

THE ROMAN SUPREMACY.

The Greek Church Testifies to it.

Now that religious minds everywhere are so deeply concerning themselves with the question of the re-union of Christendom, and that definite and practical steps have lately been taken by Pope Leo XIII. towards the re-union of the Schismatic Churches of the East with the See of Peter, the appended copious extracts from the Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewitt's article in the American Catholic Quarterly, "The testimony of the Greek Church to Roman Supremacy," will be read with peculiar interest:

That St. Peter established the Holy See in Rome, and transmitted his supremacy to his successors in that See, is certain. There are, indeed, some respectable authors who do not admit that St. Peter bound the supreme pontificate to the Roman episcopate in an irrevocable manner, by a divine commandment. We are firmly convinced that he did so, and that no Ecumenical Council or Pope has power to deprive the Roman Church of its prerogatives as the Holy Apostolic See of Peter. In point of fact, the Roman Pontiff has always had the primacy by virtue of the succession to St. Peter, the first Bishop of Rome. There cannot be a higher or more dignified title than this.

The moral impossibility of exercising a minute jurisdiction over the vast territories of the empire made it not only convenient but even necessary that the Pope should delegate a great portion of his supreme and universal power and authority to the superior metropolitans, and especially to the patriarchs of the East reserving only the greatest and most important causes, especially such as related to the patriarchs themselves, to his own court.

The Pope exercised the superior metropolitan jurisdiction, immediately in his own person in Italy, and in the missionary provinces created by Bishops sent forth from Rome, somewhat after the same manner that William II. is King of Prussia and Emperor of Germany, there being also in the empire kings of Bavaria, Saxony and Wurtemberg, and several reigning dukes; so the Pope was a patriarch and also a universal primate, having several other patriarchs under his supreme authority. At last one of these patriarchs, the Bishop of Constantinople, caused all the Eastern provinces to coalesce into one great corporation, styled himself Ecumenical Patriarch, and finally threw off all allegiance to the Pope, abjuring all communion with Western Christendom and setting up a schismatical, pseudo-orthodox Church as a rival to the true Church in communion with the Apostolic See of St. Peter. It is in this way that the terms "Greek Church" and "Roman Church" came into general use as the designations of the two great communions, separated from each other; the one by renunciation of the Roman Supremacy in consequence of the revolt of the Bishop of the chief See of the old Greek Empire, the other by steadfast loyalty to the Bishop of Old Rome and stability upon the original foundation on which Christ built the Church, the Rock of Peter.

These designations can be used in a Catholic sense, yet they easily lend themselves to an Catholic usage. "Ecclesia" denotes any Christian congregation, or temple of Christian worship. The English word "Church" and the German "Kirche" signifies, etymologically, "The house or household of the Lord," which is equivalent to the Greek and Latin "Ecclesia." In their highest sense, these terms signify the "One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church" of the creed, that universal society which Christ founded. But they are also used to denote larger and smaller divisions of the Universal Church, and the material temple in which the faithful assemble. We can speak of the Roman Church, meaning the Diocese of Rome, of the Church of Alexandria, Antioch or Jerusalem, of the African, Gallican or American Church, of cathedral and parish churches. It is even customary to give the same name to societies and temples which are sectarian.

This kind of language easily lends itself, however, to the service of totally un-Catholic ideas, and is in the highest degree ambiguous, especially when the Greek Church is put in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, or even called the Greek Catholic Church in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, the idea is conveyed to the minds of non-Catholics, that the so-called Greek Church is a society, independent and complete in its ecclesiastical organization, and standing upon its own legitimate foundation, just as the Roman empire, the German empire, and the Republic of the United States are each fully constituted and independent nations. A certain section of Episcopalians place what they are pleased to call the Anglican Church on the same level, in accordance with their theory of a Catholic Church divided into three great branches. Evidently all such conceptions are based on an idea which denies or ignores the true doctrine of Catholic unity. It is the idea of union by the aggregation of Bishops according to ecclesiastical law, into patriarchal, quasi-patriarchal or national corporations, or into alliances among such bodies, all of which are political or purely voluntary constructions built on the foundation of the Episcopal hierarchy. All other Protestants go further, and reduce the "historic episcopate" to the same category of human development, while many of them, in like manner, discard the

creed and the inspiration of the Scriptures.

The Catholic Church is Roman in the sense that the See of Rome is her centre of unity, and its Bishop her supreme head; but the Church is not Italian, Latin, Greek, Oriental or Western, because it is Ecumenical. It is more correct to speak of the Greek rite than of the Greek Church, and of the Latin rite than of the Latin Church.

Besides those provisions of the Catholic Church which use the Latin rite, whose Vulgate version of the Bible and whose liturgy are in the Latin language, there are other provinces whose Vulgate version of the Bible is in the Greek language, and their liturgy also Greek.

There are other Oriental rites also, and other liturgies, Syrian, Arabic and Slavonian.

There are eighty-six Bishops of these Oriental rites in communion with the Holy See. The great majority of the Oriental Bishops, however, are in schism, and some of them in heresy as well. All those who are in communion with the schismatical patriarch of Constantinople make up with what is commonly called the "Greek Church" of the modern period, i. e., of the past eight centuries. When the Greek Church of the first ten centuries is spoken of, all the provinces using the Greek language are intended and under the more general denomination of the Eastern Church, all the other provinces of the great Oriental world are included.

Since the great religious revolt of the sixteenth century, all Protestants, and especially the Episcopalians, have been disposed to fall back on the schismatical Greek Church for encouragement. The ancient bishoprics, possessing an unbroken external succession from apostolic and primitive times, a faith acknowledged orthodox, a priesthood of acknowledged validity, the ancient liturgies and rites, with many millions of subjects, and disowning allegiance to the Roman See, appeared to give a powerful backing to the Western revolt. Many efforts were made to secure the sympathy and support of the Eastern Bishops, but in vain. In modern times, these efforts have been renewed by the Episcopalians of England and America, with equal ill success. What success has been attained in gaining some recognition and alliance from Eastern Bishops by Protestant missionaries, has been among those sects which are not in communion with the so-called Orthodox Church of the East.

At the Parliament of Religions Dr. Schaff presented a paper on Church Unity, which brought into the foreground the idea of Catholicism existing in two great divisions—the Roman and the Greek. In his plan of reunion, the first and most important step is the reconciliation of these two great hierarchies.

"First of all, the two great divisions of Catholicism should come to an agreement among themselves on the disputed questions about the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, and the authority of the Bishop of Rome. On both points, the Greek Church is supported by the testimony of antiquity, and could not yield without justifying her whole history. Will Rome ever make concessions to history? We hope that she will."

Here is the Protestant contention distinctly stated. The Greek Church is regarded as a great historical monument, testifying to the ancient episcopal hierarchy in the Church, as constituted without any Papal supremacy. Whether this hierarchy of co-equal Bishops, confederated by purely ecclesiastical law, was or was not of Apostolic or divine institution, is a matter of dispute among Protestants. They are all glad, however, to range themselves behind the Greeks in the contention against Papal supremacy, and Dr. Schaff is a spokesman for the whole of them, from the highest churchmen to the lowest latitudinarians, with some exceptions of men who know history too well to fall into the pit which Dr. Schaff has dugged for the unwary.

The doctrinal question can be dropped. First, because, if the claim to supremacy and infallibility be justified, the accusation of error in faith against the Roman Church is absurd. And, second, because the perfect agreement of the Latin and Greek Doctors on the article of the Procession was proved at Florence.

The one question at issue is the supremacy, and we come now to the particular topic of this article, viz., "The Testimony of the Greek Church to the Roman Supremacy." So far as it is from being true that the revolt of Constantinople is justified by the testimony of antiquity and the whole past history of the Greek Church, that the great mass of evidence for the Apostolic origin of the Roman See of St. Peter comes from the East. The Eastern Patriarchs, the Eastern Councils, the Greek Fathers and historians, are the principal witnesses, not only to the primacy of honor, but also to the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome from the first to the eleventh century. Ever since the middle of the eleventh century, when Michael Cerularius was excommunicated, the Greek Church has continued to be a witness to the Papal supremacy. For it maintains the authority of the first seven councils, of the Greek Fathers, the liturgies, with all their testimonies to Catholic doctrine and polity; it was represented at Lyons and Florence, and its prelates, even in their present state of schism, admit that primacy among the patriarchs has always rightfully belonged to the Bishop of Rome.

The historical fact of the universal

recognition of the primacy throughout the East, is an irrefragable proof that it was derived from the Apostolic principle of St. Peter; that this origin was universally acknowledged from the beginning; that it was understood to imply a true supremacy residing in the successors of St. Peter, *ex jure divino*, and not merely *ex jure ecclesiastico*.

Christianity was of Eastern origin, and was transplanted into the West. Roman Christianity began in the Jewish colony, and in the popular estimation was identified with Judaism, and therefore regarded as a foreign religion. The Gentile element in early Christianity was chiefly Greek. In a certain sense, we may say, that the Greek Church of the first and second centuries was the Catholic Church. The Bible of Christians was the Greek version; the Scriptures of the New Testament were written during the last half of the first century in Greek, with the exception of the Gospel of St. Matthew, which was speedily translated into Greek; the first liturgy of the Roman Church was Greek and St. Clement of Rome wrote in Greek. Latinity did not begin to supersede the Grecian element in the local Church of the Romans, but in Africa, the country of Tertullian, St. Cyprian, the later of St. Augustine.

The transfer of the centre of Christianity from the East to Rome is, therefore, an extraordinary historical phenomenon which demands an explanation. There must have been a sufficient reason and an efficient cause for the primacy universally conceded to the Church and the Bishop of Rome. Those who deny that St. Peter, as the Supreme Head of the Church, established in Rome the metropolis of the universal Church and bequeathed his supremacy to his successors in that See, must account for the Roman primacy as the outgrowth of circumstances, of ecclesiastical development, institutions and laws, as the result of a continuous and successful effort of the Bishops of Rome to extend and increase their power and to sustain their claim to a primacy by divine right, derived from St. Peter.

For some, the first transformation of polity was a change from the purely congregational to the presbytery form, out of which arose the episcopal order, which was further modified by the development of metropolitan, patriarchal and papal systems. Others, again, ascribe the institution of the episcopate to the Apostles, and the very highest churchmen, with the Greeks, regard the confederation of Bishops under metropolitans, primates, patriarchs, and even an honorary precedence and primacy of the Bishop of Rome, as a legitimate ecclesiastical development of the hierarchical order. Not only so, but many Protestants, in the strict sense, consider the Papacy as a most useful and even necessary human institution for the whole period of the eight centuries following the epoch of the first council of Nicea. All are agreed that the episcopal hierarchy was universally organized before the end of the third century. The question is, therefore, reduced to this for all who maintain the purely human rise and progress of Roman supremacy: what were the causes of this concentration of power and authority in the Roman Church? what were the circumstances which enabled the Roman Pontiffs to assert and exercise successively their claim to universal supremacy? They may all be reduced to this: that Rome was the capital city and centre of the Roman Empire. This fact gave to the Bishop of Rome the opportunity of exercising a wide influence. Again, the great wealth of the Christian community in Rome gave to the chiefs and rulers the means of an abundant and wide-spreading charity which endeared them to Christians everywhere, who were the recipients of their bounty. The unwavering orthodoxy of the Roman Church made it a principal bulwark of the Catholic faith against heresies, and the incessant stream of evangelists who went forth to convert the heathen peoples of the imperial colonies brought these missionary churches into close and filial relations with their Mother Church. Once admitting that the entire hierarchy arose and was formed gradually by a process of development from more simple elements, it may appear probable that Rome might have become, through the operation of causes above enumerated, a patriarchal See, with an honorary precedence over Alexandria and Antioch.

As a patriarch merely, and the first in dignity of the patriarchs, the Bishop of Rome could never have acquired and exercised those rights over Alexandria, Antioch and afterwards Constantinople, as well as over all the other Eastern provinces, which metropolitans possessed over their suffragan sees. All these rights were prerogatives of a universal primacy, which was a supremacy of authority and jurisdiction, from which all privileges of metropolitans of every grade were derived and was itself of apostolic origin.

The fact that the pre-eminence of episcopal sees generally corresponded to the political pre-eminence of the cities in which they were placed does not prove that the importance of the city was the cause of the dignity of the Church. It proves only the wisdom of the Apostles and their successors in selecting those local points and centres which were the most fit and suitable for the radiation of Christian influences into their surrounding spheres. Rome was the centre of the world, and therefore, it was the best seat for the central power of Christianity. Alexandria was the second and

Antioch the third city in the empire, and, therefore, they were the most suitable seats for the two churches which shared with Rome, in a subordinate sense, the dignity of being Petrine sees, which raised them far above all other metropolitan centres. In like manner the other quasi-patriarchal, primate and metropolitan sees were generally located in cities which had a relative political pre-eminence, and the same policy has been adhered to down to the present day. Still, these pre-eminences of certain episcopal sees were founded on ecclesiastical law; they remained intact when the respective cities lost their pre-eminence, and there have been notable exceptions to the general rule. London, Paris, Madrid, Brussels and Vienna have never been the seats of primacies. In the United States, Baltimore takes the precedence of New York and Philadelphia. In ancient times whenever a Bishop claimed promotion in the hierarchy because his episcopal city had obtained a higher political dignity the claim was resisted, and the fact that a See was apostolic gave it a greater lustre than any which could be ascribed to any other cause.

No Bishop ever claimed to possess authority over other Bishops, *jure divino*, except the Bishop of Rome. In the episcopate, all Bishops were *jure divino* equal, and the primacy of the successor of St. Peter was a superiority of a higher order not given by episcopal consecration, nor by lawful appointment to his bishopric, considered as a merely human and ecclesiastical conveyance of episcopal mission and jurisdiction; but by an immediate delegation from Jesus Christ, which He had promised to confer always on the subject lawfully selected and presented to Him as the successor to St. Peter in his Roman episcopate. By apostolic ordinance, the lawful election to the episcopal chair of St. Peter in the Roman Church carried with it the inheritance of the special promises made to St. Peter as the Prince of the Apostles. The Catholic hierarchy being thus established by the divine and unchangeable law of Christ upon the foundation of the primacy and the episcopate, it was left to this hierarchy, i. e., to St. Peter and his colleagues, to the successors of St. Peter in the primacy and the successors of the Apostles in the episcopate to complete the organization of the Church by ecclesiastical law, to give a constitution to the confederation of Bishops and Churches, by which they should be united in provinces, should assemble in councils, and be subordinated to presiding Bishops, holding in their respective circles a place of primacy, in an inferior degree similar to that of the Pope in the universal Church. Manifestly, it was impossible, especially during times of persecution, that St. Peter and his successors should exercise throughout the whole Church personally and immediately all the power vested in the primacy.

It was universally recognized that the Bishops of the greater sees did not possess any authority over their suffragans *ex jure divino*, but only *ex jure ecclesiastico*. Those who admit no higher right in the Bishop of Rome, and who maintain that his universal primacy only grew up gradually after a long lapse of time, must therefore ascribe its cause to the imperial supremacy of Rome and to the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs, who availed themselves of their advantageous position to increase and extend their pre-eminence in hierarchy. But this theory is historically and rationally untenable. The primacy of the Popes in the entire Catholic Church was altogether superior to any local primacy, even of patriarchs. It over ruled the authority of all the greater prelates, and of councils. It was a true supremacy. The Greek Church would never have submitted to such a supremacy as a merely ecclesiastical institution, and as a sequel of the political supremacy of Rome.

The ambition of the Popes furnishes no sufficient reason for the fact that their supremacy was acknowledged and submitted to throughout the East, to say nothing of the West. There is as much reason for ascribing ambition to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and other great prelates as to the Popes. Rival ambitions would counteract each other. From the fourth century onward, there were certainly some ambitious prelates at Constantinople, supported by still more ambitious emperors, who aspired at spiritual as well as civil dominion, and were jealous of Roman supremacy. Nevertheless, Constantinople, although rebelling at intervals, submitted to the Roman supremacy, until the middle of the eleventh century, and twice afterwards renewed its allegiance, viz., at Lyons and at Florence. A pre-eminence founded merely on ecclesiastical law could not have been preserved and extended by the ambition and usurpation of Roman Pontiffs, into a supremacy, without any imperial power to support it.

A purely ecclesiastical primacy of the Roman Church would have had no secure ground to stand on against the combined ambition of Byzantine prelates and emperors. Much less could an ambitious usurpation of authority have had any chance of success.

But it was not a rival ambition of exalting the new Rome alone, which placed an obstacle in the way of exalting and extending the supremacy of the Old Rome. Higher motives impelled the great prelates of the East and also of the West to resist all exercise of authority by the Roman Pontiff which they regarded as an abuse or a usurpation, and to defend everything which seemed to them to be an invaded right. In the first half of the second

century St. Polycarp steadily though amicably withstood the effort to bring the churches of Asia Minor into conformity with the Paschal Rite of the Roman Church, and a half century later, Polycrates of Ephesus obstinately and not so amicably renewed the contest with Pope Victor. In the middle of the third century occurred the famous conflict between St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian and the African Bishops on the one side, and Pope St. Stephen on the other, concerning heretical baptism. Every century has a record in its history of contentions between the Papacy and some portion of the Episcopate. The Holy See has always been victorious, and although schisms and heresies have separated multitudes of the faithful, and many priests and Bishops from her communion, the unity of the Catholic Church in loyal allegiance to its Head has been ever more and more consolidated, and has never before been so perfect as it is at the present moment.

This is a wonderful and a unique phenomenon. It cannot be explained by merely natural causes, or by the methods in which the rise and progress of great political empires are explained according to the principles of the history of philosophy. Even during the period of the greatest temporal glory of the Papacy, the dominion of the Pope in the political order was only accidentally and indirectly temporal, but essentially and principally spiritual. During those early ages which elapsed before the formation of western Christendom, the Roman supremacy was purely spiritual, a power in the intellectual and moral order, over the minds and consciences of Christian rulers in the Church and State, and of the Christian people. What was the sufficient reason, the vital principle, the active force of this spiritual power? If its supernatural character and divine origin be denied, some adequate natural cause, and some human origin historically verifiable must be assigned. Rome subdued the East by arms and policy. But the supremacy in arts remained with the conquered Greeks. They retained the intellectual superiority, and were the masters of their conquerors in philosophy, literature and the fine arts.

It was not as the seat and centre of philosophy, theology, sacred science and intellectual superiority that the Roman Church was pre eminent in that ancient Christendom, and sent forth that attractive power which caused all the other churches to obey the law of gravitation which retained them in their orbits of revolution, like planetary spheres circling round their sun. Rome was not a successful competitor in the schools with Alexandria and Antioch. She was the mother and mistress of Churches, a tribunal, judging and not disputing, in controversies of faith. Her standard and rule was the apostolic tradition, and not any philosophical or theological criterion derived from science and reasoning. Her authority was acknowledged, her decisions were submitted to, and those who resisted were eventually condemned by the universal Church. Rome triumphed over patriarchs, emperors, councils and all hostile powers. There were schisms and heresies of very threatening aspects; but they were either extinguished or driven to take the form of sects, condemned and excluded from Catholic communion. There was a chronic reluctance in the Eastern prelates to render a full and hearty obedience to the Papal authority. But this very fact is an evidence that the authority existed, was exercised and was continually exacting and enforcing obedience, even from the emulous and recalcitrant patriarchs of Constantinople, and from the emperors who usurped ecclesiastical and spiritual authority.

Dr. Schaff's assertion that the whole past history of the Greek Church sustains the claim of the modern group of sects who are classed together under that denomination, to autonomy and independence, and is a testimony against Roman supremacy, is absolutely false. The precise contrary is the truth. The exercise of that supreme authority and power by the Popes which surpasses all pre-eminence of metropolitans and patriarchs, was for centuries chiefly in the East. The great mass of testimony to the Roman supremacy during the first eight centuries is furnished by the Eastern Church. Eastern Councils, Greek doctors and fathers, Eastern prelates and emperors, Greek historians, the records of the dealings of Popes with orthodox and heretical or schismatical Bishops and civil rulers

CONTINUED ON PAGE THREE.

PURITY



BEST TO BUY BECAUSE BEST TO USE.

AS IN YOUTH Ayer's Hair Vigor CORDIALLY INDORSED.



RESTORES Natural Growth OF THE HAIR -WHEN- ALL OTHER Dressings FAIL.

Ayer's Hair Vigor PREPARED BY DR. J. C. AYER & CO., LOWELL, MASS.



With a Remarkably Beautiful Frontispiece in Gold and Colors. Price, Five Shillings, 25 cents. Per dozen, \$2.00; per dozen by mail, \$2.25. The Best Writers. The Best Illustrations. The Best Family Reading for Winter Nights.

BENZIGER BROTHERS, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 39 & 41 Barclay St., 143 Main St., 178 Monroe St.

DUNN'S BAKING POWDER THE COOK'S BEST FRIEND LARGEST SALE IN CANADA.



Should be used, if it is desired to make the Finest Class of Cakes—Rolls, Biscuits, Pancakes, Johnny Cakes, Pie Crusts, Baked Paste, etc. Light, sweet, snow-white and delicate food results from the use of Cook's Friend. Guarantees satisfaction. Ask your grocer for McLaughlin's Cook's Friend.

OBJECTS OF THE—

New York Catholic Agency The object of this Agency is to supply, at the regular dealers' prices, any kind of goods imported or manufactured in the United States. The advantages and conveniences of this Agency are many, a few of which are: 1st. It is situated in the heart of the wholesale trade of the metropolis, and has completed such arrangements with the leading manufacturers and importers as enable it to purchase in any quantity at the lowest wholesale rates, thus getting its profits or commissions from the importers or manufacturers, and hence— 2nd. No extra commissions are charged its patrons on purchases made for them, and giving them besides the benefit of my experience and facilities in the actual prices charged. 3rd. Should a patron want several different articles, embracing as many separate trades or lines of goods, the writing of only one letter to this Agency will insure the prompt and correct filling of such orders. Besides, there will be only one express or freight charge. 4th. Persons outside of New York, who may not know the address of houses selling a particular line of goods, can get such goods all the same by sending to this Agency. 5th. Clergymen and Religious Institutions and the trade buying from this Agency are allowed the regular or usual discount. Any business matters, outside of buying and selling goods, entrusted to the attention or management of this Agency, will be strictly and conscientiously attended to by your giving me authority to act as your agent. Whenever you want to buy anything send your orders to THOMAS D. EGAN, Catholic Agency, 42 Barclay St., New York, N. Y.

TRY THAT MOST DELICIOUS

TEA & COFFEE

SOLD ONLY BY James Wilson & Co. 338 Richmond Street, London. Telephone 46.