**“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. After Four Centuries of Apostasy” The Present Truth 13, 35, pp. 549, 550.**

BY the pious zeal of Theodosius, “the unity of the faith” had been supposedly secured, since by imperial decree and inquisitorial repression, the empire had been made Catholic. As all his efforts in this direction had been put forth to secure the peace of the church it might be supposed that this result should have been assured. But peace was just as far from the church now as it ever had been. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.1}

**EPISCOPAL RIVALRY**

BY this time, among the chief bishoprics of the empire, the desire for supremacy had become so all-absorbing that each one was exerting every possible influence to bring the others into subjection to himself. The rivalry, however, was most bitter between the bishopric of Alexandria and that of Constantinople. Of the great sees of the empire, Alexandria had always held the second place. Now, however, Constantinople was the chief imperial city; and the Council of Constantinople had ordained that the bishop of Constantinople should hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome. The Alexandrian party argued that this dignity was merely honourary, and carried with it no jurisdiction. Rome, seeing to what the canon might lead, sided with Alexandria. Constantinople, however, steadily insisted that the canon bestowed jurisdiction to the full extent of the honour. The Bishop of Constantinople therefore aspired to the complete occupancy of the second place, and Alexandria was supremely jealous of that aspiration. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.2}

Theodosius died A.D. 395, and was succeeded by his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, by whom the empire was permanently divided. John surnamed Chrysostom—the golden-mouthed—became bishop of Constantinople. He “exposed with unsparing indignation the vices and venality of the clergy, and involved them all in one indiscriminate charge of simony and licentiousness.” (Milman.) He declared his free opinion “that the number of bishops who might be saved, bore a very small proportion to those who would be damned.” (Gibbon.) In addition to this, and with much more danger to himself, he incurred the enmity of the monks, who now existed in swarms throughout the East, by declaring with evident truth that they were “the disgrace of their holy profession.” {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.3}

These measures set the whole ecclesiastical order against him, and they began to intrigue for his overthrow. This opened the way for the bishop of Alexandria again to assert his authority. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.4}

Theophilus, a violent and unscrupulous prelate, was now Bishop of Alexandria, and he immediately espoused the cause of the malcontents, who proudly accepted him as their leader. The contest waged gave now one side and then the other the advantage. One one occasion the partisans of Theophilus were slaughtered without mercy by the populace in the streets of Constantinople. At last Chrysostom was exiled by the Emperor, because of his denunciation of the vices of the court. His banishment was attended with bloodshed, as the soldiers subdued his party, and his friends, on the day that he was finally sent out of the city, set fire to the church of Santa Sophia. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.5}

The Bishop of Rome, to whom Chrysostom appealed, sided with him against Alexandria. The war with Chrysostom was ended, yet the roots of bitterness and seeds of strife still remained between Alexandria and Constantinople. And though the two men who were now bishops of these two cities were in harmony so far as the confusion about Chrysostom was concerned, the same jealousy as to the dignity of their respective sees still existed, and soon broke out more violently than ever before. The subject of the next dispute was a question of doctrine, and like that over the *Homoousion*, was so illusive, and the disputants believed so nearly alike and yet were so determined not to believe alike, and the men who led in it were so arrogant and cruel, that from the beginning the contention was more violent than any that had yet been. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.6}

**ANOTHER CATHOLIC SAINT**

In. A.D. 412, Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus, became Bishop of Alexandria. He was one of the very worst men of his time. He began his episcopacy by shutting up the churches of the Novatians, “the most innocent and harmless of the sectaries,” and taking possession of all their ecclesiastical ornaments and consecrated vessels, and stripping their bishop of all his possessions. Nor was Cyril content with the exercise of such strictly episcopal functions as these: he aspired to absolute authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.7}

He drove out the Jews, forty thousand in number, destroyed their synagogues, and allowed his followers to strip them of all their possessions. Orestes, the prefect of Egypt, displeased at the loss of such a large number of wealthy and industrious people, entered a protest, and sent up a report to the Emperor. Cyril likewise wrote to the Emperor. No answer came from the court, and the people urged Cyril to come to a reconciliation with the prefect, but his advances were made in such a way that the prefect would not receive them. The monks poured in from the desert to the number of about five hundred, to champion the cause of Cyril. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.8}

Orestes was passing through the streets in his chariot. The monks flocked around him, insulted him, and denounced him as a heathen and an idolater. Orestes, thinking that perhaps they thought this was so, and knowing his life to be in danger, called out that he was a Christian, and had been baptized by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. His defence was in vain. In answer, one of the monks threw a big stone which struck him on the head, and wounded him so that his face was covered with blood. At this all his guards fled for their lives; but the populace came to the rescue, and drove off the monks, and captured the one who threw the stone. His name was Ammonius, and the prefect punished him so severely that shortly afterward he died. “Cyril commanded his body to be taken up; the honors of a Christian martyr were prostituted on this insolent ruffian, his panegyric was pronounced in the church, and he was named Thaumasius—the wonderful.” (Milman.) {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 549.9}

But the party of Cyril proceeded to yet greater violence than this. At that time there was in Alexandria a teacher of philosophy, a woman, Hypatia by name. she gave public lectures which were so largely attended by the chief people of the city, that Cyril grew jealous that more people went to hear her lecture than came to hear him preach. She was a friend of Orestes, and it was also charged that she, more than any other, was the cause why Orestes would not be reconciled to Cyril. One day as Hypatia was passing through the street in a chariot, she was attacked by a crowd of Cyril’s partisans, whose ring-leader was Peter the Reader. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.1}

She was torn from her chariot, stripped naked in the street, dragged into a church, and there beaten to death with a club, by Peter the Reader. Then they tore her limb, and with shells scraped the flesh from her bones, and threw the remnants into the fire, March, A.D. 414. This was Cyril,—now Saint Cyril,—Bishop of Alexandria. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.2}

**ANOTHER FAMOUS CONTROVERSY BEGUN**

In 428, there was appointed to the bishopric of Constantinople a monk of Antioch, Nestorius by name, who in wickedness of disposition was only second to Cyril of Alexandria. In his ordination sermon before the great crowd of people, he personally addressed to the emperor these words:— {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.3}

Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics, and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.4}

The fifth day afterward, in accordance with this proposition, Nestorius began his part in purging the earth of heretics. Arians and Novatians suffered, but specially the Quarto-Decimans, who refused to celebrate Easter on the Catholic Sunday, and multitudes perished in the tumults which he stirred up. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.5}

And now these two desperate men, Nestorius and Cyril, became the respective champions of the two sides of a controversy touching the faith of the Catholic Church, as to whether Mary was the mother of God or not. In the long contention and the fine-spun distinctions as to whether the Son of God is of the same substance, or only of *like* substance with the Father, Christ had been removed entirely beyond the comprehension of the people. And owing to the desperate character and cruel disposition of the men who carried on the controversy as the representatives of Christ, the members of the Church were made afraid of Him. And now, instead of Jesus standing forth as the mediator between men and God, He was removed so far away and was clothed with such a forbidding aspect, that it became necessary to have a mediator between men and Christ. *And into this place the Virgin Mary was put*. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.6}

This gave rise to the question as to what was the exact relationship of Mary to Christ. Was she actually the mother of the divinity of Christ, and therefore the mother of God? or was she only the mother of the humanity of Christ? For a considerable time already the question had been agitated, and among a people whose ancestors for ages had been devout worshipers of the mother goddesses—Diana and Cybele—the title “Mother of God” was gladly welcomed and strenuously maintained. This party spoke of Mary as “God-bearer;” the opposite party called her only “man-bearer;” while a third party coming between tried to have all speak of her as “Christ-bearer.” {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.7}

As before stated, this question had already been agitated considerably, but when two such characters as Cyril and Nestorius took it up, it speedily became the one all-important question, and the all-absorbing topic. Nestorius started it in his very first sermon after becoming bishop of Constantinople. He denied that Mary could properly be called the mother of God. Some of his priests immediately withdrew from his communion, and began to preach against his heresy, and the monks rushed in also. Nestorius denounced them all as miserable men, called in the police, and had some of them flogged and imprisoned, especially several monks who had accused him to the Emperor. From this the controversy spread rapidly, and Cyril, urged on by both natural and inherited jealousy, came to the rescue in defence of the title, “Mother of God.” {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.8}

**COUNCILS AGAIN CALLED FOR**

IT is not necessary to put into this book the blasphemous arguments of either side. It is enough to say that in this controversy, as in that regarding the *Homoousion*, the whole dispute was one about words and terms only. Each determined that the other should express the disputed doctrine in his own words and ideas, while he himself could not clearly express his ideas in words different from the others. Says Milman:— {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.9}

Never was there a case in which the contending parties approximated so closely. Both subscribed, both appealed, to the Nicene Creed; both admitted the pre-existence, the impassibility, of the Eternal Word; but the fatal duty ... of considering the detection of heresy the first of religious obligations, mingled, as it now was, with human passions and interests, made the breach irreparable. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.10}

Cyril demanded of Nestorius that he should confess Mary to be the mother of God, without any distinction, explanation, or qualification. And because Nestorius would not comply, Cyril denounced him everywhere as a heretic, stirred up the people of Constantinople against him, and sent letters to the Emperor, the empress, and to Pulcheria, to prove to them that the Virgin Mary “ought to be called” the Mother of God. He sought to have the court take his side at once against Nestorius. But Nestorius had the advantage with respect to the court, because he was present in Constantinople. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.11}

Fierce letters also passed between Cyril and Nestorius, and both sent off letters to Celestine, Bishop of Rome. Celestine called a council in Rome, A.D. 430. The letters and papers of both Cyril and Nestorius were read, after which Celestine made a long speech to prove that “the Virgin Mary was truly the mother of God.” {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.12}

The council declared that Nestorius was “the author of a new and very dangerous heresy,” praised Cyril for opposing it, declared the doctrine of Cyril strictly orthodox, and condemned to deposition all ecclesiastics who should refuse to adopt it. Nestorius refused to recant. Both parties were calling for a general council, and so to “settle” the faith again the joint emperors ordered a general council to meet at Ephesus in 431. {PTUK September 2, 1897, p. 550.13}

A. T. JONES.

 **“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Mary Is Made the ‘Mother of God’” The Present Truth 13, 36, pp. 564-566.**

THE council called to settle the controversy about the nature of Mary, met, as we stated last week, in the year 431, at Ephesus. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.1}

Of all places in the world, Ephesus was the very one where it would be the nearest to an impossibility to obtain anything like a fair examination of the question. Like Diana of old, the Virgin Mary was now the patroness of Ephesus; and the worse than heathen Catholics were more fanatically devoted to her than even the heathen Ephesians had been to Diana. But a fair examination of the question, or in fact any real examination, was not intended by Celestine and Cyril. Their only intention was either the unconditional surrender or the condemnation of Nestorius. Cyril was appointed by Celestine to preside at the council. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.2}

Neither of the emperors was present at the council, but they jointly appointed Count Candidian, captain of the imperial bodyguard, as the “Protector of the Council.” Nestorius came with sixteen bishops, accompanied by an armed guard composed of bathmen of Constantinople and a horde of peasants. In addition to this, by the special favour of the Emperor, an officer, Ireneus, with a body of soldiers, was appointed to protect him. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.3}

Cyril came with fifty Egyptian bishops, and a number of bathmen, and “a multitude of women” from Alexandria, and such sailors in his fleet as he could depend upon. Arrived at Ephesus, he was joined by Memnon, bishop of that city, with fifty-two bishops, and a crowd of peasants whom he had drawn into the city. All told, 198 bishops were present at the opening of the council. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.4}

The council was to have met June 7, 431, but owing to delays on the part of the bishops of Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Antioch, it did not open until June 22, and even then the bishops of Antioch had not arrived. But all the time was spent in preliminary disputes, winning partisans, and working up the populace. As Cyril had the great majority of the bishops on his side, and as the city was already devoted to the “Mother of God,” Nestorius was at great disadvantage, and his enemies did not hesitate to let him know it, and to make him feel it. Cyril preached a sermon in which he paid the following idolatrous tribute to Mary:— {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.5}

Blessed be thou, O Mother of God! Thou rich treasure of the world, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, scepter of true doctrine, imperishable temple, habitation of Him whom no space can contain, mother and virgin, through whom He is, who comes in the name of the Lord. Blessed be thou, O Mary, ... through whom the precious cross is adored throughout the world, through whom heaven rejoices and angels and archangels are glad, through whom the devil is disarmed and banished, through whom the fallen creature is restored to heaven, through whom every believing soul is saved. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.6}

**GETTING TO BUSINESS**

Cyril and his party urged that the council should be opened without any more delay. As the emperor had particularly required the presence of John of Antioch, Nestorius insisted on waiting till he came; and Candidian sustained Nestorius. Cyril refused, and he and his partisans assembled in the church of the Virgin Mary to proceed with the council. As soon as Count Candidian learned of this, he hastened to the church to forbid it, and there he fell into an ecclesiastical trap. He declared that they were acting in defiance of the imperial rescript which was to guide the council. They answered that as they had not seen the rescript, they did not know what it required of them. The Count read it to them. This was just what they wanted. They declared that *the reading of the rescript legalised their meeting!* They greeted it with “loud and loyal clamours,” pronounced the council begun, and commanded the count to withdraw from an assembly in which he had no longer any legal place. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 564.7}

Candidian protested against the unfairness of the proceedings; and then, he himself says, they “injuriously and ignominiously ejected” him. They next expelled all the bishops, sixty-eight in number, who were known to favor Nestorius, “and then commenced their proceedings as the legitimate Senate of Christendom.” {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.1}

One of Cyril’s presbyters was secretary, and he formally opened the business of the council by reading a statement of the dispute that had brought them together. Then the Emperor’s letter calling the council was read. They sent four bishops to notify Nestorius to appear. He courteously refused to acknowledge the legality of their assembly, and the council, after further attempts to get him before it, went on without him. His propositions in opposition to Cyril’s views were condemned with curses. Then when the list was completed, they all arose, and with one mighty roar that made the arches of the great church echo and re-echo, they bawled, “*Anathema! Anathema! The whole world unites in the excommunication! Anathema on him who holds communion with Nestorius!*” {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.2}

All signed the sentence, depriving Nestorius of office, and then it was sent to him addressed “To Nestorius, a second Judas.” All these proceedings, from the visit and protest of Candidian to the notice to Nestorius, were carried through in a single day and one prolonged sitting. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.3}

**TORCH-LIGHT CELEBRATION OF THEIR WORK**

IT was now right. Cries were sent all through the city to post up the decrees of the council, and to announce the joyful news that Mary was indeed the Mother of God. Everywhere they were met with loudest shouts of joy. The multitude rushed into the streets and poured toward the church. With lighted torches they escorted the bishops to their abodes, the women marching before and burning incense. The whole city was illuminated, and the songs and exultations continued far into the night. The demonstrations far outdid that of their lineal ancestors, who, when they tried to kill the apostle Paul, “all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.” {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.4}

**FIGHTING IT OUT**

Fdays afterward John of Antioch with his bishops, arrived, and was greatly surprised to learn that the council was over. He got together about fifty bishops, who unanimously condemned the doctrines of Cyril and the proceedings of the council, and declared accursed all the bishops who had taken part in it. Cyril and Memnon answered with counter-curses. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.5}

Cyril’s council sent messengers with overtures to John, who refused to see them. Then the council declared annulled all the acts of John’s council, and deposed and excommunicated him and all the bishops of his party. John threatened to elect a new bishop of Ephesus in the place of Memnon, whom his council had deposed. A party tried to force their way into the cathedral; but finding it defended by Memnon with a strong garrison, they retreated. Memnon’s forces made a strong sally, and drove them through the streets with clubs and stones, dangerously wounding many. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.6}

On learning that the council had been held, and Nestorius deposed before the arrival of John of Antioch, a letter had been sent down from the court, but was not received till this point in the contest. This letter annulled all the proceedings of the council, and commanded a reconsideration of the question by the whole assembly of the bishops now present. The letter also announced the appointment of another imperial officer, one of the highest officials of the State, to assist Count Candidian. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.7}

The court had not made known in Constantinople the proceedings of the council, and the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril sent away a secret message to the monks of Constantinople, announcing that Nestorius had been deposed and excommunicated. The object of this was by stirring up those fanatics to influence the court. The weak-minded Theodosius II stood in great awe of the holiness of the monks. “His palace was so regulated that it differed little from a monastery.” In 422 there died one of these who was noted for that kind of holiness that attaches to a monk, and Theodosius secured “his cassock of sackcloth of hair, which, although it was excessively filthy, he wore as a cloak, hoping that thus he should become a partaker, in some degree, of the sanctity of the deceased.” (Socrates.) And now, on receipt of Cyril’s message, a certain Dalmatius, who was famous for his filthy sanctity, left his cell, and put himself at the head of the whole herd of monks and archimandrites in and about Constantinople. They marched solemnly through the streets, and about everywhere as they passed, the populace burst into curses against Nestorius. They marched to the palace and lounged about the gates; but the chief influence at court was yet favorable to Nestorius, and their demonstrations had no immediate effect. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.8}

**THE PUGILISTIC BISHOPS ALL ORTHODOX**

BY this time the reports of both parties had reached the court. Theodosius, after examining both accounts, approved both, and pronounced Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, all three deposed. As for their faith, he pronounced them “all three alike orthodox,” but deposed them as a punishment which he said they all three alike deserved as being the chief authors of continual disturbances. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.9}

The new imperial commissioner was sent down to Ephesus with the letter announcing the Emperor’s decision. As soon as he arrived, he summoned the bishops before him. Memnon refused to appear. Those who did come, however, had no sooner arrived than each party began to denounce the other. Cyril and his party pronounced the presence of Nestorius unendurable, and demanded that he be driven out. The party of Nestorius and John of Antioch, just as sternly demanded that Cyril should be expelled. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.10}

As neither party could have its way, they began to fight. The imperial commissioner had to command his soldiers to separate the pugilistic bishops, and stop the fight. When order had thus been enforced, the imperial letters were read. As soon as the sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon was read, the uproar began again, and another fight was prevented only by the arrest of the three chiefs. Nestorius and John of Antioch submitted, Memnon was hunted up, and also taken into custody, but Cyril escaped, and with his body-guard of bathmen, women, and sailors, sailed away to Alexandria. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.11}

The Emperor next commanded that eight bishops of each party should appear in his presence at Constantinople. They were sent, but, on account of the desperate temper of the monks of Constantinople, it was counted unsafe for them to enter the city, and therefore they were stopped at Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus. There the Emperor met them. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 565.12}

**CYRIL BRIBES THE COURT AND WINE**

HE appeared so decidedly to favor the party of Nestorius, that they thought the victory was already won. So certain were they of this that they even sent off letters to their party at Ephesus, instructing them to send up a message of thanks to him for his kindness. But at the fifth meeting all their brilliant prospects were blasted. Cyril, from his post in Alexandria, had sent up thousands of pounds of gold, with instructions to Maximian, Bishop of Constantinople, to add to it, not only the wealth of that Church, but his utmost personal effort to arouse “the languid zeal of the princess Pulcheria in the cause of Cyril, to propitiate all the courtiers, and, if possible, to satisfy their rapacity.” (Milman.) {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.1}

As avarice was one of the ruling passions of the eunuchs and women who ruled Theodosius II, as Gibbon says:— {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.2}

Every avenue of the throne was assaulted with gold. Under the decent names of eulogies and benedictions, the courtiers of both sexes were bribed according to the measure of their rapaciousness. But their incessant demands despoiled the sanctuaries of Constantinople and Alexandria; and the authority of the patriarch was unable to silence the just murmur of his clergy, that a debt of sixty thousand pounds had already been contracted to support the expense of this scandalous corruption. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.3}

The efforts of Cyril were at last effective. The eunuch Scholasticus, one of the chief ministers of the emperor and the supporter of the cause of Nestorius at court, was bought; and it was this that caused the sudden revolution in the Emperor’s conduct toward the party of Nestorius. In the fifth and last audience that he gave the deputies, the emperor told them at once that they had better abandon Nestorius, and admit both Cyril and Memnon to their communion. They remonstrated, but he would listen to nothing. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.4}

Shortly afterward an imperial edict was issued declaring Nestorius justly deposed, reinstating Cyril and Memnon in their respective sees, pronouncing all the other bishops alike orthodox, and giving them all leave to return to their homes. This dissolved the council. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.5}

Even before the dissolution of the council the emperor had sent an order to Nestorius, commanding him to leave Ephesus and return to the monastery whence he had been called to the archbishopric of Constantinople. By the persistent efforts of Celestine, bishop of Rome, and others, the emperor was induced—A.D. 436—to banish him and two of his friends to Petra in Arabia. July 30, in the same year, an imperial edict was issued, commanding all who believed with Nestorius, to be called Simonians; that all the books by Nestorius should be sought for and publicly burnt; forbidding the Nestorius to hold any meetings anywhere, in city, in village, or in field; and if any such meeting was held, then the place where it was held should be confiscated, as also the estates of all who should attend the meeting. Nestorius was not allowed to remain long at Petra. He was taken from there to a place away in the desert between Egypt and Libya, and from there dragged about from place to place till he died of the hardships inflicted, at what date is not certainly known, but about A.D. 440. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.6}

Such was the cause and such the conduct of the first Council of Ephesus, the third general council of the Catholic Church. And thus was established the Catholic doctrine that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.7}

The controversy went on, however, nor did it ever logically stop until December 8, A.D. 1854, when Pope Pius IX. established the actual divinity of the Virgin Mary, by announcing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which reads as follows:— {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.8}

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as well as by our own, we declare, promulgate, and define that the doctrine which teaches that the most blessed Virgin Mary, at the very instant of her conception, was kept free from every stain of original sin solely by the grace and prerogative of the omnipotent God, in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was revealed by God, and must on that account be believed firmly and continually by all the faithful ones. {PTUK September 9, 1897, p. 566.9}

A. T. JONES.

**“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Another Historic War of Words Begun” The Present Truth 13, 37, pp. 580-582.**

IT been decided that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God, out of that decision there now arose another question involving the nature of Christ. That question was: How was the divine nature related to the human so that Mary could truly be called the mother of God? That is, Did the Divine nature become human? Or was the divine nature only joined to the human? In other words: Were there two natures in Christ? or was there but one? {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.1}

**PROMOTERS OF THE EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY**

IT was now A.D. 448, and the Eutychian controversy began. For a clear understanding of the case, it will be best formally to introduce the leading characters. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.2}

Theodosius II. was still emperor of the East; Valentinian III. was emperor of the West. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.3}

Eutyches was the abbot, or superior, of a monastery close to Constantinople. He had been the chief leader of the monks in the contest against Nestorius. “At his bidding the swarms of monks had thronged into the streets, defied the civil power, terrified the emperor, and contributed, more than any other cause, to the final overthrow of Nestorius. He had grown old in the war against heresy.” (Milman.) {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.4}

Flavianus was now the occupant of the episcopal seat of Constantinople. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.5}

Chrysaphius was another eunuch, who had risen to the place of chief minister of Theodosius II., and was also the godson of Eutyches. He hoped also to place Eutyches on the episcopal throne of Constantinople. The accession of Flavianus to that dignity had prevented this design for the time being, but he still held it in mind. When Flavianus was installed in the bishopric, Chrysaphius demanded that he should make to the emperor the offering of gold that was customary on such occasions. Instead of bringing gold, Flavianus brought only three loaves of consecrated bread. This, Chrysaphius so employed as to prejudice the emperor against the archbishop. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.6}

Dioscorus was now archbishop of Alexandria. In this place it will be sufficient description of him simply to remark that he was a second Cyril, and leave it to the progress of the narrative to reveal him exactly as he was. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.7}

Leo I., “the Great,” was bishop of Rome and regarded Dioscorus as “a prelate adorned with many virtues, and enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.8}

Eusebius was bishop of Dorylaeum, to which office he had been appointed from a civil office in the household of Pulcheria. He also had been an early, ardent, and persistent adversary of Nestorius. This Eusebius now stood forth as the accuser of Eutyches. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.9}

At a small synod which had been called for another purpose at Constantinople, November 8, A.D. 448, Eusebius presented a written complaint against Eutyches, and asked that it be read. The complaint was to the effect that Eutyches had accused of Nestorianism orthodox teachers—even Eusebius himself. To the complaint was appended a demand that Eutyches should be summoned before the present synod to answer. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.10}

As for Eusebius himself, he announced that he was ready to prove that Eutyches had “no right to the name of Catholic,” and that he was “far from the true faith.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.11}

The synod met again, November 12, and Eusebius renewed his complaint, with the addition that by conversations and discussions, Eutyches had misled many others. He then suggested that the synod should give expression to the faith on the question that had been raised. Flavianus produced a letter which Cyril had written to Nestorius at the beginning of the controversy between them; the act of the Council of Ephesus which approved this letter; and another letter, which Cyril had written, about the close of that controversy. He required the bishops present to assent to the statements therein contained. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 580.12}

This they all signed, and then at the suggestion of suggestion of Eusebius it was sent to those who were absent for them to sign. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.1}

The next session of the synod was held November 15, and the deputies who had been sent to Eutyches reported that he had refused to come, for the reason that when he became a monk, he resolved never to leave the monastery to go to any place whatever. Besides, he told them that the synod ought to know that Eusebius had long been his enemy, and that it was only out of malice that he now accused him. He said he was ready to affirm and subscribe the declarations of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus. The synod summoned him again, and again he refused to come. Then Eusebius declared, “The guilty have ever ways of escaping; Eutyches must now be brought here, even against his will.” The synod then summoned him a third time. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.2}

At the next meeting a messenger came from Eutyches, saying that he was sick. Flavianus told him the synod would wait until Eutyches got well, but that then he must come. At the next meeting, the deputies who had been sent with the third summons, reported that Eutyches had told them he had sent his messenger to the archbishop and the synod that he might in his name give his assent to the declarations of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, “and to all that Cyril had uttered.” At this Eusebius broke in with the declaration, “Even if Eutyches will now assent, because some have told him that he must yield to necessity and subscribe, yet *I am not therefore in the wrong, for it is with reference*, not to the future, but *to the past, that I have accused him*.” The deputies then closed with the information that he would come to the synod on the next Monday. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.3}

**STILL “SETTLING” THE FAITH**

At the appointed time, Eutyches came; but he did not come alone. He came accompanied by a messenger of the emperor’s privy council, and escorted by a great crowd composed of soldiers, and servants if the pretorian prefect, and “a rout of turbulent monks.” The emperor’s representative bore a letter to the synod, in which the emperor said:— {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.4}

I wish the peace of the Church and the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which was asserted by the Fathers at Nicea and Ephesus; and because I know that the patrician Florentius is orthodox, and proved in the faith, therefore it is my will that he be present at the sessions of the synod, as the faith is in question. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.5}

At this the bishops cried out:— {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.6}

Many years to the emperor, his faith is great! Many years to the pious, orthodox, high-priestly emperor! {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.7}

Then the emperor’s commissioner took his place, and Eusebius and Eutyches, the accuser and the accused, placed themselves in the midst. The first thing was to read the proceedings from the beginning up to this point, the vital part of which was the declarations to which they had demanded that Eutyches should give his assent. The reader read the Nicene Creed, and there was no dissent. He read the first of Cyril’s letters, yet there was no dissent. He read the decision of the Council of Ephesus, and still there was no dissent. Then he began the second of Cyril’s letters. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.8}

At this point Eusebius broke in. Seeing the reading was nearly finished with no sign of dissent, he was afraid that Eutyches would actually approve all the declarations, which doubtless he would have done. He therefore interrupted the reading, with the exclamation, “Certainly such is not confessed by this man here; he has never believed this, but the contrary, and so he has taught every one who has come to him!” Florentius asked that Eutyches might be given a chance to say for himself “whether he agreed with what had been read.” To this Eusebius vehemently objected, for the reason, said he, “*If Eutyches agrees to it, then I must appear as having been lightly a slanderer, and shall* LOSE MY OFFICE”!! {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.9}

Florentius renewed his request that Eutyches might be allowed to answer; but Eusebius strenuously objected. And he only consented at the last, on the express condition that no prejudice should lodge against him, even though Eutyches should confess all that was required. Flavianus confirmed this condition, with the assurance that not the slightest disadvantage should come to Eusebius. But even then Eutyches was not allowed to answer in his own way, because the predicament in which Eusebius had found himself, involved in a measure the whole synod also, as they had given full credit to the charges of Eusebius, and had refused all the assurances of Eutyches that he agreed to all the documents which they had cited. Flavianus and Eusebius, therefore, in order to save themselves from defeat and perhaps deposition, if the matter should come to a general council, determined if possible to entrap Eutyches in some statement which they could condemn. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.10}

**A SPECIMEN OF FIFTH-CENTURY CONTROVERSIALISM**

The proceedings then were as follows:— {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.11}

*Flavianus, Florentius, and Basil of Seleucia*.—“If thou dost acknowledge that Mary is of one substance with us, and that Christ has taken His manhood from her, then it follows of itself that He, according to His manhood, is also of one substance with us.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.12}

*Eutyches*.—“Consider well, I say not that the body of man has become the body of God, but I speak of a human body of God, and say that the Lord was made flesh of the Virgin. If you wish me to add further that His body is of one substance with ours, then I do this; but I do not understand this as though I denied that He is the Son of God. Formerly I did not generally speak of a unity of substance, but now I will do so, because your Holiness thus requires it.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.13}

*Flavianus*.—“Thou doest it then only of compulsion, and not because it is thy faith?” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.14}

*Eutyches*.—“I have not hitherto so spoken, but will do so now in accordance with the will of the synod.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.15}

*Florentius*.—“Dost thou believe that our Lord, who was born of the Virgin, is of one substance with us, and that after the incarnation He is of two natures or not?” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.16}

*Eutyches*.—“I confess that before the union he was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.17}

At this “the whole council was in an uproar, and nothing was heard but anathemas and curses, each bishop there present striving to distinguish himself above the rest by being the foremost in uttering the most bitter and severe his zeal could suggest.” (Bower.) When the noise had ceased, Flavianus, in the name of the synod, demanded of Eutyches a public declaration of his faith in, and curse upon every view that did not accept, the doctrines which had been set forth by the synod. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.18}

*Eutyches*.—“I will now indeed, since the synod so requires, accept the manner of speech in question; but I find it neither in Holy Scripture nor in the Father collectively, and therefore can not pronounce a curse upon the non-acceptance of the question, because that would be cursing the Fathers.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 581.19}

*All together* (*springing to their feet*).—“Let him be accursed!” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.1}

*Flavianus*.—“What does this man deserve who does not confess the right faith, but persists in his perverseness?” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.2}

*Eutyches*.—“I will now indeed accept the required manner of speaking in accordance with the will of the synod, but can not pronounce the curse.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.3}

*Florentius*.—“Dost thou confess two natures in Christ, and His unity of substance with us?” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.4}

*Eutyches*.—“I read in the writings of St. Cyril and St. Athanasius: before the union they speak of two natures, but after the union only of one.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.5}

*Florentius*.—“Dost thou confess two natures even after the union? If not, then wilt thou be condemned.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.6}

*Eutyches*.—“Let the writings of Cyril and Athanasius be read.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.7}

*Basil of Seleucia*.—“If thou dost not acknowledge two natures after the union also, then thou acceptest a mingling and confusion.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.8}

*Florentius*.—“He who does not say ‘*of two natures*,’ and who does not acknowledge two natures, has not the right faith.” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.9}

*All together*.—“And he who accepts anything only by compulsion does not believe in it. Long live the emperors!” {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.10}

*Flavianus, announcing the sentence*.—“Eutyches, a priest and archimandrite, has, by previous statements, and even now by his own confessions, shown himself to be entangled in the perversity of Valentinus and Apollinaris, without allowing himself to be won back to the genuine dogmas by our exhortation and instruction; therefore we, bewailing his complete perversity, have decreed, for the sake of Christ whom He has reviled, that he be deposed from every priestly office, expelled from our communion, and deprived of his headship over the convent. And all who henceforth hold communion with him, and have recourse to him, must know that they too are liable to the penalty of excommunication.” 1 {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.11}

The sentence was subscribed by all the synod, about thirty in number, and the synod was dissolved, November 22, A.D. 448. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.12}

It is not necessary to follow the particulars any farther; as in every other controversy, the dispute speedily spread far and wide. The decree of the synod was sent by Flavianus to all the other bishops for their indorsement. As soon as the action of the synod had been announced, Dioscorus, with all his powers, espoused the cause of Eutyches. Through Chrysaphius the Eunuch, Eutyches was already powerful at court, and added to this the disfavour in which Flavianus was already held by the emperor, the war assumed powerful proportions at the start. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.13}

The next step was, of course, for both parties to appeal to Leo, bishop of Rome. Eutyches felt perfectly safe in appealing to the because he had the words of Julius, bishop of Rome, saying, “It must not be said that there are two natures in Christ after their union; for as the body and soul from but one nature in man, so the divinity and humanity form but one nature in Christ.” This being precisely the view of Eutyches, he felt perfectly confident in his appeal to Leo, for he could not suppose that Leo would contradict Julius. He shortly found that such a hope was altogether vain. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.14}

All hoping to win by a council, pressed the Emperor of the East to call one. But Theodosius, after his experience with the council at Ephesus, dreaded to have anything to do with another one, and sought to ward off another calamity of the kind. But there was no remedy; the thing had to come. Accordingly the two emperors announced that “doubts and controversies” had arisen respecting “the right faith,” and appointed a general council to meet at Ephesus, August 1, 449—to decide again what they believed. A. T. JONES. {PTUK September 16, 1897, p. 582.15}

**“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Second General Council of Ephesus” The Present Truth 13, 38, pp. 597, 598.**

THE emperors summoned the bishops to meet in Ephesus in August, 449, in order to settle the Eutychian controversy. Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, was appointed to preside in the council. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.1}

Leo, the Bishop of Rome was specially invited; and a certain Barsumas, a priest and superior of a monastery in Syria, was called as the representative of the monks. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.2}

Not willing to wait for the decision of the question by the coming general council, Leo took occasion to assert his authority as Roman Bishop over all. He sent a letter to Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, in which he indorsed the action of the Synod of Constantinople as far as it went, but reproved the synod for treating the matter so mildly as it had done, and himself took the strongest ground against Eutyches. In answer to the request of the emperor that he should attend the general council, Leo declined to attend in person, but promised to be present by *Legates a Latere*. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.3}

**THE COUNCIL OPENED**

THE council, composed of one hundred and forty-nine members, met in the church of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus, and was formally opened August 8, A.D. 449. Dioscorus, the president, was seated upon a high throne. Two imperial commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, were in attendance, with a strong body of troops to keep order in the council, and preserve peace in the city. The council was opened with the announcement by the secretary, that “the God-fearing emperors have from zeal for religion, convoked this assembly.” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.4}

The emperor’s instructions to the two imperial commissioners, ran as follows:— {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.5}

But lately the holy Synod of Ephesus has been engaged with the affairs of the impious Nestorius, and has pronounced a righteous sentence on him. Because, however, new controversies of faith have arisen, we have summoned a second synod to Ephesus, in order to destroy the evil to the roots. We have therefore selected Elpidius and Eulogius for the service of the faith in order to fulfill our commands in reference to the Synod of Ephesus. In particular, they must allow no disturbances, and they must arrest every one who arouses such, and inform the emperor of him; they must take care that everything is done in order, must be present at the decisions, and take care that the synod examine the matter quickly and carefully, and give information of the same to the emperor. Those bishops who previously sat in judgment on Eutyches (at Constantinople) are to be present at the proceedings at Ephesus, but are not to vote, since their own previous sentence must be examined anew. Further, no other question is to be brought forward at the synod, and especially no question of money, before the settlement of the question of faith. By a letter to the proconsul, we have required support for the commissioners from the civil and military authorities, so that they may be able to fulfill our commissions, which are as far above other business as divine above human things. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.6}

Following this was read a letter from the emperor to the council itself, in which he said:— {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.7}

The emperor has adjudged it necessary to call this assembly of bishops, that they might cut off this controversy and all its diabolical roots, exclude the adherents of Nestorius from the Church, and preserve the orthodox faith firm and unshaken; since the whole hope of the emperor and the power of the empire, depend on the right faith in God and the holy prayers of the synod. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.8}

The council was now formally opened, and according to the instructions of the emperor they proceeded first to consider the faith. But upon this a dispute at once arose as to what was meant by the faith. Some insisted that this meant that the council should first declare its faith; but Dioscorus interpreted it to mean not that the faith should first be declared, for this the former council had already done, but rather that they were to consider which of the parties agreed with what the true faith explains. And then he cried out: “*Or will you alter the faith of the holy Fathers!*” In answer to this there were cries, “*Accursed be he who makes alterations in it; accursed be he who ventures to discuss the faith*.” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.9}

Next Dioscorus took a turn by which he covertly announced what was expected of the council. He said: “At Nicea and at Ephesus the true faith has already been proclaimed; but although there have been two synods, the faith is but one.” In response to this there were loud shouts from the assembly, “*No one dare add anything or take anything away. A great guardian of the faith is Dioscorus. Accursed be he who still discusses the faith; the Holy Ghost speaks by Dioscorus*.” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.10}

**EUTYCHES PRONOUNCED ORTHODOX**

EUTYCHES was now introduced to the council, that he might explain his faith. He first commended himself to the holy Trinity, and censured the Synod of Constantinople. He then handed to the secretary a written confession, in which he repeated the Nicene Creed, indorsed the acts of the Council of Ephesus and the doctrine of the Holy Father Cyril, and cursed all heretics from Nestorius clear back to Simon Magus, who had been rebuked by the apostle Peter. He then gave an account of the proceedings against himself. When this had been read, Flavianus demanded that Eusebius should be heard; but the imperial commissioners stopped him with the statement that they were not called together to judge Eutyches anew, but to judge those who had judged him, and that therefore the only legitimate business of the council was to examine the acts of the Synod of Constantinople. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.11}

Accordingly the proceedings of that synod were taken up. All went smoothly enough until the reader came to the point where the synod had demanded of Eutyches that he should acknowledge two natures in Christ *after* the incarnation. When this was read, there was an uproar against it in the council, as there had been against the statement of Eutyches in the synod; only the uproar here was as much greater than there, as the council was greater than the synod. The council cried with one voice, “*Away with Eusebius! banish Eusebius! let him be burned alive! As he cuts asunder the two natures in Christ, so be he cut asunder!*” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.12}

Dioscorus asked: “Is the doctrine that there are two natures after the incarnation to be tolerated?” Aloud the council replied: “*Accursed be he who says so*.” Again Dioscorus cried: “I have your voices, I must have your hands. He that can not cry loud enough to be heard, let him lift up his hands.” Then with uplifted hands the council unanimously bellowed: “*Whoever admits the two natures, let him be accursed; let him be driven out, torn in pieces, massacred!*” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 597.13}

Eutyches was then unanimously pronounced orthodox and declared restored to the communion of the Church, to the government of his monastery, and to all his former privileges; and he was exalted as a hero for “his courage in daring to teach, and his firmness in daring to defend, the true and genuine doctrine of the Fathers. And on this occasion, those distinguished themselves the most by their panegyrics, who had most distinguished themselves by their invectives before.” (Bower.) {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.1}

**SECURING “UNITY” WITH THE HELP OF TROOPS**

DIOSCORUS having everything in his own power, now determined to visit vengeance upon the archbishop of Constantinople. Under pretence that it was for the instruction of his colleagues, he directed that the acts of the previous Council of Ephesus concerning the Nicene Creed, etc., should be read. As soon as the reading was finished, he said: “You have now heard that the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who teaches otherwise than the Nicene Creed, or makes alterations in it, and raises new or further questions. Every one must now give his opinion in writing as to whether those who, in their theological inquiries, go beyond the Nicene Creed, are to be punished or not.” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.2}

This was aimed directly at Flavianus and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, as they had expressed the wish that the expression “two natures” might be inserted in the Nicene Creed. To the statement of Dioscorus, several bishops responded at once: “Whoever goes beyond the Nicene Creed is not to be received as a Catholic.” Then Dioscorus continued: “As then the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who alters anything in the Nicene faith, it follows that Flavianus of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum must be deposed from their ecclesiastical dignity. I pronounce, therefore, their deposition, and every one of those present shall communicate his view of this matter. Moreover everything will be brought to the knowledge of the emperor.” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.3}

Flavianus replied: “*I except against you*,” and, to take time by the forelock, placed a written appeal in the hands of the legates of Leo. Several of the friends of Flavianus left their seats, and prostrating themselves before the throne of Dioscorus, begged him not to inflict such a sentence, and above all that he would not ask them to sign it. He replied, “*Though my tongue were to be cut out, I would not alter a single syllable of it*.” Trembling for their own fate if they should refuse to subscribe, the pleading bishops now embraced his knees, and entreated him to spare them; but he angrily exclaimed: “*What! do you think to raise a tumult? Where are the counts?*” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.4}

At this the counts ordered the doors to be thrown open and the proconsul of Asia entered with a strong body of armed troops, followed by a confused multitude of furious monks, armed with chains, and clubs, and stones. Then there was a general scramble of the “holy bishops” to find a refuge. Some took shelter behind the throne of Dioscorus, others crawled under the benches—all concealed themselves as best they could. Dioscorus declared: “*The sentence must be signed. If any one objects to it, let him take care; for it is with me he has to deal*.” The bishops, when they found that they were not to be massacred at once, crept out from under the benches and from other places of concealment, and returned trembling to their seats. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.5}

**PEACE IS DECLARED RESTORED**

THEN Dioscorus took a blank paper, and accompanied by the Bishop of Jerusalem, and attended by an armed guard, passed through the assembly and had each bishop in succession to sign it. All signed but the legates of the bishop of Rome. Then the blank was filled up by Dioscorus with a charge of heresy against Flavianus, and with the sentence which he had just pronounced upon Flavianus and Eusebius. When the sentence was written, Flavianus again said: “I except against you;” upon which Dioscorus with some other bishops rushed upon him, and with Barsumas crying out, “Strike him! strike him dead!” they beat him and banged him about, and then threw him down and kicked him and tramped upon him until he was nearly dead; then sent him off immediately to prison, and the next morning ordered him into exile. At the end of the second day’s journey he died of the ill usage he had received in the council. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.6}

All these proceedings, up to the murder of Flavianus, were carried out on the first day. The council continued three days longer, during which Dioscorus secured the condemnation and deposition of Domnus of Antioch, and several other principal bishops, although they had signed his blank paper, for having formerly opposed Cyril and Eutyches. He then put an end to the council, and returned to Alexandria. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.7}

The Emperor Theodosius, whom Leo had praised as having the heart of a priest, issued an edict in which he approved and confirmed the decrees of the council, and commanded that all the bishops of the empire should immediately subscribe to the Nicene Creed. He involved in the heresy of Nestorius, all who were opposed to Eutyches, and commanded that no adherent of Nestorius or Flavianus should ever be raised to a bishopric. “By the same edict, persons of all ranks and conditions were forbidden, on pain of perpetual banishment, to harbor or conceal any who taught, held, or favored, the tenets of Nestorius, Flavianus, and the deposed bishops; and the books, comments, homilies, and other works, written by them or passing under their names, were ordered to be publicly burnt.” He then wrote to Valentinian III., that by the deposition of the turbulent prelate Flavianus, “peace had in the end been happily restored to all the churches in his dominions.” {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.8}

As the doctrine which the council had established was contrary to that which Leo had published in his letter, he denounced the council as a “synod of robbers,” refused to recognise it at all, and called for another general council. But in every respect this council was just as legitimate and as orthodox as any other one that had been held from the Council of Nice to that day. It was regularly called; it was regularly opened; *the proceedings were all perfectly regular;* and when it was over, the proceedings were regularly approved and confirmed by the imperial authority. In short, there is no element lacking to make the second Council of Ephesus as thoroughly regular and orthodox as was the first Council of Ephesus, which is held by the Church of Rome to be entirely orthodox; or even as orthodox as was the Council of Nice itself. {PTUK September 23, 1897, p. 598.9}

A. T. JONES.

**“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. Steps by Which the Bishops of Rome Secured Their Papal Supremacy” The Present Truth 13, 39, pp. 613-615.**

LEO, Bishop of Rome, called “the Great,” persisted in his refusal to recognise the validity of the acts of the second Council of Ephesus, and insisted that another general council should be called. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.1}

As it was the will of Leo alone that made, or could now make, the late council anything else than strictly regular and orthodox according to the Catholic system of discipline and doctrine, it is evident that if another general council were called, it would have to be subject to the will of Leo; and its decision upon questions of the faith would be but the expression of the will of Leo. This is precisely what Leo aimed at, and nothing less than this would satisfy him. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.2}

Leo had now been bishop of Rome eleven years. He was a full-blooded Roman in all that that term implies. “All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone.” (Milman.) {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.3}

Yet Leo was not the first one in whom this spirit was manifested. His aspirations were but the culmination of the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome which had been constantly growing. To trace the subtle, silent, often violent, yet always constant, growth of this spirit of supremacy and encroachment of absolute authority, is one of the most curious studies in all history. Not only was there never an opportunity lost, but opportunities were created, for the bishop of Rome to assert authority and to magnify his power. Supremacy in discipline and in jurisdiction was asserted by Victor and Stephen; but it was not until the union of Church and State that the field was fully opened to the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome. A glance at the successive bishops from the union of Church and State to the accession of Leo, will give a better understanding of the position and pretensions of Leo than could be obtained in any other way. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.4}

**MELCHIADES**

was bishop of Rome from July 2, A.D. 311, to December, 314, and therefore, as already related, was in the papal chair when the union of Church and State was formed, and took a leading part in that evil intrigue. And soon the bishopric of Rome began to receive its reward in imperial favours. Melchiades was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.5}

**SYLVESTER, A.D. 314-336**

In the very year of his accession, the Council of Arles bestowed upon the bishopric of Rome the distinction and the office of notifying all the churches of the proper time to celebrate Easter. And in 325 the general Council of Nice recognized the bishop of Rome the first bishop of the empire. Under him the organisation of the Church was formed upon the model of the organization of the State. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.6}

**MARK, A.D. 336**

whose term continued only from January till October, and was therefore so short that nothing occurred worthy of record in this connection. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.7}

**JULIUS, 336-352**

under whom the Council of Sardica—347—made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, upon which “single precedent” the bishopric of Rome built “a universal right.” Julius was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.8}

**LIBERIUS, 352-366**

who excommunicated Athanasius and then approved his doctrine, and carried on the contest with Constantius, in which he incurred banishment for the Catholic faith; and then became Arian, then Semi-Arian, and then Catholic again. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.9}

**DAMASUS, 366-384**

In his episcopate, Valentinian I. enacted a law making the bishop of Rome the judge of other bishops. A council in Rome, A.D. 378, enlarged his powers of judging, and petitioned the emperor Gratian to exempt the bishop of Rome from all civil jurisdiction except that of the emperor alone; to order that he be judged by none except a council, or the emperor direct; and that the imperial power should be exerted to compel obedience to the judgment of the bishop of Rome concerning other bishops. Gratian granted part of their request. and it was made to count for all. Damasus was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.10}

**SIRICIUS, 384-389**

who issued the first decretal. A decretal is “an answer sent by the pope to applications to him as head of the Church, for guidance in cases involving points of doctrine or discipline.” The directions of Siricius in this decretal were to be strictly observed under penalty of excommunication. It was dated February 11, A.D. 385. He convened a council in Rome, which decreed that “no one should presume to ordain a bishop without the knowledge of the apostolic see.” (Bower.) He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.11}

**ANASTASIUS I, 389-402**

who, though very zealous to maintain all that his predecessors had asserted or claimed, added nothing in particular himself. He condemned as a heretic, Origen, who had been dead one hundred and fifty years, and who is now a Catholic saint. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.12}

**INNOCENT I, 402-417**

Innocent was an indefatigable disciplinarian, and kept up a constant correspondence with all the West, as well as with the principal bishoprics of the East, establishing rules, dictating to councils, and issuing decretals upon all the affairs of the church. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 613.13}

Hitherto the dignity of the bishopric of Rome had been derived from the dignity of the city of Rome. Innocent now asserted that the superior dignity of the bishopric of Rome was derived from Peter, whom he designated the Prince of the Apostles; and that in this respect it took precedence of that of Antioch because that in Rome Peter had accomplished what he had only begun in Antioch. He demanded the absolute obedience of all churches in the West, because, as he declared, Peter was the only apostle that ever preached in the West; and that all the churches in the West had been founded by Peter, or by some successor of his. This was all false, and he knew it, but that made no difference to him; he unblushingly asserted it, and then, upon that, asserted that all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world are, by *Divine right*, to be referred to the apostolic see, before they are finally decided in the provinces. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.1}

At the invasion of Alaric and his siege of Rome, Innocent headed an embassy to the Emperor Honorius to mediate for a treaty of peace between Alaric and the emperor. “Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome’s universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet, and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline.” (Milman.) He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.2}

**ZOSIMUS, 417-418**

who asserted with all the arrogance of Innocent, all that Innocent had claimed. He not only boasted with Innocent that to him belonged the power to judge all causes, but that the judgment “is irrevocable;” and accordingly established the use of the dictatorial expression, “For so it has pleased the apostolic see,” as sufficient authority for all things that he might choose to command. And upon this assumption, those canons of the Council of Sardica which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, he passed off upon the bishops of Africa as the canons of the Council of Nice, in which he was actually followed by Leo, and put tradition upon a level with the Scriptures. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.3}

**BONIFACE I., 419-422**

who added nothing to the power or authority of the bishopric of Rome, but diligently and “conscientiously” maintained all that his predecessors had asserted, in behalf of what he called “the just rights of the see,” in which he had been placed. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.4}

**CELESTINE I., 422-432**

who in a letter written A.D. 438, plainly declared:— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.5}

As I am appointed by God to watch over His church, it is incumbent upon me everywhere to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.6}

It was he who appointed the terrible Cyril his vicegerent to condemn Nestorius, and to establish the doctrine that Mary was the mother of God. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.7}

**SIXTUS III., 432-440**

who, as others before, added nothing specially to the papal claims, yet yielded not an iota of the claims already made. He was succeeded by— {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.8}

**LEO I, “THE GREAT,” A.D. 440-461**

Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission, and was hailed as “the Angel of Peace,” and the “Deliverer of the Empire.” In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome through her divine religion would dominate the earth. 1 {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.9}

**LEO CAINS THE SUMMIT OF PAPAL AMBITION**

IN A.D. 445, “at the avowed instance of Leo” and at the dictation, if not in the actual writing of Leo, Valentinian III. issued a “perpetual edict” “commanding all bishops to pay an entire obedience and submission to the orders of the apostolic see;” “to observe, as law, whatever it should please the bishop of Rome to command;” “that the bishop of Rome had a right to command what he pleased;” and “whoever refused to obey the citation of the Roman pontiff should be compelled to do so by the moderator of the province” in which the recalcitrant bishop might dwell. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.10}

This made his authority absolute over all the West, and now he determined to extend it over the East, and so make it universal. As soon as he learned of the decision of the Council of Ephesus, he called a council in Rome, and by it rejected all that had been done by the council at Ephesus, and wrote to the emperor, Theodosius II., “entreating him in the name of the holy Trinity to declare null what had been done there,” and so let the matter remain until a general council could be held in Italy. Leo also wrote to Pulcheria, sist of Theodosius, appointing her a legate of St. Peter, and entreating her to use her influence in his favour. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.11}

As soon as it was learned in the East what strenuous efforts Leo was making to have another general council called, many of the bishops who had condemned Flavianus began to make overtures to the party of Leo, so that if another council should be called, they might escape condemnation. Dioscorus, of Alexandria, who had presided at the council that approved Eutches, learning this, called a synod of ten bishops in Alexandria, and solemnly excommunicated Leo, bishop of Rome, for presuming to judge anew, and annul what had already been judged and finally determined by a general council. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.12}

Leo finally sent four legates to the court of Theodosius, to urge upon him the necessity of another general council, but before they reached Constantinople, Theodosius was dead; and having left no heir to his throne, Pulcheria, Leo’s legate, became empress. As there was no precedent in Roman history to sanction the rule of a woman alone, she married a senator by the name of Marcian, and invested him with the imperial robes, while she retained and exercised the imperial authority. The first thing they did was to burn Chrysaphius, the minister of Theodosius, who had championed Eutyches. The new authority received Leo’s legates with great respect, and returned answer that they had nothing so much at heart as the unity of the church and the extirpation of heresies, and that therefore they would call a general council. Not long afterward they wrote to Leo, inviting him to assist in person at the proposed council. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 614.13}

No sooner was it known that Theodosius was dead, and Pulcheria and Marcian in power, than the bishops who had indorsed and praised Eutyches, changed their opinions and condemned him and all who held with him. Anatolius, an ardent defender of Eutyches, who had succeeded Flavianus as archbishop of Constantinople, and had been ordained by Dioscorus himself, {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 615.1}

assembled in great haste all the bishops, abbots, presbyters, and deacons, who were then in Constantinople, and in their presence not only received and signed the famous letter of Leo to Flavianus, concerning the incarnation, but at the same time anathematised Nestorius and Eutyches, their doctrine, and all their followers, declaring that he professed no other faith but what was held and professed by the Roman Church and by Leo. (Bower.) {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 615.2}

The example of Anatolius was followed by other bishops who had favored Eutyches, and by most of those who had acted in the late council, {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 615.3}

and nothing was heard but anathemas against Eutyches, whom most of those who uttered them, had but a few months before, honored as new apostle, and as the true interpreter of the doctrine of the Church and the Fathers. (Bower.) {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 615.4}

By an imperial message dated May 17, A.D. 451, a general council was summoned to meet at Nice in Bithynia, the first of September. The council met there accordingly, but an invasion of the Huns from Illyricum made it necessary for Marcian to remain in the capital; and therefore the council was removed from Nice to Chalcedon. Accordingly at Chalcedon there assembled the largest council ever yet held, the number of bishops being six hundred and thirty. {PTUK September 30, 1897, p. 615.5}

A. T. JONES.