

This file was created as a translation for my personal use and without any thought of sharing publicly at the time. Where there are uncertainties in the translation I am able to return to the original French file to sort things out for myself. I only ask that you keep that in mind when using it.

The French work is available at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k75914s>.

— Neil Godfrey - November 2023

- Turmel, Joseph (1859-1943) Auteur du texte. *Histoire Du Dogme De La Papauté. I, Des Origines À La Fin Du IVe Siècle*. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1908.

207

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### Constantine and the Papacy at Nicaea

The bishops, numbering about three hundred, arrived at Nicaea towards the end of May<sup>1</sup> (325). Almost all belonged to the Orient. Among the rare representatives of the Latin Church were the two Roman priests, Vito and Vincentius, deputies of Pope Silvestre whose age prevented a difficult journey. The problem of the generation of the Son was studied in preliminary conferences which, without having an official character, were to enlighten minds and facilitate definitive solutions. Finally, in the last days of June, Constantine came to inaugurate the council. Eusebius gave us the account of the first session<sup>2</sup>. Gathered in the great hall of the city palace, the bishops were seated on seats arranged along the walls. Suddenly the door opened: it was the imperial procession making its entrance. The officers paraded one by one, then the emperor was announced. Immediately the prelates stood up. Constantine advanced majestically through the middle of the ranks and went to the back of the room, where a golden seat had been set up for him. He sat ; the assembly did the same. One of the bishops who sat beside him—perhaps Eusebius himself—paid him a small compliment. When he had finished, the emperor stood up, looked kindly upon the audience, and delivered the following speech in Latin, which an interpreter translated into Greek:

1, See Hefele, *History of the councils*, i, §26, p. 416 (translated Farnborough); Bernoulli in *Realencycl.*, 3rd edition, XIV» 12. This date is only conjectural. Tillemont, (vi, the

council of Nicaea, i and note 1) placed the meeting of the bishops towards the end of June, and he was perhaps right.

2. Life of Constantine, iii, 10 et seq. ; see also Tillemont.

208

"I had an ardent desire, my dear ones, to see you gathered together. Today my wish came true. So I thank God, the supreme king, who, in addition to the innumerable benefits with which he has showered you, has granted you the grace, the greatest of all, to bring you all together and to witness the concert of your feelings. Therefore, let no enemy come to disturb this happy state of things. Now that, with the help of God, Savior, those who declared war on God are overthrown, let us prevent the wicked demon from exposing the divine law to insults and slander by another way. The internal divisions of the Church of God seem to me more serious and more dangerous than wars and other conflicts; and they pain me more than anything else. When God, by his goodness, had made me victorious over my enemies, I thought that in the future, I would only have to give thanks to the divinity and rejoice with those to whom God, by using me, had given freedom. But upon learning that a division, which I was far from expecting, had arisen among you, I understood that this matter was not to be neglected. This is why, wishing, by all means within my power, to cut Cernai short, I immediately gathered you together. I feel, I must say, great joy in seeing you in this enclosure. But, for my wishes to be fulfilled, your hearts must be united and you must see the peace reign among you of which your consecration to God makes it your duty to be the apostles. Work therefore, O dear ministers of God, faithful servants of him who is our Lord and Savior all, work to make all dissension disappear and to drown your controversies in peace. By doing so, you will please the Supreme God and you will be a great favor to me, your brother in the service of God. "

209

When these words were spoken, the emperor sat down and the discussion began, continuing for several weeks. On various occasions, we have tried, by bringing together texts, to establish the general framework and thus to supplement the missing minutes 1. What matters here is only to know Constantine's attitude. Eusebius described it in a few words: 1 "The emperor," he said, "listened to everything with great patience. He followed the discussion of the problems attentively. He took up the assertions made, correcting them or softening them so as to prevent the dissertations from degenerating into conflicts. He showed kindness to everyone, and he used the Greek language which was not foreign to him. His affability won him hearts. He carried, thanks to the force of his arguments, conviction in certain minds. Those he could not convince, he made blush with the force of his words. When someone spoke wisely, he gave them praise. He preached harmony to everyone. He achieved his goals and brought everyone to agreement on the point in dispute. »

1. De Broglie, II, 31; Harnack, Dogmengeschichte, ii. 222. and following. ; Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism<sup>2</sup>, p. 40 et seq.

1. Life of Constantine, iii, 13. Where the Latin version puts "€ alios orat et flectit", the Greek says καταδύσωπών which Tillemont vi, 652, exactly rendered by "to make blush".

210

Eusebius can well say that Constantine managed to get all the members of the council to agree. There were, in fact, only two bishops, Theonas and Secundus, who refused to sign symbol 2. As a price for their audacity, they were sent into exile where Arius had preceded them. All the others subscribed to the formula which proclaimed the identity of the substance of the Father and the Son. However, Arius had a number of supporters at the council, notably Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea. But none dared to clearly support his doctrine. All limited their efforts to using evasions, equivocations, and ruling out definitions that were too precise. Finally, everyone, even the two Eusebius, after having ceded the ground step by step, capitulated and accepted the symbol that was proposed to them. Historians have attributed their submission only to the fear of exile. Naturally Eusebo of Caesarea gives another reason for his conduct. In the letter he wrote after the council to the people of Caesarea 1, he explains that, if he accepted the definitions proposed by Alexander's party, it is because they were given a good meaning. However, he cannot help but recognize that the emperor asked him to insert the word "Homoousios" into his profession of faith. He thus makes it understood, despite himself, that Constantine's will weighed on his own. Moreover, by subscribing to the formulas presented to him, he reserved the right to exegesis them, and his exegesis is quite simply destructive. Does he not claim, for example, to exhaust the meaning of the term "Homoousios" by saying that the Son is completely similar to the Father?

2. Tillemont, vi, the council of Nicea, x and xi, We find 1 » all the useful references.

1. In Theodoret. hist, eccl.. i, He: "Our beloved emperor of God was the first to declare that the thought (of my profession of faith) was orthodox and that he was in perfect agreement with me. He therefore exhorted the bishops to give their support to this profession of faith, to subscribe to it and to accept its doctrine. He only asked that the word homoousios be added.

211

When the work of the council was completed, Constantine promulgated them and established them as imperial laws by two letters addressed, one to all the churches, the other to the church of Alexandria in particular 1. In the latter he begins with declare that he, under the inspiration of God 2, gathered at Nicec a large number of bishops and that, in concert with them, he carefully sought the truth. In both he declares that the decision decided by the bishops is the decision of God himself. 3 He concludes by prescribing the faithful to submit to it.

1. Eusebius gives the first (Life of Constantine, ni, 17-20; Socrates gives both (i, 9); moreover he inserts between the first and the second an edict from Constantine which

prescribes burning the writings of Arius and punishes with death anyone who keeps them at home. Gelasius of Cyzicus reproduces this three pieces ii, 36, in Hardouin i, 445.

2. ἐπισκόπων. Gelase gives θελήσει θεού\*

3. It is especially in the first that the inspiration of the councils is highly proclaimed (Life of Constantine kii, 20): "Quidquid enim in sanctis episcoporum conciliis geritur, id omne ad divinam referendum est voluntatem (τούτο προς την θείαν βούλησιν ἔχει την ἀναφοράν).

212

The council, for its part, was keen to notify its actions. We have the letter he wrote to Alexandria. It begins like this<sup>4</sup>:

"Assembled at Nicce in a holy and numerous council by the very good, very great God, and by the care of the prince who is dear to him, Constantine<sup>5</sup>, we found it necessary to communicate by letter the problems which were addressed and the solutions which were adopted. The first question that was discussed in the presence of the first pious prince, Constantine, was that of the impiety of Arius and his companions. It pleased us all to condemn the blasphemous doctrine of this man as well as the terms he used to formulate it. . »

4. In Socrates, i, 9, and in Gelasius, ii, 33, Hardouin, i, 440.

5. Ἐπειδὴ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ χάριτος καὶ τοῦ θεοφιλέστατου βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου συναγαγόντος ἡμᾶς.

213

At this time the twentieth year of the emperor's reign began. Before dismissing the bishops, Constantine wanted to celebrate the vicennia/ia with them. He therefore served them a sumptuous meal, during which Eusebius spoke and eulogized the first Christian prince. A few days later, the emperor reconvened the bishops to give them his final advice. He exhorted them to live in peace with one another, to avoid pride and envy. He also pointed out to them, like scourges, the arguments and the long speeches. He finished by commending himself to their prayers. Then he allowed them to leave. "The bishops," adds Eusebius, "returned home, full of joy. They all had the same doctrine, that which had obtained the support of all in the presence of the emperor 1.

The sentence we have just read is one of those lies that panegyrists are accustomed to. Coming out of the Council of Nicaea, Eusebius knew better personally how many equivocations were hidden behind certain adhesions. Better than anyone, he knew how artificial and fragile a union was, of which the fear of the emperor formed all the cement. And if, by impossibility, he entertained, in 325, some illusion, he could not have had any at the time when he wrote the life of Constantine. At this point, in fact (around 338), events had rushed. Let us summarize briefly. After a few years of disgrace, the Eusebians managed to gain the trust and favor of Constantine. From that moment on, the roles were reversed. Arius and his friends returned from

exile. Eustathius of Antioch, who taught Honiootsios, went to take their place. Constantine assembled two councils, one at Caesarea (334), the other at Tire (335); but it was to judge Athanasius, Alexander's right arm at the Council of Nicaea, his successor on the see of Alexandria, and the heir of his thought. Despite the firmness of his defense, Athanasius was banished and sent to Trier. This was the situation when Constantine died (337). Let us stop here for a moment, and, after recounting the facts, let us try to interpret them.

1. Life of Constantine, iii, 15, 21.

214

Eusebius relates a curious remark from the emperor which he eulogizes. "One day," he said, "when the prince had invited the bishops to his table, he declared himself to be one of them, and this is approximately how he expressed himself: You, you are for the things which are do within the Church; I have

been established bishop by God for external things. 1 » Bishop from the outside: this is what Constantine wanted to be since his conversion. Putting his powerful arm at the service of the Christian religion, protecting it against its external enemies, removing from it all internal dissensions: such is the task that he imposed on himself and which dictated his actions. He learned that the Church of Africa was torn apart by disastrous divisions: he immediately appointed a commission of bishops and charged it with stifling the threatening fire. He noted that the Council of Rome was unable to carry out its mission: he entrusted it to the Council of Arles. The day after his victory over Licinius, he was told that a priest of Alexandria was in a struggle with his bishop over dogmatic questions, and that this struggle was having repercussions throughout Egypt and even beyond. He begins by chaptering the bishop and the priest; then, seeing that he had obtained no result, he gathered the bishops at Nicaea. When the council is assembled, he realizes that minds are divided and that the discussions will degenerate into irreconcilable quarrels. He therefore attends the sessions, he listens to the speakers, he represses their too lively outbursts, he summarizes the speeches and, in summarizing them, he seeks to reconcile them. He exiles the recalcitrant, those who stubbornly reject the decisions of the majority. Finally, before sending the bishops back to their dioceses, he gives them a lesson in good behavior and Christian charity,

1. Life of Constantine, iv, 24,

216

This table of the relations of the priesthood and the empire, as it has just appeared to us, certainly does not respond to the ideal of a Gregory VII or an Innocent III. Let us temporarily leave aside the Council of Arles and the mission it received to revise the sentence of the Council of Rome. The imperial homily, which the fathers of Nicaea had to hear before returning home, resonates in our ears like an intrusion of secular power into the temple. The letters of convocation, which the bishops received to go to the council of Arles and Nicaea, are difficult to

reconcile with the distinction of the two powers. Without doubt, Eusebius assures us that the emperor's attitude was marked by the most perfect deference. He is happy to tell us that public cars were made available to all the prelates. But we have in our hands the letters which were sent to summon the bishops, either at Arles or at Nicaea, and these letters are written in an imperious tone 1; moreover, Eusebius himself uses the word commandment<sup>2</sup>, despite himself. Let us admit it frankly, the first Christian emperor was not able to establish a clear enough line of demarcation between the representatives of God and the depositaries of civil power, he was not able to escape the danger of treating bishops as his prefects. However, let us not exaggerate the scope of the abuses that we have just noted. Judges can be ordered to study a case, without dictating the sentence to be rendered; we can give them practical advice on conduct, without pretending to modify their professional convictions. Even when he set himself up as a mentor of the bishops, even when he imperatively brought them together either in Rome, or in Arles, or in Nicaea, Constantine did not enter the sanctuary of dogma; and if he had not gone further, he would have remained the bishop from outside.

1. See above, p. 194 and 206.

2. Life of Constantine, iii, 6: ὡς οἶν ἐφοῖτα παντῖ βχοῦ τε \*«ρ ἀγγιλμα.

217

But he was too close to the domain reserved for faith not to cross the limit. Let's see it the day after the Council of Arles. He then found himself facing a sentence carried by the entire Church of the West. His mission, as bishop from outside, was to enforce the decision of the bishops from within, to put his sword at the service of what he considered to be right and to impose subjugation on the Donatists. We would even have forgiven him, given his time, for bringing a bit of brutality to this work. However, instead of confining itself to the attributions of executive power, what does it do? He undertakes to review the trial of the Donatists himself, to study their case and to overturn, if there was one, the verdict rendered in Arles. In fact illicit; but he only comes to this after preliminary examination, after having set tribunal against tribunal, only after having set himself up as judge of the faith. Let us also see him at Nicaea. He is not content with policing the meeting room, keeping quarrels and violence away. He dictates to the bishops what to believe. We know this especially from Eusebius, who timidly admits to his diocesans that a certain formula was imposed on him by the emperor. 1 Without doubt this formula is homoousios, and Constantine made himself, in this circumstance, the apostle of Catholic doctrine. But he acted as a theologian or rather as a judge of the faith: the bishop from without was transformed into a bishop from within. A dangerous usurpation and from which the Church, for once having benefited, will not be long in suffering. When the emperor expounds on theological matters, he only recites a lesson learned, and. He received this lesson from those who were able to gain ascendancy over him. The Seusebians are not mistaken. They realized that at Nicaea Constantine was under the influence of Hosius and was his disciple 2. They promised to replace the bishop of Cordoba in imperial confidence and, through intrigue, they would arrive for their purposes. Then the emperor approved Arius' profession of faith and exiled Athanasius. he did nothing more than what he had done at Nicaea: only, this time, instead of being at the school of Hosius, he had the two Eusebius as teachers.

1. See above, p. 211.
2. Athanasius himself teaches us the role of Hosius at Nicaea [Hist, arian., 42): ovro; ένΝιχαίχ κίστιν έξεθετο.

218

So far there has been no question of the Pope. I believe, however, that the preceding presentation sheds light, in its own way, on Constantine's relationship with the dogma of the papacy. It shows us that the first Christian emperor was more concerned with laying down the law to the bishops than with highlighting the prerogatives of the apostolic see; that he had a tendency to conceive the Church as an annex of the empire or, if you like, as a monarchy governed by the emperor. However, certain facts require our attention. Let's study them more closely.

219

And first let us note the procedure to which the Donatist controversy was subjected. The affair opens with the Letter <i Miltiades, where we find the authoritarian note of the prince who gives orders to his minister. The pope learns that he will, in concert with three other bishops, have to judge a trial whose litigants are automatically sent to Rome. It is not he who designates his assessors or who sets the number. Nor is he the one who determines the number of witnesses to be heard. All these details are regulated by the emperor. Miltiades is informed that the opposing parties, as well as three auxiliary judges, will soon arrive in Rome, and he receives the mission to instruct the trial in accordance with divine law 1.

1. He only obtained authorization to add fifteen bishops of Italy to the three designated by the emperor. See above. p. 192.

It nevertheless remains that the choice of Rome is a tribute paid by the imperial letter to the apostolic see. But this tribute is very fleeting. The Council of Rome, we know, was followed by the Council of Arles. Now, what is the Council of Arles? An assembly of bishops invested with the mission of reviewing a trial already judged by the Pope, of overturning, if necessary, the pontifical sentence. No doubt, the dispute was more disciplinary than dogmatic. But the Pope is not only, in the eyes of the Catholic, the highest teaching authority, he is also the source of all ecclesiastical powers. By referring to the Council of Arles a case already judged in Rome, Constantine completely reversed the order of jurisdiction. We must only say in his defense that the bishops obediently agreed with his views and carried out his orders without raising any protest.

220

Let us now move on to the Council of Nicaea. From the beginning of the 6th century, an apocryphal literature was formed, in which it is said that the emperor came to an understanding

with Pope Silvestre and obtained his assent before gathering the bishops at Nicaea. We will find in his time this legend which was collected by the Liber Pontificalis. Let's leave it for now. On the contrary, we must mention here a text from the sixth council 1. Here is what we read in the speech addressed by the members of this assembly to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus: "When Aiius undertook to break the unity of the Trinity, Constantine, always august, and the venerable Silvestre immediately assembled at Nicaea a great and famous council which the Trinity used to formulate the symbol of the faith and inflict punishment on Arian perversity. When Macedonius denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit and lowered the Lord to the ing of creatures, the great emperor Theodosius and Damuse, the diamond of faith who was not shaken by the attacks of heresy, Gregory and the lecary assembled a council in this imperial city..."

1. For what follows, see Funk, Kirchengesckichtlicke Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen, I, 57.

221

Many people believe they see, in this insertion of the Fathers of the Sixth Council, the uncontestable proof that the Council of Nicaea was convened by Constantine after prior agreement with the Pope and in concert with him. We start from this principle that the bishops gathered in 680 must have known precisely the events between which they were separated by at most three and a half centuries. A principle that is certainly questionable. If the contemporaries of Constantine Pogonatus were necessarily well informed about the convocation of the Council of Nicaea, all the more reason do they deserve confidence in the information they provide on the subject of the second council. However, on this last point, they are in opposition to the best established history. The convocation of the council of 381 is the exclusive work of Theodosius; Pope Damasus and Saint Gregory had no part in it, even less Nectaire who, at that time, did not yet belong to the clergy. The Fathers of the Sixth Council were mistaken about the circumstances which led their elders from 381 to condemn Macedonius. Therefore, what guarantee does their testimony offer us regarding the convocation of the Council of Nicaea?

222

Or should it be taken into consideration, if it were only possible to agree with the contemporary documents of the famous council. But this is precisely where the formidable pitfall lies. 1 We have the speech delivered by Constantine on his entry into the hall of sessions; we have two letters that he wrote to notify the result of the episcopal deliberations; we even have the invitation letter. In each of these pieces, he declares that it is he who wants to bring together or who has brought together the bishops; he even says, in one of them—in the letter to the church of Alexandria—that he was inspired by God to convene the council. His language does not limit itself to silence on the collaboration of the pope, it absolutely excludes the hypothesis of any prior agreement with Rome. The emperor attributes to him, and to him alone, the work of convoking the Council of Nicaea. The bishops are of no other opinion. They too are aware of having only been summoned to Nicaea 1 by the imperial authority and of having only obeyed it.



This is what emerges clearly from this sentence, with which their letter to the church of Alexandria begins and which we have already encountered: "Gathered together at Nicaea in a holy and numerous council by the very good, very great God, and by the care of the prince who is dear to him, Constantine... " We see, Constantine and the Fathers of Nicaea contradict the assertion of the bishops of the sixth council. We are therefore faced with two groups of testimonies between which we have to choose. It seems that the choice is not difficult to make.

223

It would nevertheless be, if Rufinus had really, as has been said, used the same language as the members of the sixth council. But that's not the case. Rufinus relates that Constantine assembled the Council of Nicaea according to the advice and opinion of several bishops: *ex sacerdotum sentia*. He implicates several bishops and says that their intervention had the character of advice, of an opinion. From there "a step by which the emperor would have requested and obtained the consent of Rome, a long time ago. And little would be gained by maintaining that Sylvester was one of the prelates who advised Constantine to convene a council. Let us add that Rufinus does not have in mind the pope, but only the bishops who, like Hosius and Alexander of Alexandria, were in Nicomedia with the emperor in 325 1.

1. See above, p. 205.

The same school which fabricated forgeries, to make people believe in an intervention by Silvestre in the convocation of the first ecumenical council, also published documents in which the bishops gathered at Nicaea were supposed to have requested and obtained pontifical confirmation 2. We have not We do not have to dwell here on this mystification of which no one today is fooled. However, if we agree that the official text of the confirmation granted by Rome to the decisions of the Nicene Fathers has not been transmitted to us, most theologians believe that it existed, and they motivate their feelings on the profession of faith of the Roman council of 485 where we read that "supported by the word: You are Petrus, the three hundred and eighteen Fathers gathered at Nicaea attributed to the holy Roman church the right to confirm and validate all things 1" . In reality, the profession of faith of the Roman council of 485 says that the bishops of Nicaea recognized the pope's right to judge conflicts in the last resort; but it does not concern itself with the so-called confirmation that these same bishops would have requested from the apostolic see. So she has nothing to do here. Let us add that it combines, as was the custom in Rome, the decisions of Nicaea with those of Sardicus and that it has in mind the canons of the council of 343 which regulate the right of appeal. In short, no special act appears to have come from Rome to confirm the first ecumenical council. But the envoys of Pope Silvestre affixed their signature to his decisions, and Bellarmine teaches that this signature is the equivalent of a pontifical confirmation 1.

2. Hardouin, i, 344 and 527; see Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i, cxxxiii.

1. Hefele, who brings this argument (trans. Farnb., i, 61 and 631) associates the following two with it: a) The council of Chalcedon considered the approval of the pope as

absolutely necessary for its decrees, and it was has no reason to believe that this principle was a novelty and that it was not already known and observed at the time of the Council of Nicaea; b) Pope Julius declared, a few years after the Council of Nicaea, that conciliar decrees could not be published without having been approved by the Bishop of Rome, and that it was a law of the Church. — In reality the Council of Chalcedon did not seek the approval of the Pope for its decrees. As for Pope Julius, he claimed the right to be represented in councils, but not the right to confirm their decisions. See Funk, Kirkeng. Abhandlungen, i, 96-99; see also Dom Leclercq's notes in Hefele's translation, p. 61-62.

1. De Conciliis, n, 11.

225

Who was president of the Council of Nicaea? Several have exercised it, if we are to believe Eusebius who tells us that Constantine "gave the floor to the presidents" 2. John of Antioch and Theodoret seem to speak for Eustathc 3. On the other hand, Athanasius exclaims in speaking of Hosius: "What is the council over which he did not preside?4". As the bishop of Cordoba exercised, at the beginning of the Arian controversy, a great influence on Constantine, and as it was he who tainted the emperor's formula "homoousios", Athanasius is generally given the right, and Hosius is believed to have been the president, or at least one of the presidents, of Nicaea. Moreover, it is with him that Socrates begins the enumeration of the main members of the council. It is he who is also the first in the subscription lists whose authority is, it is true, very mediocre.

2. Life of Constantine, iii, 13: παρεδίδου τον λόγον τοΤ; τής Τj'ιόδου προέδροις.

3. Hist, eccl., i, 7.

4. Apologia de fuga, δ: ποιας γαρ ού καθν,γτ,σατο;

226

But in what capacity did Córdoba preside? Gelasius of Cyzicus answers this question that Hosius "held the place of bishop of Rome with the Roman priests Vito and Vincentius" 1; from which theologians have concluded that Hosius exercised the anointing of president as delegate of the pope. It is certain that, if Saint Sylvester had traveled to Xicaea, the bishops of the East would not have hesitated to give him the first place, they whom we will see later, in their days of boldness, limit their ambition to claiming for Constantinople the second rank after Rome. On the other hand, nothing prevented Silvestre from entrusting to the bishop of Cordoba the care of representing him. The hypothesis of a delegation from Hosius would therefore not raise any difficulty, were it not for the letter of Pope Julius to the bishops of the East, which mentions the priests Vito and Vineenlius as sent by the apostolic see, but does not speak of the bishop of Cordoba. 1 This silence is hardly reconcilable with the feelings of the theologians and we must, it seems, renounce the delegation. However we can keep the text of Gelasius and say that 'Hosius held the place of bishop of Rome, with this reservation that he was put in this place, not

by the will of Silvestre, but by the will of the emperor. In this conjecture, Constantine would have charged Hosius with representing Silvestre, either as a friend, or because he was the dean of the episcopate 2. Moreover, let us not forget that Eusebius, whose testimony cannot be dismissed, reports several holders of the presidency at Nicaea; above all, let us not forget that the emperor left to the ecclesiastical presidents a fairly inconspicuous role 3.

1. Syntagma concilii nicænfu, 5 and 12, Hardouin, i, 376 and 388. On Gelasius. see Loeschcke das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzicenus, Boun, 1906. Gelasius had old documents at his disposal, but he sometimes made mistakes. He commits two, including a huge one at the beginning of his book (Hardouin, i, 3\*8) when he makes Ruïn a Roman priest who attended the Council of Xicaea. He said twice that Hosius held the place of bishop of Rome. In the first place (π. δ) he reports a passage from Eusebius (Vita Constantini, ni, 7) which we know elsewhere and we can see that he added on his own authority the words ἐπεχων καί τον τόπον του τή; μεγίστης Ρώμης επισκόπου Σιλβηστρου. The second document (u, 12) being known to us only through it, we cannot control its copy.

1. Ep. ad Antiechenos xvi. See Tillemonl, vi, the Council of Nicaea, note 4.

2. Sohm Kirchenrecht, p. 441, highlights the title of dean; Hinschius, Kirchenrecht, i, 498, and Loening, Kirchenrecht, i, 429, 1st title of friend of Constantine.

3. Pope Stephen V, in his letter to the Emperor Basil, does not hesitate to say that it was Constantine who presided over Nicaea (Hard, v, 1119): "An ignoras quod in prima synodo nicaena, præside ibi sancto Constantino, beatus Silvester papa..."

227

And now we can answer the question that motivated this study. We were investigating whether Constantine contributed to the flourishing of the dogma of the papacy. History has shown us that this is not the case. No, the papacy owes nothing to the emperor who had the Council of Rome revised by the Council of Arles and who himself revised this last council. It owes nothing to the emperor who assembled councils on his own authority, who summoned the bishops by imperative mandates, who, before them, became theologian and preacher. Constantine worked to ensure the triumph of the Christian religion and to remove all divisions within it; he enriched the Church and spread his favors to the clergy; as for the prerogatives of the papacy, he behaved regarding them as if he had ignored them, he did nothing, in any case, to develop them. If he had stopped there! But no. By imposing golden chains on the bishops who, fascinated by his benefits, bowed obediently under the yoke, he introduced into the Church the class of courtier prelates; by assuming the right to judge dogmatic controversies, he inaugurated in the State the era of theologian princes From now on, for long centuries and under various names, Caesar will work more or less actively to make religion an instrument of reign, to dominate the Church, to establish orthodoxy himself. From now on, sometimes in a country, sometimes in another, the episcopate, dazzled by royal munificence, will become the humble and complacent servant of the prince from whom it will receive honors, power and riches. And, of this double obstacle which will thwart the exercise of pontifical claims, the unconscious but

true author is the first Christian emperor. Far from having protected the dogma of the papacy, Constantine created two dangerous adversaries.

229

He aroused a third, even more dangerous adversary: the bishop of Constantinople. By transporting the seat of the empire to the banks of the Bosphorus, Constantine not only struck official Rome, he, at the same time, hit religious Rome. Enveloped in the rays of imperial glory, the bishops of Constantinople will, early on, relegate to the background the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria; then, continuing their upward march, they will deal with the pope from power to power, they will not even fear to lay down the law for him, and they will find councils to support their claims. The spirit of religious independence with regard to Rome certainly did not wait until the 4th century to manifest itself; but until then it had neither principle of cohesion nor rallying center. He found what he was missing the day Byzantium became an imperial city. The Eastern Schism, consummated in the 11th century, began with the founding of Constantinople. However, the dogma of the papacy will develop despite the obstacles that Constantine has sown in its path, and we are going to witness an important phase in its development.