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THE object of the following work is to present a short summary or abstract of the Patristic evidence regarding the Titles and Prerogatives ascribed to St. Peter, and to his See and Successors, in the first ages of the Church.

The original text—Greek or Latin—of the more important passages has been appended to each extract.

In the case of those cited from authors of the first five centuries, the translation generally, but not invariably, adopted is the very literal and accurate one of the late Dr. Waterworth, to whose valuable works, *The Faith of Catholics*, vols. i. and ii., and *The Fathers on St. Peter*, &c., the reader may be referred for the context of many of the shorter extracts given in this work. As regards later authorities, the literal translations furnished by the late Dr. Rock, and other English authors, have been freely adopted.

To this new and much enlarged Edition has been prefixed a List of the principal authors quoted, with brief Notices of the best editions of their works, &c.
In the General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, the Legate Philip thus addressed the assembled Fathers:

"It is doubtful to none, yea rather it has been known to all ages, that the Holy and most blessed Peter, the Prince and Head of the Apostles, the Pillar of the Faith, the Foundation of the Catholic Church, received the Keys of the Kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race; and to him was given power to bind and to loose; who even until now, and always, both lives and judges in his Successors" (Φίλιππος πρεσβύτερος και συγγενεύτης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθήμενος εἶπεν. Οὐδὲν αμφιβολοῦσαν εστί, μᾶλλον δὲ πασι τοῖς αἰωνίων εγνώσατε, οτι ὁ ἅγιος καὶ μακαριωτάτος Πέτρος, ὁ ἐξαίχρος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ ξίων τῆς πιστείας, ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς εκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἦμων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . τὰς κλειδὸς τῆς βασιλείας ἐδεξάτο, καὶ αὐτῷ δεδομένα ἐξοικεία τοὺς θεομεν καὶ λυεῖν ἀμαρτίαις: ὡστε ἰῶς τοῦ νῦν καὶ αἰώνιον διάδοχοι καὶ ζητεῖν, καὶ δικαζεῖν. Concil. Eph. Act. iii. tom. i. Hardouin, Paris, 1715, p. 1477; Labbe, tom. iii. p. 625).
List of Fathers, Councils, and Chief Ecclesiastical Writers Cited in this Work.

Alcuin (Flaccus Albinus), an English monk, who became renowned throughout Christendom for his great learning, was born of noble Northumbrian parentage about A.D. 735, and brought up from infancy in the celebrated school of York (founded by Archbishop Egbert, the disciple and friend of Ven. Bede), of which he became the head A.D. 780. He was sent to Rome A.D. 781, and shortly afterwards, at the request of the Emperor Charlemagne, went to France, where he spent the remainder of his life in various literary and scholastic labours, dying at Tours in 804. "His services to religion and literature in Europe," says a Protestant writer, "based indeed on the foundation of Bede, were more widely extended, and in themselves inestimable" (Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Literat. 3 vol. i. p. 74). The best editions of his writings are those of Froben (Ratisbon, 1777, 2 vols. fol.), and Migne (Patrol. Lat. 2 vols. c., ci.).

1 The English reader will find much interesting and valuable information regarding the lives and writings of the Fathers and early Christian authors in Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature, London, J. Murray, (vol. i., A to D, 1877).

2 The following are the principal Collections of the works of the early Fathers and ecclesiastical writers:


The best Collections of the Councils are those of—

The Collected Epistles of the Roman Pontiffs, from A.D. 96 to A.D. 440, were published by Constant, Paris, 1721, in fol.; and continued by Thiel, Lipsiae, 1867. The most important of them are contained in Rom. Pont. Epist. Selecte (vols. xvii. xviii., 1872, of Hunter's SS. Patrum Opus. Selecta, CEniponti, 1870-77).

Ambrosiaster is the name given to a writer who was a contemporary of St. Ambrose and of Pope Damasus, and whose *Commentary on the Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul* was formerly attributed to St. Ambrose, and printed with his works. St. Augustine, however, reckons "Sanctus Hilarius" (whether Hilary the Deacon, or Hilary Bishop of Pavia, is uncertain) as the author. The words cited in p. 107 show that it was written during the Pontificate of Pope Damasus (A.D. 366-384), and "other marks, negative and positive, point to the same period" (*Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Literat.* vol. i. p. 87).

Auctor de Rebaptismate. This anonymous author is proved by Tillemont, Gallandi, and Dom Ceillier to have written against St. Cyprian about the year 254. His treatise is published in Galland (tom. iii.), and by Migne (*Patr. Lat.* vol. iii. p. 1187 sq.).

Anthony (St.), the great founder of monasticism, was born A.D. 250, at Coma, on the borders of Upper Egypt, and died A.D. 355, at the age of 105. His extant writings are in Galland (tom. iv.).

Arnobius Junior was a priest or bishop of Gaul, who flourished about A.D. 440. His *Commentary on the Psalms* is dedicated to Leontius, Bishop of Arles, and to Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne. Published in *Bibl. Max. Pat.* (tom. viii.).

Asterius (St.), Bishop of Amasea, in Pontus, was a contemporary of St. Chrysostom, and wrote about A.D. 387. His works were published by F. Combeïs, in his *Auctarium* to the *Bibl. Patrum* (Paris, 1648), and a more complete edition by Migne (Patr. Graec. vol. xl.).


Avitus (St.), Archbishop of Vienne, in Gaul, was born about A.D. 450, and died in 523. His works are published in Galland (tom. x.), and by
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Migne (Patr. Lat. vol. lix.), with the exception of some discoveries of M. Delisle, published in 1866.

Bachiarius was a monk of the early part of the fifth century. His Libellus de Fide Apologeticus was written "to satisfy the Bishop of Rome of his orthodoxy," and "its date is fixed approximately at about the middle of the fifth century" (Dict. of Christ. Biog. p. 236). This and another treatise are published by Galland (tom. ix.), and by Migne (Patr. Lat. vol. xx.).


Basil of Seleucia (St.), Bishop of Seleucia, in Isauria, took a leading part in the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, at which Eutyches was condemned. His homilies were first published, in Greek, by Commelin (Lugd. Bat. 1596), and also at the end of the works of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (Paris, 1672).

Bede (The Venerable), the historian of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and called by the Protestant Neander "emphatically the teacher of England" (Bohn's Neander, v. 210), was born at Jarrow, in Northumbria, A.D. 673, and died A.D. 735. His collected works have been published by Dr. Giles, in 12 vols. (London and Oxford, 1843), and by Migne (Patr. Lat. vols. xc.-xcv.). An English translation of his Ecclesiastical History is published in Bohn's Antiquarian Library, and one of his Explanation of the Apocalypse, by E. Marshall, Oxford, Parker & Co., 1878.

Bernard (St.), the celebrated Abbot of Clairvaux, was born A.D. 1091, and died A.D. 1153. The Benedictine edition of his works has been republished by Gaume (4 vols. roy. 8vo), and by Migne (Patr. Lat. vols. clxxxii.-clxxxv.). So great and universal was the esteem in which St. Bernard was held, that he became, says Neander, "the counsellor of noblemen, bishops, princes, and popes. . . . His multitudinous labours extended abroad from Clairvaux through the whole of Europe. . . . To all parts of France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Germany, England, Ireland, Denmark, and Sweden, monks must be sent from Clairvaux for the purpose of founding new monasteries or of reforming old ones; and thus Bernard, at his death in 1153, left behind him one hundred and sixty monasteries which had been founded under his influence" (Bohn's Neander, vol. vii. pp. 349-352).

Boniface (St. and Pope), succeeded Zosimus, A.D. 418. He was "an unswerving supporter of orthodoxy and Augustine in the contest against Pelagius" (Dict. of Christ. Biog. vol. i. p. 328). His epistles are in Galland (tom. ix.), after Couteant; and a selection of them is contained in Hurter's Patrum Opusc. Select. (vol. xviii. 1872.)
Caius, an ecclesiastical writer of the beginning of the third century, fragments of whose writings are preserved by Eusebius and Photius.

Cassian, a monk of Scythia, brought up in the monastery of Bethlehem, and who afterwards became celebrated as a founder of Western monachism, was born about the year 350, and died about 440. His writings were published in Bibl. Max. Pat. (tom. vii.), Migne (vols. xlii., 1).

Chrysologus (St. Peter), Archbishop of Ravenna, A.D. 433 to 454, was born at Imola about 405, and died there A.D. 454. Like Chrysostom, he obtained the name by which he was usually known by the golden brilliancy of his oratory. His extant works are published in Bibl. Max. Pat. (tom. vii.), and by Migne (Patr. Lat. vol. lxi.). Numerous works of his perished by fire, partly in the siege of Imola by Theodoric in 524; partly in the conflagration of the Archbishop's library at Ravenna, A.D. 700.


Clement of Rome (St. and Pope), was St. Peter's third successor in the See of Rome, from A.D. 92 to 101. The reader will find an account of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and of the restoration of the lost portion of the text (by the MS. discovered in the Library of the Holy Sepulchre at Fanari, in Constantinople, and published by Bryennios, Metropolitan of Serræ, at the end of 1875), in notes to p. 51 seq., of this work. The Appendix to Professor Lightfoot's work on the epistles of Clement contains the newly-recovered portion, with introduction, notes, and a translation of the whole epistle.

Clementines (The), are spurious writings attributed to St. Clement of Rome, and now considered to have had an Eastern origin. See Döllinger's First Age of the Church, 2d ed. p. 302; and Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Lit. vol. i. p. 577.

Celestine (St.), the forty-second Bishop of Rome, succeeded Boniface I., A.D. 422, and died in 432. This Pope sent Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, to repress the Pelagian heresy in Britain, and SS. Palladius and Patrick to convert the Irish. Hence St. Prosper of Aquitaine said of him, that “whilst he took pains to keep the Roman island (Britain) Catholic, he made the barbarian island (Ireland) to become Christian” (Pros. Adv. Collator. n. 41).

Columbanus (St.), a celebrated Irish monk, was born in Leinster, A.D. 543, and was brought up in the monastery of Bangor, on the coast of Down, under St. Comgall, by whom he was sent, A.D. 590, with
twelve other monks, to preach the Gospel to the tribes dwelling on the borders of the Frankish kingdom. He subsequently founded the great monasteries of Anegrey, Luxeuil, Fontaines, and Bobbio. See the account of his life and labours in Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, vol. ii. b. vii. His writings are published in Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra* (Lovian, 1667), and Galland (tom. xii.).

**Cornelius** (St.), succeeded the martyred Pope Fabian A.D. 251, courageously accepting his election to the Pontificate, although the tyrannical Emperor Decius had declared that he would rather see a new pretender to the Empire than a new Bishop of Rome (Cyprian, *Epist. Iv.*). He was martyred ("martyrio quoque dignatione Domini honoratus"—*St. Cypr.* A.D. 252. Several of his epistles are published amongst St. Cyprian's works. Eusebius quotes from his epistle to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 43).


**Cyril of Alexandria** (St.), was Archbishop of Alexandria, and the great opponent of the Nestorian heresy. He succeeded Theophilus A.D. 412, and died A.D. 444. He presided, as Pope Celestine's Legate, over the General Council of Ephesus. The best edition of his works is that of Aubert (6 vols. Paris, 1658), republished by Migne (*Patrol. Græc.* vols. lxviii.-lxxvii.).

**Cyril of Jerusalem** (St.), was born in Jerusalem about A.D. 315. He succeeded Maximus as Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 350. His eighteen *Catechetical Lectures*, addressed to Catechumens, and five *Mystagogical Lectures*, addressed to the newly baptized, were composed about A.D. 347, while he was still a priest. • See *Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Literat.*, vol. i. p. 762. The best editions of his works are those of Milles (Oxford, 1703), and the Benedictine (Paris, 1720, and Venice, 1761), republished by Migne (*Patrol. Græc.* vol. xxxiii.).

**Damasus** (St. and Pope), succeeded Liberius A.D. 366, after violent opposition, leading to bloodshed, on the part of the Arian faction and the ante-Pope Ursicinus. "Damasus," says a Protestant writer, "used his success well, and the chair of Peter . . . was never more respected nor
more vigorous than during his bishopric. He appears as a principal defender of orthodoxy against Arian and other heretics” (Dict. of Chris. Biog. vol. i. p. 783). “His correspondence with Jerome, his attached friend and secretary, begins A.D. 376, and closes only with his death, A.D. 384.”

Ephrem Syrus (St.), deacon or priest of the Church of Edessa, was born about A.D. 306, at Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, and died after A.D. 379. His extant works, in Syriac and Greek (the latter probably translated in his time), fill six vols. folio, and were edited by J. Assemani, at Rome, in 1732 and 1747. A Greek edition was published at Oxford in 1709 by Mr. Edward Thwaites; a Latin translation of all his works (Syriac and Greek) at Venice, in 1775.

Epiphanius (St.), Archbishop of Salamis, in the island of Cyprus, was born about A.D. 310, in Palestine, and died A.D. 403. His great work, entitled Panarion, or, Box of Antidotes against all Heresies, appeared in 374. The best editions of his complete works are those of Petavius (2 vols. fol. Colon. 1622); Dindorf (5 vols. 8vo, Lipsiae, 1859-63); Migne (Patrol. Graec. vols. xlii. xliii.).

Eusebius (Pamphilus), Bishop of Caesarea, and commonly called “The Father of Ecclesiastical History,” was born between A.D. 260 and 270. He died about 340. In his Ecclesiastical History many valuable extracts from the works of earlier writers (since lost) are preserved. His complete works are published by Migne in six vols. (Patr. Graec. xix.-xxiv.). An English translation (not always perfectly accurate) of his Ecclesiastical History is published in Bohn’s Theological Library.

Eulogius was Patriarch of Alexandria in 581, and died in 608.

Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, was a contemporary of St. Cyprian, and died A.D. 269. His Epistle to St. Cyprian is published with that Father’s works. See Mgr. Freppel’s St. Cyprien, p. 427 seg.

Fortunatus was a Christian poet, and Bishop of Poitiers in the sixth century. He died in 603. Works published by Brower (Mogunt. 1603; Migne (Pat. Lat. vol. lxxxviii.).

Gelasius I. (St. and Pope), occupied the chair of Peter from A.D. 492 to 496. Eighteen of his Decretal Epistles are published in Labbe (Concil. t. iv.); Migne (Patr. Lat. vol. lix.) ; and Thiel (Epist. Rom. Pont. tom. i. 1867).

Gregory of Nazianzum (St.), a renowned champion of the Catholic faith against the Arians, was born about A.D. 329. He became Metropolitan of Caesarea about A.D. 370, and Bishop of Constantinople in 380, but soon resigned that see and retired to his native country, where he died A.D. 389. The best edition of his works is that of the Benedictines and A. B. Caillau (2 vols. fol. Paris, 1778-1849), republished by Migne (Patr. Graec. vols. xxxv.-xxxviii.).

Gregory of Nyssa (St.), was the younger brother of Basil the Great, and became Bishop of Nyssa, in Cappadocia, A.D. 371; but was deposed and banished by the Arians in 375. He acted a prominent part at the
General Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, and died A.D. 395. The best edition of his works is that of Morell, republished by Migne (*Patr. Græc.* vols. xlv.-xlvi.).

**Gregory the Great** (St. and *Pope*), was born about A.D. 520, and died in 604. To the mission of Augustine and his monks by this Pope England owes its conversion to Christianity. The best edition of his works is the Benedictine (Paris, 1705, 4 vols. fol. and Venice, 1768-76, 4 vols.), republished by Migne (*Patr. Lat.* vols. lxxv.-lxxxix.).

**Hilary of Poictiers** (St.), was born about A.D. 320, became Bishop of Poictiers in 355, and was banished the next year by the Emperor Constantius for his zealous defence of Athanasius against Saturninus. He returned to his see in 359, and died in 366. In 1852 he was declared "Doctor of the Universal Church" by Pope Pius IX. The best edition of his works is the Benedictine (Constant, Paris, 1693), enlarged by Maffei in 1730 (2 vols. fol.), and Migne (*Patr. Lat.* vols. ix. x).

**Hormisdas** (*Pope*), was elected in the year 514. At the request of the Emperor Justin, and John, Patriarch of Constantinople, this Pope sent a deputation to bring about the re-union of the Monophysites with the Church. This was to be effected by the proposal of a profession of faith—commonly called the *Formula of Pope Hormisdas*—to be signed by the Eastern Bishops. It was accepted and signed by all of them (including those who had joined the Acacian schism), as also by the Emperor Justinian, and by the Patriarchs of Constantinople—Epiphanius, John, and Mennas. It was also signed by every Bishop before taking his seat in the eighth General Council, held A.D. 869.

**Hippolytus** (St.), a disciple of St. Irenaeus, came to Rome during the Pontificate of Zephyrinus, who, after a reign of eighteen years, was succeeded, A.D. 218, by Callistus. In combating the heretics of his time (the Sabellians and Noetians, who maintained the Patripassian doctrine), Hippolytus himself fell into an opposite extreme of error (Subordinationism), and he also opposed the mitigated system of penance which had been approved by Pope Zephyrinus. When Callistus, to whom he showed a strong personal enmity, was elected Pope, Hippolytus, who had become Bishop of Pontus, set himself to oppose him, and "declaring that a heretic could not be Pope, and that those who adhered to him were not the faithful, but formed 'a school' and not the Church, he came to the conclusion that he himself was Pope, and that such as remained to him of his flock in the Tiburtine Way were the true Church. Thus he speaks of himself in stately plural as 'the successors of the Apostles, the partakers of the same grace, supreme priesthood, and doctorship, and the guardians of the Church'" (*Month*, Feb. 1878). The small schism thus caused continued for some years; but before his martyrdom, which probably occurred at the same time as that of Pope Pontian, A.D. 235, Hippolytus was reconciled to the Holy See (Prudent., *Hymn. in S. Hippol*). See Döllinger's *Hippol. and Callist.*, Eng. trans. 1876, and
The Lives of SS. Callist. and Hippol. in Month of February and March 1878. His collected works are published in Galland (tom. ii.) and Migne (Patr. Græc. vol. x.). He is now generally considered to have been the author of the Philosophumena, or Conflation of all Heresies, in ten books, which the first editor, Miller (Oxford, 1851), attributed to Origen. His Chronicle, which appeared in the year 235, contained a catalogue of the early Bishops of Rome, counting St. Peter as the first; but the portion containing it was supposed to be lost until restored by Mommsen, who proved "that the earlier part of the celebrated Liberian Catalogue is derived from the list of Roman Bishops given by St. Hippolytus" (Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Lit. vol. i. p. 506, 7, 555, 7).

Ignatius (St.), surnamed Theophorus, was a disciple of St. John, and became the second successor of St. Peter in the See of Antioch (Origen, Hom. vi. in Lucam; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 36). He suffered martyrdom under the Emperor Trajan, by whose orders he was conveyed by soldiers to Rome, and there cast to the wild beasts in the Amphitheatre. During his journey he was met by delegates from several of the Christian Churches, and it was under these circumstances that he wrote, from Smyrna, his Epistles to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, and the Romans; from Troas, those to the Philadelphians, the Smyrneans, and to their Bishop Polycarp (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. iii. 36). His seven epistles (the shorter Greek recension) are referred to by Polycarp, Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Eusebius, Jerome, Theodoret, and other early writers; and the Syriac epitome of three of them, published by Cureton, is considered by the best critics (such as Hefele, Denzinger, and Mösinger—Catholics; Petcrmann, Ullhorn, Mæx, Dr. Jacobson and Professor Hussey of Oxford, and Dr. Mill and Professor Blunt of Cambridge—Protestants) to have rather confirmed the genuineness of the Greek text than otherwise. See also Quarterly Review, No. 175, and Dublin Review, June 1858.

Innocent I. (St. and POPE), succeeded Anastasius I. in the year 402, and died in 417. His epistles are published in Galland (tom. viii.), after Constant.

Irenæus (St.), Bishop of Lyons, was born in Asia Minor, A.D. 135-140. He himself speaks in his Epistle to Florinus (ap. Euseb. v. 20) of his former intimate acquaintance with St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and of the opportunities he had availed himself of in being thoroughly instructed by him in the doctrine and traditions of the Apostles. During the persecution under Marcus Aurelius, Irenæus came to Gaul, and he succeeded Pothinus, the martyred Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178. He himself suffered martyrdom with many others A.D. 202, during the persecution under Septimus Severus. His great work Against the Heresies, in five books, has been preserved in a very ancient and barbarously literal Latin version. Its antiquity is shown by the fact that it was used by Tertullian, as Massuet has proved; and its extreme fidelity, by comparing
it with the portions of the Greek text of the first book (c. 1-21) that have been preserved, as well as with the fragments quoted by St. Hippolytus, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, St. John Damascene, and others. The best editions of his works are those of Massuet (Benedictine, Paris, 1712, and Venice, 1734), and Stieren (Lipsia, 1853, 2 vols. 8vo), which have been reprinted by Migne, with new critical notes, and the three valuable Dissertations of Massuet regarding the life, writings, and doctrine of St. Irenæus (Patr. Græc. vol. vii.). For a full elucidation of the celebrated passage in lib. iii. c. 3, the reader must be referred to Schneemann's Sti. Irnæii, De Ecclesi. Rom. Principatu Test. Commentat. et Defensum, Friburg, 1870; or to Mr. Freppell's St. Irénée et la Primaute du Pape, 1870; reprinted from his larger work, St. Irénée, Paris, 1861.

James of Nisibis (St.), Bishop of Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, was illustrious in the annals of the Church of Syria, which venerated him as one of her greatest doctors. He was present at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. His sermons, which were commended by St. Athanasius (Epist. Encly. ad Episc. Egypt. et Lyb.), and of which Gennadius gives the titles, were published entire at Rome in 1766, with a Latin translation from the Armenian, by Nicholas Antonelli.

Jerome (St.), a profound Biblical scholar, and the author of the translation of the whole Bible known as the Latin Vulgate, was born at Stridon, in Dalmatia, about A.D. 340. His youth was passed at Rome, where he studied almost every branch of learning, especially rhetoric, Hebrew, and theology. After leading for four years a solitary life in the deserts of Syria, he went to Antioch, and was ordained priest, A.D. 377. In 381 he went to Constantinople, and from thence passed to Rome, where he became the friend and secretary of Pope Damasus. After the death of Damasus, Jerome quitted Rome (385) and retired to the Holy Land, where he superintended several monasteries, until his death at Bethlehem in 420. Besides his translation of the Scriptures (of which, according to Hain, in his Repertorium Bibliographicum, ninety-eight distinct editions were printed between the year 1460 and the close of the fifteenth century), his entire works were published by Erasmus (Basil. ap. Froben, 1516 et seq., in 9 vols. fol.), and at Rome (9 vols. fol.) in 1565. The Benedictine edition (Pouget and Martianay) appeared in 1693-1706, in 5 vols. fol. The best edition was that of Vallarisius (Verona, 1734, 12 vols. fol.). Migne's edition is reprinted from the two last named, in 9 vols. roy. 8vo (Patr. Lat. vols. xxii.-xxx.).

Julius (Pope and St.), succeeded Marcus A.D. 337, and died in 352. His Epistle to the Eusebians is published with others by Coustant, Galland, and Migne (Patr. Lat. vol. viii.).

Juvenal, a Christian poet of the fourth century, translated portions of the Scriptures into Latin verse; but only his Book on Genesis and Gospel History (4 books) are extant. Galland (tom. iv.), Migne (Patr. Lat. v. xix.).
Leo the Great (St. and Pope), succeeded Sixtus III., A.D. 440, and died in 461. It was this great Pontiff who, by his confidence in God and noble and courageous conduct, saved Rome from being pillaged by the Huns under "the Scourge of God," Attila, A.D. 452; and again, in 455, he saved the city from destruction by the awe which he inspired in the fierce Gesneric, King of the Vandals. "The Pontificate of Leo the Great," says the Protestant Milman, "is one of the epochs of Latin, or rather of universal Christianity. Christendom, wherever mindful of its Divine origin, and of its proper humanising and hallowing influence, might turn away in shame from the melancholy and disgraceful (religious) contests in the East. On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be rigidly inclined to question pretensions supported as well by such conscious power as by such singular and unimpeachable virtue; and by such inestimable benefits conferred on Rome, on the empire, on civilisation." (Hist. of Latin Christ. book ii. ch. 4). It was this Pope who summoned, and, by his Legates, presided over the General Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; and it was his famous Epistle to Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, that elicited from the assembled prelates the exclamation, "Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo." The best edition of his works is that of the brothers Ballerini (1753, in 3 vols. fol.). They are also published by Migne (Patr. Lat. vols. liv.-lvi.); and his Epistolæ Selectæ and Sermones Selecti by Hurter (Patr. Opusc. Select. Eniponti, 1868-74, vols. xiv., xxv., xxvi.).

Macarius of Egypt (St.), was born A.D. 300, and in 330 entered on a life of rigid monasticism, dying in 399. Works published by Galland (tom. viii.), and Migne (Patr. Gr. vol. xxxiv.).

Maximus of Turin (St.), was celebrated in the fifth century as a Christian orator, and was called by Gennadius, 'Vir divinis Scripturis satis intentus, et ad docendum ex tempore plebem sufficiens' (De Script. Eccl. c. 40). He acted a prominent part in the Council of Milan, A.D. 451, and at the Council of Rome, A.D. 465. The best edition of his works is that of P. Brunus (Rome, 1784), republished by Migne (Patr. Lat. vol. lvi.).

Nilus (St.), flourished under the Emperors Arcadius and Theodosius, and died about A.D. 450. He had for his master the great St. Chrysostom. His letters were published by Allatius (Rome, 1668), and his treatises by Suarez (Rome, 1673).

Optatus (St.), Bishop of Milevis in Africa, wrote his treatise De Schism. Donat. cont. Parmenian. about the year 370, and lived to see the accession of Pope Siricius (whose name he added to the list of Popes in lib. ii. c. 3) in 384. St. Jerome speaks of the treatise as containing six books (De Vir. Illust. c. 121); but the most ancient MSS. and editions contain a seventh, which was originally, it is supposed, regarded as an
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appendix, or added by the author when he revised his work (Dupin, *Pref. ad Op.* § 2; Fessler, *Inst. Patr.* vol. ii. § 255). St. Augustine (*De Doct. Christ.* ii. 40; *Cont. Epist. Parmenian*, lib. i. c. 3) reckons Optatus amongst the most renowned writers of the Church. The earlier editions of his treatise were very inaccurate, according to Dupin, who, after collating many MSS., published his highly esteemed edition at Paris (in 1700), Amstelod (1701), and Antwerp (1702). This edition has been republished with select notes by Oberther (Wincel. 1790, 2 vols.), Galland (tom. v.), Migne (*P. Lat.* v. xi.), Hurter (*Patr. Opusc.* vol. x. 1870).

**Origen**, was born at Alexandria about A.D. 185. His instructors in theology were Pantaenus and Clement of Alexandria; and in 203 he became head of the Catechetical School in that city. During the Pontificate of Zephyrinus, about A.D. 211, Origen went to Rome, *εὐθηνεύς την αρχιεπισκοπην Ρωμαιων εκκλησιαν ιδειν* (Euseb. *Hist. Ecc.* vi. 14); but, returning to Alexandria, at the desire of his bishop, Demetrius, he there wrote many of his great works on the Scriptures. He was subsequently sent by Demetrius into Achaia, and during his stay at Caesarea in Palestine, he was ordained priest, A.D. 228. He returned to Alexandria in 230, and was treated with severity by his Bishop on account of the irregularity of his ordination, and some heretical doctrines attributed to him, for which also he was condemned in two Synods. He died at Tyre in 254. The best edition of his works is the Benedictine (*De la Rue, Paris, 1743, 4 vols. fol.*), republished by Oberthur (*Coll. PP. Græc.* vols. vii.-xxi.), and Migne (vols. xi.-xvii.).

**Pacian** (St.), was Bishop of Barcelona from A.D. 370 to 391. His works are in Galland (tom. v.), and Migne (*Patr. Lat.* vol. xi.).

**Paulinus**, a deacon of Milan, wrote about the year 418. Galland (tom. ix.).

**Paulus Orosius**, was a priest of Bracara in Spain, and a disciple of SS. Jerome and Augustine. Writings in Galland (tom. ix.), and Migne (vol. xxxi.).

**Proclus** (St.), a disciple of St. Chrysostom, became Patriarch of Constantinople in A.D. 434, and was a zealous opponent of Nestorianism. He died in 447. His letters and homilies were published by Riccardi (Rome, 1630), Combejis (*Auctuar.* tom. i.), Galland (tom. xix.), Migne (*Patr. Græc.* vol. lxv.).

**Prosper of Acquitaine** (St.), a zealous disciple of St. Augustine, and opponent of the Pelagian heresy, flourished about A.D. 428. He died in 455. The best edition of his works is that of Paris (fol. 1671 and 1711), republished by Mangeant (Venice, 1744 and 1782), and Migne (*Patr. Lat.* vol. li.).

**Prudentius**, a Christian poet, was born at Saragossa, in Spain, A.D. 348, and died about A.D. 413. The latest editions of his poems are those of Dressel (Lipsiæ, 1860), and Migne (*Patr. Lat.* vols. lix. lx.).
Simplicius (ST. and POPE), sat from A.D. 468 to 483. His epistles are in Labbe (Concil. tom. iv.), &c.

Siricius (ST. and POPE), succeeded Damasus in A.D. 384, and died in 398. Epistles in Galland (tom. vii.), after Constant.

Socrates, the Greek ecclesiastical historian, was born in Constantinople about the year 380. His history, which is for the most part a continuation of Eusebius, ends with the year 439.

Sozomen, also a Greek ecclesiastical historian of the fifth century, was a native of Palestine, from whence he passed to Constantinople. He died about 450. His history, with that of Socrates, was published by Valesius (Paris, 1686), Reading (Cambridge, 1720), and Migne (Patr. Græc. vol. lxii.); and English translations of both are published in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library.

Tertullian, the son of a proconsular centurion, was born at Carthage about A.D. 150, and brought up for the profession of a Roman advocate. He embraced Christianity A.D. 185, was ordained priest in 192, became a Montanist in 199, and died about 220. His works, many of which are extant, are highly esteemed, since even those which were written after he had fallen into heresy bear important testimony regarding the faith, practice, and discipline of the Church in his time. Of his style, which is extremely terse and vigorous, St. Vincent of Lerins said: "Who can express the praises which he deserves, ... whose so many words almost are so many sentences, whose so many senses so many victories. This knew Marcion, Apelles, Praxeas, and Hermogenes, Jews, Gentiles, Gnostics, and many others, whose blasphemous opinions he hath overthrown with his many and great volumes, as it had been with thunderbolts" (Communit. c. 18.) His treatise on Prescription against Heretics was written whilst he was a Catholic. His works were published by Erasmus (1520), Pamelius (1568), Rigalt (1648), Fell (Oxford, 1682), and others. The best edition is the Benedictine (Maran, Paris, 1726), and Migne's (Patr. Lat. vols. iv. v.). English translations have been published in the Oxford Library of the Fathers, and in Clarke's Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in Palestine, was born at Antioch about A.D. 393, and died about 458. He was accused of sympathising with the heretical Patriarch Nestorius, but justified himself before the Council of Chalcedon by anathematising Nestorius and his doctrines. His works were published by Sirmond (Paris, 1642); Garnier (1684); Schulze (Halle, 1769, in 8vo, 5 vols.); Migne (Patr. Græc. vols. lxxx.-lxxxiv.).

Theodore (The Studite), became Abbot of the famous monastery in Constantinople called the Studion, A.D. 798. The Protestant Neander highly commends "the inflexibility and steadfastness of his zeal under persecutions and sufferings in maintaining the sacred laws" against the tyrannical Emperors Constantine Copronymus and Nicephorus (Nea-
der’s *Church Hist.* Bohn’s ed. vi. 269-278. His writings were published by Sirmond, and by Migne (*Patr. Graec.* vol. xcix.).

**Vincent of Lerins** (St.), was, according to Gennadius, “by birth a Gaul, a presbyter in a monastery in the island of Lerins, a man learned in the Holy Scriptures, and well instructed in the knowledge of the doctrines of the Church.” His celebrated *Commoitorium* against heretics appeared in the year 434.

**Victor,** Bishop of Vite, in Africa, who was exiled by the Arian king, Hunneric, wrote about A.D. 487 his *History of the Vandalic Persecution*, in five books, which is one of the principal sources of the history of the Vandals (*Bibl. Max. Pat.* tom. viii.); Migne (*Pat. Lat.* vol. lxviii.).

**Zeno** (St.), an African by birth, became eighth Bishop of Verona in A.D. 362. He died about 383. The best edition of his works is that of the brothers Ballerini (Verona, 1739), republished by Galland (tom. v.) and Migne (*Pat. Lat.* vol. xi.).

**Zosimus** (St. and Pope), succeeded Innocent I. in 417, and died in 418. His epistles are published by Galland (tom. ix.) after Constant.

---

**Africa, Three Councils of.** The Epistle of the African Bishops was addressed to Pope Theodore, and read in the Lateran Synod under his successor, Martin I., A.D. 649.

**Arles, Council of,** held A.D. 314. All the provinces of the Roman Empire were represented.

**Carthage and Milevis, Councils of,** held A.D. 416. See Hefele’s *Hist. of Church Councils*, Eng. trans., vol. ii. p. 455 seq.

**Chalcedon, the (FOURTH ECUMENICAL) Council of,** was held A.D. 451, under the four Legates of Pope Leo I. About 600 Bishops were present, almost all of the Eastern Church. On the 28th canon of this Council (passed by a comparatively small number of Bishops, in the absence of the Papal Legates), see *note* to p. 77.

**Constantinople, the First Council of (SECOND ECUMENICAL),** held A.D. 381, was composed of 150 Eastern Bishops, and its Creed was confirmed by Pope Damasus (v. Hefele’s *Church Councils*, vol. ii. p. 371).

**Constantinople, the Third Council of (SIXTH ECUMENICAL),** composed of 170 Eastern Bishops, was held A.D. 680, and its decisions were confirmed by the Legates of Pope Agatho. In the letter written by the Synod to the Pope, he is called *The Head of the Church*, and his chair, *The First See of the Ecumenical Church* (Hardouin, tom. iii. p. 1632).

**Ephesus, the (THIRD ECUMENICAL) Council of,** was held A.D. 431, and presided over by St. Cyril of Alexandria (having plenary power from Pope Celestine), and the Papal Legates. About 200 Bishops were present.

**Nicæa, the Second Council of (SEVENTH ECUMENICAL),** was held
A.D. 787, and attended by more than 300 Bishops. It was presided over by the Legates of Pope Hadrian I., and its decrees were confirmed by that Pontiff, who afterwards wrote to Charlemagne:—"Synodum istam secundum nostram ordinationem fecerunt;" and again, "Et ideo ipsam suscepimus Synodum" (Hard. vol. iv. p. 818, 9).

Sardica, the Council of, was assembled A.D. 343, by the Emperors Constans and Constantius, at the desire of Pope Julius. About 97 orthodox Bishops were present; and St. Athanasius states that its canons were signed or agreed to by "more than 300 Bishops." He also calls it μεγάλη συνόδος (Apol. Cont. Ar. i.), and Sulpicius Severus says that it was "ex toto orbe convocata" (Hist. lib. ii.). Pope Nicholas I. said of its canons, "Omnis Ecclesia recipit eos" (Hard. v. pp. 135, 314). John Scholasticus, Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 578, admitted them into his collection of Ecclesiastical Laws. Photius inserted them in his Nomocanon, and many Greeks have appealed to them. In accordance with the 3d, 4th, and 5th canons, in which the right of the Pope to receive appeals from all parts was distinctly acknowledged, St. Chrysostom appealed to Pope Innocent, Theodoret to Pope Leo I., and Pope Cælestine condemned Nestorius, and annulled his acts and judgments, &c. &c. See the History and Canons of this Council in Hefele's Hist. of Ch. Coun. vol. ii. pp. 68-196.

The best modern history of the Church Councils is that of Bishop Hefele (in German, 7 vols. Friburg, 1856-73; in French, 10 vols. Paris, 1869-74). The first eight books of this work (down to the year 431) have been published in an English version by Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, in 2 vols, 8vo.

A short account of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, with copious citations from their Acts, and from the Epistles of Pope Cælestine and of Pope Leo the Great, will be found in Fr. Gallwey's Lectures on Ritualism, 1878: Lect. vii., "The Faith of St. Leo the Great;" Lect. viii., "The Faith of the Council of Ephesus;" to which the reader will do well to refer.
TITLES AND PREROGATIVES OF ST. PETER, &c.

I.

The following is a brief synopsis of the titles and prerogatives given or ascribed to St. Peter by the early Fathers and Councils, &c.


Tertullian, A.D. 195:—“Was anything hidden from Peter, who is called the Rock whereon the Church was to be built?” (Latuit aliquid Petrum, ædificandæ ecclesiæ petram dictum? De Præscript. Hæret. c. 22). “I find, by the mention of his mother-in-law, Peter the only one (of the Apostles) married. I presume him a monogamist, by the Church, which, built upon him, was about to confer every grade of her order on monogamists” (per ecclesiam, quæ super illum ædificata, &c. De Monogam. c. 8. Comp. De Pudicitia, c. 21;¹ Adv. Marc. lib. iv. c. 13).

Origen, A.D. 216:—“See what is said by the Lord to that great foundation of the Church and most solid rock upon which Christ founded the Church—‘

¹ The treatise De Pudicitia was written by Tertullian after he had fallen into the Montanist heresy, and his tone throughout is bitterly hostile to the Pope (Zephyrinus), and to the Catholic Church which he had abandoned. He charges the former, to use the words of a Protestant writer (Collette, On the Supremacy, p. 97), with “usurping” a supreme power and authority in the Church, “on the plea of being St. Peter’s successor,” which very charge shows that the Pope claimed succession from St. Peter, and supremacy, in virtue of that succession, over the Church. The Protestant Bishop Kaye observes, in his work on the writings of Tertullian, that their extreme value arises in a great measure from his errors; for, on becoming a Montanist, his attempt to expose the practice and discipline (and belief) of the Church tells us what that practice and discipline (and belief) were, an account of which, but for his secession from the Church, his works would not
thou of little faith! why didst thou doubt?" (Vide magno illi ecclesiae fundamento, et petrae solidissimae, super quam Christus fundavit ecclesiam, quid dicatur a Domino, &c. In Exod. Hom. v. n. 4, tom. ii. p. 145, ed. De la Rue, Migne). "Peter, upon whom the Church of Christ is built" (Πετρός δε, εφ' ω οικοδομεῖται ἡ Χριστοῦ εκκλησία. In Ioann. tom. iv. p. 96; et ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. c. 25). "Peter, against whom the gates of hell shall not prevail" (De Principiis, lib. iii. c. 2, n. 5. Comp. Select. in Ps. 38, Hom. ii. 10, tom. ii. p. 695; In Matt. t. xiv. n. 5, tom. iii. p. 620; Schol. in Luc. c. ix. tom. vii. p. 341). "Neither against 'the rock' upon which Christ builds His Church, nor against the Church, shall the gates of hell prevail" (οντε γαρ της πετρας, εφ' ης ο Χριστος οικοδομει την εκκλησιαν, οντε της εκκλησιας, πυλαι αδου κατισχυουσιν. Tom. iii. Com. in Matt. t. xii. n. 11). "Upon him (Peter), as on the earth, the Church was founded" (cum super ipsum, velut super terram, fundaretur ecclesia. In Epist. ad Rom. lib. v. c. 10, tom. iv. p. 568).

The Clementines, A.D. 230:—"Simon, who, on account of the true faith and the most secure foundation of his doctrine, was set apart to be the foundation of the Church; and who, on this very account, had his name, by the mouth of Jesus, which deceives not, changed into Peter" (Σιμών, δι' αυτης πιστιν, και της ασφαλεστατην αυτον της διδασκαλιας υποθεσιν, της εκκλησιας βεμελος, κ.τ.λ. Epist. Clement. ad Jacob. p. 611, Galland, tom. ii.). "Solid rock and foundation of the Church" (Hom. xvii. n. 19, p. 758).

St. Hippolytus, A.D. 225:—"Peter, . . . the rock of have supplied." Tertullian's objections, therefore, to the Pope's claims, and his assertion "that whatever privileges Peter may have received from Christ, it was a personal grant to him, and not in any way to be inherited by his successors" (Collette, p. 97), only serves to show that the Pope had claimed to be Peter's successor, and to "inherit his privileges," and that this claim was allowed and acknowledged by the Catholic Church which the Montanist was attacking; and, in short, that the Pope's exercise of his prerogatives, as Peter's successor, was altogether in harmony with the belief and practice of orthodox Christians in those early times.
St. Peter the Rock.

THE CHURCH” (διὰ τούτου τοῦ πνεύματος εστερεωθη ἡ πετρα τῆς εὐκλησίας. In S. Theophan. n. 9, Galland, ii. p. 494). “Peter, the rock of the faith, whom Christ our Lord called blessed, the teacher of the Church, the first disciple, he who has the keys of the kingdom” (Ex Fabricio, Op. Hippol. tom. ii. De Fine Mundi et de Antichristo, n. 9).

St. Cyprian, A.D. 248:—“Peter, whom the Lord chose as first, and upon whom he built his church” (Petrus, quem primum Dominus legit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam. Epist. lxxi. ad Quintum). “There is one Church, founded by Christ the Lord upon Peter, for the origin and purpose of unity” (Una ecclesia a Christo Domino super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata. Epist. lxx. ad Faunar. et cct.). “The Church which is one, and founded upon one, who also received the keys thereof” (Quæ una est et super unum, qui et claves ejus acceptit, Domini voce fundata est. Epist. lxxiii. n. 11, ad Jubian.). “On whom he built the Church, and from whom he instituted and showed that unity should spring” (Super quem ædificavit ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit. Ib. n. 7). “Peter, on whom the Church was founded, by the good pleasure of the Lord” (Petrus, super quem ecclesia Domini dignatone fundata est. De Bono Patientiæ, n. 10). “There (John vi. 67-69) speaks Peter, upon whom the Church was to be built, teaching and showing in the name of the Church,” &c. (Loquitur illic Petrus, super quem ædificanda fuerat ecclesia, ecclesiae nomine docens et ostendens, &c. Epist. lxvi. ad Florent. n. 7. Comp. Epist. lxx. n. 9, ad Cornel). “Upon him alone he builds his church, and to him commends his sheep to be fed” (Super illum unum ædificat ecclesiam suam et illi pascendas mandat oves suas (De Unitate Ecclesiae, n. 4). “There is one Church and one chair, founded by the voice of the Lord upon a rock” (Una ecclesia, et cathedra una super petram Domini voce fundata (Epist. xliii. n. 5, ad Plebem. Op. ed. Goldhorn, Lipsiæ, 1838-39.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, A.D. 325:—“A truly blessed rock, in which we too are placed” (In Matt. x. 34, Ex. B
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Juvenecus, A.D. 326:—"Then the Lord thus answers to Peter: 'Thou shalt be blessed.' Thou supportest the name of Peter with worthy fortitude; and upon this foundation and upon the strength of this rock I will place My edifice that shall stand for ever with everlasting walls" (Tu nomen Petri digna virtute tueris: Hac in mole mihi saxique in robore ponam Semper mansuras æternis monibus ædes. Hist. Evang; in Matt. xvi. lib. iii. Galland, tom. iv. p. 618).

St. James of Nisibis, A.D. 340:—"Simon, who was called a rock, was deservedly called a rock because of his faith" (Serm. i. de Fide, n. i. 13, Galland, tom. v. p. 9).

"Our Lord received him, and made him the foundation, and called him the rock of the edifice of the Church" (Serm. vii. de Panitent. n. 6, p. 57). "The rock of faith" (Serm. xi. p. 84).

St. Hilary of Poitiers, A.D. 356:—"Peter, upon whom he was about to build His Church" (Super quem ecclesiam ædificaturus erat), . . . "the first confessor of the Son of God, the foundation of the Church, the doorkeeper of the heavenly kingdom" (Primum Filii Dei confessorem, ecclesiae fundamentum, æœlestis regni janitorem. Tract. in Ps. cxxxi. n. 4, tom. i. p. 502, ed. Bened. Migne).

"Oh, in thy designation by a new name, happy foundation of the Church, and the rock worthy of the building of that which was to scatter the infernal laws, and the gates of hell, and all the bars of death" (O, in nuncupatione novi nominis felix ecclesiae fundamentum, dignaque illius ædificatione petra, quæ infernas leges, et tartari portas, et omnia mortis claustra dissiparet. Comment. in Matt. xvi. 7, tom. i. p. 750). "The firm rock upon which the Church was to be built" (Firma superædificandæ in eæ ecclesiae


*St. Optatus of Milevis*, A.D. 368:—“**Peter, the head of all the Apostles, whence also he was called CEPHAS**” (Omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est. *De Schism Donat.* lib. ii. c. 2, p. 471, Galland, tom. v.). His meaning evidently is, that the Apostle was called a ROCK, because he was to be the head of all the Apostles.

*St. Ephraem Syrus*, A.D. 370:—“**Peter, who was called CEPHAS, and who received a testimony from the Great Pastor, that ‘UPON THIS ROCK I WILL BUILD MY CHURCH,’ by means of the priesthood received also ‘the keys of heaven,’ as worthy of them**” (Tom. iii. *Græc. de Sacerd.* p. 3, ed. Assemani. See also tom. ii. *Serm.* 13, *in Nat. Dom.* p. 434).


*St. Gregory Nyssen*, A.D. 370:—“**The memory of Peter, the head of the Apostles, is celebrated; and glorified indeed with him are the other members of the Church; but the CHURCH OF GOD IS FIRMLY ESTABLISHED UPON HIM. For he is, in accordance with the gift conferred upon him by the Lord, THE UNBROKEN AND MOST FIRM ROCK UPON WHICH THE LORD BUILT HIS CHURCH**” (*Πετρος ἡ κεφαλὴ των αποστόλων . . . Οὗτος γὰρ εστὶ κατὰ τὴν δοθείσαν αὐτῷ παρὰ τού κυρίου ἡωραν ἡ αφάγης και σχυφώτης πετρά, εφ*

St. Basil the Great, A.D. 370:—“Peter, upon which rock the Lord promised that He would build His Church” (Ὁ Πετρος, εφ' ἡς καί πέτρας ετησσαλατο ὁ Κυριος οικοδομησεως αὐτον την εκκλησιαν. In Isai. c. ii. n. 66, p. 427, ed. Bened. Migne). “Who, on account of the pre-eminence of his faith, received on himself the building of the church” (του δια πιστεως ῥπεροχην εφ' εαυτω την οικοδομην της εκκλησιας δεξαμενον. Lib. ii. Adv. Eunom. n. 4, tom. i. p. 240; see also tom. ii. de Punicentia, n. 4, p. 606).

St. Pacian, A.D. 372:—“The Lord spoke to one (Peter), that thus He might lay the foundation of unity from one” (Ad unum ideo ut unitatem formaret ex uno. Epist. iii. n. 11, p. 264, Galland, tom. vii.).

St. Epiphanius, A.D. 385:—“The first of the Apostles, that firm rock upon which the Church of God is built, ‘and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.’ But ‘the gates of hell’ are heresies and heresiarchs. For in every way was the faith confirmed in him who received ‘the key of heaven,’ in him who looses on earth and binds in heaven. For in him are found all the subtle questions of faith” (του πρωτον των αποστολων, την πέτραν την στερεαν, εφ' ην ἡ εκκλησια του θεου φικδομηται. Anchorat. n. 9, tom. ii. p. 14, ed. Petavii, Colon. 1682). “Peter, who was the very chief of the Apostles, who became unto us truly a firm rock, founding the faith of the Lord, upon which the Church was in every way built. . . . He became a firm rock of the building, and foundation of the house of God” (κορυφαιοτατος των αποστολων, ὃς γεγονεν ἡμιν αληθος στερεα πετρα, θεμελιουσα την πιστην του κυριου, εφ' ἡ φικδομητο ἡ εκκλησια κατα παινα τροπων. . . στερεα πετρα οικοδομης, και θεμελιων οικον θεου. Adv. Hægr. (59), n. 7, 8, tom. ii. p. 500).

St. Ambrose, A.D. 385:—“Was He not able to confirm the faith of him to whom by His own authority He gave the kingdom? whom He pointed out as the foundation of the Church, when He called him the rock?”
(Cui propria auctoritate regnum dabat, hujus fidem firmare non poterat; quem cum petram dixit firmamentum ecclesiæ indicavit? De Fide, lib. iv. c. 5, n. 56, ed. Bened. Migne, tom. ii. p. 531). “It is that same Peter to whom He said, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.’ Therefore, WHERE PETER IS, THERE IS THE CHURCH”¹ (Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia. In Ps. xl. n. 30, tom. i. p. 879). “Peter’s ship, which is the Church” (In Luc. lib. iv. 77, p. 1635). “That ship is not tossed about in which prudence sails, where unbelief is not, where faith blows. . . . For how could that be tossed about over which he presided, IN WHOM IS THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH” (Firmamentum ecclesiæ. In Lucam, lib. iv. n. 68). “IN WHOM IS THE SUPPORT OF THE CHURCH” (In quo esset ecclesiæ firmamentum et magisterium disciplinæ. De Virginit. c. 16, n. 105, tom. ii. p. 238). “THE ROCK OF THE CHURCH” (Petra ecclesiæ. Hymn. S. Amb. ap. August. Retract. lib. i. c. 21. tom. iii. p. 1220). “He is called THE FOUNDATION, because he knew how not only to sustain his own, but also that of all (commune). . . . (His) faith, therefore, is the foundation of the Church, for not of the flesh of Peter, but of HIS FAITH, was it said that ‘the gates of hell shall not prevail against it’” (De Incarnat. c. 5, n. 34, p. 711).

St. Asterius, A.D. 387:—“The Only-begotten denominates Peter THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH. . . . ‘Other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.’ But with a like appellation (to His own) did He adorn also that first disciple of His, denoting him A ROCK OF THE FAITH. THROUGH PETER, therefore, . . . THE STABILITY OF THE CHURCH IS PRESERVED INCAPABLE OF FALL AND UNSWERVING. . . . Peter is called THE ROCK OF FAITH, AND THE FOUNDATION AND SUBSTRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH OF GOD” (θεμελίων τον Πέτρου ονομάζει της

¹ Compare the words of St. Ignatius, A.D. 107:—“Where the Bishop is, there let the multitude be; even as WHERE JESUS CHRIST IS, THERE IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH” (οσπερ οποι αν η Χριστος ίησους, εκει η καθολικη εκκλησια. Epist. ad. Smyr. n. 8).
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St. Chrysostom, A.D. 387:—“Peter, the chief of the Apostles, the first in the Church, ... and when I name Peter, I name THAT UNBROKEN ROCK, THAT FIRM FOUNDATION, ... the first of the disciples,” &c. (ἡ κορυφὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ πρῶτος εἰς τῇ εκκλησίᾳ. ... Πέτρου δὲ όταν ευτω, τὴν πετραν λεγω τὴν αὔραγῆ, τὴν κρητि�δα τὴν ασαλευτον, τὸν ἀποστόλον τὸν μεγαν, τὸν πρωτὸν τῶν μαθητῶν. Tom. ii. Hom. 3, de Panitentia, n. 4. p. 300, ed. Bened. Migne).
“Peter, that leader of the choir, that mouth of the rest of the Apostles, that head of the brotherhood, that one set over the entire universe, THAT FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH” (Ὁ ὁνων Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος τοῦ χρόνου, τὸ στομα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπαντῶν, ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς φρατρίας εκείνης, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμενῆς ὑπάτης προστάτης, ὁ θεμελίος τῆς εκκλησίας. Tom. vi. In illud, Hoc scitote, n. 4. p. 282). “The first of the Apostles, THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH, the leader of the choir of the disciples” (τὸν πρῶτον τῶν ἀποστόλων, τὴν κρητιδα τῆς εκκλησίας, τὸν κορυφαίον τοῦ χρόνου τῶν μαθητῶν. Ad Eos qui scandalizati sunt, n. 17, tom. iii. p. 303). “THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH” (ὁ Πέτρος ἡ κρητις τῆς εκκλησίας. In illud, Vidi Dom. Hom. iv. n. 3); “The pillar of the Church; the buttress of the faith; THE FOUNDATION OF THE CONFESSION; the fisherman of the universe” (Tom. iii. Hom. De Dec. Mil. Talent. n. 3, p. 4). ‘And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,’—that is, ON THE FAITH OF THE CONFESSION. Hereby He signifies that many were now about to believe, and he raises his thoughts and makes him the pastor. ... Then He mentions also another honour: ‘And to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ What means ‘I will give to thee?’ ... You perceive how He leads Peter
to a sublime idea of Himself, and reveals and shows Himself to be the Son of God by these two promises. For those things which are peculiar to God alone—to remit sins, and to make the Church incapable of overthrow in so great an assault of waves, and to exhibit a fisherman more solid than any rock when the whole world is battling—these things He promises Himself to give, as the Father also said to Jeremias: ‘I have made thee a pillar of iron and a wall of brass’ (Jer. i. 18); but him to one nation, this man in every part of the world” (καὶ ανθρωπον ὡμα πετρας πασης ἀποψηις στερροτετου, της οικουμενης πολεμους ύπασης, ταυτα αυτος επαργγελεται δωσεω καθαπερδό πατηρ προς τον Ιερεμιαν ελεγεν, . . . αλλ’ έκεινον μεν ένι εθενε, τουτον δε πανταχου της οικουμενης. Tom. vii. Hom. 54, n. 2, p. 548).

St. Jerome, A.D. 390:—“Peter, upon whom the Lord founded the Church” (Petrus, super quem Dominus fundavit ecclesiam. Tom. i. Epist. 41, ad Marcellam, p. 188, ed. Migne). “Upon whom the Church was founded in stable massiveness” (Super quem ecclesia Domini stabili mole fundata est. Dial. adv. Pelag. lib. i. n. 14, t. ii. p. 707). “As Christ Himself gave light to the Apostles, that they might be called the light of the world, and as they obtained other names also from the Lord, so to Simon also, who believed on the rock Christ, He bestowed the name of Peter; and, according to the metaphor of a rock, it is rightly said of him, ‘I will build my Church upon thee.’ . . . The ‘gates of hell’ are vices and sins, or certainly the doctrines of heretics, by which men enticed are led to hell” (Simoni, qui credebat in Petram Christum, Petri largitus est nomen, ac secundum metaphorum petrae, recte dicitur ei, ædificabo ecclesiam meam super te. Tom. vii. In Matt. xvi. p. 124).

St. Augustine, A.D. 400:—“Peter, who had confessed Him the Son of God, and in that confession had been called the rock upon which the Church should be built” (Petrus, qui paulo ante eum confessus est Filium Dei, et in illa confessione appellatus est petra, super quam fabricaretur ecclesia. In Ps. lxix. n. 4, tom. iv. p. 1020, ed. Bened. 1836). Owing to his ignorance of Hebrew, or of Syro-Chaldaic, the
language spoken by Christ, St. Augustine elsewhere proposes a different interpretation of the text (Retract. l. i. n. 2; In Joann. Tract. 7, n. 14; Ib. Tract. 124, n. 5; Serm. 76, n. 1-4); on which subject see Waterworth's The Fathers on St. Peter, pp. 48-50; Kenrick On the Primacy, 5th edit. pp. 52-54.

Victor of Antioch, A.D. 405:—"To Simon He gave the name Peter, that the name may anticipate the event itself; because as Christ the Lord was about to build His Church on Peter—that is, on the unbroken and sound doctrine of Peter and his unshaken faith—therefore in prophetic spirit does He call him Peter" (In Evang. Marc. c. 3, p. 377, Bibl. Max. Pat. t. v.).

Paulus Orosius, A.D. 419:—"Peter, . . . constituted THE ROCK OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH" (De Lib. Arbit. n. 23, p. 165, Galland, ix.). "Peter, UPON WHICH ROCK Christ built His Church" (O Petre, super quam petram Christus suam fundavit ecclesiam. Ib. n. 27, p. 166).

St. Maximus of Turin, A.D. 424:—"Peter, . . . THE ROCK OF THE CHURCHES, . . . LIKE AN IMMOVABLE ROCK, HOLDS TOGETHER THE FRAMEWORK AND THE MASS OF THE WHOLE STRUCTURE OF CHRISTIANITY. Peter, therefore, for devotion is called the rock; and the Lord by power is named the rock . . . Rightly does he merit a fellowship of name who also merited a fellowship of work" (Petra ecclesiarum . . . tanquam saxum immobile totius operis Christiani compagem molemque contineat. Hom. iv. de Petro Apost. p. 24, Bibl. Max. t. vi.), "Through Christ PETER WAS MADE THE ROCK, the Lord saying to him, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,'" &c. (Hic est Petrus, cui Christus Dominus communionem sui nominis libenter indulsit; ut enim sicut Paulus Apostolus edocuit, Petra crat Christus; ita per Christum Petrus factus est petra, dicente ei Domino: Tus Petrus, &c. Ib. in Natal. App. Pet. et Paul, Hom. i. p. 34. See also Hom. de Eod. Fest. p. 377, Galland, ix. Serm. 42, p. 391; Serm. 72, p. 393, Galland).

St. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 424:—"Allusively to the name from the rock, He changes his name to Peter
for on him He was about to found His Church” (φερονυμως δε απο της πετρας μετωνομαζε Πετρον· ὥστε ἀρτι γαρ εμελε την αυτου θεμελιων εκκλησιαν. In Joann. i. 42, lib. ii. p. 131, ed. Aubert. tom. vi. Migne). “Calling, I think, the rock, THE IMMOVABLENESS IN THE FAITH OF THE DISCIPLE” (In Isai. lib. iv. p. 593, tom. iii.). “Then He also names another honour: ‘Upon this rock I will build my Church; and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ Observe how He summarily manifests Himself Lord of heaven and earth, for... He promises to found the Church, assigning immovableness to it, as He is the Lord of virtues, and OVER THIS HE SETS PETER SHEPHERD. Then He says, ‘And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ Neither angel, nor any other intellectual power, is able to utter this voice” (In Matt. xvi. tom. v. p. 55).

Theodoret, A.D. 424:—“THE GREAT FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH” (Haæret. Fab. lib. v. c. 28).

St. Prosper of Aquitaine, A.D. 429:—“THE MOST FIRM ROCK, which, from that principal rock, received a participation of His virtue and name” (De Vocat. Gentium, lib. i. c. 28, p. 185, Bibl. Max. tom. viii.

St. Leo the Great, A.D. 440:—“‘And I,’ He says, ‘say to thee,’ that is, as My Father has manifested to thee My Divinity, so also do I make known to thee thy eminence. ‘For thou art Peter,’ that is, whereas I am the inviolable rock; I the corner-stone who made both one; I the foundation besides which no one can lay other; yet THOU ALSO ART A ROCK, because thou art consolidated by My might, that what things are Mine alone by My power may be common to thee by participation with Me” (Tu quoque petra es, quia mea virtute consolidaris, ut quæ mihi potestate sunt propriá, sint tibi mecum participatione communia). Serm. iv. in Natal. Ordin. c. 2, ed. Baller). “The Lord willed that the mystery of this gift (of Divine religion to all the world) should so belong to the office of all the Apostles as to seat it chiefly in the most blessed Peter, highest of all the Apostles; and from him, as it were from the head, He wills His gifts to flow as into the whole body; that whoever dares
to recede from the solidity of Peter, may know that he has no part in the Divine mystery. For him, assumed into the participation of His indivisible unity, He willed to be named what He Himself was, by saying, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,' that the rearing of the eternal temple, by the wonderful gift of the grace of God, might consist now in the solidity of Peter, strengthening with this firmness His Church, that neither the rashness of men might attempt it, nor the gates of hell prevail against it" (Sed hujus muneri sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium apostolorum officium pertinere voluit, ut in beatissimo Petro, apostolorum omnium summio, principaliter collocaverit: et ab ipso quasi quodam capite, dona sua velit in corpus omne manare: ut exortem se mysterii intelligeret esse divini, qui ausus fuisse a Petro soliditate recedere. Hunc enim in consortium individuae unitatis assumptum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari, dicendo: Tu es Petrus, &c.; ut æterni templi ædificatio, mirabili munere gratiae Dei, in Petri soliditate consisteret; hac ecclesiam suam firmitate corroborans, ut illum nec humana temeritas posset appetere, nec portæ contra illam inferi praevalerent. Epist. x. ad Episc. per Prov. Vienn. in causa Hilarii, c. i. tom. i. p. 633). "The rock of the Catholic faith, which name the blessed Apostle Peter received from the Lord" (Catholicæ fidei petra, cujus cognomen beatus Apostolus Petrus sumpsit a Domino. Epist. cxix. n. 2, ad Maxim. Antioch. Episc.).

**General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431.** In this Council the Legate Philip called Peter "the pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church" (ὁ κων τὴς πίστεως, ὁ θεμελίος τῆς καθολικῆς εκκλησίας. Concil. Eph. Act. iii. p. 625, Labbe).

**General Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.** In the sentence against Dioscorus, approved of by all the Bishops, Peter is called "the rock and foundation of the Ca-

---

1 "The unanimous Council subscribes the judgment."—Milman's Hist. of Lat. Christ. b. ii. ch. iv. vol. i. p. 268, ed. 1867. This Council was composed of about 600 Bishops, almost all of the Eastern Church.
tholic Church, and the foundation of the Orthodox Faith” (οσ εστιν πετρα και κρητις της καθολικης εκκλησιας, και της ορθοδοξου πιστεως ο θεμελιος. Concil. Chal. iii. p. 425, Labbe, iv.).

Formula of Pope Hormisdas, A.D. 517 (v. infra, p. 68). The above extracts are sufficient to show that the early Fathers were unanimous in applying the words “this rock,” Matt. xvi. 18, to St. Peter; but it should be observed, that many of those who wrote subsequently to the Arian controversy interpreted them, also, in a secondary and figurative sense, of St. Peter’s faith and confession, and of our Lord Himself as the primary and invisible Rock whom Peter represented.

Ball erini, in his work De Vi ac Ratione Primatus, heads a section in cap. ii., “Petrae nomine fidelis S. Petri significari Patrum traditione ostenditur,” and, after citing many Fathers, Popes, and ecclesiastical writers who give this interpretation, he adds: “Itaque petrae nomine S. Petri confessionem ac fidel esse accipiendam tanta ac tam aperta Patrum, Pontificum, ac ecclesiasticorum librorum traditio nos dubitare non sinit” (p. 77, ed. Westhoff, 1845). The words of Ambrose, Chrysostom, Victor of Antioch, and Cyril of Alexandria, have been given in pp. 21, 22, 24, 25, and exemplify

1 Passaglia (De Prærog. S. Petri), Ballerini, and others, give extracts from various ancient Sacramentaries and Liturgies, which confirm the same fact. The Irish St. Sechnall, or Secundinus, a disciple of St. Patrick, whom he assisted in the administration of the See of Armagh till his death in 448, says in his hymn in praise of that Saint: “He is constant in the service of God, and immovable in the faith as Peter, upon whom the Church is built, and whose apostolate he received from God, against whose bulwark the assaults of hell cannot prevail” (Constans in Dei timore et fide immobiliis Super quem edificatur, ut Petrus, ecclesia: Cu jusque apostolatum a Deo sortitus est In cujus porta adversus inferni non prevaleat. Lib. Hymn. p. 12, Publ. of I. A. S. 1855). See Dr. Moran’s Essays on Early Irish Church (p. 91), in which the statements of Usher and later Protestant writers regarding the faith of the early Irish Church are thoroughly refuted. As a specimen of the language used by the later Greek writers, it may suffice to quote the words of St. John Damascene, who calls St. Peter “that Corypheus of the Apostles, the firm foundation, the unbroken rock,” &c. (Πετρον εκεινον των κορυφων των αποστόλων, την κρητιδα την ασαλευτον, την πετραν την αββαγη, των περιβολων της εκκλησιας, των λιμεν των αχειμαστων, των πυρων των ασαλευτων. In Sacr. Parallel. tom. ii. p. 591, ed. Migne).
what the other writers have said. Archbishop Kenrick observes that "all who interpret it (the 'rock') of the faith as confessed by Peter, perfectly harmonise with those who expound it of Peter himself; so that these two interpretations, which at first sight appear different, are in reality identical. It is worthy of remark that, before the rise of Arianism, no Father explained the rock of the confession of Peter, which interpretation was first suggested by the necessity of employing every available weapon against that impiety. It is also to be observed, that no Father who declares faith to be the rock expressly excludes Peter, while many positively mention him conjointly with the confession." F. Bottalla says: "Mr. Palmer and his friends, on the authority of Dupin, reply that many Fathers understood the rock to mean our Lord; others, the true faith; and others, the Apostles collectively. But Mr. Palmer supposes that those Fathers intended to give their interpretations as being the literal sense of the words of Christ. If such is his opinion, he does a great injustice to the Fathers, by supposing them to have adopted a strange, an unnatural, a distorted, a fanciful interpretation; for such are the terms which Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Bengel, Bloomfield, Alford, and others apply to these various interpretations; and, moreover, by falsely representing them as guilty of self-contradiction; for all the Fathers who, before the sixth century, seem to have adopted any of the above-mentioned interpretations, referred the rock literally to St. Peter. . . . Now if those very Fathers who understood the rock either of Christ, or of Peter's faith and confession, are to be found maintaining the obvious reference of the rock to St. Peter, it manifestly follows that, in proposing that collateral, mediate, and indirect exposition, they did not forget the immediate, original, and traditional interpretation of the rock, ever maintained by the Church Catholic. But, further, the literal interpretation which refers the rock to St. Peter, so far from excluding the other interpretations given above, is perfectly consistent with them. Nay, all these interpretations, if we put

1 This, of course, is shown also by Ballerini.
them together, supply us with the complete and full meaning of Christ's words. For St. Peter was, it is true, appointed the rock on which the Church was to be built; but he was not to be the principal, the original rock, from which the Church was to derive its internal strength. Peter was not himself to be the rock; 'that rock was Christ,' according to the words of the Apostle; and 'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' Peter was to be the rock of the Church, but secondarily to Christ, from whom the Church was to receive its stability. Yet he was to be the outward and visible rock, whilst Christ was the inward and invisible foundation. Moreover, faith, and faith in Christ, is the principle which constitutes Christ's Church. Therefore Peter was appointed to be the rock of the Church on account of his faith in, and public confession of, the Divinity of Christ. In other words, our Lord founded His Church upon Peter, who had solemnly professed his faith in His Divinity. Peter, then, is the rock, because he represents, and in a manner embodies, the principle of faith in Christ. On this account some of the Fathers, whilst taking the rock in its literal sense, at the same time say also that faith in Christ, or public confession of this faith, is the rock of the Church. These interpretations, far from being incompatible, rather are naturally implied each in the other, and serve to bring out the full import of the words of Christ. What wonder, then, if in the fourth and fifth centuries, when Arianism impugned the Divinity of Christ and attempted to shake the rock of the Church, the Fathers lifted up their voice, and denounced the heretics as destroyers of the Church; for the Church, as they teach, is built on the rock of Christ, on the confession of His Divinity? In speaking thus, they did not reject the literal sense handed down by the tradition of the first three centuries, which they themselves had already repeatedly set forth in their writings. But in opposing the Arian heresy and its offshoots, they preferred to aim a blow against it by the use of the mediate, indirect, and relative interpretation" (Bottalla, The Pope and the Church, part i. pp. 36-38). On the secondary and figurative interpre-


**Tertullian:**—“If thou thinkest heaven is still closed, remember that the Lord left here the keys thereof to Peter, and, through him, to the Church” (Memento claves ejus hic Dominum Petro, et per eum ecclesiae reliquisse. *Scorpiace*, n. 10). “Peter, who obtained the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of loosing and of binding in heaven and on earth” (Latuit aliquid Petrum . . . claves regni coelorum consecutum, &c. *De Præscript. Hæret.*, n. 22).

**Origen** observes that there is “much difference between what is spoken to Peter and what to the others. For it is no small distinction that Peter should receive the keys, not of one heaven, but of many. . . . For they (the others) do not transcend in power, as Peter, so as to bind and loose in all the heavens” (πολλὴν διαφορὰν καὶ ύπεροχὴν εκ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον εἰρημενῶν παρὰ τοὺς δευτέρους· οὐ γαρ ὅλην διαφορὰν τὸν Πέτρον εἰληφεναι τας κλεῖδας οὐχ ἐνὸς οὐρανοῦ, αλλὰ πλειονοῦ . . . Οὐ γαρ διαβαίνουσι τῇ δυναμει ὡς Πέτρος, ἵνα δησοσιν ἴπ λυσοσιν εν πᾶσιν οὐρανοῖς. *In Matt. tom. xiii. n. 31, p. 613*).

**St. Cyprian:**—“The Church, which is one, and was by the voice of the Lord founded upon one, who also received the keys thereof” (Ecclesia, quæ una est, et super unum, qui et claves ejus acceptit, Domini voce fundata est. *Epist. lxxxiii. ad Jubianum*, n. 11).

**St. Hilary:**—“The door-keeper of the heavenly kingdom” (*Tract. in Ps. cxxxii. n. 4, tom. i. p. 503*). “O blessed keeper of the gate of heaven, to whose disposal are delivered the keys of the entrance into eternity; whose judgment on earth is an authority prejudged in
heaven” (O beatus coeli janitor, cujus arbitrio claves æterni aditus traduntur, cujus terrestre judicium præjudicata auctoritas sit in coelo. In Matt. xvi. 7, p. 749).


St. Optatus of Milevis:—“The keys, which PETER ALONE RECEIVED” (Claves, quas solus Petrus accepit. De Schism. Donat. lib. i. c. 10, p. 42). “For the good of unity, blessed Peter both merited to be preferred before all the Apostles, and HE ALONE RECEIVED THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, that he might communicate them to the others” (Bono unitatis beatus Petrus praeferti apostolis omnibus meruit, et claves regni coelorum communicandas ceteris solus accepit. Ib. lib. vii. c. 3, p. 244, ed. Hurter, 1870).

St. Ephrem Syrus:—“The Prince of the Apostles, who had RECEIVED THE KEYS, and was accounted the shepherd of the flock” (Tom. ii. Syr. lvi. AdÆ. Hær. p. 559, ed. Asseman). “We hail thee, Peter, the tongue of the disciples, the voice of the heralds, the eye of the Apostles, THE KEEPER OF HEAVEN, THE FIRST-BORN OF THOSE THAT BEAR THE KEYS” (τῶν αποστόλων ἡ ὁφις, τῶν οὐρανῶν ὁ φυλάξ, ὁ τῶν κλειδούχων πρωτοτοκός. Tom. iii. Gr. in SS. Apost. p. 464). See also extract given in p. 19.

St. Gregory Nyssen:—“Through PETER He gave (to Bishops) the key of the supercelestial honours” (διὰ Πέτρου ἐδωκε τὴν κλείδα τῶν επουρανίων τιμῶν. De Compunctione, p. 312, tom. ii.).


St. Basil:—“That blessed Peter, who was preferred before all the disciples; who alone received a greater testimony and blessing than the rest; he TO WHOM WERE INTRUSTED THE

St. Epiphanius:—"In every way was the faith confirmed in HIM WHO RECEIVED THE KEYS OF HEAVEN; who looses on earth and binds in heaven. For in him are found all the subtle questions of faith" (Tom. ii. Anchorat. n. 9, p. 15). See the context, supra, p. 20.

St. Ambrose:—"Him to whom HE GAVE THE KINGDOM" (De Fide, lib. iv. c. 5, n. 56). "Peter strikes off his ear; and why Peter? Because he it is WHO RECEIVED THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN; for he condemns and absolves, since he received the power both of binding and of loosing. He strikes off the ear of him who sins by his hearing; but by the spiritual sword he will cut off the inward ear of him who sins by his understanding" (Ipse est qui accepit claves regni ceelorum; ille enim condenmat qui et absolvit, quoniam idem et ligandi et solvendi adeptus est potestatem. In Lucam, lib. x. n. 67, p. 1821). "What fellowship can these (Novations) have with Thee; men who take not up THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM, denying that they ought to forgive sins; which, indeed, they rightly confess of themselves; for they have not PETER'S INHERITANCE who have not Peter's chair, which they rend with impious division" (Non habent Petri hereditatem, qui Petri sedem non habent, quam impia divisione discerpunt. De Pænitent. lib. i. c. 7, n. 32, p. 399).

St. Asterius:—"Peter went not away unrequited and unrewarded; but, declared 'Blessed' by the truly blessed, he is called the rock of faith, and the foundation and substructure of the Church of God. He receives, too, by promise, 'the keys of the kingdom,' and BECOMES THE LORD OF THE GATES THEREOF, so as to open them to whom he may choose, and to close them against those against whom they justly ought to be shut,—plainly against the defiled and profane, and the deniers of this confession, through which, as a careful guardian of the wealth of the Churches, he was APPOINTED TO

St. Chrysostom:—“Great was God’s consideration towards this city (Antioch), as He manifested by deeds; inasmuch as Peter, who was set over the whole habitable world; INTO Whose HANDS HE PUT THE KEYS OF HEAVEN; to whom he intrusted to do and to support all things; him He ordered to tarry here for a long time”¹ (Hom. in St. Ignat. Martyr. tom. ii. p. 712).


St. Augustine:—“Amongst the Apostles almost everywhere Peter alone merited to bear the person of the Church. On account of this very person, which he alone of the whole Church bore, he merited to hear, ‘To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ For these keys not one man, but the unity of the Church received. Hence the excellence of Peter is set forth, because he bore the figure of that very universality and unity of the Church when to him was said, ‘To thee’ I deliver what was delivered to all”² (Tom. v. Serm. ccxcv. in Nat. App. Pet. et Paul. n. 2). “Not without cause amongst all the Apostles does Peter sustain the person of the Church Catholic; for to this Church were the

¹ In another Homily he says: “This is also one privilege of our city, that it received in the beginning for its teacher the chief of the Apostles. For it was befitting that city which, before the rest of the world, was crowned with the name of Christian, should receive as shepherd the first of the Apostles. But, after having had him as our teacher, we did not retain him, but surrendered him to imperial Rome” (Tom. iii. Hom. ii. in Inscript. Act. n. 6, p. 70).

² This theory was propounded by St. Augustine in opposition to the Donatist heretics, who made the efficacy of the sacraments depend on the holiness of the minister. See the note on his doctrine in Waterworth’s “Fathers on St. Peter,” pp. 48-50; also the remarks of Archbishop Kenrick (The Primacy of the Apostolic See, pp. 53, 54), who concludes from the above and numerous other passages in Augustine’s works, that he inculcates plainly that the Church received the power of forgiveness through Peter, who in his official capacity represented her, on account of the primacy of his Apostleship. This does not imply that the keys, as symbols of governing power, were not given to Peter in a more special manner.
keys of the kingdom of heaven given, when given to Peter” (Tom. vi. de Agone Christ. n. 32, p. 439).

Prudentius, A.D. 405:—“Possessing the FIRST CHAIR, he (Peter) THROWS OPEN THE GATES OF ETERNITY, THAT HAVE BEEN INTRUSTED TO HIM” (Cathedram possidens primam, recludit creditas æternitatis januas. Hymn. ii. in St. Laurent. Galland, viii. p. 440).


General Council of Ephesus:—“It is doubtful to none . . . that the holy and most blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, RECEIVED THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM from our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . and to him is power given to bind and loose,” &c. (Act. iii. p. 624).

St. Maximus of Turin:—“Diligently notice what the greatness of his glory TO WHOM THE KEYS OF THE ETERNAL KINGDOM ARE COMMITTED, and it is permitted to him to shut and to open heaven” (Cui dum claves regni committuntur eterni, ccelum illi claudere et aperire permissum est. Hom. iii. in Fest. Ap. Pet. et Paul. Bib. Max. Pat. vi. p. 35). Comparing Peter and Paul, he says: “To Peter, as to a good steward, He gave ‘the key of the kingdom of heaven;’ to Paul, as a fit teacher, He enjoined the mastership of ecclesiastical institution. . . . Both received keys from the Lord; the one of knowledge, THE OTHER OF POWER” (Petro sicut bono dispensatori clavem regni cælestis dedit, Paulo tanquam idoneo doctori magisterium ecclesiasticae institutionis injunxit. . . . Ambo igitur claves a Domino perceiverunt, scientiae iste, ille potentiae.1 Hom. v. de Eodem Fest. p. 36). “To Peter He gave the keys of the kingdom; to Paul He gave the word of wisdom: to each a wonderful work” (De Eod. Galland, ix. p. 377). “I will make thee, He says, bear A PERPETUAL

1 Comp. Venantius Fortunatus, A.D. 570:—“Doctior hic (Paulus) monitis, celsior ille (Petrus) gradu” (Lib. iii. Carm. 7). And again: “Princeps clave Petrus, primus quoque dogmæ Paulus” (Lib. ix. Carm. 2).
Primacy in Heaven and in My Kingdom” (Serm. lxxii. De Verb. Evan. Vos estis sal terrae, Galland, p. 393).

St. Leo the Great:—“The right of this power (of the keys) passed also indeed to the other Apostles, and the constitution of this decree has flowed on to all the princes of the Church; but not in vain is that intrusted to one which is intimated to all. For to Peter is this therefore intrusted individually, because the pattern of Peter is set before all the rulers of the Church. The privilege of Peter therefore remains, whatever judgment is passed in accordance with his equity” (Non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus intimatur. Petro enim ideo hoc singulariter creditur, quia cunctis ecclesiæ rectoribus Petri forma præponitur. Manet ergo Petri privilegium, ubicunque ex ipsius fertur æquitate judicium. Serm. iv. in Natal. Ord. c. 3, ed. Baller.; et p. 23, Serm. Select. ed. Hurter, 1871).

St. Peter Chrysologus:—“Let Peter hold his long-established headship over the apostolic choir; let him open to those who enter the kingdom of heaven” (Petrus apostolici chori vetustum teneat principatum, aperiat intrantibus regnum caelorum. Serm. cliv. p. 217, Bibl. Max. Pat. tom. vii.).

Eulogius of Alexandria, A.D. 581:—“Neither to John, nor to any other of the disciples, did our Saviour say, ‘I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,’ but to Peter” (ouste proq Toiωνην, ouste proq eteron tina ton mabhton eph o Sqwtet to kai diqsw sou tas klesis tis basteias ton oupanov, kai ta ekhs aλλην proq Ptepron. Lib. ii. Cont. Novation. ap. Photium, Biblioth. cod. 280).

St. Gregory the Great, A.D. 604:—“It is evident to all who know the Gospel, that by the voice of the Lord the care of the whole Church was committed to holy Peter, the prince of all the Apostles. For to him it is said, . . . ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church. And to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ Behold, he receives the keys of the heavenly kingdom; the power of binding and of loosing is given to him; to him the care and government of the whole Church is committed” (Cunctis evangelium scientibus liquet, quod
voce Dominica sancto et omnium Apostolorum principi Petro Apostolo totius ecclesiae cura commissa est... Ecce claues regni celestis accipit, potestas ei ligandi ac solvendi tribuitur, cura ei totius ecclesiae et principatus committitur. Epist. ad Maurit. August. lib. iv. epist. 32).

**Venerable Bede, A.D. 700:**—“Blessed Peter in a special manner received the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the headship of judiciary power, that all believers throughout the world might understand that all those who in any way separate themselves from the unity of his faith and communion,—such can neither be absolved from the bonds of their sins, nor enter the gate of the heavenly kingdom” (Beatvs Petrus specialiter claues regni celorum et principatum judiciarum potestatis accepit, ut omnes per orbem credentes intelligant, quia quicumque ab unitate fidei vel societatis illius quolibet modo semetipos segregant, tales nec vinculis peccatorum absolvint, nec in eam possessint regni celestis ingredi. Bedae. Ven. Hom. in die SS. Pet. et Paul.). The Irish Claudius, Bishop of Auxerre in the tenth century, seems to have adopted this passage from Bede, in his Comment. in St. Matt. Evang. (Vide Dr. Moran’s Essays on the Early Irish Church, p. 108).

3. In reference to Luke xxii. 31, 32, in which Christ prays “that the faith of Peter might never fail,” and commands him to “confirm his brethren,” the Fathers call him The Confirmer of the Brethren—The Foundation and Pillar of the Faith—The One Intrusted with the Care of all—The Support of the Church, &c.

**St. Ambrose:**—“Peter, after having been tempted by the devil, is set over the church (ecclesiae praeponitur). The Lord, therefore, signified beforehand what that is, that He afterwards chose him the pastor of the Lord’s flock. For to him He said, ‘But thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren’” (In Ps. xliii. n. 40, p. 1109). “To whom He gave the kingdom, his faith could He not con-
firm?” (De Fide, lib. iv. c. 5, n. 56). See context, supra, p. 20.

St. Chrysostom, on the words, “In those days Peter rose up in the midst of the disciples” (Acts i. 15):—“Both as being ardent, and as intrusted by Christ with the flock, . . . he first acts with authority in the matter, as HAVING ALL PUT INTO HIS HANDS; for to him Christ had said, ‘And thou, being converted, confirm thy brethren’” (Πρωτός τοῦ πραγματος αὐθεντεί, αὐτὸς πάντας εγκεκρισθεῖς, πρὸς γὰρ τούτον εἶπεν ὁ Χριστὸς: καὶ ποτε ἐπιστρεφας, στηρίσου τοὺς αδελφοὺς σου. Hom. iii. in Act. Apost. tom. ix. p. 26).

St. Cyril of Alexandria:—“‘Confirm thy brethren,’ that is, become THE SUPPORT AND TEACHER OF THOSE WHO COME TO ME BY FAITH” (τοὔτος ἡμοῦ στηρίγμα καὶ δίδασκαλος τῶν διὰ πίστεως προσιόντων εμοί. In Luc. p. 420, tom. v.).

St. Leo the Great:—“For the faith of Peter in particular does He pray, as if the state of the others would be more sure if the mind of their prince were not conquered. IN PETER, therefore, the fortitude of all is defended, and the help of Divine grace is so ordered, that the firmness which through Christ is given to Peter may THROUGH PETER be conferred on the Apostles. Therefore, since we see that so great a safeguard has been divinely instituted for us, reasonably and justly do we rejoice in the merits and dignity of our leader, giving thanks to our everlasting King and Redeemer, who GAVE SO GREAT A POWER TO HIM WHO MADE THE PRINCE OF THE WHOLE CHURCH, that if anything is rightly done and rightly ordered by us, even in these our days, it be referred to his doing, to his governing, unto whom was said, ‘And thou, converted, confirm thy brethren’” (Commune erat

1 Cf. Theophylactus:—“This (to ‘confirm thy brethren’) becometh thee, who, after Me, art the rock and the foundation of the Church. We may suppose that this has not been said of the Apostles alone, that they were to be confirmed by Peter, but of ALL THE FAITHFUL, EVEN TO THE END OF THE WORLD” (στηρίσων τοὺς λοιποὺς τούτο γὰρ προσηκεὶ σοὶ ὁ ἔμε σωτῆρ τῆς εκκλησίας πέτρα καὶ στρατηγα, . . . ὃς ἐν ὑποστηρίξεωι ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ παντῶν τῶν ἀντὶ τῆς συνελείας του αἰωνος πιστῶν. Comment in Luc. xxii. Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. cxxiii. p. 1073).

Theodoret:—“The great foundation of the Church was shaken, and confirmed by the Divine grace. . . . And the Lord commanded him to apply the same care to the brethren: ‘And thou,’ He says, ‘converted, confirm thy brethren’” (Tom. iv. Haæret. Fab. lib. v. c. 28, p. 478). “For as I,” He says, “did not overlook thee when thou wast tottering, so do thou also become A SUPPORT TO THY BRETHREN WHEN SHAKEN, and communicate of that help of which thou hast partaken. . . . Then did the great pillar support the tottering world, . . . and received a command to feed the sheep of God” (Ὧ διὸ κυρὶος τῆς πίστεως. Act. iii. p. 625).
In the General Council of Chalcedon:—“The foundation of the orthodox faith” (της ὀρθοδοξον πιστεως ο θεμελιος. Act. iii. p. 425).

Pope Gelasius, A.D. 492:—“For the government of the Apostolic See, engaged without ceasing in the care of the whole flock of the Lord, which care was delegated to the blessed Peter by the voice of our Saviour Himself, ‘And thou, converted, confirm thy brethren,’ we neither can, nor ought to, dissemble such things as constrain our solicitude” (Pro Sedis Apostolicæ moderamine totius ovilis dominici curam sine cessatione tractantes, quæ beato Petro Salvatoris ipsius nostri voce delegata est: Et tu conversus fratres confirma tuos. Et item: Petre amas me? Pasce oves meas. Epist. v. ad Honorium Dalmat. Episc. Labbe, iv. p. 1170).


General Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, in which the letter of Pope Agatho, who in like manner applies the text to the infallible faith of St. Peter and his successors, was received with acclamations by the assembled Fathers (Labbe, vii. pp. 659, 662, ed. Venet. 1729).

4. Pastor of the Lord’s Flock—I trusted with the Flock—Shepherd of the Church—Universal Pastor—Vicar of Christ—To Whom He committed the Presidency over His Sheep and over the Universal Church, &c. (in reference to John xxii. 15-17).

Origen:—“When the chief authority as regards feeding the sheep was delivered to Peter, and upon him as on the earth the Church was founded,” &c. (Petro cum summa rerum de pascendis ovibus traderetur, et super ipsum
velut super terram, fundaretur ecclesia, &c. Lib. v. in Epist. ad Rom. n. 10, tom. iv. p. 568).

St. Cyprian:—“Peter, TO WHOM THE LORD COMMENDS HIS SHEEP TO BE FED AND GUARDED” (Petrus, cui oves suas Dominus pascendas tuendasque commendat. De Habitu Virginum, n. 10, ed. Goldhorn). “Upon that one He builds His Church, and TO HIM HE ASSIGNS HIS SHEEP TO BE FED. And although to all the Apostles, after His resurrection, He gives an equal power, and says: ‘As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose sins ye retain, they are retained;’ yet, IN ORDER TO MANIFEST UNITY, He has, by His own authority, so disposed the origin of that same unity as that it BEGINS FROM ONE. Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endowed with an equal fellowship both of honour and power; but the commencement proceeds from unity, and THE PRIMACY IS GIVEN TO PETER, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one, and the Chair as one. . . . He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He who strives against and resists the Church, he who abandons the Chair of Peter, upon whom the Church was founded, does he feel confident that he is within the Church?” (Super illum unum edificat Ecclesiam suam, et illi pascendas mandat oves suas,1 . . . ut unitatem

1 This, and the following clauses printed in italics have been considered by some critics to be interpolations. They were omitted in the editions of ERASMUS (1520), FELL (1682), and BALUZIUS; but retained in those of PAUL MANUTIUS (1563), PAMELIUS (1568), RIGALTIUS (1648), DOM PRUD. MARANUS (1726), and others. They are undoubtedly wanting in many MSS.; but, on the other hand: i. They were quoted as far back as the year 582 by Pelagius II. in his second epistle to the Bishops of Istria, also in the Acts of Alexander III., and by Ivo of Chartres and Gratian (FREPPOL’S St. Cyprien, p. 279). In addition to the MSS. consulted by Manutius, Pamelius, and others, they are also found in the Vatican MS. of Cyprian’s works, in a Bavarian copy discovered by Gretzer, and in four ancient English MSS. mentioned by the Protestant editor Bishop Fell. 2. By the admission of Protestant writers, such as NEANDER, the clauses referred to contain nothing that is not elsewhere taught by Cyprian in passages of undoubted authenticity; e.g., “There is one Church and one CHAIR, FOUND BY THE VOICE OF THE LORD UPON A ROCK” (Epist. 43, n. 5); “Peter, whom the Lord chose as chief, and upon whom He built His Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him regarding circumcision, did not claim any-
manifestaret, unitatis originem ab uno incepientem sua auctoritate dispositum, ... exordium ab unitate profisciscitur, et primatus Petro datur, ut una Ecclesia et Cathedra una monstraretur. ... Hanc Ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui Ecclesiae renititur et resistit, qui Cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est Ecclesia, deserit, in Ecclesia se esse confidit? De Unitate Eccles. n. 4).

St. Ephrem Syrus:—“He was the prince of the Apostles, and received the keys, and was accounted THE SHEPHERD OF THE FLOCK” (Tom. ii. Syr. lvi. Adv. Haer.).

St. Ambrose:—“Set over the Church ... THE PASTOR OF THE LORD’S FLOCK” (Pastor dominici gregis. In Ps. xliii. n. 40). “Him whom, as He is about to be raised to

thing to himself insolently or assume anything arrogantly, so as to say that he held the primacy (ut diceret se primatum tenere, i.e., so as arrogantly to insist or fall back upon his supreme authority, when justly upbraided by St. Paul); ... nor did he despise Paul,” &c. (Epist. 71, ad Quintum.); “There is one Church, founded by the Lord upon Peter, for the origin and purpose of unity” (Epist. 70, ad Jan.); “The Chair of Peter and the ruling Church (the Roman), whence the unity of the priesthood has its source” (Epist. 55, ad Cornel.). This last passage is, as Neander observes, “uncontroverted” (Bohn’s Neander, v. p. 298), and is even stronger than those in the treatise De Unitate. It is admitted by Milman, also, that Cyprian “assigned a kind of primacy to St. Peter, and acknowledged the hereditary descent of the Roman Bishops from the great Apostle” (Hist. of Latin Christ. b. ii. c. 4, vol. i. p. 238, ed. 1867). 3. The genuineness of the entire text, as maintained in the Benedictine edition, seems to be strongly confirmed by the very similar language regarding St. Peter’s “Primacy” and “Chair,” used by Optatus (De Sch. Don. ii. c. 3), Jerome (Epist. ad Pap. Dam. et Adv. Jovianin. n. 26), Augustine (In Joan. Tract. 56, n. 1), De Bapt. cont. Donat. l. xi. n. 2; Ps. in Part. Donat.), and Pope Gelasius, A.D. 492 (Epist. xiv.), all of whom seem to have had Cyprian’s words before their eyes. 4. If there had been any design to corrupt the text “in the interest of the Roman Church,” how is it that the passages on which Protestants insist, regarding the equality of the Apostles, were not omitted or altered? Lastly, It would be well for those Anglicans and Protestants who, on account of the paucity of existing MSS. containing them, reject the clauses referred to as evident interpolations, to explain on what principle they themselves receive certain controverted passages of the New Testament itself, e.g., verses 7 and 8 of the fifth chapter of St. John’s Second Epistle, of which a Protestant writer says: “Of all the ancient MSS. of this Epistle, which amount to 150, there have been found but five containing this passage, and these are of but questionable authority” (Dr. Pinno<ref>ck’s Analysis of New Test. Hist. 4th edit. Cambridge, p. 91). Of the disputed passages in Cyprian this same writer observes, that “they are said to have been interpolated by the Roman Church” (Anal. of Ecclesiast. Hist. p. 242); but he omits to state how many of the existing MSS. do or do not contain them.
heaven, He was leaving to us, as it were, THE VICAR OF HIS LOVE. For thus you have it: 'Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? . . . Feed My sheep. . . . Because he alone out of all makes this profession (of love), he is PREFERRED BEFORE ALL. . . . And now he is not ordered, as at first, to 'feed His lambs,' . . . but 'His sheep,' THAT THE MORE PERFECT MIGHT GOVERN THE MORE PERFECT" (Quem elevandus in ccelum amoris sui velut vicarium relinquebat . . . omnibus antecfertur . . . perfectiores ut perfectior gubernaret. In Lucam, lib. x. p. 1848, tom. ii.).

St. Epiphanius:—"He heard from that same God, 'Peter, feed My lambs;' TO HIM WAS INTRUSTED THE FLOCK; he leads the way admirably in the power of his own Master" (ὁ πεπιστευμένος την ποιμήν ὁ καλὸς ὁδηγῶν εν τῇ δυναμεὶ τοῦ ἰδίου δεσποτοῦ. Tom. ii. In Anchorat. n. 9).

St. Chrysostom:—"And why, then, passing by the others, does He converse with Peter on these things? (John xxii. 15). He was the chosen one of the Apostles, and the mouth of the disciples, and the leader of the choir. On this account, Paul also went up on a time to see him rather than the others. And withal, to show him that he must thenceforward have confidence, as the denial was done away with, HE PUTS INTO HIS HANDS THE PRESIDENCY OVER THE BRETHREN. And He brings not forward the denial, nor reproaches him with what had past, but says, 'If thou lovest Me, PRESIDE OVER THE BRETHREN, . . . and the third time He gives him the same injunction, showing at what a price He sets THE PRESIDENCY OVER HIS OWN SHEEP. And if any one should say, How then did James receive the throne of Jerusalem? This I would answer, that He appointed this man (Peter) TEACHER, not of that throne, but OF THE WORLD" (Καὶ τι δηποτε τους ἀλλους παράδραμων τουτῷ περὶ τούτων διαλεγεται; εκκριτος ἦν των ἀποστόλων καὶ στομα των μαθητων, καὶ κυριφῇ του χορου . . . εγχειριζεται την προστασιαν των αδελφων . . . λεγει δὲ στι ει φιλεως με προιστασο των αδελφων . . . Ει δε λεγοι τις, πως ουν ὁ Ἰακώβος τον θρονον ελαβε των Ιεροσολυμων; εκεινο αν ευτοιμη, στι τουτω ουκ τον θρονου, αλλα της οικουμενης εχειροτονησε διδασκαλον. In Ioan. Hom. lxxviii. n. 1, tom.

St. Asterius:—“He INTRUSTS TO THIS MAN THE UNIVERSAL AND OECUMENICAL CHURCH, after having thrice asked him ‘Lovest thou me?’ . . . Peter RECEIVED THE WORLD IN CHARGE; AS IT WERE FOR ONE FOLD, ONE SHEEPHERD, having heard ‘Feed My lambs;’ and the Lord gave, well-nigh in His own stead, that most faithful disciple to the proselytes as a father, and pastor, and instructor” (την καθολον και οικουμενικην εκκλησιαν τουτω τω ανδρι παρατηται, τριτων αυτου πυθομενοι το Φιλεις με; . . . ελαβεν τον κοσμον εις επιμελειαν, ως μιαν αγελην, εις ποιμνην, ακοουσα Βοσκε τα αρνια μονω και σχεδου ανθ’ εαυτοις τω πιστωτατω μαθητην εδοκεν ο κυrios των προσηλυτων πατερα, και νομα, και παιδευτην. Hom. viii. in S.S. Pet. et Paul. tom. i. p. 147, ed. Combesis; et p. 281, ed. Migne).

Ambrosiaster:—“After the Saviour all were included in Peter; for He constituted him to be their head, that he might be the Shepherd of the Lord’s flock. . . . And He says to Peter, ‘Behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.’ What doubt is there? He prayed for Peter, but prayed not for James and John, not to mention the others. It is manifest that all are included; for, praying for Peter, He is seen to have prayed for all; for a people is ever blamed or praised in him that is set over it” (Quast. 75, ex N. Test. in App. St. August. tom. iii. 2894).

St. Augustine:—“I am held in the communion of the Catholic Church by . . . the succession of priests from the very Chair of the Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, committed His sheep to be fed,
even to the present Episcopate" (Tenet ab ipsa sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit usque ad praesentem Episcopatum, successio sacerdotum. Tom. viii. Cont. Epist. Manich. Fund. n. 5, p. 269). "Peter was made the Pastor of the Church, as Moses was made the ruler of the Jewish people" (Petrus factus est pastor ecclesiae, sicut Moyses . . . factus est rector illius synagogae. Cont. Faustum, lib. xxii. c. 70). "Peter, to whom He commended His sheep as another self, He wished to make one with Himself, that so He might commend the sheep to him; that he might be the head, he bear the figure of the Body—that is, of the Church—and as husband and wife be two in one flesh" (Tom. v. Serm. xlvi. n. 30, p. 345). "The Lord commended to Peter himself His sheep to be fed. But not he alone amongst the disciples merited to feed the Lord's sheep; but when Christ speaks to one, unity is commended, and to Peter primarily, because among the Apostles Peter is the first" (Serm. ccxcv. in Nat. Pet. et Paul. n. 4, p. 1757).

St. Boniface, Pope, A.D. 419:—"Peter, . . . the perpetual shepherd of the Lord's sheep, in whom we read that the foundation of the Universal Church was laid" (Qui pastor dominicarum ovium est perpetuus constitutus, . . . in quo universalis ecclesiae positis legitimus fundamentum. Epist. v. Rufo, Thess. Ep. n. 1, Galland, ix. p. 50).

St. Maximus of Turin:—"Peter found a grace greater than that which he had lost. As a good shepherd, he received the flock to guard, that he, who before had been weak in his own case, might become a support to all . . . and a foundation to the rest by stability of faith" (Tanquam bonus pastor tuendum gregem accepit, ut fieret omnibus fundamentum, et . . . ceteros fidei stabilitate fundaret. Denique pro soliditate devotionis ecclesiarum petra dicitur, &c. Hom. iv. De Pet. Apost. Bibli. Max. Pat. vi. 24).

St. Cyril of Alexandria:—"Over the Church He sets Peter as shepherd" (In Matt. xvi. tom. v. p. 25).

St. Leo the Great:—"To whom, while the power of binding and loosing was given beyond the rest, yet was the
CARE OF FEEDING THE SHEEP MORE SPECIALLY ASSIGNED. To whom whoso thinks that THE PRIMACY is to be denied, he can in no wise lessen the dignity of Peter, but, puffed up by the spirit of his own pride, he sinks himself down into hell” (Cui cum præ ceteris solvendi et ligandi tradita sit potestas, pascendarum tamen ovium cura specialius mandata est. Cui quisquis principatum æstimat denegandum, illius quidem nullo modo potest minuere dignitatem: sed inflatus spiritu superbiae sua semetipsum in inferna demergit. Epist. x. ad Episc. per Prov. Vืนn. c. 2. “TO THE BLESSED PETER ABOVE THE OTHERS, after the keys of the kingdom, IS THE CARE OF THE LORD’S FOLD ASSIGNED” (Beato Apostolo Petro supra ceteros, post regni claves, ovilis Dominici cura mandatur. Tom. i. Serm. lxxxiii. de Ascen. Dom. c. 2, p. 291, ed. Ball.) “Whereas Peter alone received many things, nothing passed unto any one else without his participation in it. OUT OF THE WHOLE WORLD THE ONE PETER IS CHOSEN TO BE SET OVER BOTH THE CALLING OF THE NATIONS, AND OVER ALL THE APOSTLES, AND ALL THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH; that although in the people of God there be many priests and many shepherds, PETER MAY RULE ALL AS MADE HIS, WHOM CHRIST ALSO RULES BY SUPREME HEADSHIP” (De toto mundo unus eligitur Petrus, qui et universarum gentium vocationi, et omnibus Apostolis cunctisque Ecclesiae patriarchis praeponatur: ut quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes multique pastores, omnes tamen propri regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus. Serm. iv. in Natal. Ora. c. 1, tom. i. p. 14).

St. Eucherius of Lyons:—“First He committed to him the lambs, then the sheep; because He constituted him not only shepherd, but THE SHEPHERD OF SHEPHERDS. Therefore, Peter feeds the lambs, he feeds also the sheep; he feeds the offspring, he feeds also the mothers; HE RULES BOTH SUBJECTS AND PRELATES. HE IS THE SHEPHERD, THEREFORE, OF ALL, BECAUSE, BESIDES LAMBS AND SHEEP, THERE IS NOTHING IN THE CHURCH” (Non solum pastorem, sed pastorum pastorem eum constituit. . . . Regit et subditos et prælatos. Omnia igitur pastor est, quia

St. Peter Chrysologus, A.D. 440: — "To Peter He commends his sheep, in His stead, to be fed" (Vice sua, ut pasceret, commendat. Serm. vi. in Ps. xcix. Bibl. Max. Pat. vii. 10).

Arnobius Junior, A.D. 440: — "Behold, that succour is given to a penitent Apostle, who is the Bishop of Bishops (qui est episcopus episcoporum), and a greater rank is restored to him now weeping than was taken from Him when he 'denied.' That I may prove this, I show that no other Apostle received the name of Shepherd. For the Lord Jesus alone said, 'I am the Good Shepherd;' and again, 'My sheep,' He says, 'Follow Me.' This holy name, therefore, and the power of the same name, He, after the resurrection, conceded to the penitent Peter; and the Denied bestowed on him who denied Him this power which He alone had; that he might be proved not only to have recovered what he had lost, but also to have acquired even much more by being penitent than he had lost by denying" (Hoc ergo sanctum nomen, et ipsius nominis potestatem post resurrectionem suam Petro penitenti concessit, &c. Com. in Ps. cxxxviii. tom. viii. Bib. Max. Pat. p. 320).

St. Simplicius, Pope, A.D. 468: — "Him on whom the Lord enjoined the care of all the sheepfold" (Cui Dominus totius curam ovilis injunxit, cui se usque ad finem seculi minime desuturum, cui portas inferi nunquam praenalituras esse promisit. Epist. iv. ad Basil August. Labbe, iv. p. 1071).

St. Gelasius (v. supra, p. 39).

St. Gregory the Great: — "By the voice of the Lord, the care of the whole Church was committed to Peter, the head of all the Apostles; for to him it

1 St. Chrysostom says: "Peter so washed away that denial as to be even made the first Apostle, and to have the whole world committed to him" (οὕτως ἀπενεψατο την αρνησιν ἕκεινη, ὥς καὶ πρώτος γενεσθαι τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμενὴν εὔχειρισθηραι ἄπασαν. Tom. i. Orat. viii. n. 3).

**St. Columbanus, A.D. 580.** The celebrated Irish Liturgy known as the **Missal of St. Columbanus**\(^1\) contains the following Collect in the Mass assigned for the *Cathedra Sancti Petri*—"O God! who on this day **DIDST GIVE TO ST. PETER, AFTER THYSELF, THE HEADSHIP OF THE WHOLE CHURCH**, we humbly pray Thee that, as Thou didst constitute him pastor for the safety of the flock, and that Thy sheep might be preserved from error, so now Thou mayest save us through his intercession" (Deus, qui hodierna die B. Petrum post Te dedisti caput Ecclesiae. . . . Te suplices rogamus, ut qui dedisti pastorem, ne quid de ovibus perderes, et ut grex effugiat errores, &c. *Museum Italicum*, vol. i. p. 297, a D. J. Mabillon, Paris, 1724).

---

5. **The First\(^2\) of the Apostles—The Chosen One—The Head—The Chief—The Highest—The Leader—The Prince of the Apostles—To whom had been Intrusted the Government or Supremacy—Universal Bishop—Bishop of Bishops—Primate**

---

1 This Missal was discovered by the learned MABILLON at Bobbio, the MS. being then, as he declared, "more than a thousand years old" (*Mus. Ital.* vol. i. p. 275). For a full account of it, and proofs that both the Missal and the MS. itself are Irish, see Dr. MORAN'S *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, 1864, pp. 95, 96, 275–295.

2 Wherever the Apostles are enumerated in the Gospels, St. Peter is invariably named first. St. Matthew expressly calls him "**THE FIRST**" (x. 2), the same Greek word (*πρωτος*) being rendered "**CHIEF**" in chap. xx. 27, and other passages. Mr. Allies remarks: "Now, that **second** and **third** do not follow, shows that 'first' is not a numeral here, but designates rank and pre-eminence. Thus in heathen authors this word 'first' by itself indicates the more excellent in its kind: thus in the Septuagint occur, 'first friend of the king,' 'first of the singers,' 'the first priest,' i.e., the chief priest (Nehem. xii. 46; 2 Chron. xxvi. 20). So our Lord: 'Whichever among you will be first' (Matt. xx. 27); 'Bring forth the first robe' (Luke xv. 22); and St. Paul: 'Sinners, of whom I am the first,' i.e., chief (1 Tim. i. 15). Thus 'the first of the island' (Acts xxviii. 7), means the chief magistrate; and 'first' generally, in Latin phraseology, the superior or prince."—*St Peter, His Name and Office*, p. 95, 2d edit.
of all Bishops—Prince of the whole Church—in whom the Government and Headship of the Universal Church reside—Prince of the Princes—Prince of the Episcopal Crown, &c., &c.
—Who now and always Lives and Judges in his Successors—Always Presides in his own See, and shows the Truth of Faith to those seeking it—Whose Dignity fails not in an unworthy Heir—Who in all things Protects and has regard to the Heirs of his Administration, &c.

St. Ignatius, A.D. 107:—“And when He came to PETER AND HIS COMPANY,¹ He said, ‘Take, handle Me, and see that I am not an incorporeal demon’” (τοὺς πέρι Πέτρου. Ἐπιστ. ad Smyr. c. 3, et ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iii. 36).

Tertullian:—“It was His pleasure to communicate to THE MOST HIGHLY ESTEEMED OF HIS DISCIPLES, in a peculiar manner, a name (Peter) drawn from the figures of Himself” (Carissimo discipulorum de figuris suis peculiariter nomen communicare. Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. c. 13).

Origen:—“Peter, the PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES” (In Lucam, Hom. xvii. tom. iii. p. 953). “MORE IONOUR THAN THE REST” (τῶν λοιπῶν τιμωτέρος. Tom. xxxii. in Joann. n. 5, tom. iv. p. 413). On the words in Matt. xvii. 26 he remarks, that the disciples “considered that this was a very great favour to Peter on the part of Jesus, as having ADJUDGED HIM GREATER THAN THE OTHER DISCIPLES” (κριναντός αὐτὸν μείζωνα τῶν λοιπῶν γνωρίμων.² Tom. xiii. in Matt. n. 14, tom. iii. p. 588).

¹ Comp. Acts xiii. 13, οἱ πέρι τῶν Παυλον, “Paul and his company.” The expression of St. Ignatius is similar to those so frequently used in the Gospels and Acts:—“Simon and they that were with him” (Mark i. 36); “Peter and they that were with him” (Luke viii. 45, ix. 32); “Peter standing up with the eleven” (Acts ii. 14); “Peter and the other Apostles” (ii. 37); “Peter and the Apostles” (v. 29). See also Mark xvi. 7; Acts i. 15); and evidently indicates the superior dignity and authority of St. Peter. Compare the following:—“David and they that were with him” (Luke vi. 3; Matt. xii. 3); “He ordained twelve, that they should be with Him” (Matt. iii. 14); “Them that had been with Him” (xvi. 10; comp. Acts iv. 13, 14).

² St. Chrysostom, on the same words, “Give unto them (the tribute) for Me and for thee,” says:—“Dost thou see the exceeding greatness of the honour? See also the self-command of Peter’s mind. For Mark, the follower of this Apostle, does not appear to have written down this point, because it pointed out

St. Cyprian:—“Peter, whom the Lord chose to be the FIRST or CHIEF” (Quem Dominus primum elegit. Epist. lxxi. ad Quintum). “THE PRIMACY IS GIVEN TO PETER” (Primatus Petro datur. De Unitate Eccles.).


Eusebius:—“THAT POWERFUL AND GREAT ONE OF THE APOSTLES, who, on account of his excellence, was the LEADER OF ALL THE REST” (τὸν καρτερὸν καὶ μεγαν τῶν αποστόλων, . . . τῶν λοιπῶν ἅπαντων προηγορὸν. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 14). “THE VERY HEAD OF THE APOSTLES” (αὐτὸς τε ὁ κορυφαῖος τῶν αποστόλων Πέτρος. Com. in Ps. lxviii. 9, tom. v. p. 737). “SET ABOVE ALL THE REST” (ὁ παντῶν αὐτῶν προκεκριμένος. Demonstrat. Evang. lib. iii. c. 7). “Peter, that CORYPHÆUS, after having first founded the Church at Antioch, went away to Rome preaching the Gospel; and he also, after the Church in Antioch, presided over that of Rome until his death” (Chron. ad Ann. 44, tom. i. p. 539, Migne).


the great honour paid to him (Peter); but whilst he also wrote of the denial, he has passed over in silence the things that made him illustrious; his Master, perhaps, entreated him not to mention the great things about himself” (Hom. 58, in Matt. n. 2). Eusebius makes a similar remark in regard to St. Mark’s omission of the words recorded in Matt. xvi. 18:—“Such great things having been said to Peter, Mark mentions nothing of them; neither did Peter name them in his discourses. Probably, therefore, Peter thought it right to pass these things in silence, and Mark consequently omits them; but, as regards his denial, he published it to all men” (Demonstr. Evang. iii. 4).

St. Athanasius:—"THE CHIEF, Peter" (*In Ps.* xv. 8, tom. iii. p. 106, Migne).


p. 180). “Moses was succeeded by Peter,¹ who HAD COMMITTED TO HIS HANDS THE NEW CHURCH OF CHRIST, AND THE TRUE PRIESTHOOD” (Πετρος Μωσεα διεδεξατο, την καινην εκκλησιαν Χριστου και την αληθινην ιεροσυνην εγχειριοθεις. Hom. xxvi. n. 23, p. 101).

St. Basil the Great:—“Peter, who was PREFERRED BEFORE ALL THE APOSTLES” (ὁ μακαριος Πετρος,ὁ παντων μεν των μαθητων προκριθεις, μονος δε πλειον των αλλων μαρτυρηθεις και μακαριωθεις. De Judicio Dei, n. 7, tom. iii. p. 671).


St. Epiphanius:—“Andrew was the first to meet Christ, inasmuch as Peter was the younger in age. But . . . Peter became a leader to his own brother. And God sees the dispositions of the heart, and knowing who is worthy to be appointed unto presidency, He also CHOSE PETER TO BE THE LEADER OF HIS DISCIPLES, as in every way has been clearly shown” (μηνωσωκων την εν πρωτοι αξιον Ταπτεοθαι, και εκελευθατο τον Πετρου αρχηγου ειναι των αυτου μαθητων. Adv. Haer. [51] n. 17, p. 440). “THE VERY CHIEF OF THE APOSTLES” (ὁ κορυφαιοτατος των αποστολων. Adv. Haer. [59] n. 7, tom. ii. p. 500).

Ambrosiaster:—“Andrew followed the Saviour before Peter; and yet not Andrew, but PETER OBTAINED THE PRIMACY” (Prior sequitus est Andreas Salvatorem quam Petrus; et tamen primatum non accepit Andreas sed Petrus. Comment. in Epist. ad Cor. xii. 12, ed. Bened. Op. Ambros. Migne, p. 205).

St. Jerome:—“One is chosen out of the twelve, in order that, A HEAD being appointed, the occasion of schism might be removed” (Inter duodecim unus eligitur ut, capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio. Adv. Jovinian. lib. i.

¹ In Roma Sotterranea, by Northcote and Brownlow, an account is given of the gilded glasses, &c., discovered in the Catacombs at Rome, in some of which St. Peter is represented under the type of Moses (Book iv. ch. vii., and the Plates in p. 287). See also Martigny’s Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes, Paris, 1865, p. 540, i, and p. 412. St. AUGUSTINE says: “Petrus . . . factus est pastor ecclesiae, sicut Moyses . . . factus est rector illius synagogae.” Cont. Faustum, lib. xxii. c. lxx.

St. Augustine:—“Who can be ignorant that the most blessed Peter is the first of the Apostles?” (Quis enim nesciat primum Apostolorum esse beatissimum Petrum?” Tract. lvi. in Joan. n. i, p. 2218, tom. iii.). “Holding the principality of the Apostleship. . . . In the order of Apostles the first and the principal” (Serm. lxxvi. tom. v. pp. 595-597). “In whom the primacy of the Apostles is pre-eminent by so excellent a grace. . . . Who knows not that that principality of the Apostolate is to be preferred before any episcopate whatever? . . . The grace of the chairs (of Peter and of Cyprian) is different” (Petrum in quo primatus Apostolorum tam excellenti gratia praeminet. . . . Quis enim nescit illum Apostolatus principatum cuilibet episcopatui praeferendum? Distat cathedrarum gratia. De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. ii. n. 2, tom. ix. p. 181). See numerous other passages in Waterworth’s Faith of Catholics, vol. ii. p. 42.

St. Asterius:—“The first disciple, and greater than the brethren” (πέωτος μαθητής και μετέχων τῶν ἀδελφῶν. Hom. viii. in SS. Pet. et Paul. p. 274, Migne). “Blessed indeed also was the great John, who ‘reposed on the Lord’s breast;’ great, too, was James, as being called ‘the son of thunder;’ illustrious was Philip; but yet they all must yield to Peter, and confess that they hold the second place, when the comparison of gifts decides on the one honoured above the rest” (αὐτ’ ομος οἱ πάντες ὑποχωρεύτωσαν Πέτρῳ καὶ δευτερευον ὑμολογεῖτωσαν, ὅταν ἡ τῶν χαρισμάτων συγκρισις δοκίμαζῃ τὸν προτιμωτέρων. Ib. p. 277).
St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles.

St. Chrysostom:—"Peter, the chief of the Apostles, the first in the Church" (ἡ κορυφή τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ πρῶτος εν τῇ εκκλησίᾳ. Tom. ii. Hom. iii. de Pænitent. n. 4, p. 300). "Peter it was to whom I had been intrusted the government" (την αρχὴν εγκεκριμένον. Tom. ix. Hom. xxxiii. in Act. n. 2). "The chief" (τὸν κορυφαίον. In i Cor. ix. 5, Hom. xxii. n. 2). "He intrusted to his hands the primacy over the Universal Church" (την επιστασιαν τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς εκκλησίας ενεχείρει. Hom. v. de Pænitent. n. 2, tom. ii. p. 311). On 1 Cor. i. 12 he says: "Not honouring himself before Peter, has he set him last, but preferring Peter even greatly before himself. For he has arranged his statement on an ascending scale" (Hom. iii. in 1 Cor. tom. x. p. 16). See also passages cited in pp. 22, 42.


St. Innocent I., Pope, A.D. 410:—"Peter, through whom both the apostolate and episcopate took its beginning in Christ" (Petrus, per quem et apostolatus et episcopatus in Christo cœpit exordium. Epist. ii. ad Victric. n. 2, p. 546, Galland, viii.). "From whom the episcopate itself, and the whole authority of this name, has sprung" (A quo ipse episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit. Epist. xxix. ad Concil. Carth. n. 1, p. 599). "As often as a principle of faith is ventilated, I am of opinion that all our brethren and fellow-bishops ought not to refer save to Peter, that is, to the author of their name and dignity" (Præsertim quoties fidei ratio ventilatur, arbitror
omnes fratres et co-episcopos nostros nonnisi ad Petrum, i.e., sui nominis et honoris auctorem referre debere. Epist. xxx. ad Concil. Milev. n. 1, p. 602).

St. Boniface, Pope:—"Peter, TO WHOM THE HIGHEST PLACE OF THE PRIESTHOOD was granted by the voice of the Lord" (Cui arx sacerdotii Dominica voce concessa est. Epist. iv. Rufo, n. 1, Galland, ix. p. 47). "The institution of the universal nascent Church took its beginning from the honour of blessed Peter, IN WHOM ITS GOVERNMENT AND HEADSIIIP RESIDE" (Institutio universalis nascentis Ecclesiae de beati Petri sumpsit honore principium, in quo regimen ejus et summa consistit. Epist. xiv. Rufo, n. 1, p. 57).


St. Leo the Great:—"Not only the prelate of this See (Rome), but THE PRIMATE OF ALL BISHOPS" (Omnium episcoporum primatem. Serm. iii., de Natal. Ord. c. 4). "THE PRINCE OF THE WHOLE CHURCH" (Totius Ecclesiae principem. Serm. iv. c. 4). "Our care is extended throughout all the Churches,—this being required of us by the Lord, who

1 On the titles given to St. Peter in the ancient Greek and Syriac Liturgies, vide Passaglia, De Prærog. S. Petri, p. 97, and the authors referred to by him.
COMMITTED THE PRIMACY OF THE APOSTOLIC DIGNITY TO THE MOST BLESSED APOSTLE PETER, in reward of his faith, establishing the Universal Church on the solidity of him, the foundation” (Per omnes ecclesias cura nostra dirigitur, exi gente hoc a nobis Domino, qui Apostolicæ dignitatis, B. A. Petro primatum fidei suæ remuneratione commisit, universalis ecclesiam in fundamenti ipsius soliditate constituens. Epist. v. ad Episc. Metrop. per Illiric. c. 2).

Arnobius, Junior, calls Peter “THE BISHOP OF BISHOPS” (Episcopus episcoporum. Comment. in Ps. cxxxviii. p. 320).


General Council of Ephesus: —“WHO EVEN UNTIL NOW, AND ALWAYS, LIVES AND JUDGES IN HIS SUCCESSORS” (οστις εως του νυν, και αει, εν τωι αυτου διαδοχωι και ξι, και δικαιωι. Act. iii. p. 625).

General Council of Chalcedon: —“PETER HATH SPOKEN THROUGH LEO” (Sess. ii. p. 368).

St. Peter Chrysologus, A.D. 440: — “We exhort you (Eutyches) that in all things you obediently attend to those things which have been written by the blessed Pope of the
city of Rome; because blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own see, gives the truth of faith to those who seek it” (Quoniam beatus Petrus, qui in propria sede vivit et praesidet, praestat quærentibus fidei veritatem. \(^1\) Epist. ad Eutych. Proleg. Op. ed. Bacchin. 1758, p. 16).

**St. Xystus III., Pope**, A.D. 434: — “The blessed Peter, in his successors, has delivered that which he received. Who would be willing to separate himself from his doctrine, whom the Master Himself declared the first amongst the Apostles?” (Beatus Petrus in successoribus suis, quod acceptit, hoc tradidit. Epist. vi. ad Joan. Antioch. n. 5, p. 529, Galland, ix).

**St. Leo the Great**: — “In whose see his own power lives and authority is pre-eminent” (Cujus in Sede sua vivit potestas et excellit auctoritas. Serm. iii. in Natal. Ord. c. 3). “Whose dignity fails not even in an unworthy heir” (Cujus dignitas etiam in indigno haerede non deficit. Ib. c. 4). “The blessed Peter ceases not to preside over his own see, and he enjoys never-ceasing fellowship with the everlasting Priest, Christ. For that solidity which, when he was made the rock, he received from Christ the rock, transmits itself to his heirs” (Sedi suæ præesse non desinit, et indisiciens obtinet cum æterno sacerdote consortium. Soliditas enim illa, quam de Petra Christo etiam ipse petra factus acceptit, in suos quoque se transfudit heredes. Serm. v. in Natal. Ord. c. 4).

**Pope Siricius**, A.D. 386: — “I bear the burdens of all who

---

\(^1\) “During the early progress of the Eutychian controversy, A.D. 449, a letter was addressed to Chrysologus, in common with the occupants of all the principal sees of the West, by Eutyches himself, remonstrating against his condemnation by Flavian of Constantinople, and seeking to stir up all the Western Bishops against him. Chrysologus’s reply, which is extant among the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon (Labbe, Concil. iv. 35; cf. the notes of Binnius, ib. 992), expresses the sorrow with which he had received Eutyches’s letter, and exhorts him to submit to the decision of the See of Peter, as declared in the Encyclical of Leo, since ‘the blessed Peter lives and presides in his own Cathedra, and gives the true faith to all who seek for it.’” —Smith’s Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Literat., vol. i. p. 518.
are heavily laden; yea, rather in me that burden is borne by the blessed Apostle Peter, who, we trust, in all things protects and has regard to us who are the heirs of his government” (Hæc portat in nobis B.A. Petrus, qui nos in omnibus, ut confidimus, administrationis suæ protegit et tuetur heredes. Epist. I. ad Himer. Tarrac. Episc. Galland, vii. p. 533).
THE SEE OF PETER.

II.

The following is a brief synopsis of the titles and prerogatives ascribed by the early Fathers and Councils to the Roman See or Church:

1. The Apostolic See—The Apostolic Chair—The Apostolic Throne—The See, Chair, Throne, or Place of Peter—The Rock of the Church—The See to which Heresy cannot gain access—Which has ever remained free from taint of Heresy—The See of Faith—In which the true Faith is never troubled—And Religion has always been preserved without spot, &c., &c.

Tertullian:—“Run through the Apostolic Churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles to this very day preside over their own places;¹ in which their own original letters are read, echoing the voice, and making present the face of each. Is Achaia near to thee? thou hast Corinth... If thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome,”

¹ Eusebius testifies that “the throne of James” (Ἰακώβου θρόνος), i.e., his actual episcopal chair, was preserved even in his own time in Jerusalem, of which See that Apostle was the first Bishop (Hist. Eccles. vii. 19 and 32). For the history of the actual “Chair,” or episcopal throne of St. Peter, the reader should consult Roma Sotterranea, p. 388 seq., Longmans, 1869.

² Tertullian passes rapidly over the other Churches founded by the Apostles (those of Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Ephesus), but pauses to speak of the peculiar “felicity” of the Roman Church in possessing the full treasure of apostolic doctrine. Elsewhere, in answer to the objection of the heretics that some of these Churches had erred and had been reproved by the Apostles themselves (Galat. iii. 1, i. 6; 1 Cor. iii. 1, seq., viii. 2, xvi. 9), he says: “When they object to us that the Churches were reproved, let them believe that they
The See of Peter.

whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church how happy! into which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter had a like passion with the Lord, where Paul is crowned with an end like the Baptist’s” (Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc Cathedrae Apostolorum suis locis præsidentur. . . . Habes Romam. . . . Ista quam felix Ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur. De Praescript. Hæret. c. 36).

St. Cyprian says that Cornelius was chosen Bishop of Rome, and “mounted to the lofty summit of the priesthood, . . . when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter, and the rank of the Sacerdotal Chair, was vacant.” Ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus adscendit . . . cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri et gradus cathedrae sacerdotalis vacaret. Epist. lii. ed. Baluz. lv. c. 7, ed. Goldhorn, pp. 107, 108). He says of certain heretics: “After all this, they dare to sail, and to carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to the Chair of Peter, and to the ruling Church, whence the unity of the priesthood has its source; nor do they consider that they are the same Romans—whose faith is praised in the preaching of the Apostle—to whom faithlessness cannot have access” (Navigare audent et ad Petri Cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde were amended; and let them also recollect those concerning whose ‘faith,’ and ‘knowledge,’ and conversation, the Apostle ‘rejoices,’ and ‘giveth God thanks’ (Rom. i. 8, xv. 14, xvi. 19), which, nevertheless, at this day join with those which were reproved in the privileges of one constituted body” (De Præser. Hæret. c. 27).

1 St. Cyprian says that Cornelius courageously accepted his election to the Pontificate, although the tyrannical Emperor Decius had declared that he would rather see a new pretender to the Empire than a new Bishop of Rome!” (Quanta in ipso suscepto episcopatu suo virtus, quantum robur animi, qualis firmitas fidei, . . . sedisse intrepidum Romæ in sacerdotali Cathedra eo tempore, cum tyrannus infestus sacerdotibus Dei fanda atque infanda comminaretur, cum multo patientius et tolerabilius audiret, levari adversus se æmulum principem, quam constitui Romæ Dei sacerdotem! lb. Ep. lv. n. 8, p. 108).

2 “The Roman Church,” says PALMER, an Anglican writer, “was particularly
The See of Peter.

unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare, eos esse Romanos, quorum fides apostolo prædicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Epist. lv. ed. Baluz. lix. c. 19, p. 144, ed. Gold.). "He who abandons the Chair of Peter, does he feel confident that he is within the Church?" (Qui cathedram Petri deserit, in Ecclesia se esse confidit? De Unitate Eccles.)

Firmilian, A.D. 257, says of Pope Stephen:—“He prides himself on the Place of his Episcopate, and contends that he holds the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundahonoured as having been presided over by St. Peter; and was therefore, by many of the Fathers, called the See of Peter” (Treatise of the Church, vol. ii. part vii. c. 3, p. 473, Oxon.). Neander, the Protestant historian of the Church, admits that “Cyprian looked upon the Roman Church as really the Cathedra Petri, and as the representative of the outward unity of the Church” (Bohn's Neander, vol. i. p. 299); and that “very early indeed” the Popes themselves assumed “that to them, as successors of St. Peter, belonged a paramount authority in ecclesiastical disputes; that the Cathedra Petri, as the source of Apostolic tradition, must take precedence of all other Ecclesia Apostolica,” &c. (Ib. p. 298). He refers especially to the conduct of Pope Victor, A.D. 190, Pope Zephyrinus, A.D. 200, and Pope Stephen, A.D. 250. Dean Milman also admits that “Cyprian acknowledged the hereditary descent of the Roman Bishops from the great Apostle” (Hist. of Latin Christ. b. ii. c. 4, p. 238, vol. i.); and that “the succession of the Bishop of Rome from St. Peter was now, near 200 years after his death, an accredited tradition” (Ib. b. i. c. 1, p. 66). The Protestant Archbishop Bramhall had acknowledged long before, “that St. Peter had a fixed Chair at Antioch, and after that at Rome, is what no man who giveth any credit to the ancient Fathers, and Councils, and historiographers of the Church can either deny or well doubt of” (Bramhall's Works, p. 628, ed. Oxon.). See also Bishop Pearson's Opera Posthuma, London, 1688.

Complete catalogues of the Bishops of Rome are given by Irenæus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Optatus, Epiphanius, and Augustine, from St. Peter down to their own contemporaries. (See Note I. ad fin.) Caius, A.D. 220, names Pope Victor as “the 13th Bishop of Rome from Peter” (πριγκαδικατοσ απο Πετρου εν ρωμη επισκοπος. Ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 28). St. Hippolytus, A.D. 225, in the portion of his Chronicle from which the earlier part of the ancient Liberian Catalogue was derived (See Smith's Dict. of Christ. Biogr. and Literat. vol. i. pp. 507, 555.), “Counts Peter as first Bishop of Rome” (Ib. p. 577). Eusebius says that “Linus was the first after Peter to obtain the Episcopate of the Roman Church” (Δυσος δε πρωτος μετα Πετρον της ρωμαιων εκκλησίας την επισκοπην, κ.τ.λ. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 4). Hegesippus (A.D. 156) and Irenæus were the authorities that Eusebius relied on as to the first Roman Bishops, and the duration of their Episcopate. Hegesippus states, that when he was in Rome, he wrote down the list of the Bishops up to Anicetus” (διαδοχην επισκοπην μεσας'Ανικητων. Ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iv. 22). See Dollinger's First Age of the Church, p. 299, 2d edit.
tions of the Church were laid. . . . Stephen, who proclaims that he occupies by succession the Chair of Peter, is moved by no zeal against heretics,” &c.¹ (De Episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesiae collocata sunt. . . . Stephanus, qui per successionem Cathedram Petri habere se prædicat, &c. Epist. ad Cyprian. ap. Op. Cyp. p. 239, ed. Gold.).

The Council of Arles, A.D. 314, in its Synodical Epistle to Pope Sylvester, calls Rome “the place in which the Apostles daily sit (in judgment), and their blood without ceasing witnesses to the glory of God” (In quibus locis et Apostoli quotidianie sedent, et cruror ipsorum sine intermissione Dei gloriam testatur. Labbe, tom. i. p. 1425).

The Council of Sardica, A.D. 343,² “honours the memory of Peter,” by sanctioning appeals from all the provinces “to the head, i.e., to the see of the Apostle Peter” (Ei δοκει υμων τη αγαπη Πετρου του αποστολου των μημιου τυμπομεν και γραφηναι παρα τουτων των κριναντων Ιουλιο τω επισκοπω Ρωμης, κ.τ.λ. Can. iii. Hoc enim optimum et valde congruentissimum esse videbitur, si ad caput, id est ad Petri Apostoli Sedem, de singulis quisbusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes. Epist. ad Julium, Labbe, ii. p. 661).

St. Athanasius, A.D. 362, calls Rome “the Apostolic Throne” (αποστολικος θρωνος. Hist. Ariau. ad Monach. n. 35).

¹ In his Epistle to St. Cyprian, Firmilian writes in a hostile and violent manner against Pope Stephen, from whom he differed on the disciplinary question of the re-baptisation of converted heretics. Whilst declaiming bitterly, however, against what he supposed to be an arbitrary and uncalled-for exercise of the Pope’s authority in that particular matter, he does not for a moment call his authority itself in question, or deny that he “held by succession the Chair of Peter”—which, undoubtedly, his indignation against him would have impelled him to do, had such a mode of opposing him been practicable, and had not the fact of the Pope’s succession from St. Peter been undisputed and indisputable. See, on the whole controversy, Monsgr. Freppel’s S. Cyprian, pp. 363-446, Paris, 1865.

St. Optatus of Milevis, addressing the Donatist, Parmenian, says: "You cannot affect ignorance of the fact, that the Episcopal Chair was first established by Peter in the city of Rome, in which sat Peter, the head of all the Apostles" (Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram Episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus. De Schism. Donat. l. ii. n. 2, p. 76, ed. Hurter). "Peter, therefore, first filled that pre-eminent chair, which is the first of the marks of the Church (the prerogatives); to whom succeeded Linus," &c.¹ (Ergo Cathedram unicum, quae est prima de dotibus, sedit prior Petrus: cui successit Linus, &c. Ib. c. 3, p. 76). "If Macrobius be asked in what Chair he sits in Rome, can he answer, in the Chair of Peter?" (Si Macrobius dicatur, ubi illic sedeat, numquid potest dicere in Cathedra Petri? Ib. c. 4, p. 78. Comp. c. 5, p. 81).


St. Ambrose:—"They (the Novatians) have not Peter's inheritance who have not Peter's Chair" (Non habent Petri hereditatem, qui Petri Sedem non habent. De Panti- tent. lib. i. c. 7, n. 32).

The Council of Carthage, A.D. 416, to Pope Innocent:—"These proceedings of ours, Lord and Brother, we have

¹ The Protestant historian Neander says: "Optatus of Milevis, who wrote in the last half of the fourth century, represents the Apostle Peter as the head of the Apostles—as the representative of the unity of the Church and of the Apostolic power, who had received the keys of the kingdom for the purpose of giving them to the others. . . . In the Roman Church he perceives the indestructible Cathedra Petri. This stood in the same relation to the other Episcopal Churches as the Apostle Peter stood to the rest of the Apostles. The Roman Church represents the one visible Church, the one episcopate. There was one Apostolic power in Peter, from which the Apostolic powers of the others issued forth, as it were like so many different streams; and, in like manner, there is one episcopal power in the Roman Church, from which the other episcopal powers are but so many different streams."—Bohn's Neander, vol. iii. pp. 236, 237.
thought are to be made known to your holy charity, that to the statutes of our lowliness may be applied the authority of THE APOSTOLIC SEE, for the defence of the salvation of many, and the correction of the perversity of some” (Ut statutis nostrae mediocratis etiam Apostolicae Sedis adhibeatur auctoritas, pro tuenda salute multorum, et quorundam perversitate etiam corrigenda. Epist. xxvi. in ed. Constant.; Epist. clxxv. Innocentio, n. 2, Op. S. August.).

Council of Milevis, A.D. 417:—“As the Lord, by the sovereign gift of His own grace, has placed you in THE APOSTOLIC SEE, . . . we beseech you that you would vouchsafe to apply your pastoral diligence to the great dangers, &c. . . . We think that . . . those who hold such pernicious opinions (Pelagians), will more easily yield to the authority of your Holiness, derived as it is from the authority of the Holy Scriptures” (Quia te Dominus gratiæ suæ præcipuo munere in Sede Apostolica collocavit, talemque nostris temporibus praestitit. . . . Arbitramur, adjuvante misericordia Domini Dei nostri, qui te et regere consulentem, et orantem exaudire dignatur, auctoritati sanctitatis tuae, de Sanctorum Scripturarum auctoritate depromptæ facilius eos . . . esse cessuros. Epist. Concil. Milev. Innocentio, Op. S. August. Epist. clxxvi. p. 928).  

1 “They implore,” says Milman, “the dignity of the Apostolic throne, of the successor of St. Peter, to complete and ratify that which is wanting to their more moderate power.”—Hist. of Lat. Christ. b. ii. c. 2, p. 154.

2 Regarding the reply of Pope Innocent to these appeals, St. Augustine remarked:—“He wrote back to us on all these matters in a manner that was right and becoming in the Prelate of the Apostolic See” (Epist. clxxvi. Paulina, n. 2). Milman says: “He did not pass by the opportunity of asserting, as an acknowledged maxim, the dignity of the Apostolic See, the source of episcopacy, and the advantage of an appeal to a tribunal which might legislate for all Christendom” (Hist. of Lat. Christ. vol. i. p. 154). “It is impossible to doubt,” says Neander, “as to what the Popes, even as early as the fifth century, believed themselves to be, or would fain be, in relation to the rest of the Church, after having once listened to the language which they themselves hold on this subject. When a North-African Council at Carthage had sent a report of their conclusions, in the decision of a controverted point of doctrine, to the Roman Bishop Innocent, and demanded his assent to these conclusions; in his answer of the year 417, he first praised them because they had considered themselves bound to submit the matter to his judgment, since they were aware what
General Council of Ephesus:—Arcadius, the Legate, said:—"Let your Blessedness order the letter of the holy and venerable Pope Celestine, Bishop of the Apostolic See, to be read, from which you will be able to know what care he has for all the Churches" (Act. ii. p. 611).

General Council of Chalcedon:—"The Apostolic Throne" (Sess. i. p. 94).

Canon of St. Patrick, A.D. 450:—"If any case of extreme difficulty shall arise, . . . let it be referred to the See of the chief Bishop of the Irish (that is, of Patrick). . . . But if it cannot easily be decided in that See, . . . we have decreed that it be sent to the Apostolic See, that is, to the Chair of the Apostle Peter, which holds the authority of the city of Rome" (Ad Sedem Apostolicam decrevimus esse mittendam, id est, ad Petri Apostoli Cathedram auctoritatem Romae urbis habentem. Can. S. Patric. vide Moran's Essays on the Early Irish Church, 1864, c. ii. p. 120 et seq.; and Appendix, No. vi. p. 304).

St. Jerome (to Pope Damasus):—"I am linked in communion with thy Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. On that rock I know that the Church is built" (Beatitudini tuae, id est, Cathedrae Petri, communione consocior. Super illum petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio. Epist. xv. ad Damasum tom. i. p. 38). "I cry out, If any one is joined to the Chair of Peter, he is mine" (Ego interim clamito, Si quis Cathedrae Petri jungitur, meus est. Epist. xvi. n. 2, p. 42). "The Apostolic Chair" (Epist. cxxx. ad Demetriad. n. 16). "The Apostolic See" (Adv. Ruffin. ii. 15).

was due to the Apostical Chair; since all who occupied this seat strove to follow in the steps of that Apostle from whom the episcopal dignity itself, and the entire authority of this name, had emanated. With good right had they held sacred the institutions of the Fathers, who had decided, not according to human, but according to the Divine counsels, that whatever was transacted in the provinces, let them be ever so remote, should not be considered as ratified until it had come to the knowledge of the Apostolic Chair; so that by its entire authority every just decision might be confirmed, and the other Churches (as the pure streams should be distributed from the original, undisturbed source, through the different countries of the whole world) might learn from this Church what they had to ordain, whom they had to pronounce innocent, and whom to reject as irreclaimably wrong" (Neander, vol. iii. pp. 241, 242).
St. Siricius, Pope, A.D. 386:—"The Apostolic rock, upon which Christ constructed the Universal Church, ... the Apostolic See" (Præfatam regulam omnes teneant sacerdotes, qui nolunt ab apostolicae petrae, super quam Christus universalem construxit Ecclesiam, soliditate divelli. ... Ab omni ecclesiastico honore, quo indigne usi sunt, Apostolicae Sedis auctoritate dejectos, &c. Epist. i. Himer. Episc. Tarracon. n. 3, 11). "To none of the Lord's priests is it allowable to be ignorant of the statutes of the Apostolic See, or of the venerable decisions of the Canons" (Statuta Sedis Apostolicae, &c. Ib. n. 20, Galland, vii. p. 533-536).

St. Augustine:—"Number the Bishops, even from the See itself of Peter; and in that order of Fathers see who succeeded to whom: this is the rock which the proud gates of hell overcome not" (Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Sede Petri; ... ipsa est petra quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ. In Ps. Cont. Part. Donat. tom. ix. p. 49). "The Chair of the Roman Church, in which Peter sat, and in which Anastasius sits at present" (Cont. Lit. Petilian. lib. ii. n. 118, tom. ix. p. 411). "The Roman Church, in which the primacy of the Apostolic See has always been in force" (Romana Ecclesia, in qua semper Apostolicae Cathedrae viguit principatus. Epist. xliii. Glorio et cet. n. 7, tom. ii. p. 136). "The succession of prelates in the very Chair of the Apostle Peter, ... down to the present Episcopate, keeps me in the Catholic Church" (Tenet ab ipsa Sede Petri Apostoli, cui pasandas oves suas Dominus commendavit usque ad præsentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum. Cont. Ep. Manic. n. 5, tom. viii. p. 268). "Some of these men (Pelagians) before this

1 "The answer of Siricius" (to Himerius), says Milman, "is in the tone of one who supposes that the usages of the Church of Rome were to be received as those of Christendom" (vol. i. p. 97). Yet Janus has the assurance to state that "the Popes at that time made no attempt to exercise legislative power. ... Declarations or ordinances issued by Popes in reply to questions of particular Bishops could not be regarded as general laws of the Church, for this simple reason, that they were only known to particular Bishops and Churches" (Janus, p. 79, Eng. trans.). Dollinger says that "the Popes issued their decrees for the Oriental Church no less than for the Western" (Hist. of Ch. vol. ii. p. 225).
pestilence was condemned also by the most manifest judgment of THE APOSTOLIC SEE, might have been known to you, but whom you may now see of a sudden silent” (Epist. ccxi. Sixto, n. 2, p. 1064). “For already on this cause (Pelagianism) the decisions of two Councils have been sent to THE APOSTOLIC SEE; thence also answers (rescripta) have come. The cause is ended (causa finita est); would that at length the error may end” (Serm. cxxxii. de Verb. Evang. Ioan. vi. n. 10, p. 930).

St. Gelasius, Pope:—“Granting to the SEE, which he himself (Peter) blessed, that, in accordance with the Lord’s promise, IT SHOULD NEVER BE CONQUERED BY ‘THE GATES OF HELL,’ and be the safest harbour of those tossed by the waves” (Præstans Sedi, quam ipse benedixit, ut a portis inferi nunquam pro Domini promissione vincatur omnium-que sit fluctuantium tutissimus portus. Epist. xiv. p. 1216, Galland, x.; Tract. ii. n. 10, ed. Thiel. p. 259).

Theodoret:—“If Paul, the herald of the truth, the trumpet of the Holy Ghost, hastened to the great Peter, to convey from him the solution to those at Antioch, who were at issue about living under the law, how much more do we, poor and humble, run to the APOSTOLIC THRONE, to receive from you (Pope Leo) healing for the wounds of the Churches. For it pertains to you to have the primacy in all things; for your throne is adorned with many prerogatives” (Εἰ Πάους . . . πρὸς τὸν μεγαν ἐδράμε Πέτρων . . . πόλλῳ μαλλον ἡμεῖς, οἱ εὐτελεῖς καὶ σπικροι, πρὸς τὸν ἀποστολικὸν ὑμων πρέχομεν θρόνον, ὡστε παρ’ ὑμων λαβεῖν τοις των εκκλησιων ἐκκεσι θερα-πειαν. Διὰ πάντα γαρ ὑμών το πρωτευεις ἀρμοττει. Πολλοῖς

1 Comp. the words of St. Leo Mag. (Serm. et Epist. Passim), of Pope Simplicius (Epist. iv.), and of Council of Rome, A.D. 494 (Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1013). Sergius, the Metropolitan of Cyprus, thus addressed Pope Theodore:—“O holy head! Christ our God hath destined thy Apostolic See to be an immovable foundation, and a pillar of the faith. For thou art, as the Divine Word truly said, Peter, and on thee, as a foundation-stone, have the pillars of the Church been fixed” (Epist. ad Theod. Lect. in Sess. ii. Concil. Lat. Anno 649). “The writings of the Fathers,” says Hergenröther, “whenever they speak of the Pope, are full of echoes and allusions to those Scriptural words, and what is said of Peter the Popes claim decidedly for themselves” (Anti-Janus, Eng. trans. p. 63).
The See of Peter.

γαρ ὁ ἴμετερος θρόνος κοσμεῖται πλεονεκτημασί. Ἐπιστ. cxiii. Leoni, tom. iv. p. 1187). “For that all holy throne has the office of heading the Churches of the whole world, for many reasons; and, above all others, because IT HAS REMAINED FREE OF THE COMMUNION OF HERETICAL TAINT, AND NO ONE HOLDING HETERODOX SENTIMENTS EVER SAT IN IT, BUT IT HAS PRESERVED THE APOSTOLIC GRACE UNSULLIED”¹ (ἐχει γαρ ὁ παναγιος θρόνος εκείνος των κατά την ουκομενήν εκκλησιων την ἡγεμονιαν δια πολλα, κ.τ.λ. Ἐπιστ. cxvi. Renato, p. 1197).

Bachiarius, A.D. 420:—“Not one of them (the heresies)

---

¹ See, on this subject, the admissions of Dean MILMAN (Hist. of Lat. Christ. vol. i. pp. 37, 38, 76-79, 104-111, 115, 177, 195, 228, 254, 271, 272, &c.). PALMER says: “We find that the Roman Church was zealous to maintain the true faith from the earliest period, condemning and expelling the Gnostics, Artemonites, &c.; and, during the Arian mania it was the bulwark of the Catholic faith” (Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. part vi. c. 3, p. 472). The agency of the Holy See in maintaining the integrity of revelation, through a long lapse of ages, was acknowledged by the learned Protestant CASAUBON:—“No one who is in the least versed in ecclesiastical history can doubt that God made use of the Roman Pontiffs, during many ages, to preserve the doctrines of the true faith” (Nemo autem peritus rerum Ecclesiae ignorat, opera Romanorum Pontificum per multa secula Deum esse usum in conservanda recte fidei doctrinam. In Annal. Baron. Exercit. xv. p. 384, Genevæ, 1655). “The orthodoxy of the West,” says MILMAN, “stood out in bold relief at the Council of Sardica. . . . Western Christendom might seem disposed to show its gratitude to Rome for its pure and consistent orthodoxy, by acknowledging at Sardica a certain right of appeal to the Bishop of Rome from Illyricum and Macedonia” (vol. i. pp. 78, 79). Both this writer, and also NEANDER and Archbishop TRENCH, attribute the development and increase of the Papal power in a great measure to the unswerving orthodoxy of the Apostolic See (see Neander’s Church Hist. vol.iii. pp. 242, 243, and Trench’s Lectures on Mediaeval Church Hist. p. 154). The learned Protestant Archbishop USHER, referring to the above-quoted Canon of St. Patrick, in which it is decreed that in difficult matters an appeal should be made to the Apostolic See, says:—“It is most likely that St. Patrick had a special regard for the Church of Rome, from whence he was sent for the conversion of this island; so as, if I myself had lived in his days, for the resolution of a doubtful question, I should as willingly have listened to the judgment of the Church of Rome, as to the determination of any Church in the whole world: so reverent an estimation have I of the integrity of that Church as it stood in those days” (Dissert. On the Religion of the Ancient Irish, c. viii. Works, Dub. ed. vol. iv. p. 330). This seems a curious admission, considering what, according to the acknowledgment of Milman and Neander, the Roman Church had taught regarding her own supremacy, even many years before the time of Pope Celestine and St. Patrick!
either could hold or move the Chair of Peter, that is, the See of Faith” (Nulla earum Cathedram Petri, hoc est, sedem fidei, aut tenere potuit, aut movere. De Fide, n. 2, p. 183, Galland, ix.).

Paulinus, the Deacon, A.D. 418:—“I appeal to the justice of your blessedness, my Lord Zosimus, venerable Pope. The true faith is never troubled, and especially in the Apostolic Church, wherein the teachers of a corrupt faith are as easily detected as they are truly punished,” &c. (Libell. adv. Caelest. Zosimo Obl. n. 1, p. 32, Galland, ix.).

In the Formula of Pope Hormisdas, A.D. 517, which was signed by the Emperor Justinian, by the Patriarchs of Constantinople—Epiphanius, John, and Mennas—by 2500 Oriental Bishops (Dollinger, vol. ii. p. 221, Eng. trans.), and confirmed by the Fathers of the eighth General Council, it is said:—“Because the statement of our Lord Jesus Christ, when He said, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,’ &c., cannot be set aside; this, which is said, is proved by the results; for in the Apostolic See religion has always been preserved without spot. . . . in which (See) is the perfect and true solidity of the Christian religion” (Hæc, quæ dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper servata religio. . . . In quà est integra et verax Christianæ religionis soliditas. Form. Hormisd. Ep. Orient. Praescript. Denzinger’s Enchirid. p. 42).

General Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680. In this Council the Epistle of Pope Agatho was read, and received as the voice of Peter. Addressing the Emperor, he says: “Relying on the protection (of Peter), this, his Apostolic Church, has never deviated from the way of truth in any way of error whatsoever; and his authority, as that of the Prince of all the Apostles, the whole Catholic Church of Christ and all the universal Synods always and faithfully have in all things embraced and followed. . . . Which Apostolic Church, by the grace of Almighty God, will never be convicted of erring from the path
OF APOSTOLIC TRADITION, NOR HAS IT EVER YIELDED OR BEEN DEPROVED BY HERETICAL NOVELTIES; but as it received in the beginning of the Faith from its founders, the chief of the Apostles of Christ, IT ABIDES UNTAINTED TO THE END, ACCORDING TO THE DIVINE PROMISE OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR HIMSELF, which in the Holy Gospels He uttered to the Prince of His disciples: 'Peter, Peter, behold Satan hath desired to sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren'" (Quæ [Eccl. Rom.] ejus [Petri] annitente præsidio nunquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est. . . . Quæ per Dei Omnipotentis gratiam a tramite Apostolicae traditionis nunquam errasse probabitur, nec hæreticis novitatus depravata succubuit, sed ut ab exordio fidei Christianæ percepit ab auctoriibus suis Apostolorum Christi principibus illibata fine tenus permanet, &c. Labbe, Concil. tom. vii. pp. 659, 662, ed. Ven. 1729).


2. This Church Presides—It has a more Powerful Headship—It is the Chief or Ruling Church, and the Source of Ecclesiastical Unity—The Church in Which the Primacy of the Apostolic See has always been in Force—The First of all the Sees—The Head of all the Churches—Appointed by God to Rule over all the Rest, and from Which flow unto all the Rights of Venerable Communion—The Head of Pastoral Honour, by Which, by Christ's Concession, the Dignity of all Priests is Confirmed—Which Confirms every Synod by Its Authority, and without Whose Authority no Council can be Held—Which Judges the Whole Church, and itself is Judged of None, &c.

St. Ignatius, A.D. 107, addresses the Roman Church as
the one "which presides" (ὅτις καὶ προκαθήται) in the place of the country of the Romans, all-godly, all-gracious, all-blessed, all-praised, all-prospering, all-hallowed, and presiding in the covenant of love" (προκαθήμενη τῆς ἁγαπῆς Epist. ad Rom. Proem.). Cureton's translation from the ancient Syriac version is as follows:—"To her who presideth in the place of the country of the Romans, who is worthy of God, and worthy of life and happiness and praise and remembrance, and is worthy of prosperity, and presideth in love, and is perfected in the law of Christ blameless" (Corpus Ignatianum, p. 230, London, 1849).

St. Gregory Nazianzen says:—"The faith (of Rome) was of old, and still is now, right, binding the whole West by the saving word, as is just in her who presides over all, reverencing the whole harmonious teaching of God" (Τούτων δὲ πίστις ἡ μεν ἡν εκ πλειονος—<em>Kai νῦν ετ' εστ' ευδρόμος, τὴν εσπεραν—</em>Πασαν δεουσα τῷ σωτηρίῳ λογῳ,—<em>Kαθως δικαιον τὴν προέδρον τον ὁλων,—</em>Ολην σεβουσαν την θεου συμφωνιαν, Carm. de Vitâ Sôlû, vv. 568-573, tom. ii. p. 704).

St. Irenæus, A.D. 178:—"With this Church (of Rome), on account of her more powerful headship, it is necessary that every Church—that is, the faithful everywhere dispersed—should agree" or "be in communion" (Ad hanc Ecclesiæ, propter po(ten)tiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiæ, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles. Adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3, ed. Massuet).

The original Greek text of Irenæus has been lost, and there has been much controversy regarding the word rendered principalitatem in the ancient and perfectly literal Latin

1 See, on the force of this expression, Wocher (Epist. of St. Ignat. p. 82, Tubing. 1829). "Il voit dans l’évêque de Rome l’hérétique de la prééminence de Pierre, de là le nom de προκαθήμενη τῆς ἁγαπῆς, ‘présidente du lien de la charité,’ qu’il décerne à l’Eglise" (Alzog’s Patrologie, p. 64, Paris, 1877). It should be observed, also,—I. That the word rendered "preside" is used in two other places by St. Ignatius, and in each place it implies superior dignity: προκαθήμενον τοις επισκοπωις τοις υιοις (Epist. ad Magnes. n. 6); τοις προκαθήμενοι (ib.). 2. That in all his Epistles to other Churches, instead of "presides," St. Ignatius invariably uses the word "is": "To the Church which is (τη ευσηγη) in Ephesus;" "to the Church which is (την ευσαγ) in Magnesia," "in Smyrna," &c.
version, which was made at the end of the second century, and was the one used by Tertullian, as the learned editor, Massuet, has clearly proved. SALMUSIAS and MASSUET conjecture that it was πρωτειον;\(^1\) GRABE, αρχην or αυθεντιαν. ARMELLI and HERGENRÖTHER prefer αυθεντιαν, but GRIEBACH, αρχην; ThiERSCH and GIESELER, πρωτειαν; and STIEREN, αρχαιοτητα. The controversy seems to have been set at rest by SCHNEEMANN (S. Irenæi, De Ecclesiae Romanæ Principatu Testimonium, Commentatum et Defensum, Friburg, 1870), who, after carefully examining all the passages in which “principalitas” occurs in the Latin version, and comparing them with the corresponding Greek in the fragments of Irenæus that have been preserved in the original, concludes:—“Quotiescunque ‘principalitas’ in versione Latina reperitur, auctoritatem, potestatem, præsertim supremam, divinam, significat, et quidem, si vox græca nomen substantivum est, semper fere αυθεντια, semel αρχη, cum eadem tamen significacione, usurpatur” (p. 22). He examines, in like manner, the passages in which the Vetus Interpres uses the synonymous word “principatus,” and concludes:—“Ergo viginti tribus versionis antiquæ locis ‘principalitas’ vel synonyma vox ‘principatus’ potestatem, dominationem, imperium significat. Nullum alium locum, ubi voces illæ positæ essent, toto opere perfecto, reperimus, neque adversarii attulerunt.”\(^2\)

1 They confirm their opinion by a passage in lib. iv. c. 38, n. 3:—πρωτευει εν πασι ο θεος, which the Vetus Interpres renders “principalitatem habebit in omnibus Deus.” He also translates αρχη, occurring in Ephes. i. 21, by principalitatem in lib. ii. c. 30, n. 9. According to SCHNEEMANN, “propter potentiorum principalitatem” = δια την ικανωτηταν αυθεντιαν.

2 Replying to the author of No. 4 of the “Church Defence Tracts,” FR. ADDIS says: “My opponent contends, that while in two places ‘principalitas’ is used for principality and supremacy, in the others it is used for the ‘pleroma,’ and for an ‘original and primary being.’ He forgets that the primary being of the Gnostics was also supreme, and that this supremacy is specially emphasised by St. Irenæus (cf. lib. i. 26. 1:—principalitas quæ est super universa); but, fortunately, we can bring matters to a crucial test. In two of the places (i. 26, 1; and i. 31, 1) in which we are told that ‘principalitas’ does not mean supremacy, we have the original Greek (in Philosoph. x. 21, and in Theodoret. Heret. Fáb. i. 19). In both these places the Greek word which answers to ‘principalitas’ is αυθεντια, and for αυθεντια Liddel and Scott give but one rendering, viz., ‘absolute sway’” (Anglicanism and the Fathers, p. 12).
Tertullian thus defines the word *principalitas*:—"Ad hæc discipere superest principalitas ubi sit, id est, qui cui praest," &c. (De Animâ, c. 13). "It remains to examine where lies the supremacy; in other words, which of the two is superior to the other" (the soul or the mind). . . . "It is to the soul that you ascribe the supremacy, . . . the ruling power" (Holmes' Tertullian, Clark's Anti-Nicene Christian Library).

The writers who refer the "potentior principalitas" of the Roman Church to its *Apostolic origin or higher antiquity* are refuted by Schneemann (*loc. cit.*). St. Irenæus, in lib. iii. c. 12, assigns a higher honour, as regards its *antiquity*, to the Church of Jerusalem,—"the metropolis of the citizens of the New Covenant;" and, as regards mere Apostolic foundation and antiquity, the Church of Antioch and others were nothing inferior to that of Rome. It is clear that the claim of the latter to Apostolic origin or great antiquity would not have been a sufficient proof or guarantee of the truth of its doctrine, even at the time when St. Irenæus wrote; for to this the heretics of his day might have answered, with Anglicans, that "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch had erred, so also had the Church of Rome erred," &c. What St. Irenæus declares of the Church of Rome is, that, *on account of its more powerful headship or supremacy*, every other church must of necessity agree with and submit to it; and that, by appealing to its tradition, "**ALL**" heretics—opposing it—stand utterly confounded.

It may be observed that Roberts and Rambaut, the Protestant translators of Irenæus in Clark's *Anti-Nicene Christian Library*, render the passage in question "on account of its *pre-eminent authority*." Grabe and the earlier Protestant writers pretended that by *principalitas* the *civil principedom* of Rome was denoted—an interpretation now generally abandoned as untenable by all whose judgment is of any value. The fact that St. Irenæus wrote in the time of Pope Eleutherus (i.e., between the year 177, when M. Aurelius was persecuting the Christians, and 192, which was the last of the Emperor Commodus), and that he himself describes it as
Supremacy of the See of Peter.

an age of persecution (lib. iv. c. 33, n. 9), is alone enough to show the absurdity of the interpretation referred to.\(^1\)

St. Cyprian, who teaches that "there is One Church founded by the Lord upon Peter, for the Origin and Purpose of Unity" (Una Ecclesia super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata. Epist. lxx. ad Januar.), calls the Roman Church, in which is the See of Peter, "the Chief or Ruling Church, whence the Unity of the Priesthood has its Source" (Ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est. Epist. lv. Balus, lix. n. 19, ed. Goldh.). Compare the words of St. Augustine: "The Roman Church, in which the Primacy of the Apostolic See has always been in force" (In qua semper Apostolicae Cathedrae viguit princiatus. Epist. xlii.); of Pope Boniface, A.D. 422: "The Apostolic See holds the Primacy, that it may receive the complaints of all" (Ideo tenet Sedes Apostolica princiapatum ut querelas omnium licentes acceptet, &c. Epist. xiv. n. 4); and of Pope Anastasius II.,\(^2\) A.D. 496: "Through the ministry of my lowliness... may the See of Peter hold the Primacy assigned to it by the Lord our God in the Universal Church" (Sedes Petri in Universali Ecclesia assignatam sibi a Domino teneat.

---

1 Grabe also supposed that Christians were constantly going on embassies to the Roman Emperors—a fiction which is thus refuted by the learned Massuet: "Si Irenæus de confluo eorum, qui ab Ecclesiis Romam mittebantur, ut caussam Christianorum agerent apud Imperatores, intelligendus sit; sensus erit, necesse fuisset, omnem Ecclesiæ, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, Romam venire, ut caussam Christianorum agerent apud Imperatores. Atque tantum abest, id necesse fuerit, ut ante Irenæi aetatem factum aliquando fuisset ne uno quidem exemplo probare possit Græbii. Plures quidem Christianorum Apologistas oblatas Imperatoribus, a Quadrato, Aristide, Melitone, Apollinari, Athenagora, et Justino legimus: sed eos ab Ecclesiis Romam missos fuisset, ut caussam Christianorum agerent apud Imperatores, falsissimum: immo plerosque, ipsum etiam Athenagorum, cujus Apologiae titulo, quod inscribatur Legatio, abutitur Græbius, et patria pedem extulisse, ut Apologiae suas offerent, nullibis legimus: si qui vero, ut Justinus, Romæ obulerint, dudum antea ibi degeant, nec huc eo fine venerant. Et, quæso, quæ necessitas Christianis adeundi Imperatoribus Ethnico, a quibus nihil nisi juss omne fasque violatum sperare poterant?"

2 Compare also the words of St. Leo the Great: "Curam quam universis Ecclesiis principaliter (in virtue of our headship—Allies) ex divina institutione debemus. Epist. xiv. ad Anast. Thessal. Episc. See also the passages cited in pp. 37, 45, 54, 78.
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PRINCIPATUM. Epist. i. ad Anast. August. Labbe, iv. p 1278).

St. Optatus will be cited later on. It will suffice to quote, in this place, the admission of the Protestant historian Neander, that "Optatus represents the Apostle Peter as head of the Apostles. . . . In the Roman Church he perceives the indestructible Cathedra Petri. This stands in the same relation to the other Episcopal Churches as the Apostle Peter stood to the rest of the Apostles" (Hist. of the Church, vol. iii. p. 236, Bohn's ed. The whole passage is cited above in a note).

Council of Sardica, A.D. 344:—"This will seem to be best, and by far most congruous, if the priests of the Lord, from each of the several provinces, refer to the Head, that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter" (Ad caput, id est, ad Petri Apostoli Sedem. Epist. Synod. ad Julium, Labbe, ii. p. 661).

St. Ambrose, with the Council of Acquileia, A.D. 381, calls the Roman Church "the head of the whole Roman world" (East and West), . . . "whence flow unto all the rights of venerable communion" (Totius Romani orbis caput . . . inde enim in omnes venerandae communionis jura dimanant. Epist. xi. n. 4, p. 811).

St. Siricius, Pope:—"The Roman Church, the head of the body" (Causas, de quibus ad Romanam Ecclesiam, utpote ad caput tui corporis retulisti. Epist. i. ad Himer. n. 20, Galland, vii. p. 536).

St. Anastasius I., Pope, A.D. 399:—"Certainly care shall not be wanting on my part to guard the faith of the Gospel as regards my peoples, and to visit by letter, as far as I am able, the parts of my body throughout the divers regions of the earth" (Partesque corporis mei per spatia diversa terrarum. Epist. i. ad Joann. Hieros. n. 5, p. 248, Galland, viii.).

1 Referring to this, Pope Innocent, A.D. 410, says: "If any greater causes shall have arisen, let them, after the episcopal judgment, be referred to the Apostolic See, as the Synod ordained, and a blessed custom demands" (Epist. ii. Victor. Khotomag. Episc. n. 6, Galland, viii. p. 547).
St. Innocent, Pope, A.D. 414:—"The Apostolic See, ... the head of the Churches" (Sedi Apostolice, ad quam ... quasi ad caput Ecclesiarum. Epist xvii. n. i. ad Rufum et Socios, p. 575, Ib.). "The head and summit of the episcopate" (Ad nos quasi ad caput atque ad apicem episcopatus referre, ut consulta videlicet Sedes Apostolica ex ipsis rebus dubii certum aliquid faciendumque pronunciet. Epist. xxxvii. n. i, p. 608).

St. Zosimus, Pope, A.D. 418:—"Although the tradition of the Fathers has assigned so great an authority to the Apostolic See, that no one should dare to dispute about a judgment given by it," and that See by canons and regulations has kept to this; and the discipline of the Church, in the laws which it follows, still pays to the name of Peter, from whom that See descends, the reverence due; for canonical antiquity, by universal consent, willed that so great a power should belong to that Apostle—a power also derived from the promise itself of Christ our God—that he should loose what is bound, and bind what is loosed, &c. ... Seeing, then, that Peter is the head of so great authority, and that he has confirmed the statutes of all who have gone before us; and that by all laws and regulations, both human and divine, the Roman Church is strengthened; and you are not ignorant that we rule over

1 The statements of Neander (vol. iii. p. 248), Janus (p. 70, Eng. trans.), E. de Pressevere (Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Lit. p. 220), and others, that Pope Zosimus taught a different doctrine from his predecessor, Innocent I., that "he proclaimed the orthodoxy of the Pelagian doctrines," and that the African Bishops resisted him on this ground, are utterly false. The controversy was solely regarding the personal orthodoxy of Caelestius. "The latter represented himself to Zosimus as perfectly orthodox, and obtained from him a mild treatment, as indeed Innocent had, in the case of his repentance, held out to him the same prospect; so that though for a time he deceived the Pontiff, he never at least received any sort of sanction to his errors, which were afterwards duly discovered" (Anti-Janus, p. 78). St. Augustine himself distinctly denies that Zosimus ever approved of the Pelagian heresy (Lib. ii. Cont. duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonif. c. 3). Regarding the case of Aparius, and the controversy about African appeals to Rome, referred to by Palmer, Pusey, and other Anglican writers, see Allies' Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church, p. 69 seq.; Kenrick's Primacy of the Apostolic See, 5th ed. p. 195 seq.; Murray, De Ecclesia, vol. iii. p. 718 seq.
his place, and are in possession also of the authority of his name; nevertheless, though so great be our authority, that none may reconsider our sentence," &c. (Quamvis patrum traditio Apostolicae Sedi auctoritatem tantam tribuit, ut de ejus judicio disceptare nullus auderet. ... Cum ergo tantae auctoritatis Petrus caput sit, ... ut tam humanis quam divinis legibus et disciplinis omnibus firmetur Romana Ecclesia, cujus locum nos regere, ipsius quoque potestatem nominis obtinere non latet vos, ... cum tantum nobis esset auctoritatis, ut nullus de nostra possit retractare sententia, &c. Epist. xii. n. 1; Aurelio ac ceteris, pp. 15, 16, Galland, ix.).

St. Boniface, Pope, A.D. 422:—“The institution of the Universal Church began from the honour bestowed on blessed Peter, in whom its government and headship reside (In quo regimen ejus et summa consistit). For from him as its fountain-head did ecclesiastical discipline flow throughout all the Churches, when now the culture of religion had begun to make progress. Nor do the canons of Nicæa testify otherwise, inasmuch as they do not venture to make any regulations in his regard, seeing that nothing could be conferred that was superior to his own dignity, and knowing that all things had been given him by the words of Christ. It is certain, then, that this See stands, in relation to the Churches spread over the whole world, as the head is to its own members; from which Church whoso has cut himself off becomes an outcast from the Christian religion, since he has ceased to be in the same bonds of fellowship” (Hanc ergo ecclesiis toto orbe diffusis velut caput suorum certum est esse membrorum; a qua se quisquis abscedit, fit religionis Christianæ extorris, cum in eadem non cæperit esse compage. Epist. xiv. n. 1, Rufo, p. 57, Galland, ix.).

Theodoret: — “That most holy throne has the office of heading the Churches of the whole world” (Epist. cxvi. Renato). See Greek and context, supra, pp. 66, 67.

St. Prosper of Acquitaine, A.D. 429:—“Rome, the See
of Peter, . . . made to the world THE HEAD OF PASTORAL HONOUR, possesses by religion what it did not possess by arms” (Sedes Roma Petri, quæ pastoralis honoris facta caput mundo, quicquid non possidet armis, religione tenet. Carm. de Ingratiss, p. 106, Bibl. Max. Pat. tom. viii.).

In the General Council of Chalcedon, Paschasinus calls Rome, or its Bishop, “THE HEAD OF ALL THE CHURCHES” (κεφαλὴς ὑπαρχοντος πασῶν τῶν εκκλησιῶν. Act. i. p. 93, Labbe). One of the charges made against Dioscorus in this Council was, that he “HAD PRESUMED TO HOLD A COUNCIL WITHOUT THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTOLIC THRONE, WHICH HAS NEVER BEEN DONE OR LAWFUL TO DO” (ότερ ουδεποτε γεγονεν, οὑδε έξον γενεσθαι.1 Act. i. p. 94).

1 Pope Julius had long before (A.D. 342) written to the Eusebians:—“Are you ignorant that this has been the custom, for word to be written first to us, and so what is just to be decreed from this place?” (Epist. ad Euseb. n. 21, p. 13, Gall. v.). The Greek historian Socrates, A.D. 429, says:—“But neither was Julius present (at the Synod of Antioch), nor had he sent any one as his representative, although our ecclesiastical canon decrees that the Churches should not pass laws without consulting the Roman Bishop” (Hist. Eccles. ii. 8). Julius complained also that they had not invited him to their Synod: “When an ecclesiastical canon decrees that the Churches should not pass laws without consulting the Roman Bishop” (ib. ii. 17.) Sozomen, A.D. 440, gives Pope Julius’ answer to the Arian Bishops as follows—“It is a sacerdotal law that the things done contrary to the sentiment (γρωμη) of the Bishop of the Romans be looked upon as null” (Hist. Eccles. iii. c. 10).

Regarding the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which raised the See of Constantinople to the first Patriarchal rank after the Roman, Dollinger says that not only was it rejected by the Papal Legates and by the Pope, but also that “the Emperor Marcian surrendered it, and extolled the constancy of the Pontiff in maintaining the rights of the Church. The whole Western Church repudiated the canon, and the Greeks themselves, until the time of Photius, did not place it in their collections; hence Theodore Lector and John Scholasticus, who lived in the sixth century, enumerate only twenty-seven canons of the Council of Chalcedon” (Doll. Hist. of Ch. ii. p. 252). Writing to the Empress Pulcheria, St. Leo had declared that he, by his apostolic authority, altogether quashed the canon in question (Per auctoritatatem beati Petri apostoli generali prorsus definitione cassamus, &c., Epist. cv. c. 3); and the Patriarch Anatolius wrote to excuse himself, declaring that “the whole ground and confirmation of what had been done was reserved for your Blessedness” (Anatol. Epist. int. Leon. Ep. cvii.). “It,” the 28th canon, “was not the act of the Æcumeneal Council, but made after the Pope’s Legates had quitted the Church of St. Euphemia, and was subscribed by only 200 Bishops, a slender minority of the 600 or 630 who were assembled at Chalcedon.” See Dr. Husenbeth’s Faberism Exposed and Refuted (p. 199),—a most able reply to Faber’s “Difficulties of Romanism” (Pickering, London).
St. Leo the Great:—“These (Peter and Paul) O Rome, are they who have advanced thee to this glory, to be a holy nation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal city; that, by the See of blessed Peter, made the head of the universe, thou mightest rule more widely by divine religion than by earthly empire” (Per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres religione divina quam domitiatione terrena. Serm. lxxxii. in Natal. Apost. Pet. et Paul, n. 1, ed. Ball.). “The first of all the sees, . . . the head. . . . That See which the Lord appointed to preside over the rest” (Prima omnium Sedes, . . . quam ceteris omnium Dominus statuit præsidere. Epist. cxx. c. i. ad Theodoret. Episc. Cyr.). “Even amongst the most blessed Apostles, in likeness of honour there was a certain distinction of power; and whereas the election of all was equal, to one, nevertheless, was it given to be pre-eminent over the others. Out of which mould the distinction also among Bishops has arisen, and by a great ordering it was provided that all should not claim to themselves all things, but that in every province there should be one whose sentence should be accounted first amongst the brethren; and others, again, constituted in the greater cities, should undertake a wider care, through whom the care of the universal Church should flow together to the one See of Peter, and no part be anywhere at variance with its head” (Per quos ad unam Petri Sedem universalis Ecclesiae cura confluueret, et nihil usquam a suo capite desideret. Epist. xiv. ad Anastas. Thessal. Episc. c. ii).

Victor of Vite, A.D. 480:—“The Roman Church, which is the head of all the churches” (Ecclesia Romana, quae caput est omnium ecclesiarum. De Persecut. Afric. lib. iii. p. 682, Bibl. Max. viii.).

Pope Felix III., A.D. 490:—“The Apostolic See, by which, by Christ’s concession, the dignity of all priests is confirmed” (Epist. v. Flavit. Ep. Constantinop. n. 1). “The three hundred and eighteen Fathers assembled at Nicea referred the confirmation and authority
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of matters to the holy Roman Church" (Concil. Rom. ii. Labbe, iv. p. 1126).

St. Gelasius, Pope, A.D. 492:—"The canons themselves willed the appeals of the whole Church to be referred to the examination of this See. From it they decreed also that no appeal whatever ought to be made; and thereby that it judged of the whole Church, and that itself passed under the judgment of none. . . . Timothy of Alexandria, Peter of Antioch, Peter, Paul, John, not one, but many, bearing the name of the priesthood, were deposed by the sole authority of the Apostolic See. . . . The canons cannot summon the Apostolic See to judgment. . . . Therefore we are in no fear lest the Apostolic judgment be reversed, which both the voice of Christ and the tradition of the fathers, as also the authority of the canons support, in such wise that rather it always may judge the whole Church." (Epist. iv. Com- monitor ad Faustum, pp. 1169-1171, Labbe, iv.; and Epist. Rom. Pont. ed. Thiel, 1867, tom. i. p. 343, Epist. x. n. 5). "The first See both confirms every Synod by its authority, and guards by its continuous rule, by reason, to wit, of its supremacy, which, received by the Apostle Peter from the mouth of the Lord, the Church nevertheless seconding, it both always has held and retains. . . . We will not pass over in silence what every Church throughout the world knows, that the See of the blessed Apostle Peter has the right to absolve from what has been bound by the sentence of any prelates whatsoever, in that it has the right of judging of the whole Church; neither is it lawful for any one to pass judgment on its judgment, seeing that the canons have willed that it may be appealed to from any part of the world, but that from it no one be permitted to appeal" (Cuncta per mundum novit ecclesia, quoniam quorumlibet sententiiis ligata pontificum Sedes B. Petri Apostoli jus habeat resolvendi, utpote quæ de omni ecclesia fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare

**Council of Rome**, A.D. 494:—"The holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church has been raised above the other churches, not by any synodal decrees, but from the evangelic voice of our Lord and Saviour has it obtained the primacy,—He saying, 'Thou art Peter,'" &c. (Sancta Romana, Catholica et Apostolica Ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis caeteris ecclesiis praëtata est, sed evangelica voce Domini et Salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit, Tu es Petrus, inquentis, et super hanc petram, &c. *Gelasii Decret. de Script. Canon. Edit. in Concil. Rom. an. 494. Denzinger's Enchiridion*, p. 41, ed. 1874).

**St. Columbanus**, A.D. 608, in his Epistle to Pope Boniface IV., says:—"We are Irish, inhabitants of the furthermost part of the world, receiving nothing beyond the evangelic and apostolic doctrine. None of us has been a heretic, none a Jew, none a schismatic; but the faith, just as it was at first delivered by you, the successors, to wit, of the holy Apostles, is held unshaken. . . . Purity is to be reputed not to the stream, but to the fountain-head. . . . We are, as I said before, bound to the CHAIR OF PETER. For although Rome is great and illustrious, it is only through this chair that she is great and bright among us, . . . and if it can be said, on account of Christ's two Apostles (Peter and Paul), . . . You are almost heavenly, and Rome is the head of the churches of all the world, saving the singular prerogative of the place of the Lord's resurrection" (Fides, sicut a vobis primum sanctorum scilicet Apostolorum successoribus, tradita est, inconcussa tenetur . . . non rivo puritas, sed fonti reputanda est. . . . Nos enim, ut ante dixi, devincit sumus Cathedrae S. Petri: licet enim Roma magna est et vulgata, per istam Cathedram tantum apud nos est magna et clara, . . . et Roma orbis terrarum caput est ecclesiarum salva loci dominicae resurrectionis sin-

In the Second General Council of Nice A.D. 787, the letters of Pope Hadrian to Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, were read and approved. He says:—"Whose (Peter’s) See shines forth in primacy over the whole Church, and is head of all the Churches of God. Wherefore the same blessed Peter the Apostle, governing the Church by the command of the Lord, left nothing uncared for, but held everywhere, and holds, supreme authority" (οὐ δὲ θρόνος εἰς πασαν τὴν οἰκουμενὴν πρωτευον διαλαμπεῖ, καὶ κεφαλὴ πασῶν των εκκλησιων του Θεου ὑπαρχεῖ. . . τῷ τού κυρίου προσταγματι ποιμανῶν την εκκλησιαν, . . . ἐκράτησε παντοτε καὶ κρατεῖ την αρχην. *Epist. ad Taras. Labbe*, tom. vii. p. 125). Hadrian then requires Tarasius to adhere to "our apostolic See, which is the head of all the Churches of God" (τῷ ἡμετερῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ, ὡστε εστὶ κεφαλὴ πασῶν των εκκλησιων του Θεου. *Ib.*). The whole Synod cried out in acclamation: "The Holy Synod so believes, so is convinced, so defines."

3. The Roman Church teaches other Churches with Divine Authority—With it all other Churches must agree in Faith, since it is the Fountain of Truth for all Christians—it is the Root and Womb of the Catholic Church—Communion with whose Bishop is Communion with the Catholic Church—By Communion with this Church of Rome, i.e., with its Bishop, the Faithful throughout the World are preserved from Error, evince their Orthodoxy, and prove their Right to the Title of Catholics—In this Church Peter always Lives and Presides, and gives the Truth of Faith to those seeking it, &c.

St. Clement of Rome, Pope, A.D. 96:—"The Church of God which is at Rome to the Church of God which is at

1 This is the date now assigned by the best critics to St. Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians, written by him in the name of the Roman Church (it being the ancient custom to assemble the clergy on occasions of great importance,
Corinth. . . . Brethren, the sudden and unexpected dangers and calamities that have fallen upon us have, we fear, made us the more slow in our consideration of those things which you inquired of us; as also of that wicked and detestable sedition, so unbecoming the elect of God, which a few heady and self-willed men have fomented to such a degree of madness that your venerable and renowned name, so worthy of all men to be beloved, is greatly blasphemed thereby. . . . It is a shame, my beloved, yea, a very great shame, and unworthy of your Christian profession, to hear that the most firm and ancient Church of the Corinthians should, by one or two persons, be led into a sedition against its priests. And this report is come not only to us, but to those also that differ from us; inasmuch that the name of the Lord is blasphemed through your folly, and even ye yourselves are brought into danger by it. . . . Do ye, therefore, who laid the first foundation of and to act with their advice and concurrence; also to identify the Bishop and his Church in such acts, according to the saying of St. Cyprian, that "the Church is the people united with the priest and the flock following its pastor; whence you are to know that the Bishop is in the Church and the Church is in the Bishop," &c. Epist. lix. ad Fupian.), in reply to an appeal from the Church of Corinth, and for the purpose of repressing the schism that had broken out in that Church. St. Irenæus says:—"Under this Clement, then, there having happened no small dissension among the brethren who were at Corinth, the Church which is at Rome wrote a most powerful letter (καινωνια γραφὴν) to the Corinthians, gathering them together to peace, and repairing their faith, and announcing the tradition which it had so recently received from the Apostles" (Adv. Her. lib. iii. c. 3). Eusebius says:—"Of this Clement there is one acknowledged Epistle extant, a great and wonderful one, which he wrote as from the Church of the Romans to that of the Corinthians. This we know was publicly read in many of the Churches, both in former times and in our own; and that at that time a sedition disturbed those at Corinth, Iregessipus is a most trustworthy witness" (Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 16). A still earlier writer, Dionysius of Corinth, speaks of the custom of reading Pope Clement's and Pope Soter's Epistles publicly in the Churches. "To-day," he says, in his Epistle to Pope Soter, "we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your Epistle, in reading which we shall always have our minds stored with admonitions, as we shall also from that written unto us before by Clement" (Ap. Euseb. iv. 23).

The appeal of the Corinthians to the Roman Church was made, it should be observed, whilst the Apostle St. John was still living either at Patmos or Ephesus; and it is of itself a remarkable evidence and acknowledgment of that "more powerful headship" of the Roman Church of which St. Irenæus speaks, and of that "presidency in the covenant of love", which St. Ignatius had at a
this sedition, submit yourselves unto your priests, and be instructed unto repentance, bending the knees of your hearts. Learn to be subject, laying aside all proud and arrogant boasting of your tongues; for it is better for you to be found little, and approved in the sheepfold of Christ, than to seem to yourselves better than others, and be cast out of His fold. . . . IF 1 ANY DISOBEY THE WORDS SPOKEN BY GOD THROUGH US, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression and no small danger, but we shall be clear from this sin. . . . You will cause us joy and exultation if, OBEYING THE THINGS WRITTEN BY US THROUGH THE HOLY SPIRIT, you cut out the lawless passion of your jealousy, according to the intercession we have made for peace and concord in this letter. But we have sent faithful

still earlier period accounted as one of her prerogatives. See, on this subject, Mgr. FREPPEL’S Les Pères Apostoliques, p. 133 sqq.

ST. CLEMENT’S Epistle was, until lately, known only through a single MS.—the great ALEXANDRIAN MS., in 4 vols. folio, (the three first vols. containing the whole of the Old Testament in Greek, and the fourth the New Testament, with the two Epistles of Clement), which is said to have been written by Theckla, a noble Egyptian lady, about A.D. 350, and of which one leaf, containing about the tenth part of St. Clement’s Epistle, has been lost. Since the publication of the last edition of HIEFEL’s Patres Apostolici, in 1875, “an entirely new authority for the text of the Epistle has been gained by the discovery in the Library of the Holy Sepulchre at Fanari, in Constantinople, of a MS. containing an unmutilated text of the two Epistles ascribed to Clement. The discovery was made known, and the new authority first used in establishing the text, in a very careful and able edition of the Epistles by BRYENNIOΣ, Metropolitan of Serræ, published in Constantinople at the end of 1875. . . . Besides filling up small lacunae in the text of the older MS., it supplies the contents of the entire leaf which has been lost,” and, except for the trifling omission of one or two words, “we have the letter now as complete as it was originally in the Alexandrian MS.” (Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Liter. vol. i. pp. 557, 558). Shortly after this discovery it was announced that the University of Cambridge had procured by purchase a Syriac MS. containing a translation of the two Epistles of Clement. The Appendix to Professor LIGHTFOOT’S work on the Epistles of Clement of Rome contains the newly-recovered portion, with introduction, notes, and a translation of the whole Epistle.

1 Referring to the two following passages, DR. SALMON, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, whose translation has been adopted, says: “VERY NOTICEABLE IN THE NEW PART OF THE LETTER IS THE TONE OF AUTHORITY USED BY THE ROMAN CHURCH IN MAKING AN UNSOLICITED” (?) “INTERFERENCE WITH THE AFFAIRS OF ANOTHER CHURCH” (Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Liter. i. 558).
and discreet men, who have walked from youth to old age unblamably amongst us, who shall be witnesses between us and you. This have we done, that you may know that all our care has been and is that you may speedily be at peace” (Epist. i. ad Cor. c. 1, 47, 57, 58).

St. Ignatius, A.D. 107, writes to “the presiding” Church of Rome:—“I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. . . . Ye have taught others. I would, therefore, that those things may be firmly established which teaching you have commanded” (ἡ εκκλησία . . . ἴτις καὶ προκαθηταὶ . . . αλλοὺς εἰδιδάσατε. Ἐγώ δὲ θέλω, ὅνα κύκλου βεβαιά ἡ ἄ μαθητεύοντες εὐτελέσθε. . . . ὁ δὲ ὁς Πέτρος καὶ Παύλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν. Epist. ad Rom. n. 3, 4).

St. Irenæus, A.D. 178:—“Wherefore, in every Church there is, for all who may wish to see what things are true, at hand to look unto, the tradition of the Apostles made manifest throughout the whole world; and we have it in our power to enumerate those who were by the Apostles instituted Bishops in the Churches, and the successors of those Bishops down to ourselves, who neither taught nor knew anything like the wild opinions of these men. For if the Apostles had known any hidden mysteries, which they taught apart and secretly from others to the perfect, they would have delivered them more especially to those to whom also they committed the Churches themselves. For they wished those to be very perfect and blameless in all things whom also they left as successors, delivering unto them their own post of government (quos et successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes), who, acting faithfully, great usefulness would be the result, but falling, a great calamity.

“But, as it would be a very long task to enumerate in such a volume as this the successions of all the Churches; pointing out that tradition which the greatest and most ancient and universally known Church—founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul—derives from the Apostles, and that faith announced to (all) men, which through the succession of her Bishops has
COME DOWN TO US, WE CONFOUND ALL THOSE WHO IN ANY WAY, WHETHER THROUGH CAPRICE OR VANGLORY, OR BLINDNESS OR PERVERSE OPINION, GATHER (OR ASSEMBLE) OTHERWISE THAN IT BEHOVETH. FOR WITH THIS CHURCH, ON ACCOUNT OF HER MORE POWERFUL HEADSHIP (OR SUPREMACY), IT IS NECESSARY THAT EVERY CHURCH, THAT IS, THE FAITHFUL EVERYWHERE DISPERSED, SHOULD AGREE (OR BE IN COMMUNION); IN WHICH (IN COMMUNION WITH WHICH) CHURCH HAS ALWAYS BEEN PRESERVED BY THE FAITHFUL DISPERSED THAT TRADITION WHICH IS FROM THE APOSTLES” (c. 2).

“The blessed Apostles, therefore, having founded and built up that Church, committed the sacred office of the Episcopate unto Linus, of whom Paul makes mention in his Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, to Clement is allotted the Episcopacy.”¹ He gives the whole succession down to Eleutherus, who “now, in the twelfth place, holds the inheritance of the Episcopate from the Apostles;” and concludes:—“BY THIS SAME ORDER, AND BY THIS SAME SUCCESSION, BOTH THAT TRADITION WHICH IS IN THE CHURCH FROM THE APOSTLES AND THE PREACHING OF THE TRUTH HAVE COME DOWN TO US. AND THIS IS A MOST FULL DEMONSTRATION THAT IT IS ONE AND THE SAME LIFE-GIVING FAITH WHICH IS PRESERVED IN THE CHURCH FROM THE APOSTLES, AND HANDED DOWN IN TRUTH” (Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriissimis duobus

¹ This is the order given also by Hegesippus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, as well as in the ancient Canon of the Roman Mass ("Lini, Cleti, Clementis"), which expresses the earliest traditions of the Roman Church. The Chronicle of St. Hippolytus, as before remarked, "counts Peter as first Bishop of Rome" (Dict of Christ. Biog. and Liter. i. p. 577), but reckons Clement as his second successor (Ib. p. 554), which order was adopted by Optatus, Augustine, and several other Latin Fathers. Dollinger remarks that the consentient statements of the first-named writers—confirmed as they are by the ancient Canon of the Roman Mass—"are of the most reliable kind," and "infinitely more trustworthy" than the lists in which Clement is placed before Cletus (First Age of the Church, 2d edit. p. 298. See also Dict of Christ. Biog. and Liter. p. 555).
Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatae et constitutæ Ecclesiae cam, quam habet ab Apostolis, traditionem et announced hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quouomodo, vel per sibi placentiam vel vanam gloriam vel per ceccitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet, colligunt. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potentio sim principalitem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio. Θεμελιωσαντες ουν και οικοδομησαντες οι μακαριοι αποστολοι την εκκλησιαν, Διω την της επισκοπης λειτουργιαν ενεχειρισαν . . . Τη αυτη ταξει και τη αυτη διαδοχη γητε απο των αποστολων εν τη εκκλησια παραδοσις και το της αληθειας κηρυγμα κατηγρικεν εις ημας. Et est plenissima haec ostensio, unam etandemque vivificatricem fideem esse, quæ in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate. Adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 2, 3; et ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 6).

"In order to confound all heretics," says MASSUET, "Irenæus deemed it sufficient to appeal to the ROMAN Church's

1 With regard to the word ""CONVENIRE," which has been rendered "RESORT TO," "AGREE WITH," "BE IN COMMUNION WITH," it may be observed that Irenæus uses a similar phrase in lib. iii. c. 40:—"Quoi non CONCURRUNT ad Ecclesiam." Convenire is used by the Vet. Interp. for συμφωνεων (Acts xv. 15) in lib. iii. c. 12, n. 14; and again, in the sense of "TO HARMONISE," "AGREE WITH," in lib. iv. c. 33. That in the passage above quoted, St. Irenæus spoke of the necessity of other Churches concurring in doctrine and faith with the Roman Church, is admitted by the Protestant SALMIASUS:—"Necesse est, dicit, omnem Ecclesiam convenire ad Romanam, id est, ut Graece locutus fuerat Irenæus, συμβαινων προς την των Ρωμαων εκκλησιαν, quod significat: CONVENIRE ET CONCORDARE IN REBUS FIDEI ET DOCTRINÆ CUM ROMANÀ ECCLESIA (De Primatu Pæpe, c. 5, p. 65). With Salmiassis agree the German Protestants THIERSCH and STIEREN. Compare St. Ambrose's words cited in p. 94.

The words "in quod (Ecclesiæ)" are rendered by MOHLER "for through it," and by DOLLINGER (Hist. of Ch. Eng. trans. i. 256) "in which communion." HIERGENRÖTHER remarks that the word "in" is to be taken in the ecclesiastical sense of the Greek preposition ἐν, and can thus be rendered "in her bosom," "in her communion," or "through her," "by virtue of her." Compare the Biblical and Patristic expressions ἐν κυριω, ἐν Θεω, ἐν τοιῳ κρατεσωται, &c. The translator of Irenæus often uses "in" for "per." "Salutem in eo (Christo) dedit hominibus" (lib. iii. c. 12, n. 4); "Ut quod perdideramus in Adam, hoc in Christo recuperemus" (c. 18, n. 1); "In Christo universa bene dictio" (lib. iv. c. 21, n. 3), &c.
tradition, preserved therein by the unbroken succession of her Bishops; rightly judging that, by the ascertainment of her tradition, the tradition and doctrine of all other Churches would forthwith be at once learned also. For, since the Roman Church is the chief, head, and first of all; the greatest, and most ancient, and most renowned; founded by St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and his companion St. Paul; the Church which by its own right presides and rules over all the rest, and with which it is necessary that all the faithful should be united by the bonds of one and the same faith and communion; it is thence clearly evident that the faith and tradition of the other Churches could not but be in accordance with that of the Roman Church. Passing by, therefore, the Episcopal successions in all the Churches of the world, it is enough to recount the unbroken succession in that Church only, and to declare the Apostolic tradition which has flowed down to us through that channel, in order that, by the common judgment and tradition of all the Churches—bound as they are to agree with this Roman Church—all heretics may be utterly vanquished."

It is quite incredible that St. Irenæus should have attributed the superiority of the Roman Church, and her freedom from error, to "the circumstance of the pure tradition being guarded and maintained there through the constant concourse of the faithful from all countries" (Janus, p. 87); for in this case Rome must have learnt her doctrine from other Churches, not other Churches from Rome; and, again, the heretics, against whom he was arguing, would certainly not have granted that Rome must have—and still less "always" have—the true Apostolic tradition, because of the fortuitous concourse of Christians to the imperial city. "In Rome," says Milman, "every heresy, almost every heresiarch, found welcome reception. . . . They were all strangers and foreigners; not one of all these systems originated in Rome, in Italy, or in Africa. On all these opinions the Bishop of Rome was almost compelled to sit in judgment; he must receive or reject, authorise or condemn; he was a proselyte whom it
would be the ambition of all to gain."¹ (Hist. of Lat. Christ. b. i. c. 1, vol. i. pp. 38, 39). If, then, heretics, as well as Catholics, thus flocked to Rome, what security would such a concourse afford that the Roman Church would not be infected with their errors? It is, evidently, to the tradition and faith of the Bishops² of Rome, endowed with special prerogatives,

¹ Tertullian, himself a Montanist, shows very clearly what importance he attached to Pope Victor's recognition of Montanus, when he says of Praxeas: "This man prevailed on the Bishop of Rome, who was on the point of acknowledging (jam agnoscentem) the prophecies of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and by that acknowledgment bringing in peace to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia (et ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesiis Asie et Phrygiae inferentem). . . . to revoke the letters of peace already sent out," &c. (Adv. Praxeam, c. 1).

² "It was natural," says Dr. Newman, "for Christians to direct their course in matters of doctrine by the guidance of mere floating, and, as it were, endemic, tradition, while it was fresh and strong; but in proportion as it languished, or was broken in particular places, did it become necessary to fall back upon its special homes, first the Apostolic Sees, and then the See of Peter" (Essay on Develop. of Doct. p. 167). "In the Catholic Church it was always an article of faith that our Lord, by the assistance and guidance of His Holy Spirit, preserved the whole Church, in her collective capacity, from falling into error in her dogmatic teaching. But it was also a point of belief, which may be traced up to the Apostolic age, that in the administration of this teaching authority, the See of St. Peter held a supreme office; that it was the centre of ecclesiastical operations, if we may use such a term; that apart from it there would be no genuine orthodoxy, no true Catholicity; and that in all the great controversies which from time to time divided the Christian world, the most crucial test of truth was the adherence to any dogma by the See of Peter" (Union Review, May 1875). Tertullian says:—"Now what the Apostles preached, i.e., what Christ revealed unto them, I will here also rule must be proved in no other way than by those same Churches which the Apostles themselves founded, themselves by preaching to them, as well vivē vocē, as men say, as by epistles afterwards. If these things be so, it is in like degree manifest that all doctrine which agrees with the Apostolic Churches, the wombs and originals of the faith, must be accounted true, as without doubt containing that which the Churches have received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; but that every doctrine must be judged at once to be false which savoureth things contrary to the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God. . . . We have communion with the Apostolic Churches because we have no doctrine differing from them. This is the evidence of truth" (Communicamus cum Ecclesiis Apostolicis, quod nulla doctrina diversa. Hoc est testimonium veritatis. De Præscript. Heret. c. 21). "Come now, thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, run over the Apostolic Churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles to this very day preside over their own places, in which their own authentic writings are read, echoing the voice, and making the face of each present. Is Achaia near to thee? thou hast Corinth. . . . But if thou art near to Italy, thou
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and empowered to require the assent and standard of obedience of all, that Irenæus appeals as the chief rule and standard of orthodoxy for all Christians; and therefore, after giving a list of her Bishops down to his own time, he concludes: "By this same order, and by this same succession, have the tradition of the Apostles and the preaching of the truth come down to us. And this is a most full demonstration that it is one and the same faith which is preserved in the Church," &c.¹

"St. Irenæus," says Hergenröther, "does not appeal to the journeys to Rome, but to the succession of Bishops. And as

hast Rome, whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church—how happy!—on which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood, . . . let us see what she hath learned, what taught, what tokens of doctrine she has sent to the Churches of Africa" (Habels Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. Ista quam felix Ecclesie! Cui totam doctrinan Apostoli cum sanguine suo profunde-runt . . . Videamus quid didicerit, quid docuerit, quid cum Africanis Ecclesiis contessersit. ib. c. 36). "Let them (the heretics) make known the origins of their Churches, let them unroll the catalogue of their Bishops, so coming down by succession from the beginning, that their first Bishop had for his author (ordainer) and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or of apostolic men, so he were one that continued steadfast with the Apostles. For in this manner do the Apostolic Churches reckon their origin (or their registries of succession); as the Church of the Smyrneans recounts that Polycarp was placed there by John, as that of the Romans does that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter; just as the rest also show those whom, being appointed by the Apostles to the Episcopate, they have as transmitters of the Apostolic seed. Let the heretics counterfeit something like this" (ib. c. 32). Like Irenæus and Tertullian, SS. Optatus, Augustine, and Epiphanius, when writing against heretics and schismatics, appeal to the succession of Bishops in the Roman See, of whom they give complete catalogues, down to their own contemporaries. St. Epiphanius concludes in words similar to those of Irenæus:—"And let no one wonder that we have thus diligently gone through each of these matters; for by means of these the manifest truth is for ever pointed out" (Καὶ μὴ τις ἀχαμαγε ὅτι ἐκαστα οὐτως ακριβος διηλθομεν' δια τον τούτων αι το σαφες δεικνυα. Adv. Her. n. 27).

¹ With this passage of Irenæus should be compared another, evidently having reference to it, in lib. iv. c. 43:—"It behoves us to obey those pastors who hold succession from the Apostles, as we have shown, who, with the episcopal succession, have received the sure grace of truth, according to the good-will of the Father" (qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum . . . acce-perunt). "But the rest, who depart from the principal succession" (qui a principali successione absistunt), in whatever place they assemble" (colligunt: comp. the words in iii. 3. "Præterquam oportet colligunt," and St. Jerome's words to Pope Damasus: "Quicunque tecum non colligit, spargit"), "we ought to hold suspected as heretics, and of evil opinion, or as schismatics," &c.
it would be too long to number the succession of Bishops in all the Churches, he gives a short and sufficient way of proceeding; for he says that, to put false teachers to shame, it suffices to 'declare the tradition received from the Apostles by the greatest Church, the most ancient, the most conspicuous, and founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, and to declare the faith announced to men by this Church, coming to us even by the succession of Bishops.' His argument is as follows: If the faith of the Roman Church has remained pure, the faith of other Churches must have remained so. For all Churches universally acknowledge the duty of remaining in harmony with the Church of Rome; and if we know the faith of the Roman Church, we know that of all others. Finally, after enumerating the successors of St. Peter, he says that through this succession the doctrine of the Apostles has reached us, and that we have by it the fullest assurance that the ancient faith will continue unchanged" (Cath. Church and Christ. State, Eng. trans. vol. i. p. 96).

It may be added, that St. Irenæus himself illustrates his statement, regarding the Roman Church's headship and authority over other Churches, by referring to the exercise of her prerogatives in regard to the far distant and Apostolic Church of THE CORINTHIANS, to which, under the circumstances already detailed, "The Church which is at Rome," he says, "wrote a most powerful letter, GATHERING THEM TOGETHER TO PEACE, AND REPAIRING THEIR FAITH, AND ANNOUNCING THE TRADITION WHICH IT HAD SO RECENTLY RECEIVED FROM THE APOSTLES" (Επεστείλει ἑν Ρωμαίοις)

1 One of the latest Protestant writers on the life and writings of Irenæus, Ziegler, says: "To the mind of Irenæus, it is the Episcopate which sanctions the rule of faith, not vice versa. With him, as with Cyprian, the highest ecclesiastical office is inseparable from orthodox doctrine. . . . He makes the preservation of tradition, and the presence of the Holy Ghost with the Church, dependent upon the Bishops, who in legitimate succession represent the Apostles, and . . . this manifestly because he wants at any price to have a guarantee for the unity of the visible Church. This striving after unity appears in the most striking way in that passage (iii. 3, 2) where he passes, as if in a prophetic spirit, beyond himself, and anticipates the Papal Church of the future" (Ziegler, Irenäus der Bischof von Lyon, Berlin, 1871). See Anglicanism and the Fathers, p. 7.
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Very similar to the "in quâ semper," &c., of Irenæus (see n. in p. 86) is the expression of

St. Optatus, of Milevis:—"That in THAT ONE CHAIR (established by Peter, the head of all the Apostles, in Rome) UNITY MIGHT BE PRESERVED BY ALL, . . . and that he might be at once condemned as a schismatic and a sinner who against that pre-eminent Chair should place another. Therefore, in that one chair, which is the first of the prerogatives, Peter sat first; to whom succeeded Linus; to Linus succeeded Clement." He gives the whole succession down to "Siricius, who is at this day associated with us, WITH WHOM THE WHOLE WORLD IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH US IN THE ONE BOND OF COMMUNION, BY THE INTERCOURSE OF LETTERS OF PEACE" (Igitur negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est: in quâ und Cathedrâ unitas ab omnibus servâretur, ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent; ut jam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram collocaret. Ergo Cathedram uniam, quæ est prima de dotibus, sedit prior Petrus: cui successit Linus, . . . Damaso Siricius, hodie qui noster est socius: cum quo nobiscum totus orbis commercio formaturum in una communiois societate concordat. De Schism. Donat. lib. ii. c. 2, 3, pp. 76, 77, ed. Hurter). "Of the aforesaid prerogatives, then, THE CHAIR IS, AS WE HAVE SAID, THE FIRST, WHICH WE HAVE PROVED IS OURS THROUGH PETER, and this mark carries with it the angel (lawful bishop or jurisdiction). . . . Understand, then, that you are ungodly children; that you are branches broken off from the tree; that you are tendrils cut off from the vine; that you are a stream separated from the fountain-head. For a stream which is small and does not spring from itself cannot be a fountain source; nor a lopped branch be a tree, since a tree flourishes resting on its
own roots, but a branch that is cut off withers. Seest thou, now, brother Parmenianus, . . . that thou hast fought against thyself? Whereas it has been proved that we are in the holy Catholic Church; . . . and THROUGH THE CHAIR OF PETER WHICH IS OURS, THROUGH IT THE OTHER PREROGATIVES ARE OURS ALSO” (Igitur de dotibus supradictis Cathedra est (ut diximus) prima, quam probavimus per Petrum nostram esse, quæ ducit ad se angelum. Ib. c. 6, p. 87. Probatum est nos esse in ecclesia sancta Catholica, . . . et per Cathedram Petri, quæ nostra est, per ipsam et ceteras dotes apud nos esse. Ib. c. 9, p. 91). Also of the celebrated

**Formula of Pope Hormisdas**, which was subscribed, A.D. 519, by the Eastern Emperor, Patriarchs, and Bishops, and confirmed, A.D. 869, by the Fathers of the **Eighth General Council**:—“IN THE APOSTOLIC SEE THE CATHOLIC RELIGION HAS ALWAYS BEEN KEPT UNDEFILED AND HER HOLY DOCTRINE PROCLAIMED. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be IN THE ONE COMMUNION WITH YOU WHICH THE APOSTOLIC SEE PREACHES, IN WHICH IS THE ENTIRE AND TRUE SOLIDITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION: promising also that the names of those who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church, THAT IS, NOT CONSENTIEN WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE, shall not be recited during the sacred mysteries. This my profession, I have subscribed with my own hand, and delivered to you Hormisdas, the holy and venerable Pope of the city of Rome” (In sede Apostolica immaculata est semper servata religio. . . . Sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam sedem et prædicantes ejus omnia constituta, spero, ut in una communione vobiscum quam sedes Apostolica prædicat, esse merear, in quæ est integra et verax Christianæ religionis soliditas. Form. Hormisd. Episc. Orient. Prescript. Denzinger’s Enchirid. p. 42, ed. 1874).

**St. Cyprian** calls Rome “The Chair of Peter and the ruling Church, WHENCE THE UNITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD HAS ITS SOURCE, AND TO WHICH HERETICAL PERFIDY
CANNOT GAIN ACCESS” (Epist. lix. ad Cornel.) V. supra p. 59.
Writing to the same Pope, he says: “I exhorted all that went from hence (to Rome), that they should own and hold to the root and matrix¹ of the Catholic Church” (Ut Ecclesiae Catholicae radicem et matricem agnoscerent et tenerent); and tells him that he had procured a general letter from the African Bishops “that they should all own him and his communion, that is, the unity and charity of the Catholic Church” (Ut te universi collegae nostri et communicationem tuam id est, Catholicae ecclesiae unitatem pariter et caritatem probarent firmiter ac tenerent. Epist. xliv. ed. Baluz., et Ep. xlviii. p. 94, ed. Goldh.). In his epistle to Antonianus, he tells him that a letter was written to Pope Cornelius “to let him know that you were in his communion, that is, in the communion of the Catholic Church” (Ut sciret te secum hoc est cum Catholica Ecclesia communicare.² Epist. lii. ed. Baluz. lv. p. 104, ed. Goldh.).

¹ “The root and the mother” (radicis et matris. Epist. xliii. Baluz. xlv. Goldh.). Compare St. Augustine’s words to the Donatists:—“You know what the Catholic Church is, and what it is to be cut off from the vine: if there be any among you prudent, let them come, let them live on the root. . . . Come, my brethren, if you desire to be engrafted on the vine. It is a pity to see you thus lying lopped off from the tree. Number the Bishops from the very See of Peter, and observe the succession of every father in that order: it is the rock against which the proud gates of hell prevail not” (In Ps. Cont. Part. Donat. tom. ix. p. 49).

The Irish Bishops, quoted by St. Cummian, in his Epistle on the Paschal question, A.D. 634, call Rome, “The source of our Baptism and Wisdom;” and that writer adds that, “in accordance with the Synodical decree, that when causes were of great moment they should be referred to the head of cities, our seniors judged it proper to send wise and humble men to Rome, as children to their mother,” &c. (Velut natos ad matrem. Epist. ad Sagien. ap. Usher, Syllog. Epist.

² The Protestant historian of the Church, Mosheim, avows that the principles laid down by St. Irenæus and St. Cyprian lead naturally to the admission of a central authority, such as is ascribed to the See of Peter, and alleges that they were too simple-minded and short-sighted to understand the consequences! “Cyprian and the rest cannot have known the corollaries which follow from their precepts about the Church. For no one is so blind as not to see that between a certain unity of the Universal Church, terminating in the Roman Pontiff, and such a community as we have described out of Irenæus and Cyprian, there is scarcely so much room as between hall and chambers or between hand and fingers” (Mos. Dissert. Theologico-Hist. de Gallorum Appell. ad Concil. Univ. Ecc. &c., sec. xiii.).
St. Ambrose, in similar language, declares union with the Roman See to be union with the Catholic Church. Speaking of his brother Satyrus, who had arrived, after shipwreck, in a place of doubtful orthodoxy, he says:—"He called the Bishop to him, and not accounting any grace true which was not of the true faith, he inquired of him whether he agreed with the Catholic Bishops, that is, with the Roman Church" (Percontatusque ex eo est, utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est cum Romanâ Ecclesiâ conveniret. De Excessa Frat. n. 46, tom. ii. p. 1126). "From this Church" (of Rome), as he elsewhere declares, "the rights of venerable communion flow unto all" (Inde enim in omnes venerandæ communionis jura dimanant. Epist. xi. n. 4).

St. Jerome:—"What does he (Ruffinus) call his faith? That which is the strength of the Roman Church, or that which is in the volumes of Origen? If he answer, 'the Roman,' then are we Catholics, who have borrowed nothing from Origen's error" (Fidem suam quam vocat? Eamne, quà Romana pollet Ecclesia? . . . Si Romanam respondet ergo Catholici sumus. Adv. Ruffin. i. 4, tom. ii. p. 461). To Demetriade he says: "When you were a little child, and Bishop Anastasius of holy and blessed memory ruled the Roman Church, a fierce tempest from parts of the East tried to defile the simplicity of that faith which was praised by the voice of the Apostle. But that man of the wealthiest poverty and of Apostolic solicitude at once struck down the noxious head and silenced the sibilant mouth of that hydra. And because I have learnt that, in certain places, the venomous plants still live and put forth shoots, I think that I ought to give you this warning, that you hold fast the faith of holy Innocent, who is both the successor and the son of the aforesaid man, and of the apostolic chair; nor, however prudent and wise you may seem to yourself, receive any strange doctrine" (Illud te pio caritatis affectu præmonendum puto, ut S. Innocentii, qui Apostolicæ Cathedræ successor est, teneas fudem; nec peregrinam, quatenus tibi prudent callidaque videaris, doctrinam recipias. Epist. cxxx. ad
Demetriad. n. 16). Writing to Pope Damasus, he says: “Since the East tears into pieces the Lord’s coat, and foxes lay waste the vineyard of Christ, so that among broken cisterns, though hold no water, it is difficult to understand where is the sealed fountain and the enclosed garden: therefore have I thought that I should consult the Chair of Peter, and the faith praised by the mouth of the Apostle. . . . Wherefore, though your greatness terrifies me, yet your kindness invites me. . . . Let us speak without offence; I court not the Roman height;¹ I speak with the successor of the fisherman, and the disciple of the cross. I, following none as the first but Christ, am linked in communion with thy blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. Upon that rock I know that the Church is built. Whoso shall eat the Lamb outside this house is profane. If any be not in the ark of Noah, he will perish when the deluge prevails. . . . I know not Vitalis, Miletius I reject, I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whoso gathereth not with thee, scattereth, that is, he who is not of Christ, is of Antichrist” (Ideo mihi Cathedram Petri, et fidem Apostolico ore laudatum, censui consulendam. . . . Tanquam igitur tui me terreat magnitudo, invitat tamen humanitas. . . . Faccias at invidia: Romani culminis recedat ambitio: cum successor piscatoris, et discipulo crucis loquor. Ego, nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, Beatitudini tuae, id est, Cathedrae Petri, communione consocior: super illam petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit profanus est. Si quis in arca Noe non fuerit, peribit regnante diluvio. . . . Non novi Vitalem, Miletium respuo, ignoror Paulinum. Quicumque tectum non colligit, spargit:² hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. Epist. xv. ad Damas. tom. i. p. 38).

¹ “Envy avaunt; away with the pride of the topmost dignity of Rome” (Waterworth’s Faith of Cath. ii. p. 78).

² Comp. St. Cyprian’s words: “There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one Chair, founded by the voice of the Lord upon a rock. . . . Whosoever gathereth elsewhere, scattereth” (Cathedra una, super petram Domini voce fundata. . . . Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Epist. xl. p. 85, ed. Goldh.).
St. Peter Chrysologus:—"Blessed Peter, who LIVES AND
PRESIDES IN HIS OWN SEE, GIVES THE TRUE FAITH TO
THOSE WHO SEEK IT. For we, in our solicitude for truth
and faith, CANNOT WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE ROMAN
CHURCH, HEAR CAUSES OF FAITH" (*Epist. ad Eutech*). See
context and note in p. 56.

St. Augustine and other African Bishops, writing to
Pope Innocent I. to solicit his confirmation of two Councils
(of Carthage and Milevis), in which the Pelagian heresy had
been condemned, say: "We do not pour back our *streamlet*
for the purpose of increasing your great *FOUNTAIN*; but . . .
we wish it to be decided by you WHETHER OUR STREAM,
HOWEVER SMALL, FLOWS FORTH FROM THAT SAME HEAD OF
RIVERS WHENCE COMES YOUR OWN ABUNDANCE; and by
your answers to be consoled respecting our common partici-
pation of grace" (Non enim rivulum nostrum tam largo
fonti angendo refundimus, sed . . . utrum etiam noster licet
exiguo ex eodem quo etiam tuus abundans emanet capite
fluentorum, hoc a te probari volumus, tuisque rescriptis . . .

Pope Innocent, in his reply, A.D. 416, praises the COUNCIL
OF CARTHAGE, that, "keeping to the precedents of ancient
tradition, and mindful of the discipline of the Church, you
have, in your examination of the things of God, . . . estab-
ilished in an undeniable manner the firmness of your religion,
no less now in consulting (U8), than when you previously
passed sentence; approving, as you have done, of a reference
to our judgment, KNOWING WHAT IS DUE TO THE APOSTOLIC
SEE (scientes quid Apostolicae Sedi debeatur), since all We
who are set in this place desire to follow that Apostle from
whom the very Episcopate and all the authority of this title
sprung (a quo ipse Episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus
emersit). Following whom, we both know how to condemn
what is evil, and to approve of what is commendable. And
this, too, that, guarding by your priestly office the institutions
of the Fathers, ye resolve that these regulations should not
be trodden under foot, which they, in pursuance of no human
but a DIVINE sentence, have decreed, viz., that whatever was
being carried on, although in the most distant and remote provinces, should not be accounted as terminated until it had come to the knowledge of this see; by the full authority of which the just sentence should be confirmed, and that thence all other churches might derive (that they may proceed, like as all waters, from their own parent spring, and the pure streams of an uncorrupted fountain-head may flow throughout the divers regions of the whole world) what to order, whom to cleanse," &c. (Quod illi non humana, sed divina decrevere sententia, ut quidquid quamvis de disjunctis remotisque provinciis ageretur, non prius ducerent finiendum, nisi ad hujus Sedis notitiam perveniret: ut tota hujus auctoritate justa quae fuerit pronunciatio firmaretur; indeque suerent ceteræ Ecclesiae (vel ut de natali suo fonte aquæ cunctæ procederent, et per diversas totius mundi regiones puri latices capitis incorrupti manarent) quid præcipere, quos abluere, &c. Epist. xxix. Episc. Concil. Carth. Galland, viii. p. 599).

To the council of milevis he says:—"Diligently, therefore, and congruously do you consult the secret treasures (arcana) of the apostolic dignity (that dignity, I mean, on which, beside those things that are without, the care of all the churches falls) as to what judgment is to be passed on doubtful matters; following therein the form of the ancient rule, which, you know as well as I, has been preserved always in the whole world (quam toto semper ab orbe mecum nostis esse servatam). . . . You know that, throughout all the provinces, answers to questions always emanate from the apostolic spring. Especially, as often as matters of faith are under discussion, I am of opinion that all our brethren and fellow-bishops ought only to refer to peter, that is to the author of their name and honour, even as your affection has now referred, for what may benefit all churches in common throughout the whole world. For the authors of these evils must needs be more cautious, on seeing themselves, upon the report of two synods, separated from
the communion of the Church by the decree of our sentence. . . . Wherefore we do, by the authority of the Apostolic power, declare Cælestius and Pelagius . . . deprived of the communion of the Church” (Scientes quod per omnes provincias de apostolico fonte petentibus responsa semper emanent. Praesertim quoties fidei ratio ventilatur, arbitror omnes fratres et coepiscopos nostros nonnisi ad Petrum, id est, sui nominis et honoris auctorem referre debere, velut nunc retulit vestra dilectio, quod per totum mundum possit ecclesiis omnibus in commune prodesse, &c. Epist. xxx. ad Conc. Milev. n. 2, 6, pp. 602, 603).

It was in these declarations of Pope Innocent that St. Augustine declared:—“He answered to all as was right, and as it became the Prelate of the Apostolic See” (ad omnia ille rescripts, eodem modo, quo fas erat atque oportebat Apostolicae Sedis Antistitem. Epist. clxxxvi. n. 2, p. 997); and again:—“Already (the decisions of) two Councils have been sent to the Apostolic See; whence also replies have been received. The cause is ended; would that the error may presently terminate likewise” (Inde rescripta venerunt: causa finita est. Serm. cxxxi. n. 10, p. 930). See the remarks of Milman and Neander in note to p. 63.

Three Councils of Africa, in their Synodical letter sent to Pope Theodore, and read in the Council of Rome under Martin I, A.D. 646:—“No one can doubt that there is in the Apostolic See a great unfailing fountain, pouring forth waters for all Christians; whence rich streams proceed, bountifully irrigating the whole Christian world; to which See also, in honour of blessed

1 “St. Augustine, who so often appeals to the orbis terrarum, sometimes adopts a more prompt criterion. He tells certain Donatists to whom he writes, that the Catholic Bishop of Carthage was able to make light of the thronging multitude of his enemies, when he found himself by letters of credence joined both to the Roman Church, in which ever had flourished the principality of the Apostolic See, and to the other lands whence the gospel came to Africa itself” (Epist. xlîii. n. 7). Newman’s Essay on Develop. p. 280.

2 St. Columbanus, speaking for the Early Irish Church, says to Pope Boniface IV:—“Our purity is to be reputed not to the stream, but to the
Peter, the decrees of the Fathers gave special veneration in searching out the things of God, which ought by all means to be carefully examined; and above all, and justly, by THE APOSTOLIC HEAD OF BISHOPS (præsulum vertice Apostolico), whose care from of old it is, as well to condemn evils as to commend the things that are to be praised. For by the ancient discipline it is ordained that WHATSOEVER BE DONE, EVEN IN PROVINCES REMOTE AND AFAR OFF, SHALL NEITHER BE TREATED OF NOR ACCEPTED, UNLESS IT BE FIRST BROUGHT TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF YOUR AUGUST SEE, SO THAT A JUST SENTENCE MAY BE CONFIRMED BY ITS AUTHORITY, AND THAT THE OTHER CHURCHES MAY THENCE RECEIVE THE ORIGINAL PREACHING AS FROM ITS NATIVE SOURCE, AND THAT THE MYSTERIES OF SAVING FAITH MAY REMAIN IN UNCORRUPT PURITY THROUGHOUT THE VARIOUS REGIONS OF THE WORLD” (Magnum et indificientem omnibus Christianis fluentam redundantem apud Apostolicam Sedem consistere fontem nullus ambigere potest, de quo rivuli prodeunt afluenter, universam largissime irrigantes orbem terrarum. . . . Antiquis enim regulis sanctum est, ut quidquid quamvis in remotis, vel in longinquos positis ageretur provincis, non prius tractandum vel accipienda sit, nisi ad notitiam almar Sedis vestrae fuisset deductum, ut hujus auctoritate justa quae fuisset pronunciatio, firmaretur, indeque suerent ceteræ Ecclesiae velut de natali suo fonte praedicationis exordium, et per diversas totius mundi regiones puritatis incorruptæ maneant fidei sacramenta salutis.¹ Labbe, Concil. tom. viii. p. 131, ed. Venet. 1729).


¹ A host of testimonies from later writers will be found in the works of BALERINI, SCHRADER, and others. It may suffice to quote here the following:—

ACLUIN:—“That he may not be found to be a schismatic or non-Catholic, LET HIM FOLLOW THE MOST TRUSTWORTHY AUTHORITY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH; . . . THAT THE MEMBERS BE NOT SEPARATED FROM THEIR HEAD: that the bearer of the keys of the heavenly kingdom may not reject them as having deviated from his doctrines” (Alc. Epist. lxx).

ST. BERNARD:—“It behoves us to make known to your Apostleship all the dangers and scandals that spring up in the kingdom of God, especially such as
Union with the See of Peter.

concern faith; for I think it right that the wounds of the faith should there in the first place be healed, when faith can know no defect. For this is the prerogative of that See.” Prol. Epist. cxviii. ad Innoc. ii. cont. error. Abelard.

Sergius, Metropolitan of Cyprus. (See p. 66, note.)

Theodore the Studite calls the Roman See “the See of the Coryphæus, the See in which Christ has deposited the keys of faith, and from which we are to receive the certainty of faith” (κάκειθεν [ἀπὸ τῆς Ρωμῆς] τὸ ἀσφαλὲς δεχομαι τῆς πιστεως. (See Epist. lxiii. ad Naucrat. Migne, vol. xcix. p. 1281, Epist. cxxix. ad Leon. p. 1420).
PAPAL TITLES AND PREROGATIVES.

III.

The following are some of the chief Titles and Prerogatives ascribed to the ROMAN PONTIFFS in the early ages of the Church:

Successor of the Fisherman\(^1\)—Heir of Peter’s Administra-

\(^2\)—Vicar of Peter—Holding the Succession of Peter—

Peter’s Successor in Order, and Holder of His Place\(^3\)—Constitu-

\(^1\) St. Jerome, A.D. 390:—“Cum successore piscatoris loquor”

(\textit{Epist. xv. ad Pap. Damasum}).


Vide \textit{supra}, p. 57.

\(^3\) Bishops of Spain, A.D. 440:—“The most blessed Peter, the

supremacy of whose vicar, as it is eminent, so is it to be feared and

loved by all” (cujus vicarii principatus sic ut eminet, ita metuendus


1033, Labbe, tom. iv.). \textbf{St. Cyprian}, A.D. 250, speaks of “the

place of (Pope) Fabian, that is, the place of Peter” (Fabiani


257, says of Pope Stephen:—“Se successionem Petri tenere

contendit . . . per successionem Cathedram Petri habere se

prædicat” (\textit{Epist. Firm. int. Epist. S. Cypr.}). In the \textbf{General

Council of Ephesus}, A.D. 431, Pope Celestine is called

“PETER’S SUCCESSOR IN ORDER (\textit{kara ταξιν ὁ διάδοχος}) AND HOLDER

OF HIS PLACE” (\textit{Act. iii. p. 625}, Labbe, tom. iii. et tom. ii. Hardouin,

1477). \textbf{Pope Zosimus}, A.D. 417:—“Whose place we rule

over, and are in possession of the authority of his name” (cujus

locum nos regere, ipsius quoque potestatem nominis obtinere, non

latet vos. \textit{Epist. xi. ad Afros. p. 16}, Galland, ix.). See note to

pp. 59, 60.
tuted unto all Men Interpreter of the Voice of Blessed Peter 4 —The Bishop of the Apostolic Chair—The Prelate of the Apostolic See 5 —The very One Commissioned with the Guardianship of the Vine by the Saviour 6 —The Head—Head of all the most Holy Priests of God—Head of all the Holy Churches—In relation to whom the Fathers of the Councils of Constantinople and Ephesus called themselves “the Members,” and the Fathers of Chalcedon “the Children” 7 —Archbishop of all the

4 General Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 :—πασὶ τῆς τοῦ μακάρου Πιστοῦ φωνῆς εξαιρετικώς καθόσταμος (Epist. Synod. ad Leonem. p. 834, Labbe, iv.).


6 General Council of Chalcedon, regarding Dioscorus, to Pope Leo I. :—“He even extended his madness against the very one commissioned with the guardianship of the Vine by the Saviour, that is to say, against your Apostolic Holiness” (και κατ’ ἀυτὸν τοῦ τῆς αμαρτίας τῆς φωνῆς παρὰ τοῦ σωτηρίου εἰσερχόμενον τῇ μοναχή εἴστειν λειτουργεῖν δή, τῆς σης ὑσιοτητος. Epist. Synod. Leoni, p. 835, Labbe).

7 The Emperor Justinian, A.D. 533:—“Nor do we allow that any of these things, concerning ecclesiastical institution, should fail to be brought before his Holiness, as being the head of all the holy priests of God, and because as often as heretics have arisen in these parts, they have been repressed by the sentence and judgment of that holy See” (Caput omnium sanctissimorum Dei sacerdotum. Epist. ad Epiph. Cod. Justinian, lib. i. tom. i. n. 7). “Yielding honour to the Apostolic See, and to your Holiness, and honouring your Holiness, as one ought to honour a father, ... we have hastened to subject all the priests of the whole Eastern district, and to unite them to the See of your Holiness. ... For we do not allow of any point, however manifest and indisputable it be, which
Papal Titles and Prerogatives.

habitable world—Universal Archbishop, and Patriarch of Great Rome—Pope or Bishop of the Universal Church—

relates to the state of the Churches, not being brought to the cognisance of your Holiness, since you are the Head of all Holy Churches” (vestrae Sanctitati, quae caput est omnium sanctarum Ecclesiarum. Epist. ad Pap. Joan. ii. Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 1). Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. In their Synodical Epistle to Pope Damasus and the Bishops assembled at Rome, the Eastern Fathers say:—“You have summoned us as your own members (ως εικονα μελη) by the letters of the most religious Emperor” (Ap. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 9); and the Pope in his reply says: “Most honoured children (υοι τιμωτατοι), in that your charity accords to the Apostolic See the reverence due, you confer the greatest honour on yourselves” (οι τη αποστολη καιδιδη την οφειλομεναι αιων η αγαπη υμων απονεμει, κ.τ.λ. Theod. Hist. Eccles. v. c. 10). General Council of Ephesus:—“Philip, Priest and Legate of the Apostolic Chair, said: “We offer thanks to the holy and venerable Synod, that the letters of our holy and blessed Pope (Cælestine) having been read to you, you have united your holy members, by your holy acclamations, to that holy head (τα άγια μελη... τη άγια κεφαλη). For your Blessedness is not ignorant that the blessed Peter is the head of all the faith, yea, and of the Apostles” (η κεφαλη ολης της πιστεως, η και των αποστωλων. Act. ii. p. 619, Labbe; p. 1471, Hardouin). General Council of Chalcedon:—“Over whom (the Fathers of the Council) thou (Leo) didst rule, as a head over the members, in those who filled thy place” (ον σα μεν, ως κεφαλη μελως, γημονους εν τοις την συν τυχην εις Χουθοι. Epist. Synod. ad Leonem. p. 834). “We therefore call upon you to honour with your sanction our judgment; and as we have brought our harmonious agreement with the Head in all good things, so let the Head fill up what is fitting for the children” (παρακαλουμε τοις, τημοσι και τοις σαις σημειω την κεφαλη ωστη σης τη κεφαλη την εν τοις καλως συμφωνων ειςινηχαμεν, ουτω και εις οικεια τοις παισιν ανακλησωσοι το πεσον. Ib. p. 838, Labbe). “The most blessed and Apostolic Bishop of the city of Rome, the Head

1 “He” (Justinian), says Dean Milman, “acknowledges the supremacy of the Roman Church, and commands all Churches to be united with her” (Hist. of Lat. Chr. b. iii. c. v.). See also, regarding the Law of Valentinian III. A.D. 445, Neander’s Ch. Hist. iii. 246.
The Bishop of the Catholic Church — The Chief of the Universal Church — Elevated to the Lofty Summit of the

OF ALL THE CHURCHES” (κεφαλῆς ὑπαρχόντως πασῶν τῶν εκκλησιῶν. Sess. i. p. 94, Labbe). St. Isidore of Seville, A.D. 598: — “And although the dignity of this (pastoral) power is derived to all Catholic Bishops, yet in a more special manner it remains for ever in the Roman Bishop, who is by a singular privilege set as the head over the other members. Whoso, therefore, renders not reverently to him due obedience, involves himself, as being severed from the head, in the schism of the Acephali” (Epist. ad Eugenium Episc. Toletan).

8 St. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 424: — ἀρχιερείας τὰς τῆς οἰκουμενῆς πατέρα τοῖς καὶ πατρίας ἡ̄ν Κελεσονοῦ, τοῦ τῆς μεγαλοπολίως ῥωμῆς (Hom. xi. in S. Mariam Deipar, p. 385).

9 General Council of Chalcedon: — ὑποκεφαλικω τὴν αρχείας καὶ πατρίας τῆς μεγαλοπολίως ῥωμῆς Δοστή (Ad. iii. pp. 399, 411, Labbe; pp. 325, 332, 335, Hardouin, tom. ii.). It is well known that this title was, at a later period, rejected by Pope Gregory the Great, in the sense in which he understood it to have been usurped by John, Patriarch of Constantinople: — “It is a lamentable thing, to be forced to suffer patiently, that, despising all others, my brother and fellow-bishop John endeavours to be called the only Bishop” (quatenus despectis appellari episcopus. Lib. v. Epist. 21, ad Constant. August.). He himself declined the title, preferring rather to call himself “Servant of the servants of God” (servus servorum Dei); nevertheless he none the less strenuously maintained the Supremacy of his See over the Universal Church: “As to what they say of the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See? This is constantly owned by the most pious Emperor, and by our brother the Bishop of that city” (Lib. ix. Epist. xii.). On this subject see Kenrick, On the Primacy, 5th edit. pp. 156–160; Hawarden's Charity and Truth, Amer. ed. 1860, pp. 212–220.1

10 Council of Chalcedon: — “I Paschasinus, Bishop of the Church of Lilybœta, ... presiding over the holy Synod in the stead of the most blessed and Apostolic Leo, of the city of Rome,

1 See also the Protestant writers, Neander, and Milman, cited by Dr. Newman (Via Media, vol. i. p. 188, note, ed. 1877); and Fr. Gallwey's Lectures on Ritualism, 1878, pp. 222–241.
Priesthood — The Head and Chief of the Episcopate — Apostolic Head of Bishops — Chief Pontiff and Bishop of Bishops

Pope of the Universal Church” (see Labbe, tom. iv. pp. 399, 448, 581; and Hardouin, tom. ii. pp. 385, 465-467), &c.


12 St. Avitus, A.D. 495: — “We were anxious in mind and fearful in the cause of the Roman Church, as feeling our own position tottering in the head assaulted . . . the Chief of the Universal Church. . . . If the Pope of that city is called into doubt, not a Bishop, but the Episcopate will at once seem to be in danger” (In laecessito capite . . . Si Papa urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus jam videbitur, non episcopus vacillare. Epist. xxxi. p. 724, Galland, tom. x.).


15 Tertullian, A.D. 195: — “I hear that an Edict has been sent forth, and a peremptory one indeed, to wit, the Chief Pontiff, that is the Bishop of Bishops, proclaims, I remit, to those who have done penitence, the crimes both of adultery and fornica-

1 The Protestant historian, Neander, observes that “very early indeed do we observe in the Roman Bishops traces of the assumption that to them, as successors of St. Peter, belonged a paramount authority in ecclesiastical dis-
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—Equal in office to other Bishops, but excelling them by the prerogative of the Apostolic See—Apostolic Lord and Father of Fathers—The Ruler of the Church—He has "the super-
tion." But this is read in the Church, and openly announced in the Church" (Pontifex Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum. *De Pudicit. c. i*). The title of Pontifex is several times given to Christ by Tertullian:—"Authenticus Pontifex Dei Patris" (*Adv. Marc. iv. 35*); "Christus Pontifex Patris" (*Ib. c. 14*). The Bishops of three Councils of Africa (see above, p. 89) address the Pope as "Apostolic head of Bishops" (Præsulum vertex Apostolicus), and "Supreme Pontiff of all Prelates" (Summo omnium præsulum pontifici). *Epist. Synod. ad Pap. Theod. lect. in Concil. Rom. ann. 649, sub. P. Mart."

16 Council of Rome, A.D. 378, regarding Pope Damasus:—
"Prærogativã tamen Apostolicae Sedis excellit" (*Epist. Synod. Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1003*).

17 The fathers of the General Council of Chalcedon call Pope Leo, "Most holy and blessed Father," and themselves his "children." (*Epist. Synod. ad Leonem*). The Bishops of Dardania, A.D. 492:—"To the most holy Apostolic Lord, and most blessed Father of Fathers, Gelasius, Pope of Rome, the..."
vision in matters of Faith."¹⁹—He has "Apostolic power over all, and the Primacy in all things."²⁰—Contrary to his judg-

¹⁸ Ambrosiaster, a d. 380 :—"Whereas the whole world is God's, yet is the Church said to be His house, of which Damasus is at this day the ruler" (Ut cum totus mundus Dei sit, ecclesia tamen domus ejus dicatur, cujus hodie rectore est Damasus. Comment. in Epist. i. ad Tim. Inter. Op. S. Ambros.). The Emperor Valentinian III., a d. 445 :—"The primacy of the Apostolic See having been established by the merit of the Apostle Peter, by the dignity of the city of Rome, and by the authority of a holy Synod, no pretended power shall arrogate to itself anything against the authority of that See. For peace can be universally preserved only when the whole Church acknowledges its ruler" (Ap. Neander, Hist. of Ch. iii. p. 246).

¹⁹ The Emperor Marcian to Pope Leo I. :—"Sanctitatem tuam principatum in episcopatu divinæ fidei possidentem" (Epist. lxxiii. int. Epist. S. Leonis. Mag.).

²⁰ Theodoret :—"I, therefore, beseech your holiness to persuade the most holy and blessed Archbishop (Leo) to use his Apostolic power (τη αποστολικη χειρουργια εξουσια), and to order me

ment the Churches cannot make Ecclesiastical Laws—To Him are intrusted “the Gate” and “the Sheep”—He is the Shepherd of the Church—On account of the Dignity of his
to hasten to your Council. For that most holy throne has the sovereignty over the Churches throughout the universe on many grounds” (εξει γαρ ο παναγις θέσος εκείνος των κατα την εκκλησίαν εκκλησίου την πηγήναια δια πολλα. Tom. iv. Epist. cxvi. Renato, p. 1197). “It pertains to you (Pope Leo) to hold the primacy in all things, for your throne is adorned with many prerogatives” (Δια παντα γαρ ιδιν το πρωτερια ας άρματε το Πολλός γαρ ο άμεσος θέσος κοσμείται Πλεονεκτημα. Ib. Epist. cxiii. Leoni, p. 1187).

21 Sozomen, A.D. 440:—“It is a sacerdotal law, that the things done contrary to the sentiment of the Bishop of the Romans be looked upon as null” (εναι γαρ νομον ερασικον, ως ακυριω αυροανεν, τα πασα γνωριη περιτομεια του Πολλων επισκουπων. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 8, 10). See note to p. 77. The Greek Patriarch Anatolius, to Pope Leo I. regarding the Council of Chalcedon:—“The whole ground and confirmation of what had been done was reserved for your blessedness.” (Gestorun vis omnis est confirmatio auctoritati vestrae beatitudinis fuit reservata. Epist. Anatot. int. Epist. Leonis, cxxxii.).

22 St. Ambrose, A.D. 385, to Pope Siricius, who had ordered that Jovinian and others should be excommunicated in the Church of Milan:—“We have recognised in the letter of your Holiness the watchfulness of the good shepherd, who dost faithfully keep the gate intrusted to thee, and with pious solicitude dost guard the fold of Christ, worthy, indeed, that the Lord’s sheep should hear and follow thee” (Recognovimus litteris Sanctitatis tuae boni pastoris excubias, qui fideliter commissam tibi januam serves, et pia solicitudine Christi ovile custodias, dignus quem oves Christi audiant et sequantur. Epist. xliii. Siricio. tom. ii. p. 966). St. Jerome, writing from the East to Pope Damasus:—“From the shepherd the sheep asks protection” (A pastore presidium ovis flagito. Epist. xv. ad Damas. n. 2). St. Columbanus, writing in the name of

1 On the authority of the Pope over General Councils, in regard to their convocation, presidence, direction, confirmation, &c., see HeffeI’s History of Church Councils, vol. i. Eng. trans. ; Dollinger, Hist. of Church, Eng. trans. vol. ii. p. 221, seq.; Heringkóther’s Anti-Janus, Eng. trans. p. 120, seq.; Kenrick’s Primacy of the Apostolic See, 5th ed. p. 227, seq.
Throne, the Care of All belongs to him — The Vicar of Christ — With Whom whoso gathereth not, scattereth, and belongeth to Antichrist — His authority is derived from the authority of Holy Scripture, and is of Divine Institution — Placed by God the Irish Church to Pope Boniface IV.: — "Watch, therefore, for the peace of the Church; help thy sheep already affrighted at the dread, as it were, of wolves. WHEREFORE USE, O Pope, THE WHISTLINGS AND THE WELL-KNOWN VOICE OF THE TRUE SHEPHERD, AND STAND BETWEEN THY SHEEP AND THE WOLVES, SO THAT, CASTING AWAY THEIR FEAR, THY SHEEP MAY IN EVERYTHING KNOW THEE THE FIRST PASTOR" (Subvenite ovibus vestris . . . utere veri, O Papa, pastoris sibilis notaque voce, et sta inter illas et lupos, ut deposite pavor, tunc primum te ex integro cognoscant pastorem. Epist. ad Bonif. Pap. p. 352, Galland, xii.). "THE PASTOR OF PASTORS" (pastorum Pastori. Ib. p. 351).

23 Sozomen, a.d. 445, says of Pope Julius, to whom St. Athanasius and other Eastern Bishops, deposed by the Arians, had appealed: — "And as, ON ACCOUNT OF THE DIGNITY OF HIS THRONE, THE CARE OF ALL BELONGS TO HIM, he restored to each his own Church" (Oia de της παντων κηδεμονιας αυτω προσποιουσις δια την αξιαν του θρονου, ικαστῳ την ιδιαν εκκλησιαν ανεδωκε. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 8).

24 Council of Rome, a.d. 495. In their acclamations at the close of this Council, the Fathers call Pope Gelasius "THE VICAR OF CHRIST" (vicarium Christi te videmus, Apostolum Petrum te videmus. Concil. Rom. sub Gelas. Labbe, iv. p. 2275). St. Jerome to Pope Damasus: — "HE THAT GATHERETH NOT WITH THEE, SCATTERETH, THAT IS, HE WHO IS NOT OF CHRIST IS OF ANTICHRIST" (Quicunque tecum non colligit, spargit, hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. Epist. xv. ad Pap. Damas.).

25 St. Augustine and Council of Milevis, a.d. 416, to Pope Innocent: — "We think that those who entertain such perverse opinions will more readily yield to the authority of your holiness, derived as it is from the authority of the Holy Scriptures" (auctoritati Sanctitatis tuæ, de sanctarum Scripturarum auctoritate depromptæ, &c. Epist. clxxvi. n. 5). St. Leo the Great: — "The care which, in virtue of our headship, we owe, by the Divine institution, to all the Churches" (Curam, quam universis Ecclesiis principaliter ex divina institutione debemus. Epist. xiv. ad Anastas. Thessalon. Episc. c. 1. Et ap. Hurter, Patr. Opusc. vol.
on a Watch-tower, higher than all other mortals, His Spiritual Care extends over all places where the name of God is preached.\textsuperscript{36}

xxv. p. 99). "Solicitudo, quam universæ Ecclesiae ex divina institutione dependimus" (Epist. xii. ad Episc. Prov. Maurit. Cæsar. c. 1). **Council of Rome,** A.D. 494:—"The holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church has been raised above the other Churches, not by any Synodal decrees, but from the Evangelic voice of our Lord and Saviour has it obtained the primacy, He saying, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock,'" &c. (Decret. Conc. Rom. sub Gelas. Labbe, iv. p. 1261; and in Denzinger's Enchiridion, p. 41, ed. 1874). This extract is given here, because what is said of the Roman Church is evidently said of, and on account of, its Bishops, as successors of St. Peter. Thus, also, the Fathers of the **Sixth General Council,** held at Constantinople, A.D. 680, so little distinguished "inter sedem et in eâ sedentem," that they identify Pope Agatho and the See as one and the same. They address him ὃς προστάθεσα ως τῆς αικουμενικῆς εκκλησίας: "To thee, therefore, as the first See of the Universal Church, we leave what is to be done" (Labbe, vii. 1110).

\textsuperscript{36} **Pope Celestine,** A.D. 423:—"Placed as we are by God on a watch-tower, . . . our spiritual care fails not as regards places however distant, but extends through all places where the name of God is preached" (Epist. iv. Univ. Episc. per Vienn. et Narbonens. Prov. n. 1, Galland, ix.). **St. Columbanus:**—"In specula quasi cunctis mortalibus altior positus," &c. (Epist. ad Bonif. p. 252). Speaking of the conversion of this country by Pope Gregory the Great, **Venerable Bede** says: "Whereas he bore the pontifical power over all the world, and was placed over the Churches already reduced to the faith of truth, he made our nation, till then given up to idols, the Church of Christ" (Bede's Eccles. Hist. lib. ii. c. 1, Giles' trans. Bohn's edit.).

The following extracts from the writings of **Alucin, Theodore the Studite,** and **St. Bernard**—all of whom were renowned throughout Christendom—may suffice to show what was the belief universally entertained regarding the Prerogatives of the Pope in the eighth, ninth, and following centuries:—
Alcuin, who flourished about A.D. 780, thus addresses Pope Leo III.:—"To Leo the Pope, the most blessed Lord, &c. . . . As much as ever I could, have I always loved the most blessed princes, and shepherds of the holy Roman See; wishful to be numbered, through their most holy intercessions, among Christ's sheep, which Christ our God intrusted unto the blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, to be fed. This, I acknowledge, was truly becoming, that the multitude of this flock, though abiding in sundry pastures of the earth, should, by the one faith of love, be placed under its Shepherd, whom, as a godly Pastor, it cometh to have a great care for the flock intrusted to his keeping, &c. . . . BEHOLD, THOU ART, MOST HOLY FATHER, THE PONTIFF CHOSEN BY GOD, THE VICAR OF THE APOSTLES, THE HEIR OF THE FATHERS, THE PRINCE OF THE CHURCH, THE NOURISHER OF THE ONE SPOTLESS DOVE. In the kindness of fatherly feeling, by thy most holy prayers, and sweetest exhortations of sacred writings, gather us unto God's holy Church, within the very strong bonds of the Church's soundness; lest any of us, wandering about, should be met on the outside to be devoured by the ravenousness of the wolf" (Ecce tu, sanctissime Pater, Pontifex a Deo electus, vicarius Apostolorum, hæres Patrum, Princeps Ecclesiae, unius immaculæ columbæ nutritor, &c. Alcuin, Epist. Op. tom. i. p. 30, ed. Froben.).

Theodore, Abbot of the Studium at Constantinople, thus addresses Pope Paschal I., A.D. 817:—"Hear, O APOSTOLIC HEAD, O SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP OF CHRIST, SET OVER THEM BY GOD! O DOOR-KEEPER OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN! O ROCK OF THE FAITH UPON WHICH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS BUILT! For Peter thou art, who adornest and governest the See of Peter. To thee, said Christ our God, 'And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren.' Behold the time, behold the place; help us, THOU WHO ART ORDAINED BY GOD FOR THIS! Stretch forth thy hand as far as may be: POWER THOU HAST FROM GOD, BECAUSE THOU ART THE CHIEF OF ALL. Terrify, we beseech thee, the wild beasts of heresy with the sword of thy divine word. Good Shepherd, give thy life for the sheep. Let the whole Church which is under heaven hear that thou
hast in thy Council anathematised all who dare to do such things, and to anathematise our holy Fathers” (Epist. lib. ii. Ep. xii. p. 1152, seq., Migne, Patr. Gr. tom. xcix.).

St. Bernard, A.D. 1150, thus addresses Pope Eugenius III.:—“Who art thou? The High Priest, the Supreme Bishop. Thou art the Prince of Bishops, thou art the Heir of the Apostles. Thou art Abel in primacy, Noah in Government, Abraham in the Patriarchal rank, in Order Melchisedech, in Dignity Aaron, in Authority Moses, Samuel in the Judicial office, Peter in Power, Christ in Unction. Thou art he to whom the Keys of Heaven are given, to whom the Sheep are intrusted. There are, indeed, other door-keepers of heaven, and other shepherds of the flocks; but thou art the more glorious in proportion as thou hast also, in a different fashion, inherited before others both these names. The former have the flocks assigned to them, each one his own: to thee all are intrusted, one flock for the one. Not merely for the sheep, but for all the shepherds also thou art the one shepherd. Whence do I prove this? thou askest. From the word of the Lord. For to whom—I say not among the Bishops, but among the Apostles—have the whole flock been committed in a manner so absolute and undistinguishing? ‘If thou lovest me, Peter, feed My sheep.’ What sheep? The inhabitants of this or that city or country, those of a particular kingdom? ‘My sheep,’ He saith. Who does not see that He designates not some, but all? Nothing is excepted where nothing is distinguished. The power of others is limited by definite bounds; thine extends even over those who have received authority over others. Canst thou not, when a just reason occurs, shut up heaven against a Bishop, depose him from his Episcopal office, and deliver him over to Satan? Thus thy privilege is immutable, as well in the keys committed to thee, as in the sheep intrusted to thy care” (De Considerat. lib. ii. c. 8, quoted by Hergenröther, Anti-Janus, Eng. trans. p. 100).
APPENDIX:

ST. PETER THE FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

That St. Peter was the first who sat in the Apostolic Chair in Rome, is shown by various testimonies contained in this work. (See, especially, the note to p. 60.) As this fact is still continually disputed by Protestant writers, it may be worth while to append here the following letter to a Protestant friend, containing notes on the Rev. R. Maguire’s work, entitled “St. Peter non-Roman”:

My dear . . .,—To avoid charging the author of the book you sent me with wilful misstatements and suppression of facts, it must be supposed that he omitted to verify, in many instances, not only his quotations from ancient authors, but even those from the more modern ones—such as Bellarmine and Bishop Pearson.

He refers (p. 4) to Bellarmine as laying down, as an “indispensable requisite” of the Papal claims, that St. Peter was actually resident in Rome for twenty-five years; whereas, what Bellarmine really asserts, in common with most Catholic theologians (see Murray, De Ecclesia, vol. iii. p. 536, dat. 1866), is, that St. Peter’s actual presence in Rome, and his death there, are not points essential to be established at all; for that he would have been Bishop of Rome, and would have remained so until his death, although he himself (like some of the Avignon Popes) had never set foot at all in that City! The whole fiction, therefore, invented by Mr. M., of its being “an essential requirement”—“the very core of the Papal theory” (p. 149)—that St. Peter “really sat in Rome for twenty-five years,” by which Mr. M. understands “an official residence for so many years” (p. 21), is exploded at once, as well as all his laboured argumentation to prove—what no one denies—that St. Peter was certainly often in other places. No Catholic cares to contend for “the twenty-five years’ theory” (p. 151). Dollinger, in his History of the Church (vol. i.), says:—“As for a continuous residence of twenty-five years’ duration at Rome, that was never maintained by
any person whatever.” “No Catholic,” says Waterworth, “ever pretended that St. Peter always remained in Rome after the establishment of the Episcopal See in the Imperial City. *All suppose that he did not remain there.* And if they still allow that he was the Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, *notwithstanding years of absence*, they maintain this precisely on the same grounds as they ascribe twenty-three years of spiritual sovereignty to Pius VI., and twenty-three to Pius VII.” *(Engl. and Rome, c. ii.)*

In regard to the two points which Bellarmine declares to be *non-essential*, though demonstrable by the clearest historical testimony, viz., St. Peter’s *presence* in Rome and *death* there, the learned Protestant Whiston says: “That St. Peter was in Rome is so clear in Christian antiquity, that it is a shame for a Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it.” Chamierius (whose words are quoted and approved by Cave) says: “*All the Fathers with great unanimity have asserted that Peter did go to Rome, and that he did govern that Church*” *(Panstrat. Cath. de Rom. Pont. lib. xiii. c. 4, quoted by Dr. Cave, “Lives of the Apostles”—St. Peter).* Another learned Protestant—Grotius—says, in his note on 1 Pet. v. 13: “Ancient and modern interpreters differ about this ‘Babylon.’ The ancients understood it of *Rome, where that Peter was, no true Christian will doubt*” *(Veteres Romam interpretantur, ubi Petrum fuisse nemo verus Christianus dubitabit).* I observe that Mr. M. alludes (p. 151) to the Protestant Bishop Pearson, and represents him as “simply pleading for St. Peter’s *martyrdom* in Rome,” ignorantly or dishonestly suppressing the fact that Pearson wrote a learned and elaborate treatise expressly to prove that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, and that the Popes are his legitimate successors *(Opera Posthuma, Lond., 1688).* Archbishop Bramhall also says: “That St. Peter had a fixed Chair at Antioch, and *after that at Rome*, is what no man, who giveth any credit to the ancient Fathers, and Councils, and historiographers of the Church, can either deny or well doubt of” *(Bram. Works, p. 628, ed. Oxon.)*. Dr. Cave says: “We intrepidly affirm with *all antiquity*, that St. Peter was at Rome, and *for some time resided there*. . . . All, both ancient and modern, will, I think, agree with me that Peter may be called Bishop of Rome in a less strict sense, inasmuch as he *laid the foundations of this Church*, and rendered it illustrious by his martyrdom” *(Sec. Apost. S. Pet.)*.

The whole subject of the *Scriptural* evidence bearing on St. Peter’s work in Rome is treated in a masterly way by Dr. Dollinger,
in his *First Age of the Church*. I may remind you that St. Paul had not been in Rome, before he wrote his Epistle to the Church there constituted (see Rom. i. 10-13; xv. 22, 23). By whom, then, had that Church been founded—a Church so well-ordered and renowned that, as he states in c. i. 8, *its "faith was spoken of in the whole world"*? Clearly by St. Peter; for Christian antiquity points out only him and St. Paul as having been the founders of the Church at Rome. Again, it was clearly foretold to St. Peter that by his martyrdom by crucifixion he should "glorify God" (John xxi.). The place where he did so must consequently have been well known in the Early Church. But *no other place than Rome was ever mentioned or thought of by any ancient writer*, as the one where St. Peter thus glorified God by his martyrdom. St. Clement, A.D. 96 (see Maguire, p. 32), alluded to a fact too notorious 1 to require particular mention or details, when referring to the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul, in his Epistle to the Corinthians.

In ch. iv. of his work Mr. M. makes a vain attempt to invalidate the testimony of Eusebius, and to depreciate his authority as an historian. Any one that desires can read Eusebius' history for himself, as an English translation of it is published in Bohn's *Theological Library*. Mr. M. simply *garbles* his first chapter (pp. 37, 38). In point of fact, Eusebius had, when compiling his history, access to a host of works by earlier authors, most of which have long been lost. In lib. v. cap. 27, he says: "Numerous works, indeed, of ancient ecclesiastical writers are still preserved by many, the monuments of a virtuous industry." Some of these authors he mentions, and continues, "Innumerable others there are also, that have come down to us, even the names of which it would be impossible to give. All of them

1 The following is a list of early authors who distinctly refer to St. Peter's residence in Rome, or to his martyrdom, or the establishment of his Episcopal See in that city:—Clement of Rome (A.D. 96), Ignatius (107), Papias (118), Irenæus (178), Clement of Alexandria (190), Dionysius of Corinth (168), Tertullian (195), Caius (214), Origen (216), Hippolytus (220), Cyprian (248), Pope Stephen (250), Anatolius (270), Peter of Alexandria (306), Arnobius (310), Lactantius (320), Eusebius (320), Pope Julius (342), Athanasius (362), Cyril of Jerusalem (363), Optatus (375), Ambrose (375), Pope Damasus (370), Gregory Nazianzen (370), Epiphanius (383), Jerome (390), Chrysostom (385), Augustine (400), Prudentius (405), Theodoret (424), Prosper (429), &c. To these must be added the Council of Arles (314), the Council of Sardica (343), several African Councils (416), and the General Councils of Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451),—in all of which a distinct reference is made to the Roman Church as the See of St. Peter, and to the authority of the Bishop of Rome as his successors.
were orthodox and Ecclesiastical writers." Compare this with Mr. M.'s statement in p. 37 of his book, where he represents Eusebius as complaining of the paucity of earlier ecclesiastical authors! It is evident that when Eusebius speaks of himself as entering on "a trackless and unbeaten path," and "unable to find the bare vestiges of those who preceded him," he means in writing a complete history of the whole Church, which he himself was the first to undertake to do.

The value of Papias' testimony (depreciated by Mr. M. p. 63) is shown by the Protestant Dr. Cave, who refutes Spanheim's objections. Mr. M.'s statement that Eusebius "speaks of his works as having only a traditional existence," is simply untrue. Eusebius' words are: "There are said to be five books of Papias, which bear the title of 'Interpretation of our Lord's declarations.' Irenæus also makes mention of these as the only works written by him, in the following terms: 'These things are attested by Papias, an ancient author who mentions them in the fourth book of his works. For he has written a work in five books'" (Euseb. iii. c. 39). Thus it appears that Irenæus, who wrote 150 years before Eusebius, positively attests the fact in his own writings, and Eusebius himself proceeds to quote from these works of Papias—still extant in his own day! The "fabulous" notions which Eusebius (who in Lib. iii. c. 36, calls him, "a man well skilled in all kinds of learning, and well acquainted with the Scriptures") attributes to Papias, related to the subject of the "Millennium," or personal reign of Christ on the earth; and this is the sole point to which Eusebius refers when he "deplores the effect of his testimony on those that came after him" (Maguire, p. 64). The value of Eusebius' judgment, and his accuracy as an historian, are shown by his summary rejection of all dubious traditions of this sort; and his mode of speaking of the spurious writings attributed to St. Peter shows how very unlikely he was to have introduced into his history any facts or statements that were not based upon the most reliable testimony. It may be said, indeed, that he rather erred, at times, in the opposite direction, since he speaks doubtfuly of the Second Epistle of Peter, and several more of the Canonical writings. His words are: "As to the writings of Peter, one of his Epistles is acknowledged as genuine. For this was anciently used by the ancient Fathers in their writings, as an undoubted work of the Apostle. But that which is called the second, we have not indeed understood to be embodied with the Sacred Books; yet as it appeared useful to many, it was studiously read
with the other Scriptures. As to that work, however, called 'The
Acts of Peter,' and 'The Gospel according to Peter,' and that called
'The Preaching and the Revelations of Peter'” (these were all heretical
compositions), “we know nothing of their being handed down as
Catholic writings; since neither among the ancients, nor the Eccle-
siastical writers of our day, has there been one that has appealed to
testimony taken from them” (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. iii. 3).

Dr. Dollinger (First Age of the Church, p. 296), discusses the
subject of St. Peter’s presence in Corinth (see Maguire, p. 97) in
connection with his journey to Rome. St. Paul’s allusion to him,
“Cephas,” in 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 32, shows that he had been in Corinth;
and Clement of Rome alludes to the fact as well as Dionysius of
Corinth. The last named author, who wrote A.D. 175, distinctly
attributes the founding of the Roman and Corinthian Churches to
St. Peter and St. Paul, i.e., as Paul founded the Corinthian, St. Peter
founded the Roman Church. St. Irenæus, also, says that “Peter
and Paul preached the gospel and founded the Church at Rome”
(Euseb. v. 8); and St. Ignatius, writing to the Roman Church,
refers to the same fact. “I do not command you,” he says, “as did
Peter and Paul.” The testimony of these writers is not shaken by
anything that Mr. M. has said.

There can be no doubt that the order of the first Bishops of
Rome was:—1. Peter, 2. Linus, 3. Cletus (or Anencletus),
4. Clement. This, as before observed (p. 85), is the order given by
Irenæus, Eusebius (who followed Hegesippus and Irenæus), and
Epiphanius, as well as in the ancient Canon of the Roman Mass,
which expresses the earliest traditions of the Roman Church. Euse-
bius says that Linus was “the first after Peter to obtain the episco-
pate” (συντα γυναι Πετρου. Hist. Ecc. iii. 4); “the first after the
martyrdom of Paul and Peter” (iii. 2, and 21). St. Irenæus, after
referring to those whom the Apostles “left as their successors in the
Churches, delivering to them their own post of government,” confines
himself to giving the succession in the Roman Church only; and
states that “the blessed Apostles (Peter and Paul) having founded
and established this Church, transmitted the office of the episcopate
to Linus. He was succeeded by Anencletus, and after him Clement
held the episcopate, the third from the Apostles” (Iren. ap. Euseb.
v. 6). Eusebius, also, still reckoning from Linus as “the first” (i.e.
“after Peter,” iii. 4), calls Clement “the third bishop” (Ib), “the
third that held the episcopate after Paul and Pe.cr” (i.e. “after
their martyrdom,” iii. 21, comp. c. 2). Alexander is called by him “the 5th in the succession from Peter and Paul” (iv. 1); Xystus “the sixth from the Apostles” (Iren. ap. Euseb. v. 6); Telesphorus “the seventh in the succession from the Apostles (iv. 5). Hyginus is counted by Irenæus and Eusebius as the eighth Bishop, when reckoning from Linus as “the first” after Peter (v. 6); but elsewhere Irenæus twice calls him “the ninth in the succession,” “the ninth that held the episcopate in succession from the Apostles” (ap. Euseb. iv. 11), evidently counting Peter himself as “the first.” Hyginus is also called the ninth by the ancient author of the Carm. adv. Marcius, by St. Cyprian (“Hyginus Episcopus qui in urbe nonus fuit,” Epist. 74), and by St. Epiphanius. Other Popes are in like manner reckoned by Eusebius “from the Apostles” (Praem. in lib. v. 6); and Victor is called “the thirteenth Bishop of Rome from Peter” (v. 28).

Mr. Maguire and other Protestant writers contend, that because Linus, Cletus, and Clement are reckoned by Irenæus and Eusebius as “the first,” “second,” and “third” Bishops of Rome, therefore, those authors did not regard St. Peter himself as the first Bishop (see Maguire, pp. 117-124); but these objectors invariably suppress the fact that Irenæus and Eusebius counted Linus as “the first after Peter,” just as Eusebius also reckons the Bishops of Alexandria from Annianus as “the first Bishop” (iii. 14, iv. 1), meaning that he was “the first Bishop after Mark,” whom “he succeeded in the administration of the Church of Alexandria” (ii. 24). He calls Annianus “the first” Bishop of Alexandria, just as he calls Linus “the first” Bishop of Rome, and reckons the Bishops of Alexandria “from the Apostles” (iv. 1) just as both he and Irenæus reckon those of Rome. Eusebius reckons the Bishops of Antioch in like manner, “from the Apostles” (Quast. ad Stephan.; and Hist. Eccl. iv. 20, 24; v. 22), naming Evodius as the first Bishop, and Ignatius the second; but here, again, he did not mean to exclude St. Peter himself, who had been Bishop of Antioch before them for some years, and accordingly he distinctly speaks of Ignatius as the second “successor of Peter” in that See (iii. 36); and, before him, Origen had termed Ignatius “the second Bishop of Antioch after Peter” (Hom. vi. in Lucan, op. ed. Delarue, iii. 938). It appears, then, that Eusebius counted St. Peter to have been Bishop of Rome before Linus, as truly as he counted him to have been Bishop of Antioch before Evodius and Ignatius; or as truly as he counted St. Mark to have been Bishop of Alexandria before Annianus.
Appendix.

The expression so often used by him, "from the Apostles," when giving the successions in the Sees of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, and also in that of Jerusalem (lib. iv. c. 5, v. 12), neither excludes an Apostle from the first episcopate in each See, nor does it prove that more than one Apostle had held it. As regards the See of Jerusalem, Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius distinctly state that St. James the Apostle was the first Bishop (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. ii. 1, 23; iii. 5; iv. 5); and Eusebius adds that, in his own day, the episcopal "throne" of the Apostle was still preserved with great veneration in that city (vii. 19, 32). In the case of the three first-named Sees, he reckons "from" or "after" Peter and Mark, calling the first successor in each See "the first Bishop," just as an English historian might speak of William Rufus as the first Norman king of England "from" or "after" the Conqueror, certainly without meaning to exclude the Conqueror himself.

The Chronicle of St. Hippolytus (A.D. 225) "counts Peter as first Bishop of Rome" (Smith's Dict. of Christ. Biog. and Literat. i. p. 577), and Linus as second; but it then places Clement before Cletus, and seems to reckon Cletus and Anencletus as different persons. The best Protestant writers agree with Catholic historians in considering the order mentioned above as infinitely more trustworthy than the lists in which Clement is placed before Cletus.

The words of Tertullian: "The Roman Church refers to Clement, ordained by Peter" (Romanorum ecclesia Clementem a Petro ordinarum referat. De Praescr. Hæret. c. 32), do not necessarily imply that this writer regarded Clement as first in the succession, as it was not Tertullian's object to give the Apostolical succession in the Roman Church, but to prove the apostolicity of doctrine; and it suited his purpose to name Clement, as being the most renowned,

1 Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, gives the following reasons for preferring the order given by Irenæus and Eusebius:—"First, because it is distinctly the more ancient; secondly, because if the earlier tradition had not placed the undistinguished name of Cletus before the well-known Clement, no later writer would have been under any temptation to reverse its order; thirdly, because of the testimony of the Liturgy." He concludes "that the commemoration in the order, Linus, Cletus, Clement, had been introduced before the time of Hippolytus, and was at that time so firmly established, that even the contradictory results arrived at by Hippolytus had no power to alter it" (Dict. of Chr. Biog. and Literat. p. 555). He accounts for Hippolytus' deviation "from the order which he found acknowledged in his Church" by his having accepted as historically true the ordination of Clement by Peter, as related in the Epistle to James (spurious), and continues: We retain, then, the order of Irenæus, accounting that of Hippolytus as an arbitrary transposition devised to get over a chronological difficulty."
and the nearest to his own time of those Bishops of Rome who had actually been "ordained by Peter." Other early Latin writers, however, have varied as to the order of the first Bishops, some placing Clement next to Peter, and the apparent discrepancy has been accounted for by the fact stated by Epiphanius, Rufinus, Venerable Bede, and others, that Linus, Clement, and Cletus had all three been *ordained* by St. Peter as his coadjutors (*cum jure successions*), to act either as missionary Bishops, or in the administration of the Roman Church during his occasional absence, &c. (see Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 164). Epiphanius also, who is followed by Baronius, Bollandus, Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, and others, considers that St. Clement, although first ordained by St. Peter, *resigned* the episcopal office in favour of Linus and Anencletus, and did not resume it until the death of the latter; whilst some have thought it more probable that he was ordained by St. Peter as a missionary bishop, unattached to any particular Church, and designed to assist the Apostles in their labours, by going about to preach the gospel and to establish and confirm the Churches in various places; and that, after the death of Anencletus, being required by the Christians at Rome, he "was then," as St. Epiphanius says, "compelled to take the episcopate" (*Hær.* 27).

It has been supposed by many, that when St. Paul came to Rome, he undertook there a part of St. Peter's episcopal administration—exercising this office in regard to the *Gentile* converts, whilst St. Peter's local charge was specially that of the *Jewish* converts. In confirmation of this it may be observed, says Dr. Hawarden, "1st, that Epiphanius says: 'In Rome *Peter and Paul* were the first, both Apostles and Bishops' (*Hær.* 27). 2dly, that Eusebius says Alexander 'derived in the fifth place a succession from *Peter and Paul* (*παντοτιαν απο Παπατου και Παυλου και σαμων διαδοχην.* Lib. iv. c. 1). 3dly, That the Jewish and Gentile converts required to be treated at first in quite a different manner. 4thly, That whereas the ancients differ concerning the first Bishop of Rome after St. Peter—some affirming him to be Linus (as Irenæus, Eusebius, Optatus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, and Theodoret); others to be Clement (as Ruffinus, and the Latins commonly, according to St. Jerome); both opinions may be reconciled if we suppose that, after the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, the successors of St. Peter were Linus, Cletus (or Anencletus), whilst Clement succeeded St. Paul; and that Clement after their decease, A.D. 91, was also chosen to succeed Cletus, and so joined both the converted Jews and con-
Appendix. 121

Verted Gentiles at Rome under one pastor. St. Epiphanius thinks it probable that, because St. Peter and St. Paul were often absent from Rome, they had, whilst yet living, their coadjutors there. So Linus might be St. Peter’s coadjutor, as Clement, whom, according to Tertullian, St. Peter had ordained, perhaps for that reason, might be St. Paul’s.” Dr. Hawarden adds, that on this supposition, there would only have been a division of St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s labours, not of their jurisdiction; and that “it would neither injure the Pope’s supremacy, nor his being the successor of St. Peter only in the government of the whole Church, though in the government of the Roman diocese he were the successor of St. Peter and St. Paul.” (True Church, &c., ed. 1808, vol. ii. p. 99).

Other early writers use language confirmatory of this supposition. “I do not,” wrote St. Ignatius, A.D. 107, “like Peter and Paul, command you” (Epist. ad Rom. n. 4). St. Irenæus speaks of both Apostles as having transmitted the Episcopal office to Linus (iii. 3). St. Anatolius, A.D. 270, calls the Roman Bishops “the successors of Peter and Paul” (Canon. Paschal. n. 10, Galland. iii. 548); and the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, calls Rome “the place in which (both) Apostles sit continually in judgment, and their blood without ceasing witnesses to the glory of God” (Epist. Synod. ad Sylvest. Labbe, i. p. 1426). “The Roman Church,” says Dollinger, “was viewed as inheriting alike from St. Paul his prerogative of Apostle of the Gentiles, and from St. Peter his dignity as the foundation of the Church, and as possessing the power of the keys” (First Age, &c., p. 300). It is, however, a certain and most remarkable fact, that whereas that Church was by ancient Fathers and Councils continually denominates “the See of Peter,” no single instance can be adduced of its ever being called the See of Paul. “These” (Peter and Paul), said Leo the Great, “are they who have advanced thee to this glory, . . . that, by the See of Peter made the head of the universe, thou mightest rule more widely by divine religion than by earthly empire” (Serm. 82, in Natal. App. Pet. et Paul).

Mr. Maguire’s laboured attempt to prove that the early writers are discordant in their testimony, is not a whit more successful than are the efforts of infidels and rationalists to undermine the authority of various books of Scripture, by alleging instances of apparent discrepancy, and pointing to the chronological, scientific, and historical difficulties on which Strauss, Colenso, and others have insisted so vehemently. After the facts and evidence that I have adduced, it would be mere waste of time to enter on a more detailed examination of the nume-
rous misstatements contained in Mr. Maguire's book. His historic doubts regarding St. Peter's Roman Episcopacy can hardly be said to have any better or more rational foundation than the late Dr. Whateley's "Historic Doubts relative to the Existence of Napoleon Bonaparte."—I am, &c.

DEVELOPMENT OF PAPAL POWER.

It may be objected that few of the Papal Epistles, &c., from which passages are quoted in this work, are of higher antiquity than the fourth and fifth centuries; to which the reply is, that the series of genuine Decretal Letters that have been preserved commences only with Pope Siricius. Tertullian, Firmilian, and other hostile writers, however, speak of the "peremptory edicts" of earlier Popes, and of their claiming supreme authority as successors of St. Peter. We know also from Eusebius that Pope Victor (A.D. 190) threatened to excommunicate the whole of the Eastern Churches for their non-observance of Easter according to the Roman custom; from which extreme measure he was deterred chiefly by the pacific representations of St. Irenæus, who "becomingly exhorted him," says Eusebius, "not to cut off whole Churches of God, who observed the tradition of an ancient custom" (Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 24). Pope Victor's authority to interfere in the affairs of the Eastern Churches, or even to excommunicate them, was not called in question; and it is clear that his threat was not looked upon as an insolent assumption of power, or an idle waste of words, but that every effort was made, by argument, remonstrance, and entreaty, to avert its execution.

To those who reflect that the Church itself was only gradually and by slow degrees to become great and powerful, developing itself as from "a grain of mustard-seed," it can be no difficulty that Papal prerogatives were not referred to by St. Clement or St. Ignatius in such terms as were in use in the fifth and following centuries. Certainly, kings and queens had not as yet become "the nursing fathers and mothers of the Church," nor "bowed down before her with their faces to the earth, to lick up the dust of her feet" (Isa. xlix. 23). "We must ever keep in view," says Herogenröther, "that the primacy was never as a ready-made system traced out for the constitution of the ancient Church, but was deposited in it like a fructifying germ, which developed with the life of the Church. . . . According to the will of Providence, the primacy was to enter on the domain of history; hence it could not be circumscribed within exact and sharply-defined limits, but must be allowed such a freedom of movement and of development as would enable it to enforce in
every sphere its divine power, according to the various circumstances and special needs of different ages.”

“IT is true,” says Dr. Newman, “that St. Ignatius is silent in his Epistles on the subject of the Pope’s authority; but if that authority was not, and could not be, in active operation then, such silence is not so difficult to account for as the silence of Seneca or Plutarch about Christianity itself, or of Lucian about the Roman people. St. Ignatius directed his doctrine according to the need. While Apostles were on earth there was need neither of Bishop or Pope; their power was dormant, or exercised by Apostles. In course of time, first the power of the Bishop awoke, and then the power of the Pope. When the Apostles were taken away, Christianity did not at once break into portions; yet separate localities might begin to be the scene of internal dissensions, and a local arbiter in consequence would be wanted. Christians at home did not yet quarrel with Christians abroad; they quarrelled at home amongst themselves. St. Ignatius applied the fitting remedy. The Sacramentum Unitatis was acknowledged on all hands; the mode of fulfilling and the means of securing it would vary with the occasion; and the determination of its essence, its seat, and its laws would be a gradual consequence of a gradual necessity. ... For St. Ignatius to speak of Popes, when it was a matter of Bishops, would have been like sending an army to arrest a housebreaker. ...

“When the Church, then, was thrown upon her own resources, first local disturbances gave rise to Bishops, and next œcumenical disturbances gave rise to Popes. ... It is not a greater difficulty that St. Ignatius does not write to the Asian Greeks about Popes than that St. Paul does not write to the Corinthians about Bishops. And it is a less difficulty that the Papal Supremacy was not formally acknowledged in the second century than that there was no formal acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity till the fourth. No doctrine is defined until it is violated. And, in like manner, it was natural for Christians to direct their course in matters of doctrine by the guidance of mere floating, and, as it were, endemic, tradition, while it was fresh and strong; but in proportion as it languished, or was broken in particular places, did it become necessary to fall back upon its special homes, first the Apostolic Sees, and then the See of Peter. Moreover, an international bond and a common authority could not be consolidated, were it ever so certainly provided, while persecutions lasted. If the Imperial power checked the development of Councils, it availed also for keeping back the power of the Papacy. The Creed, the Canon of Scripture, in like manner both remained undefined. The Creed, the Canon, the Papacy, œCumenical Councils—all began to form, as soon as the Empire relaxed its tyrannous
oppression of the Church. And as it was natural that her monarchical power should rise when the Empire became Christian, so was it natural also that further developments of that power should take place when that Empire fell. Moreover, when the power of the Holy See began to exert itself, disturbance and collision would be the necessary consequence. ... As St. Paul had to plead, nay, to strive, for his Apostolic authority, and enjoined St. Timothy, as Bishop of Ephesus, to let no man despise him,—so Popes too have not therefore been ambitious, because they did not establish their authority without a struggle” (Newman, *On Development of Doct.* pp. 165-168).

The Rev. H. Milman, D.D. (late Dean of St. Paul’s), writes as follows regarding the necessity of a development of the Papal authority in the time of Pope Gregory the Great, and during the mediæval period:—

“Now was the crisis in which the Papacy must reawaken its obscured and suspended life. It was the only power which lay not entirely and absolutely prostrate before the disasters of the times—a power which had an inherent strength, and might resume its majesty. It was this power which was most imperatively required to preserve all which was to survive out of the crumbling wreck of Roman civilisation. To Western Christianity was absolutely necessary a centre, standing alone, strong in traditionary reverence, and in acknowledged claims to supremacy. Even the perfect organisation of the Christian hierarchy might in all human probability have fallen to pieces in perpetual conflict: it might have degenerated into a half secular feudal caste with hereditary benefices, more and more entirely subservient to the civil authority, a priesthood of each nation or each tribe, gradually sinking to the intellectual or religious level of the nation or tribe. On the rise of a power, both controlling and conservative, hung, humanly speaking, the life and death of Christianity—of Christianity as a permanent, aggressive, expansive, and to a certain extent, uniform system. There must be a counterbalance to barbaric force, to the unavoidable anarchy of Teutonism, with its tribal, or at the utmost national independence, forming a host of small, conflicting, antagonistic kingdoms. ... It is impossible to conceive what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages, without the mediæval Papacy; and of the mediæval Papacy the real father is Gregory the Great” (*Hist. of Latin Christ.* b. iii. c. vii. vol. ii. pp. 100-102, ed. 1867).

FINIS.