches disagreed, in the celebration of Easter, with the Roman; and, it seems, with all other catholic churches. For they had, but three years before, that is, in 631, kept that festival on the 21st of April; whereas it was kept, that same year, by the Roman and all other churches, at least in the west, on the 24th of March;[3] and the purport of the pope's letter to them was, to persuade them to relinquish their own, and conform to the usage of the catholic church.[4] But notwithstanding that letter, they still adhered to their ancient practice, however singular; and could not, till many years after, be prevailed upon to change it.(*)

Honorius is said by Anastasius to have repaired many churches, to have built some, to have enriched others with gifts of great value, and to have obtained leave of the emperor Heraclius to take the gilt copper-tiles from the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and cover with them the church of St. Peter.[5] Of this pope nothing else is recorded worthy of no-

[1] Syn. 6. Act. 13. Bar. ad Ann. 633. p. 324.
[2] Syn. 6. Act. 3. Bar. ad Ann. 633. p. 324.

(*) Honorius had succeeded Justus in the see of Canterbury, and had been ordained by Paulinus in the city of Lincoln, about the year 631. For Paulinus had not confined his apostolic labors to the kingdom of Northumberland; but, extending them to the kingdom of Mercia, had preached the gospel in that part of the present Lincolnshire, that borders on the Trent and the Humber; and brought over such numbers to the faith in the city of Lincoln itself, that a church was erected there for the public exercise of the Christian religion: and in that church Honorius was, by Paulinus, ordained archbishop of Canterbury.(a)

(a) Bed. l. 2. c. 18.

[1] Bed. Hist. Angl. l. 2. c. 17. [2] Bed. ibid. c. 18.
[3] Vide Usher. Antiq. Britann. Eccles. p. 482. et 934. et Alford. in Annal. Eccles. Anglo-Sax. Ann. 630. n. 3.
[4] Bed. ibid. c. 12.

(*) The English who had been converted to the Christian religion by the Scots, complied with the practice of the Roman church in the year 664, the Picts in 699, the Scots in 726, and the Britons about the year 800.

[5] Anast. in Honor.

Honorius dies;—[Year of Christ, 638.] Heraclius publishes his famous edict, named the ecthesis. Sergius the true author of the ecthesis. Severinus chosen. What occasioned so long a vacancy.

tice. He died on the 12th of October, 638, having held the see twelve years, eleven months, and sixteen days.

It was in this year, and about the time of the death of Honorius, that the emperor Heraclius published, or rather Sergius published in the emperor's name, the famous edict, stiled the ecthesis or exposition; that edict being an exposition of the faith, which the emperor was there said to profess, and require all his subjects to hold and profess. It begins with an explanation of the catholic faith, concerning the Trinity, entirely orthodox; and, with respect to the mystery of the incarnation, two distinct natures are there acknowledged in Christ against the Eutychians, and one person in opposition to the followers of Nestorius. But as to the will and operations in Christ, the emperor, or rather Sergius, explains himself thus: "We ascribe all the operations in Christ, the human as well as the divine, to the word incarnate. But whether they should be called two, or should be called one, we will suffer none to dispute; and none even to mention either one operation, or two operations; but require all to confess, agreeably to the doctrine of the five general councils, that in Christ every operation, whether human or divine, proceeded from the same incarnate word, without division or confusion: For, though the expression of one operation has been used by some of the holy fathers, yet many are alarmed at that term, apprehending it to be used in opposition to the two natures; while others are no less alarmed at the expression of two operations; an expression, which the fathers have all carefully avoided; as obliging them to acknowledge two disagreeing and opposite wills in Christ; the one consenting to the accomplishment of his passion, and the other declining it. Now, if the wicked Nestorius, who divided the divine humanity of our Lord, and introduced two sons, did not, nevertheless, acknowledge two wills, but one only, even in two persons, how can a catholic, in one person, acknowledge two? We, therefore, confess, agreeably to the doctrine of the apostles, of the councils, and the fathers, but one will in Christ; and believe, that his body, though animated with a rational soul, produced no motion whatever of itself." In the end of the edict, anathemas are thundered against several heretics; and the catholics are all required and exhorted to hold and profess the doctrine thus declared and explained.

To this edict was prefixed the following title: "An exposition of the orthodox faith, made by our most pious lord and great prince Heraclius, on occasion of the controversy concerning the operations in Christ: which exposition the bishops of the patriarchal sees have received, as agreeing in all things with the definitions of the five holy oecumenical councils, and have readily consented to, as establishing in peace the holy churches of God.[1] However, the emperor afterwards disowned it; declaring, in a letter, which he wrote, not long before his death, to pope John IV., that the ecthesis was neither dictated by him, nor published by his order; but that, on his return from the east, that is, from Syria, to the imperial city, he had been persuaded by Sergius to sign it, and suffer it to pass under his name.[2] That letter Heraclius wrote to exculpate himself, when he found the ecthesis was universally condemned in the west, as containing heretical doctrines; and he, as the reputed author of it, branded by all who condemned it, with the opprobious names of heretic and heresiarch. Of the disturbances which this famous edict raised, both in the east and west, I shall speak in the sequel.

SEVERINUS, SEVENTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HERACLIUS,—ROTHARIS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 638.] In the room of Honorius was chosen Severinus, by birth a Roman, and the son of one Labienus. He was elected soon after the death of his predecessor, but not ordained till the 28th of May 640, when the see had been vacant one year, seven months, and seventeen days. What so long a delay was owing to, may be gathered from a letter of the abbot Maximus, who flourished at this time, to another abbot named Thalassius: for in that letter Maximus tells his correspondent, that the apocrisiarii, whom the Roman clergy had sent to Constantinople to acquaint the emperor with the election of Severinus, and beg him to confirm it, had been obliged to continue a long time there, the emperor refusing, at the instigation of the clergy of that city, to comply with their request, till they had promised to persuade their new bishop to sign the ecthesis; which they did in the end, says Maximus, though they never intended to perform so sinful a promise.[3] They did not, it seems, think it sinful to make a promise, which it was sinful to perform. The learned Combifisius will have the ordination of Severinus to have been so long delayed, either because the emperor was indisposed,

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secretario 3. Tom. 6. Concil. p. 83. et Bar. ad Ann. 639. p. 352—354.

[2] Vide Bar. ad Ann. 640. p. 359. et Pagi ad eund. ann. n. V.

[3] Anast. in Collectaneis edit. a Sirmond.

The Lateran palace plundered, and the treasure of the Roman church seized. The election of Severinus confirmed, and he dies soon after. He condemned the Monothelite doctrine.

and could no sooner confirm his election, or because he was unwilling to confirm it, as not being well acquainted with the character of the elect, or his not thinking him equal, on account of his years, to so great a charge.[1] But the letter of Maximus leaves no room for such groundless conjectures; nor would so judicious a writer have ever indulged them, had he perused that piece with the least degree of attention. The exarchs of Ravenna were empowered by Heraclius, for the reasons I have alleged above, to confirm the election of the bishops of Rome, which the other emperors had all reserved to themselves. But Isaacius, at this time exarch, would not confirm the election of Severinus till he had received the ecthesis; nor indeed could he, the emperor having transmitted a copy of that edict to him, and at the same time enjoined him to see it was received by the new bishop of Rome before he issued the decree confirming his election:[2] and it was, without all doubt, upon the exarch's refusing to confirm the election of Severinus, that the Roman clergy applied immediately to the emperor, and sent their apocrisiarii to Constantinople.

While the see still continued vacant, Mauricius the chartulary or keeper of the public registers, fell unexpectedly, with the soldiery and populace, on the Lateran palace, where the treasure of the Roman church was lodged, consisting of money, jewels, and many other things of great value, which, says Anastasius, emperors, patricians, and consuls, had given or bequeathed to St. Peter for the redemption of their souls. But as St. Peter had no occasion for them, the chartulary thought they had better be employed in supplying the exigencies of the state, reduced at that time to a most deplorable condition, than suffered to lie useless in the palace of the bishop, or to be kept there for mere show and parade. Severinus, who, as bishop elect, had taken possession of the palace, and those who were with him, well apprised of the design of Mauricius, withstood him at first with great resolution and vigor. But their courage soon failed them; and they surrendered the third day, when Mauricius, entering the palace with the judges, and those of his council, seized, and carefully sealed up, in their presence, whatever he found valuable in the different apartments. Having thus secured the whole treasure, he sent to acquaint the exarch with what he had done, who thereupon hastened to Rome, where he no sooner arrived, than he banished into different cities all the leading men among the clergy, all the cardinals of the holy Roman church, says Baronius, probably to prevent their stirring up the populace to mutiny and sedition. He then took possession of the palace, and having continued there eight days, searching every room, and every other place, so narrowly, that nothing could escape him, he returned to Ravenna, leaving nothing behind him, but what he did not think worth the trouble of carrying away with him. Part of the treasure the exarch sent to the emperor, who was not at all displeased at it having been seized, though it had not, it seems, been seized by any order from him, or even with his knowledge.[1] But he could not think it a sacrilege, not even unlawful, to employ the superfluous and superabundant wealth of the church in the defence of the state, and consequently of the church too.

In the meantime the apocrisiarii, whom I have mentioned above, returned from Constantinople with the imperial decree confirming the election of Severinus, who was thereupon ordained at last. But he enjoyed his dignity a very short time, only two months, and four days:(*) for he was not ordained until the 28th of May, and he died on the first of August of the same year, and was buried in the church of St. Peter.[2] That Severinus did not receive the ecthesis, nay that he condemned it, and the doctrine it contained, appears from the confession of faith, which the bishops of Rome were required to make at the time of the sixth general council. For in that confession they professed to receive, and promised to observe, the decrees of Severinus, John, Theodorus, and Martin, pontiffs of the Roman see, against the late doctrine of one will in Christ, and one operation.[3] Severinus therefore must have condemned the doctrine of one will, as well as the other popes mentioned in that confession, and condemned it in council, since, in his days, the popes had not yet taken upon them, as is agreed on all hands,[4] to issue any decrees in points of faith, but in councils.

[1] Combif. in hist. hæres. Monoth. disput. 1. n. 11, 12.
[2] Cyril. ep. ad Serg. in Concil. Lateran. Secret. 3. et apud Bar. ad ann. 639. p. 351.

[1] Anast. in Severin.
(*) Baronius, or perhaps his amanuensis, mistaking the Roman numbers II., for the Arabic ciphers in the copy of Anastasius, which he perused, supposes Severinus to have held the see, according to that writer, eleven months and four days. But in all, or almost all the other manuscripts, as well as printed copies of Anastasius, Severinus is said, without either figures or ciphers, to have sat "menses duos, dies quator." This blunder or oversight has obliged the annalist to depart from Anastasius in computing the years of all the succeeding popes, and to be guided, in point of chronology, by his own, for the most part, quite groundless conjectures.
[2] Anast. in Severin.
[3] Diurn. Rom. Pontific. c. 3. tit. 6.
[4] Vide Bellarmin. in Ep. ad Clement. VIII. in Hist. de Auxiliis, t. 1. p. 325. Garner. in Not. ad Diurnum Roman Pontif.

John IV. chosen. Some Scotch bishops write to Rome concerning the celebration of Easter. The Scots had long disagreed in that point with the Roman church. The Scots and Irish no Quartodecimans.

JOHN IV., SEVENTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[HERACLIUS, CONSTANTINE, HERACLEONAS, CONSTANS,—ROTHARIS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 640.] Severinus was succeeded by John the IVth of that name, a native of Dalmatia, the son of one Venantius, and arch-deacon of the Roman church.[1] He was chosen by the people with one consent, but not ordained, though chosen a few days after the death of his predecessor, until the 24th of December of the present year, when the see had been vacant four months, and twenty-four days. During that interval a letter was received at Rome from some bishops, presbyters, and abbots of the Scotch nation,(*) concerning the controversy about the time of celebrating Easter, and likewise to inform the pope, that the Pelagian heresy began to revive in that kingdom. The letter was directed to Severinus; but he being dead, and the new pope not yet confirmed by the emperor, and consequently not ordained, nor true pope, it was opened, and answered by those, who governed the Roman church during the vacancy of the see, namely, the archpriest, the archdeacon, the primicerius, or chief of the notaries, and a fourth, who styles himself only "servant of God, and counsellor of the apostolic see."[2](†) The purport of their letter was, to convince the Scots of their error concerning the time of keeping the Easter festival, and stir them up to an abhorrence of the Pelagian heresy. As they called the practice, that obtained among the Scots, with respect to the celebration of Easter, a new heresy among them, which some of their province endeavoured to introduce and establish; Bede thence takes occasion to observe, that such a practice had been then, that is, in 640, but very lately introduced into that nation; and that it was only adopted by some, and not by the whole nation.[1] The same historian having[2] elsewhere related the death of Edwin, king of Northumberland, which happened, according to him, in the year 633, adds, "and at that time the error of the Quartodecimans was received among the Scots." But in that particular the venerable historian was certainly mistaken; nay, and contradicts himself; for he tells us in another place, that the practice, which obtained among the Scots in the celebration of Easter, had been observed by them ever since the time of Columba, who from Ireland brought it into Scotland in the year 560.[3] So that in 640, it had already obtained among the Scots, according to Bede himself. for the space of seventy-five years, and consequently was not then a new heresy among them, nor could it be said to have been but very lately introduced.(*) Besides, the practice of the Scots and Irish was very different from that of the Quartodecimans. The latter kept Easter with the Jews, that is, on the 14th of the first moon after the vernal equinox, without any regard to the day of the week; whereas the Scots and Irish, as we learn from Bede himself,[4] deferred it to the first day of the week, when the 14th of the first moon after the vernal equinox happened to fall on any other day. However, when the 14th of that moon fell on a Sunday, they did not wait until the Sunday following, as had been prescribed by the council of Nice; and it was perhaps on that account that their practice was by the Roman clergy called an heresy. As for the other observation of Bede, that the said practice was adopted by some, and not by the whole Scotch nation; we read of no disagreement among them concerning that point, whereas frequent instances occur

[1] Anast. Platin. &c.

(*) The letter was probably written and signed by the five bishops, the five presbyters, and the abbot Saranus, who are all mentioned by name in the answer.

[2] Bed. l. 2. c. 19.

(†) The Roman church was governed, during the vacancy of the see, only by the three former, unless one of them was chosen pope, as it happened at this time; and in that case a fourth was added. If the elect was not one of the three before his election, he was not added to them after it, his election giving him no power or authority whatever, till it was confirmed by the emperor, or the exarch. If he was one of the three, and only archdeacon, he still yielded the first place to the archpriest. Thus in the answer, that was returned at this time to the Scots, the archpriest Hilarius is named in the first place, and John, notwithstanding his election, in the second, as being only archdeacon; but with this addition, "In the name of God, elect;" "Joannes diaconus, et in Dei nomine electus." When the pope died, the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the primicerius were immediately to take upon them the administration, and give notice of his death to the exarch. The form of the direction they were to use, when they wrote to the exarch on that occasion, or when they acquainted him with the election of the new pope, is thus prescribed in the journal of the Roman pontiffs: "Domino excellentissimo atque præcellentissimo, et a Deo nobis longæviter in principalibus ministeriis feliciter conservando, III. Exconsuli, patricio et exarcho Italiæ, III. Archipresbyter, III. Archidiaconus, III. Primicerius notariorum, servantes locum sanctæ sedis apostolicæ."(a) It is to be observed, that III, was anciently a mark for the name, as the letter N is in our days. The three above-mentioned dignitaries governed the Roman church, not only on the death, but in the absence of the pope.

(a) Diurn. Rom. Pontif. tit. 1

[1] Bed. l. 2. c. 19. [2] Idem l. de sex ætat.

[3] Idem l. 3. c. 4. et l. 4. c. 4.

(*) The learned Usher thinks the practice of the Scots and Irish might have been called by the Roman clergy a new heresy or error, and said by Bede to have been revived among them in the year 633, because in that year a council was held in Ireland, by which it was anew approved and enjoined.(a) The Scotch bishops and clergy probably gave an account of that council in the letter, which they wrote to Severinus.

(a) See Ush. Antiquit. Britann. Eccles. p. 482.

[4] Bed. l. 3. c. 25.

The ecthesis condemned by the new pope;—[Year of Christ, 641.] The ecthesis confirmed by Pyrrhus, of Constantinople; who charges Honorius with having held the same doctrine. The pope strives to excuse his predecessor.

of their disputing on that head, and quarreling with the Roman missionaries, and those who had been converted and instructed by them: and thence we may well conclude, that such a practice was adopted, not by some only, but, at least, by the far greater part of the Scotch nation, if not (which indeed is most probable) by the whole nation. Besides, the Scotch nation would never have been said, as it generally is, to have differed, in the celebration of Easter, from all others, had some only of that nation thus differed. It is not therefore "evident, that the more sound, the better, and the greater part of the Scotch nation conformed, from the beginning, to the Roman practice," as has been confidently advanced by the Jesuit Alford in his annals of the Anglo-Saxon church.[1]

The new pope was no sooner confirmed by the exarch, and ordained, than assembling in council the bishops, who were immediately subject to his see, he solemnly condemned, with their approbation and consent, the ecthesis, anathematizing, at the same time, the doctrine of one will in Christ, and one operation, as evidently repugnant to the catholic faith, to the doctrine of the fathers, to the definition of Chalcedon establishing in Christ two distinct natures, and consequently two distinct operations.[2] A copy of the acts of this council the pope caused to be immediately transmitted to Constantinople, signed by himself, and the bishops who were present, hoping he should thereby check the progress which the new doctrine, or heresy, was making daily in the east. But Pyrrhus, who in 639, had succeeded Sergius in the see of Constantinople, had already not only received the ecthesis, but confirmed in a council the doctrine it contained as the true and genuine doctrine of the apostles, of the fathers, and of the catholic church.[3] Instead therefore of paying any sort of regard to the authority of the pope or his council, he expressed, in a letter which he wrote on that occasion to the pope, no small surprise at his having condemned a doctrine, which, he said, his predecessor Honorius had received, taught, and approved. At the same time he caused the two letters, which Honorius had written to Sergius concerning the doctrine of one will,[4] to be transcribed and sent to all the chief bishops in the east, appealing to them, whether or not pope Honorius had approved, by the authority of the apostolic see, the doctrine, which his successor had, by the authority of the same see, rejected and condemned. This was sapping the very foundation of the papal authority; and the charge was too well grounded to admit of a satisfactory answer. The pope, however, sensible that the reputation of his see was at stake, as well as that of his predecessor and his own, undertook to answer it in the best manner he could, maintaining in a long letter, or rather an apology, which he addressed to the emperors Constantine and Heracleonas, who had succeeded their father Heraclius in the empire,(*) that Honorius

[1] Alford, ad ann. 639.
[2] Theoph. ad Ann. Heracl. 20. et Act. S. Maximi apud Bar. ad Ann. 640.
[3] Concil. t. 4. Edit. Labbe. p. 214. et. t. 5. p, 1697.
[4] See p. 434, 435.

(*) Heraclius died on the 11th of February, 641, having reigned thirty years, four months, and six days.(a) He was engaged a great part of his reign in war with the Persians, which he carried on with surprising success. For though upon his accession to the crown, he found the empire overrun by several barbarous nations, the exchequer quite drained, the military discipline decayed, and the army consisting of raw and inexperienced levies, that scarce deserved the name of soldiers; there being, in the whole army, only two soldiers alive, when he came to the crown, who had served under Mauricius, though he came to the crown but seven years after the death of that prince;(b) he reduced, notwithstanding all these disadvantages, that powerful nation, by the many victories he gained over them, to so low a condition, that they were never afterwards capable of attempting any memorable exploit, nor even of defending themselves, when attacked by the Saracens. But the glory which he acquired in the war with the Persians, he forfeited in that which he waged with the Saracens, who, breaking into the Roman dominions in his time, made themselves masters of some of the best provinces of the empire. As I shall have frequent occasion to mention that people, a succinct account of them here will not, I presume, be thought foreign to the subject in hand. As to their origin, they are commonly supposed to be the offspring of those Arabs, who being descended from Ishmael, the son of Agar, were thence called Ishmaelites and Agarenians: for both these names are given indifferently to the Saracens, by the ancient writers. The name of Saracens they are said by some to have taken, to conceal the meanness of their origin, as if Ishmael their progenitor were the son of Sarah the wife, and not of Agar the handmaid of Abraham. But others more probably derive that appellation from Sarac, the name of one of the best provinces in the country they possessed.(c) They were always a warlike people, being seldom at peace with one another, or with the neighboring nations. Some of them lived in towns and villages; others, having no fixed habitation, lived in tents, and removed from one part of the country to another. They were famous for breeding horses, and excelled all other nations in the use of bows, swords, and lances. Before the time of Mahomet they were subject to different petty kings, or princes, and professed different religions, some the Jewish, and some the Christian, but the far greater part of the nation were pagans. The Christian religion was planted among them as early as the fourth century; for we read of a bishop sent into their country about the year 380, at the request of a queen of their nation, named Mavia.(d) But to Mahomet they all submitted, a very inconsiderable number of Christians excepted, or were forced to submit, and, receiving his law, acknowledged him for their sole monarch, as well as their prophet. And such was the rise of that empire, which in process of time, became so formidable. Under Mahomet they lived in peace with the Romans, as has been observed above,(e) but the very year after his death, they became irreconcilable enemies to the Roman name. This enmity is differently accounted for by the historians. Theophanes writes, that an eunuch, whom Heraclius had appointed to distribute a largess among the soldiery, having excluded the Saracens, who had served in the imperial army, from their share of the largess, as deserving rather to be treated like dogs than like men, the whole nation resented the insult, swore revenge, and, flying to arms, broke into the empire.(f) But

(a) Niceph. p. 18. Chron. Orient. p. 60.
(b) Theoph. in Vit. Heracl.
(c) Chron. Orient. Echell. c. 5. Elmakin. in hist. Saracen. l. 1. Soz. l. 6.
(d) See Henschen. in vit. Moys. Episc. Saracenor.
(e) See p. 431.
(f) Theoph. ad Ann. Alexandrin. 622. Sigebert. in Chron.

never had acknowledged but one will in Christ, and never had approved of that doctrine. He begins the letter, or apology, with acquainting the emperor, that he daily received advice from all parts, informing him, that the whole east was offended and scandalized at the letters, which his brother, the patriarch Pyrrhus, spread abroad, teaching a new doctrine, repugnant to the catholic faith, and pretending that pope Honorius, of holy memory, had held that opinion. He then undertakes to clear his predecessor from so black a calumny, as he styles it, and so groundless an imputation, and proceeds thus: "Our predecessor, having been informed by the patriarch Sergius, of venerable memory, that some taught there were two contrary wills in Christ, answered, that Christ was perfect God, and perfect man; but that he alone, as he came to restore human nature, was conceived and born without sin, and therefore had not two contrary wills, the will of the flesh never opposing in him, or combatting that of the spirit. We indeed have all these two wills, as we have all been conceived and born in sin; and the one frequently withstands and contradicts the other. But our Lord took one will only, and that entirely subject to him as to God, whom all things obey. This doctrine my predecessor taught, and no other. But from his teaching, that there were not in Christ, as there are in us, two contrary wills, the will of the flesh, and that of the spirit, some misunderstanding his meaning, or pretending to misunderstand it, have concluded, that he admitted but one will in Christ as God, and as man." Surely the pope was better acquainted with the subject of the letters that passed between Sergius and Honorius, than to think, that the question was, what he would here make the emperor believe it to have been, whether two contrary wills were to be admitted in Christ, the one of the flesh, the other of the spirit. He could not but know, that the dispute was not whether in Christ, only as man two wills were to be admitted, but whether two were to be admitted in Christ as God and man, the one human and the other divine, and in consequence of these two wills, two distinct operations or acts of willing. That was, as is evident from the letter of Sergius, and the answer of Honorius,[1] the subject of the dispute; and in that dispute Sergius declared for one will, and so did Honorius, openly protesting, that he agreed with Sergius, and with him acknowledged one will in Christ, "unam fatemur voluntatem Domini nostri Jesu Christi;" and, "hæc nobiscum fraternitas vestra prædicet, sicut et ea vobiscum unanimiter prædicamus."[2] Had he acknowledged but one will in Christ only as man, he had not agreed with Sergius maintaining, that there was but one will in Christ as God and as man; and his answer had been quite impertinent and foreign to the purpose. But I shall have occasion to resume this subject hereafter.

The pope in the next place undertakes to confute the doctrine of the Monothelites; and argues thus: "If we are to admit but one will in Christ, as God and as man, which of the two must we admit? the human only, or only the divine? If the human, it will thence follow, that Christ was not perfect God; if the divine, that he was not perfect man. For he could not be perfect man without the

Nicephorus tells us, that the Saracens being forbidden by Heraclius to export any commodities out of the empire, though purchased with the money which he paid them yearly, to the amount of thirty pounds weight of gold, they were highly provoked at such a prohibition, and supposing it to have been suggested to the emperor by Sergius, then governor of Syria, they fell unexpectedly upon that province, and having seized the governor, put him to a most miserable death, by sewing him up alive in a camel's skin.(a) This happened in 633; and the following year a numerous body of Saracens, sent into Palestine by Abubacharus, as Theophanes calls him, or Abubeker, as he is called by Elmakin; the successor of Mahomet in the newly founded empire, took and plundered several cities, laid waste the country far and near, and having cut in pieces the Roman general, who came to oppose them, with all his men, returned home loaded with booty.(b) The same year Abubeker died, and was succeeded by Omar the third caliph or emperor of the Saracens. Under him they invaded Syria anew in 635, defeated Bahanes the imperial general; took Damascus, and having made themselves masters of all Phœnice, advanced from thence into Egypt; but Cyrus, bishop of Alexandria, engaging, in the name of the people, to pay them an annual tribute, they were thereby prevailed upon to spare the country, and retire. From Egypt they marched into Palestine, besieged Jerusalem, and reduced that city in 637, after a two years' siege.(c) The following year they completed the conquest of Syria by the reduction of Antioch, the metropolis of that province; and either in that or the preceding year made themselves masters of Medecina or Medecinum, and the whole treasure of the Persian kings lodged in that city, "and consisting," says Elmakin, "of ter millies mille millia aureorum."(d) In the mean time Heraclius not approving of the agreement between the Saracens and Cyrus, and the Egyptians thereupon refusing to pay the stipulated tribute; the Saracens returned into Egypt, and having defeated with great slaughter, and put to flight the imperial army, first reduced Memphis, and afterwards Alexandria, the metropolis of that ancient kingdom, having lost in the siege of the latter place, which lasted fourteen months, twenty-two thousand men. Alexandria being thus reduced, the whole country submitted to the conquerors. The loss of Egypt, which had continued subject to the empire ever since the time of Augustus, happened, according to Elmakin,(e) in the 20th year of the Hegira, of the Christian era 641st, and the first of the emperor Constantine, Heraclius dying some months before the reduction of Alexandria. Such was the rise of the empire of the Saracens, and such their first conquests. Heraclius was unquestionably one the best generals the empire had to boast of; and scarcely ever failed of success when he commanded in person. But after the many signal victories he had gained over the Persians he looked upon the Saracens, a people till his time obscure and inglorious, as an enemy to be despised rather than feared; and therefore instead of heading his armies himself, he trusted the command to men not at all equal to that trust, till the flower of his troops were cut off, and the rest so disheartened by their frequent losses, as to fly at the very sight of the enemy. Thus we may well account for the great advantages which the Saracens gained in his time, without recurring, with the ecclesiastical writers, to any judgment upon him for his having countenanced the Monothelites, or married his niece.

(a) Niceph. in Breviar. p. 16.
(b) Theoph. ad Ann. Alexandrin. 624. Elmak. ad Ann. Hegir. 13.
(c) Theoph. ad Ann. Alex. 627. Elmakin. ad Ann. Hegir. 16.
(d) Elmakin. ad Ann. Hegir. 10. Theoph. ad Ann. Alex. 627. (e) Elmakin. ad ann. Hegir. 20.

[1] See p. 434, 435. [2] Ibid. et Bar. ad Ann. 633. p. 318.

The ethesis revoked by the emperor. John dies;—[Year of Christ, 642.] Theodore chosen. Paul of Constantinople sends him his confession of faith;—[Year of Christ, 643.]

human, nor perfect God without the divine will. If the human will is said to have been absorbed by the divine will, the human nature too must necessarily be said to have been absorbed by the divine nature; for where there is one will, there can be but one nature. And thus we come in the end to agree with the Eutychians, and to hold a doctrine so often condemned by the church, and the fathers." On this argument great stress was laid by all, who argued or wrote against the Monothelites, as the most obvious, the most easy to be understood, and the most unanswerable by those of that sect, who received the doctrine of Chalcedon, or that of two distinct natures in Christ. The pope closes his letter with earnestly entreating the two emperors, as the protectors and guardians of the true faith, to cause the writing (meaning the ecthesis,) which he was informed had been lately issued against the council of Chalcedon, and set up in the most public places of the imperial city, to be taken down, and publicly torn, or consigned to the flames.[1]

Constantine, who was a catholic prince, and heir, as Zonaras informs us, to the empire, but not to the wicked opinions of his father, did not live long enough to satisfy the pope, or even to return an answer to his letter. But Constans his son and successor(*) is said by Eutychius to have answered it, and to have acquainted the pope in his answer, that agreeably to the "excellent command of his holiness, he had caused the writing, containing calumnies against Leo the holy patriarch of Rome, and the council of Chalcedon, to be taken down, and consigned to the flames."[1] But the authority of that writer is by no means to be relied on; and in this very place he confounds Constantine Pogonatus the son of Constans with Constans himself, ascribing to Pogonatus the answer to the pope's letter, and not to his father Constans, by whom alone it could have been written, Pogonatus not being yet born at the time it is supposed to have been written. However, from the letter which pope Theodore, the successor of John, wrote immediately after his election to Paul the successor of Pyrrhus in the see of Constantinople, it appears, that the emperor revoked the Ecthesis: for in that letter the pope complains of the new patriarch for not causing the writing to be taken down, which had been publicly set up in the imperial city, though the emperor had been pleased to repeal it.[2]

The pope spent the remaining part of the short time he lived in collecting relics, in building, repairing, or embellishing churches, and, what is far more commendable, in redeeming the unhappy Christians, whom the Slavi or Sclavi(*) had carried into captivity.[3] He had learnt, it seems, from what had happened in the vacancy preceding the late pontificate thus to employ, and not to hoard up, as Honorius had done, the wealth of the church. He died on the 11th of October 642, having set in the chair one year, nine months, and eleven days,[4] and was buried in the Vatican.

THEODORE, SEVENTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANS.—ROTHARIS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 642.] John was succeeded by Theodore, a native of Jerusalem, and the son of a bishop of the same name. He was ordained on the 24th of November, 642, after a vacancy only of one month, and thirteen days;[2] a plain proof, that the election of the pope was still confirmed by the exarch. For the decree of the election of Theodore could not, in so short a time, have been sent to Constantinople, and the imperial decree, confirming it, brought from that city to Rome. His election was no sooner known at Constantinople, than Paul, the new patriarch, sent to him, according to custom, as he did, without doubt, to the bishops of the other great sees, his confession of faith. Paul had been advanced to the patriarchal dignity, by

[1] Anast. in Collectaneis.

(*) Heraclius bequeathed the empire to Constantine and Heracleonas, his two sons; the former by Eudocia, and the latter by Martina his sister's daughter. Constantine outlived his father only one hundred and three days, says Theophanes, (*a*) and consequently must have died on the 25th of May, 641, since the death of Heraclius happened on the 11th of February of that year. Upon the death of Constantine, Heracleonas took Martina, by whom his brother is said to have been poisoned, for his partner in the empire. But they had scarce reigned six months, when the senate, highly dissatisfied with their administration and conduct, deposed them; and having caused his nose to be cut off, and her tongue to be pulled out, sent them both into exile, and proclaimed in their room Constans the son of Constantine, and grandson of Heraclius. (*a*)

(*a*) Theoph. ad Ann. Alex. 638.

(*b*) Idem ibid. et Niceph. in Chron. p. 18. Zonar. Cedren. &c.

[2] Anast. in Theodor.

[1] Eutych. Annal. Edit. Oxon. t. 2. p. 335.

[2] Anast. in Collectan. p. 50.

(*) The Slavi or Sclavi came originally from the banks of the Borysthenes in the European Sarmatia, passed the Danube in the reign of Justinian, (*a*) and breaking into Illyricum, made themselves masters, in process of time, of the western part of that province between the Drave and the Save, which from them took, and still retains, the name of Sclavonia. They made frequent inroads into the neighboring provinces, especially in the reign of Heraclius, while that prince was engaged in war with the Persians, and carried off great numbers of captives.

(*a*) Procop. de Bell. Goth. l. 3.

[3] Anast. in Joan. IV. [4] Anast. ibid.

The pope supposes Paul orthodox in his belief, but finds fault with him in other respects. His charges against Pyrrhus. A modest proposal of the pope. The ecthesis received by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

the emperor Constans, in the room of Pyrrhus, who, being generally suspected, and, it seems, not without reason, as if he had been privy to the death of the emperor Constantine, had thought it advisable to abandon his see, and save himself by flight from the fury of the incensed populace, and the judgment of the Senate. Paul's confession, or synodical letter, as it was called, has not reached our times; but from the pope's answer it appears, that though he was a no less zealous Monothelite than his two immediate predecessors, Sergius and Pyrrhus, he passed himself upon his holiness for a true catholic, for one whose belief was entirely orthodox. "The hearts of men," says the pope in his answer, "are purified by faith; and you have shown by your letter, that the streams of your faith flow from the purest fountains; that you preach what we preach, that you believe what we believe, and teach what we teach." But notwithstanding the supposed orthodoxy of his faith, the pope finds great fault with his conduct in other respects, and reproaches him in a friendly manner with not having yet ordered the scandalous writing to be taken down from the gates of the great church (meaning the etchesis) and with suffering himself to be ordained in the room of a bishop not lawfully deposed. "As your faith is orthodox, (says he,) I should be glad to know, why you, my brother, have not yet ordered the writing to be taken down, which has given so great offence to all true catholics? If you condemn it, how can you suffer it to remain exposed to public view on the very gates of your church? If you receive and approve it, which heaven avert, why have you not ingenuously owned what you truly believe? Do you believe what you are afraid or ashamed to own you believe? We have indeed been greatly surprised to find the title of *Most Holy* bestowed on Pyrrhus by the bishops who ordained you, in their letter to us. They inform us, that Pyrrhus has abandoned his see on account of the public disturbances, and the hatred of the people. But can the public disturbances, can the hatred of the people, deprive a bishop of his episcopal dignity? I must let you know, beloved brother, that I have been some time in suspense with myself whether I should receive your letter now, and acknowledge you for my fellow-bishop, or wait until Pyrrhus was lawfully deposed. For so long as he lives, and is not fairly tried and condemned, a dangerous division may arise in the church. You must therefore, to secure your own ordination, assemble a council of the neighboring bishops, and judge him with them according to the canons. It is not necessary that he should be present, since you have his writings, and his crimes are notorious." The crimes he specifies, and reduces the charge against Pyrrhus to the following articles: I. He bestowed great commendations on the emperor Heraclius, who had anathematized the catholic doctrine, and the orthodox fathers. II. He approved and signed a scandalous writing, containing a pretended symbol, or confession of faith. III. He surprised some bishops into an approbation of the same pretended symbol, and persuaded them to sign it. IV. He caused that writing, though evidently repugnant to the council of Chalcedon, to be publicly set up in the imperial city, as the only rule of faith. These are the crimes, for which Pyrrhus ought, in the opinion of the pope, to have been not only divested of the episcopal dignity, but even of the priesthood, and reduced to the state of a layman.[1] As to his conspiring against the emperor, and being accessory to his death, as was generally supposed, and is positively affirmed by Theophanes, that was but a venial sin, not worthy of notice, when compared with his commending Heraclius, and receiving the ecthesis. The pope closes his letter with the following proposal, namely, "That if the judging Pyrrhus at Constantinople was likely to be attended with, or prevented by, any public disturbances, he might be sent to Rome to be judged there, and punished according to his deserts by him and his council."[2] A modest demand indeed, that a bishop of Constantinople should be sent to Rome to be judged, condemned, and deposed there by the pope, and his council! But at this time Pyrrhus had fled in disguise from Constantinople, and nothing was alleged against him by the pope but what Paul approved of, though thought at Rome to be quite orthodox in his belief. At the same time the pope wrote to the bishops, who had ordained the new patriarch, congratulating them on the election and ordination of so worthy and deserving a prelate, and yet finding fault with their conduct in ordaining him before his predecessor, guilty of so many enormous crimes (the crimes mentioned above) was lawfully condemned and deposed.[3]

The patriarch paid no kind of regard, as we may well imagine, to the advice of the pope; nay, instead of assembling a council to judge Pyrrhus, to condemn and depose him for countenancing the Monothelites, and their doctrine, he confirmed that doctrine in a council assembled for that purpose; ordered the ecthesis to be kept on the gates of the great church, that all might know what they ought, and what they were to believe; and would suffer no bishop or presbyter to be ordained, within the limits of his extensive jurisdiction, who had not previously received it, and solemnly declared his assent to the doctrine it contained. His example was followed by the two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and the ecthesis by that means universally received in three of the great patriarchates, as the only rule of faith with respect

[1] Anast. in Collect. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Idem ibid.

The ecthesis rejected and condemned by the bishops of Cyprus, who write to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 644.] The ecthesis universally condemned in the west, especially in Africa. The African bishops write to the pope and the emperor in favor of the doctrine of two wills. Victor, the new bishop of Carthage, acquaints the pope with his promotion. He acknowledges no power in the pope but what was common with him to all bishops. The abbot Maximus a zealous advocate for the doctrine of two wills.

to the mystery of the incarnation. In Palestine it was received by some, and rejected by others; which gave rise to a schism among the bishops of that province; those who received it, acknowledging, and those, who did not receive it, refusing to acknowledge Sergius of Joppa, a most zealous Monothelite, who, upon the death of Sophronius, has intruded himself into the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, and usurped a patriarchal power and authority over the bishops and churches of Palestine. In the island of Cyprus the bishops joined all to a man against the ecthesis, condemned it with one voice in a council held there under Sergius their primate, (for the primate of Cyprus was autocephalus, or subject to no patriarch,) and wrote a long letter to pope Theodore to complain of Paul of Constantinople for holding and promoting to the utmost in his power, an opinion plainly repugnant to the faith of Chalcedon, and the repeated decrees of St. Peter and his see. Their letter was directed "to Theodore the most holy and blessed father of fathers, archbishop, and universal pope;"[1] and no less pompous titles were given to the bishops of Constantinople by those of their party.[2]

In the west the ecthesis was universally condemned; and the bishops of Africa distinguished themselves above the rest by their zeal for the opposite doctrine. The three primates of Numidia, Byzacene, and Mauritania, not satisfied with anathematizing the doctrine of one will in the councils they held in their respective provinces, wrote a letter in common to the pope, exhorting him not only to anathematize that impious doctrine, but to cut off from the communion of the church all who maintained it, even their common brother, Paul of Constantinople, if, being admonished, he did not repair, by a speedy repentance, the scandal he had given. They wrote at the same time two other letters; one to Paul of Constantinople, exhorting him to renounce the impious doctrine, which they were informed he taught and professed, and to cause the scandalous writing to be taken down, which they heard, with great concern, was still kept, by his order, exposed to public view on the gates of the chief church of the imperial city. The other letter they wrote to the emperor, entreating him, as the protector and defender of the church, and the catholic faith, to maintain that faith pure and undefiled, and restrain, by his royal authority, the patriarch from teaching any other, and leading astray the numerous flock committed to his care.[3] With these letters the African bishops proposed sending a solemn deputation to Constantinople; but all intercourse being in the mean time cut off between Africa and Constantinople by the revolt of Gregory, governor of that province, they sent their letters to the pope to be transmitted by him to the imperial court. The bishops likewise of the proconsular province, or the province of Carthage, assembling in that city, acknowledged in Christ two natures, two wills, and two distinct operations, condemned with one voice the opposite doctrine, by whomsoever taught and maintained; and wrote a long letter, much to the same purpose with that of the other three councils, to Paul of Constantinople, styling him nevertheless, their most blessed, honorable, and holy brother.[1]

About this time died Fortunatus of Carthage; and Victor, who was chosen in his room, had no sooner taken possession of the see, than by a solemn deputation, at the head of which was Mellosus, bishop of Gisippe, he acquainted the pope with his promotion, declaring in the letter which he wrote on that occasion, his inviolable attachment to the doctrine of the fathers, and an utter abhorrence of that, which, in opposition to them, was taught and countenanced by his brother and fellow bishop, Paul of Constantinople. The other African bishops had addressed the pope in a style quite unbecoming men of their rank and dignity, calling him "the father of fathers. and the high pontiff of all bishops;" had extolled without reserve or discretion the power and authority of the apostolic see, and magnified beyond all bounds the pretended privileges and rights of that see. But the new primate, to prevent, as it were, the pope from taking advantage of, or founding any claim upon the indiscreet and unguarded expressions of his fellow bishops, addressed him only as his brother; and in his letter told him, in plain terms, that the blessed apostles had all an equal share of honor and power, "omnes beatissimi apostoli pari honoris ac potestatis consortio præditi:"[2] which was telling him in other words, that he could claim no honor or power as the successor of St. Peter, but what was common with him to the other bishops, as the successors of the other apostles.

It was chiefly by means of an abbot named Maximus, a man famous at this time for his learning and piety, and a most zealous stickler for the doctrine of two wills, that the African bishops were brought thus unanimously to declare for that, and to condemn, in the manner we have seen, the opposite doctrine. Maximus, of whom we shall have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel, was descended of an ancient and illustrious family in Constantinople, and had been many years employed by Heraclius as his private secretary, and trusted with affairs of the greatest importance. But when that emperor, declaring for the doctrine of one will, took the Monothelites

[1] Apud Bar. ad Ann. 643. p. 365, 366. et Concil. Lateran. Secret. 2.
[2] See. p. 433. note (*) [3] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 2.

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 2.
[2] Idem ibid. et Baron. ad Ann. 646. p. 380.

The African bishops first gained over by Maximus. Pyrrhus of Constantinople, and Maximus, form two opposite parties in Africa. Public dispute between the two antagonists. Pyrrhus pretending to be overcome, abjures the doctrine of one will, first in Africa, and afterwards at Rome. The pope writes to Paul of Constantinople; —[Year of Christ, 647.] His answer to the pope.

under his protection, he resigned his employment, and bidding, at the same time, farewell to the court and the world, withdrew to a monastery in the city of Chrysopolis, where he had not been long, when he was by the monks, for his eminent virtues, appointed their abbot. But in the mean time the Monothelite party growing daily more powerful in the east, he resolved to abandon his native country, and retire to the west to alarm the bishops in those parts against the new doctrine, and prevent by that means their being brought by surprise to receive it; no pains being spared by Pyrrhus, then patriarch of Constantinople, to gain over to that party the western bishops. Pursuant to that resolution, Maximus, quitting his solitude, went first into Africa, where he had been but a very short time, when Pyrrhus, who had abandoned his see, and fled from Constantinople, arrived in that province. As Pyrrhus was a no less zealous advocate for the doctrine of one will, than Maximus was for the doctrine of two, and both were men of great parts and address, they soon formed two opposite parties, to the great disturbance of the whole province. Hereupon the bishops, who till their arrival in Africa either had not heard of that controversy, or had not thought fit to concern themselves with it, applied to Gregory, then governor of the province, begging he would no longer suffer either Pyrrhus or Maximus to preach such abstruse doctrines to the ignorant multitude, but oblige them to dispute the points, about which they disagreed, in his and their presence, that the state of the question being thoroughly known, as well as the reasons and arguments for and against the two opposite opinions, they might be capable of judging which was the best grounded, and consequently which ought to be received, and which rejected.

The proposal was readily agreed to by Gregory, and no less readily by the two antagonists, who thereupon entered the lists in the presence of the bishops, and the nobility, assembled from all parts on purpose to hear them. The whole dispute was carefully taken down by the public notaries; and several very ancient manuscript copies of it are still to be seen in the Vatican library, under the following title: "The question concerning an ecclesiastical dogma, that was disputed before the most pious patrician Gregory, in an assembly of the most holy bishops, and the nobility, by Pyrrhus patriarch of Constantinople, and the most reverend monk Maximus, in the month of July, the third indiction; Pyrrhus defending the new dogma of one will in Christ, wickedly introduced by himself and his predecessor Sergius; and Maximus maintaining the doctrine of the apostles, and the fathers, as delivered to us from the beginning." It was translated into Latin by the Jesuit Turriano; and his translation, with the Greek original in the opposite column, is to be found at the end of the eighth volume of Baronius' Annals, where it takes up twenty-eight pages in folio. The subject of the dispute was metaphysical; and the disputants, to do them justice, showed themselves thoroughly acquainted with all the subtleties of the most refined metaphysics. But Pyrrhus, who had been obliged to abandon his see, and wanted to recommend himself to the protection and favor of the bishop of Rome, and the other bishops in the west, yielded in the end; and pretending that he thought the doctrine of one will unanswerably confuted, and the doctrine of two unanswerably proved, solemnly abjured the former opinion, as evidently repugnant to the doctrine of the church, and the fathers, and embraced the latter, as entirely agreeable to both. I said, "pretending that he thought" the doctrine of one will unanswerably confuted, &c. for that he did not really think so will sufficiently appear from his future conduct; and we shall see him embracing again the opinion, which he now abjures, and abjuring that, which he now embraces. However his conversion was thought sincere by the African bishops, who thereupon, assembling in their different provinces, declared with one voice for the opinion of Maximus, and condemned, in the manner we have seen, the opinion of Pyrrhus. From Africa, Maximus carried his pretended convert, as it were in triumph, over to Rome, where he abjured his heresy anew (for so he styled it) in the presence of the pope, and the whole Roman clergy and people crowding to see so new a spectacle; and was thereupon received with great pomp and solmnity to the communion of the Roman church, and thenceforth treated and honored by the pope as patriarch of Constantinople.[1]

The African bishops had not only written to the pope, condemning the doctrine of one will, and complaining of Paul of Constantinople for striving to establish that opinion, but likewise to the emperor, and to Paul himself, as has been related above; and these letters the pope, to whom they were sent, took care to convey, as soon as he received them, to his apocrisarri at the imperial court. He wrote himself, on that occasion, a second letter to the patriarch, much to the same purpose, as we may suppose (for it has not reached our times) with the letter of his brethren in Africa. These letters were, pursuant to the pope's express command, both delivered by his apocrisarii into the patriarch's own hands, who, in a long letter, which he thereupon wrote to the pope, ingenuously owned, that he acknowledged but one will in Christ, and one theandric operation, alleged many reasons and arguments, and likewise the testimony of some of the fathers, in favor of that

[1] Theoph. Phot. Anast. in Theod.

Pyrrhus publicly retracts his late retraction;—[Year of Christ, 648.] Excommunicated by the pope in a very remarkable manner. Paul causes the ecthesis to be suppressed; and advises the emperor to impose silence on both parties. An edict issued for that purpose, known by the name of the type.

opinion, strove to show it no-ways repugnant, but rather agreeable to the decrees of the councils condemning Nestorius and Eutyches; and concluded with exhorting the pope, in his turn, not to disturb the peace of the church, but acquiesce in the doctrine, which their predecessors the two holy bishops of new and old Rome, Sergius (whom he names in the first place) and Honorius, had professed and defined.[1] In his letter he gave the pope no other title but that of brother and fellow-bishop.

The pope had not yet received this letter, when he was informed that Pyrrhus, whose conversion had afforded matter of great triumph to the western bishops, had publicly retracted, at Ravenna, his late retraction, and put himself at the head of the Monothelite party there. He had continued some time at Rome, entertained by the pope, who acknowledged him for bishop of Constantinople, in a manner suitable to his high station. But when he found, that the favor and protection of the western bishops served rather to obstruct than to forward the restoration of his forfeited dignity, he resolved to abandon them, and return to his old friends. With that view he withdrew from Rome to Ravenna, and meeting there with great encouragement from the exarch Plato, a most zealous Monothelite, and a man of great interest at court, he changed sides anew, abjuring the opinion which he had lately embraced, and no less solemnly than he had solemnly embraced it. This new and unexpected change in Pyrrhus mortified, and at the same time exasperated the pope to such a degree, that he no sooner heard of it, than assembling the neighboring bishops, and the whole Roman clergy, in the church of St. Peter, he not only thundered the sentence of excommunication, with repeated anathemas, against the new Judas, but calling, in the transport of his zeal, for the consecrated wine of the eucharist, he poured some drops of it into the ink, and wrote his condemnation with the blood of Christ.[2] Did Theodore believe the wine, which he thus mixed with his ink, to be the real blood of Christ? No man can think he did, without condemning him as guilty of the most criminal profanation and sacrilege. As for the example of St. Basil alleged by Combifisius to justify the conduct of Theodore on this occasion; no unprejudiced person can think that father less guilty of profanation and sacrilege, than the pope, if he believed the consecrated bread to be the real body of Christ, and yet desired it might be buried with him. These and several other instances of the like nature, that occur in history, plainly show, that the doctrine of the real presence was yet unheard of in those times.

In the mean time Paul of Constantinople, to gratify, in some degree, and appease the pope and the African bishops, whom he found from their letters to be strangely incensed against him, caused at last the ecthesis, of which they chiefly complained, to be taken down from the gates of the great church; and at the same time to prevent their raising new disturbances, should they still complain, and insist, as he apprehended they would, on his renouncing his own, and embracing their opinion, he advised the emperor, and no better advice could have been offered in the present circumstances, to interpose his authority, and forbid, as he tendered the peace of the state as well as the church, all farther disputes concerning a point, which, as it could never be determined to the satisfaction of both parties, would prove an eternal source of strife and contention. The emperor hearkened very readily to the advice of the patriarch: and soon after was issued, and set up in the most public places of the imperial city, the famous edict, known by the name of type, or formulary. In that edict the emperor first explains, and indeed with great perspicuity, the two different opinions concerning the will and operations of Christ; hints at the reasons, on which both opinions were grounded, without betraying the least bias to the one or the other; and after expressing great concern at the unchristian divisions, that reigned among his catholic subjects, and a sincere desire of seeing them all united, especially their pastors, in brotherly kindness and charity, he strictly forbids all disputes, under any pretence or color whatever, concerning the will or wills, the operation or operations of Christ; exhorts his loving subjects to take the holy scriptures, the five oecumenical councils, and the doctrine of the approved fathers, for the rule and standard of their faith, without troubling themselves, or others, about articles not defined by them, nor expressly delivered; and solemnly protests and declares, that in thus imposing silence on both parties, he has nothing in view but to consult the welfare and peace of the people, whom it has pleased the Almighty to commit to his care. He adds, that to leave no room for farther complaints, and to satisfy even those, who seemed most inclined to quarrel and complain, he has caused the writing, which had been set up on the gates of the great church of the imperial city, concerning the present dispute, to be taken down and suppressed; and closes the edict with exhorting all to conform to it on pain of incurring his indignation, and being, in consequence thereof, punished with the utmost severity, as disturbers of the public peace and tranquillity. All bishops and other ecclesiastics were to be deposed and degraded; the monks were to be excommunicated, and driven from their habitations, men of fortune and rank were to forfeit both, as well as their employments, whether civil or military, and

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 4. et Bar. ad Ann. 646. p. 382—384.

[2] Theoph. ad Ann. Heracl. 20. et Auct. Lib. Synodici.

In what the type differed from the ecthesis. The pope excommunicates the patriarch;—[Year of Christ, 649.] The patriarch revenges himself upon the apocrisarii of the pope. No kind of regard paid to the sentence of the pope. Pope Theodore dies. Martin chosen. The emperor confirms his election, and exhorts him to conform to the type.

persons of no rank nor fortune to be publicly whipt, and condemned to perpetual banishment.[1]

This edict differed widely from the ecthesis, of which I have spoken at length elsewhere.[2] For by the ecthesis the doctrine of one will was expressly defined, and silence enjoined only concerning the operations. But by the present edict silence was required concerning the will as well as the operations, and nothing was defined for or against either of the two opposite opinions. No wonder, therefore, that the emperor, who had flattered himself that both parties would, on that consideration, readily comply with his edict, wreaked his vengeance, in the manner we shall see hereafter, on those who did not comply with it.

The patriarch had suggested to the emperor the suppressing of the ecthesis to gratify the western bishops, as has been observed above, and the publishing of the present edict, or the type, to prevent their raising new disputes, or attempting any thing in the heat of their zeal, against him or his brethren in the east, that might endanger the peace of the church. But before the suppression of the ecthesis was known at Rome, or the publication of the type, the pope had received the above-mentioned letter from the patriarch, and thereupon excommunicated him with great solemnity as an incorrigible heretic, and declared him, by the authority of St. Peter, divested of all ecclesiastical power and authority. This rash step in the pope provoked the patriarch to such a degree, that he no sooner heard of it than, to revenge the affront, he ordered the altar in the chapel of the palace of Placidia, where the apocrisarii of the bishops of Rome lodged, and performed divine service, to be pulled down, the sacred utensils to be seized, some of their retinue to be imprisoned, some to be sent into exile, and some to be publicly whipt.[3] Such acts of violence and revenge can no more be justified in the patriarch, than the excommunicating of him can be justified in the pope. But the pope struck the first blow, and the ecclesiastics of those days seem to have been all alike unacquainted with the doctrine of our Savior, and the maxims of our gospel.

On the pope's thus excommunicating and deposing two bishops of Constantinople, Paul and Pyrrhus, great stress is laid by the popish writers, to prove the universal jurisdiction of the apostolic see. But instances are not wanting of popes being excommunicated in their turn, and deposed by the bishops of Constantinople, and the bishops of Alexandria. And why should the pope's excommunicating them be rather alleged as a proof of an universal jurisdiction, than their excommunicating him? The truth is, and a man must be very little versed in ecclesiastical history, not to know it, that the patriarchs were all independent of each other; that by the laws of the church, as well as the empire, they were to be condemned and deposed only by a general council, and consequently that it was an open violation of those laws in the pope, to excommunicate or depose any other patriarch, and in any other patriarch to depose or excommunicate the pope. And truly no greater regard was paid in the church to the judgment given by the pope against the other patriarchs, than was paid to the judgment given by the other patriarchs against the pope. Thus Paul, though condemned and deposed by Theodore, was nevertheless, so long as he lived, acknowledged for lawful bishop of Constantinople by the emperor, by the other patriarchs, and by all the bishops in the east, some few excepted, who, in the present controversy, adhered to the pope; nay, and upon his death Pyrrhus, though excommunicated, deposed, and condemned at Rome, in the very extraordinary manner we have seen, was restored to the patriarchal dignity, and universally owned in the east for lawful bishop, as if he had never been judged, nor condemned.

The pope lived but a very short time after the condemnation of Paul. For, according to the most probable opinion, he was condemned in 649, and Theodore died on the 13th of May of the same year, having held the see six years, five months, and nineteen days. He is said to have built some churches, to have repaired others, and to have enriched several with many valuable presents.[1]

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 4. Bar. ad Ann. 648. p. 388.
[2] See p. 436.
[3] Anast. in Theodor. Concil Lateran. in exord.

[1] Anast. in Theodor.

MARTIN, SEVENTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANS.—ROTHARIS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 649.] In the room of Theodore was chosen, and ordained on the fifth of July, after a vacancy of fifty-two days, Martin, a native of Todi in Umbria, and presbyter of the Roman church.[2] The emperor had very readily confirmed his election, flatter-

[2] Anast. in Martin.

The pope assembles a council in Rome. His speech to the bishops who composed it. He misrepresents the meaning and purport of the type. A letter from Maurus of Ravenna read in the council. Several petitions presented to the council, and read.

ing himself that he should thereby the more easily engage him to receive the type, and observe the silence enjoined by that edict. At the same time therefore that he confirmed his election, he begged and conjured him, by a very friendly letter, to forbear all farther disputes concerning the will and operations in Christ, and conform to an edict, which he assured his holiness had been issued with no other view or design, but to defeat the wicked attempts of evil men, who sought to divide his catholic subjects, and involve in endless disturbances both the state and the church.[1] What answer the pope returned to that letter we know not, but certain it is, that instead of acquiescing in the type, as the emperor had flattered himself he would, nothing being there required of the one party, that was not required of the other, he had no sooner taken possession of the see, than he assembled a great council to condemn the doctrine, concerning which silence had been so strictly enjoined, nay, and the type itself, or imperial edict, that enjoined it. His acting thus in open opposition to the declared will, and express command of the emperor, is said to have been chiefly owing to the importunate suggestions of the abbot Maximus, who was at this time in Rome, and had, it seems, a great ascendant over the new pope. The council assembled in the secretarium, or vestry of the church, called Constantinian, in the Lateran palace, was composed of two hundred and five bishops, all of Italy, or the adjacent islands, and ended in five sessions or conferences called Secretaria, by the name of the place, where they were held.

The council met the first time on the fifth of October of the present year, 649, when the bishops being all seated, Theophylactus, the primicerius or chief of the notaries, rising, exhorted them, with the words of the prophet Joel, to "blow the trumpet," to "sound an alarm," to warn the faithful of the danger they were in of being seduced, and led astray, by the teachers of wicked and detestable doctrines. He then addressed the pope, begging his holiness would acquaint the venerable bishops with the motives, that had induced him to call them together, as well as the end, for which he had called them. Hereupon the pope, in a long speech, gave them an account of the rise and progress of the new heresy, of the attempts made by Cyrus of Alexandria, by Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople to introduce their heretical doctrine into the church; alleged several passages out of the fathers to show, that they, no doubt inspired and taught by the Holy Ghost, had acknowledged two wills in Christ, and two operations as well as two natures, and that to deny or confound the two wills was, according to their doctrine, no less repugnant to the definition of Chalcedon and the catholic faith, than to deny or confound the two natures; charged the two patriarchs Sergius and Paul with publishing expositions of faith, in the names of the emperors Heraclius and Constans, evidently inconsistent with that doctrine, but thought Paul the more guilty of the two, since by him men were neither allowed to acknowledge in Christ one will, nor two, as if Christ had no will at all. Here the pope grossly mistakes the meaning and purport of the type, and no doubt wilfully to bias the bishops of the council against that edict; since he could not but know, that men were not thereby required to acknowledge no will in Christ, neither one nor two, for that had been condemning both opinions, but were only restrained from disputing and quarreling about either opinion; which was no more than what pope Honorius had done, when this impertinent question first began to make a noise, and raise disturbances in the church.[1] The pope in the close of his speech told the bishops, that his predecessors had done all that lay in their power to maintain the catholic truth, to suppress the prevailing heresy, and reclaim the bishops of Constantinople from the errors they taught and patronized; but the exhortations, entreaties, menaces, letters, and embassies, of the apostolic see, having all alike proved ineffectual, he had thought it necessary to assemble a council, and hear the opinions of his brethren, concerning the new doctrine, as well as the persons who taught and maintained it. He therefore exhorted them to speak their minds freely, remembering the command of the apostle: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God."

When the pope had done speaking, Maurus bishop of Cesena, and Deusdedit deacon of the church of Ravenna, acquainted the assembly, that Maurus metropolitan of Ravenna had proposed assisting at the council in person; but having been prevented, had appointed them to supply his room, and charged them with a letter, which they desired might be read and inserted in the acts of the council. It was addressed to "pope Martin, universal pontiff," and contained a declaration, in the strongest terms, of the doctrine of two wills and two operations. The letter being read, Maximus of Aquilea rising up declared, that he too acknowledged two wills in Christ, and two distinct operations, and condemned all expositions of faith inconsistent with that doctrine. But Deusdedit of Cagliari begged that none might deliver, or be required to deliver their opinion, until the question was thoroughly examined. To this they all agreed; and thus ended the first session.[2]

The council met again on the 8th of the same month, when Stephen bishop of Dora

[1] Surius l. 4. die 24. Aug. c. 8.

[1] See p. 435.

[2] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 1.

Ridiculous observation of the pope on the letter of Victor of Carthage to his predecessor. Passages and writings in favor of the doctrine of one will read and examined. Paul of Constantinople declared a professed heretic. The type rejected.

in Palestine presented a petition to the assembly, setting forth, that Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, had broached a new heresy; teaching that in Christ, as God and man, there was but one will, and one operation; that Sophronius of blessed memory, patriarch of Jerusalem, had opposed that doctrine as soon as it was broached, and published a writing containing six hundred passages from the fathers in favor of two wills and two operations; that not long before his death he had taken the petition with him up to Mount Calvary, and there made him promise to go to Rome in person, and solicit the condemnation of an opinion so expressly condemned by the fathers; that, pursuant to that promise, the petitioner came to Rome in the time of the late pope, and applied to him, as he now applies to the council. In the next place was read a memorial presented by some Greek monks and presbyters, and addressed to pope "Martin, bishop of bishops, and father of fathers." They begged that Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, might be condemned as the authors, abettors, and promoters, of heresy, and with them the impious type lately published in the name of the emperor. After these memorials, the letters were read which I have mentioned above, from Sergius metropolitan of Cyprus, from the three councils of Africa, and from Victor of Carthage to the late pope, all filled with heavy complaints against Paul of Constantinople, and warm declarations in favor of the doctrine of two wills. As Victor had charged Paul, in his letter, with teaching new doctrines, and yet styled him his fellow-bishop, the pope took occasion from thence to observe, that though the holy primate of Africa looked upon Paul as an heretic, he continued nevertheless to own him for his fellow-bishop, not presuming to treat him otherwise than as a bishop, until he was judged and deposed by the authority of the apostolic see; that is, says the pope, "by the authority of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, who alone deserved to receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and to whom alone they were given."[1] No passages so clear and decisive ever were or could be alleged, out of the fathers, against the doctrine of one will, as might be alleged against the doctrine, which the pope here so confidently lays down. For that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were not given to St. Peter alone, but to the other apostles as well as to St. Peter, is, in express terms, affirmed by all the fathers, who have explained the words of our Savior, "To thee will I give," &c., or spoken of the keys.(*) But that there were two wills in Christ, and two distinct operations, could only be inferred, and by a long chain of consequences, from the passages quoted by the pope, and the bishops of the council, none of the fathers having, in express terms, asserted either that there were, or that there were not, two wills in Christ, and two operations.

In the third session, held on the 17th of the same month, several passages were produced and read out of the writings of those who were said to have held the doctrine of one will; and it was found, that Theodorus, formerly bishop of Pharan, in Palestine, had the first of all taught that doctrine; maintaining that in Christ there were indeed different operations, but that they all proceeded from the word alone. As Sergius and Cyrus had alleged a passage from the supposed works of Dionysius the areopagite to confirm their opinion, the original was consulted, and it appeared, that they had changed the words, "a new theandric operation," into "one theandric operation." The pope took a great deal of pains to prove, that by "a new theandric operation" were meant two operations; the works ascribed to Dionysius the areopagite, being then as universally received as genuine, as they are now universally rejected as spurious. In the same session were read the ecthesis of Heraclius, the acts of the two councils held at Constantinople by Sergius and Pyrrhus, to approve that exposition or edict, and a letter to the same effect from Cyrus of Alexandria to Sergius.[1]

The council met the fourth time on the 19th of October, when the letter which Paul had written to pope Theodore, was read,[2] and he thereupon declared a professed and incorrigible heretic. The type was read next, and by all rejected, as plainly calculated to restrain men from professing the truth, and combating the opposite errors. The decrees of the five general councils were read in the last place, and with them the Nicene creed, as the standard and rule, by which all persons arraigned

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 2.

(*) "Were the keys of the kingdom of heaven," says Origen, "given by the Lord to Peter alone, and did none of the other apostles receive them? But if this, 'To thee will I give,' &c., was common, are not likewise all the other things common, that were spoken to St. Peter?" (a) Here Origen supposes those words of our Savior to have been spoken to the apostles in common; and consequentiy the keys to have been promised and given to them in common, as a truth that no man questioned; and concludes from thence, that whatever else was by our Savior spoken to St. Peter, was spoken to the apostles in common. St. Jerom says in express words, that "all the apostles received the keys of the kingdom of heaven." (b) St. Ambrose, that "what was said to St. Peter, was said to all the apostles:" (c) And Theophylactus, that "though it was said to Peter alone, 'I will give thee the keys,' yet they were given to all the apostles." (d) Nay, Chrysostom distinguishes St. John by this character: "He who has the keys of the kingdom of heaven:" (e) And St. Austin thought the words, "To thee will I give the keys," &c., though spoken to Peter, had no clear sense, but when they were understood of the church. (f)

(a) Orig. in Mat. 16: p. 275.
(b) Hier. in Jov. l. 14. (c) Ambr. in Psal. 38.
(d) Theophyl. in Mat. 16.
(e) Chrys. in Pref. Evangel. Joan.
(f) Aug. in Psal. 108.

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 3. [2] See p. 444, 445.

The doctrine of one will condemned; and with it the ecthesis and the type; and all anathematized who received either, or did not believe whatever had been taught by the fathers. Scandalous partiality of Martin to his predecessor Honorius.

of heresy, were to be judged and condemned, or absolved.[1]

In the fifth and last session, which was held the last day of October, the pope ordered the passages to be read out of the Greek and Latin fathers, that countenanced, or seemed to countenance, the doctrine of two wills and two operations; and in opposition to them, such passages out of the works of the Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian writers, as countenanced, or seemed to countenance, the doctrine of one will and one operation; and it was with one voice concluded by the whole assembly, that the doctrine of two wills was the true catholic doctrine, and that of one, plainly heretical. Hereupon twenty canons were issued, anathematizing the doctrine of the "Monothelites, the most impious ecthesis, the most wicked type" lately published against the catholic church by the most serene emperor Constans, at the instigation of Paul, the pretended bishop of Constantinople, and all who had received, did receive, or should thenceforth receive, either of those impious edicts. In the canons twenty-one heretics were anathematized by name, and with them Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, as avowed heretics, and rebels to the catholic church. The canons were signed by all who were present, and in the first place by the pope, in the following terms: "I Martin, by the mercy of God, bishop of the holy catholic and apostolic church of the city of Rome, have signed, as judge, this definition, confirming the orthodox faith, and condemning Theodorus, formerly bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, and their heretical writings, with the impious ecthesis, and the impious type."[2] It is observable, that in the canons, establishing what they called the catholic doctrine, it is constantly said, if any do not receive and profess such and such doctrines "according to the holy fathers," let him be anathematized; but as to the scripture, it was not so much as once mentioned, as if such a book had never been written, or none of the council ever had heard of it. By the seventeenth canon all are anathematized, who do not believe in their hearts, and profess with their mouths, "to one jot or tittle," whatever has by the fathers been delivered to the church, which was anathematizing all who did not believe in their hearts, and profess with their mouths, contradictory doctrines; nothing being more certain, nothing better known to those who are in the least versed in the writings of the fathers, than that they sometimes contradict themselves, and frequently one another; nay, that the most renowned among them have taught doctrines evidently repugnant to the holy scriptures, to reason, and even to common sense.[3]

I cannot help observing, before I proceed, the scandalous partiality which Martin betrayed, on occasion of this council, to his predecessor Honorius. For that Honorius held the doctrine, for which Cyrus of Alexandria, and the three bishops of Constantinople, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, were condemned by the council, is manifest from his letters; and we shall soon see him, for those very letters, anathematized as a heretic by an oecumenical council, and the letters themselves condemned to the flames, as containing the impious doctrine taught by Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul. And yet of these letters Martin took not the least notice, nor even of the famous letter, which Sergius wrote to Honorius, establishing and proving the doctrine of one will;[1] but contented himself with producing against Sergius the letter, which he wrote on the same subject to Cyrus, with the answer of Cyrus to that letter; and, upon these letters, both were condemned by the council. Had he produced against Sergius his letter to Honorius, and caused it to be read in the council, he could not well have avoided causing the answer to be read at the same time which Honorius had returned to that letter, and consequently condemning him as well as Sergius. And it was, without all doubt, to avoid that, and to screen his predecessor, while he condemned, we may say, his accomplices, that he suppressed the above-mentioned letter of Sergius to him. For what other reason can be alleged, why he condemned all the other letters in favor of the doctrine of one will, as conveying the venom of the most pestilent heresy; and suffered that alone, conveying as much venom, as the most venomous among them, to pass uncondemned? Bellarmine, from Martin's not condemning Honorius with Cyrus, Sergius, &c. argues thus in favor of that pope: Martin was a great saint, and consequently incapable of all partiality; ergo, if he did not condemn Honorius with Cyrus, Sergius, &c. it was because he found nothing in his letters repugnant to the catholic faith.[2] But 1st, the fathers of the sixth general council found something in his letters repugnant to the catholic faith; and so did some popes more honest than Martin, though not so great saints, as we shall see hereafter. 2dly, Martin well knew, that the Monothelites all quoted the letters of Honorius; that they declared in all their writings, that they taught no other doctrine, but what had been taught by Honorius, bishop of old Rome in his letters to Sergius. And can any man believe, that if Martin had found nothing in the letters of Honorius repugnant to the catholic faith, he would not have produced them to confound the Monothelites, and clear his predecessor, in the eyes of the council and the world, from so black and groundless a calumny, as Bellarmine styles it? Can

[1] Concil. Lateran. Secret. 4. [2] Ibid. Secret. 5.
[3] See Daillé concerning the right Use of the Fathers, l. 2. c. 4.

[1] See p. 434. [2] Bellar. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 11.

The pope sends the acts of his council to the chief bishops in the east, and in the west. His chief argument in favor of two wills. Bold attempt of the pope to establish his power and jurisdiction in the east.

any man believe, that when the letter was read in the fourth session, which Paul of Constantinople had written to Theodore, the immediate predecessor of Martin, exhorting that pope to acquiesce in the doctrine, which their two holy predecessors, Sergius and Honorius, had held and professed; can any man, I say, believe, that Martin would not, on such an occasion, at least have produced the letters of Honorius, had he thought, that from them it would have been made to appear, that he never had taught or professed any such doctrine? From what has been said, it is manifest, that Martin well knew Honorius had held the very doctrine for which he condemned Cyrus, and the three bishops of Constantinople; and consequently, that he acted the part of a partial and unjust judge, in condemning them, and not him.

Another instance of Martin's partiality, on occasion of this council, was his condemning the type as wicked, and in every respect impious, without taking the least notice of the letters of Honorius to Sergius and Cyrus, enjoining the same silence that was enjoined by the type, and consequently liable to the same censure.[1] That the letters of Honorius were liable to the same censure, is owned by some Roman catholic writers. But others, by distinguishing the times, pretend to discover a wide difference between the type and those letters, as if it had been highly commendable to enjoin silence, when Honorius enjoined it, but wicked and impious, when Constans enjoined it, or his counsellor Paul. Honorius, say they, enjoined silence when the question was first moved, when the dispute was just begun, when nothing had been yet defined for or against either opinion, and every man was at liberty to embrace the one or the other. But it was after the one had been condemned as an heresy, and the other defined as a catholic truth by the pope in a council (pope John IV.)[2] that silence was enjoined by the emperor.[3] But if every man was at liberty to embrace either opinion till the one was condemned and the other approved, by John IV. in the council of Rome, it will thence follow, that Cyrus and Sergius, who died before that council, could be guilty of no heresy; and consequently, that they were both unjustly condemned by Martin, as heretics. Besides, the type was condemned by Martin, as wicked and impious, because silence was thereby enjoined concerning a doctrine defined, or pretended to have been defined, by the council of Chalcedon, and taught by all the approved fathers. And if the type was condemned on that consideration as wicked and impious, it is manifest, that the letters of Honorius were so too; since by them, as well as by the type, silence was enjoined concerning a doctrine supposed to have been defined by the council of Chalcedon, and taught by all the approved fathers. To enjoin silence therefore, when Honorius enjoined it, was no less wicked and impious, than it was wicked and impious to enjoin it, when Constans enjoined it, or his counsellor Paul. To conclude, the only difference that appears to have been between the type, and the letters of Honorius; the only reason that can be alleged, why the type was condemned, and not the letters, is, that the type was supposed to have been suggested by a bishop of Constantinople, and the letters were written by a bishop of Rome. Now to resume the thread of the history.

The above-mentioned canons were no sooner signed, than the pope caused them to be copied, and sent with the whole proceedings of the council to several bishops in the east, in Africa, in France, in Spain, and in Britain; informing them, by a circular letter, of the new heresy; of the progress it had made in the east; and of the complaints of the catholic bishops in those parts, and in Africa, which had obliged him to assemble a general council (for so he calls it), as the only effectual means of putting a stop to the growing evil. In that letter he alleges several arguments in confirmation of the doctrine defined by the council; but on this he lays the chief stress, namely, that Christ was, according, to the fathers, perfect God, and perfect man; but could not be perfect God, without a divine will and divine operations; nor perfect man, without an human will and human operations. The type he condemns, as in every respect impious; pretending it was thereby defined, that Christ had no will at all, neither a divine or an human will; and, generally speaking, charges the Monothelites with holding and professing, as their avowed doctrine, all the absurd and blasphemous doctrines, that could, according to him, and his method of reasoning, be anyways deduced from their real opinion.

Besides the circular letter addressed to all bishops, presbyters, deacons, monks, and the whole church, the pope wrote to several bishops in particular, to acquaint them with the condemnation of the new heresy and its abettors, and exhort them to cause the canons of the council, that had condemned them, to be observed in their respective dioceses. As the popes let no opportunity of extending their power pass unimproved, Martin finding that several bishops in the east adhered to him in opposition to their own patriarchs, took occasion from thence to appoint one of them (John of Philadelphia) his vicar in those parts, empowering him by the authority, and in the name of St. Peter, to exercise all patriarchal jurisdiction in the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, the two patriarchs Macedonius and Sergius, who had intruded themselves into those sees, and besides openly professed the doctrine of one will, not being acknowledged by those of the opposite party for lawful bishops. This was a bold attempt, but so

[1] See p. 434. [2] See p. 439.
[3] Pagi in Annal. Bar. ad Ann. 648. n. VI. et seq.

The pope proposes to acquaint the emperor by a solemn legation with the proceedings of the council, and to employ on that occasion the subjects of the kings of France; but his design not taking place, he acquaints the emperor with them by a letter;—[Year of Christ, 650.] The exarch, in compliance with the emperor's order, attempts to seize on the pope; but fails in the attempt. Fables related by Anastasius. The new exarch commanded to seize the pope, and oblige the Romans to choose another in his room.

well timed as not to prove quite unsuccessful, the bishops in those parts, who opposed the Monothelites, choosing rather to obey the pope, who was at the head of their party, than their own patriarchs, whom they looked upon both as intruders and heretics.

It was on occasion of this council that the popes had first recourse to the kings of France, who afterwards proved their great patrons and protectors. For Martin, thinking it his duty to acquaint the emperor, and by a solemn legation, with the proceedings of his council; but at the same time apprehending, and indeed with a great deal of reason, that Constans, provoked at his condemning, in so solemn a manner, an opinion, concerning which he had commanded a strict silence to be observed, might, in the transport of his passion, wreak his vengeance on the legates; bethought himself of employing, in that legation, the subjects of the two French kings, Clovis and Sigebert, of whom the former reigned in Neustria and Burgundy, and the latter in Austrasia. As the emperor courted, at this time, the friendship and alliance of those princes against Rotharis, the brave king of the Lombards, the pope did not doubt but their subjects would be well received at the imperial court; and even flattered himself, that the emperor, fearing to disoblige them, would not take that vengeance of him which he otherwise might. He therefore wrote to both kings, acquainting them with the condemnation of the Monothelites in a general council, and earnestly entreating them to appoint some of the greatest reputation and credit among their bishops, to be employed in a solemn legation, which he proposed sending to Constantinople, with the acts of that council. His request was readily complied with, and the two bishops, Eligius of Noyen, and Audoenus of Rouen, both men of great merit, and both now honored by the church of Rome as great saints, were named for the intended legation. But while they were upon the point of setting out for Rome, something happened, as we are told, quite unforeseen, that obliged them to lay aside all thoughts of undertaking, at that time, so long a journey.[1] This proved a great disappointment to the pope, who hereupon contented himself with informing the emperor of the transactions of the council by a most submissive and flattering letter, addressed to his "most pious and serene lord and son, Constans Augustus, who loved God in truth, and his Son our Lord Jesus Christ." In that letter he alleged the same reasons, which he had alleged in his other letters, to convince the emperor that the doctrine of one will was repugnant to the definitions of the councils, to the doctrine of the fathers, and to the belief of the church; and consequently that it had been deservedly condemned.[2]

[1] Vita S. Eligii, c. 33. [2] Martin. ep. 3.

The emperor, greatly concerned to see his subjects divided among themselves by religious disputes, at a time when they ought all to have united against the common enemy, the Saracens, who made daily new acquisitions in the empire, had ordered the governors of the provinces to cause the type to be strictly observed within the limits of their respective jurisdictions, more especially Olympius, exarch of Italy—charging him, if he found the soldiery disposed to stand by him, and the pope offered to oppose his edict, to seize him, and send him prisoner to Constantinople, that the other bishops might be thereby deterred from following his example. Pursuant to that order, the exarch no sooner heard of a council assembling at Rome, than he repaired thither in great haste, with a design to execute the commission he had received, if the pope rufused to comply with the imperial edict. But on his arrival in that city, he found the populace, suspecting he was come with no good design, all determined to defend the pope, and the soldiery no ways disposed to act against him. Hereupon not thinking it advisable to make any attempt on the person of the pope, which he knew would be attended with a good deal of bloodshed, and might in the end prove unsuccessful, he contented himself with striving to raise a schism in the Roman church. But he was obliged in the mean time to leave Rome, and hasten into Sicily with all the troops he could muster, to oppose the Saracens, who had made a descent upon that island; and there he died, spent with the toils and fatigue of that expedition.[1] The bibliothecarian adds, that Olympius, finding he could not prevail by force, had recourse to treachery, and going to the church of the Virgin Mary, now known by the name of Santa Maria Maggiore, to receive the eucharist there at the pope's own hands, he gave private orders to his shield-bearer to stab his holiness while he was administering it to him, and not upon his guard; but that the shield-bearer was miraculously struck blind in the attempt, and the exarch, converted by that miracle, was reconciled with the pope, and revealed to him the order, which he had received from the emperor.[2] But of this miracle no notice is taken by any of the contemporary writers, not by the pope himself, even where he relates what passed at Rome between him and the exarch.

Olympius being dead, Theodorus, surnamed Calliopas, was appointed exarch of Italy in his room, and charged by the emperor, provoked beyond measure at the proceedings of the council, and the disobedience of the pope, which he styled open rebellion, to get him, at all events, into his power, to oblige the Romans to choose another bishop in his room, and send Martin, thus deposed, under a strong

[1] Anast. in Martin. Plat. ibid. [2] Idem. ibid.

The exarch marches to Rome. Seizes the pope in the Lateran church, and carries him prisoner to his palace. He is put on board a vessel in the night, and conveyed to the island of Naxos. Suffers great hardships in his voyage, and during his imprisonment in that island.

guard to Constantinople. In compliance with that order, Calliopas no sooner arrived at Ravenna, than, assembling all the troops of the exarchate, he marched with them in person to Rome. His unexpected appearance, with so great a force, alarmed the Romans; and the pope, not doubting but he designed some attempt upon him, caused himself to be carried in his bed, which he had kept some time, from the Lateran palace into the Lateran church, and to be laid there, as in a safe asylum, before the altar. However, he immediately sent some of the chief men among the clergy to wait on the exarch in his name, and at the same time to discover, if by any means they could, his real design and intention; for he gave out, that he was marching into Sicily, to drive out the Saracens, who had settled in that island. The exarch received the ecclesiastics, in appearance, with the most sincere protestations of friendship and kindness; and told them, that he was greatly concerned to hear his holiness was indisposed; that indeed he was too much fatigued with his journey, to wait on him that day; but that nothing should prevent him from paying his respects to the holy bishop the next day. But he was, in the mean time, either informed, that the Lateran palace was filled with men and arms, or suspected it was; and that the pope was determined to repel force, if any was offered, by force, having the whole city of Rome on his side. Upon that intelligence, or suspicion, the exarch, pretending to be indisposed, and not yet well recovered from the fatigues of his journey, put off his visit to the third day; and then to discover, in his turn, the designs and intention of the pope, he sent his secretary with others of his retinue, to acquaint him, that he did not think it safe for him to wait on his holiness in person, having been informed, that he had provided himself with men and arms, and designed to receive him not like a friend, but an enemy. The pope received those who were sent, with the greatest condescension and kindness; complained to them of the exarch, for crediting such groundless and bare-faced calumnies; assured them, that he had rather die a thousand times, than suffer any man to expose his own life to the least danger to save his; and, for their farther satisfaction, allowed them to search the whole palace. Upon their return the exarch, now satisfied that he should meet with no opposition, for he was desirous of executing the order he had received without bloodshed, set out from his palace attended by a band of soldiers, and repairing to the Lateran, entered the church, where the pope lay in bed, with the whole Roman clergy assembled about him. The soldiery, on their first entering the church, broke all the wax-tapers in pieces, overturned the candlesticks, and with that noise, and the clashing of their arms, struck all, who were present, with consternation and terror. In the midst of that tumult, and general fright, the exarch produced an order from the emperor, commanding him to depose Martin as unworthy of the episcopal dignity, to send him prisoner to Constantinople, and cause another to be chosen in his room. When this order was read, the pope, rising from his bed, delivered himself up into the hands of the exarch, without hearkening to some of the clergy, who declaring they would stand by him to the last, advised him not to submit, but suffer them to repel force by force. As he came out of the church surrounded by the soldiery, the clergy, and with them the populace, ever at their devotion, cried all aloud, "Cursed be the man, who says or believes, that pope Martin has made the least alteration in the faith: Cursed be the man, who doth not persevere in the catholic faith to the hour of his death." At those words the exarch turning to the multitude, "I join with you," said he, "there is no other true faith, and I profess no other myself." When the pope was told by the exarch, that he must go with him to his palace, he begged some of the clergy might be allowed to accompany him thither; which being readily granted, the bishops, who were present, cried out, "We will all attend him, we will all live, and we will all die with him."

He passed that night in the palace under a strong guard; and was visited the next morning by the whole Roman clergy, a free access to him being granted by the exarch to all who came. Some determined to attend him to Constantinople, were suffered to stay the following night in the palace; and they had got all things ready for the intended voyage. But in the dead of the night the pope was privately conveyed on board a vessel, that lay in the Tyber, with a few domestics, the gates of the palace, as well as the city, being shut as soon as he was carried out, to the great disappointment of those who intended to have embarked with him. After a three months navigation, they landed in the island of Naxos, one of the Cyclades in the Ægean sea, or the Archipelago, and there the pope was kept prisoner a whole year. During that voyage they touched at several places, and all went ashore but the pope, who was never once suffered to set foot out of the vessel; though by the sickness incident to those, who are not accustomed to the sea, he loathed all kind of food, and besides was most miserably tormented with the gout, and at the same time with a flux, that allowed him no respite night nor day. In several places the clergy and others came on board to visit and comfort him, bringing with them whatever they thought a man in his situation could stand in need of. But what they brought was seized by his inhuman guards, and those, who brought it, or pitying his condition came to comfort him, were driven away, and sometimes cruelly

Martin is conveyed after a year's imprisonment from Naxos to Constantinople;—[Year of Christ, 654.] The cruel treatment he met with there. His letters to Theodore of Esbus, giving an account of his sufferings, and the crimes laid to his charge. His trial. He is charged with high treason.

beaten as enemies to the state, and rebels to the emperor. In the isle of Naxos he was kept prisoner in a private house; and during the whole year he staid there, only allowed to bathe three times; which he complains of as a great hardship in the letter, from which I have copied the present account of his sufferings from the time he was seized till his removal from Naxos to Constantinople.[1]

For when he had been kept a year in that island, his guards, or keepers, received an order from the emperor to bring him to Constantinople; and he was accordingly put on board a vessel, which sailing from Naxos arrived in the port of that city on the 17th of September of the present year, the pope having met with no better treatment in this, than he had done in his former voyage. The vessel came in early in the morning, but the pope was left lying on the deck till near sunset, exposed to the insults of a rabble, whom his keepers stirred up against him; calling him an heretic, a rebel, an enemy to God and the state. At last came, a little before sunset, a scribe named Sagoleva, attended by a numerous guard, who taking the pope from on board the vessel, carried him in a close chair, the gout not allowing him to set foot to the ground, to the prison called Prandearia, where he was kept ninety-three days, no one being suffered during that time, to come near him. He found means, however, to write and convey from his prison two letters to Theodore of Esbus in Arabia, whom he styled his sincerely beloved brother. For Thodore had once distinguished himself by his zeal for the doctrine of one will; but renouncing that, was become a most zealous advocate for the opposite doctrine. In the first of these letters the pope acquaints Theodore with the crimes, that were laid to his charge, namely, that he had altered the faith; that he had privately corresponded with the Saracens, the enemies of the empire, and assisted them both with his advice, and with money; and had spoken disrespectfully of the Virgin Mary. He solemnly declares the whole to be a contrivance of his enemies to compass his ruin; and as to the last article of the charge, he anathematizes, in this world and the next, all who do not honor, who do not adore the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, above all creatures, her Son only excepted.[2] Here the learned Du Pin would not have us to take the word adore in a rigorous sense;[3] but in what other can it be taken, when it signifies more than to honor, as it evidently does in the pope's letter? In the other letter the pope gives Theodore the account of his sufferings, which I have delivered above; and adds, that at the time he wrote he had been forty-seven days without using, or being suffered to use, either the cold or the hot bath; that his flux still continued as violent and troublesome as ever; that the food, which he liked, was denied him, and that only allowed him which he disliked the most, and which therefore could neither nourish or support him; but that he hoped he should soon have finished his course, and that then God would, in his infinite mercy, touch the hearts of his enemies, and bring them to repentance.[1]

When the pope had been kept ninety-three days in the above-mentioned prison, and treated all that time in the manner we have seen, he was at last, by an order from the emperor, brought under a strong guard to the council-chamber; and there he found the whole senate assembled, and the high treasurer of the empire sitting, as judge, above all the rest. He was scarce set down, for he was carried thither in a chair, when the treasurer, named Bucoleon, commanded him, in great wrath, to rise up and stand. The pope kept silence, but those, who were about him, saying that he was not able to stand, "if he cannot stand," replied the treasurer, "let two of you hold him up; for he must not sit here." He was held up accordingly; and then the treasurer said to him with an imperious voice, "tell me, thou miserable wretch, what has the emperor done to thee? Has he injured thee? Has he oppressed thee? Has he taken any thing from thee by force? Hast thou nothing to say?" For the pope was silent, "let the witnesses come in." At these words the doors were opened, and a crowd of witnesses came in, among whom were Andrew, the secretary of the late exarch Olympius, and Dorotheus a patrician of Sicily; but the rest were all common soldiers, who had served under Olympius. At their appearance, the pope smiling, "are these," said he, "your witnesses? Is this your method?" And when they were required to swear on the gospels, he earnestly begged the judge, in the name of him who was one day to judge them all, he would be satisfied with their bare asseveration, and not oblige so many unhappy wretches to forswear themselves, and damn their souls. They were sworn however; and all agreed in attesting upon oath, that Martin, late bishop of Rome, was privy to the treasonable practices of Olympius, who had formed a design, as was discovered after his death, of revolting from the emperor, and causing himself to be acknowledged for absolute lord of the territories, that still belonged to the empire in Italy. Dorotheus declared among the rest, that if Martin had fifty heads, he ought to lose them all for concealing the wicked designs of the traitor Olympius, and thereby exposing the whole western empire to ruin. Another deposed upon oath, that Martin was assisting to Olympius, and even encouraged the soldiers to take the oath of allegiance to him. Hereupon the pope, being

[1] Martin ep. 15. ad Theodor. [2] Martin. ep. 14.
[3] Du Pin Nouv. Biblioth. t. 5. p. 68.

[1] Martin. ep. 15.

The senate declares Martin guilty of high treason. He is used with great barbarity. The patriarch prevails on the emperor to spare his life.

asked, whether he confessed or denied what he had heard alleged against him, answered, "I will tell you the truth, if you are disposed to hear it: when the type was first published, and sent to Rome by the emperor—" but he was immediately interrupted by the prefect Troilus crying out, "what type? what have we to do with the type? You are now questioned about crimes against the state, and not your belief; we are all Christians, and all good catholics." The pope answered, "I wish to God it were so, but fear, that one day I shall bear witness against you; and that too at a more tremendous tribunal than yours." "But what an abandoned wretch art thou," continued Troilus, "to know what Olympius was machinating against the emperor, and not offer to oppose him; nay to encourage and countenance him." The pope denied that he had ever encouraged or countenanced him; and as to his not having opposed him, if that was a crime, he maintained Troilus to be the more guilty of the two, since he too well knew what Olympius was plotting, and yet never offered to oppose him, though far more capable than he of defeating his wicked designs, and saving the western empire from ruin. He ended his speech with these words: "Was I in a condition to oppose a man, who had all the soldiery of Italy at his back? Did I make him exarch? Am I responsible for his conduct? But dispose of me as you please, and as soon as you please; for great will my reward be in heaven."

Other witnesses waited at the door, and were ready to come in; but the senate declaring, that the charge was sufficiently proved, the treasurer went out to make his report to the emperor, and the pope was carried, surrounded with guards, and crowds of spectators, into one of the courts of the imperial palace, to wait his return. But he was soon removed from thence to an adjoining terrass, and there held up by two of the guards, that the emperor might see him through the lattices of his window. In the mean time the treasurer returned, and addressing the pope, "Thou hast," said he, "conspired against the emperor; thou hast abandoned God, and God has abandoned thee, and delievered thee up into our hands." He then ordered the guards to strip him, and bid the people anathematize him in the mean time as a rebel and traitor. He was stript accordingly of all his garments, nothing being left him but a tunic to cover his nakedness, and even that the soldiery tore from top to bottom. But he was anathematized only by few, compassion prevailing among the rest of the multitude. In that condition the treasurer delivered him up to the governor of Constantinople, with a warrant to cut him, if he pleased, that moment, in pieces. The governor had immediately an iron collar put about his neck, and loading him with chains, ordered him to be dragged through the city, the executioner walking before him with a drawn sword, to show, according to the custom of those days, that he was sentenced to death. We are told, that amidst these sufferings, which one would think any man with his complaints must have sunk under, he ever appeared with a serene and cheerful countenance, without betraying the least concern or dejection, as if he had not felt what he suffered. When he had been thus shown to the whole town, he was carried to the Prætorium, and there thrown into a dungeon among murderers and other notorious criminals. But he had scarce been an hour there, when he was carried away to another prison, called the prison of Diomedes, where he was dragged with such violence up the steps leading to the door of his new prison, that his legs being all flayed and cut with the heavy irons, the steps were in several places stained with his blood. When he was thus spent and ready to expire, instead of affording him the least comfort or relief, they chained him to the keeper of the jail, as was then commonly practised with great criminals the day before their execution, and placed him thus chained and loaded with irons on a bench in the open air, exposed to a most cutting wind, which happened to blow at that time. Their design in treating him with so much cruelty, was, without all doubt, to put an end to his life without a public execution, which it was apprehended would not at all be pleasing to the people; for they had now changed their rage into compassion. But the two women, who kept the keys of the prison, were the only persons, who had an opportunity, and indeed the courage to relieve him. These, upon the jailor's being for some time called away, taking their prisoner, while he lay quite senseless, and ready to expire with the excessive cold, and the pain of his wounds, carried him to their own room, and placing him in their bed, spared nothing they could think of to comfort and relieve him. However he continued speechless until the evening, when the eunuch Gregory, the emperor's chamberlain, sent him some provisions by his steward, who got his irons taken off.

The next day the emperor went to visit the patriarch Paul, who lay at the point of death, and having, on that occasion, acquainted him with what had passed, the patriarch earnestly entreated him to spare the life of that unhappy man, and to be satisfied with what he had suffered already. The author of the present relation adds, that the patriarch, hearing what treatment the pope had met with, cried out, "Is it meet that a bishop should be thus treated? Alas! of that too I must soon give an account." But surely the patriarch could not think it a crime to have suggested to the emperor the most effectual means he could think of to maintain the peace of the church; nor could he think himself accountable for the disobedience of the pope to the emperor's express command; and it was to his disobe-

Martin is interrogated concerning the abjuration of Pyrrhus at Rome. Pyrrhus is restored to the see of Constantinople. Martin is banished to the Sarmatian Chersonesus. Hardships he suffered there. He is forgotten even by his own church. His complaints in a letter to a friend.

dience alone all his sufferings were owing. However that be, the emperor, to gratify the dying patriarch, promised to spare the pope's life.

Paul died a few days after, and Pyrrhus striving to be restored, but some opposing him on account of his having retracted at Rome the doctrine, which he had professed at Constantinople,[1] the emperor sent one of the treasurer's officers named Demosthenes, with a notary to interrogate the pope, and have from his mouth an authentic account of what had passed on that occasion at Rome. The pope answered their several interrogatories, solemnly declaring, that Pyrrhus came to Rome of his own accord; that of his own accord he renounced his former opinion (for his friends gave out, that he had done it by force, and had even been tortured;) that he was received by his predecessor Theodore, and entertained as a bishop, adding, that the Roman church received all, who came; that St. Peter supplied even the poorest among them with white bread and different sorts of wines. In the end Demosthenes begged he would compare his present with his former condition, and reflect that so great a change, and all his misfortunes, were owing to himself. The pope answered, "I am in your power, and you may dispose of me as you please; but were I to be cut in pieces, pursuant to the order, that was given to the governor of the city when I was delivered up to him, I would not communicate with the church of Constantinople." The pope's answers were all set down by the notary, and shown to the emperor, who nevertheless restored Pyrrhus upon his promising to comply with the type. For Constans did not concern himself about any man's private opinion, whether he held the doctrine of one will, or the doctrine of two; nor did he himself ever declare for either opinion, or quarrel with any but such as by an open disobedience to his declared will and express command, choose to quarrel with their brethren, and by indulging their peevish humor, disturb the peace both of the church and the state. And it is on that account alone, that he was stigmatized by the popes, and those of that party, with the names of heretic, persecutor, and tyrant, as if it had been heresy, persecution, and tyranny, to restrain them from venting their spleen on all, who did not agree in opinion with them.

When the pope had been kept eighty-five days in the same prison (the prison of Diomedes), a notary, named Sagoleva, came to acquaint him, that he was ordered to take him from thence to his house, and that in two days time he was to be conveyed to another place. The pope asked to what place, and seemed very desirous to know; but the notary only answered, to the place, which the treasurer shall think fit to send you to. Hereupon the pope, submitting cheerfully to his fate, took immediately leave of his fellow-prisoners; and as they all on that occasion burst into tears, he endeavored to comfort them; saying, that they ought rather to rejoice than to weep, since all his sufferings would soon be rewarded. The notary took him with him to his house, and two days after, that is, on Maundy-Thursday, which, in the present year 655, fell on the 26th day of March, he was privately put on board a vessel to be conveyed to the Sarmatian Chersonesus. Thus far the account, that was given to the western bishops, by an anonymous writer, under the name of a good Christian.[1]

What happened to him after his departure from Constantinople we learn from two letters, which he wrote from the place of his exile. In the first he writes thus to one of his friends in Constantinople: "we arrived at this place on the 15th of May; and the bearer, who delivered me a letter, came in thirty days after us. His arrival gave me great joy; for I did not doubt but he had brought me some relief from my friends in Italy; but was disappointed, and praised God. A grievous famine prevails in this land; and if we are not assisted and supported by our friends with some kind of provisions from Pontus or Italy, we must perish with hunger. For we hear of bread, but see none. If any corn, wine, oil, or any thing else is sent to you from those parts for us, let it be immediately conveyed to us. I have not, I think, deserved so ill of the saints at Rome, or of those, who belong to that church, that with respect to me they should even forget the command of our Lord. If St. Peter relieves and supports even such as are strangers at Rome, are we to be neglected, who are his own servants, though we have served him but a very short time, in such an exile, and such tribulation? I have mentioned to you some particular things, that are to be had there; (that is, at Constantinople) and I intreat you to get them, and send them to me as soon as you possibly can; for I am in great want, and labor under many infirmities."[2]

The other letter he wrote in the month of September, not many days before his death; and in that too he relates to his friend, whom he does not name, lest he should bring him into trouble, the hardships he endured; and complains of his being entirely forgotten by his own clergy, the clergy of Rome: "We are separated," says he, "from the rest of the world, and deprived in a manner of life itself. The natives here are all pagans; and those, who come from other parts and settle among them, adopt their manners, are destitute of all charity, and strangers even to that pity that is to be met with among the barbarians. Nothing is brought to this country but by the vessels that come, and they come very seldom, to load salt: so that, to the present month of

[1] See p. 444.

[1] Apud Bar. ad Ann. 651. p. 432, et seq.
[2] Martin. Ep. 17. 1.

September, I have found nothing to buy but one bushel of wheat, and that I have bought at a most exorbitant price. I am amazed at the entire want of compassion, which all have betrayed, who were any ways connected with me. They have all so absolutely forsaken me, that they know not, nor do they care to know, whether I am dead or still living. But I am most of all surprised at the behavior of those, who belong to the church of the apostle St. Peter, in not supplying one of their own body even with necessaries of life. If that church has neither gold nor silver, it wants not, God be thanked, corn, wine, and other provisions, of which they might have sent us, in our present distress, at least a small portion to keep us from starving. What fear has seized on all men, and made them neglect the commands of their Creator? Have I been an enemy to that church? Or do they now look upon me as an enemy? But may God, by the intercession of St. Peter, keep them all steady in the catholic faith, especially the pastor who governs them at present, that they may receive with me the reward that is promised to those, who, in spite of all temptations, persevere to the last in the orthodox faith. As for me, I am in the hands of the Lord, who, I hope, is near at hand, and will soon put an end to my life and my sufferings."

This letter he wrote in the month of September; and he died on the 16th of the same month, worn out with hardships, and abandoned by all. He was buried in a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary at a small distance from the city of Chersonesus, and is honored by the church of Rome on the 12th of November as a martyr. But if it is not, as St. Austin well observed, what a man suffers, but the cause for which he suffers, that makes him a martyr, Martin can have no pretence to that title. Few martyrs indeed have suffered more than he, and none, to do him justice, with more patience and fortitude. But it was not for the faith that he suffered, nor in defence of the faith. It was for disobedience, I might call it rebellion, in not only opposing the declared will of the emperor, but solemnly censuring his command, the command of his lord and his sovereign as wicked, as in every respect impious, when he might have obeyed it without the least prejudice to the faith, and consequently ought to have obeyed for the sake of the public peace, which it was wisely calculated to establish. That he might have obeyed it without the least prejudice to the faith, is manifest; since nothing was contained in the imperial edict, repugnant, in the least, to the catholic faith; nay, all were thereby required to receive the doctrine defined by the five general councils; to believe that Christ was perfect God and perfect man, and that in him, as in one person, were united the two distinct natures, the human and the divine, in opposition to the Nestorians acknowledging two persons, and to the Eutychians owning but one nature. As to the silence enjoined by that edict, it was the best expedient that could be thought of to put an end to the dispute, since neither party would yield to the other, and it was no more required of the one party than of the other, but indifferently imposed upon both; nay, if the emperor showed any partiality to either party, it was to that of the pope and the western bishops, who styled themselves the orthodox party, that he showed it. For to oblige them, and encourage them the more willingly to observe the silence he enjoined, he revoked the edict of his predecessor Heraclius, establishing the doctrine of one will, and caused it at last to be taken down, as has been observed above, from the gates of the great church of the imperial city. Thus did the emperor strive, to the utmost of his power, to restore the peace of the church. But his measures were all defeated by the pope, not only condemning, as heretical, the doctrine, concerning which the emperor had enjoined a rigorous silence, but the edict itself, by which he had enjoined it, as wicked and impious. As it therefore was on that score he suffered, and that score alone, his sufferings, however great, however patiently borne, can by no means entitle him to the name or the glory of a martyr.

As to the treason, of which he was arraigned, he solemnly declared, on his trial, that he never had encouraged Olympius in his treasonable practices, and showed that it was not in his power to prevent them. Besides, the witnesses who appeared against him, were persons of no reputation or credit, and seemed all to have been suborned. But had he been condemned for what had any kind of relation to religion, the emperor would have been looked upon, by those of his party, that is, by all the western bishops, as a tyrant and persecutor. And it was, without all doubt, to prevent that, they chose to arraign him of treason, and condemn him as a traitor. In short, they charged him with a false crime to punish him for a real one, or what they thought a real one.

Martin was certainly a man of uncommon parts, and undaunted courage, of an enterprising genius, and a temper to have carried the papal power to a greater height than it had yet been carried by any of his predecessors. But the first step he took towards it proved fatal to him, and taught his successors to be, for some time, more obedient to the commands of their liege lords, the emperors. He is greatly extolled and commended by all the writers of those days, but above all by St. Audoenus, the famous bishop of Rouen, who assures us (and he was a contemporary writer, and a great lover of truth, as Baronius observes)[1] that Martin, during his imprisonment in the east, restored the sight to a blind person.[2] Of that miracle indeed no notice is

[1] Bar. ad Ann, 654. p. 447.
[2] Audoen. in vit. S. Eligii, c. 34. apud Sur. I. Decem.

Eugenius chosen. The Roman church, how governed during a vacancy. Eugenius at first an intruder, but afterwards lawful pope. He probably neither received nor condemned the type.

taken by the anonymous writer, who lived at Constantinople, and sent from thence a minute account to the western bishops of all the pope's actions and sufferings. But St. Audoenus, who was then at Rouen, might have been better informed than he; and Baronius seems not to doubt but he was. The Annalist adds, that miracles are wrought to this day at his tomb in Chersonesus: I suppose by his tombstone; for his body is believed to be at Rome; having been translated, as we are told, from Chersonesus to Constantinople, and from thence to Rome; but when, by whom, or on what occasion, nobody knows.

EUGENIUS, SEVENTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANS, CONSTANTINE POGONATUS.—ROTHARIS, RODOALD, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 655.] Martin having been carried prisoner to Rome in the manner we have seen, Eugenius, a native of Rome, and the son of one Rufinianus, was chosen by the Roman people and clergy to succeed him, when the see, says Anastasius,[1] had been vacant one year, two months, and twenty days. For when a pope was deposed, whether he was justly deposed or unjustly, the time that passed between his deposition and the election of another, was by the ancient historians reckoned in the vacancy of the see, and the time the deposed pope lived after his deposition, however long, was reckoned to his successor. If the see remained vacant one year, two months, and twenty days, Eugenius must have been ordained on the 8th of September 654, which in that year fell on a Sunday. For it was on the 19th of June, 653, that Martin was put on board a vessel lying in the Tyber, and conveyed away from Rome, as appears from the account of his sufferings, where the anonymous writer, mentioned above, has marked all the dates with the greatest exactness.

During the time that passed between the departure of Martin from Rome and the election of Eugenius, the Roman church was governed, not by Eugenius in the quality of his vicar, as Baronius has dreamt, but by the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the primicerius or chief of the notaries, as was customary in the absence as well as on the death of the pope. The Roman people and clergy chose a successor to Martin in his lifetime; apprehending, as is supposed, that if they did not choose a new bishop in compliance with the order of the emperor, he would have imposed one upon them, and perhaps a Monothelite. Some, to save the reputation of Eugenius, suppose Martin to have resigned, and consented to the election of a successor. But in the first place it is a received opinion among the Roman catholic divines, that the pope, who has been chosen into his office, not by men, but by the Holy Ghost, has not a power to resign it; and in the second place it is manifest beyond all dispute, that Martin had not resigned it, at least when Eugenius was chosen. For in the letter, which he wrote from Constantinople to his friend Theodore,[1] giving him an account of the violent proceedings of the exarch at Rome, he tells him, among other things, that the exarch produced an order from the emperor to the presbyters and deacons, commanding them to depose him, and choose another in his room: "what has never yet been done," says he, "and I hope never will; for when the pontiff is absent, the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the primicerius of the notaries, supply his place."[2] This letter was written after the 17th of September, 654, for on that day Martin arrived at Constantinople, according to the account of the anonymous writer quoted above; and Eugenius was ordained in that year on the 8th of the same month; and consequently before Martin had resigned. Nay, his saying, that he hoped the Roman clergy would never choose another in his room (so long as he lived), is a plain proof, that he neither intended to resign, nor thought himself lawfully deposed; and consequently, that Eugenius was, in his opinion, an intruder. However his being, after the death of Martin, acknowledged by the Roman people and clergy for their lawful bishop, supplied the room of a canonical election; and he thereby became their lawful bishop.

The emperor, pleased with the obedience of the Romans in choosing a new pope in the room of Martin, pursuant to his command, readily confirmed the person, whom they had chosen; and Eugenius had no sooner taken possession of the see, than he dispatched legates to Constantinople, to acquaint the emperor with his ordination, and to deliver to him, at the same time, his confession of faith, there being now no kind of communication or intercourse between the two bishops. The legates were received by Constans with uncommon marks of respect and esteem; whence some have taken it for granted, as his letter has not reached our times, that the new pope received the type. But such a step had armed the whole west against him. For the dispute was now become a party affair, and the great point was, whether the bishop of

[1] Anast. in Eugen.

[1] See p. 452. [2] Mart. Ep. 15.

Agreement between the new patriarch and the pope's legates. The pope unwilling to quarrel with the emperor. Eugenius dies;—[Year of Christ, 657.] Rotharis the first lawgiver of the Lombards; and a great warrior. Lombard kings, successors of Rotharis.

Rome, and the other western bishops, should prevail, or the bishop of Constantinople, with the three other eastern patriarchs, and the bishops depending upon them. It is therefore more probable that Eugenius abstained from all mention of the type, from all mention of one will or two; for had he, in his confession, condemned either that edict, or the doctrine of one will, his legates would not have met with so kind a reception at the imperial court.

At the time the legates arrived, or soon after their arrival at Constantinople, died the patriarch Pyrrhus; and Peter, a no less zealous Monothelite than Pyrrhus, or any of his predecessors, was chosen in his room. With him the legates frequently conferred; and various expedients were proposed to bring about a reconciliation between Constantinople and Rome. But the legates obstinately refusing to acknowledge one will only, the patriarch, to remove that obstacle, suggested the acknowledging of one will, and at the same time of two; declaring that, for the sake of the public peace, he was ready to acknowledge two wills besides one, on condition they acknowledged one besides two,—unam super duas. This the legates thought a very reasonable proposal, and they agreed to it accordingly, choosing rather to admit any number of wills, than seem to yield by admitting only one. The one will, besides the two, they styled, with the Monothelites, a substantial will; and the two, with the orthodox, natural wills. The meaning of these terms neither party seems to have well understood; nor will I take upon me to explain it. But both parties were fully satisfied, the legates with the patriarch's admitting two natural wills, and the patriarch with their admitting one substantial will, whatever those terms imported, or were thought to import. Upon this agreement the legates assisted at divine service in the great church, and publicly communicated with the patriarch, and those of his party.[1] Soon after the legates returned home; but as to the reception they met with from Eugenius, on their arrival at Rome, we are left quite in the dark. Some are of opinion that the pope, dreading the fate of his predecessor, had privately charged his legates rather to agree with the Monothelites than to quarrel with the emperor. And truly that he was willing to keep fair with those of that party, may, perhaps not improbably, be concluded from what we read in Anastasius; namely, that Peter, the new bishop of Constantinople, having sent a confession of faith to the apostolic see, expressed in the most obscure, doubtful, and equivocal terms, in which no mention at all was made of the will and operations in Christ,—the Roman people and clergy, highly provoked against the patriarch, would not suffer the pope to perform divine service in the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe, now Santa Maria Maggiore, till he had assured them that he would not receive it.[1] I cannot persuade myself that the Roman people and clergy would have presumed to use such violence with the pope, had they not thought him inclined to receive that confession, and suspected that he would receive it.

Of this pope no farther mention is made till his death, which must have happened on the 1st of June, 657, if what Anastasius writes be true; namely, that he held the see two years, eight months, and twenty-four days.[2] He is commended by Platina for his wondrous piety, religion, mildness, affability, generosity.[3] But notwithstanding his wondrous generosity, he suffered the unhappy Martin to die for want of necessaries, without once offering to afford him the least relief. We have not a single letter written by this pope, nor ascribed to him.

In the pontificate of Eugenius died Rotharis, the seventh king of the Lombards, and their first lawgiver: for till his reign the Lombards had governed themselves only by their ancient customs. But Rotharis having summoned, in the year 644, a general diet at Pavia, enacted, with the consent and approbation of his nobles, three hundred and eighty-six laws, which he caused to be inserted in an edict, and published in all the provinces under his dominion, commanding all differences that should arise after the publication of that edict to be determined by the laws comprised in it. Thus a new body of laws appeared, called the Longobard laws; and they prevailed in all the provinces of Italy, except the exarchate of Ravenna, the dukedom of Rome, and the small dukedoms of Naples, Gaeta, and Amalsi, which continued subject to the emperors. Rotharis was as great a warrior as a lawgiver; for he took from the Romans the provinces of Umbria and Venetia, reduced the Alpes Cottiæ, and engaging the exarch Isaacius, killed eight thousand of his men on the spot, and obliged the rest to save themselves by a precipitate and disorderly flight. He professed the doctrine of Arius, but allowed his subjects full liberty to embrace which of the two religions they liked best; and therefore took care, that in most of the cities subject to him, there should be two bishops, the one catholic, and the other Arian.[4] Rotharis was succeeded by his son Rodoald, who was murdered, in the first year of his reign, by a Lombard, whose wife he had debauched. As he left no children behind him, the Lombards chose Aribert in his room, the nephew of their famous queen Theudelinda. Aribert died in the ninth year of his reign; and having two sons, Godebert and Bertharith, whom he equally loved, he

[1] Acta S. Maximi ap. Bar. ad Ann. 657. p. 469. et Ep. Anast. Monachi ap. Pagi ad Ann. 655. n. 4.

[1] Anast. in Eugen. [2] Idem ibid. [3] Platina in Eugen. [4] Paul Diac. l. 4. c. 44. Sigon. de Regn. Italiæ, l. 11. ad Ann. 643.

Vitalianus chosen. Sends legates into the east. The emperor's present to St. Peter. Vitalianus avoids disobliging the emperor. Neither receives nor condemns the type.

very imprudently divided the kingdom between them. Bertharith chose Milan for the place of his residence, and Godebert Ticinium or Pavia. But the latter, not satisfied with a part, resolved to make himself master of the whole kingdom. That resolution he privately imparted to Grimoald, duke of Benevento, by far the most powerful of all the Lombard dukes, inviting him to assist him in the undertaking; and promising to give him his sister in marriage, if he succeeded. But Garibald, duke of Turin, whom he employed, on that occasion, as his embassador at the court of Grimoald, instead of persuading that prince to assist his master, agreeably to his instructions, advised him to lay hold of the present opportunity, and to decide the dispute between the two brothers, by driving them both out, and seizing on the kingdom for himself. Grimoald readily hearkened to his advice, and having killed Godebert, and obliged Bertharith to abandon his kingdom, and take refuge among the Avares, he was, in the year 662, proclaimed king, with the general consent of the nation, the Lombards apprehending that the disagreement between the two brothers would, in the end, have proved fatal both to them and the kingdom. Grimoald, now lawful king, sent back the army, which he had brought with him from Benevento, choosing entirely to rely on his own conduct, and the affections of his subjects. Of this revolution the reader will find a particular and distinct account in Paulus Diaconus.[1]

VITALIANUS, SEVENTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANS, CONSTANTINE POGONATUS.—RODOALD, ARIBERT, GODEBERT, BERTARITH, GRIMOALD, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 657.] In the room of Eugenius was chosen and ordained, after a vacancy of one month and twenty-nine days, Vitalianus, the son of Anastasius, and a native of Segnia, now Segni, in the country of the Hernici.[1] The shortness of the vacancy plainly shows, that the election of the new pope was confirmed by the exarch; for that power had been granted to the exarchs, as I observed above. Vitalianus was no sooner ordained, than he sent legates, according to custom, to Constantinople, with his confession of faith, to be presented by them, says Anastasius, to the most pious princes, meaning Constans and his son Constantine, whom Constans had distinguished with the title of Augustus, and taken for his partner in the empire ever since the year 654. Constans not only received the legates with uncommon marks of kindness, but sent by them, on their return to Rome, the book of the Gospels covered with gold, and enriched with precious stones of extraordinary size, as a present to St. Peter.[2] As the present was accepted, Baronius gravely concludes from thence, that Constans had abjured his heresy, the doctrine of one will, and made a public profession of the catholic faith, the doctrine of two wills; else the pope, says he, would never have accepted his present, the Roman church having always abhorred and rejected the oblations of heretics, as abominable things in the eyes of God.[3] But did not the Roman church receive of Theodoric, the Arian king of the Goths, two silver candlesticks weighing seventy pounds, presented by that prince to St. Peter?[4] This the annalist, it seems, did not remember, though related by himself;[2] else he might have used the same distinction on occasion of the present of Constans, which he had used on occasion of the present of Theodoric; namely, that it was accepted indeed, though given by an heretic, but accepted only as a gift, not as an oblation, the Roman church abhorring the oblations of heretics, though very well pleased with their gifts. I might add, that Constans never openly professed either the doctrine of one will, or the doctrine of two; so that he was no professed heretic, should we even allow the doctrine of one will to be an heresy; and consequently there could be no room for an abjuration. The truth is, Vitalianus showed himself, on all occasions, extremely complaisant to the emperor, remembering, and the popes did not soon forget it, what his predecessor had suffered for presuming to oppose him: And Baronius, that his complaisance to a tyrant, to an heretic, to a persecutor, to one who had so unjustly deposed, and so cruelly treated his holy predecessor, might not be thought to have been owing to any fear in him of the like treatment, would make us believe, without the least foundation in history, that Constans in appearance renouncing his heresy, pretended to be a good catholic, and that it was on that consideration the pope behaved in so obliging a manner to a prince whom he calls the most wicked of men.[3]

But to return to the legates: As the confession of faith, which the pope sent by them to the emperor, has not reached our times, some have concluded from the reception they

[1] Anast. in Vitalian. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Bar. ad Ann. 655. p. 450. [4] See p. 324.

[1] Paul. Diac. l. 4. c. ultim. et l. 5. c. 2. et seq.
[2] Bar. ad Ann. 523.
[3] Bar ad Ann. 655. p. 450. et ad Ann. 663. p. 486.

Artful conduct of Vitalianus. Constans comes into Italy, and falls on the Lombards;—[Year of Christ, 663.] His bad success. Goes to Rome.

met with at Constantinople, that the new pope received the type, and promised to acquiesce in that edict. But all, I think, that can be inferred from thence is, that he did not condemn it; for if he had, who can believe that Constans would have received his legates in the manner he did, Constans, who at this very time was proceeding with the utmost severity, or rather cruelty against the abbot Maximus, because he had persuaded the western bishops to condemn it?(*) It is therefore more likely, that Vitalianus, unwilling to disoblige the emperor by condemning the type, or his brethren in the west by receiving it, abstained from all mention of that edict, and likewise of the point in dispute; which in effect was complying with the edict, and was probably looked upon by the emperor in that light.

By the same legates Vitalianus wrote to Peter, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople. But neither has his letter, nor the patriarch's answer, reached, or been suffered to reach, our times. In the answer several passages were alleged out of the fathers to prove the doctrine of one will; but in the sixth general council they were all found to have been strangely maimed and corrupted.[1] It began thus: "Your letter, holy brother, as you are of one mind with us, has given us spiritual joy."[2] These words would incline one to think, that Vitalianus agreed in opinion with him, as Honorius had done with Sergius. But that the Monothelites did not look upon him as one of their party, is manifest from their causing his name to be struck out of the diptychs, with the names of all the other popes, Honorius alone excepted, who had governed the Roman church from the time the question was first moved, to the meeting of the sixth council. Upon the whole, Vitalianus seems to have behaved, in what concerns the present dispute, with great art and address, to have taken care neither to disoblige his own party, nor to provoke the other, and, in short, to have complied with the type, without declaring either that he rejected or received it.

We hear no more of Vitalianus till the year 663, when he received at Rome the emperor Constans. For Constans, leaving Constantinople in that year, on what account is not agreed among authors,(*) came unexpectedly into Italy. He landed at Tarento with a considerable body of troops, and thence marched to Naples, where he was joined by all the forces of that dukedom. Being thus reinforced he broke unexpectedly, and without any declaration of war, into the territories of the Lombards, and took several places, which they had abandoned, alarmed at the approach of so great an army commanded by the emperor in person. But what the emperor had most at heart was, the reduction of Benevento, the metropolis of that dukedom, comprehending in those days almost the whole country now called the kingdom of Naples. He therefore pursued his march, without loss of time, to that city, and invested it with his whole army. But meeting there with a most vigorous resistance from duke Romoald, the son of Grimoald, king of the Lombards, and receiving intelligence at the same time that the king was advancing, at the head of a powerful army, to the relief of his son, he resolved to raise the siege and withdraw out of the territories of the Lombards. He raised the siege accordingly; but Mitula, duke of Capua, meeting him before he got out of the dominions of the Lombards, cut off great numbers of his men, and obliged the rest, together with the emperor, to save themselves by a precipitate and disorderly flight. Hereupon Constans, already sick of the war, instead of

(*) Maximus, of whom I have spoken above,(a) being charged with having persuaded the western bishops, especially pope Martin, to reject and condemn the type, was, by an order from the emperor, seized at Rome, about the same time that Martin was seized, and sent prisoner to Constantinople, with his disciple Anastasius, and another Anastasius, called the apocrisarius of the Roman church, because he had been formerly employed at the imperial court in that capacity. On their arrival at Constantinople, they were all three treated, if possible, with more cruelty than the pope himself. But as they continued, in spite of the most cruel and inhuman treatment they met with, to anathematize the type, which the judges said was anathematizing the emperor, and refused to communicate with the church of Constantinople, that received it, they were in the end sentenced to be publicly whipped, to have their tongues plucked out by the root, their right hands cut off, to be led in that condition, through the twelve districts of the imperial city, to teach all who beheld them the obedience that was due to the commands of the emperor, and finally to be sent into perpetual banishment. While they were whipped, (and they were whipped most barbarously,) the public criers stood by them, repeating aloud the following words: "Thus all deserve to suffer, who obstinately refuse to obey the royal commands." They were sent into different exiles, the most inhospitable places of the whole empire; and there they died abandoned by all. The death of Maximus is supposed to have happened in 660.(b)

(a) See p. 443. (b) Vide Bar. tom. 8. p. 427—473.

[1] Concil. 6. Act. 13. [2] Ibid.

(*) Some writers tell us, that finding himself hated and despised by the Byzantines, either on account of his favoring the Monothelites, or for the murder of his brother Theodosius; to be revenged on them, he left Constantinople with a design to transfer the seat of the empire to Rome, or to Syracuse.(a) Others say, that having, out of jealousy, caused his brother, who was greatly beloved by the people, first to be ordained deacon, and afterwards to be murdered; he was haunted night and day with his apparition, imagining that he saw his brother constantly standing before him, in the habit of a deacon, with a cup of blood in his hand, inviting him with the words, "bibe frater," to quench his inhuman thirst; and that, terrified with this imagination, he left Constantinople, where the murder had been committed, and repaired to Italy, hoping to divert his mind with the sight of new objects from so tormenting a thought.(b) But the most credible writers, and among the rest Anastasius and Paulus Diaconus,(c) take it for granted, that he came into Italy upon no other account but to make war on the Lombards, and attempt, by putting himself at the head of his army, the recovery of that country. And indeed that he came upon no other motive, and with no other design, sufficiently appears from the great number troops he brought with him from the east, and his falling on the Lombards as soon as he landed.

(a) Cedren. ad Ann. 18. Const. Constantin. Manasses, Zonaras.

(b) Sigon. de Regn. Ital. ad Ann. 633.

(c) Anast. in Vitalian. et Paul. Diac. l. 5. c. 4.

Constans' reception by the pope at Rome. How he passed his time there. He plunders the city, and returns to Sicily. The pope's complaisant behavior to the emperor. Wighard sent to Rome to be ordained by the pope.

pursuing it, marched with part of his forces to Rome, being desirous of seeing that ancient metropolis of the empire and the world, while Saburrus, one of his generals, lay encamped at the pass of Formiæ, with 20,000 men to cover his march.[1] As he approached Rome, the pope went out six miles, with all his clergy, to receive him, and attended him, during the whole time he staid in the city, as his lord and his master. We read of none of those extraordinary honors paid to him, in return, by the emperor, which his successors have since required, and expect to this day from the greatest princes on the earth. But Vitalianus did not, it seems, look upon himself as "king of kings," as "prince of the world," as "monarch of the earth," as one "vested with all power above all powers;"[2] and therefore neither required nor expected them. The emperor arrived at Rome on Wednesday the 5th of July, 663, and the same day visited the church of St. Peter, and there made his offering. On the Saturday following he made his offering in the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe; and on Sunday he visited the church of St. Peter a second time, but in procession with all his troops. He visited the apostle the first time, as it were, incognito: but this was a public and solemn visit; and therefore he was met and attended into the church by the whole clergy, and, no doubt, by the pope among the rest, with lighted torches in their hands. On this occasion he presented the apostle with a pall of gold tissue, and assisted at divine service. Having thus satisfied his devotion, he spent the rest of the week in plundering the city, and stripping it of all the valuable monuments in gold, silver, brass, and marble, he could meet with, not even sparing the churches, and other sacred places. On Saturday he bathed and dined in the Lateran palace; and having caused all the plunder to be conveyed on board the vessels that lay in the Tyber, in order to be transported into Sicily, he assisted again the next day (Sunday) at divine service in the church of St. Peter, took leave of the pope, and on Monday set out on his return to Naples.[3] From Naples he marched to Rhegium, where his army was a third time defeated by the Lombards; I say a third time, for during his stay at Rome, Romoald, duke of Benevento, falling upon Saburrus, gave him a total overthrow. From Rhegium he passed over to Sicily, glad to leave the brave Lombards in possession of the country, which they had acquired with the sword, and were both determined and able, as he found by experience, to defend with the sword.

But to return to the pope; he had, without all doubt, during the twelve days the emperor continued at Rome, many favorable opportunities of recommending to him the distracted state of the church, of remonstrating against the type, which the preceding popes, and all the bishops in the west, had so loudly complained of, of reproving him for the murder of his brother Theodosius, an ecclesiactic and a deacon, and for his cruelty to Martin and Maximus, the two great champions of the catholic cause. Many such opportunities he must certainly have had; and yet it does not appear, that he ever was prompted by his zeal to avail himself of them: for if he had, the bibliothecarian would not have failed, nor would the annalist, to have acquainted us with it. If Constans was a tyrant, an heretic, a persecutor, was it not the duty of the pope, of the first bishop of the catholic church, of the bishop of bishops, to have rebuked him, at least in season, in one of his fits of devotion, and endeavored to retrieve him? A thing much to be wondered at, exclaims here father Pagi, but certainly true! Three popes successively, Martin, Eugenius, and Vitalianus, forbore excommunicating the emperor Constans, though guilty of the most enormous excesses against the church, and the supreme head of the church, the high pontiff.[1] That they did not excommunicate him is not at all to be wondered at, since the popes in those days had not yet taken upon them to excommunicate princes. But that Vitalianus, knowing him to be guilty of such enormous excesses, should have carried his complaisance so far as not to take the least notice of them; as not only to admit him into the church, instead of shutting the doors against him, as St. Ambrose did against Theodosius, but to accept his oblations or presents; nay, and to assist with him, though he thought him an heretic, at divine service, which was communicating with him, was a conduct, I will not say much to be wondered at, but highly to blame, and altogether unworthy of a bishop. "We do greatly offend," said pope Gregory the first on a like occasion, "if we are silent, and dissemble things that ought to be corrected."[2] But the whole conduct of Vitalianus bespeaks him a man of a most slavish spirit, and of a temper to flatter men in power rather than rebuke them. That Constans had abjured his heresy before he came to Rome, as Baronius would make us believe, to excuse the conduct of the pope, is one of the annalist's dreams.

During the three following years, either Vitalianus performed nothing worthy of notice, or if he did, it has been passed over in silence by the writers of those times. For of him no farther mention is made in history till the year 667, when he received Wighard, the elect archbishop of Canterbury, sent by Oswy and Ecgbert, the kings of Northumberland and Kent, to receive his ordination at Rome.

[1] Paul. Diacon. l. 5. c. 6, 7, &c.
[2] Concil. Lateran. sub. Leon. X. Sess. 1. 8. 10.
[3] Paul. Diacon. ubi supra. Anast. in Vitalian.

[1] Pagi in Annal. Bar. ad Ann. 663. 665. n. 6.
[2] Greg. Ep. l. 2. Ep. 37.

For the famous dispute between the missionaries from Rome, and the Scotch bishops and clergy, concerning the time of keeping Easter, and the ecclesiastical tonsure,(*) being at last determined in favor of the former, and Deusdedit of Canterbury dying soon after, the two

(*) As no time was fixed by the apostles, or their immediate successors, for the annual celebration of the easter festival, it was kept, in the earliest ages of the church, at different times by different churches.(a) Some observed it every year on a fixed day; others kept it, with the Jews, on the 14th day of the moon following the vernal equinox, on what day soever of the week it happened to fall; and some put it off till the following Sunday. The first council of Arles in 314 decreed, "That the Pasch of Resurrection (so called from the Hebrew word Pesach, which signifies passover) should be observed at one time, and on one and the same day, throughout the world;" and that decree was confirmed by the council of Nice in 325. But as the precise time was not fixed by either council, nor the method of finding it prescribed, even those who agreed in keeping that festival on a Sunday, did not always agree in keeping it on the same Sunday. In the year 387 it was kept by some churches on the 21st of March, by others on the 18th of April, and by some on the 25th of April:(b) and so it happened again in the year 577.(c) In the years 322, 349, 406, the Easter of the Latins was a whole month earlier than that of the Alexandrians.(d) This disagreement was owing to the different cycles, that obtained in the different churches. The Roman church followed the Jewish cycle of eighty-four years till the time of pope Leo the Great, who in 455, changed it for that of Alexandria;(e) as he did two years after the Alexandrian cycle for that of Victorius Aquitanus, which was again changed, in 525, for the cycle of Dionysius Exiguus, consisting of nineteen years. Thus did the Roman church thrice change her cycles, and with them the time of the paschal solemnity. To these changes the Scots, the Britons, and the Picts, were utter strangers, as they held but little correspondence with Rome, and therefore adhered to the ancient cycle of eighty-four years. This difference in the cycles produced a difference among the Saxon churches; the northern Saxons, who had been converted by the Scotch clergy, following the old cycle; and those, who owed their conversion to the Roman or French missionaries, conforming to the more modern one. Thus in the year 631, the churches, founded by the Scots, kept Easter on the 21st of April; and those that had been founded by the Roman and French missionaries, on the 14th of March.(f) At other times the Scotch Easter came first; for it sometimes happened in Oswy's court, as Bede informs us,(g) that while the king, who conformed to the usages of the Scots, by whom the Northumbrians had been converted, was celebrating the feast of Easter, the queen, who had been brought up in Kent, where the Roman usages obtained, was still keeping Lent. The Roman missionaries pretended to derive their practice from the apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, though of so late a date as the year 525, and stigmatized with the name of schismatics, all who did not conform to it. The Scots, on the other hand, would not relinquish a practice, which had been observed by them ever since the conversion of their nation, and which they pretended to have been handed down to them by tradition from the apostles, St. John and St. Philip. And truly the cycle of eighty-four years, which the Jews had invented to settle the anniversary returns of their passover, continued, however faulty, to be used by the Christians for near two hundred years, as is agreed on all hands; so that the Britons and the Scots, who still used the same cycle, may be rather said to have agreed with the apostles, even with St. Peter and St. Paul, as to the time of keeping Easter, than the Roman missionaries, or those who sent them; the cycle, which at this time was in use among them, having been invented, or at least adopted by their church, five hundred years after the apostles' times.

The manner or fashion of the ecclesiastical tonsure afforded matter for as warm disputes as the time of celebrating the Easter festival. The grand question was, "Whether the hair of the priests and monks should be clipped or shaved on the fore part of the head from ear to ear, in the form of a semicircle, or on the top of the head, in form of a circle, to imitate the crown of thorns, which our Savior wore, and of which it was thought to be an emblem." The Scots shaved the fore part of their heads; and the missionaries from Rome the top, calling that the tonsure of St. Peter, as if it had been derived from that apostle. When, by whom, or on what occasion, the ecclesiastical tonsure, that is, the clipping or shaving the hair of the ecclesiastics, was first introduced, is not well known. But certain it is, that in the time of St. Jerom, who flourished in the end of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century, a Romish priest, with his shaven crown, would have been taken for a priest of Isis or Serapis; a shaven crown being then, as that father informs us,(a) the characteristic or badge of those priests. As for the Christian priests, they were neither to shave their heads, as we learn of the same father,(b) lest they should look too like the priests and votaries of Isis and Serapis; nor to suffer their hair to grow long, after the luxurious manner of the barbarians and soldiers, but to observe a decent mean between the two extremes; that is, as he explains it, to let their hair grow long enough to cover their skin. It was therefore probably the custom to cut their hair, to a moderate degree, at their ordination, not by way of a religious mystery but merely for the sake of decency; and that nothing else was originally meant by the ecclesiastical tonsure. However that he, the cutting of the hair was, in process of time, improved into a mystery; and the heathenish ceremony of shaving the head not only adopted by the church, but looked upon as important enough to divide it.

As the peace of the English church (yet in its infancy) was greatly disturbed, and the propagating of the gospel interrupted and checked by these unseasonable disputes among the ecclesiastics about rites and usages, while they all agreed in faith and religion, king Oswy undertook to reconcile the contending parties; and with that design convened a synod in 664, at Streanes-halch, now Whitby in Yorkshire. In that synod the matters in debate were not put to the vote, as was usual in all other synods; but the king, after hearing both parties, declared for the Romish; taking it for granted, that their customs were all derived from St. Peter, whom he said, he would by no means disoblige; lest he being disobliged, who had been trusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, agreeably to that of our Savior, "To thee will I give," &c., no other should be found, who would take upon him to open the gates of heaven, and let him in.(c) The king had, without all doubt, been gained over before-hand to the rites and ceremonies brought by the missionaries from Rome and France, probably by Eanfeld his queen, or by his son Alcfrid, king of Deïra; for I cannot think, that the motive, which he alleged for his change, could have any ways influenced him, or that he was serious when he alleged it. However his speech was received with great applause by the assembly, as Bede informs us;(d) and it was concluded, that Easter should be thenceforth observed after the Roman manner. It is not to be doubted, but the dispute about the ecclesiastical tonsure, and other matters that were canvassed in the same assembly, was likewise determined in favor of the missionaries, though Bede has not told us that it was. Thus were the English churches, founded by the Scots, brought to submit to the customs of Rome; which soon brought them, and it was what the missionaries aimed at, to submit to the authority of Rome; nay, their changing their own rites and ceremonies for those of that church was, in itself, a tacit acknowledgment of, and a virtual submission to her authority. And it was, without all doubt, on that consideration, that Colman, the Scotch bishop of the Northumbrians, chose rather to quit his bishopric, than to comply with the decision of the synod, or rather of the king. Besides, the missionaries required a conformity to the usages of the Roman church as absolutely necessary; and to require even the priests and the monks to shave, not the forepart, but the top of their heads, upon that principle, was sapping the very foundations of the

(a) See p. 202. (b) Ambros. Ep. 87.
(c) Stillingf.'s Answer to Cressy, p. 323.
(d) Bucher. Comment. in Hippolyt. Canon. Pasch.
(e) Leo Ep. 95.
(f) Usher Antiquit. Britan. Eccl. p. 482.
(g) Bed. l. 3. c. 25.

(a) Hier. l. 13. in Ezek. c. 44. (b) Idem ibid.
(c) Bed. l. 3. c. 25. (d) Idem ibid.

Wighard dies at Rome. The pope's letter to king Osway, on that occasion. The monk Theodore chosen by the pope in the room of Wighard. His ordination delayed, and why.

kings agreed to name him a successor out of the English clergy, and send him for his ordination to Rome; that being ordained there, he might prove more active and zealous in promoting the customs and rites of that church. Pursuant to that resolution, Wighard, presbyter of the church of Canterbury, where the Romish customs and ceremonies obtained, was chosen, and sent to Rome with letters from both kings to the pope, and a present to St. Peter, consisting of several vessels of silver and gold; but neither of those letters has reached our times. Wighard was received, as we may well imagine, by the pope, with all possible marks of respect and esteem. But a violent plague raging at that time in Italy (and it raged with no less violence in England),(*) he died of it at Rome before he was ordained, and with him died almost his whole retinue. The person being dead whom the two kings had named, the pope resolved to lay hold of so favorable an opportunity, and name one to the see of Canterbury himself. At the same time therefore that he wrote to king Oswy, to acquaint him with the death of Wighard, he took care to let him know, that as soon as he found a person equal to so great a charge, he would send him into England, with proper instructions to root up the tares throughout the whole island. By the tares the pope could only mean such rites and usages as differed from those of Rome; for at this time they all agreed in doctrine and faith. In the same letter he commended and extolled the zeal of the king for the true and apostolic faith; exhorted him to conform not only in the celebration of Easter, but in every thing else, to the rule of the holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul; and thanking him for the present to St. Peter, he sent in return, to him, a choice collection of relics, and to the queen, whom he styled his spiritual daughter, a cross and a golden key, containing some of the filings of the supposed chains, with which the two apostles were bound, when prisoners in Rome.[1](†)

The pope lost no time, but made it his study to find a proper person to fill the vacant see of Canterbury. He first cast his eyes on Adrian, abbot of a monastery in the neighborhood of Naples. But he, not thinking himself sufficiently qualified to discharge so great a trust, recommended to the pope, first a monk named Andrew, and upon his excusing himself on account of his infirmities, another monk named Theodore, well known to Adrian, who made no objection to the episcopal dignity, though he was then in the sixth-sixth year of his age, and the see, to which he was preferred, lay at so great a distance from Rome. He was a man of uncommon parts, good morals, and great learning, but a native of Greece, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, which gave no small umbrage to the pope, apprehending that he might introduce into the English church the rites and usages of the Greeks; and he would not ordain him, notwithstanding all his good qualities, until Adrian promised to attend him into England, and there keep a wathful eye over his actions and conduct. The fears of the pope, who reposed an entire confidence in Adrian, being thus allayed, Theodore, yet a layman, was immediately ordained subdeacon; but he was not consecrated bishop until three months after; though he was impatiently expected by the two kings and their people, and his presence was necessary in England. What occasioned, in these circumstances, so long a delay, Bede gravely informs us. The new archbishop had his head shaved all over after the manner of the eastern monks, which was called the tonsure of St. Paul; and the pope waited until his hair grew, that it might be shaved, at his ordination, only on the top of

power and liberty, which all national churches had ever enjoyed of settling their own discipline, and appointing such rites, ceremonies, and forms of worship, as they judged most decent and edifying. No wonder therefore, that Colman abandoned a church, which he saw thus running headlong into slavery, and withdrew to Scotland.

(*) It raged with such violence in England, that the unhappy people, preferring a quick death to the insufferable torments of a tedious illness, ran in crowds to the clifts on the shore, and thence threw themselves headlong into the sea. (a) It swept off great numbers of the inhabitants, and among the rest Suidhelm, king of the East-Saxons. (b)

(a) Westmonasterien. ad Ann. 665.

(b) Bed. l. 3. c. 30.

[1] Bed. l. 3. c. 29.

(†) As St. Peter was thought to keep the keys of the kingdom of heaven, it was a crafty contrivance of the popes, to have small keys made of different metals, some even of gold, and to send them as presents from St. Peter, to persons who had deserved well of the apostolic see, or whom they wanted to oblige. Of these keys Gregory the Great was of all popes the most liberal. One he sent to king Childebert, the son of Brunichild, assuring him, that if he wore it at his neck, it would screen him from evils, "Quæ collo vestro suspensæ a malis vos omnibus tueantur." (a) Another he bestowed on Columbus, bishop in the province of Numidia. (b) A third he gave to Theodorus, physician to the emperor Mauritius; (c) and a fourth, of gold, the most remarkable of all, to Theotistes and Andrew, the governors of that emperor's children. For it had even wrought a miracle, which he thus relates in the letter he wrote to them when he sent it. "This key," says he, "was found by a Lombard in a city beyond the Po; who indeed made no account of it, as the key of St. Peter; but observing that it was of gold, he took it up, and pulled out a knife with a design to cut it. But he was that moment possessed with an evil spirit, and he stuck the knife in his own throat, and died on the spot. At this spectacle king Autharis, who was present, and the Lombards who attended him, were struck with such dread and terror, that not one of them had the courage to take up the key, or so much as to touch it. A Lombard, therefore, named Minulphus, who professed the catholic faith, was sent for; and he took it up without the least fear or apprehension. King Autharis, surprised at the event, caused another golden key to be made, and sent both to my predecessor, namely, Pelagius II., with an account of the miracle. That very key," continues Gregory, "the key by which God was pleased to destroy an haughty and perfidious man, I send to your excellency, that you, who love and fear him, may 'by it' (remarkable words!) attain your eternal salvation.'" (d) The unhappy Lombard had perhaps his throat cut by some zealous catholic for the affront which he offered to St. Peter in his key.

(a) Greg. l. 5. Ep. 6. (b) Idem. l. 2. Ep. 47.

(c) Idem. l. 6. Ep. 25. (d) Idem. l. 6. Ep.

Theodore sets out for England;—[Year of Christ, 668.] He arrives at Canterbury, the following year. His zeal in promoting the Romish ceremonies. John, bishop of Lappa, appeals to the pope from the judgment of his metropolitan.

his head, and in the form of a crown.[1] This was the mode of the Roman tonsure; and it was called the tonsure of St. Peter. It seems quite incredible, and would not be credited, were it not well attested, that so great stress could ever have been laid on such trifles. But insignificant rites and ceremonies were now become essential parts of the Christian religion.

Theodore was ordained at last by the pope on the 26th of March, 668, (his hair being by that time sufficiently grown,) and from Rome he set out for England together with Adrian on the 27th of May. They went by sea to Marseilles, and from thence by land to Arles, with letters of recommendation from the pope to John archbishop of that city. From Arles Theodore proceeded on his journey, and arriving at Paris, passed the winter there with Agilbert, formerly bishop of the West-Saxons, and now bishop of Paris. During his stay in that city, he was told by Agilbert that pope Gregory had granted to Austin, the first bishop of Canterbury, an unlimited jurisdiction over all the churches of Britain, though Austin had never had an opportunity of exercising it. Upon that information Theodore, whose idol was power, as it afterwards too plainly appeared, wrote immediately to Vitalianus, and continued at Paris until he had obtained of him the same jurisdiction, and by a general grant every privilege, power, and prerogative, that might by him be judged necessary to promote the good of the churches in Britain.[2] In the mean time Ecgbert, king of Kent, being informed that the new archbishop of Canterbury was in France, dispatched immediately the prefect Redfrid to attend him over into England; and he arrived at Canterbury on the 27th of May, 669. As for Adrian, he was detained some time by Ebroinus, Mayor of the palace to Clotaire III., upon a suspicion that he was charged with some private embassy from the emperor to the kings of England against the kingdom of France. But that suspicion being found to be groundless, he was suffered to pursue his journey to England; and on his arrival at Canterbury, had the monastery of St. Peter allotted him for his habitation; the pope having ordered Theodore, at his departure from Rome, to provide him and his companions (no doubt a new colony of monks) with a convenient habitation within his diocese.[3] Theodore governed the church of Canterbury twenty-one years, and proved the greatest prelate for parts and learning, as well as the most active and zealous, England had yet seen in that chair; active and zealous, not in preaching the gospel, or causing it to be preached, though the whole kingdom of the South-Saxons was yet unconverted;(*) but in establishing what he seems to have had chiefly at heart, his own authority in the kingdoms already converted, and with it the pompous rites and ceremonies of Rome. And he succeeded in both; the Romish rites and modes of worship were by his means universally received, and the jurisdiction of the see of Canterbury, which until his time had been confined within the narrow limits of the kingdom of Kent, was, with the concurrence of the Saxon kings, especially of Oswy, extended over all England. He is therefore very justly said by Bede to have been the first archbishop who was acknowledged as such by all the churches in England;[1] and it is to his ambition that the archbishops of Canterbury owe the power and authority which they enjoy to this day. But of him I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

To return to Vitalianus; he had, the same year, 668, a favorable opportunity of exerting the power, which his predecessors had usurped, of receiving appeals from all parts of the world, of reversing the judgment of other bishops or synods, and absolving those whom they had condemned, or condemning those whom they had absolved; and that power he exerted accordingly, on the following occasion. John, bishop of Lappa in the island of Crete, having been found guilty

[1] Bed. l. 4. c. 1. [2] Malmesbur. l. 1. de Pontif.
[3] Bed. l. 4. c. 1.

(*) The South-Saxons, inhabiting the present counties of Sussex and Surry, were not converted till the year 681, twelve years after the arrival of Theodore in England; and that they were converted even then was not owing to any zeal in him, nor indeed in the person by whom they were converted, but to chance, or to speak more properly, to a particular providence of God. The first who preached the gospel to that people was Wilfrid, bishop of York, whose name is famous in the annals of the English church. But he preached to them, as Jonah preached to the Ninevites, against his will, and when he had nothing less in his thoughts than the preaching of the gospel. He had been driven from his see by Ecgfrid, king of Northumberland, whose high displeasure he had incurred; and finding nowhere else a safe retreat, the other kings being unwilling to protect him against so powerful a prince, he was forced to take sanctuary in the pagan kingdom of the South-Saxons. There he was received with open arms by Ethelwalch, king of that country, overjoyed, as he himself had embraced the Christian religion some years before, at the favorable opportunity that offered of having the same faith preached to his people. That Wilfrid undertook, having then no hopes of being restored to his see, and was attended in the undertaking with all the success he could have wished. The South-Saxons readily embraced the Christian religion, and at the persuasion of Wilfrid, an episcopal see was founded by the king at Seolsy in Sussex, the capital of the kingdom; and of that see Wilfrid was the first bishop. The see was afterwards, about the year 1070. removed to Chichester; and hence Wilfrid is reckoned the first in the succession of the bishops of that city. Thus were the South-Saxons converted at last, eighty-four years after the arrival of Austin in England;(a) and I do not find that their conversion had, till that time, been ever attempted, though their country bordered on the kingdom of Kent, which swarmed with missionaries and monks from Rome. As for Theodore and Adrian, and the monks who came over with them, they were so much taken up in converting to the rites and ceremonies of Rome those who were already converted to the faith, in causing Easter to be every where kept at the time which it was kept at in Rome, in persuading the priests and monks to shave the top and not the forepart of their heads, &c., that they had not time to think of any other conversion.

(a) Bed. l. 4. c. 13. Eddius vit. Wilfrid. c. 40. 15. Script. p. 72.

[1] Bed. l. 4. c. 2.

John, bishop of Lappa, is absolved by the pope; who writes four letters on this occasion. The authority of the pope still disputed in Italy itself. Maurus of Milan, excommunicated by the pope, excommunicates him in his turn.

(we are not told of what crime) and been thereupon condemned by Paul his metropolitan, in a synod consisting of all the bishops of that island, instead of acquiescing in their sentence, appealed from them to the pope. This the metropolitan highly resented; and far from paying any kind of regard to the appeal, he ordered the appellant to be conveyed to the public jail, and to be kept there till he owned himself justly condemned. But he found means to make his escape, got safe to Rome, and there presented a memorial to the pope, complaining of the injustice that he said had been done him, and earnestly entreating his holiness to re-examine his cause, and absolve or condemn him according to the canons. The pope readily hearkened to his request, as we may well imagine, and having procured a copy of the acts of the council of Crete, and caused them to be read and examined in a council assembled for that purpose at Rome, they were, by all the bishops who composed that assembly, declared illegal, the former sentence was reversed, and the bishop of Lappa absolved as having been unlawfully judged and unjustly condemned. Few, if any, who appealed to Rome, were there found guilty; the merit of appealing, covering, it seems, in the eyes of the pope the multitude of sins; for no man can think that all, who appealed to Rome, were innocent, and had been elsewhere unjustly condemned. On that occasion the pope wrote four letters: namely, two to Paul, primate of Crete, to acquaint him with the judgment of the council of Rome, to reprimand him, which he does very sharply, for not suspending (as was required by the canons) all farther proceedings against the accused bishop, when he had once appealed to the apostolic see, and to command him, by the authority of that see, to restore his beloved brother, and make good the damages, which he, or his church, might have suffered by the unjust persecution. In one of these letters he complains to Paul of a deacon, who had married after his ordination, and served two churches, and requires him to prevent, by all means, for the future, such enormous abuses.[1] The other two letters the pope wrote to George, bishop of Syracuse, where Constans still resided, and to Vaanus, chamberlain and chartulary to the emperor, entreating them to use their interest at court in behalf of the bishop of Lappa, irregularly condemned, and unjustly deposed.[2] The right of receiving appeals the popish writers all pretend to be of divine institution; but that Vitalianus did not know, and therefore resolved it in his letter to the metropolitan of Crete, into the canons of the church; which Baronius did not think worthy of his notice, though he has taken care to observe on this occasion, with what resolution and vigor Vitalianus asserted the authority of his see.[1] What was the issue of that affair, we are nowhere told; but from the conduct of Paul it is manifest, that he acknowleged no power in the pope of judging one whom he had already judged, or restoring one whom he had deposed.

It was not only in the east that the authority of the pope was still disputed. It was not yet universally acknowledged, and tamely submitted to, even in the west, no, not in Italy itself, without the limits of the suburbicarian provinces, the ancient limits of the jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome. The Italian bishops indeed, generally speaking, patiently bore with the usurpations and encroachments of the popes, sacrificing the rights of their sees to their own quiet and peace. But still we read of some, who had courage and resolution enough, especially when supported by the civil power, manfully to oppose the wild pretensions of the popes; and vigorously to assert, in spite of their anathemas, the liberty with which Christ had made them free. One of these was Maurus, bishop of Ravenna, who being summoned by Vitalianus to Rome, to give an account there of his faith and his conduct, not only refused to obey the summons, but let the pope know, that as he had no kind of authority over him, or his see, he could have no right to issue such a summons. This unexpected answer provoked Vitalianus to such a degree, that, transported with rage at seeing his authority questioned and despised even in Italy, he immediately thundered against Maurus the sentence of excommunication. But of his excommunication Maurus made no more account than he had made of his summons; nay, thinking he had as good a right to excommunicate the pope, as the pope had to excommunicate him, he retorted the sentence, and excommunicated him in his turn. That raised the rage, or, as Baronius will have it, the zeal of the pope beyond all measure; and a council being summoned without delay, Maurus was, with the unanimous consent of the bishops who composed it, struck, as Baronius supposes, with horror at an attempt so daring, and superlatively wicked, degraded, stript of his priesthood, and reduced to the state of a layman. But the bishop of Ravenna was supported by the exarch; and therefore, being well satisfied that the pope had no kind of power over him or his church, he continued to exercise, in defiance of him and his council, all the functions of his office so long as he lived; and when reduced to the point of death, he recommended to his clergy the liberties of their church, and charged them, with his last breath, never to submit to the authority of the pope. This was setting a very bad example, and to deter others from following it, pope Adeodatus, in whose time Maurus died, ordered his name to be struck out of the dip-

[1] Epist. 1. et 2. Vital. Tom. 6. Concil. p. 445.
[2] Ep. 3. et 4. ibid.

[1] Bar. ad Ann. 667. p. 501.

Maurus' name struck out of the diptychs after his death. The example of Maurus followed by his successor. Vitalianus dies;—[Year of Christ, 672.] The emperor Constans murdered. In his time the Saracens make great conquests. Adeodatus chosen.

tychs. Had he promoted the papal usurpations with as much zeal as he opposed them, it is not to be doubted but his name would have been thought worthy of a place in the calendar as well as in the diptychs; and he would be now honored as a saint of the first rate, as many others are, who had no other merit but that of betraying their trust, and sacrificing the just rights and liberties of their churches to the ambition of the popes. Maurus was succeeded by Reparatus, who, in compliance with the injunctions, and last will, as we may call it, of his predecessor, not only refused to acknowledge the authority of the pope, but obtained, by the interest he had at court, an imperial rescript, exempting his see from all subjection to that of Rome. But the rescript was revoked twelve years after by Constantine Pogonatus, the son of Constans, at the request of pope Leo II., who on that occasion issued a constitution, forbidding the anniversary of Maurus, which the church of Ravenna observed out of gratitude to the memory of their deliverer, to be thenceforth celebrated, or his name to be mentioned at the altar.[1]

Of Vitalianus we hear no more till the time of his death; and he must have lived to the 27th of January, 672, if what we read in Anastasius,[2] and all the pontificals, be true, namely, that he presided in the Roman church fourteen years and six months: for he was ordained on the 30th of July, 657. Bollandus seems to have entertained a mighty opinion of this pope; for he tells us, that had his actions been all faithfully recorded, he would have made as great a figure in history as the greatest of popes.[3] But who can say, that his actions have not all been faithfully, recorded? What great things are related of him, that can incline us to think, that greater things have been omitted?

In the year 668, the twelfth of Vitalianus, was murdered, in the bath of Daphne at Syracuse, by one Andrew, the emperor Constans, after he had reigned twenty-seven years. He scarce performed any thing, during his long reign, worthy of notice; but suffering himself to be diverted, by the unseasonable and impertinent disputes among the ecclesiastics, from providing, as he otherwise might, for the safety of the empire, he allowed the Saracens to pursue their conquests and ravages, almost without interruption. For in his time they not only laid waste, with fire and sword, most of the provinces of the empire, carrying everywhere off incredible multitudes of captives, but reduced all Africa, and making a descent on the island of Cyprus with seventeen hundred ships, made themselves masters of the city of Constantia, and, with very little difficulty, of the whole island.[1] However, Constans had once the courage to face them, and commanding his fleet in person, engage them by sea. But he was shamefully defeated, and his ships were most of them taken or sunk; among the rest his own ship was taken. But he had already quitted her and made his escape, having changed garb with one of his men, whom the barbarians mistook for the emperor, and cut in pieces.[2] Upon the death of Constans the conspirators proclaimed one Metius, or Mezentius, by birth an Armenian. But in the mean time Constantine, the deceased emperor's son, having with the utmost expedition equipped a fleet at Constantinople, sailed with it to Sicily, and having there defeated, taken, and put to death the usurper, and the rest of the conspirators, he caused himself to be by all acknowledged for lawful emperor, and returning to Constantinople, was there received with loud acclamations by all ranks of people.[3](*)

ADEODATUS, SEVENTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE POGONATUS.—GRIMOALD, GARIBALD, BERTARITH, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ 672.] Vitalianus was succeeded by Adeodatus, a native of Rome, the son of one Jovinianus, and a monk of the monastery of St. Erasmus on mount Cœlius. He was ordained, after a vacancy of two months and twenty-five days;[4] and consequently on the 22d of April, 672. The only thing we read of him is, that he confirmed the privilege, which Chrotbert, bishop of Tours, had granted to the monastery of St. Martin, situated in his diocese, exempting that monastery from the jurisdiction of the bishop: and some have even suspected the authenticity of the letter or bull ascribed to Adeodatus, confirming that privilege;[4] which has given occasion to great

[1] Hier. Rub. Hist. Raven. l. 4. Anast. in Leon. II. Vide Bar. ad Ann. 669. p. 505.
[2] Anast. in Vitalian. [3] Bolland. ad diem 27 Jan.
[4] Anast. in Adeodat.

[1] Theoph. ad Ann. Incarnat. secund. Alexandrin. 639, 640. Elmakin. Hist. Saracen. ad Ann. Hegir. 27.
[2] Theoph. ad Ann. 13. Const.
[3] Theoph. ad Ann. Constan. 27. Paul. Diac. l. 5. prope fin.
(*) He must have continued some time in the west, settling the provinces that were there still subject to the empire; for we are told by Zonaras, that he was surnamed Pegonatus by the people of Constantinople, because, at his departure from thence, only a little down appeared on his chin, and he returned with a beard.
[4] Launoy in Assert. Inquisit. in Privileg. Sanmedardense.

Adeodatus dies;—[Year of Christ, 676.] In his time the Lombards renounce the doctrine of Arius. Donus chosen. The patriarch writes to him. The emperor resolves to assemble a general council;—[Year of Christ, 677.] The following year he imparts his design to the pope. His letter to Donus.

disputes.[1] The other actions of this pope, if he performed any worthy of notice, and Baronius takes it for granted that he did, have been all buried in oblivion. He died on the 26th of June, 676, having governed the Roman church four years, two months, and five days.[2] The bibliothecarian paints him as a man of a mild temper, of great generosity, and universal benevolence, being to all alike accessible, to the lowest as well as the highest, and ever ready, so far as it lay in his power, to gratify all.[3] A most amiable character; better than that of many popes, who have made a great noise in the world.

In the beginning of the pontificate of Adeodatus, died king Grimoald, of whom I have spoken above. He had been let blood in one of his arms; and, as he was nine days after bending a bow, the vein opened, and all possible means for closing it proving ineffectual, he bled to death.[4] He had been brought up in the principles of Arius; but he renounced them, being, as we are told, convinced of his error by John bishop of Bergamo, a prelate of great piety and learning. The example of Grimoald was followed by the kings his successors, who all professed the catholic religion; so that Arius was, in a short time, forsaken by the whole nation of the Lombards. As the laws of king Rotharis were found to be in many instances deficient, and some of them were thought too severe, Grimoald, in the sixth year of his reign, undertook the correcting of the edict, which that king had published twenty-four years before; and in a general diet held at Pavia in 668, with the consent and approbation of his nobles, he repealed some laws, enacted others in their room, and published a new edict, which was received, not only by the Lombards, for whom it was made, but, in process of time, by the ancient inhabitants of Italy, though they had never been forbidden the use of the Roman laws.[1] Grimoald left behind him, besides Romoald, duke of Benevento, another son, named Garibald, to whom, though yet very young, he bequeathed the kingdom of the Lombards. But he was deposed, after a short reign of three months, and Bertarith recalled and placed again on the throne.

DONUS, SEVENTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE.—BERTARITH, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 676.] In the room of Adeodatus was chosen and ordained, after a vacancy of four months and five days,[5] and, consequently on the first of November, 676, Donus, Domnus, or Dominus, the son of Mauritius, and by birth a Roman.[6] In the same year, and about the same time, was raised to the see of Constantinople, Theodorus, who professed the doctrine of one will, and therefore did not send his confession of faith to the new pope, being well apprised that it would not be received at Rome. However he wrote to Donus, as soon as he heard of his promotion, an exhortary letter, earnestly entreating him to pity the distracted state of the church, and to concur with him in such measures as might restore the harmony that had formerly reigned between the two sees.[7] What answer Donus returned to the patriarch's letter we know not. But if the pope did not pity the distracted state of the church, the emperor did; and having, at this time, concluded a peace with the Saracens, he resolved to leave nothing unattempted, that lay in his power, to establish in the church the peace and tranquillity that reigned in the state. With that view he first of all applied to the two patriarchs, Theodorus of Constantinople, and Macarius of Antioch, to learn of them what was the true cause of the divisions that rent the church in so miserable a manner? What the subject, about which the holy bishops disagreed and quarreled, cursing and excommunicating each other as heretics, though they all professed to receive the five general councils, to acquiesce in the doctrine of the fathers, and to abhor and anathematize all heretics, and all heresies? The patriarchs answered, that some new expressions had been introduced either out of ignorance, or through a sinful curiosity of searching into the unsearchable things of God; and that it was about them they quarreled; some understanding them in one sense, as they had never yet been thoroughly examined, and others in another. The answer of the patriarchs suggested to the emperor the thought of assembling a general council, that the subject of the debate, whatever it was, being thoroughly examined by men of both parties, no room might be left for farther disputes.

The emperor had no sooner formed that design, than impatient to have it put in execution, he wrote to Donus to acquaint him with it,

[1] Radulph. Mousnyer de Jur. Eccles. Sti. Mart. Turonens. Le Cointe Annal. Eccles. Francor. ad. Ann. 676.
[2] Anast. in Adeodat.
[3] Idem ibid.
[4] Paul. Diac. l. 5. c. 33.
[5] Anast in Dono.
[6] Idem ibid.
[7] Concil. t. 6. p. 594.

[1] Paul. Diac. c. 12. Signon. de Regn. Ital. l. 2. ad Ann. 668.

expressing in his letter great concern, Dolorem ultra omnem dolorem, at the divisions that reigned in the church, and a most sincere and ardent desire of seeing them healed. To attain so desirable an end, he lets the pope know, that he has resolved to assemble a general council; exhorts him to suffer the frivolous disputes, that served only to render the Christian religion contemptible in the eyes of the pagans, to be determined at last; and earnestly entreats him, as he tendered the welfare of the church, to "lay aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies;" and concur with the two holy patriarchs, Theodorus and Macarius, in inquiring impartially, and with mildness and modesty, after the truth. In the same letter he puts the pope in mind of the saying of our Savior, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister;" and of that other, "By this shall all men know, that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another;" being well apprised, that the present disputes and disagreements between the two sees were chiefly owing to pride, jealousy, desire of victory, and want of charity. He does not require the pope to assist at the council in person, but to choose some of the most eminent men of his church for probity, learning, and modesty, men, above all, well versed in the sacred sciences, and the doctrine of the fathers, and to send them, with the necessary books, to supply his room. He thinks three persons may be sufficient to represent the pope, though he gives him leave to send as many above that number as he shall judge proper and expedient; but desires that twelve metropolitans may be sent to represent his council. He assures the pope, and assures him with an oath, per deum omnipotentem, that he is no ways, in the least, prejudiced for or against either party; that he is determined to act, on all occasions, with the strictest impartiality; that those who come from his holiness shall be well received, and treated, during their stay at Constantinople, with the greatest kindness and respect; and that whether they agree with their brethren in the east or not, they shall be sent back safe and unhurt. He adds, that he has ordered Theodorus, exarch of Italy, to supply those who shall be sent by his holiness or his council, with money, with provisions, with ships for their passage, and, if they choose it, for their greater safety, with ships of war. In the end of his letter he tells the pope, that the two holy patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch had requested him, with great earnestness, to suffer the name of Vitalianus to be struck out of the diptychs; but that he had withstood their requests and entreaties, being resolved to leave all things in the state which they at present were in, until the points in dispute were finally determined.(*) The emperor expresses, throughout the whole letter, a most sincere and earnest desire of seeing a lasting peace established in the church, which he says has been committed to his care; and often declares, that as he (not the pope) has been chosen and appointed by God to maintain the catholic faith pure and undefiled, he will spare no pains to discharge, as he ought, so great a trust; but that he can only employ exhortations, entreaties, and prayers, not being warranted to use any kind of compulsion. The letter was addressed "to Donus the most holy and blessed archbishop of ancient Rome, and universal pope;" and it ended thus: "May God preserve you many years, most holy and blessed father!" It is dated the 12th of August, 678.[1] The emperor was unwilling to quarrel with either patriarch about their titles; and therefore, in compliance with their respective claims, and to gratify the pride and vanity of both, he distinguished the bishop of Rome with the title of universal pope, and the bishop of Constantinople with that of universal patriarch, as we shall soon see.

The emperor's letter had not reached Rome when Donus died; and his death happened on the 11th of April of the present year, after he had sat in the chair one year, five months, and ten days.[2] All we know of him is, that he repaired and embellished several churches, that he was very kind to his clergy, and that having discovered in Rome a monastery of Syrian monks, who professed the doctrine of Nestorius, he dispersed them, sending them into different monasteries to be better instructed, and placed Roman monks in their room.[3]

(*) Peter, the Monothelite, patriarch of Constantinople, of whom I have spoken above, was succeeded by three orthodox patriarchs, Thomas, John, and Constantine; and the name of Vitalianus had been either by John or Constantine, who were both his contemporaries, allowed a place in the diptychs. But as that honor had been granted to no other pope, since the dispute commenced between the two sees, except to Honorius, whom the Monothelites looked upon as one of their party, Theodorus, the successor of Constantine, and a zealous Monothelite, applied to the emperor jointly with Macarius of Antioch, who held the same doctrine, to have the name of Vitalianus erased. Constantine did not for some time hearken to their request; but finding they were backed by the whole party, and apprehending he might be taxed with partiality, if he continued deaf to their repeated petitions, solicitations, and remonstrances, he thought it advisable in the end to consent to, or connive at, their striking out the name of that pope.

[1] Tom. 4. Concil. p. 594.
[2] Anast. in Dono. [3] Idem. ibid.

Agatho chosen. He receives the emperor's letter. The Monothelites condemned by all the western bishops. Wilfred of York arrives at Rome. Is persecuted by the king of Northumberland.

AGATHO, SEVENTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE POGONATUS.—BERTARITH, CUNIPERT, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 678.] Donus was succeeded by Agatho, a native of Sicily, chosen and ordained two months and fifteen days after the decease of his predecessor;[1] that is, on the 27th of June, which, in the present year, 678, fell on a Sunday. He had no sooner taken possession of the see, than the above-mentioned letter from the emperor to Donas was delivered to him by the secretary Epiphanius, who had been dispatched with it from Constantinople, and arrived at Rome during the vacancy. Agatho expressed great satisfaction at the good disposition of the emperor, commended his zeal for the peace and unity of the church, and in compliance with his command, requiring him to send deputies to represent both him and his council in the general council to be held at Constantinople, he immediately summoned the bishops of Italy to meet at Rome in order to choose, together with him, such persons as should be judged the best qualified, for their probity and learning, to discharge so great a trust. As the pope was well apprised that the bishops in the west all zealously professed and maintained the doctrine of two wills, he wrote a circular letter to the primates and metropolitans of most of the western provinces and kingdoms, exhorting them to convene their respective synods, to examine, with their suffragans, the doctrine in dispute, and having established the catholic truth, as he did not doubt but they would, to transmit their decrees to Rome, that the legates, who were to assist at the general council appointed to meet at Constantinople, might there represent not the Italian bishops only, but all their brethren in the west, and satisfy the emperor, as well as the fathers of the council, that they all agreed in receiving the doctrine of two wills, and two operations, as the only true catholic and apostolic doctrine. In compliance with this request provincial synods were accordingly every where convened, in Spain, in Italy, in France, in England, and the Monothelites every where condemned, as maintaining a doctrine condemned and anathematized by the councils and the fathers.[2] Mansuetus of Milan, not satisfied with condemning the doctrine of one will, and defining that of two, wrote a long letter to the emperor, wherein, after exhorting him to imitate the zeal of Constantine the Great, and giving him a succinct account of the heresies condemned in the first five general councils "convened by the authority of the emperors his predecessors," he declared, that he, and the bishops assembled with him in the royal city of Milan, all inviolably adhered, and ever would inviolably adhere to the doctrine taught and defined by those councils, and that as they acknowledged, agreeably to them, two distinct natures in Christ, they could not but acknowledge two distinct wills, and two distinct operations.[1] The provincial synods were all, except that under Theodore of Canterbury, of which I shall speak hereafter, held in the latter end of the present, or the beginning of the following year; and by some of them, namely, by the council of Milan, and that of Arles, deputies were appointed to assist, in their name, at the council, which the pope was to assemble at Rome.[2]

While the bishops, who had been summoned to that council, were, pursuant to their summons, assembling at Rome, Wilfrid, the famous bishop of York, who had been deposed, and had thereupon appealed to the pope, arrived in that city. He was deposed by Theodore of Canterbury, at the request of Ecgfrid, king of Northumberland, whose high displeasure he had incurred. What provoked that prince against him Bede has not thought fit to let us know, if he knew it himself. For he only says, that a dispute arising between king Ecgfrid and the most reverend bishop Wilfrid, that prelate was driven from his see, and two new bishops were appointed in his room.[3] Eddius, who wrote the life of Wilfrid, and was a partaker with him in all his sufferings, ascribes the displeasure of the king against that prelate to the wicked suggestions of Elmemberg, whom Ecgfrid had married upon his queen quitting him to retire into a monastery, according to the prevailing bigotry of that age. For he tells us that Elmemberg, coveting the immense wealth which Wilfrid was possessed of, left nothing unattempted to inflame the king against him, railing on all occasions at his secular pomp, his riches, the multitude of his abbeys, the magnificence of his houses, the innumerable army of his followers, clothed and armed as princes; that having in the end filled the mind of the king with the strongest prejudices against him, she sent for Theodore of Canterbury, as Balak did for Balaam, and gained him with presents to concur with her and the king in their wicked measures, and depose the innocent prelate, without hearing what he had to offer in his own defence.[4] This account redounds no ways to the honor of Wilfrid, though given by a most partial writer, by one of his greatest

[1] Anast. in Dono. [2] Concil. tom. 6. p. 630.

[1] Concil. tom. 6. p. 601. Bar. ad Ann. 679. p. 527.
[2] Concil. p. 697. [3] Bed. l. 4. c. 12.
[4] Eddius in vit. Wilfrid. XV. Script. p. 63.

friends and admirers. For from that very account he appears to have been a man of great pride and vanity, one who took delight in secular pomp, ostentation, and grandeur. As for Theodore, he is painted there as a man who stuck at nothing to gratify his avarice, and earn the favor of the king. But after all, I cannot think that Eddius has pointed out the true cause of Ecgfrid's anger and indignation against Wilfrid: for had the king been only offended at the pomp and grandeur in which he lived, he would have been satisfied with causing him to be deposed, to be stripped of all his wealth, and driven from his see; whereas he continued to persecute him as implacably after his deposition, as he had done before, as is related at length by the author of his life, and all the English historians. As for the lands and revenues enjoyed by the deposed bishop, the king appropriated no share of them to himself, but divided them between the two bishops, who were appointed in his room; the kingdom of Northumberland, hitherto but one bishopric, being on this occasion divided into two, and soon after into three.(*) Thomas Eliensis, in the life of Etheldreda, Ecgfrid's queen, ascribes the anger of that prince against Wilfrid to a very different cause. According to him the queen had resolved to live a virgin even in wedlock; and though the king left nothing unattempted to divert her from such a resolution, urging his right, the injustice done him, and the temptations which he was thereby exposed to, he could not prevail on her to comply with her duty. But Wilfrid had a great ascendant over her; and to him the king applied, promising him, says Bede,[1] great wealth, and large possessions, provided he persuaded her to become a wife. As men were then very little acquainted, or rather utterly unacquainted, with the doctrine of the scripture, virginity was generally looked upon, and preached up by the monks and the clergy as the highest pitch of perfection which a Christian could arrive at, as a virtue containing in itself all other Christian virtues; and therefore Wilfrid, instead of putting the queen in mind of her duty, and of the express command of the apostle,[2] confirmed her, in opposition to both, in the resolution she had taken; nay, and advised her, that she might never be tempted to depart from it, to solicit a divorce, and leave of the king to retire into a monastery. As nothing else would satisfy her, and she continued importuning the king, without any regard to his prayers, entreaties, remonstrances, and even to his authority, he yielded, at last, much against his will, says the historian; and the queen withdrew into a monastery in Scotland, where she received the veil at the hands of Wilfrid. But the king loved her with the greatest tenderness and passion; and therefore soon repenting what he had done, undertook a journey into Scotland, to try whether he could not still persuade her to return. But he found her unalterable; and his passion for her being thereupon changed into rage against Wilfrid, by whose counsels she was governed, he caused him to be deposed, and banished him the kingdom of Northumberland. Thus the author of the life of the famous queen Etheldreda, now known by the name of St. Andre;[1] and thus we may well account for the irreconcilable hatred which the king ever after bore to Wilfrid; and of which that prelate felt the effects, and very deservedly, both at home and abroad. However, he is now honored as a saint of the first rate, and so is the queen; the queen for disobeying her husband and her king; and Wilfrid for countenancing her in her sinful disobedience.

Wilfrid was too much attached to the things of this world tamely to part with his wealth and his dignity; and therefore instead of acquiescing in the sentence that deprived him of both, as his predecessor had done, though most unjustly deposed,(*) he protested against it, and appealing to the pope, immediately set out, full of rage and resentment against Theodore, on his journey to Rome. No man had deserved better of that see than Wilfrid. In the council of Whitby,[2] he had espoused the cause of the Roman missionaries against the Scotch bishops and clergy; had, in that assembly, pleaded with great zeal, and not without learning, for the Romish ceremonies; and, having had the good luck to get them approved by the king of Northumberland, he had taken unwearied pains to establish them in all the churches of that kingdom. These were extraordinary merits in the eyes of the pope; and what was still more meritorious, Wilfrid was the first who had ever appealed from Britain to Rome. No wonder therefore that he was received by Agatho with all possible marks of respect, kindness, and esteem, though the monk Coënwald, and others, whom Theodore sent to accuse him, had arrived at Rome some months before him, and, no doubt, had not been idle, but done all that lay in their power to prejudice the pope against him.[3]

Wilfrid had not been long in Rome, when

(*) It was on this occasion divided into the bishopricks of York, and Hagulstad, now Hexam in Northumberland, but under the old name of Landisfarn. Three years after the bishopric of Hagulstad and Landisfarn was divided into two under the same titles. Bosa was appointed bishop of York, Eata of Landisfarn, and Trumbert of Hagulstad. (a)

(a) Bede Hist. Eccles. l. 4. c. 12.

[1] Bed. l. 4. c. 19. [2] 1 Corinth. c. 7: v. 4. 5.

[1] Vit. Ethelred. Act. Benedict, Secul. secund. p. 748.

(*) Wilfrid succeeded Ceada in the bishopric of Northumberland, who being told by Theodore (wanting a pretence to remove him that room might be made for Wilfrid,) that he had not been canonically ordained, answered, that it was not by choice, but merely in obedience to his superiors, that he had taken upon him so great a charge; and was therefore very ready to part with it and retire; which he did accordingly. But Jarumman of Lichfield dying soon after, he was translated to that see. (a)

(a) Bed. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 28. et l. 4. c. 3.

[2] See p. 462. note (*)

[3] Eddius vit. Wilfrid. c. 51.

Wilfrid's cause examined in a council, and he declared innocent. He assists at a council held at Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 679.] The pope writes to the emperor to excuse his delay in sending proper persons to assist at the general council. Recommends to the emperor his deputies, and those of his council.

Agatho, at his request assembled a council to re-examine his cause, and confirm or reverse, as he should be found guilty or innocent, the sentence of Theodore. This council consisted of fifty bishops : many of them were come to Rome to assist at the council, which the pope had appointed to meet in order to choose the legates, who were to be sent into the east. Before them appeared Wilfrid on the one side, and his accusers on the other; and both being heard and examined, a decree was issued, with one accord, by the council, declaring Wilfrid to have been unjustly deposed, and ordering him to be restored to his see. As Wilfrid had complained of the division of his diocese, it was likewise enacted, that if such a division should be thought necessary, the new bishops should not be appointed without his previous consent and approbation. By the same decree the laity as well as the clergy were required to pay due obedience to the determination of the council; the clergy on pain of being deposed, and the laity of being for ever excluded from the eucharist.[1]

What obedience was paid in England to that decree we shall see the following year, when Wilfrid returning home presented it to the king of Northumberland. But the remainder of the present, and part of the ensuing year he passed at Rome, being desired by Agatho to put off his journey, and assist, with the other bishops, at the council, that was to meet there in a few months.[2] The council met accordingly on the 5th of April, 679, and consisted of one hundred and twenty-five bishops, or their deputies, all of Italy, except Wilfrid of York, Felix of Arles, Adeodatus of Toul, and the deacon Tourinus, sent by the bishop of Toulon. Of this council nothing now remains but two letters, the one from the pope, the other from the bishops of the council to the emperor Constantine, and his two brothers Heraclius and Tiberius, whom their father Constans had created Cæsars ever since the year 659, and taken for his partners in the empire.

The pope begins his letter with commending the zeal of the emperors his most religious lords in striving to maintain the catholic faith pure and undefiled, and their truly Christian spirit in declaring against all force and compulsion, since it is not a forced, but a free and voluntary confession of the true faith, that is required of us by our lord, agreeably to that of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles: "feed the flock of God which is among you; not by constraint, but willingly."[3] In the next place, Agatho excuses his delay in obeying the commands of his most pious sovereigns, and sending proper persons to assist in his name, and the name of his brethren, at the council, which they had appointed to meet at Constantinople. That delay he ascribes to his infirmities, and his having long waited the arrival of some, whom his predecessors had sent to preach the gospel in countries lying at a great distance from Rome; meaning as appears from the letter of the Roman council, Theodore of Canterbury, and Adrian. For Theodore was the ablest man, at this time, in all the west; the only man, says Baronius,[1] of any knowledge in this barbarous and ignorant age; and the pope, wanting his assistance, besides the infallible and never-failing assistance of the Holy Ghost, had invited him to Rome, nay, and in expectation of his arrival, had considerably delayed the assembling of the council. But he, notwithstanding the obligations he owed to the see of Rome, could not be prevailed upon to gratify the pope, pretending, no doubt, that his presence was more necessary in England. And this indeed was a critical juncture. Theodore was in great favor with the Saxon kings, especially with the king of Northumberland, the most powerful of them all, whom he had highly obliged by siding with him against Wilfrid; and he hoped by their means to establish, in a short time, the Romish ceremonies, and with them the authority of his see, in the different kingdoms.

The pope, having excused his delay in executing the commands of his lords and sovereigns, names and earnestly recommends to them the persons, who are to represent him; and those, who are to represent his council. He owns them to be men of no great learning, which, he says, cannot be well expected in men, who live among the barbarians, meaning the Lombards, and who, having been stripped by them of all their substance, have no other means of supporting themselves but by their daily labor. What poverty must the churches of Italy have been reduced to, when even bishops were obliged to earn a livelihood, and with much ado, "cum summa hæsitatione," by daily labor! The pope adds, that though those, whom he sends, cannot be said to be men of great learning, they are not, however, quite unacquainted with the doctrine of the fathers, and the definitions of the five general councils. If so, I do not see what occasion they could have for any other learning, the scripture being quite out of date, and the doctrine of the councils, and the fathers the only true standard of the catholic faith. The remaining part of the pope's letter contains his confession of faith, wherein he acknowledges two distinct wills in Christ, and two distinct operations; a confutation of the opposite doctrine, and a long descant in praise of his see, and his predecessors, none of whom, he says, have ever erred, have ever been tainted with any heresy, but have, on the contrary, always confirmed their brethren in the true faith, agreeably to that of our Savior to St Peter, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," &c.[2] But the fathers of the

[1] Eddius vit. Wilfrid. c. 32. [2] Idem ibid. c. 31. et 50. [3] 2 Peter c. 5 : v. 2.

[1] Bar. ad Ann. 679. p. 528. [2] Concil. t. 6. p. 630.

Letter from the pope's council to the emperor. The letter signed by Wilfrid; but not as legate of the Scotch nation, nor of the English.

sixth general council were not, as we shall soon see, of that opinion.

The letter from the council to the emperor contained a confession of faith, agreeing in every article with the confession of the pope; and that faith they declared themselves ready to defend even at the expense of their lives, the only thing which the barbarians, among whom they lived, had left them. They too ascribe their delay in complying with the desire of the emperor, to their having long waited the arrival of some of their brethren, especially of the philosopher Theodore, archbishop of the great island of Britain, who, they had hoped, would have joined them, but were disappointed. They were as sensible as the pope, that at this time they had no men of learning among them; and therefore recommended their deputies to the emperor as men, who were to be more respected for their probity, than their secular eloquence or knowledge.[1]

This letter was signed by all the bishops, who were present, each of them signing it, and the confession it contained, in his own name, and in the name of his city, or his province. Wilfrid, among the rest, is said to have confessed the catholic faith, and to have confirmed it with his subscription in the name of the English, the Britons, the Scots, and the Picts, inhabiting the islands of Ireland and Britain. For he had continued in Rome at the request of the pope, as has been observed above, till the meeting of the council, that he might there give an account of the faith of the churches of Britain, with respect to the point in dispute; and their faith appearing, by his account, to be entirely orthodox, he was desired by the other bishops to confess it, and sign that confession in his own name, and in the name of the Britons, the English, the Scots, and the Picts.[2]

Hence Schelstrate concludes, and likewise Baronius and Binius, that the British, the English, the Scotch, and Pictish bishops were all summoned by the pope to his council; and that, in obedience to his summons, they appointed, with one consent, Wilfrid, who was already at Rome, to represent them, in that assembly, as their common legate. And this he uses as an argument to prove, that the bishops of Britain were all subject to the see of Rome, and that the pope had a right to summon them to his councils.[3] It is quite surprising that a man of Schelstrate's knowledge should have been so utterly unacquainted with the present state of the churches of Britain. The Britons, the Scots, and the Picts, did not at this time communicate with Rome, much less did they acknowledge any power or authority in the bishop of Rome over them, or their churches; and therefore it cannot be supposed, that, had the pope summoned them to his council, they would have paid any kind of regard to his summons. But had they even paid the greatest regard to it, and in compliance with it, thought themselves bound to appoint one to represent them in that council, Wilfrid was of all men the last, whom the Scots, at least, would have honored with that trust and commission. He was, in opposition to them, the great champion of the Romish party; had distinguished himself at the council of Whitby by his zeal for the Romish ceremonies against Colman and the other Scotch bishops; and upon Colman's choosing rather to quit his bishoprick than to conform to those ceremonies, he had been appointed bishop of Northumberland in his room. The Scots therefore must have looked upon him as an open and avowed enemy; and consequently cannot be said, without the greatest absurdity, to have chosen and appointed him to represent them in the abovementioned council.

Of this Baronius seems to have been aware; and therefore supposes Wilfrid to have assisted at the pope's council as the legate of the English church only, having been charged with that commission by Theodore, and the other English bishops in the council, that was convened in England to condemn the Monothelite heresy.[1] But in the first place the council, at which Wilfrid is said to have appeared as the legate of the English church, was held several months before that, which was convened in England to condemn the Monothelite heresy. The former council was held, according to Eddius,[2] who was probably then at Rome, on the 5th of April, 679, or 680, as Baronius will have it; and the later, according to Bede,[3] on the 17th of September, 680. Wilfrid therefore could not, as is evident, assist at the Roman council, as the legate of the English church, in virtue of any delegation or commission from the English council. In the second place Theodore and Wilfrid were, at this time, irreconcileable enemies to each other. Theodore had sided with the king of Northumberland, against Wilfrid, and deposed him; and Wilfrid had thereupon appealed from his sentence to the apostolic see, and was gone to Rome to complain to the pope of the injustice, which he pretended to have done him. And is it at all probable, that Theodore would, in these circumstances, have honored him with the character of his deputy, and legate of the English church? or that the English bishops would have chosen one to represent them at the pope's council, whom they no longer looked upon as a bishop? For Wilfrid was no less obnoxious to most of them than he was to Theodore, "digladiabili odio impetierunt Wilfridum," says Malmsbury,[4] speaking of some of them, probably on account of his pride, and

[1] Concil. t. 6. p. 636.
[2] Eddius Vit. Wilfrid. c. 50. et Bed. l. 5. c. 20.
[3] Schelstrat. Antiquit. illustrat. Sect. 115. p. 104.

[1] Bar. ad Ann. 680. p. 531.
[2] Eddius in Vit. Wilfrid. c. 50. [3] Bed. l. 4. c. 17.
[4] Malmsb. de Gest. Pontif. Angel. l. 3. p. 267.

The decree of the pope in favor of Wilfrid, how received in England. Wilfrid sent first to prison, and afterwards banished. The Monothelite doctrine condemned in a council at Hatfield;—[Year of Christ, 680.]

his haughty and over-bearing conduct. As for what Binius writes in his notes on the council of Hatfield, of which I shall speak hereafter, namely, that Theodore, hearing Wilfrid had been absolved at Rome, was immediately reconciled with him, and in token of an entire reconciliation, honored him with the character and title of legate from the English church,[1] it is scarce worthy of notice, it being manifest from Eddius,[2] and indeed from all the English historians, that Theodore and Wilfrid were not reconciled till several years after, till the year 686, according to the most probable opinion.[3] From what has been said, it is manifest beyond contradiction, that Wilfrid did not assist at the pope's council with the character of legate from any of the churches of Britain, as Baronius, Binius, and Schelstrate, would have it believed, and consequently, as no other did, that either the bishops of Britain were not summoned by the pope to his council, or, if they were, that no kind of regard was paid by them to that summons; and either sufficiently proves, according to the method of arguing used by those writers, that the power of the pope did not extend, at this time, to the island of Britain.

The council no sooner broke up than Wilfrid, impatient to see himself restored to his dignity, to his wealth and his former grandeur, set out in great haste from Rome on his return to England, and arriving in Northumberland, presented the decree of the pope and his council to the king. Ecgfrid was no enemy to Rome, but had, on the contrary, always countenanced the Romish missionaries, and promoted, with as much zeal as his father Oswy, their rites and ceremonies: Wilfrid therefore did not doubt but, out of respect to the pope, he would cause his decree to be immediately put in execution. But to the king it appeared so strange, that the pope should have taken upon him to restore, by his authority, one, whom he had caused to be deposed, and had driven from his see, that he could not believe the decree to be genuine. However, not trusting to his own judgment, and that he might not seem to have acted out of passion or revenge, he assembled a great council, consisting of all the chief men of the kingdom, charging them to examine the decree, which Wilfrid pretended to have been issued by the pope and his council, and to deliver their judgment concerning it. At this council assisted, among the rest, Bosa of York, and Eata of Hexham, the only bishops, at this time, in the kingdom of Northumberland; and they were all of opinion, the bishops as well as the nobility, that the decree was either forged, or had been purchased with money; and consequently that Wilfrid was either guilty of forgery, or of a still more detestable crime, the crime of simony. Pursuant to this judgment, he was by the king's order, and with the consent of the bishops, says the historian, sent to prison, and there kept nine months under close confinement, no one being allowed to come near him; and when he was released, it was on condition that he should never again set foot in Northumberland.[1] Such was the issue of the first appeal, that occurs in history, from Britain to Rome. This instance the Jesuit Alford did not remember, or thought his readers did not remember it, when he confidently asserted the English bishops to have been all from the beginning appointed or confirmed, removed or restored, by the pope or his delegates, without any control from the Saxon kings.

In the mean time Theodore, hearing that in most other kingdoms councils had been held against the Monothelites, and their doctrine had been every where condemned, that he might not appear to be wanting in zeal on such an occasion, the rather as he was a native of Greece, where that doctrine chiefly prevailed, assembled a council at Hatfield, and having there found, says Bede, upon diligent inquiry, that the bishops who composed it, were all orthodox in their belief, he drew up, with their consent and approbation, a confession of faith, which they all signed. In that confession they declared their assent to the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and to every other doctrine, that had been taught and defined by the five general councils, to which they added the council that had been convened by pope Martin in Rome against the Monothelites, anathematizing all whom those councils had anathematized, and receiving all whom they had received. This council is said to have consisted of the bishops of the island of Britain; but that must be understood of the English bishops only, there being no communication at this time between them and the Britons, the Scots, and the Picts. Theodore presided, and is styled in the preamble to their confession of faith, archbishop of the island of Britain, and the city of Canterbury.[2] Besides the bishops, of whom there was then but a small number in England, several other ecclesiastics were present, and among the rest John Precentor of the church of St. Peter, and abbot of the monastery of St. Martin in Rome. He was brought over by the famous monk Biscop, surnamed Benedictus, founder of the monastery of Wiremouth in Northumberland, to instruct his monks in the art of singing, and teach them to perform the festival services throughout the year according to the Roman manner. The precentor had been charged by Agatho, at his setting out for England, to inform himself of the doctrine of that church with respect to the heresy that prevailed in the east, and to acquaint him with it on his return. For as Theodore was by birth a Greek, the pope suspected he might

[1] Concil. t. 6. Ed. Lab. col. 579.
[2] Eddius Vit. Wilfrid. c. 41.
[3] See Pagi ad Ann. 686. n 15.

[1] Edd. vit. Wilfrid. c. 37. [2] Bed. l 4. c. 17.

The legates of the pope arrive at Constantinople, and are well received by the emperor. The emperor writes to the other patriarchs, inviting them to the council. The council meet. In what order they sat. Speech of the pope's legates. The legates answered by Macarius of Antioch.

favor, or at least, not oppose as he ought, the errors of the Greeks. Of that Theodore was well apprised, as Bede seems to insinuate; and therefore to satisfy the pope as to the orthodoxy of his own faith, as well as the faith of the church committed to his care, he not only invited John to his council, but at his departure gave him a copy of the confession which he and the other bishops had signed in his presence, to be delivered by him to the pope.[1]

The council of Hatfield was the last that was held in the west against the Monothelites; and the pope had yet received no account of it, when his legates, and those of his council set out for the east. They left Rome in the month of April of the present year, 680, and arrived at Constantinople on the 10th of September, where they were immediately introduced to the emperor, who received them with all possible marks of respect and esteem, alloted them the palace of Placidia for their habitation, and that they might not be burdensome to their sees or their churches, ordered them to be maintained at the public expense. Upon their delivering to him the letters of the pope and his council, he expressed a sincere desire of seeing discord and division banished, in his days, from the church, and warmly exhorted them to divest themselves of all prepossession or prejudice, to forbear all metaphysical cavils, and having nothing in view but the discovery of truth, to keep to the doctrine of the scriptures, as understood and explained by the fathers and the councils.[2] For it was, at this time, rank heresy to understand and explain the scriptures in a different sense from that, in which they had been understood and explained by the fathers, though they often contradicted each other, and sometimes themselves, in their expositions and comments.

As the western bishops had been long expected, two years being nearly elapsed since they were first summoned, and the emperor was quite impatient to see an end put to the troubles of the church, as he had happily put an end to those of the state, he wrote, the very day the legates arrived, to George, patriarch of Constantinople, requiring him to assemble, as soon as possible, the metropolitans and bishops subject to his see; and at the same time to notify the meeting of the council to Macarius of Antioch, that he too might assemble, without delay, the metropolitans and bishops of his patriarchate, and repair with them to the imperial city, to examine there and finally determine, in conjunction with the legates of the pope, and those of his council, the so long controverted article concerning the will and operations of Christ. This letter is dated the 10th of September, the 27th year of the reign of Constantine, and the twelfth of his consulship, that is, of the Christian era 680, and is addressed to George, "the most holy archbishop of Constantinople, and universal patriarch."[1] This order the two patriarchs notified, as soon as they received it, to the metropolitans under the jurisdiction of their respective sees, charging them to repair, with all expedition, to the place where the emperor had appointed them to meet. And thus, in the space of less than two months, was assembled a number thought sufficient by the emperor to begin the sessions. It did not at first exceed forty, but amounted in the end to one hundred and sixty-six and upwards.

They assembled in a spacious hall of the imperial palace, called from the form of the building trullus or trulla, that is, cupola, and met, for the first time, on the 7th of November of the present year. The emperor assisted in person at the eleven first sessions, and at the eighteenth, or the last, seated on an high throne, and attended by the great officers of state, who in the acts of the council are constantly styled the judges, and acted as such on all occasions. After them the bishops sat in the following order: the legates of the pope in the first place, namely, the two presbyters, Theodore and George, and the deacon John; George of Constantinople in the second; the deputy of the church of Alexandria, that see being vacant, in the third; Macarius of Antioch in the fourth; the deputy of the church of Jerusalem, that see being likewise vacant, in the fifth; and the deputies from the pope's council in the sixth, namely, John of Porto, Abundantius of Paterno, and John of Reggio. After them were placed the deputies of the bishop of Ravenna, and the other bishops, or their deputies, each according to the rank and dignity of their churches or sees. In the midst of the assembly was placed on a chair of state the book of the gospel, the only honor that was paid to it; for by neither party was it ever once opened, quoted, or even mentioned; insomuch that had they not allowed it a place in their assembly, no man could have thought, that they ever had heard of such a book.

When the bishops were all placed, the legates of the pope and his council rising up, charged the bishops of Constantinople, namely, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, and with them Cyrus of Alexandria, and Theodorus of Pharan, with having introduced a new doctrine into the church, teaching that in Christ there was but one will, and one operation. This doctrine, said they, was unknown to the fathers, and it is incumbent on those, who maintain it, to show on what they ground their opinion. When they had done speaking, the emperor ordered those, who taught or professed that doctrine, to answer the legates, and show on what grounds they taught and professed it. Hereupon Macarius of Antioch, the ablest, as well as the most zealous man of the party, rising up and advancing into

[1] Bed. l. 4. c. 18. [2] Anast. in Agath.

[1] Concil. t. 6. p. 500.

The first ten sessions spent in examining passages out of the councils and fathers. The Monothelite doctrine explained by Macarius.

the midst of the assembly; "the doctrine," said he, "which we teach, is not a new doctrine, nor has it by us been introduced into the church. The fathers have taught it before us, the councils have defined it; and it is upon their authority that we teach and profess it, upon their authority, as understood and explained by the holy archbishops of Constantinople, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, by Honorius of old Rome, and by Cyrus of Alexandria, all men of eminent learning and probity." "If so," replied the emperor, "let the authentic copies of the councils, and the writings of the fathers, be brought; let the passages, that countenance your doctrine, be publicly read, and compared with the originals, that no room may be left for misconstruing their words, or misunderstanding their meaning." The councils were brought accordingly out of the archives of the patriarch, and with them the voluminous works of the fathers; and in examining the innumerable passages alleged from them by both parties in favor of their respective opinions, in comparing them with the originals, and disputing about their true meaning, which was not easily, if at all, to be found out, were spent the first ten sessions. In the first session a passage cited by Macarius out of a letter from Cyril of Alexandria to the emperor Theodosius, gave occasion to a very warm dispute between him and the legates. For it being there said, that "the will of Christ was omnipotent," Macarius concluded from thence, that Cyril had acknowledged but one will in Christ, and that an omnipotent or a divine will. On the other hand the legates maintained, that Cyril spoke there of the will of Christ only as God, and consequently of his divine will only; and that as the divine will and the human were not incompatible in one and the same person, it was quite absurd to infer from Cyril's admitting the one, that he excluded the other. Macarius would not allow two wills to be compatible in one and the same person, arguing from the plurality of wills the plurality of persons, and taxing the legates with rank Nestorianism. Here the orthodox party, recurring to the mystery of the Trinity, reasoned thus: if two wills argue two persons, one will only will of course argue one person only; but in the Trinity there is but one will, the Father not having a different will from that of the Son, nor the Son from that of the Holy Ghost; ergo, in the Trinity there is but one person; than which nothing can be more absurd, heretical, blasphemous. They added, that in the Trinity the Father willed as God, "voluit quatenus Deus," and not as the Father; else, as he is a distinct person from the person of the Son, his will would be likewise a distinct will from the will of the Son; and thence they concluded, that to will belonged to the nature, and not to the personality; and consequently where the nature was one, could there be but one will, let the persons be ever so many; and on the contrary, where the natures were more than one, the wills too must be necessarily more than one, let the persons be ever so few. After a great deal of such metaphysical jargon on both sides, the emperor and the judges, who, no doubt, perfectly understood it, decided the dispute in favor of the legates.

In the second session a new dispute arose between Macarius and the legates on occasion of a passage in the famous letter of pope Leo to Flavianus of Constantinople concerning the mystery of the incarnation.[1] For it being there said, that in Christ there were two natures, namely, the human and the divine, and that after their union both retained their respective properties, and both operated, the legates inferred from thence, that Leo had acknowledged two distinct wills in Christ, and two distinct operations, as well as two distinct natures: For else how could both natures, said they, retain their respective properties? how could they both operate? We do not deny, replied here Macarius, that both natures retained their respective properties; we even allow both natures to have operated; but they did not both operate in the same manner. The divine nature operated as the chief agent or cause; and the human as a mere instrument of the divine, and therefore could not be said, no more than any other instrument, to have any operation of its own, any operation different or distinct from that of the primary agent or cause. Thus was the doctrine of the Monothelites, which some modern writers seem to have grossly mistaken, understood and explained by Sergius,[2] Pyrrhus,[3] Theodorus of Pharan,[4] and the other men of learning who maintained and professed it. According to them the humanity of Christ produced no action or operation of itself, but was moved, as a mere instrument, by the Divinity, in the same manner as the human body produces no action or operation of itself, but is, in every action or operation, governed and moved by the soul. Hence they concluded, that in Christ there was no human will, nor was there any occasion for a human will, the divine will supplying the room of the human. And it is to be observed, that though the humanity of Christ was, in their system, an instrument of the Divinity, to which it was united; yet they allowed it to co-operate with the Divinity, and to produce its proper operations; but those operations they called sometimes divine, as originally proceeding from the Divinity, and sometimes theandric, as being produced not by the humanity and the Divinity, but by the humanity only, as an instrument of the Divinity. "Christ," said Sergius in his letter to Honorius,[5] "operated what was

[1] See p. 203.
[2] Serg. in Ep. ad Honor.
[3] Pyrr. in Disp. cum Maxim.
[4] Theodor. Pharan. Concil. Lateran. Secret. 3.
[5] Serg. in Ep. ad Honor. Concil. 6. Sess. 12.

The Monothelites found guilty of forgery. George of Constantinople renounces the Monothelite doctrine, and all the bishops subject to his see;—[Year of Christ, 681.] Macarius refusing to renounce that doctrine, is anathematized and driven out of the council. Sergius, Cyrus, &c. and pope Honorius condemned as heretics.

human and what was divine by one and the same operation, because the human as well as the divine operations proceeded from one and the same Incarnate Word." In this dispute nothing was determined by the judges in favor of the one party or the other.

In the third session were read the acts of the fifth general council; and to them was found prefixed a discourse or letter under the name of Mennas of Constantinople to pope Vigilius, proving, that in Christ there was but one will. That piece had been often quoted both by Sergius and Cyrus, and great stress was laid on it by the whole Monothelite party. But the legates questioning its authenticity, and alleging against it, that Mennas died in the 21st year of Justinian, whereas the fifth council was not held until the 27th year of that emperor's reign,(*) it was carefully examined by the emperor, the judges, and some of the bishops, and found to have been added, not long before, to the acts of that council, the writing being yet fresh, and no such letter appearing among the authentic letters of Mennas, lodged in the archives of the patriarch.(†) Hereupon it was by the judges declared a forgery, and ordered by the emperor to be laid aside. In the acts of the same council, were two letters from pope Vigilius; the one to the emperor Justinian, and the other to the empress Theodora; and in both the pope anathematized Theodorus of Mopsuesta, for not confessing one nature in Christ, one person, and one operation. But those letters were found to have been falsified in several places; and so were most of the passages alleged by Macarius out of the fathers to support his opinion. On the other hand the texts quoted by the legates and the pope in his letter to the emperor, entirely agreed with the originals; and there wanted no more to convince the fathers of the councils, that the doctrine of two wills was the true catholic and apostolical doctrine.

George of Constantinople was the first who changed his opinion, publicly declaring, to the great mortification of the Monothelite party, that he was now fully satisfied the fathers had all acknowledged two wills in Christ; that he acknowledged two wills with them, and would thenceforth teach no other doctrine. His example was followed by all the bishops of his patriarchate; and by all was received the letter of Agatho, defining the doctrine of two wills, and anathematizing those who taught any other. Great things were said on this occasion by some of the converts (for so we may style them,) in commendation of Agatho. Among the rest, Domitius of Prusias in Bithynia declared, that he received the letter of the thrice blessed Agatho, archbishop of the first see, as dictated by the Holy Ghost, and uttered by the mouth of St. Peter himself. Macarius however still continued to maintain and warmly defend the opposite opinion; nay, and boldly declared, when exhorted by the emperor to agree with the majority, and put an end to so long and so obstinate a dispute, that he could not acknowledge two wills in Christ, and never would, were he to be cut in pieces, or thrown headlong into the sea. This declaration was received with a peal of curses and anathemas by the orthodox party. "Cursed be the new Dioscorus," they all cried out; "let him be deposed, let him be driven out; cursed be the new Apollinaris;(*) let him be degraded; let him be stript of his pall." At these words, one of the bishops, Basil of Crete, more zealous than the rest, starting up, and laying violent hands on the unhappy patriarch, tore his pall off his shoulders, and drove him by force, while his brethren continued their curses, out of the assembly. The treatment which the patriarch met with, so terrified the bishops of his patriarchate, that most of them abandoning him, and siding with the legates and the orthodox party, became at once as zealous advocates for the doctrine of two wills, as they had been until that time for the doctrine of one.

In the twelfth session, held on the 20th of March, were read three letters, which Macarius, who was no longer allowed to assist at the council, had presented to the emperor; namely, a letter from Sergius to Cyrus of Alexandria, another to pope Honorius,[1] and the pope's answer to that letter. These three pieces being compared with the originals, brought for that purpose out of the archives of the patriarch, and found perfectly to agree with them, the judges ordered the bishops to examine the doctrine they contained, and declare their opinion concerning them. They were accordingly read again in full council on the 28th of March, when the fathers, after ex-

(*) The legates were grossly mistaken in point of chronology: for Mennas died not in the twenty-first, but in the twenty-sixth year of Justinian, of the Christian era 522, one year only before the meeting of the fifth general council, as is manifest from Nicephorus,(a) Theophanes,(b) and the acts of that council.

(a) Niceph. Chron. 1.

(b) Theoph. ad Ann. Incar. secund. Alexand. 546.

(†) As that letter had never been heard of till quoted by Sergius, it is generally supposed to have been forged by him, and to have been afterwards inserted by some of his successors in the acts of the fifth general council. However that be, it greatly contributed to the establishing of Monothelism in the east, many readily embracing a doctrine taught, as they were made to believe, by a bishop of Constantinople, and approved by a bishop of Rome.

(*) Apollinaris held the body of Christ to have been animated by the Divinity supplying the room of an human soul. Of Dioscorus I have spoken at length elsewhere.(a) He was a zealous Eutychian, and at the head of that party. The Monothelites acknowledged two natures in Christ against the Eutychians, and an human soul in opposition to the Apollinarists. But in all disputes the contending parties constantly charged each other as holding the doctrines however absurd, that could, by their method of arguing, be deduced from the doctrines they really held; and by that means made each other guilty of heresies, which had by neither ever been thought of.

(a) See p. 200.

[1] See p. 433, 434.

The heretical writings of pope Honorius, &c. condemned to the flames. Pretended vision of a monk. Agreement proposed between the two parties. The definition of the council.

amining them with the utmost care and attention, solemnly delivered their judgment, and with one accord, in the following terms: "having examined the dogmatic letters, that were written by Sergius, formerly bishop of this royal city, to Cyrus once of Phasis, and to Honorius, bishop of old Rome, and likewise the answer of the said Honorius to the letter of Sergius, we have found them quite repugnant to the dotrine of the apostles, to the definitions of the councils, to the sense of the fathers, and entirely agreeable to the false doctrines of the heretics; therefore we reject and accurse them as hurtful to the soul. As we reject and accurse such impious dogmas, so we are all of opinion, that the names of those, who taught and professed them, ought to be banished from the church, that is, struck out of the diptychs; namely, the names of Sergius, formerly bishop of this royal city, who first wrote of this impious tenet, and Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, who once held this see, and agreed in opinion with them, and likewise of Theodorus, formerly bishop of Pharan; who have all been mentioned by the thrice blessed Agatho, in his letter to our most pious lord and mighty emperor, and have been anathematized by him, as holding opinions repugnant to the true faith. All these, and each of them, we too declare anathematized; and with them we anathematize, and cast out of the holy catholic church, Honorius, pope of old Rome, it appearing from his letter to Sergius, that he entirely agreed in opinion with him, and confirmed his impious doctrine. We have likewise examined the synodal letter of Sophronius of blessed memory, formerly bishop of the holy city of Jerusalem,[1] and having found it agreeable to the catholic faith, and the doctrine of the apostles and fathers, we have received it, and ordered his name to be put into the diptychs."[2] In the same session was read, examined, and by a decree of the council condemned to the flames, and publicly burnt, with the writings of the other Monothelites, the second letter of Honorius to Sergius, as containing the same profane and impious doctrine. And it is to be observed, that this decree, as well as the sentence mentioned above, passed without the least opposition, no one offering to defend Honorius, or excuse him, no not even the legates of the pope; a plain proof that they did not think he could by any means be excused or defended.

In the fifteenth session a monk and presbyter, named Polychronius, presented a confession of faith to the council, wherein he acknowledged but one will in Christ; and at the same time solemnly declared, that he had been confirmed in that belief by a person of a most majestic and heavenly aspect, who appearing to him had assured him, that he was no Chistian, who held any other doctrine; and had therefore ordered him to acquaint the emperor with his vision, and strive to divert him from introducing any other into the church. He was believed by the credulous multitude, and had brought great numbers of them over to his opinion; nay, he was himself so firmly persuaded of the truth of the faith revealed to him in the pretended vision, and of the vision itself, that he undertook to confirm his belief, in the presence of the judges and the council, by restoring a dead man to life. He miscarried, as we may well imagine, in the undertaking; but nevertheless could not be prevailed upon to change his opinion, and acknowledge two wills in Christ. The council therefore anathematized and degraded him both as an impostor and an heretic.[1]

In the sixteenth session Constantine, presbyter of Apamea in Syria, being admitted into the council, and allowed to speak, proposed an agreement between the two parties; and the terms he recommended were, that the Monothelites, who acknowledged in Christ one operation only, should, for the sake of peace, acknowledge two; and the orthodox, who admitted two wills in Christ, should, for the same reason, admit only one. Thus, he said, no room would be left for either party to insult the other, or boast of victory. But his proposal was rejected by the fathers with the utmost indignation, and he deposed and anathematized with Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius, and all, who had taught, with them, any other doctrine than that, which had been defined by the councils, and taught by the fathers.[2]

In the seventeenth session was proposed, and in the eighteenth, held on the 16th of September, was publicly read, approved, and signed, the definition or decree of the council. At this session the emperor assisted in person, and were present one hundred and sixty-six bishops, or their deputies. In their definition they first received the five preceding general councils, the decree of the council of Rome under Agatho, and the letter of that pope to the emperor:[3] In the next place they anathematized the impious and execrable doctrine of one will in Christ, and one operation, with which the devil had attempted to poison the minds, and kill the souls of the faithful, employing for that purpose, as his organs, Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, Honorius of old Rome, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Macarius of Antioch. Lastly they acknowledged two distinct wills in Christ, and two distinct operations; and strictly enjoined all, the laity as well as the clergy, to hold, teach, and profess, that and no other doctrine, the clergy and bishops on pain of being deposed, and the laity of being for ever cast out of the church. This definition was signed by the legates of the pope, by George patriarch of Constantinople, by the legate of the church of Alexandria, by Theophanes, who had been appointed patriarch

[1] See p. 435. [2] Concil. 6. Sess. 12, 13.

[1] Concil. 6. Sess. 15. [2] Concil. 6. Sess. 16.
[3] See p. 471.

The bishops all unanimous in the definition of the council. They write to the pope. Copies of the decree of the council delivered to the five patriarchs. The imperial edict. The infallibility of the pope irreconcilable with that of the council. Honorius of Old Rome was condemned by this council, and not Theodorus of New Rome.

of Antioch in the room of Macarius, by the legates of the archbishops of Thessalonica, Cyprus, and Ravenna, by those of the council of Rome, and by all the other bishops in the order they were placed. In no other council were the bishops more unanimous than in this. For the emperor asking them, when the decree was read, whether they all agreed to it, "We all agree to it," they answered, "all to a man, we are all of one mind; this, and no other, is the faith of the apostles, the councils, and the catholic church." On this occasion they broke out into loud acclamations, extolling the zeal and piety of the emperor, wishing him long life and a prosperous reign, and at the same time anathematizing all heretics, whether ancient or modern, and among the latter Honorius, pope of old Rome. The emperor solemnly declared, that in assembling the present council he had no other design, nothing else in view, but to establish, by that means, the most effectual he could think of, the orthodox faith; and therefore exhorted the bishops, if they disliked the decree, or any part of it, to speak their minds freely. They answered again all with one voice, "This is the faith of the catholic church, the faith of the fathers, the councils, and ours;" and begged the emperor to sign, ratify, and confirm it, which he did accordingly. In the end of this session was read a panegyric on the emperor in the name of the council, signed by all the bishops of the assembly, to express their gratitude to a prince, under whose auspices they had firmly established the catholic faith, condemned the opposite heresy, and anathematized its chief abettors, namely, Sergius, Cyrus, Theodorus of Pharan, &c., and likewise Honorius bishop of old Rome, "who in all things had agreed with them."[1]

The bishops, before they parted to return to their respective sees, wrote to Agatho to let him know that they had approved his letter, and adhering to the doctrine it contained, overturned the very foundations of the new heresy; that they had condemned as heretics, and anathematized Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, &c., and deposed Macarius late patriarch of Antioch, with his disciple Stephen, monk and presbyter of that city, and likewise Polychronius, who all taught and professed the same impious doctrine. As for other particulars, they refer the pope to the acts of the council, and his legates, who, they say, will give his holiness, on their return to Rome, a distinct account of their conduct in maintaining the faith, which he had established in his letter. The letter of the council was signed by the patriarchs, or their deputies, by thirty-four metropolitans in their own names, and in the names of the bishops of their respective provinces, by fourteen bishops, and by the deputies of the council of Rome.

[1] Concil. 6. Sess. 18. et ult.

Before the bishops left Constantinople, the emperor caused five copies of the decree of the council to be transcribed, and delivered them signed by himself to the five patriarchs, or their deputies, namely, to George, patriarch of Constantinople, to Theophanes, the new patriarch of Antioch, and to the deputies or legates of the patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. At the same time he issued an edict, containing a confession of faith agreeable to that of the council, anathematizing those whom the council had anathematized, and Honorius among the rest, and requiring all the subjects of the empire to conform, in their belief, to the present edict, and the definition of the council, on pain of being deposed, if ecclesiastics, of forfeiting their honors and estates, if laymen of rank and distinction, and if private persons, of being banished for ever the city of Constantinople, and all the other cities of the empire.

Such were the proceedings of the sixth general council, a council received by the church of Rome, and all Roman catholics, as of equal authority with the council of Nice, with that of Trent or any other council; and consequently of equal authority, according to pope Gregory the Great, with the gospels themselves. But by this council a pope was arraigned of heresy, his writings were condemned to the flames, as containing heretical doctrines, and he himself anathematized over and over again as an heretic. Here one would think, that the papal infallibility would at last by all be given up, by all who received the present council, and believed it infallible, as every Roman catholic is bound to believe it on pain of damnation. For if the pope was justly condemned, how could he be infallible? If he was unjustly condemned, how could the council be infallible that condemned him? The infallibility of a general council is no less sacred in the church of Rome, than the infallibility of the pope; and how can the infallibility of the one, in the present case, be reconciled with the infallibility of the other? In answer to these troublesome queries, (for the papal infallibility must be maintained at all events) long dissertations have been written, nay, and whole volumes by the ablest men of that party. But all that has been hitherto said on this subject, or indeed can be said, for nothing has been omitted that can be said, may be reduced to the three following heads: namely, 1. That the pope was not condemned, as is universally supposed, by the sixth general council. 2. That he was not condemned as an heretic. 3. That the council, however incapable of erring in matters of faith, erred in matter of fact, and condemned the pope as an heretic, though guilty of no heresy.

That Honorius was not condemned by the sixth general council is asserted by Baronius, and stiffly maintained in his account of that

The copies of the decree of the council not falsified by Theodorus. Leo II. owns that Honorius was condemned. The pope's legates complain of no alteration in the decree of the council. Agreed on all hands that Honorius was condemned. What is said of Honorius not applicable to Theodorus.

council[1] According to him Theodorus, patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed by the emperor, and was, as he supposes, condemned as an obstinate Monothelite by the council, being afterwards restored to the patriarchal see, and getting possession of the archives, where the acts of the sixth council were lodged, took care to blot his own name every where out of them, and to insert that of Honorius in its room: so that Honorius of old Rome was not the person, whom the council condemned as an heretic, but Theodorus of new Rome; and, therefore, wherever the name of the former occurs in the acts of the council, we ought to substitute and read in its place the name of the latter. Nothing, surely, but the utmost despair could have suggested to the annalist so desperate a shift; and no man can entertain so mean an opinion of his parts and his knowledge, as to think that he was not himself sensible of the absurdity of his plea. For first, that Theodorus was condemned is a mere conjecture of his, without the least foundation in history, no mention being made of him by any of the contempory historians, who have written of this council, and named all who were condemned by it. If Theodorus was condemned, how came they to name all the rest, and omit him? That might be owing to forgetfulness in some, but could not be owing to forgetfulness in all. But not to insist on a negative argument; the restoration of Theodorus to his former dignity is a positive and convincing proof that he was not condemned. For who can believe, that the emperor would have consented to his restoration had he been condemned by the council as an obstinate Monothelite? the emperor, who, by his edict, had ordered all bishops to be deposed, who did not receive and profess the doctrine defined by the council, and who, according to Baronius, had caused Theodorus to be deposed for not receiving it even before it was defined?

Secondly, Theodorus was not yet restored, when the five authentic copies of the definition of the council, signed by the emperor himself, as has been observed above, were delivered by his order to the five patriarchs, or their deputies; for one of the copies is said, in the eighteenth and last session of the council, to have been delivered to George, the most holy patriarch of the apostolic church of the great city of Constantinople. These copies therefore cannot be said to have been falsified by Theodorus. But that Honorius was condemned, and not Theodorus, in the copy that was delivered to the legates of the pope, is evident from the letter, which Leo II. the successor of Agatho, wrote to the emperor after he had perused it, and had been informed by the legates of all the transactions of the council. For in that letter he declared, that he received the definition of the council, that he professed no other faith, and that he anathematized those whom the council had anathematized, namely, Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius, Cyrus, &c. and Honorius. At the same time he wrote to the Spanish bishops, and likewise to Ervigius king of Spain, to acquaint them with the proceedings of the council, and in both letters he names Honorius among those, who had been anathematized and condemed by the council.

Thirdly, the legates never complained of any alteration made in the copy that was delivered to them. And who can believe, that, had they found the name of a bishop of Constantinople erased, whom the council had condemned, and the name of a pope, whom the council had not condemned, substituted in its room, they would have been silent on such an occasion; that they would not have acquainted the pope with it; that they would have suffered him to communicate a copy, thus falsified, to all the western bishops, and exhort them to receive it, to embrace the doctrine that was there defined, and anathematize those who had taught any other, namely, Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius, Cyrus, &c. and Honorius?

Fourthly, that Honorius was condemned by the sixth general council is attested by the emperor in his edict, and in his letter to the pope, by the bishops of the council in their letter to the pope, by the two popes, Leo II. and Adrian, II. by two general councils, the seventh and eighth, by all the contemporary writers to a man, and by almost all the historians, who have spoken of that council since the time in which it was held, to the time of Baronius. The annalist therefore might have as well questioned or denied the condemnation of Arius by the first general council, or the condemnation of Nestorius and Eutyches by the third and the fourth, as the condemnation of Honorius by the sixth; it being no better attested, that they were condemned, nor by a greater number of unexceptionable witnesses, than it is, that he was condemned: nay, as Baronius pretends the copies of the sixth council to have been all falsified, and the name of Honorius, who was not condemned, to have been everywhere inserted instead of the name of Theodorus, who was condemned, and the historians to have been all misled, as well as the popes and the councils, by the falsified copies; so might an Arian, a Nestorian, an Eutychian, pretend, and with as much appearance of truth, had he as much assurance as Baronius, the copies of the above-mentioned councils to have been all falsified, and the names of Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, who were not condemned, to have been everywhere inserted instead of the names of Athanasius, Flavianus, and Cyril, who were condemned, and the historians, as well as the succeeding councils and popes, to have been all misled by the falsified copies. I might add, that where Honorius is condemned,

[1] Bar. ad Ann. 681.

Reasons alleged by Baronius to prove that Honorius was not condemned. The council might have approved the letter of Agatho, and condemned Honorius.

things are said of him, that are no ways applicable to Theodorus, nor to any but him. Thus in the thirteenth session the letter, which he wrote to Sergius, who died fifty years before the time of Theodorus, is condemned, as containing doctrines repugnant to the doctrine of the apostles, and the definitions of the councils. In the fourteenth session his letter to Sergius is again condemned, as agreeing in all things with the writings of the heretics; and in the eighteenth session it is ordered to be publicly burnt, as containing the same heretical opinions, the same impieties, that were found in the writings of the other Monothelites. But from what has been said already it is no less certain and evident, if there is any certainty and evidence in history, that Honorius was condemned by the sixth general council, than it is certain and evident, that such a pope ever existed, or such a council ever was held; and Baronius might have as well questioned or denied the one as the other.

As for the reasons, on which the annalist founds his opinion, they are such as can only serve to convince us, that his opinion is absolutely destitute of all foundation. Those, on which he lays the chief stress, are; I. The council approved the letter of Agatho to the emperor, asserting that the apostolic church of Rome had never gone astray from the path of truth, but that his predecessors had constantly confirmed their brethren in the true faith. And how could they approve of that letter, and at the same time condemn one of his predecessors as an heretic? II. It does not appear, that the legates of the pope, who were present at the council, ever once offered to justify Honorius, or to excuse him; and who can believe, that had he been arraigned of heresy, they would have been silent on such an occasion? III. Several writers, who speak of the sixth council, and even name those, who were there condemned, have not named Honorius among them. Ergo, Honorius was not condemned; and the passages in the acts of the council, where it is said that he was, must have been altered and falsified. These are the reasons gravely alleged by Baronius to convince us, that till his time none were rightly informed of the transactions of the council, no not even the bishops of whom it was composed. These he calls weighty proofs; but that they are not of weight enough to counterbalance the testimony even of a single historian of any character, much less of all antiquity, may be easily made to appear.

For as to the first, we might agreeably to the annalist's method of reasoning, deny that the letter of Agatho was approved by the council, and argue thus: The council condemned one of the predecessors of Agatho as an heretic; and how could they at the same time approve of his letter asserting, that the apostolic church of Rome had never gone astray from the path of truth, but that his predecessors had constantly confirmed their brethren in the true faith? It is only from the acts of the council we learn that the letter of Agatho was approved; and from the same acts we learn that Honorius was condemned. Might we not therefore, with as good reason, take it for granted, upon the authority of those acts, that Honorius was condemned, and thence conclude that the letter of Agatho was not approved, as Baronius takes it for granted, that the letter was approved; and thence concludes that Honorius was not condemned? But not to question with Baronius the authenticity of the acts of the council; had the letter of Agatho contained nothing but the commendations, which he bestows in it on his predecessors and his see, or had it been read in the council to prove the innocence of Honorius, the fathers could not have approved of it, as Baronius observes, and at the same time condemned that pope without contradicting themselves. But the letter contained an exposition at large of the belief of the catholic church concerning the two wills in Christ, and two operations; and it was only to know the sentiments of the pope and the other bishops in the west, with respect to that article, that the fathers ordered it to be read; and when it was read and examined, they approved and received it, declaring that the blessed Agatho had rightly explained and firmly established the catholic doctrine, and that they acknowledged with him two wills in Christ, and two operations.[1] It is therefore manifest, that they only approved the letter of Agatho so far as it explained and established the doctrine that had given occasion to the controversy, which they were met to determine. As for the praises, which in the same letter the pope bestowed on his predecessors and his see, they were quite foreign to the subject of the present controversy, as well as to the purpose, for which the letter was ordered to be read; and therefore the fathers had no occasion either to approve or disapprove that part of it. I might add, that had they done either, they must have disproved it; the pope asserting there, that the general councils had in all disputes consulted, and taken for their guide the holy Roman church, the church of the prince of the apostles; which is absolutely false, nothing being more certain than that the second general council was held without so much as the knowledge of the holy Roman church, and was guided by Nectarius and Gregory Nazianzen, as is, in express terms, averred by the fathers of Chalcedon in their letter to the emperor Marcian;[2] and the sixth general council was so far from being guided by the Roman church or the pope, that it was convened against his will, and against his will it condemned the three chapters, as has been related at length elsewhere.[3] But as these commendations were quite foreign

[1] Concil. 6. Sess. 6. et 7.
[2] Concil. Chal. in Ep. ad Marcian. p. 469.
[3] See p. 361.

The silence of the legates proof of the guilt of Honorius, rather than of his innocence. The silence of some writers no argument of his not being condemned. Most councils falsified, but this not falsified as to the decree of faith.

to the subject in hand, and the pope had inserted them in his letter only by the way, after the example of other popes, magnifying on all occasions right or wrong, in season and out of season, "the apostolic see of the prince of the apostles," the fathers of the council, attending only to the point in dispute, took no manner of notice of them however groundless and false. They approved his divinity, and connived at his vanity.

As to the second reason alleged by Baronius, the silence of the legates; that Honorius was condemned has been demonstrated so far as any fact can be so; and therefore the silence of the legates can be only brought as an argument to prove that he was justly condemned; nay, that his guilt was too notorious to admit of any defence or excuse. Thus we may, at least, better account for the silence of the legates than by giving the lie, with Baronius, to all antiquity. They either were not acquainted with the chicanery, with the pitiful quibbles and impertinent distinctions of later times, or were ashamed to use them; and therefore when the letter of Honorius was read, wherein he approved of the letter of Sergius establishing the doctrine of one will, and declared that "he agreed in opinion with him, that he acknowledged but one will in Christ,"[1] instead of recurring to metaphysical subtleties, and unintelligible distinctions, or attempting to force, as the modern popish writers have done, an unnatural sense on his words, they acquiesced, owned him guilty, and joined the rest in anathematizing Honorius bishop of old Rome. I have hitherto supposed with Baronius, that the legates were quite silent in the cause of Honorius; but that they were not, is manifest from the acts of the council, which one would think the annalist had never perused. For in the eighth session, when the Greek copy of the pope's letter was read, the legates, not able to persuade themselves that he had so openly declared for the heretical doctrine of one will, and suspecting some fraud, desired that the Greek copy might be compared with the Latin original lodged in the archives of the patriarch; and it was not till they themselves found an entire agreement between the original and the copy, that they consented to the condemnation of the pope, being then well apprised, that nothing could be offered capable of making any impression on the fathers in his favor, or diverting them from condemning both him and his letter.[2] They did all therefore that could be reasonably expected of men, who thought it their duty to discover and know the truth, and not to combat or oppose it, when known and discovered. For the crime being undeniable if the letter was genuine, all they could do was to see that the letter was genuine; and that they did accordingly. But the infallibility of the pope was not an article of their belief; and therefore they did not think themselves bound to maintain it even against demonstration.

What the annalist adds in the third place, namely, that some writers have not named Honorius among those, who were condemned by the council, is too trifling to be seriously answered, or even to be thought worthy of notice. For that he was condemned is affirmed, I may say, by an hundred writers for one who is silent about it, and by writers, who lived at the very time of the council, nay, who were present at the council, and relate what had been done by themselves in the council; so that had all, who have spoken of the council since their time, not only been silent about the condemnation of Honorius, but even denied it; neither could their silence or their testimony weaken or affect, in the least, the testimony of so many contemporary and unexceptionable witnesses.

As to the long descant of Baronius, and after him of Gretser, on the perfidiousness of the Greeks in corrupting the councils, and the writings of the fathers, I readily allow all they say on that head to be true, nay, and am inclined to think, considering the perfidiousness of the Latins as well as the Greeks (for that the Latins have not been behind-hand with the Greeks in that kind of perfidiousness, might be shown by innumerable instances,) and the dreadful havock both have made of all ancient records and writings, that there can be no room to doubt, but they, who blindly follow the fathers and the councils, as they now are, may receive and believe as an article of faith what was anathematized by them as a damnable heresy, and anathematize as a damnable heresy what was by them taught and defined as an article of faith. That the acts of a council therefore should have been falsified and corrupted, is no new thing, as the above-mentioned authors observe; but that all the copies of a council, and the original itself, should have been corrupted before the council broke up, and the fathers parted, who composed it; that they should have carried back with them the copies thus corrupted to their respective sees, and either should not have been apprised of those corruptions, or being apprised of them should have suffered the whole Christian world to be imposed upon by spurious copies without once offering to undeceive them; is not only a new thing, but a thing absolutely impossible; and yet what must have certainly happened, if Honorius was not condemned. And thus far of the opinion of Baronius, and the reasons on which it was grounded; an opinion, which I should not have been at the trouble of relating, much less of confuting, had it not been to show how desperate the case of Honorius must have appeared to the annalist himself, the great champion of the papal infallibility,

[1] See p. 434.

[2] Concil. 6. Sess. 8.

Honorius, according to some, not condemned as an heretic; according to others, condemned as an heretic, but unjustly. Condemned as an heretic. Condemned justly.

since he thought he could by no other means maintain that prerogative, and clear the pope from the charge of heresy, but by denying a fact, than which no fact is better attested in history, and very few are attested so well.

The opinion of Baronius, how groundless soever, and absurd, was received at first with great applause by the friends of Rome; and that the acts of the sixth council had been falsified, was the only answer returned by the advocates for the papal infallibility to those, who from the acts of that council argued against that prerogative. But the more modern writers, well apprised of the many glaring absurdities, and unsurmountable difficulties, attending that opinion, have not only abandoned Baronius, but inveigh, and some of them with great acrimony,[1] against him, for presuming to question, and upon such slight grounds, the authenticity of records, that till his time had been received as genuine by the catholic church, and the whole Christian world. These all allow the pope to have been condemned by the council; but as the council is, with them, as infallible as the pope, and the pope as infallible as the council, they are strangely at a loss, and at great variance among themselves, how to reconcile these two, in the present case, opposite and jarring infallibilities! Some will not allow the pope to have been condemned as an heretic, or for heresy, but for a criminal neglect in not suppressing, as he might and ought to have done, the heresy that sprung up in his time; others allow him to have been condemned as an heretic, but pretend the sentence to have been unjust, and the fathers to have misunderstood the true sense or meaning of the letters, for which they condemned him.

Among the former are De Marca,[2] Garnerius,[3] Tamagninus,[4] and F. Pagi.[5] But that Honorius was condemned as an heretic, or for heresy, is so plain from the words of the judgment given by the council against him, that one might as well, with Baronius, deny him to have been condemned, as deny him to have been condemned as an heretic. The words of the judgment are, "having read and examined," say the fathers of the council, "the dogmatic letters written by Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis, and to Honorius bishop of old Rome, and likewise the answer of Honorius to the said Sergius, and finding them entirely repugnant to the apostolic dogmas, as well as to the definitions of the councils, and the doctrine of the approved fathers, and agreeing with the doctrines of the heretics, we reject and accurse them." The council then ordered the names of those, whose "impious dogmas they had accursed and rejected," to be erased out of the diptychs, namely, the name of Sergius, Cyrus, &c. and of Honorius pope of old Rome, "because they had found, by his letter to Sergius, that he had been in all things of the same mind with him, and had confirmed his impious dogmas, quia in omnibus ejus mentem sequutus est, et impia dogmata confirmavit."[1] Thus the council in the thirteeeth session; and in the end of the same session they ordered the writings of Sergius, of Cyrus, &c. and likewise of Honorius, to be publicly burnt, as "all containing the same impiety," or the same impious doctrine. In their decree, or definition of faith, which they issued in the eighteenth and last session, and all signed to a man, they styled Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius, Cyrus, &c. and likewise Honorius, organs of the devil, as having been employed by the enemy of mankind "in sowing errors, and propagating among the orthodox people the damnable heresy of one will in Christ, and one operation."[2] Now whether one condemned for writing letters that "contained doctrines repugnant to the apostolic dogmas, to the definitions of the councils, to the doctrine of the fathers, and agreeing with the doctrine of the heretics; for being, in all things, of the same mind with a professed heretic, and confirming his impious dogmas; for sowing errors, as an organ of the devil, and propagating a damnable heresy;" whether, I say, one thus condemned, can be said to have been condemned only because he did not suppress that heresy when he might, I leave the reader to judge.

That Honorius was condemned by the sixth general council, and condemned as an heretic, is allowed by cardinal Turrecremata,[3] and after him by Bellarmine,[4] by cardinal Pallavicini,[5] by Melchior Canus,[6] by Arsdekin,[7] and by Franciscus Antonius Cavalcanti, archbishop of Cosenza, in his "Vindicia Romanorum pontificum," published at Rome in 1749, and inscribed to the present pope Benedict XIV. That Honorius was condemned, says Turrecremata,[8] is manifest from the acts of the council; and no less manifest it is from the words of his sentence, that he was condemned as an heretic. But from thence we can only conclude, that the fathers of the council, misunderstanding his letters, thought him an heretic; and a man may be thought an heretic even by the pope, or a general council, and yet be free from all heresy. For whether a man be, or be not an heretic, is a question de facto; and in questions de facto a general council may err, and so may the pope, though neither can err in questions de jure, or in questions concerning either doctrine or manners. Thus Turrecremata: but, first, By this method of arguing, Theodorus of

[1] Combefis. Hist. Monoth. passim.
[2] Baluz. in ejus Vit. præfixa Libris de Concord. Sacerdot et Imp.
[3] Garner. in Append. ad not. capit. 2. Libri Diur. Rom. Pontif.
[4] Tamagn. in hist. Monothelit. [5] Pagi ad Ann. 633.

[1] Concil. 6. Sess. 13. [2] Concil. 6. Sess. 18.
[3] Turrecremat. de Eccl. l. 2. c. 93.
[4] Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 11.
[5] Pallavicin. in Hist. Con. Trident. l. 7. c. 4.
[6] Can. de Locis Theol. l. 5. c. 5.
[7] Arsdekin. Theolog. tripartit. 3. quæst. 3.
[8] Turrecremat. ubi supra.

Honorius, at least, not thought infallible by the council. This council assembled by the emperor, and not by the pope.

Pharan, Sergius, Cyrus, &c., might be excused from all heresy as well as Honorius, nay, and all who have been, or ever will be condemned as heretics either by the popes, or the councils, it being a question de facto, whether a man is or is not an heretic; and consequently a question, in the determining of which both the popes and the councils may err. II. The fathers of the council, in condemning Honorius as an heretic, meant no more than that the doctrine, which he taught in his letters, was heretical; and hence it evidently follows, that if they condemned him as an heretic, though guilty of no heresy, they condemned his doctrine as heretical, though it was not heretical, which was erring in a question relating to doctrine, or in a question de jure. III. The fathers of the council understood the letters of Honorius in an heretical sense, as establishing the doctrine of one will; and who can believe those letters to have been better understood by a Turrecremata, a Bellarmine, a Cavalcanti, than by all the bishops of the council, and the legates of the pope, who, had they thought them capable of being explained, we may be sure, would not have failed to explain them in a catholic sense? But they acquiesced, as we have seen, as soon as the letters were found to be genuine, and joined the rest in anathematizing Honorius, with the other Monothelites. What Cavalcanti adds, namely, that the letters of Honorius are very perplexed and obscure, and consequently that the bishops of the council, who were no great scholars, might have mistaken their meaning, may be urged in favor of Sergius, of Cyrus, &c., as well as of Honorius; and besides, the more obscure they are and perplexed, the less reason we have to doubt, but that the bishops of the council, who were well acquainted with the modes of speech that then obtained, understood them better than they who lived many ages after; better even than Cavalcanti himself, notwithstanding his great scholarship and the pains he has taken to convince us that they did not understand them so well. And it is to be observed, that the expressions in the letters of Honorius, which that writer explains in a catholic sense, and pretends to have been misunderstood by the fathers of the council, are, most of them, the very expressions, which Sergius had used in his letter to that pope, and Cavalcanti allows to have been rightly understood by the council, and justly condemned;[1] so that, according to him, the same expressions were plainly heretical in the letter of a bishop of Constantinople, and entirely orthodox in the letter of a bishop of Rome.

Lastly, from the judgment of the council condemning Honorius as an heretic, it is evident at least, that whether they erred in their judgment or not, they did not believe him infallible, but as capable of erring as the bishop of Constantinople, with whom they condemned him as teaching the same impious doctrine. And is it not altogether incredible, that the pope should be infallible, or incapable of erring, and yet be thought, by the fathers of a general council, as capable of erring as any other bishop, seven hundred years after he had enjoyed such an invaluable privilege? I might say nine hundred; for the judgment of the sixth general council in 681, anathematizing Honorius as an heretic, was confirmed by the eighth in 869, as we shall see hereafter. It is true, says here Bellarmine,[1] the sixth general council, as well as the seventh and eighth, thought Honorius capable of erring; but they only thought him capable of erring as a private person, not as head of the church; and as a private person he may err, and be thought to err, though he cannot err as head of the church. That the above-mentioned councils did not think him capable of erring as head of the church, I readily grant, for they did not acknowledge him for head of the church. But they thought him capable of erring as a public person, as pope, as bishop of Rome; for he was consulted as such by the bishop of Constantinople, who wanted to gain him over to his opinion, not as a private person, which would have little availed him, but as bishop of Rome; and it was for his answer to the bishop of Constantinople consulting him as bishop of Rome, that he was condemned by the council as guilty of heresy. Besides, if the pope were capable of erring as a private person, but incapable of erring as pope, a distinction which the advocates for the papal infallibility often recur to, it would thence follow, that the pope might be, in his heart, an heretic, a Jew, a Mahometan, an atheist, and consequently be head of the church, though no member of the church, be Christ's vicar, and as Paul Vth styled himself, "vice-God upon earth," though he neither believed in Christ, nor in God; than which nothing can be conceived more absurd or more blasphemous. To conclude; from what has been said it is manifest beyond all dispute, that a pope was condemned by a general council; that he was condemned as an heretic, that he was justly condemned; and consequently, that if a general council is, the pope is not infallible. And it was not to demonstrate a truth so plain in itself, that I have dwelt so long on this subject, but chiefly to show what pitiful shifts, what disingenuous cavils, and unmeaning distinctions, those who pretend to reconcile the infallibility of the one with that of the other, men otherwise of great learning and parts, are obliged to recur to.

Before I dismiss this subject, it may not be improper to observe, I. That the present council, as well as all other councils held to this time, was convened by the emperor. "This holy and oecumenical council," say

[1] Cavalcant. ubi supra, p. 177—204.

[1] Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 11.

The emperor presides at the council. The scriptures never consulted. The whole dispute philosophical rather than theological. No regard had by the council to the decisions of the popes. The emperor lessens the sum paid by the popes before their ordination.

the bishops who composed it, "convened by the grace of God, and the religious command of our most pious, most faithful, and great emperor Constantine:"[1] And in their definition, "Our most gracious emperor, having gathered us together in this holy and oecumenical synod," &c. Not a word of the pope; and yet that they were gathered together by the pope is asserted by Baronius with as much assurance, as if the fathers had named him wherever the emperor is named. But perhaps the annalist supposed the name of Agatho to have been everywhere erased by Theodorus, and that of Constantine to have been substituted in its room; a supposition which he might have more easily maintained than the other mentioned above. II. That from the account I have given of this council it is manifest, that the legates of the pope did not preside at it, as is pretended by Baronius and Bellarmine, but the emperor himself, so long as he assisted in person; and in his absence the imperial commissaries, or those whom he had appointed to represent him, and assist in his room. For they sat in the first place, and are always named the first; they regulated the proceedings and method of proceeding, proposed what they thought fit to be discussed, declared on which side was the majority, adjourned the council when and how long they pleased, and, what is more, they finally decided, after hearing both parties, the most important disputes; the fathers of the council appealing to them, and all acquiescing in their decisions and judgment. And what else can be meant by presiding at a council, or at any other assembly? III. That in the present dispute the authority of the fathers was quite decisive, that the fathers alone were consulted and appealed to, and the doctrine, which they had taught, or were thought to have taught, was, without any regard to the scriptures, made by the council an article of faith, as if any thing necessary to be believed, could be contained in the writings of the fathers, and not in the scriptures. IV. That the Monothelites all acknowledged Christ to be perfect God and perfect man, as well as they who styled themselves catholics; nay, they even owned the two natures to remain, after their union, distinct and unmixed, as had been defined by the council of Chalcedon. But two wills they thought quite incompatible in one and the same person; and therefore excluding the human, admitted in Christ only the divine. Against them the catholics urged, that without an human will Christ could not be said to be perfect man, and consequently, that not allowing him an human will, they did not allow him to be perfect man; so that the dispute was, after all, concerning a question more fit to be resolved by an assembly of philosophers, than an assembly of bishops; namely, whether human nature could be said to be perfect, or to have all its essential perfections and properties, without an human will. Those, who maintained that it could not, were, it must be owned, better philosophers than they who maintained that it could; but so long as both believed Christ to be God and to be man, to be perfect God and perfect man, the faith of the one was quite as orthodox as the faith of the other. Lastly, that though the present controversy had been decided by several popes, especially by Pope Martin I. in the famous council of Lateran, consisting of one hundred and five bishops, yet it was not thought to have been finally determined until it was determined by a general council: And it was determined by a general council, without any kind of regard to the preceding decrees and definitions of the popes, which were not so much as once mentioned: A plain proof that the pope was not yet looked upon as the sovereign judge in all disputes and controversies of faith. For if he had been acknowledged as such, the bishops of the council would not have failed to produce the decrees of the sovereign judge, and thus at once put an end to the controversy, without giving themselves the unnecessary trouble of consulting the writings of so many fathers. But instead of that they did not even receive the letter of Agatho, until they found the doctrine it contained, agreeable to the doctrine which the fathers had taught. And thus far of this famous controversy, and the council, by which it was at last finally determined, a council of equal authority in the church of Rome, with any other general council, though entirely subverting, as has been undeniable shown, the authority which has been since claimed and assumed by the popes.

To return now to Agatho; he was not, it seems, so concerned for the good success of the council, and the establishing of the catholic faith, as to forget the temporal interests of his see; but had charged his legates, at their departure from Rome, to apply to the emperor, in the name of St. Peter, for an abatement of the sum, which, ever since the time of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, the popes had all paid into the exchequer before they could be ordained. The legates applied, pursuant to their directions, being encouraged by the kind reception and treatment they met with; and upon their application, an edict was immediately issued, moderating the abovementioned sum.[1] Baronius supposes this "most iniquitous exaction," as he styles it,[2] to have been entirely abolished by the good emperor Constantine; and thence takes occasion to inveigh against the Arian and impious kings of the Goths, by whom it was first introduced. But Anastasius, whom he quotes, only says, that the sum, which the popes usually paid for their ordination, was lessened, "relevata est quantitas," &c., and the annalist might, with

[1] Concil. 6. Sess. 18.

[1] Anast. in Agath. [2] Bar. ad Ann. 681. p. 62.

The emperor resumes the power of confirming the election of the popes. Agatho dies;—[Year of Christ, 682.] His writings. His letter to Edictus of Vienne spurious. One copy of his letter to Ethelred spurious. Another may be allowed to be genuine. Agatho honored as a saint.

much better reason, have taken occasion from thence to inveigh against the popes, than the Arian and impious kings of the Goths; since the popes have far exceeded them in iniquitous exactions, obliging not only the new bishops of the greater and more wealthy sees, to pay a certain sum, as the kings of the Goths had done, and after them the catholic emperors, but exacting of every ecclesiastic, let the benefice, to which he is presented, be ever so small, a whole year's income, for what they call the expedition, or expediting of the bulls. By the same edict Constantine resumed the power of confirming the election of the pope, which his predecessors had vested in the exarchs of Ravenna; and the elect was not thenceforth to be ordained until his election was notified to the court of Constantinople, and the imperial decree confirming it was received by the electors in Rome.[1]

Agatho lived but a very short time after the close of the council; for the last session was held on the 16th of September, 681, and he died on the 10th of January, 682, having governed the Roman church from the 27th of June, 678, to that time; that is, three years, six months, and fourteen days.[2] Had he held the see only two years, six months, and three days, as Anastasius supposes, he must have died on the 29th of December, 680; whereas he was still living, according to Anastasius himself, when the council broke up, or on the 16th of September, 681.[3]

As to the writings of this pope; besides his letter to the emperor against the Monothelites, which was received, as we have seen, and so highly commended by the council, three others are ascribed to him; namely, one to Edictus bishop of Vienne, another to Ethelred king of the Mercians, and a third containing a grant of privileges to the monastery of Wiremouth. In the letter to Edictus the pope gives that bishop an account of a council, consisting of one hundred bishops, which he had held at Rome after the return of his legates from Constantinople. But the letter is dated the last day of February, 682, and Agatho died on the 10th of January of that year. Besides, no mention is any where made of that council; nor was there, in the time of Agatho, a bishop of Vienne named Edictus.[4] Of the letter to Ethelred the Saxon copy, lodged formerly in the monastery of Peterborough, and translated by Spelman into Latin,[1] is unquestionably spurious. For in that copy the abbot of the monastery of Medeshamsted, or Peterborough, is appointed by Agatho perpetual legate of the Roman see in all the kingdoms of England; a dignity, which it is certain he never enjoyed; and Wilfrid, by whom the letter is supposed to have been brought into England, is said to have been sent to Rome by Ethelred to get the privileges confirmed by Agatho, which he and his brother Wolfer had granted to the above-mentioned monastery; whereas it is evident both from history and chronology, that Wilfrid was not sent to Rome by Ethelred, but banished by Ecgfrid king of Northumberland, as has been related above,[2] and banished before Agatho was raised to the papal dignity. The copy of the same letter, that has been published by Dugdale,[3] is not liable to the same objections, nor indeed to any other, and may therefore be allowed to be genuine. The only privilege granted there to the abbot of Peterborough, is that of precedency with respect to all other abbots within a certain district, or the honor of sitting before them in all assemblies as abbot of the monastery of St. Peter, prince of the apostles. That privilege is said in the subscription to have been granted by the holy pope Agatho, with the consent and approbation of the council of one hundred and twenty-five bishops, that is, of the council which Agatho assembled at Rome to appoint the legates, who were to be sent to Constantinople.[4] The third letter of Agatho, granting, or rather confirming the privileges, which king Ecgfrid had granted to the monastery of Wiremouth, is mentioned by Bede,[5] but has not reached our times.

Agatho is now honored as a saint by the Greeks as well as by the Latins; by the Latins on the 10th of January, the day on which he died; by the Greeks on the 20th of February, the day perhaps on which the news of his death was brought to Constantinople. His letter against the Monothelites, and the general council, that was held in his time, and condemned them, has rendered his name famous in the annals of the church.

[1] Anast. ubi supra. [2] See Pagi ad Ann. 682. n. 2.
[3] Anast. in Agath.
[4] Vide Annal. Le Cointe, et San-Marthanos in Gal. Christian.

[1] Spelman. de Syn. Angliæ, l. 2. p. 164.
[2] See p. 469-70. [3] Monastic. Angelican. tom. 1. p. 67.
[4] See p. 471.
[5] Bed. in vit Benedict. Biscop. l. 2. n. 6.

Leo II. chosen. The emperor's letter to him. The pope in his answer anathematizes his predecessor Honorius. Leo writes several other letters, and in all mentions the condemnation of Honorius. Macarius of Antioch, and others, condemned by the council, are sent to Rome.

LEO II., SEVENTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[Constantine Pogonatus.—Bertarith, Cunipert, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 682.] In the room of Agatho was chosen, and ordained on the 17th of August, 682, that is, after a vacancy of seven months and seven days, Leo, the second of that name, a native of Sicily, and the son of one Paul. His first care was to answer the letter, which he received from the emperor together with the decree confirming his election. For Constantine was no sooner informed of his election than he confirmed it, and at the same time wrote a long letter to the new pope, styling him, "the most holy and blessed archbishop of old Rome, and universal pope." In that letter he acquainted him with the proceedings of the council, and the steps he had taken to establish the catholic faith, exhorting his holiness to maintain the faith, which the council had defined, to cut off all heresies with the sword of the word, as Peter cut off the ear of the perfidious Jew, and to cut down every tree with the axe of the Spirit, that did not bear good fruit, nor could be brought to bear any, and doom it to hell fire. In the same letter he told Leo, that the letter of his predecessor Agatho had been examined by the council, and being found to agree with the scriptures, and definitions of the councils, and the writings of the fathers, it had been received by all, but Macarius of Antioch, no otherwise than if it had been written or dictated by St. Peter himself. In the end of his letter he required the pope to send, without delay, an apocrisarius or nuncio to reside in the imperial city, who, representing him, might act there in his name.[1]

In answer to this letter, the pope expressed the greatest satisfaction at the happy issue of the council, extolled the piety and zeal of the emperor, declared that he received the sixth as he received the five preceding councils, to which he found it entirely agreeable, and anathematized all, whom the council had anathematized, namely, "Arius, Sebellius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, &c. and with them the authors of the new heresy, Theodorus of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, &c. of Constantinople, and likewise Honorius, who had not adorned that apostolical church with the doctrine of the apostolical tradition, but had treacherously endeavored to subvert the catholic faith."[2]

Leo, not satisfied with receiving the council himself, wrote immediately to the metropolitans of the different provinces in the west, to acquaint them with the proceedings of the council, and require them to receive it, and cause it to be received by the bishops under their respective jurisdictions. Into Spain he despatched a deacon of the Roman church, named Peter, with four letters, namely, one to all the bishops of that country; another to a bishop named Quiricus; the third to Simplicius, a count of great interest in those parts; and the fourth to king Ervigius. By these letters the pope informs those to whom they are addressed, of the condemnation of the new heresy, and exhorts them to receive the council that condemned so detestable an error, and established in its room the catholic truth, the true and genuine doctrine of the apostles, the councils, and the fathers.[1] In the letter to the bishops of Spain, and likewise in that to king Ervigius, the pope mentions the condemnation of Honorius; and it is to be observed, that these letters, as well as the abovementioned letter to the emperor, were all written by the pope after he had received the decree of faith condemning Honorius with the other Monothelites, and he had been informed by the legates of the minutest transactions of the council, as he himself writes in his letter to the emperor; so that if the name of Theodorus, whom the council condemned, was erased, and that of Honorius, whom the council did not condemn, was substituted in its room, as Baronius pretends, it will thence follow, either that the legates, who had assisted at that council, were not themselves apprised of so remarkable an alteration, than which nothing can be conceived more incredible; or, if they were, that they did not apprise the pope of it, but to the great disgrace of his see, suffered him to publish, all over the west, the condemnation of one of his predecessors, who they knew had not been condemned; which no man can possibly believe or imagine. Baronius indeed would persuade us, that these letters have been all forged, or at least falsified by the enemies of Rome;[2] but his conjectures, if they even deserve that name, are so trifling, so destitute of all appearance of truth, and have been so fully answered by several eminent writers of his own communion,[3] that it would be losing time to dwell on them here.

In the time of Leo arrived in Rome, Macarius of Antioch, and with him his disciples Stephen, Anastasius, Leontius, Polychronius, Epiphanius, and another Anastasius, who had been all condemned as incorrigible heretics, and deposed by the council. Anastasius

[1] Bar. ad Ann. 683. p. 571. 573.
[2] Bar. ad Ann. 683. p. 573.

[1] Apud Bar. Ann. 683. p. 574. 576. [2] Idem. ibid.
[3] Vide Anton. Pagi ad Ann. 683. n. 5. 15. et Du Pin. Nouv. Bibliot. t. 5. p. 105.

Some of the disciples of Macarius recant. Leo dies;—[Year of Christ, 683.] He obtained a decree of the emperor, subjecting the see of Ravenna to that of Rome. Benedict II. chosen, and ordained. The sixth council received in Spain;—[Year of Christ, 685.]

writes, that the emperor banished them to Rome;[1] and Constantine himself, in his letter to Leo, tells him, that Macarius and his accomplices had all joined in a memorial begging his serenity would send them to his holiness, that he had sent them accordingly, and that he entirely submitted their cause to his paternal judgment; which was abandoning them to his mercy, to be punished by him as he should think fit. It was, no doubt, to prevent their being confined, as obstinate heretics, to some inhospitable place, that they begged the emperor to send them to Rome; and Constantine probably granted them their request, flattering himself that the pope would in the end overcome their obstinacy, and prevail on them to acquiesce, with the rest, in the judgment of the council. However that be, on their arrival in Rome they were shut up by the pope in different monasteries; where two of them, namely, Anastasius the presbyter, and Leontius the deacon, growing soon sick of their confinement, and the treatment they met with, were convinced of their errors, publicly abjured them, and were admitted by the pope to his communion.[2]

Leo enjoyed his dignity but a very short time, only ten months and seventeen days;[3] for he was ordained on the 17th of August, 682, and died on the 3d of July, 683. He was, according to the bibliothecarian, a man of great eloquence, sufficiently versed in the scriptures, well skilled in the Greek and the Latin, but far more commendable for his piety, his generosity to the poor, and an universal benevolence, than for his parts or his learning. Till his time the church of Ravenna had claimed an entire independence on that of Rome. But Leo, availing himself of the partiality, which he observed in the present emperor for him and his see, obtained an imperial edict, subjecting for ever the see of Ravenna to the see of Rome, and obliging the bishops of that city to repair to Rome after their election, to be ordained there by the pope. That edict was no sooner brought to Rome, than Leo, as it were, impatient to exert his new power, issued a decree strictly forbidding the church of Ravenna, now under his jurisdiction, ever more to celebrate the festival of Maurus,[1] who, so long as he governed that church, had vigorously opposed the papal usurpations, and had, on that score, after his death been honored there as a saint.[2] That honor Leo now enjoys; and truly if the one deserved to be unsainted for withstanding the papal usurpations, the other well deserved to be sainted for having so successfully extended them. Leo was buried in the church of St. Peter, and in 1607, his supposed remains, with those of Leo the First, the Third, and the Fourth, who have been all sainted, were removed by Paul V. out of the old church into the present.[3]

[1] Anast. in Leon. II.
[2] Idem ibid.
[3] Idem ibid.
[4] Anast. Benedict. II.

BENEDICT II., EIGHTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE POGONATUS, JUSTINIAN II.—BERTARITH, CUNIPERT, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 684.] Leo was succeeded by Benedict, the second of that name, by birth a Roman, and the son of one John.[4] He was elected a few days after the decease of his predecessor; but as by the constitution of Constantine mentioned above, the new pope was not to be ordained till his election was notified to the emperor, and the decree confirming it was received in Rome, the ordination of Benedict was by that means delayed to the 26th of June, 684, when the see had been vacant eleven months, and twenty-two days.[5] However, he wrote in the mean time to the nuncio, who had been dispatched by Leo into Spain, with the decree of the sixth council, but had yet given no account of the success of his negotiations there; pressing him to execute without delay, the commission which his predecessor had charged him with, that is, to get the decree, condemning the new heresy, received by the Spanish bishops, and to bring with him on his return to Rome, a copy of it, with their subscriptions. As the imperial decree, confirming his election, had not yet been received in Rome, he did not take upon him the title of pope or bishop, but only styled himself "presbyter," adding, "and in the name of God, the elect of the holy and apostolic see."

In the beginning of the following year, the pope was, to his great satisfaction, at last informed by his nuncio, that the bishops of the province of Carthagena had, in a council assembled for that purpose in Toledo, and consisting of seventeen bishops, the deputies of ten more, and six abbots, carefully examined, approved, and received the sixth general council; and that their example had been followed by the bishops of the other provinces throughout Spain, the present state of the affairs of that kingdom not allowing them to assemble in one council. This account was soon after confirmed by the arrival of the legates, whom the bishops assembled in Toledo had dispatched to Rome with a copy of the decree of

[5] See p. 465.
[1] Anast. in Leon. II.
[2] Henschenius ad diem XI. April.

Benedict obtains an edict allowing the pope to be ordained before he was confirmed by the emperor. The emperor sends the hair of his two sons to the pope. Macarius chooses rather to die in exile, than renounce his opinion, and be restored to his see.

the sixth council, which they had all signed, and a confession of their faith, wherein they acknowledged two wills in Christ, and two distinct operations. But in that confession they used some expressions which the pope did not at all approve of, and which he therefore in his answer required them to explain. The expressions were, "The will begat a will," and "in Christ are three substances." To examine these expressions a council was assembled at Toledo, the fifteenth held in that city; and they were, notwithstanding the offence which they had given to the pope, declared by the bishops who composed that assembly, sixty in all, entirely orthodox, and agreeable to the doctrine of Athanasius, Austin, Cyril, and the other fathers, whose doctrine was now the only true standard of the Christian faith.

Benedict did not enjoy his dignity a whole year, but made good use, as Anastasius observes, of the short time he enjoyed it, having obtained of the emperor what none of his predecessors, however great, however holy, had ever been able to obtain. The bibliothecarian might have added, and what none of his predecessors, however bold, however fond of independence and power, had ever yet had the assurance to ask. For, availing himself, as his two immediate predecessors had done, of the partiality of Constantine to his see, he took occasion, from the late long vacancy, to represent to him, and exaggerate, beyond measure, the inconveniences which he said must necessarily arise from their delaying the ordination of the person elected, till the decree confirming his election was brought from Constantinople to Rome; and therefore begged the emperor, in the name of St. Peter, that since those inconveniences, which in the end might prove fatal to the church, would only be prevented by his allowing the person elected to be immediately ordained, he would grant that favor to the prince of the apostles, and his church. With this demand, however unreasonable, how plainly soever calculated to establish the independency of the pope on the emperor, Constantine readily complied; and an edict was issued, addressed to the clergy, to the people, and to the army of Rome (for the army too had, as will soon appear, a right to vote in the election of the pope), allowing the person, whom they should elect, to be thenceforth ordained as soon as elected.[1] Thus did the good and pious Constantine, says Baronius, out of the great regard and veneration he had for the prince of the apostles, set at length his church at liberty. But her liberty was, as we shall see, very short-lived; the immediate successor of Constantine thinking he could, by some other means, better show his regard and veneration for the prince of the apostles, than by betraying to the ambition of his successors his own dignity, and also the rights of his crown.

About the same time the emperor sent to the pope, as Anastasius informs us,[1] the hair of his two sons, Justinian and Heraclius, which Benedict received attended by the Roman clergy and the army. What was thereby meant we learn in Paulus Diaconus, who in his history of the Lombards[2] tells us, that Charles king of the Franks sent his son Pepin to Luidprand king of the Lombards, to have his hair cut by him, according to custom, and that Luidprand having cut it accordingly, became thereby the father of Pepin. The hair of children was not cut, in those days, till they attained to a certain age; and the person who first cut the hair of a child, or to whom it was sent when first cut, became thereby the father of that child.[3] The pope therefore, by receiving the hair of the two young princes, became, by a kind of adoption, their father, and they were to respect and honor him as his children; and it was with that view that Constantine sent their hair to the pope. The cutting of children's hair, which was not done till they attained to a certain age, was a kind of religious ceremony among the pagans, who used to offer it, when first cut, to some of their gods. Of them the Christians borrowed that, as they did many other rites and ceremonies; and in the "ordo Romanus" are several prayers, that were anciently said on that occasion, and are there called "orationes ad tonsurandum puerum." At what time this ceremony was first adopted by the church is quite uncertain. But the present is the first instance of it that occurs in history, though it was, as appears from Paulus Diaconus, an established practice in the eighth century.[4]

This year died Theophanes, who had been appointed patriarch of Antioch, in the room of Macarius, deposed for his obstinacy by the late general council; and the pope, thinking that a favorable opportunity to attempt the conversion of the exiled patriarch, sent Boniface the ablest of his counsellors to instruct him, and at the same time to let him know, that if he hearkened to his instructions, was convinced of his error, and abjured it, he should be restored to his liberty and his see. This was, it seems, an irresistible argument with the pope; but Macarius withstood it to the last, though the pope had allowed him thirty days to deliberate with himself, and reflect on the consequences that would attend his rejecting such an offer at so critical a juncture.[5] An obstinate heretic indeed, whom not even the offer of his liberty, of a rich bishopric, and the patriarchal dignity, could convince of his error!

Benedict died this year, and on the 7th of

[1] Anast. Benedict. II.

[1] Anast. Benedict. II.
[2] Paul. Diac. de gest. Longobard. l. 6. c. 53.
[3] Mabil in præfat. ad Part. prim. Secul. III. Benedictin. n. 27.
[4] Paul. Diac. ubi supra. [5] Anast. in Benedict. II.

John V. chosen. Maintains the rights of his see. John V. dies:—[Year of Christ, 686.] Constantine Pogonatus dies. Constantinople besieged in his time by the Saracens. Their fleet destroyed, and army cut in pieces. They are greatly harassed by the Maronites.

May, if what Anastasius writes be true, namely, that he was ordained on the 26th of June, 684, and held the see ten months, and twelve days.[1] He is said by the bibliothecarian to have served the church from his infancy, to have applied himself to the study of the scripture, a study at this time generally neglected, to have been a man of a mild disposition, generous to the poor, and liberal to the monks and the clergy.[1] In the Roman martyrology a place has been allotted him among the saints. And truly his attempt towards rendering the see of Rome independent of the emperors, well deserved the greatest reward, which his successors in that see could bestow.

JOHN V., EIGHTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE POGONATUS, JUSTINIAN II.—BERTARITH, CUNIPERT, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 685.] In the room of Benedict was chosen, and ordained on the 23d of July, 685, when the see had been vacant two months and fifteen days, John, the fifth of that name, a native of Syria, and the son of Cyriacus.[2] He was, while yet a deacon, one of the three legates whom Agatho chose to represent him at the sixth general council; and it was by him, as he understood the Greek tongue, that the Greek copy of the letters of Honorius to Sergius, produced and read in the council, was compared, and found entirely to agree with the Latin original lodged in the library of the patriarch.[3] And hence, by the way, it is manifest, that the Greek copy of those letters was not altered or falsified, as the bishop of Cozensa would make us believe. The new pope enjoyed his dignity but a very short time, only one year and ten days; and was almost all the while confined to his bed. However, being informed that Citonatus, archbishop of Cagliari, had ordained, without his leave, Novellus bishop of Turris Libisonis, now Porto di Torre, in Sardinia, he held a council on so important an occasion; and by that council the see of Porto di Torre was declared to be under the immediate jurisdiction of the see of Rome.[4] And truly the churches of Sardinia, as well as those of Corsica and Sicily, were all immediately subject to that see, being all comprised under the name of the suburbicarian churches.

The pope died on the 2d of August, 686, and was the next day buried in the church of St. Peter. He is said by Anastasius to have left a legacy of 1900 solidi to the monks and the clergy.[5]

In the pontificate of John V., and in the beginning of the month of September, of the present year, died Constantine Pogonatus, having reigned fifteen years with his father Constans, and seventeen after his death, partly with his two brothers Heraclius and Tiberius, and partly alone. In the first year of his reign the Saracens, having overrun Africa, Sicily, and Cilicia, committing every where dreadful ravages, and carrying off with them incredible numbers of captives, at last entered Thrace, and laid siege to Constantinople itself. The siege is said to have lasted seven years, the enemy withdrawing to Cyzicus in the winter, and renewing their attacks early in the spring. This enterprise cost them dear, and the vigorous resistance they met with from the garrison, and the inhabitants, headed and encouraged by the emperor in person, obliged them in the end to raise the siege, and withdraw, after they had lost the flower of their army, and the greater part of their numerous fleet burnt by a kind of fire invented by one Callinicus, a native of Heliopolis, and called sea-fire, because it burnt under water. As they were returning home, the remaining part of their fleet was shipwrecked off the Scyllean promontory, and their naval power thereby entirely destroyed. About the same time three of the emperor's generals, Florus, Petronius, and Cyprianus, falling on the army, which the Saracens had in Syria, cut 30,000 of them in pieces, and put the rest to flight, obliging them to quit the field, and retire to their fastnesses and strongholds.[2]

In the mean time the inhabitants of Mount Libanus, known by the name of Maronites, a brave and warlike people, falling unexpectedly on the Saracens in Phœnicia, drove them with great slaughter out of that province, and, being joined by multitudes of Christian captives flocking to them from all parts, reduced the whole country between Mount Maurus and Jerusalem. From thence, in numerous bodies, they made daily incursions into the territories of the enemy, and, sparing none who fell into their hands, men, women, nor children, spread such consternation and terror over the whole country, that the caliph Mavias, despairing of being able, after so many losses, to contend with them, and at the same time with the Romans, began to think of suing for a peace with the latter, or abandoning his conquests, if he could not obtain it. And truly had the Romans pursued their success on the one side, while the Maronites pursued theirs on the other, they would have driven

[1] Anast. in Benedict. II.
[2] Anast. in Joan. V.
[3] See p. 481.
[4] Anast, in Joan. V.
[5] Anast. in Joan. V.

[1] Anast in Benedict. II.
[2] Theoph. Cedren. &c. ad Ann. Constantin. 5.

The emperor diverted by the unseasonable disputes of the ecclesiastics from pursuing his conquests. The downfall of the empire chiefly owing to the quarrelsome humor of the clergy. Disagreement between the clergy and army in the election of a new pope. Conon chosen by the clergy. His election approved by the army. In what manner the pope was elected at this time, and by whom his election approved.

the barbarians, if the writers of those times are to be credited, quite out of the empire. But Constantine, greatly concerned at the quarrels and disputes among the ecclesiastics, who had now for the space of threescore years been cursing and damning each other, had long wished for some respite from his wars, that he might be at leisure to reconcile them, to have the important question, that thus divided them, namely, "whether in Christ there was one will or two, one operation or two operations," finally determined, and a general council assembled for that purpose. A peace therefore was no sooner proposed by the caliph, than it was agreed to by the emperor, and upon the caliph's own terms; one of which was, that the Saracens should thenceforth quietly enjoy, as their own, all the provinces which they had seized, and then possessed, namely, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and great part of Africa, the best and most wealthy provinces of the whole empire.[1] Constantine passed the remaining part of his reign in great peace and tranquillity; and is highly commended by pope Leo II., and all the ecclesiastical writers of those times, for his piety, his religion, and above all for his Christian zeal in establishing the catholic doctrine, and persecuting all, without mercy, who did not receive it. He was a man both of courage and parts, and would soon have retrieved the losses, which his predecessors had sustained from the enemies of the Christian name, had he not suffered himself to be diverted by the impertinent disputes of the ecclesiastics, from pursuing the war, which he had, for some time, carried on with surprising success. The downfall of the empire is generally ascribed to the sloth, indolence, and inactivity of the emperors; but in truth it was not so much owing to their sloth and indolence, as to the quarrelsome humor of the clergy of those days, who being ever at variance among themselves, ever wrangling and quarreling, kept the people divided, and the emperors employed in assembling councils to decide their disputes, instead of assembling armies to repress the barbarians; nay, the ruin of the empire may be well ascribed to the controversy, which prevailed at this time, as to its chief and original cause; for it was while the emperors were, at the instigation of the clergy, wholly intent, some on establishing the doctrine of one will, and others on promoting the doctrine of two, in convening councils for that purpose, and issuing edicts, that the Saracens gained the advantages, which enabled them, in process of time, to overturn the Roman empire, and raise their own on its ruins. Constantine was succeeded by his son Justinian, of whom I shall have occasion to speak in the sequel.

CONON, EIGHTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN II.—BERTARITH, CUNIPERT, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 686.] The death of John Vth was attended with some disturbances, occasioned by the disagreement of the clergy and the army in the election of his successor. The clergy all declared for Peter the archpriest, and went to the Lateran church with a design to choose him. But the army, declaring for a priest named Theodore, sent some of their body to guard the gates of the Lateran, and prevent the clergy from assembling there, while the rest met in the church of St. Stephen. The clergy, finding the entry into the church guarded by the soldiery, assembled daily at the gate; and thence sent deputies, as often as they met, to treat of an agreement with the army. But the negotiations not succeeding, and the proposals of the one party, as they were both alike inspired, being constantly rejected by the other, the clergy, at length, entering the Lateran palace, chose with one voice a third person, the presbyter Conon, a native of Sicily, and a man, says Anastasius, venerable for his angelic aspect, and gray hairs, but more for his piety, the simplicity of his manners, the sweetness of his temper, and the reproachless life, which he had led to a great age, having never concerned himself with secular affairs.[1] His election, continues Anastasius, was no sooner known, than the judges and the chief citizens went and acknowledged him, applauding with loud acclamations the choice of the clergy. In the mean time the army, finding the people and the clergy thus unanimous in electing Conon, and signing the decree of his election, yielded a few days after; and they too signed the decree, and sent, according to custom, their messengers to the most excellent exarch Theodore with the messengers of the people and the clergy.[2] From this account it appears, I. That Justinian, no doubt, apprised of the dangerous consequences, that in time might attend the popes being ordained without the knowledge and consent of the emperors, or their ministers, had, in the very beginning of his reign, revoked the edict, which Benedict II. had obtained of the late emperor, allowing the popes to be ordained as soon as elected; and that the power of confirming the election of the new pope was again vested in the exarch of Italy. II. That the army, or the troops quartered in Rome, and garrisoning

[1] Theoph Cedren. &c. ad Ann. Constantin. 5.

[1] Anast. in Conon. [2] Idem ibid.

The custom of kissing the pope's foot. Conon ordained. The emperor's letter to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 687.] The taxes paid by the patrimonies of the Roman church lessened. Kilian sent to preach the gospel at Wirtzburg. Conon dies. No writings ascribed to Conon.

that city, had a right to vote in the election of the pope, as well as the clergy and the people. III. That the clergy elected in the first place, or named the person; that the person named or elected by them was to be approved of by the judges or magistrates of Rome, by the heads of the people, and by the army; and that the decree of his election was to be signed by all, and sent thus signed to the exarch by their respective deputies. IV. That the magistrates, the people, and the army, declared their approbation and consent by their acclamations, and by saluting the new pope, that is, as is commonly thought, by kissing his foot: For that practice was introduced pretty early, and Anastasius tells us, that the clergy of Rome having in 827 elected Valentine, the Roman senate and the people declared their approbation and consent by saluting the new pope, and kissing his feet, according to custom. He repeats the same thing in speaking of the election of Leo IV., chosen in 847.[1] At what time this ceremony was first introduced is quite uncertain; but certain it is, that it was yet practised only on occasion of the election of a new pope, and by the Romans only, who elected him; the popes not being arrived, till some ages after, to such a height of pride and presumption as to require all, who approached them, excepting crowned heads, and cardinals, whom they equal to crowned heads, to fall down at their feet, and kiss them.

To return to Conon; his election being universally approved, and confirmed by the exarch, he was ordained on the 22d of October, when the see had been vacant two months and seventeen days. As the exarchs were again empowered to confirm the election of the pope, from this time to their expulsion, which happened in the following century, the see was never vacant above three months; whereas it had sometimes remained vacant almost a whole year, when the election was to be confirmed by the emperor himself.

Conon received, some months after his ordination, a letter from the emperor Justinian, dated the 7th of February, 687, and addressed to his predecessor John V. By that letter the emperor acquainted the pope, that he had assembled the patriarchs, and all the bishops and metropolitans, then at Constantinople, with the nuncio of the apostolic see, the senate, the heads of the people, and the officers of the palace, of the guards, and of the armies quartered in the different provinces of the empire; that in their presence he had caused the acts of the late general council to be read; that he had required all, who were present, to sign them; and that, to prevent their being, at any time, interpolated, altered, or corrupted, he had ordered them thus signed to be carefully sealed up, and lodged in the imperial palace.[2] These precautions did the emperor think necessary to preserve the acts of a council, held but five years before, free from all corruption: To such a degree did the practice of altering, corrupting, and interpolating all sorts of writings prevail at this time.

Conon enjoyed his new diginity but a very short time; and all we read of him is, that he obtained of the emperor two rescripts lessening the taxes paid by the patrimonies or estates of the Roman church in the country of the Brutii, and in Sicily; and that he sent Kilian, a Scotch monk, to preach the gospel at Herbipolis, now Wirtzburg, in Franconia, where the new apostle converted and baptized Gozbert, duke or prince of that country, and all his people.[1] The pope died on the 21st of September of the present year, after a pontificate of eleven months, and was buried in the church of St. Peter.[2] Pope Nicholas I. in a letter, which he wrote to the emperor Michael, supposes the apocrisarii of Conon at the court of Constantinople to have been forced by Justinian to renounce the truth faith, and embrace the errors, which the emperor professed.[3] But as Justinian is commended by the contemporary historians, and even by the bibliothecarian, as a most Christian and orthodox prince, and no mention is made by the writers of those times of any kind of violence used by him with the apocrisarii of Conon, a pope, whom he greatly favored, as we have seen, we may well conclude with F. Pagi,[4] that pope Nicholas mistook both the pope, whose apocrisarii were forced to renounce the true faith, and the emperor, who forced them. Binius indeed, and Baronius, unwilling that a pope should be thought capable of erring even in point of history, take it for granted, that Justinian was a professed heretic; but neither can tell us what heresy he professed. It is true, the officers of the emperor quarreled with Constantine, deacon of the church of Syracuse, whom Conon had appointed steward of the patrimony of the Roman church in Sicily, treated him very roughly, and even threw him into prison.[5] But the treatment he met with from them was owing to his litigious temper, his exorbitant claims, and unjust prosecutions, which obliged the imperial officers to keep him confined, since the pope did not think proper to remove him. In that quarrel the emperor was noway concerned, nor was he, probably, acquainted with it.

Conon left no writings behind him, that we know of, and none have ever been ascribed to him. At his death he bequeathed the same sum to the monks and the clergy, says Anastasius, that had been bequeathed to them by his predecessor Benedict II. that is, the thirty pounds weight of gold.[6]

[1] Anast. in Valentin. et Leon. IV.
[2] Anast. in Conon.

[1] Vit. S. Kilian.-per Henric. Canis. Antiq. Lection. t. 4. et Vit. ejusd. in Secul. II. Benedictin.
[2] Anast. in Conon.
[3] Nicho. I. Epist. VIII. ad Michael, III.
[4] Pagi ad Ann. 686. n. 7. [5] Anast. in Conon.
[6] Anast. in Conon.

Schism in the Roman church. Sergius chosen. Obliged to pay a large sum to the exarch for his confirmation. Sergius ordained;—[Year of Christ, 688.] He shuts up his competitor in a monastery. Ceadwalla, king of the West Saxons, arrives at Rome.

SERGIUS, EIGHTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN II. LEONTIUS, TIBERIUS APSIMARUS.—BERTARITH, CUNIPERT, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ 687.] Conon being dead, the people were divided about the election of his successor, and a schism ensued, some declaring for Theodore the archpriest, and some for Paschal the archdeacon. Theodore, with his friends, possessed himself of one part of the Lateran palace, for there the popes resided; and Paschal, with his, took possession of the other. The judges, or magistrates of Rome, with the leading men among the clergy, and the officers of the army, strove for some time to bring the two parties to an agreement; but finding they strove in vain, and that neither could be prevailed upon to yield to the other, they left both in the Lateran, and assembling with some of the people in the sacred or imperial palace (for by that epithet the palace of the emperor was distinguished then, as the pope's is now) chose there, with one consent, a third person, namely, Sergius, presbyter of the Roman church; and, carrying him in triumph to the Lateran, forced the gates, and put him in possession of the place. Hereupon Theodore gave up his claim, acknowledged Sergius, and joined him with all his party. But by the archdeacon Paschal a private agreement had been made with John, surnamed Platys, the new exarch, in virtue of which the archdeacon was to deliver up to the exarch the thirty pounds weight of gold, which the late pope had bequeathed to the monks and the clergy; and on that consideration the exarch was to get him chosen pope. Paschal therefore, instead of acquiescing, as Theodore had done, in the election of Sergius, dispatched a messenger to the exarch at Ravenna to acquaint him with the state of his affairs, and press him to repair to Rome in person, and with all possible expedition, to support his interest there against his new competitor. The messenger no sooner arrived at Ravenna, than the exarch, loth to lose the promised sum, set out from thence, and traveling with great expedition, arrived so unexpectedly in the neighborhood of Rome, that the soldiery had scarce time to go out, according to custom, to meet him, nor the citizens and clergy to receive him with the usual marks of distinction. On his arrival in the city he found that in the mean time Paschal had been forced to acknowledge Sergius, that thereupon most of his party had abandoned him, and consequently that it would be in vain for him to attempt anything in his favor. He therefore attempted nothing. But, determined not to be disappointed, if Paschal was, he insisted on Sergius's paying him a hundred pounds weight of gold before he confirmed his election. Sergius was very unwilling to comply with so exorbitant a demand; the rather as the late emperor had, out of his great regard to the prince of the apostles, exempted his successors from paying the usual sum for the decree confirming their election: but the exarch, who had not the same regard for the prince of the apostles, absolutely refusing to sign the decree till the demanded sum was paid him, Sergius was, in the end, forced to comply, and to pawn the very ornaments of the tomb of St. Peter, to satisfy the exarch, and secure to himself the possession of the see.[1]

The election of Sergius being thus confirmed, he was ordained on the 15th of December, after a vacancy of two months and twenty-four days. He was descended of a Syrian family, but born in the city of Palermo in Sicily. He came first to Rome in the time of pope Adeodatus, chosen in 672, and entering among the clergy there, he was ordained priest by Leo II. and seven years after raised to the episcopal dignity in the manner we have seen.[2] He no sooner found himself in the quiet possession of the see than he deposed the archdeacon his competitor, charged with practising magic; and ordered him to be shut up in a monastery, where he died impenitent, says Anastasius, five years after.[3]

In the second year of the pontificate of Sergius, arrived at Rome Ceadwalla, king of the West-Saxons. He had governed that kingdom only two years; but, being a prince remarkable for his prowess and bravery, he had, in so short a time, greatly extended its limits by many signal advantages gained over the kings of Sussex and Kent.[4] As he was not yet baptized, though he professed the Christian religion, and was even for propagating it with fire and sword,(*) he resolved to go to Rome to receive baptism there at the hands of the pope. Pursuant to that resolution, he left his kingdom in the height of his glory, and set out on his journey. He was everywhere received by the princes, through whose dominions he passed, with all the

[1] Anast in Serg. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Idem ibid. [4] Bed. l. 4. c. 15.

(*) Having reduced the isle of Wight, and finding that the inhabitants were still pagans, he was for putting them all to the sword, and planting a colony of Christians in their room. However, from that barbarous resolution he suffered himself to be diverted by the famous Wilfrid; but it was upon condition that they embraced the Christian religion; which they all readily did, choosing rather to be baptized, than to be put to the sword. (*a*) "Thus," says Bede, "after all the provinces of Britain had received the faith of Christ, the isle of Wight received it too, (*b*) or rather pretended to receive it. Of such methods of preaching, and such conversions, but too many instances occur in the history of the church."

(*a*) Bed. l. 4. c. 16. (*b*) Idem ibid.

Ceadwalla is baptized by the pope, and dies soon after. Pilgrimages to Rome thought highly meritorious. First introduced among the English by Wilfrid. The bad effects of this devotion in women. Ceadwalla buried in the church of St. Peter. A new council assembled by the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 691.]

marks of distinction that were due to his rank, especially by Cunipert, king of the Lombards, who entertained him in a most magnificent manner.[1] He arrived at Rome a little before Easter, and, being received by Sergius with all possible demonstrations of respect and esteem, he was baptized by him on the eve of that festival; and he took at his baptism the name of Peter, no doubt to show his regard for the apostle of that name, and earn his protection. He had, as Bede informs us, all along wished to die soon after his baptism; and he had his wish; for while he yet wore his white garment, "in albis adhuc positus,"(*) he was suddenly seized with a faintness, and died on the 20th of April of the present year, being then only about thirty years old.[2] In the early ages of the church, it was a common practice with the catechumens to put off their baptism to the end of their lives, that they might not fall into sin after it, but go pure and undefiled to heaven: And it was, as appears from Bede, on that consideration, that Ceadwalla wished to die as soon as he was baptized. He wished to die, says that writer, immediately after his baptism, that he might pass to eternal bliss, cleansed from all his sins:[3] and it was, probably, on the same consideration that he had so long delayed his baptism, though otherwise a great zealot, and, in his way, even an apostle.

As for his resolution of going to Rome, it was owing to the opinion, that began to prevail here at this time, of the extraordinary merit and holiness of pilgrimages to the supposed tombs of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. As such pilgrimages proved very profitable to the popes, the Roman missionaries spared no pains to encourage them; they even persuaded their credulous proselytes, as may be gathered from Bede, that all, who travelled to Rome, to visit the tombs of the apostles, and died there, went strait to heaven. For that historian, speaking of the journey of Ceadwalla to Rome, tells us, that the king had ardently desired to be baptized at the tombs of the apostles, and to die at Rome, having learnt (no doubt, of the Romish missionaries, for who but they could have taught him such a lesson?) that from the ground, where the tombs stood, the entry into heaven was open to all mankind.[1]

The superstitious practice of traveling to Rome was first introduced among the English by Wilfrid, who, being yet a youth, undertook a journey to Rome, says Eddius Stephanus in his life, to see the chair of St. Peter; attempting, with that design, a way never before trodden by any of his nation.[2] That journey Wilfrid undertook in the year 658, and before he died, he had the satisfaction of seeing his example followed by incredible numbers of his countrymen, traveling to Rome, to visit the holy places there; and in the mean time, leaving their families to shift for themselves. It was not only among the men, but among the women as well as the men, that this humor prevailed. And what fruit the female pilgrims reaped from their pilgrimages, we learn from a letter written about the middle of the eighth century, by Boniface, archbishop of Mentz, to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury: in that letter Boniface, who was himself a native of England, and had the honor of his country at heart, advises Cuthbert to get the pilgrimages of women to Rome, by all means, forbidden, either by the kings, or a synod, "because most of the women," says he, "perish in the undertaking, that is, forfeit their virtue, there being scarce a city in France or Lombardy, where some adultress, or prostitute, is not to be found of the English nation;"[3] so that the effect of this devotion in the English women, was to supply with prostitutes the French and Lombards, through whose countries they passed. However, it does not appear that Cuthbert ever offered to forbid it, or to get it forbidden.

To return to Ceadwalla; as he died at Rome, he was buried in the church of St. Peter, where Sergius caused a stately monument to be erected to his memory, with an epitaph partly in verse, and partly in prose, giving an account of his name, quality, and age, of the motives of his journey to Rome, and the time of his death.[4]

No further mention is made of Sergius till the year 691, when a new council was assembled by the emperor Justinian, which occasioned a misunderstanding between him and the pope. As no canons or laws relating to discipline had been made by the two last general councils, the fifth and the sixth, and several abuses prevailed, at this time, in the different churches; the emperor, by the advice of the chief bishops in the east, assembled a council to correct those abuses, and establish among the churches an entire conformity in point of discipline, as well as of faith. This council is commonly styled synodus Quinisexta, or the Quinisext council, in Greek πενθέκτη, to show, that it is only a kind of

[1] Paul. Diac. l. 5. c. 14.

(*) All persons newly baptized were anciently clothed in white garments, to signify their having "put off the old man with his deeds, and having put on the new man Christ Jesus." Hence they were called the white flock of Christ, "Grex Christi candidus et niveus."(a) These garments were commonly delivered to the Neophytes with a solemn form of words, in the nature of a charge; such as that which we read in the Sacramentarium of pope Gregory: "Receive the white and unspotted garment, which thou mayest produce without spot before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life. Amen."(b) These garments were commonly worn eight days, and then laid up, and carefully preserved in the vestries of the church, to be produced as an evidence against such as should not observe the promises which they had made at their baptism.

(a) Lact. Car. de Resurrect. Domini.

(b) Greg. Sacramenta. de Bapt. Infant.

[2] Bed. l. 5. c. 7. [3] Idem ibid.

[1] Bed. l. 5. c. 7. [2] Edd. Stephan in Vit. Wilf. c. 3.

[3] Bonif. Ep. Concil. Brit. vol. 1. p. 241. et ap. Bar. ad Ann. 740. [4] Bed. l. 5. c. 7.

The pope excepts against some of the canons of that council. The council condemns a practice established by the laws of the Roman church. Fasting on Saturdays forbidden, though practised at Rome. All the canons of the council rejected by the pope. The emperor orders the pope to be seized, and sent prisoner to Constantinople;—[Year of Christ, 692.]

appendix, or supplement, to the fifth and sixth general councils. And indeed it consisted mostly of the same bishops, who had assisted at the sixth general council, and its canons are commonly quoted as the canons of that council. It is also called by the Latins, "synodus trullana," "and synodus in trullo," from the place where it met, the great hall of the imperial palace, built in the form of a cupola, and therefore called trullus, the place where the fathers of the sixth council had met ten years before.[1] The council consisted, according to some, of two hundred and forty bishops, according to others, of two hundred and seventeen; but the present copies are only signed by two hundred and eleven. Among these are Paul of Constantinople, Peter of Alexandria, George of Antioch, Anastasius of Jerusalem, John of New Justinianopolis, and Basilius of Gortina, the metropolis of Crete, who had been appointed by Agatho his vicar in the east, and therefore styled himself the representative, or legate, of the holy Roman church. It does not appear, as De Marca observes,[2] that extraordinary legates were appointed by the pope to assist at this council in his name. But certain it is, that the apocrisarii of the Roman see, who resided at Constantinople, were present, and signed, with the rest, the ninety-two canons, that were issued by the council to restore the decayed discipline, and correct the abuses, that had crept into the church.

Sergius, however, excepted against five of those canons; namely, the second, the thirteenth, the fifty-fifth, the sixty-seventh, and the eighty-second. By the second canon, the bishops of the council approved and received the eighty-five canons that were ascribed to the apostles; and had been, they say, approved and received by the fathers. But by pope Gelasius they had been judged apocryphal, and no-ways binding; and in his judgment Sergius chose rather to acquiesce, than in that of all the other patriarchs and bishops.

By a canon or law of the Roman church, the presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, promised, at the time of their ordination, thenceforth to forbear all commerce with their wives. But that practice the council condemned by their thirteenth canon, not only as a deviation from the apostolical canons, but as expressly forbidden by our Savior in these words, "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder;"[3] and by his apostle St. Paul saying, "art thou bound to a wife? seek not to be loosed."[4] They therefore command that practice to be absolutely suppressed; and after great commendations on marriage, as having been instituted by God, and sanctified by our Savior with his own presence, they close this canon with the following words; "if any one shall henceforth presume, against the apostolical canons, to deprive the clergy of the lawful company of their wives, let him be deposed." Thus the fathers of the present council. And here we may observe by the way, 1st, that the pope was not yet, so late as the latter end of the seventh century, thought to be an infallible guide in point of manners (for the popes now pretend to be as incapable of erring in dictating what is to be done, as in dictating what is to be believed;) else the council would not have presumed to declare a practice established by the decrees of several popes, and recommended by them as the height of all Christian perfection, to be contrary to the express command of our Savior, and to condemn it as such. 2dly, That the fathers of the council thought themselves empowered, not only to make laws that were binding, with respect to the pope, but even to depose him, if he did not obey the laws they had made. For it was chiefly against the pope the above-mentioned canon was levelled, as it was chiefly by him the abuse was countenanced, which gave occasion to that canon: and hence it is manifest that the doctrine, asserting the superiority of the pope to a general council, had not yet been heard of; but, on the contrary, that the bishop of Rome was thought as liable to be judged, censured, and deposed by a general council, as any other bishop.

By the fifty-fifth canon the practice of fasting on Saturdays, observed in the Roman church, was forbidden, on pain of excommunication for the laity, and deposition for the clergy. By the sixty-seventh, the laity, as well as the clergy, were commanded, likewise on pain of excommunication and deposition, to abstain from things suffocated, and from blood; and by the eighty-second Christ was not to be painted in the form of a lamb, but only of a man, because, in the form of a man, he had fulfilled all other types.

With these five canons the pope was so displeased, especially with the thirteenth and the fifty-fifth, condemning practices established by his predecessors, and observed by all the churches subject to his see, that on account of them he rejected all the rest; and, declaring the proceedings of the council void and null, he would not even suffer the copy, which the emperor had sent to Rome to be signed by him, to be read in his presence, though signed by Justinian himself, by the other four patriarchs, by his own legates, and by all the bishops of the council. This behavior in the pope the emperor looked upon as the height of arrogance and presumption; and he was therefore no sooner informed of it, than, resolved to teach him the regard that was due to the authority of a general council and his own, he dispatched Zachary, his protospatharius, or chief sword-bearer, into Italy, with an order to apprehend the pope, and bring him prisoner to Constantinople.

[1] See p. 474. [2] De Marca de Concord. l. 5. c. 18.
[3] Matth. c. 19: v. 6. [4] 1 Corinth. c. 7: v. 27.

The soldiery declare in his favor, and drive the officer sent to apprehend him out of Rome. The pope recommends the new archbishop of Canterbury to the English;—[Year of Christ, 693.]

But that order was no sooner known in Italy, (and it was known almost as soon in all the countries subject to the emperor in Italy, as it was in Rome,) than the soldiery, whose favor the popes had of late taken care to court and earn with their largesses, declaring they would suffer no kind of violence to be offered to the pope, marched from all parts to protect and defend him. As they approached Rome, the protospatharius, a man more fit to bear the sword than to use it, dreading the consequences of their entering the city, and his falling into their hands, fled in the utmost consternation to the palace of the pope, and, throwing himself at his feet, begged with tears in his eyes, that his holiness would take pity on him, that he would cause the gates of the city to be shut, and allow him, for his greater safety, an apartment in his own palace. The pope, in compliance with his request, immediately ordered the gates to be shut; but part of the army had already entered the city, and, appearing unexpectedly at the gates of the Lateran palace, insisted, with great noise and menaces, on their seeing the pope, a report being spread, that he had been conveyed away the night before. The sudden appearance of the army so terrified the protospatharius, that, thinking himself no where else safe, he took refuge under the pope's bed, and there lay quiet and concealed, till the pope, showing himself to the multitude, and returning thanks to the army for their zeal, appeased their rage, and persuaded them to retire. The army however took care, before they left Rome, to drive the protospatharius, loaded with reproaches and curses, out of the city.[1] These proceedings the emperor, however provoked, thought it adviseable to dissemble for the present, and wait till a more favorable opportunity offered of wreaking his vengeance on the mutineers, as well as the pope, whom he charged with seducing the army from their allegiance and duty. But in the meantime Justinian was deposed, and Sergius died before his restoration.(*)

The following year Sergius wrote to the English kings, recommending Berctuald, Brituald, or Brightwald, the new archbishop of Canterbury,(†) to their protection. The direction of the letter was, "Sergius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Ethelred, Alfrid, Adulph, kings of the English."[1] Of these kings we know nothing besides their names. At the same time the pope wrote to the English bishops, exhorting them to pay the obedience that was due to their new primate.[2] William of Malmesbury is the only writer, who mentions these letters or takes any notice of them.

Of Sergius nothing else occurs in history till the year 696, when he ordained Willibrord or Wilbrord, who had undertaken the conversion of the Frisians, bishop of that nation. Willibrord was a native of England, and having, with the help of other English missionaries, whose language was the same with that of the other German nations, con-

[1] Anast. in Serg. Bed. l. de Sex Ætat. Paul. Diacon. l. 6. c. 11.

(*) Justinian being universally hated, on account of his cruelty, and the cruelty of his two former ministers, Stephen and Theodorus; Leontius the patrician, encouraged by the patriarch Callinicus, whom the emperor had ordered to be murdered, and by two monks, who, pretending to be skilled in astronomy, assured him of success, took upon him the title of emperor, and without meeting with the least opposition, seized on Justinian, and carrying him in triumph to the circus, caused his nose to be there publicly cut off, and banished him to Chersona. At the same time the two favorite ministers were dragged to the forum and there burnt alive.(a)

(a) Niceph. in hist. Theoph. ad Ann. secund. Alex. 686. Cedren. ad Ann. Just. 10.

(†) Berctuald succeeded the famous Theodore in the see of Canterbury, and was the first of the English nation honored with that dignity. He was chosen on the first of July, 692, after a vacancy of seventeen months and some days; was ordained on the 29th of June of the following year, not by the pope as the bibliothecarian supposes, but by Godwin, whom Bede styles the metropolitan of Gaul;(a) and he took possession of his see on the last day of August of the same year.(b) What occasioned so long a delay between the death of Theodore, and the election of his successor, between the election of his successor and his ordination, we are nowhere told. The new archbishop was at the time of his election abbot of Raculph, in the kingdom of Kent; and is commended by Bede, as a man well versed in the scriptures, and thoroughly acquainted with the affairs of the church.(c)

As for Theodore, he died on the 19th of September, 690, being then in the 88th or 89th year of his age, and the 22d of his episcopacy; for he was sixty-six when named by Vitalian in 668, to the see of Canterbury; and he governed that church twenty-two years and some months. His life has been written by father Mabillon, chiefly out of Bede,(d) and to him I refer the reader, observing only here that if what Eddius Stephanus, a contemporary writer, says of him be true, he can have no kind of claim to the honors that are now paid to him in the church of Rome, as a saint: for Eddius tells us, that in the quarrel between the king of Northumberland and Wilfrid,(e) Theodore was, with rich presents, prevailed upon or bribed by the king to side with him against that prelate; and that he himself owned as his end approached, that he had on that occasion acted with the utmost injustice, and contrary to the dictates of his conscience, being fully satisfied, in his own mind, that Wilfrid was unjustly persecuted at the very time he concurred with the king in deposing, banishing, and stripping him of his wealth as well as his dignity. This Theodore confessed, as the same historian assures us, to Wilfrid himself in the presence of Erchenwald, bishop of London; and, touched with remorse, would have named him, had Wilfred agreed to it, for his successor in the see of Canterbury, to repair by that means the injury he had done him, and atone in the best manner he could for so heinous a sin.(f) Bede, however, who lived some time after, and either was not acquainted with these transactions, or, partial to the memory of Theodore, as Pagi insinuates,(g) passed them over in silence, speaks of him with great commendations; and upon his authority Theodore has been sainted, and a place allowed him on the 19th of September, the day of his death, in the Roman martyrology.(h)

As for the famous Penitential of Theodore, the reader will find a summary account of it in the collection of the English councils published by Spelman. It was the first work of the kind that appeared in the west: and contains, under fourteen titles, a great many canons, copied partly from the Greek councils, and partly from the Latin. But the copies, that have reached our times are generally thought neither to be entire, nor quite uncorrupted and genuine.

(a) Bed l. 5. c. 9. (b) Idem ibid. (c) Idem ibid.
(d) Mabill. Secul. 2o Benedictin. (e) See p. 469.
(f) Edd. in Vit. Wilfrid. c. 41.
(g) Pagi. ad ann. 690. n. v.
(h) Martyrol. Rom. die 19. Septemb.

[1] Malmsb. de Pontificib. l. 1. p. 209. [2] Idem ibid.

Sergius ordains Willibrord bishop of the Frisians;—[Year of Christ 696.] He preaches the gospel among them with great success. Sergius dies. His letter to Ceolfrid supposititious, or written by another pope. A forged miracle. His presents to churches.

verted to the Christian religion that part of Frisia or Friseland, which was then subject to the kings of France, Pepin the elder, at that time mayor of the palace, sent him to Rome to be ordained by the pope bishop of the Frisians. He was ordained accordingly by Sergius in the church of St. Cæcilia in Rome on the anniversary of that saint, that is, on the 22d of November of the present year.[1] Willibrord, or Clement (for that name the pope gave him at his ordination, thinking perhaps the other too uncouth for an apostle) stayed but fourteen days at Rome; and returning to Friseland, was there received by Pepin with all the marks of distinction that were due to his new dignity and character. He even gave him one of his castles, called, says Bede, in the ancient language of the country, Wiltenburg, that is, the town of the Wilti, but in the French tongue Trajectum, now Utrecht. Willibrord built a church there, by which means Utrecht became a bishop's see; and so it continued till the year 1560, when it was erected into an archbishopric by pope Paul IV. Willibrord, the founder and first bishop of that see, was still living when Bede wrote, and in the 36th year of his episcopacy.[2] He is said by Bede, and by Alcuin, who wrote his life, to have founded a great many churches in Friseland, to have erected there several bishoprics, and to have converted almost the whole nation. He died in 739, at the age of eighty-one, having spent fifty years among the Frisians.[3] His remains, real or supposed, are worshiped to this day in a monastery of Benedictines not far from Treves, which he founded, and in which he died.

Sergius lived five years after the ordination of Willibrord; but during that time, nothing is said to have been performed by him worthy of our notice. He died in the year 701; and if what Anastasius writes be true, namely, that he presided in the church thirteen years eight months and twenty-three days,[4] his death must have happened on the 7th of September of the present year; since he was ordained, according to the same writer, on the 15th of December, 687.[5]

As to the writings of Sergius, the letter supposed by William of Malmesbury to have been written by that pope to Ceolfrid, abbot of the monastery of Wiremouth, where Bede was educated and lived, is generally thought to be either a supposititious piece, or to have been written by some other pope, posterior to Sergius. For in that letter the pope speaks of Bede as a man already famous for his learning; and desires the abbot to send him to Rome, that he might have an opportunity of advising with a person of his judgment and knowledge, concerning some ecclesiastical matters of a very intricate nature.[1] But in the year 701, when Sergius died, Bede had scarce attained to the 26th year of his age; and as at that time he had not yet begun to write, he could not have been in the pontificate of Sergius, so famous as he is supposed in that letter to have been, for his judgment and knowledge.[2] F. Pagi is of opinion, that the letter might have been written by some of the successors of Sergius; and that the pope, who wrote it, dying soon after, the abbot Ceolfrid thought there could be no farther occasion for Bede to undertake a journey to Rome:[3] For that he never went to Rome is certain; as he himself assures us, that he spent his whole life in the monastery, where he was brought up from his infancy.[4]

In the life of St. Aldhelmus, abbot of Malmesbury, written by an anonymous monk of the same monastery, it is said, that a child being laid to Sergius, Aldhelmus, who was then at Rome, and baptized the child, commanded it, on that occasion, to speak the truth, and tell whether or no the pope was its father; and that thereupon the infant, though but nine days old, solemnly declared, that his holiness had no kind of commerce with the female sex, and that it was not begotten by him.[5] But as no mention is made by any other historian of so miraculous an event, Baronius gravely questions the truth of the fact.[6]

Sergius is said, by Anastasius, to have repaired several churches at a very great expense, and enriched them, especially the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, with many valuable presents, and sacred utensils of gold and silver.[7] The epitaph, which Baronius supposes to be his, and on which he founds several conjectures, belongs to the third pope of that name, and not to the first, as shall be shown hereafter.

[1] Bed. l. 5. c. 12. [2] Idem ibid.
[3] Alcuin. in Vit. l. 2. c. 24.
[4] Anast in Serg. [5] Idem ibid.

[1] Malmbs. de reg. Angl. l. 2. c. 3.
[2] Vide Mabill. Secul. 3. Benedict. in Elog. historic. Bedæ; et Henscen. ad diem 27. Maii in Vit. Bed.
[3] Pagi ad Ann. 701. n. 2. [4] Bed. in epit. versus fin.
[5] Apud Henschen. ad diem 25 Maii.
[6] Bar. ad Ann. 699. p. 636. [7] Anast in Serg.
[8] Bar. ad ann. 701. p. 643.

END OF VOL. I.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries

1 1012 01218 5171

Date Due

NOV 1			
GB	PRINTED	IN U. S. A.	