

Another great Father is intimately concerned in the Meletian schism. John Chrysostom, born at Antioch, owed very much to Meletius; in fact, he was baptised by him (c. 369) at the age of twenty-five. Chrysostom had followed the extraordinary custom—against which he later, as other Fathers in like case, vigorously protested—of deferring baptism till adult years. S. John Chrysostom, like S. Basil, was a devoted adherent of Meletius, who, according to the testimony of sympathisers of even the other Catholic party, e.g. Jerome and Epiphanius, was a man of great holiness, personal charm, and popularity. Meletius also ordained John “reader” (ἀναγνώστης), and in 381 deacon, while Flavian, Meletius’ successor, raised him to the priesthood in 386.

Though Meletius died in communion with Rome and is one of her canonised saints, the rival lines of bishops (as we have seen) continued for eighty-five years after his death, and when the Eustathian line came to an end, it was by the efforts of S. John Chrysostom that Flavian the bishop of the Meletian succession was recognised by the pope (Siricius) as the lawful bishop.

In view of this connection, so intimate, with Meletius, and also of the great position which this wonderful orator filled as Patriarch of Constantinople, it is of peculiar value to estimate what Chrysostom thought of Petrine prerogatives and claims.

It is astonishing how Bishop Gore can deliver himself of such a statement as the following: “I believe, indeed, that none of the Greek Fathers of the first six centuries connects the position of the bishop of Rome with S. Peter.”<sup>19</sup> Is it that the bishop would acknowledge all that S. Chrysostom claims for S. Peter personally? Evidently not (see p. 6). Still less if he acknowledged it of S. Peter would he allow it of Peter’s successors. Chrysostom’s writings simply abound in passages—there are nearly a hundred of them—dealing with Peter, his name and

write to the Bishop of Rome that he should examine our affairs and to advise him, since it would be difficult to send anyone thence by the common decree of a council to use his lawful authority in the matter, choosing men fit to bear the fatigue of a journey and also fit to correct all perverse people in our parts, firmly but gently.”

To Pope Damasus, Basil wrote to acquaint him with the state of the East during the persecution of Valens: “The only remedy which we see for these evils is a visitation from Your Mercy” (*Ep.* 70) [and see *Prologomena in S. Dam.*, 1 ap., *P. L.* xiii]. “Send us men who share our faith. They will settle quarrels, they will bring unison to the Churches of God; at least they will make known to you the authors of the troubles, so that you will know whom to admit to your communion.”—*Ep.* 70, *P. G.*, xxxii, 435.

<sup>19</sup> *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 91.

his office. It is the mere controversialist who tries to explain them away—but without success. Those passages which will be adduced have a meaning neither ambiguous nor equivocal.<sup>20</sup> They make this extraordinary assertion of Dr. Gore's, to me, more puzzling still.

To take but a few passages from the many of this Patriarch of Constantinople relative to S. Peter :

(1) *S. Peter's life and death at Rome.*

It used to be the fashion, or duty—as Lanciani observed<sup>21</sup>—to cast doubts on the presence of Peter in Rome. The Tübingen school with their absurd theories have supplied much controversial ammunition to modern Eastern opponents of the papacy. But their Father Chrysostom's evidence should be of more weight with Easterns than modern German speculation.

In the Second Homily on the Epistle to the Romans Chrysostom says :

Your faith, said Paul to the Romans, is known in all the world . . . and indeed *Peter had preached there.*<sup>22</sup>

In the last Homily on the Epistle to the Romans there is a magnificent passage in which he says that while he might praise Rome because of her greatness, antiquity, beauty, population, power, riches, victories, these are not the things which have any weight with him. Greater than all this is to have had a letter from Paul. In all his writings one finds a great devotion to S. Paul, "whose heart was the heart of Christ."

"This is what raises this city above all others. Like an immense giant this city has two sparkling eyes which are the bodies of the saints (*sc.* Peter and Paul) . . . From there Paul will be raised, thence Peter will rise. . . The body of Paul is for this city a rampart more secure than all the towers and fortifications, the *Body of Peter too.*"

During his life Peter received marks of honour from Paul :

"I went up to Jerusalem said the latter to make the

<sup>20</sup> Since this section was written, I have come across the recent work of Cardinal Marini, *Il primato di S. Pietro e de suoi Successori* (Rome, 1922), which exhaustively deals with the question of Chrysostom and the Roman primacy. Granted that some of the Cardinal's conclusions could not be accepted—he certainly makes the most of his material—his main contentions are incontestable. Dom J. Chapman in the *Dublin Review*, 1903, pp. 1-27, devoted a learned article to the same subject, "Saint Chrysostom on S. Peter."

<sup>21</sup> See Appendix IV.

<sup>22</sup> P. G., ix, 402. *Epist. ad Rom.*, ii, 1.

acquaintance of Peter. That is why, when Peter died, grace Divine willed to make him the companion of Paul.”<sup>23</sup>

(2) *Chrysostom shows that Peter received a primacy, not simply of honour, but of jurisdiction.*

The Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev delivered a lecture in Belgrad (1923) on the Orthodox Church and the papacy.<sup>24</sup> As he presides under the Patriarch Tikhon's commission over all Russians outside Russia, his words have special weight. This is from his own summary :

“ If the Roman Catholics should renounce their imaginings, then their restoration to union with the Church would be a matter for the greatest joy . . . for the realisation of the restored fulness of the Church's life to which our brethren of the West would bring that corporate ecclesiastical activity which is characteristic of them. In the circumstances of the renunciation by the Roman Catholics of their pseudo-dogmas, and in particular of that absurd one of them which ascribes infallibility to the Pope in matters of Faith, the Holy Church, in restoring them to union with herself, *would not only certainly restore to the Roman Primate that primacy which was assigned to him before his falling away into schism, but would probably invest him with such an authority in the œcumenical Church as had never hitherto been assigned to him—inasmuch as that which he formerly possessed was confined to Western Europe and North-West Africa. But such authority, assumed as being given to the Pope after his return to orthodoxy, would be based, not on Roman fables about the Apostle Peter as chief over all the apostles, about the succession of the popes to the fulness of his imaginary authority . . . but in the practical need of ecclesiastical life by the force of which that life was gradually centralised ; first, in the metropolitanates (from the third century) and then in the patriarchates (from the fourth and fifth centuries), with the result that the authority of the metropolitans and patriarchs in their areas was continually strengthened in proportion to the assimilation of the people to Christian culture. We admit for the future the conception of a single personal supremacy of the Church in consonance with the broadest preservation of the conciliar principle and on the condition that that supremacy does not pretend to be based on such invented traditions as the above, but only on the practical need of ecclesiastical life.*”

<sup>23</sup> Hom., 32, in *Epist. ad Romanos*, 2, 4. P. G., lx, 678, 680.

<sup>24</sup> *The Christian East*, p. 24, vol. v, 1924.

Turning now to S. Chrysostom, S. Matt. xvi, 18, we find these comments, which it would be hard, indeed, in my judgment, impossible, to reconcile with the Metropolitan's confident assertions :

“ ‘ But you, whom do ye say that I am ? ’ What does Peter reply . . . . he the mouth of the apostles, he *the coryphæus of the choir of the apostles* ? All were asked, but it is he who begins speaking. ‘ And I say unto thee that thou art Peter and on this Rock I will build my Church,’ that is to say, on the faith of thy confession. He shows him thereby that many will soon receive the faith ; he gives him the feeling of his dignity and *makes him Shepherd* . . . . ‘ And I will give thee,’ as My Father has given it to you to know Me in the same way, I too, will give you . . . . What dost thou give him, I say ? ‘ The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.’ Things which are proper to God alone (‘*Α τοῦ θεοῦ μόνου ἔστιν ἰδία*’) to forgive sins, to make the Church unmovable in the midst of so furious tempests, to give to a simple fisherman a force of resistance superior to that of a rock. . . . The Father speaking to Jeremiah, said to him, ‘ I will place thee as a column of brass and as a rampart ’ but he was sent to one nation only ; *this one (Peter) is concerned with all the world.* (ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνον μὲν ἐν ἔθνει τοῦτον δὲ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης.)”<sup>25</sup>

It is “ on the faith of his confession,” but that is not separable from the person of Peter. He, too, is the Rock.

He speaks to the same effect in other passages, e.g.

“ Jesus says ‘Thou art Simon son of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas.’ He does not say, ‘ I will call thee Peter and I will build My Church on this Rock,’ but ‘ thou shalt be called Cephas.’ The first manner of speaking indicates authority and power, but Christ does not expose at once from the beginning the extent of His power, for the moment he employs more human language. It was only when Peter had published his divinity that He said with sovereign authority, ‘Blessed art thou Simon for My Father has revealed it to thee.’ And again, ‘And I say to thee that thou art Peter.’”<sup>26</sup>

Again he writes :

“ He who built the Church upon the confession of Peter . . . Who gave to this apostle the keys of heaven and invested him with so great a power.”<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Hom. 54, in Matt. 1, 2. P. G., lviii, 533.

<sup>26</sup> Hom. 19, in Joan. P. G., lix, 122.

<sup>27</sup> Hom. 82, in Matt. P. G., lviii, 741. *τοσαύτης ἐξουσίας.*



Again :

“ ‘ Since Peter had the appearance of being the first among the disciples,’ it is to him that the tax-gatherers address themselves, he comments. Jesus replied to Peter ‘ Take this stater and give it to them for me and thee.’ You see the exceeding greatness and honour which is done him. See also the self-command of Peter’s mind.<sup>28</sup> For this point Mark, the follower of this apostle, doth not appear to have set down, because it indicated the great honour paid to him ; but while of the denial he wrote as well as the rest, the things which make him illustrious he hath passed over in silence, his master perhaps entreating him not to mention the great things about himself. And he used the phrase ‘ for Me and thee ’ because Peter too was a firstborn child.”

This passage is quite sufficient of itself to show that S. Peter stood, in Chrysostom’s mind, quite by himself—that there were promises and privileges designed by Christ peculiar to Peter alone. Chrysostom remarks that they were not distressed when the three were specially honoured in the Transfiguration, but this was different, and they felt hurt when the honour was confined to one. But it is not an isolated incident. It was indeed to Peter that Jesus had said, “ I will give thee the keys and Blessed art thou Son of Jonas.”<sup>29</sup>

“ Is it not because he was unmovable in his faith that Peter received this name ?”<sup>30</sup>

“ He received this surname of Peter because of the firmness and immutability of his faith, and when all were asked, he, outstripping the others, cried, ‘ Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God.’ It was then that the keys of heaven were entrusted to him.”<sup>31</sup>

“ Peter, the *coryphæus* of the choir of apostles, the mouth of the disciples, the column of the Church, the support of the Faith, the foundation of the confession, the *Fisherman of the Universe*, who draws our race from the abyss of error to lead it to the skies.”<sup>32</sup>

“ Since they had thrown in prison Peter and John, the son of thunder and the *Foundation of the Faith*.”<sup>33</sup>

But as I have said above, the quotations could be multiplied.

<sup>28</sup> Hom. 58, in *Matt.*, 1, 2. P. G., lviii, 566, 568.

<sup>29</sup> Hom. 58, in *Matt.*, 1, 2. P. G., lviii, 568.

<sup>30</sup> Hom., in *faciem ei restiti*. P. G., li, 375.

<sup>31</sup> *Ad Galatas*, c. 2. P. G., lxi, 640.

<sup>32</sup> P. G., li, 20. Hom., *de talentorum debitore*.

<sup>33</sup> P. G., lxii, 499. Hom. 7, in *templo*. S. *Anastasie*.

It is certainly difficult to find here the idea of "*primus inter pares*"—a primacy of honour merely. Evidently Chrysostom believed "*the Roman fables about the Apostle Peter as chief over all the apostles!*" Plainly he fully accepted what the Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev terms '*invented traditions!*' In his comments on S. John xvi, "Simon son of Jonas, lovest thou Me, etc.," Chrysostom says :

"the fault and his denial have been effaced. *He restores to him the government of his brothers*, and without saying a word about the denial, without reproving him with the past, only says to him, 'If thou lovest Me, be set over the brethren.'"<sup>34</sup>

Chrysostom dealing with the earlier incident in the Gospel history, when Peter had asked Christ, "Who, then, can be saved?" had commented thus on it :

"He was not yet shepherd and he had already a soul of a shepherd. He had not yet received the authority (*ἀρχή*) and he would already show the solicitude which belongs to a ruler. *Already he had the care of the interests of all the world.*"<sup>35</sup>

And so here, in this incident of the Risen Christ, Chrysostom says :

"Peter had a great love for John, and since Jesus had just spoken of great things to him and had conferred on him the care of the world, he wished to have John as companion . . . In replying to Peter : 'As for thee, do thou follow Me,' Jesus lets him hear afresh the care he has for him and the close intimacy with which He favours him. And if anyone were to ask me how it happens that it should be James who received the see of Jerusalem I should reply *that it is not to a single see but to the whole world that Jesus has given Peter for Doctor.*"<sup>36</sup>

Soloviev has emphasised the extraordinary assertion that Chrysostom makes that S. Peter of *his own authority* might have appointed a successor to Judas. The whole passage from the Russian philosopher is worth quoting at this point.

"*Saint Jean Chrysostome a victorieusement réfuté d'avance les objections contre la primauté de Pierre, qu'on tire encore aujourd'hui de certains faits de l'histoire évangélique et apostolique (la défaillance de Simon dans la cour du grand-prêtre, ses rapports avec saint Paul, etc.). Nous renvoyons nos lecteurs aux arguments*

<sup>34</sup> P. G., lix, 477. Hom. 88, in Joan., 477-9. τὴν προστασίαν τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

<sup>35</sup> P. G., li, 21. Hom. de 10,000 talentorum debitor.

<sup>36</sup> P. G., lix, 480. Hom. 88, in Joan. διδάσκαλον.

du grand docteur œcuménique.<sup>37</sup> Aucun écrivain papiste ne saurait affirmer avec plus de force et d'insistance la Primauté de pouvoir (et non seulement d'honneur) qui appartenait à Pierre dans l'Eglise apostolique. Le prince des apôtres, à qui tous ont été confiés (ἀρε αὐτος πάντας ἐγχέουσθεις) par le Christ, était, selon notre saint auteur, en puissance de nommer de son propre chef le remplaçant de Judas, et si, à cette occasion, il a fait appel au concours des autres apôtres, ce n'était nullement une obligation mais l'effet de son bon plaisir."

Comment on S. Chrysostom's belief as regards Petrine prerogatives could hardly be stronger than these words of the Orthodox Soloviev. They are the very antithesis of those quoted above of his fellow-countryman and churchman, the Metropolitan Anthony (Hrapovitsky), whom, however, another Russian, Professor Glubokovsky, sometimes finds too liberal.<sup>38</sup>

Dom J. Chapman<sup>39</sup> draws attention to this assertion of S. John Chrysostom, that Peter, of his sole authority, was competent to fill Judas' place, but he considers that Chrysostom perhaps exaggerates and goes too far. But he very pertinently remarks, "I know of no more emphatic testimony to the supreme jurisdiction of S. Peter in any writer . . . for I know of no act of jurisdiction in the Church more tremendous than the appointment of an apostle."

These are the passages :

"Jesus does not say, 'I have prayed for thee that thou mayest not deny but that thy faith fail not,' in order that it may not perish completely. Peter has full authority in this business (i.e. the election of Matthias) because it is to him that all have been committed. It is to him, indeed, that Christ said, 'And thou, when once thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.'"<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, p. 153. "On sait que l'Eglise gréco-russe attribue ce titre en particulier à trois anciens hiérarques : saint Basile de Césarée, dit le Grand, saint Grégoire de Nazianze, dit le Théologien, et saint Jean-Chrysostome. Ils ont une fête le 30 janvier de notre calendrier."

<sup>38</sup> See *The Christian East* (Sept., 1924), p. 129. Art. "The Modern Papacy and Reunion." "That austere guardian and meticulous exponent of Eastern Orthodoxy, the Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev—Hrapovitsky—has recently expressed himself as favourable to the possibility of granting the pope a supremacy in rank *de jure ecclesiae* over the other patriarchs (cf. *Church Times*, Dec. 28, 1923 and *Tserkovniya Viedemoste*, 1923, Nos. 23-4). For my own part, I consider his declaration to be hasty and untimely, since Roman Catholicism, believing that it possesses far more *de jure divino*, will not respond to his advances."

<sup>39</sup> *Art. cit.*, p. 90.

<sup>40</sup> P. G., lviii, 741. Hom. lxxxii, in *Matt.* cf. Hom. iii, in *Act. Ap.* 3. P. G., lx, 37.

"After this lamentable fall, for no evil could befall me after, I say, this fault so enormous Jesus laid on me his first dignity and entrusted to him the government of the Universal Church."<sup>41</sup>

"Since it was his great love which had led him to elect Jesus, the latter wishes to give him a leadership which will be charged with the government of the world."

ὅταν τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀναδέξῃται

And when Christ appears first to Peter after the Resurrection, it is

"because Peter was the head of all."<sup>42</sup>

The Acts of the Apostles shows Peter exercising his authority. It is

"because Christ has entrusted to him the government of the Church."

that Peter gets up and opens proceedings at the Council of Matthias.<sup>44</sup>

Discussing the Council of Jerusalem, appraised by the Fathers, considered that Peter could have settled the question of the right off, just as he could have appointed Matthias to the apostolic authority. καὶ ὅρα ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ συγχωρεῖ πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸτε λέγει.<sup>45</sup>

And in the following passage he gives a summary of the powers and activities of Peter.

"Like a general he passed through the world, examining whether such a part was compatible with the order in good order, what demanded his presence on occasions he goes about, everywhere found him. It was necessary to elect an apostle (sc. Matthias) in the first place. When it was needful to speak to the people, he told them that the apostles were not dead. When a man was to be healed, when the multitude was gathered, Peter always takes the lead; when he was about presenting themselves before the authorities, when concerning Ananias, he it is who undertakes the healings were wrought by the shadow of Peter's garment."

"Everywhere where there was danger, wherever there was a direction to give, he was there."

<sup>41</sup> P. G., xlix, 308. Hom. v, de *Poenis*. τὴν ἁμαρτίαν μου

<sup>42</sup> P. G., lix, 395. Hom. lxxiii, in *Joan*.

<sup>43</sup> P. G., lxi, 327. Hom. 38, in *Ep. I. ad. Cor.*

<sup>44</sup> Hom., iii, in *Act. Apost.* i, 2. P. G., lx, 35

<sup>45</sup> Hom., xxxii, in *Act. Apost.*, 2. P. G., lx, 23



"After this lamentable fall, for no evil equals the denial—after, I say, this fault so enormous Jesus led Peter back to his first dignity and *entrusted to him the government of the Universal Church.*"<sup>41</sup>

"Since it was his great love which had made him contradict Jesus, the latter wishes to give him a lesson . . . when he will be charged *with the government of the world.*"

ὅταν τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀναδέξῃται.<sup>42</sup>

And when Christ appears first to Peter after the Resurrection, it is

"*because Peter was the head of all.*"<sup>43</sup>

The Acts of the Apostles shows Peter exercising this primacy. It is

"*because Christ has entrusted to him the flock,*"

that Peter gets up and opens proceedings at the election of Matthias.<sup>44</sup>

Discussing the Council of Jerusalem, apparently Chrysostom considered that Peter could have settled the questions at issue right off, just as he could have appointed Matthias on his own authority. καὶ ὅρα ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ συγχωρεῖ πρῶτον ζήτησιν γενέσθαι, καὶ τότε λέγει.<sup>45</sup>

And in the following passage he gives a striking summary of the powers and activities of Peter.

"Like a general he passed through the ranks (of the army), examining whether such a part was compact, if such a part was in good order, what demanded his presence. See how on all occasions he goes about, everywhere found the first. When it was necessary to elect an apostle (*sc.* Matthias) he was the foremost. When it was needful to speak to the Jews and to tell them that the apostles were not drunk, when the lame man was to be healed, when the multitude were to be addressed, Peter always takes the lead; when it was a question about presenting themselves before the rulers he is there, when concerning Ananias, he it is who undertakes it; where healings were wrought by the shadow still it was he.

"Everywhere where there was danger, everywhere where there was a direction to give, he was there. There, on the other

<sup>41</sup> P. G., xlix, 308. Hom. v, *de Poenis*. τὴν ἐπιστάσιν.

<sup>42</sup> P. G., lix, 395. Hom. lxxiii, *in Joan*.

<sup>43</sup> P. G., lxi, 327. Hom. 38, in *Ep. I. ad Cor.*, 4.

<sup>44</sup> Hom., iii, in *Act. Apost.* i, 2. P. G., lx, 35.

<sup>45</sup> Hom., xxxii, in *Act. Apost.*, 2. P. G., lx, 236.



hand, where all was calm, he left the field free to the action of all, and did not demand greater honour (than the others)."<sup>46</sup>

Chrysostom's interpretation of the disciplinary dispute at Antioch between Paul and Peter is curious and ingenious, but unconvincing—that the dispute was really a sort of acted lesson to the faithful.

But, anyhow, it shows that the objectors to a Petrine primacy can find no support from Chrysostom here. However, there are other portions of his writings which the objectors quote as supporting their contention, passages which, if they stood alone and Chrysostom had not written all the extracts I have quoted (and many more like them), might justify them. Passages are quoted which seem to teach the entire equality of S. Paul with S. Peter, e.g. the following, where Paul says :

“ ‘ I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.’ After an apostleship so brilliant, he who had need in nothing of Peter nor of his teachings, he who, not to say more, was equal to him in dignity (*ἰσότητος ὧν αὐτῷ*) goes, however, to find him as his superior and his elder, and it is solely in order to know him that he undertakes the journey. The same feeling which drives the faithful of our days to go to consult holy personages led Paul to Peter.”<sup>47</sup>

“ He shows that he is not of an inferior rank, and it is not to the other apostles, but to the *coryphæus* that he compares himself, showing that each one of them enjoyed the same dignity.”<sup>48</sup>

The answer that would be given, I imagine, to the objections is this : “ Yes, all this is quite true.” As apostles all were equal in teaching power and jurisdiction, “ each of them was sufficient of himself and had nothing to learn from his neighbour.”<sup>49</sup> But there was something which Paul recognised in Peter over and above what he himself and the other apostles possessed—a peculiar privilege—what Chrysostom implied in his term “ *coryphæus* ” “ the mouth of the disciples ” which induced Paul to go to see Peter, ὡς πρὸς μείζονα, as being ἑκκριτος τῶν ἀποστόλων.<sup>50</sup>

It is indeed true that Chrysostom uses the term *coryphæus*

<sup>46</sup> Hom., xxi, in *Act. Apost.*, 2. P. G., lx, 165.

<sup>47</sup> *Ad. Galat.*, c. 1. P. G., lxi, 631.

<sup>48</sup> *ibid.*, 638. cf. Hom., in *faciem*, li, 379 and 373.

<sup>49</sup> P. G., lxi, 637.

<sup>50</sup> cf. P. G., li, 378 ; lviii, 535. For recognition on the part of S. Paul of S. Peter's superiority, see Hom. in *illud hoc*, section 4, P. G., lvi, 275, also Hom., iii, *de paenit.*, 4. P. G., xlix, 298 and lvii, 380 ; lix, 142 ; lx, 171 ; lx, 660.

of other apostles besides Peter, e.g. he speaks of Peter, James and John together as the *coryphæi*<sup>50a</sup> and with Andrew, they are "two pairs of *coryphæi*,"<sup>50b</sup> and again Peter and Paul are *coryphæi*. But Peter is always *the coryphæus par excellence*.

Granted that Chrysostom reiterates that Peter is the *coryphæus*, "the universal shepherd," etc., what evidence is there, it is asked, that he recognised these claims in the Bishop of Rome?

(a) Is there anything in his writings to that effect?

(b) Is there anything in his dealings with Rome that shows it?

With regard to (a), if it be held that all this labouring by Chrysostom of the honour and powers of Peter does not of itself demand the exalted position of his successors as its explanation, it must be conceded that there is little or nothing in his writings which explicitly and incontestably affirms that the Bishop of Rome is the successor of S. Peter in his primacy.<sup>51</sup>

Surely, however, if Peter is the *foundation* of the Church, as Chrysostom constantly affirms, and if the Church is eternal as the Founder made it, he must last as long as the building, the Church, which is erected on him.<sup>52</sup>

There is indeed one passage which may be a categorical affirmation of the primacy of the pope.

*De Sacerdotio* : 53

"Why did Christ shed His Blood? To purchase the sheep which *He confided to Peter and those who came after him.*"

It may be urged that S. Chrysostom means no more by this than all those who have the cure of souls. On the other hand, there may be a reference to Peter only and to his personal commission: "Feed my sheep"; and Chrysostom soon afterwards actually quotes these words. And when one recalls his comments on them given above, as meaning Peter's "government" and "ruling the brethren," it is at least likely that here is a reference to Peter's successors in the see of Rome.

<sup>50a</sup> Hom. 56 in *Matt.*

<sup>50b</sup> Hom. 37 in *Matt.*

<sup>51</sup> The writer (Chrys. Baur) of the article "S. John Chrysostom," in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, says: "There is no clear and direct passage in favour of the primacy of the pope"; and see *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, t. viii, col. 679. Art. by J. Bardy.

<sup>52</sup> cf. Soloviev. *Op. cit.* p. 156, seq. *L'Apôtre Pierre et la Papauté*.

<sup>53</sup> P. G., xlviii, 632. cf. Marini, *Op. cit.* p. 67, and Chapman, Art. cit. *Downside Review*.

With regard to (b) his conduct towards, relation with, and appeal to Rome can only *demand* it.

On this last, the objection raised by the writer (J. Barmby) of the article "Innocentius" is to be noted : 53<sup>a</sup>

"The appeal of S. Chrysostom and his friends to Innocent during their troubles involved no acknowledgment of any authority of the Roman bishop over the Eastern Church. They apply to him, not as a superior or a judge, but as a powerful friend, whose support they solicit. Chrysostom's own letter, though in Roman editions it appears as addressed to the pope alone, was really written to the three principal bishops of the west. Its contents leave no doubt of this. Honorius, in his letter to his brother, speaks of the western bishops generally having been applied to, and quotes their views as being of equal moment with that of the bishops of Rome. And Innocent in his replies makes no claim to adjudicate himself, nor does he mention in this case an assertion of the universal supremacy of his see, such as appears in his letters to the Africans and to Decentius, but all along recommends a council of Easterns and Westerns as the proper authoritative tribunal."

It is perfectly true that after his unlawful deposition by the infamous Synod of the Oak (σύνodos ἐπὶ τὴν δρῦν) Chrysostom sent the identical letter of appeal, not to the Pope only, but also to Venerius of Milan and Chromatius of Aquileia. The suggestion of the writer of the above extract seems to be that Chrysostom did not recognise any primacy in the Bishop of Rome. But a perusal of the history of the appeal, especially in the sequel—the breaking of communion by Innocent with the enemies of John; the agitation for the restoration of John's name to the Diptychs—shows, in my judgment, that Chrysostom had Innocent chiefly in mind; that the appeal concerned him primarily. Again, this section of history cannot be treated, as it were, *in vacuo*. It must be related, not only to that which follows, but to that which precedes: Chrysostom was not ignorant of Athanasius and Julius and Sardica; the canons regarding the Roman see of which Socrates and Sozomen tell; the not infrequent proclamation of Petrine privileges in which Innocent himself (as the author of the quotation acknowledges) indulged. Or did Chrysostom ignore all these?

As regards the referring of the matter, which was primarily a matter of discipline, to a General Council—that "all along

(Innocent) recommends a Council of Easterns and Westerns as the proper authoritative tribunal"—the suggestion surely cannot be that Innocent himself had become doubtful of his own primacy!?

If Socrates is a trustworthy recorder, it was the wish of Chrysostom himself that the case should be remitted to an œcumenical council.

"John taking exception to those who had cited him, on the ground of their being his enemies, refused to attend, and demanded a general council (οἰκουμενικὴν δὲ ἐπεκαλεῖτο σύνοδον)." 53<sup>b</sup>

When, owing to the opposition of the Emperor, the council which was proposed for Thessalonica could not take place, the Pope, by his assurance of his communion to John, and, as we have seen, by his breaking off his communion with the Patriarch's enemies, did all that he could. Nor did his efforts cease with the death of the exiled archbishop. Much more could be said—these points are enough. Here it is well to record the result of the persecution of Chrysostom, in the words of an Anglican historian; they have an important bearing on the development of our thesis, they corroborate one of our main contentions:—"But the see of Constantinople never recovered from the wound which it received in the banishment of Chrysostom. Its patriarchs, with few exceptions, were, from that time, little more than pliant officers of the court." 54

53<sup>b</sup> *H.E.* lib. vi, c. 15.

54 J. C. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii, p. 11. cf. Milman, iii, 438. *Op. cit.*