**“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Pope Made Author of the Faith” The Present Truth 13, 40, pp. 626-628.**

**HOW THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON WAS MANAGED**

THE six hundred and thirty bishops met in the first session of the Council of Chalcedon October 8, A.D. 451. Marcian, the emperor of the East, was represented by commissioners, and Leo, Bishop of Rome, who had got the council summoned in order to undo the work of the Council of Ephesus, was represented by legates. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.1}

As soon as the council opened the legates demanded the withdrawal of Dioscorus, Archbishop of Alexandria, and the presiding bishop in the preceding council which had approved Eutyches. The commissioners argued against the demand, but by threats of leaving the council the legates of Rome overbore the emperor’s representatives. Dioscorus took his place among the accused, and a long list of charges against him was read by Eusebius, the original accuser of Eutyches. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.2}

**A FRIGHTFUL STORM**

THE late council at Ephesus had excommunicated Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus. Theodoret had appealed to Leo. Leo had re-instated him, and the emperor Marcian had specially summoned him to this council. Theodoret had arrived, and at this point in the proceedings, the imperial commissioners directed that he should be admitted to the council. “The actual introduction of Theodoret caused a frightful storm.” (Hefele.) A faint estimate of this frightful storm may be formed from the following account of it, which is copied bodily from the report of the council:— {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.3}

And when the most reverend bishop Theodoret entered, the most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine (the party of Dioscorus) shouted out, “Mercy upon us! the faith is destroyed. The canons of the Church excommunicate him. Turn him out! turn out the teacher of Nestorius.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.4}

On the other hand, the most reverend the bishops of the East, of Thrace, of Pontus, and of Asia, shouted out, “We were compelled (at the former council) to subscribe our names to blank papers; we were scourged into submission. Turn out the Manicheans! Turn out the enemies of Flavian; turn out the adversaries of the faith!” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.5}

Dioscorus, the most reverend bishop of Alexandria, said, “Why is Cyril to be turned out? It is he whom Theodoret has condemned.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.6}

The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, “Turn out the murderer Dioscorus. Who knows not the deeds of Dioscorus?” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.7}

The most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine shouted out, “Long life to the empress!” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.8}

The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, “Turn out the murderers!” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.9}

The most reverend the bishops of Egypt shouted out, “The empress turned out Nestorius; long life to the Catholic empress! The orthodox synod refuses to admit Theodoret.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.10}

Here there was a “momentary” lull in the storm, of which Theodoret instantly took advantage, and stepped forward to the commissioners with “a petition to the emperors,” which was really a complaint against Dioscorus, and asked that it be read. The commissioners said that the regular business should be proceeded with, but that Theodoret should be admitted to a seat in the council, because the bishop of Antioch had vouched for his orthodoxy. Then the storm again raged. Some shouted that he was worthy, others called, “Turn him out!” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.11}

At this stage the commissioners were enabled by a special exertion of their authority to allay the storm. They plainly told the loudmouthed bishops, “Such vulgar shouts are not becoming in bishops, and can do no good to either party.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.12}

When the tumult had been subdued, the council proceeded to business. First there were read all the proceedings from the beginning of the Synod of Constantinople against Eutyches clear down to the end of the late Council of Ephesus; during which there was much shouting and counter-shouting after the manner of that over the introduction of Theodoret, but which need not be repeated. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 626.13}

This session ran into the night, which was made hideous by the cries of the bishops. In the end Dioscorus was condemned. Many of his party now forsook him and asked for pardon, confessing their error, and the council condemned only Dioscorus to deposition. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.1}

**THE SECOND SESSION, OCTOBER 10**

As soon as the council had been opened, the direction was given by— {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.2}

The imperial commissioners:—“Let the synod now declare what the true faith is, so that the erring may be brought back to the right way.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.3}

The bishops protested that no new formula could be drawn up, but that already laid down (at Nice, Constantinople, and the first of Ephesus,) was to be held fast. These were read and approved, and Leo’s letter setting forth his disapproval of Eutyches. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.4}

This was acclaimed as the voice of Peter, and the true faith. As there were some points in Leo’s letter, however, which one or two doubted, the council was adjourned. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.5}

As the council was about to be dismissed, some bishops entered a request that the bishops who had taken a leading part in the late council of Ephesus, should be forgiven! {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.6}

This led to another great uproar, similar to that over the introduction of Theodoret. In the midst of this uproar, the imperial commissioners put an end to the session. The recess continued only two days. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.7}

**THE THIRD SESSION, OCTOBER 13**

The first step taken at this session was by Eusebius of Doryleum, who proudly stepped forward to secure by the council his vindication as the champion of orthodoxy, and prayed for punishment. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.8}

Following this, Dioscorus was charged with enormous crimes, with lewdness and debauchery to the great scandal of his flock; with styling himself the king of Egypt, and attempting to usurp the sovereignty. Dioscorus was not present, and after being summoned three times without appearing, Leo’s legates gave a recapitulation of the crimes charged against him, and then pronounced the following sentence:— {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.9}

Leo, Archbishop of the great and ancient Rome, by us and the present synod, with the authority of St. Peter, on whom the Catholic Church and orthodox faith are founded, divests Dioscorus of the episcopal dignity, and declares him henceforth incapable of exercising any sacerdotal or episcopal functions. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.10}

**FOURTH SESSION, OCTOBER 17**

At this session, the discussion of the faith was resumed. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.11}

The commissioners.—“What has the reverend synod now decreed concerning the faith?” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.12}

The papal legate.—“The holy synod holds fast the rule of faith which was ratified by the Fathers at Nicea and by those at Constantinople. Moreover, in the second place, it acknowledges that exposition of this creed which was given by Cyril at Ephesus. In the third place, *the letter of the most holy man Leo*, archbishop of all churches, who condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches, *shows quite clearly what is the true faith, and this faith the synod also holds, and allows nothing to be added to it or taken from it*. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.13}

All thereupon voted to abide by the creeds of Nice and Constantinople and to believe “as Leo does.” The five bishops who had been associated with Dioscorus were formally received back into the council. As they took their place, the council cried, {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.14}

God has done this! Many years to the emperors, to the Senate, to the commissioners! The union is complete, and peace given to the churches! {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.15}

The commissioners next announced that the day before, a number of Egyptian bishops had handed in a confession of faith to the emperor, who wished that it should be read to the council. The bishops were called in and took their places, and their confession was read. It was seen that the confession did not curse Eutches by name, and the council demanded that the Egyptians bishops should subscribe to Leo’s letter and pronounce the curse. The Egyptians asked for time, as they were under the Archbishop of Alexandria and wished to confer with him. They feared for their lives if they return to Egypt after cursing Eutyches. Leo’s legates and the council insisted on their immediate assent. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.16}

The Egyptians.—“We shall be killed, we shall be killed, if we do it. We will rather be made away with here by you than there. Let an archbishop for Egypt be here appointed, and then we will subscribe and assent. Have mercy on our gray hairs! Anatolius of Constantinople knows that in Egypt all the bishops must obey the archbishop of Alexandria. Have pity upon us; we would rather die by the hands of the emperor, and by yours than at home. Take our bishoprics, if you will, elect an archbishop of Alexandria, we do not object.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.17}

It was eventually decided that the Egyptian bishops should not be allowed to leave until a new Archbishop of Alexandria was elected. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.18}

During the rest of the session matters were discussed which had no direct bearing upon the establishment of the faith. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.19}

**FIFTH SESSION, OCTOBER 22**

The object of this session was the establishment of the faith; and the object was accomplished. The first thing was the reading of a form of doctrine which, according to arrangement made in the second session, had been framed, and also the day before had been “unanimously approved.” As soon as it was read, however, there was an objection made against it. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.20}

John bishop of Germanicia—“This formula is not good; it must be improved.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.21}

Then followed a discussion in which the Roman legates demanded that the letter of Leo should be agreed to or they would withdraw, and call a council in the West. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.22}

The following extract from the proceedings shows how they were disputing merely about words, and how the authority of Leo, Bishop of Rome, was asserted to establish the faith to be received. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.23}

The commissioners.—“Dioscorus has rejected the expression, ‘There are two natures in Christ,’ and on the contrary has accepted ‘*of* two natures;’ Leo on the other hand says, `In Christ there are two natures *united;*’ which will you follow, the most holy Leo, or Dioscorus?” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.24}

The whole council.—“*We believe with Leo*, not with Dioscorus; whoever opposes this is a Eutychian.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.25}

The commissioners.—“*Then you must also receive into the creed, the doctrine of Leo, which has been stated*.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.26}

By imperial authority a commission of bishops was appointed to draw up the formula of the true faith. After a short consultation they returned, bringing in the creeds of Nice and Constantinople, with a long preamble, adding the letter of Leo to the statement of Catholic doctrine, and affirming the two natures in Christ, united in one person. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.27}

When the reading of this report of the commission was finished, the council adjourned. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.28}

**SIXTH SESSION, OCTOBER 25**

At this session the emperor Marcian and the empress Pulcheria, came with their whole court to ratify the decision which the council in the previous session had reached concerning the faith. Marcian of course approved the faith now “settled” by the council and as declared by “the letter of the holy Pope Leo of Rome.” He was hailed as a new Constantine, a new Paul, and Pulcheria as a defender of the faith. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.29}

The emperor then “gave thanks to Christ that unity in religion had again been restored, and threatened all, as well private men and soldiers as the clergy, with heavy punishment if they should again stir up controversies respecting the faith.” {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 627.30}

Instead of dismissing them, however, the emperor commanded them to remain “three or four days longer,” and to continue the proceedings. The council continued until November 1, during which time ten sessions were held, in which there was much splitting of theological hairs, pronouncing curses, and giving the lie; and an immense amount of hooting and yelling in approval or condemnation. None of it, however, is worthy of any further notice except to say that twenty-eight canons were established, the last of which confirmed to the archbishopric of Constantinople the dignity which had been bestowed by the Council of Constantinople seventy years before, and set at rest all dispute on the matter of jurisdiction by decreeing that in its privileges and ecclesiastical relations it should be exalted to, and hold, the first place after that of Old Rome. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.1}

**NO MORE TO BE LEARNED**

February 7, A.D. 452, the emperor Marcian, in the name of himself and Valentinian III., issued the following edict confirming the creed of the council, and forbidding anybody to inquire further about the faith:— {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.2}

All unholy controversy must now cease, as he is certainly impious and sacrilegious who, after the declaration made by so many bishops, thinks that there still remains something for his own judgment to examine. For it is evidently a sign of extreme folly when a man seeks for a deceptive light in broad day. He who, after discovery has been made of the truth, still inquires after something else, seeks for falsehood. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.3}

Severe penalties were threatened any who should question the creed established or dispute respecting religion. The faith had been “settled” and all was to be peace and harmony. Eutychus died before the sentence was enforced, and Dioscorus died in exile. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.4}

Eutyches and Dioscorus were sentenced to banishment. Eutyches died before the sentence was enforced, and Dioscorus died in exile. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.5}

As Leo had published his letters rejecting the canon concerning the see of Constantinople, and had not yet formally published any approval of the doctrinal decree of the council, the report went abroad throughout the East that he had repudiated all the decisions of the council. The report, therefore, was a new incentive to all who disagreed with the creed of the council, and “heresy” became again so prevalent that February 15, A.D. 453, Marcian addressed a letter to Leo, earnestly beseeching him as soon as possible to issue a decree in confirmation of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, “so that no one might have any further doubt as to the judgment of his Holiness.” March 21, Leo responded giving his approval as to the statement of the faith, but rebuking the ambition of the Bishop of Constantinople. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.6}

**THE POPE OF ROME ESTABLISHED THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH**

As the necessity for the Council of Chalcedon was created by the will of Leo alone, as the council distinctly acknowledged Leo as its head, as his letter was made the test, and the expression of the faith, and with that all were required to agree, as the decisions of the council were submitted to him for approval, and were practically of little or no force until he had formally published his approval, and then only such portion as he did approve; as, in short, everything in connection with the council sprung from his will and returned in subjection to his will,—Leo, and in him the bishopric of Rome, thus became essentially *the fountain of the Catholic faith*. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.7}

It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Leo should officially declare that the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were inspired. This is precisely what he did. In a letter to Bishop Julian of Cos (Epistle 144), he said:— {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.8}

The decrees of Chalcedon are inspired by the Holy Spirit, and are to be received as the definition of the faith for the welfare of the whole world. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.9}

And in a letter (Epistle 145) to the Emperor Leo, who succeeded Marcian in A.D. 457, he said:— {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.10}

The Synod of Chalcedon was held by Divine inspiration. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.11}

As, therefore, the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were the expression of the will of Leo; and as these decrees were published and held as of Divine inspiration; by this turn, it was a very short cut *to the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome*. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.12}

By reviewing the story of this Eutychian controversy which was used to assert the headship of Rome, it will be seen that Leo and the Council of Chalcedon came so near to saying what Eutyches had said, that no difference can be perceived. Eutyches had been condemned as a heretic for saying that in Christ, after the incarnation, the two natures *are one*. Now Leo and the council express the orthodox faith by saying that in Christ there are two natures *united in one*. In other words, Eutyches was a condemned heretic for saying that Christ is “*of* two natures;” while Leo and the council were declared everlastingly orthodox for saying that Christ is “*in* two natures.” In Greek, the difference was expressed in the two small words, *ek* and *en;* which like the two large words, *Homoousion* and *Homoiousion*, in the beginning of the controversy between Alexander and Arius, differed only in a single letter. And like that also, the meaning of the two words is so “*essentially the same*,” that he who believes either, believes the other. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.13}

And that is all that there was in this dispute, or in any of those before it, in itself. Yet out there came constant and universal violence, hypocrisy, bloodshed, and murder, which speedily wrought the utter ruin of the empire, and established a despotism over thought which remained supreme for ages, and which is yet asserted and far too largely assented to. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.14}

The whole world having been thus once more brought to the “unity of the faith,” the controversy, the confusion, and the violence, went on worse than before. But as the *faith of Leo* which was established by the Council of Chalcedon, “substantially completes the orthodox Christology of the ancient Church,” and has “passed into all the confessions of the Protestant churches” (Schaff); and as the work of these four general councils—Nice, Constantinople, first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon—was to put dead human formulas in the place of the living oracles of God; *a woman in the place of Christ;* and MAN IN THE PLACE OF GOD; it is not necessary to follow any farther the course of ambitious strife and contentious deviltry, which makes up the story of the councils. {PTUK October 7, 1897, p. 628.15}

A. T. JONES.

**“How the Catholic Creed Was Made. The Church in the World and the World in the Church” The Present Truth 13, 42, pp. 661, 662.**

THE course of the bishops in assuming civil authority led to still further evils. Ecclesiastical officers especially the bishoprics, were the only ones in the empire that were elective. All manner of vile and criminal characters had been brought into the church. Consequently these had a voice in the elections. It became, therefore, an object for the unruly, violent, and criminal classes to secure the election of such men as would use the episcopal influence in their interests, and shield them from justice. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.1}

**EPISCOPAL OFFICE SEEKING**

“As soon as a bishop had closed his eyes, the metropolitan issued a commission to one of his suffragans to administer the vacant see, and prepare, within a limited time, the future election. The right of voting was vested in the inferior clergy, who were best qualified to judge of the merit of the candidates; in the senators or nobles of the city, all those who were distinguished by their rank or property; and finally in the whole body of the people who, on the appointed day, flocked in multitudes from the most remote parts of the diocese, and sometimes silenced, by their tumultuous acclamations, the voice of reason and the laws of discipline. These acclamations might accidentally fix on the head of the most deserving competitor of some ancient presbyter, some holy monk, or some layman conspicuous for his zeal and piety. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.2}

“But the episcopal chair was solicited, especially in the great and opulent cities of the empire, as a temporal rather than as a spiritual dignity. The interested views, the selfish and angry passions, the arts of perfidy and dissimulation, the secret corruption, the open and even bloody violence which had formerly disgraced the freedom of election in the commonwealths of Greece and Rome, too often influenced the choice of the successors of the apostles. While one of the candidates boasted the honors of his family, a second allured his judges by the delicacies of a plentiful table, and a third, more guilty than his rivals, offered to share the plunder of the church among the accomplices of his sacrilegious hopes.” (Gibbon.) {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.3}

**POLITICAL RELIGION**

THE offices of the church, and especially the bishopric, thus became virtually political, and were made subject to all the strife of political methods. As the logical result, the political schemers, the dishonest men, the men of violent and selfish dispositions, pushed themselves to the front in every place; and those who might have given a safe direction to public affairs were crowded to the rear, and in fact completely shut out of office, by the very violence of those who would have office at any cost. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.4}

Thus by the very workings of the wicked elements which had been brought into the church by the political methods of Constantine and the bishops, genuine Christianity was separated from this whole Church-and-State system, as it had been before from the pagan system. The genuine Christians, who loved the quiet and the peace which belong with the Christian profession, were reproached by the formal, hypocritical, political religionists who represented both the church and State, or rather the church and the State in one,—the real Christians were reproached by these with being “righteous overmuch.” {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.5}

In the episcopal elections, “Sometimes the people acted under outside considerations and the management of demagogues, and demanded unworthy or ignorant men for the highest offices. Thus there were frequent disturbances and collisions, and even bloody conflicts, as in the election of Damasus in Rome. In short, all the selfish passions and corrupting influences which had spoiled the freedom of the popular political elections in the Grecian and Roman republics, and which appear also in the republics of modern times, intruded upon the elections of the church. And the clergy likewise often suffered themselves to be guided by impure motives.” (Schaff.) {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.6}

**SOME EXAMPLES**

IT was often the case that a man who had never been baptized, and was not even a member of the church, was elected a bishop, and hurried through the minor offices to this position. Such was the case with Ambrose, bishop of Milan in A.D. 374; Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople in 381; and many others. In the contention for the bishopric, there was as much political intrigue, strife, contention, and even bloodshed, as there had formerly been for the office of consul in the republic in the days of Pompey and Cesar. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.7}

It often happened that men of fairly good character were compelled to step aside and allow low characters to be elected to office, for fear they would cause more mischief, tumult, and riot if they were not elected than if they were. Instances actually occurred, and are recorded by Gregory Nazianzen, in which certain men who were not members of the church at all, were elected to the bishopric in opposition to others who had every churchly qualification for the office, because “they had the worst men in the city on their side.” And Chrysostom says that “many are elected on account of their badness, to prevent the mischief they would otherwise do.” Nothing but evil of the worst kind could accrue either to the civil government or to society at large. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.8}

More than this, as the men thus elected were the dispensers of doctrine and the interpreters of Scripture in all points both religious and civil, and as they owed their position to those who elected them, it was only the natural consequence that they should adapt their interpretations to the character and wishes of those who had placed them in their positions. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 661.9}

Nectarius, who has already been mentioned, after he had been taken from the pretorship and made bishop by such a method of election as the above—elected bishop of Constantinople before he was baptized,—wished to ordain his physician as one of his own deacons. The physician declined on the ground that he was not morally fit for the office. Nectarius endeavored to persuade him by saying,— {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.1}

Did not I, who am now a priest, formerly live much more immorally than thou, as thou thyself well knowest, since thou wast often an accomplice of my many iniquities? {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.2}

The physician still refused, but for a reason that was scarcely more honorable than that by which he was urged. The reason was that although he had been baptized, he had continued to practise his iniquities, while Nectarius had quit his when he was baptized. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.3}

The bishops’ assumption of authority over the civil jurisprudence did not allow itself to be limited to the inferior magistrates. It asserted authority over the jurisdiction of the emperor himself. Dean Milman says:— {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.4}

In Ambrose the sacerdotal character assumed a dignity and an influence as yet unknown; it first began to confront the throne, not only on terms of equality, but of superior authority, and to exercise a spiritual dictatorship over the supreme magistrate. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.5}

**THE CHURCH USING THE STATE**

AS the church and the State were identical, and as whoever refused to submit to the dictates of the bishopric was excommunicated from the church, this meant that the certain effect of disobedience to the bishop was to become an outcast in society, if not an outlaw in the State. And more than this, in the state of abject superstition which now prevailed, excommunication from the church was supposed to mean direct consignment to perdition. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.6}

“The hierarchical power, from exemplary, persuasive, amiable, was now authoritative, commanding, awful. When Christianity became the most powerful religion, when it became the religion of the many, of the emperor, of the State, the convert or the hereditary Christian had no strong pagan party to receive him back into its bosom when outcast from the church. If he ceased to believe, he no longer dared cease to obey. No course remained but prostrate submission, or the endurance of any penitential duty which might be enforced upon him.” (Milman.) {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.7}

When the alliance was made between the bishops and Constantine, it was proposed that the jurisdiction of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities should remain separate, as being two arms of the same responsible body. This was shown in that saying of Constantine in which he represented himself as a “bishop of externals” of the church, that which pertained more definitely to its connection with civil society and conduct; while the regular bishops were bishops of the internal, or those things pertaining to the sacraments, ordinations, etc. As Dr. Schaff says in his “History of the Christian Church“:— {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.8}

Constantine ... was the first representative of the imposing idea of a Christian theocracy, or of a system of policy which assumes all subjects to be Christians, connects civil and religious rights, and regards church and State as the *two arms of one and the same divine government on earth*. This idea was more fully developed by his successors; it animated the whole Middle Age, and is yet working under various forms in these latest times. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.9}

To those who conceived it, this theory might have appeared good enough; and simply in theory it might have been imagined that it could be made to work; but when it came to be put into practice, the all-important question was, Where is the line which defines the exact limits between the jurisdiction of the magistrate and that of the bishop? between the authority of the church and that of the State? The State was now a theocracy. The government was held to be moral, a government of God; the Bible, the supreme code of morals, was the code of the government; there was no such thing as civil government—all was moral. But the subject of morals is involved in every action, yea, in every thought of man. The State, then, being allowed to be moral, it was inevitable that the church, being the arbiter of morals, and the dispenser and interpreter of the code regulating moral action, would interpose in all questions of human conduct, and spread her dominion over the whole field of human action. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.10}

To overstep every limit and break down every barrier that seemed in theory to be set between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, was the only consequence that could result from such a union. And when it was attempted to put the theory into practice, every step taken, in any direction, only served to demonstrate that which the history everywhere shows, that “the apparent identification of the State and church by the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the empire, altogether confounded the limits of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdiction.” (Milman.) {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.11}

The State, as a body distinct from the church, was gone, As a distinct system of law and government, the State was destroyed; and its machinery existed only as the tool of the church to accomplish her arbitrary will and to enforce her despotic decrees. {PTUK October 21, 1897, p. 662.12}

A. T. JONES.

**“After the Creed was Made: How the Papacy Ruled and Ruined. The Church Leads Toward Ruin” The Present Truth 13, 43, pp. 677-679.**

**A REVIEW OF THE INFLUENCE OF IMPERIAL PATRONAGE**

WE have seen the church secure the enactment of laws by which she could enforce church discipline upon all the people, whether in the church or not. We have seen her next extend her encroachments upon the civil power, until the whole system of civil jurisprudence, as such, was destroyed by being made religious. We shall now see how the evils thus engendered caused the final and fearful ruin of the Roman empire. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.1}

Among the first of the acts of Constantine in his favours to the church was the appropriation of money from the public treasury for the bishops. Another enactment, A.D. 321, which as the church used it—was of vastly more importance, was his granting to the church the right to receive legacies. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.2}

That which made this a still more magnificent gift to the church was the view which prevailed, especially among the rich, that they could live as they pleased all their lives, and then at their death give their property to the church, and be assured a safe conduct to eternal bliss. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.3}

We have seen in former papers what kind of characters were chosen to the bishopric in those times. Not content with simply receiving bequests that might voluntarily be made, they brought to bear every possible means to induce persons to bestow their goods upon the churches. They assumed the protectorship of widows and orphans, and had the property of such persons left to the care of the bishop. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.4}

Now into the coffers of the bishops, as into the coffers of the republic after the fall of Carthage, wealth came in a rolling stream of gold, and the result in this case was the same as in that. With wealth came luxury and magnificent display. The bishopric assumed a stateliness and grandeur that transcended that of the chief ministers of the empire; and that of the bishopric of Rome fairly outshone the glory of the emperor himself. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.5}

**FIGHTING FOR THE BISHOPRIC**

The offices of the church were the only ones in the empire that were elective. The bishopric of Rome was the chief of these offices. As that office was one which carried with it the command of such enormous wealth and such display of imperial magnificence, it became the object of the ambitious aspiration of every Catholic in the city; and even a heathen exclaimed, “Make me bishop of Rome, and I will be a Christian!” {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.6}

Here were displayed all those elements of political strife and chicanery which were but referred to in preceding articles. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.7}

The scenes which occurred at the election of Damasus as bishop of Rome, A.D. 366, will illustrate the character of such proceedings throughout the empire, according as the particular bishopric in question compared with that of Rome. There were two candidates,—Damasus and Ursicinus,—and these two men represented respectively two factions that had been created in the contest between Liberius, bishop of Rome and Constantius, Emperor of Rome. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.8}

“The presbyters, deacons, and faithful people who had adhered to Liberius in his exile, met in the Julian Basilica, and duly elected Ursicinus, who was consecrated by Paul, bishop of Tibur. Damasus was proclaimed by the followers of Felix, in S. M. Lucina. Damasus collected a mob of charioteers and a wild rabble, broke into the Julian Basilica, and committed great slaughter. Seven days after, having bribed a great body of ecclesiastics and the populace, and seized the Lateran Church, he was elected and consecrated bishop. Ursicinus was expelled from Rome. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.9}

“Damasus, however, continued his acts of violence. Seven presbyters of the other party were hurried prisoners to the Lateran; their faction rose, rescued them, and carried them to the Basilica of Liberius. Damasus, at the head of a gang of gladiators, charioteers, and labourers, with axes, swords, and clubs, stormed the church; a hundred and sixty of both sexes were barbarously killed; not one on the side of Damasus. The party of Ursicinus was obliged to withdraw, vainly petitioning for a synod of bishops to examine into the validity of the two elections. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.10}

“So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the prefect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighborhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the Basilica of Sisinnius.... Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus; he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the Church of St. Agnes. The emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Praetextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see. “But Damasus had the ladies of Rome in his favour; and the Council of Valentinian was not inaccessible to bribes. New scenes of blood took place. Ursicinus was compelled at last to give up the contest.” (Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity.”) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.11}

Of the bishop of Rome at this time we have the following sketch written by one who was there at the time, and had often seen him in his splendor:— {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 677.12}

I must own that when I reflect on the pomp attending that dignity, I do not at all wonder that those who are fond of show and parade, should scold, quarrel, fight, and strain every nerve to attain it; since they are sure, if they succeed, to be enriched with the offerings of the ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in stately chariots, and gorgeously attired; to keep costly and sumptuous tables; nay, and to surpass the emperors themselves in the splendor and magnificence of their entertainments. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.1}

The example of the bishop of Rome was followed by the whole order of bishops, each according to his degree and opportunities. Chrysostom boasted that “the heads of the empire and the governors of provinces enjoy no such honor as the rulers of the church. They are first at court, in the society of ladies, in the houses of the great. No one has precedence of them.” By them were worn such titles as, “Most Holy,” “Most Reverend,” and “Most Holy Lord.” They were addressed in such terms as, “Thy Holiness” and “Thy Blessedness.” “Kneeling, kissing of the hand, and like tokens of reverence, came to be shown them by all classes, up to the emperor himself.” (Schaff.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.2}

The manners of the minor clergy of Rome are described by one who was well acquainted with them. “His whole care is in his dress, that it be well perfumed; that his feet may not slip about in a loose sandal; his hair is crisped with a curling-pin; his fingers glitter with rings; he walks on tiptoe lest he should splash himself with the wet soil; when you see him, you would think him a bridegroom rather than an ecclesiastic.” (Jerome.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.3}

Such an example being set by the dignitaries in the church, these, too, professing to be the patterns of godliness, their example was readily followed by all in the empire who were able. Consequently, “The aristocratical life of this period seems to have been characterised by gorgeous magnificence without grandeur, inordinate luxury without refinement, the pomp and prodigality of a high state of civilisation with none of its ennobling or humanising effects.” (Milman.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.4}

As in the republic of old, in the train of wealth came luxury, and in the train of luxury came vice; and as the violence now manifested in the election of the bishops was but a reproduction of the violence by which the tribunes and the consuls of the later republic were chosen, so the vices of these times were but a reproduction of the vices of the later republic and early empire—not indeed manifested so coarsely and brutally, more refined and polished; yet essentially the same iniquitous practice of shameful vice. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.5}

Because of the insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, and because of the shameful corruption that was practiced with the means thus acquired, a law was enacted, A.D. 370, by Valentinian I., forbidding any ecclesiastics to receive any inheritance, donation, or legacy from anybody. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.6}

The fact that such a law as this had to be enacted—a law applying only to the clergy—furnishes decisive proof that the ecclesiastics were more vicious and more corrupt in their use of wealth than was any other class in the empire. This in fact is plainly stated by another who was present at the time:— {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.7}

I am ashamed to say it, the priests of the idols, the stage-players, charioteers, whores, are capable of inheriting estates and receiving legacies; from this common privilege clerks alone, and monks, are debarred by law, debarred not under persecuting tyrants, but Christian princes.” (Jerome.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.8}

**MORE PAGAN RITES ADOPTED**

NOR was this all. The same pagan rites and heathen superstitions and practices which were brought into the church when the Catholic religion became that of the empire, not only still prevailed, but were enlarged. The celebration of the rites of the mysteries still continued, only with a more decidedly pagan character, as time went on, and as the number of pagans multiplied in the church. To add to their impressiveness, the mysteries in the church, as in the original Eleusinia, were celebrated in the night. As the catechumen came to the baptismal font, he “turned to the west, the realm of Satan, and thrice renounced his power; he turned to the east to adore the Sun of Righteousness, and to proclaim his compact with the Lord of Life.” (Milman.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.9}

About the middle of the fourth century there was added another form and element of sun-worship. Among the pagans for ages, December 25 had been celebrated as the birthday of the sun. In the reigns of Domitian and Trajan, Rome formally adopted from Persia the feast of the Persian sun-god, Mithras, as the *birth* festival of the unconquered sun—*Natales invicti Solis*. The Church of Rome adopted this festival, and made it the birthday of Christ. And within a few years the celebration of this festival of the sun had spread throughout the whole empire east and west; the perverse-minded bishops readily sanctioning it with the argument that the pagan festival of the birth of the real sun, was a type of the festival of the birth of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. Thus was established the church festival of Christmas. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.10}

This custom, like the forms of sun-worship—the observance of the *day* of the sun (the Sunday), worshipping toward the East, and the mysteries—which had already been adopted, was so closely followed that it was actually brought “as a charge against the Christians of the Catholic Church that they celebrated the Solstitia with the pagans.” (Neander.) The worship of the sun itself was also still practised. Pope Leo I. testifies that in his time many Catholics had retained the pagan custom of paying “obeisance from some lofty eminence to the sun.” And that they also “first worshipped the rising sun, paying homage to the pagan Apollo, before repairing to the Basilica of St. Peter.” (Schaff.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.11}

The images and pictures which had formerly represented the sun were adopted and transformed into representations of Christ. And such was the origin of the “pictures of Christ.” {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.12}

The martyrs, whether real or imaginary, were now honoured in the place of the heathen heroes. The day of their martyrdom was celebrated as their birthday, and these celebrations were conducted in the same way that the heathen celebrated the festival days of their heroes. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.13}

“As the evening drew in, the solemn and religious thoughts gave way to other emotions; the wine flowed freely, and the healths of the martyrs were pledged, not unfrequently, to complete inebriety. All the luxuries of the Roman banquet were imperceptibly introduced. Dances were admitted, pantomimic spectacles were exhibited, the festivals were prolonged till late in the evening, or to midnight, so that other criminal irregularities profaned, if not the sacred edifice, its immediate neighborhood. The bishops had for some time sanctioned these pious hilarities with their presence; they had freely partaken of the banquets.” (Milman.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.14}

So perfectly were the pagan practices duplicated in these festivals of the martyrs, that the Catholics were charged with practicing pagan rites, with the only difference that they did it apart from the pagans. This charge was made to Augustine:— {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.15}

You have substituted your Agape for the sacrifices of the pagans; for their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honors. You appease the shades of the dead with wines and feasts; you celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calends and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them. (Draper.) {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 678.16}

And the only defence that Augustine could make was in a blundering casuistical effort to show a distinction in the nature of the two forms of worship. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 679.1}

In the burial of their dead, they still continued the pagan practice of putting a piece of money in the mouth of the corpse, with which the departed was to pay the charges of Charon for ferrying him over the River Styx. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 679.2}

These things show the utter corruption of religion and morals in the church, which as we shall learn next week brought swift ruin upon the Empire. {PTUK October 28, 1897, p. 679.3}

A. T. JONES.