

A MANUAL OF COUNCILS OF
THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH

A MANUAL OF COUNCILS OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY THE
REV. EDWARD H. LANDON, M.A.
LATE OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

NEW AND REVISED EDITION

VOLUME I.



Edinburgh
JOHN GRANT

1909

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE following work is intended to supply, in some measure, what appears to be a desideratum to the English reader, viz.—a *compendious* account of the Councils of the Church. This I had originally proposed to do by a translation of a small French work, published anonymously, at Paris, in 1773, in one volume, entitled, “*Dictionnaire Portatif des Conciles*,” but when the task had been commenced, so many alterations and additions appeared to be needed, that I resolved so far to abandon my first design as to make the French work merely the groundwork of a more extended volume on the same plan. Thus, although the work alluded to has furnished no small part of the present book, very considerable alterations have been made in it, and not only has much fresh matter been added relating to the councils contained in that work, but an account has also been given of many others which it passes over in silence, especially those which, although not recognised by the Church of Rome, are not the less regarded by other branches of the Church.

The materials with which I have had to work were unhappily scanty, and some apology may seem to be due for attempting a work of this nature, while debarred, as in this place I have been, from many of those authorities which it would have been desirable to have consulted; but the reader will bear in mind that the present book pretends only to be of an elementary character, and reference has, in almost every case, been given to the larger works of Labbe

and Wilkins; I may also add, that I believe the work, as far as it goes, will be found to be accurate; the account of every council having been verified either by myself, whilst in England, or by my friend, the Rev. William Pridden, to whom my sincere thanks are due for this and other valuable assistance: and also to the Rev. J. M. Neale, who kindly permitted me the use of the MS. of his history of the Oriental Church.

Nor would I omit to mention my obligation to the Reverend the Canon Ant. J. F. Pestana, rector of the seminary of Funchal, for his courtesy in allowing me, at all times, free access to the valuable library attached to that Institution, and to the Rev. E. M. Johnson, rector of Brooklyn, New York, for some useful documents relating to the convocations of the Church, in the United States of America.

MADEIRA, 1845.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

It may be useful to preface this revised version of the "Manual of Councils" with a few words of explanation. The additions and corrections incorporated in the present edition were compiled by my father with the intention of republishing the work, entirely rewritten and in an enlarged form. His death in 1877 prevented the completion of the undertaking, but the present edition practically contains the "Manual" in the shape in which he intended it to appear. How considerable these corrections are a mere glance will sufficiently show: the accessibility of many authorities to which reference was before impossible, has caused much to be altered, much to be added, while in a few cases his maturer judgment has excised an article altogether.

But the chief improvement, beyond a thorough reverification of the entire work, which distinguishes this edition, is the greater importance which is attached to what, for want of a better word, may be called the synoptic aspect of the councils,—that is to say, attention has been more particularly drawn to the contemporary enunciation of certain canons by different Councils.

In so advanced a state were the materials left that the work of preparing them for the press has been very small, though the changes involved affect more than half the original volume; but a word of thanks is due to the publishers for the consideration shown to me while the work was passing through the press at a time when other occupations left me little leisure.

PERCEVAL LONDON.

LONDON, 1893.



Manual of Councils.

—o—

A.

ABERDEEN (1788). [*Concilium Aberdonense.*] An assembly of the bishops of the Church in Scotland was held at Aberdeen, April 24, 1788, to take into consideration the state of the Church. In this synod it was unanimously agreed to comply with and submit to the government of the house of Hanover; and to testify this compliance by uniformly praying for George III., by name, at public worship. This resolution was duly intimated to the clergy and laity of their respective dioceses, the clergy being required to make public notification to their respective congregations on the 18th of the following month, that on the succeeding Lord's-day, a prayer for the king would be authoritatively introduced, and from that time continued in all the religious assemblies of the Church; finally, they exhorted all persons in their communion to receive cordially this determination of their spiritual fathers.—*Skinner's Eccl. Hist. Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 689.

ADANA (1316). [*Concilium Adanense.*] Held in 1316 by the Armenian Catholic at Adana in Cilicia, Oscinus, the king, being present.

AFRICA (217). [*Concilium Africanum.*] Held in 217, by Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, and attended by seventy bishops of Africa and Numidia. In this council it was declared, that those who have received the form of baptism out of the Church, may not be admitted into it without being baptised.—*Tom. i. Conc. p. 607.*¹

AFRICA (or CARTHAGE) (251). Held in 251, upon the

¹ This and all similar references are to Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia Sacrosancta*, in 16 tomes, *ed. Paris*, 1671.

case of those who had relapsed into idolatry during the persecution. The circumstances which led to the assembling of this council were as follows: Novatus, a priest of the Church of Carthage, in order to avoid the just punishment of his crimes, joined, together with five other priests, the party of Felicissimus, a deacon of the same church, who had set himself up against his bishop (then absent on account of the persecution), from motives similar to those which actuated Novatus. The pretext for their conduct was, chiefly, that St Cyprian was too rigid with those who, having relapsed during the persecution, sought to be admitted to penance.

In 251, Novatus, having forsaken the communion of Cyprian, and originated a new party, promised absolution, without penance, to all the relapsed who would join him, and went to Rome, where he met with Novatian, another turbulent and ambitious priest, who, disappointed at seeing Cornelius preferred to the see of Rome instead of himself, caused a schism in that Church, contriving, with the help of Novatus, to get himself also consecrated as bishop of Rome, by three bishops fetched from a distant part of Italy. To this schism he added heresy, teaching, amongst other things, that absolution is not to be given to those who have committed mortal sin after baptism, whatever the nature of the sin may be. He would have them only exhorted to repentance; and asserted that there exists in the Church no power to absolve from mortal sin, nay, he even went so far as to hold that no hope of salvation remained for those who had relapsed in time of persecution, even though they had sealed their subsequent repentance by martyrdom. In order to draw over others to his errors, he wrote letters to all the Churches, and circulated falsehoods and calumnies in the name of some confessors at Rome whom he had succeeded in bringing over to his party.

Cornelius, at the same time, was not idle in defence of the truth. He, too, wrote letters to all the bishops; and, in consequence of these exertions, several councils were held upon the subject, and particularly that of which we are at present speaking. St Cyprian, who had now returned to his post, in order to appease the troubles that had arisen, convoked this council.

First, to remove the doubts of those who had been in-

fluenced by the false statements of Novatian and his party, with respect to the conduct and consecration of Cornelius, the council resolved to obtain the testimonial of those who were present at his consecration, and to send deputies to Rome to inquire into the matter. This precautionary step did not, however, hinder St Cyprian from at once recognising the election of Cornelius.

When the deputies of Novatian arrived at Carthage, they required that the bishops should examine their accusations against Cornelius; to which the fathers in council answered, that they would not suffer the reputation of their brother to be attacked, after he had been elected by so many votes, and consecrated; and that a bishop having been once recognised by his fellow-bishops, it was a sin to consecrate another to the same see; and further, the council addressed a synodal letter to Cornelius upon the subject.

Then they proceeded to inquire into the case of Felicissimus, and the five priests who had followed him: these men they condemned and excommunicated. And further, seeing that the two sects, viz., that of Felicissimus and Novatus on the one hand, and of Novatian on the other, virtually destroyed penance by the opposite extremes to which they endeavoured to bring it; the former abolishing it in fact, by admitting at once to communion all those who had fallen into sin, whilst the others altogether refused to acknowledge its efficacy; they proceeded to consider the case of the relapsed. It was decreed that the *Libellatici*,¹ who, immediately after the commission of their fault, began a course of penance, should be thenceforward admitted to communion: that those who had actually sacrificed should be treated more severely, yet so as not to take from them the hope of forgiveness; that they should be for a long period kept to a course of penance, in order that they might thus seek with tears and repentance to obtain God's pardon for their sin. It was further decreed that the different circumstances of the sin of each individual ought to be inquired into, in order that the duration of their course of penance might be regulated accordingly, that those who had for a long time resisted the violence of the torture should be treated with more lenity; and they judged that three years

¹ *Libellatici*, so called because they received from the magistrates, for a sum of money, an *attestation* (*libellus*) of their having sacrificed.

of penitence ought to suffice in order to render these admissible to communion.

At this council several articles or canons were drawn up, and afterwards forwarded in writing to every bishop. Baronius thinks that these were the same as those afterwards styled the "Penitential Canons."

With respect to bishops and others of the clergy who had either sacrificed or had received certificates of having done so, it was determined that they might be admitted to penance; but that they should be for ever excluded from the priesthood, and from all exercise of their office, or of any ecclesiastical function. It was also determined that the communion ought to be administered to persons who might be visited with mortal sickness during the course of their term of penance.

Novatus and Felicissimus were both condemned in this council, which continued sitting for a long time.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 714.

AFRICA (348). Held in the year 348, under Gratus, bishop of Carthage. Fourteen canons relating to discipline were here drawn up.—See C. CARTHAGE, A.D. 348.

AFRICA (or HIPPO) (393). [*Concilium Hipponense.*] A general council held at Hippo on the 8th October 393; Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, presided; and Megatos, primate of Numidia, and all the other primates of the provinces of Africa were present. Cecilianus and Theodorus spoke in the name of the other bishops. We may perceive from this council how highly St Augustine was already esteemed, although at the time only in priest's orders. At the request of the bishops assembled, he made a discourse before them upon the subject of faith, and upon the Creed; particularly combating the errors of the Manichæans, of which he had himself been a follower. One fragment alone remains of the acts of this council: it was ruled, that the bishop of Carthage should every year give notice to the primate of each province, of the day on which Easter was to be celebrated in the year following, in order that the latter might inform his suffragans. It was also ordered, that a general African council should be held annually, either at Carthage or in some one of the provinces; which practice continued until the year 407. In this council forty-one canons were agreed to, which were taken as the model for after-councils.—*Cod. Afric.* Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1149.

AFRICA (398). Held at Carthage on the 28th of August 398, called the third council of Carthage. The bishop Aurelius presided, at the head of forty-four bishops.—See C. CARTHAGE, A.D. 398.

AFRICA (401). Held on the 13th September 401, to consult upon the best method of acting towards the Donatists. It was resolved to treat them with lenity; and to bring them, as far as possible, to a sense of their miserable condition, in the hope that God might be pleased to open their eyes. And further, it was agreed that those of the Donatist clergy who desired to resume their ministerial functions in the Church, should be received. Afterwards the council drew up certain rules of discipline: ¹

1st. The canon made in the council of Carthage, A.D. 390, which forbids the marriage of bishops, priests, and deacons, was confirmed, and its observance enforced under pain of deposition. In the case of other ecclesiastics, it was ruled that each Church should follow its own custom in the matter.

2ndly. It was forbidden to any bishop to change the place of his see, or to absent himself from it for long together.

3rdly. It was ordered, that whenever it became necessary to convoke a general council, all the bishops of each province should assemble previously, in two or three classes, from each of which deputies should be chosen, who should be obliged to proceed forthwith to the council, or to communicate the cause of their absence.

4thly. That such of the clergy as should be refused communion and deposed, on account of any crime committed, should be allowed the space of one year wherein to justify themselves; which not being done within the year, they should never be received again.

5thly. That if any bishop should make any strangers, not his relatives, or even his relatives, if they were heretics or heathens, his heirs, in preference to the Church, he should be anathematised after his death. This is to be understood of that property only which the eighth canon of the council of Hippo permitted them to dispose of by will; viz., his patrimony and property which had been given to him.

6thly. In order to prevent superstition, it was resolved to

¹ Some suppose that these canons were drawn up at another council in the same year. See C. CARTHAGE, A.D. 401.

allow of no altar or chapel in honour of a martyr, except his body was actually there buried, or except he had lived or had suffered there; and that all altars should be destroyed which had been erected upon the strength of pretended revelations.

It is not known what bishops were present in this council, but there is good reason to believe that the number was large, and that Alypius, St Augustine, and St Euodius, were of the number.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1242.

AFRICA (403). Held at Carthage on the 25th August 403; at which Alypius, St Augustine, and Possidius, were present; what other bishops were there, is unknown. At this council the Donatists were invited to a conference, but they rejected the offer with contempt, pretending that they could not enter upon a conference with sinners: the fathers in council were obliged in consequence, through their legates, the bishops Euodius and Theasius, to require from the emperor Honorius that laws should be enacted against the Donatists.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1331.

AFRICA (405). Held at Carthage on the 23rd August 405. It was resolved that letters should be written to the governors of the provinces, begging them to labour to effect union throughout Africa: also a letter to the emperor was agreed upon, thanking him for the expulsion of the Donatists.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1333.

AFRICA (407). Held at Carthage in 407. At this council deputies were present from every province in Africa. By common consent it was agreed to annul the canon of Hippo,¹ which decreed that a general African council should be held annually, because the difficulty of getting to the council was too much for the bishops. It was further ruled, that when any circumstance arose affecting the whole Church of Africa, the matter should be communicated in writing to the bishop of Carthage, who should thereupon convoke a council, in which it might be determined what should be done: that other matters should be considered and determined in their own province. That in case of an appeal, each party should name their own judges, from whose decision there should be no further appeal. In order to prevent the bishops from going to the emperor's court more than was absolutely necessary, the council

¹ See C. AFRICA, A.D. 393.

ordered that the cause should be specified in the letter to the Roman Church, given to every bishop journeying to Rome, and that when at Rome, a letter for the court should be given to him. That if any bishop, having received a commendatory letter for his voyage to Rome, without saying that he intended to go to the court, should nevertheless go thither, he should be separated from communion. It was also ruled, that no new see should be erected without the consent of the bishop out of whose diocese it was to be formed, and that of the primate and whole council of the province. Rules were also laid down concerning the converted Donatists; the council further deputed the bishops Vincentius and Fortunatianus to attend the emperor in the name of the whole African Church, and to defend the cause of the Church in the conference with the Donatists, and also to demand of the emperor five advocates to defend the interests of the Church.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1333.

AFRICA (418). Held at Carthage on the 1st May 418; composed of two hundred and seventeen or two hundred and fourteen bishops. Here nine doctrinal articles, drawn up by St Augustine, were agreed to against the Pelagians. These nine articles or canons have come down to our time, and are dated May 1, 418. The three last definitively declare that no man can be said to be without sin, and anathematise those who should deny it. Besides these eight canons, the oldest Roman code adds another, by which the council condemns with anathema those who hold that infants dying without baptism enjoy a happy existence, without the kingdom of heaven. Photius, who, as Tillemont observes, we must believe to have had the use of good MSS., recognises this canon; and, as a further proof of its genuineness, St Augustine in his letter to Bonifacius says, that both councils and popes have condemned the heresy of the Pelagians, who maintain that infants not baptised enjoy a place of salvation and repose out of heaven.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1576. *Aug. ad Bon.* l. 2. c. 12. p. 492. 1. d.

In this same council ten other canons were agreed to, relative to the Donatists. It was determined, that in places containing both Catholics and Donatists, each party recognising a different diocesan, the Donatists, at whatever period they might have been converted, should belong to the bishopric which the original Catholics of the place recog-

nised. That if a Donatist bishop should be converted, those parishes where the Donatists had been under his jurisdiction, and the Catholics under the bishop of some other city, should be equally divided between the two bishops, the oldest to make the division, and the other to have the choice. The same council determined by another remarkable canon, that if the priests and other inferior clergy had any complaint to make against the judgment of their bishop, their case might be judged by the neighbouring bishops, from whose decision they might appeal either to the primate or to the council of Africa; but if they pretended to appeal to any authority beyond the sea, all persons in Africa were forbidden to communicate with them. It also gave permission to a virgin to take the veil and the vows before the age of twenty-five, in cases where her chastity was endangered by the power of those who sought her in marriage, provided also that those upon whom she was dependent made the demand as well as herself.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1576.

AFRICA (OR CARTHAGE) (419). Held at Carthage, 15th May 419, in the Basilica of Faustus; convoked by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, assisted by Valentinus, the primate of Numidia; Faustinus, the legate of the pope, had the third place; bishops or their deputies from the different provinces of Africa, viz.: from Numidia, Byzacena, Mauritania Cæsariensis, Mauritania Tingitana, Tripoli, and the proconsular province were present, making in all two hundred and seventeen bishops; Aurelius presiding. St Augustine was present.

At the first sitting, the pope's instructions to his legate were read, and also the canon, which he brought forward in order to show the right of appeal to the pope. St Alypius represented, that as this canon did not appear in the Greek copies of the acts of the council of Nicea, which they possessed, and which Cœcilianus had brought to Carthage, it was necessary that Aurelius should send to Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, where the genuine canons were kept, to procure an authentic copy of them. It was, however, agreed, that in order not to give offence to the pope's legate, they should content themselves with writing upon the subject to Zosimus. Secondly, all that the pope had written relating to the case of appeals was read, and

St Augustine promised that it should be observed, until they had received more authentic copies of the council of Nicea. Thirdly, the Nicene Creed was read, together with the canons and regulations made by the African councils held under Aurelius. Fourthly, the affair of Apiarius was discussed; this man was a priest of Sicca, in the province of Mauritania; having been guilty of most immoral conduct, he had been deposed and excommunicated by his bishop, Urban, from whose judgment he appealed to the pope, although that step was forbidden by several African councils, and although the council of Nicea had determined that the affairs of the clergy should be settled in their own province without any external appeal. Nevertheless, Zosimus, according to Baronius, received the appeal of Apiarius, and re-admitted him to communion. The African bishops refused to admit this pretension of the pope with regard to the right of appeal to Rome, and great contentions arose upon the subject.

Since, therefore, the African bishops had complained that Zosimus had violated ecclesiastical discipline by receiving the appeal of Apiarius, they were not a little surprised to hear the legate Faustinus justify the act of Zosimus, upon the authority of the canons of the council of Nicea. They maintained, that the canons cited under the name of *Nicene*, in order to justify the pretension of Zosimus, were not to be found in any copy, either Greek or Latin, but that they were, in fact, made in the council of Sardica, A.D. 347.

The bishops further desired, that the clergy should make complaint of judgments passed upon them to the primate or council of the province, and not to the bishops of the neighbouring provinces. Before the close of the year, Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and Atticus of Constantinople, delivered to the priests deputed by the council, faithful copies of the acts of the council of Nicea, made from the originals preserved amongst the archives of their Churches. These transcripts were inspected by the council (which seems to have continued its sessions), and no appearance of the canons alluded to by Zosimus being found, the fathers immediately despatched the delegates, who came out of the East, to *Bonifacius*, with the records which they had brought from thence.

It is worthy of remark that Alypius, bishop of Tagaste,

addressed Aurelius, in this council, as "sancte papa," and that the bishops repeatedly speak of the Roman pontiff as "*consacerdos noster*."—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1589. *Bar.* 419, § 60.

AFRICA (424). Held in the year 424, upon the business of Apiarius, mentioned in the account of the preceding council. After having been re-established, he was again guilty of great enormities, and, accordingly, a second time excommunicated, and driven out of Trabuca, a city in the proconsulate of Africa, whence he fled to Rome. The pope, Celestinus, giving credit to every thing that he was pleased to pretend in the way of justification, re-admitted him to communion, and added further, a letter to the bishops of Africa. This conduct on the part of the pope caused the whole of the African bishops to assemble at Carthage, and to hold there a general council. Out of the whole number present, the names of fifteen only have come down to us. Amongst them are those of Aurelius of Carthage, Servus-Dei, who was a confessor, Fortunatianus, &c.

Apiarius appeared at the council with Faustinus, who came thither rather in the character of his advocate than his judge; he even wished to exact from them a promise that they would receive Apiarius into communion with them. The fathers in council, however, judged that they ought, in the first place, to examine into his criminal conduct, in which he tried to justify himself by his usual artifices; but Apiarius, unable to endure the tortures of his conscience, confessed, almost in spite of himself, the crimes of which he had been guilty. Faustinus gave way to this evidence of the truth; and Apiarius was cut off from the body of the Church.

As the fathers in council had now received an answer from the east, and had been thus certified that the canons cited by Zosimus were not in truth amongst those enacted by the council of Nicea, they wrote to pope Celestinus a letter,¹ in which, after having complained of his conduct in absolving Apiarius, they begged of him in future not to listen so easily to those who came to him from Africa, and not to receive into communion those whom they had excommunicated, since, by doing so, he violated the canons of Nicea, which direct that cases of this kind shall be

¹ See Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1674.

settled in the province in which they arise, so that they could not be carried elsewhere without the especial decision of the Church. They added, that the aid and illumination of the Holy Spirit might as reasonably be hoped for several bishops assembled freely in each province, as for one in particular; that to judge of affairs in the place where they have arisen, and where information and witnesses are at hand, is more natural than to remove them beyond sea. Lastly, they begged of the pope to send no more legates to execute his judgments, lest, said they, the pride of the world be introduced into the Church of Christ, which ought to hold forth the light of simplicity and the brightness of humility to all who seek God.

The Church of Africa kept possession of the right of judging her priests, definitively and without appeal, till the time of Gregory the Great.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1638.

AFRICA (or CARTHAGE) (525). Held in 525, at Carthage, under the primate Bonifacius, in order to restore the discipline of the Church. On this occasion an abridgment of the canons made under Aurelius was read. The last three forbid all appeals beyond the sea absolutely, without making any distinction between bishops and others.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1628.

AFRICA (535). Held in 535; composed of two hundred and seventeen bishops; convoked to Carthage by Reparatus, bishop of that city. A demand was made of the emperor Justinian to restore the rights and property of the Church, which had been usurped by the Vandals, which request was granted, by a law bearing date the 1st of August in the same year.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1784.

AFRICA (645). In the year 645, a conference was held between Pyrrhus, bishop of Constantinople, the chief of the Monothelites, and the abbot, St Maximus, in the presence of the patrician Gregory, and several bishops. Maximus there showed that there were two wills (*duæ voluntates*) and two operations in Jesus Christ. Pyrrhus yielded to his proofs, and went afterwards to Rome, where he retracted what he had formerly taught, and was received into communion; subsequently, however, he returned to his errors.

AFRICA (646). Held in the year 646. Several councils were held in Africa during this year, against the Monothelites: one in Numidia, another in Byzacena, a third in

Mauritania, and a fourth at Carthage (sixty-eight bishops present), in the proconsular province.

AGAUNE (or ST MAURICE EN VALAIS) (523). [*Concilium Agaunense.*] Held on the 14th May 523; nine bishops were present. The continual psalmody established in this monastery was here confirmed by Sigismond, king of Burgundy, "upon the system of the Acæmetian monks at Constantinople. According to Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, who wrote 'The Acts of the Martyrdom of the Soldiers of the Theban Legion,' this psalmody was first instituted here in 351, in honour of the martyrs, forty-nine years after the event, and whilst their bones still lay scattered about."

AGDE (506). [*Concilium Agathense.*] Held on the 11th September 506. Twenty-four bishops were present, and ten deputies of absent bishops, from different provinces of Gaul, which at this time was under the dominion of the Visigoths. Cesarius, bishop of Arles, presided. In this council the discipline of the Church was treated of, and forty-seven canons¹ were drawn up, confirming the discipline already established in many other councils.

Of these, the 1st forbids the ordination of those who had been married twice since their baptism.

The 2nd directs that clerks who neglect their duty shall be deprived of their share in the distributions, and have their names erased from the *Matricula*.

The 12th enjoins fasting every day in Lent, Sundays excepted.

The 15th forbids to refuse the *viaticum* or Holy Eucharist to the dying in any case.

The 16th forbids the making any person deacon under the age of twenty-five years; and if married, without the consent of his wife, and a promise of continence.

The 17th forbids the ordination of bishops or priests under thirty years of age.

The 18th orders all lay persons to communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide.

The 19th forbids any woman to take the veil under forty years of age, however holy and exemplary her previous life had been.

The 20th forbids the clergy to wear long hair, and orders

¹ Gratianus and others add to these twenty-four canons, which do not appear in the ancient copies of the acts.

the archdeacon to cause that of the disobedient to be cut.

The 27th forbids the establishment of any monastery without the consent of the bishop; also forbids the bishop to ordain any monk without the consent of his abbot first had.

The 31st orders that those persons who, having been at variance for a long time, refuse to be reconciled, shall be excommunicated.

The 34th orders that converted Jews shall remain eight months in the rank of catechumens before they are baptised.

The 39th forbids persons in holy orders to attend wedding festivities.

The 44th forbids a priest to bless the people or a penitent in Church.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1381.

AGNANI (1160). [*Concilium Agnanium.*] Held on the 24th March 1160. Pope Alexander III., assisted by certain bishops and cardinals, in this council solemnly excommunicated the emperor Frederic, and absolved all his subjects from their oath of fidelity to him. However, as Fleury remarks, it does not seem that Frederic was at all the less obeyed or the less recognised as emperor *after* this excommunication than he was *before*.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (799). [*Concilium Aquisgranense.*] Held in 799. At this council Felix d'Urgel was heard in his defence before Charlemagne. He was answered and refuted by Alcuin, originally deacon of the Church of York, and abbot of the monastery of Canterbury, whom Charles had induced to come over to France. On account of his frequent relapses, Felix was deposed, but he returned into the bosom of the Church, having sincerely abjured his errors,¹ which he did in the form of a letter addressed to the clergy and people of Urgel; he was nevertheless banished to Lyons, where he died in the following year. See C. NAIONNE, 791; C. FRANKFORT, 794; C. RATISBON, 792; C. ROME, 792, and C. URGEL, 799.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1151.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in the month of October,

¹ There was a difference of opinion as to the sincerity of his recantation. Agobardus, the bishop of Lyons, publicly announced his having again fallen away, but there were not wanting those who defended him from this accusation.

in the year 802, by order of Charlemagne; it was a numerous council. The bishops, with the priests, read the canons, and the abbots, with the monks, the rule of St Benedict; in order that both parties might thenceforth live in conformity to the law which was prescribed for them. At that time there were no monks or religious persons who followed any other rule than that of St Benedict. There remains to us of this council a capitular of seven articles: the most important are those which relate to the chorepiscopi; it was determined that they had no power to perform any episcopal function, and should be considered simply as priests. This discipline agrees with that of the ancient councils of Ancyra and Neocesarea.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (809). Held in December 809, upon the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, which had been first raised by John, a monk of Jerusalem. In order to decide it, the emperor sent as deputies to pope Leo III. two bishops, Bernarius and Jesse, and the abbot Adelhard, who held a long conference upon the use of the words "*Filioque*," chanted in the creed by the Churches of France and Spain, but not by the Church of Rome. The pope expressed his regret that the same caution had not been used elsewhere; and without *condemning* those who in chanting the creed added the words "*Filioque*," and allowing that the words expressed the true faith, he refused to give his sanction to the introduction of the words into the creed, respecting the decision of those councils which had forbidden any addition to be made.—*Fleury*. See C. TOLEDO, A. D. 447, and ROME, 809. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1194.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (816). Held in September 816. In it a rule was composed for canons, containing one hundred and forty-five articles; another was also drawn up for nuns, which contained twenty-eight articles. Both rules are of great length, and are said to have been mainly composed by Amalry, deacon of Metz.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1307.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (817). Held in July 817. Here eighty chapters were drawn up concerning the rule of St Benedict, which the emperor Louis confirmed, and by his authority put into execution.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1505.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (825). Held in the year 825. This council, held upon the subject of images, was a continuation of one held at Paris in the same year. The

bishops wrote on the 6th of December a letter to the emperor at Aix-la-Chapelle, containing their decision; the whole matter was then sent to the pope by the hands of two bishops. What was the result of the negotiation between the pope and the bishops is not known; the French, however, maintained, for some time after, that images are neither to be broken nor to be adored, rejecting the second council of Nicea, although the pope had approved it.—*Fleury*. See C. PARIS, A.D. 825.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (836). Held on the 6th of February 836. The acts of this council are divided into three parts :

Part I. refers to the life and doctrine of bishops, and contains twelve canons, the third of which makes it imperative upon all bishops to have some poor persons always at their table when they eat, or to have them, at least, somewhere within sight, and to send them food.

Part II. relates to the morals, and conversation, and degree of knowledge to be required in other ecclesiastics, and contains twenty-eight canons.

Part III. treats of the virtues and duties required from the emperor and his children, principally in those matters which affect ecclesiastical affairs. This part contains twenty-five canons.

A very long address was also drawn up to Pepin, king of Aquitaine, requiring him to restore the property of the Church.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1700.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE (1165). Held in 1165. This was a plenary court of the emperor Frederic, assembled for the canonisation of Charlemagne, which was performed on the 29th December. Although this canonisation was the act of schismatics, and had the sanction only of an antipope, no pope has ever refused to recognise it.—*Fleury*.

AIX (1585). [*Concilium Aquense.*] Held in September 1585, by Alexander Canigianus, archbishop of Aix, assisted by the bishops of Apt, Gap, Riez, and Sisteron, his suffragans, together with the grand vicar of the bishop of Frejus. Several useful regulations were drawn up relating to the discipline of the Church and the reformation of morals, similar to those of Bourges in the preceding year.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1119.

ALBI (1254). [*Concilium Albiense.*] Held in 1254, by

order of St Louis, who had lately returned from the Holy Land; bishops from the provinces of Narbonne, Bourges, and Bourdeaux attended, Zoen, bishop of Avignon, presiding. Seventy-one canons were published; part of them relate to the extirpation of heresy, and part to the reformation of the clergy, &c. The first twenty-eight are taken from the canons of Toulouse, A.D. 1229.

1. Orders that persons be duly appointed to search after heretics.

2. Grants a silver mark to every one taking a heretic.

5. Deprives of their land persons who allow heretics to harbour there.

6. Orders the destruction of the houses of heretics.

11, 12. Enact that all persons arrived at the age of puberty shall abjure heresy, and take an oath of fidelity to the Roman Church.

18. Orders that all boys above seven years of age shall be brought to Church by their parents, to be instructed by the curate in the Catholic faith, and to be taught the *Credo*, *Pater Noster*, and Salutation of the Blessed Virgin.

21—23. Relate to the papers, &c., of the Inquisition.

24. Orders the construction of prisons for the condemned heretics, where they shall be detained and supported (as the bishop shall direct) out of their confiscated property.

25. Orders that the bones of those who have died in heresy and have been buried, shall be taken up and publicly burnt.

29. Renews the canon "Omnis utriusque sexus."

31—36. Relate to excommunications.

37. Orders that every will shall be made in the presence of a priest.

41. Forbids to harbour any suspicious woman within the precincts of the Church.

42. Orders silver chalices to be used in all churches of which the revenues amount to 15 *livres tournois*.

46. Forbids regulars to have any of their horse harness, &c., of silver or gold; orders them to use saddles of white or black, or polished saddles (*rasæ*).

48. Forbids clerks to gamble; orders them to have their hair so cut all round as to leave the ears altogether uncovered.

50, 51. Forbid them to hunt and hawk and tilt, in game, with shield and lance.

55. Orders two regular canons, at least, in every prison.

56. Orders all collators to benefices to present without any previous agreement with their nominee or diminution of revenue.

57—60. Of the visitations of bishops.

62, 63. Of usurers and Jews.

64, 65. Order that Jews shall have a distinctive dress, and shall constantly wear a large wheel figured on their breast.

66—70. Of Jews.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 720.

ALCALA DE HENARES (1326). [*Concilium Complutense.*] Held in 1326 by Juan of Arragon, archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain; three bishops and three deputies were present. Two canons only were published:

1. Of the consecration of suffragans.

2. On the defence of the rights and property of the Church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1771.

ALEXANDRIA (230). [*Concilium Alexandrinum.*] Held in 230, under the bishop Demetrius, in which Origen was deposed from the priesthood, but not without opposition.

ALEXANDRIA (306). Held in 306, under Peter, bishop of Alexandria (martyr). Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, was deposed here, being convicted of having sacrificed to idols, and of having committed many other crimes. In revenge, Meletius began a schism which lasted for upwards of fifty years. His disciples were called Meletians.

ALEXANDRIA (321). Held in 321, by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, attended by all his clergy, on account of the heresy of Arius, which had spread through all Egypt, Lybia, and upper Thebais. Nearly one hundred bishops attended from Egypt and Lybia, and anathematized his errors and deposed him (Schoans). Socr. i. 6, in p. 101. Arius, who held a Church in Alexandria, was a man of very considerable talent, with all the external appearance of inward excellence. Jealousy at seeing Alexander promoted to the throne of Alexandria, betrayed him into heresy, and the unimpeachable life of his bishop affording him no handle for attacking his character, he determined to accuse him on the score of doctrine; and as Alexander taught, according to the faith of the Church, that our Saviour Jesus Christ is truly God, Arius dared, first in private conversation, and afterwards publicly, to assert that the bishop was in error, and had

fallen into the heresy of Sabellius ; that our Lord was but a creature, however exalted.

Alexander having sent for Arius, endeavoured to win him back by mildness, advising and exhorting him to open his eyes to the enormity of his error. He even held conferences with his clergy in the presence of Arius ; but the latter persisted in his opinions, and maintained with insolence all that he had advanced. At last this council was convoked early in the year 321, in which Arius and nine other of the clergy of Alexandria were condemned and deprived. Also a synodical letter was addressed by Alexander to his brother-bishop, Alexander of Byzantium, which Theodoret gives, l. i. c. 4.—*Cave's Apostolici*, p. 349.

ALEXANDRIA (321). Held later in the same year, by Alexander, composed of one hundred Egyptian bishops, exclusive of the priests who were present. Arius was here questioned concerning his faith, and the heresy of which he was accused. He maintained his error with boldness ; and the bishops, having heard his blasphemies from his own mouth, proceeded to anathematize him and twelve of his followers, both priests and deacons ; also two bishops, Secundus and Theona ; and to pass censure upon Eusebius of Nicomedia.

Arius retired into Palestine, where he had already gathered many followers. The most considerable of his disciples was the above-mentioned Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, the city in which the emperors of the east resided. This Eusebius enjoyed great reputation at the court, and was in high favour with Constantia, the wife of Licinius, and the sister of Constantine. It may indeed be justly said, that amongst all the followers of Arius, no one has been more celebrated, or has done more mischief to the Church.—*Tillemont ; Epiph. Hæres*, 69.

ALEXANDRIA (324). Held in the year 324, by the celebrated Hosius, bishop of Cordova, sent by Constantine¹ to appease the troubles to which the heresies of Arius, and the schism of Meletius, had given rise, and to restore the peace of the Church. Hosius conducted himself in the business with fidelity and care, worthy of his piety and of

¹ By Pope Sylvester, according to Baronius : but there appears to be no foundation for the assertion.—*Cave*.

the confidence placed in him. In this council everything relating to the doctrine of the Trinity, and to the condemnation of the heresy of Sabellius, who denied the distinction of persons in the sacred Trinity, was thoroughly discussed.¹ Very little else is known of what passed here.—*Tillemont*; *Socrates*, l. iii. c. 7. Tom. i. Conc. p. 1493.

ALEXANDRIA (326). A council was held April 16, 326, in which Athanasius was ordained patriarch of Alexandria. Complaint was made of the continued persecution of Athanasius by the Eusebians. They, it was said, had exiled him and had sent to the emperors a letter filled with fresh calumnies against him. The father justified his conduct; they went back to the origin of the persecutions which Athanasius had suffered; they showed that his ordination was strictly according to rule; they observed, that Eusebius of Nicomedia had changed his see several times, forgetting that he who is once bound to a Church by the episcopate may not seek to change, lest he be found guilty of adultery according to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. They showed, further, that the proceedings of the council of Tyre were invalid, both because the party of Eusebius was dominant there, and because the secular power prevented all freedom of action; they again exonerated Athanasius from the murder of Arsénius, alluded afresh to the irregularity of the proceedings in the Marcotis, accused the Eusebians of dividing the Church by menaces and terror, and, finally, exhorted the bishops to give no credit to anything written against Athanasius.—*See Tyre*, 335. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 532, p. 129.

ALEXANDRIA (362). Held in the year 362, by St Athanasius, in concert with St Eusebius of Vercelli, to deliberate with him and the other bishops upon the affairs of the Church, and particularly upon the means to be adopted for restoring peace and union to the Church of Antioch, where

¹ "Factum est in synodo, ut in Sanctissimâ Trinitate sicut una prædicaretur *obola*, id est essentia, ita tres dicerentur *subsistentiæ* nempe *ὁμοούσιος*, sed cum hæc vox apud nonnullos acciperetur pro *substantia*, inde major oborta est controversia num recte dicerentur tres esse in Trinitate substantiæ."

In this council Colluthus, a priest of Alexandria, who had pretended to exercise episcopal functions, and had celebrated a mock ordination, was censured.

Probably several councils were held in Egypt about this time.

the orthodox Christians, who for some time had communicated with the Arians, having at last, in 361, separated from them, and united themselves to Meletius (elected bishop in the council of Antioch, A. D. 360), could not induce the Eustathians (who were the original Catholics of the city¹) to unite with them.

Besides St Athanasius and St Eusebius, we find in Arabia, Paphnucius, of Saïs, and about twenty others. They applied themselves with great industry to discover the most advisable methods for restoring order in the Church, agitated as it had been by such a tempest of heresy. Constantius, the great patron of the Arians, was now dead.

The council settled that those who had been *leaders* or *defenders* of the heresy should be admitted to penance, but that they could not be permitted to retain any clerical office; while those who had been led away by the violence of others should be allowed to retain their rank, provided they subscribed the acts of the council of Nicea.—*Bar.* A. D. 362, § 235.

In the next place, the affairs of the Church of Antioch were discussed, where the Eustathians refused to submit to Meletius, who had been in communion with the heretics, by whom also he had been consecrated bishop. The bishops in council requested Eusebius and Asterius to proceed to Antioch in the name of the council; and, further, wrote a letter to the three bishops, Luciferus, Cymatius, and Anatolius, in which they expressed their joy that the Meletians were willing to unite with the followers of Paulinus, *i. e.*, with the Eustathians; they exhorted them to require nothing

¹ When the Arian bishops had taken possession of the see of Antioch, many, both of the clergy and laity, who purposed to abide in the true faith, forsook the public service of the Church, and assembled by themselves for divine service. Those who did so were called Eustathians, because they began first to assemble in this way after the ejection of Eustathius. These men who from the first had boldly contended for the true faith, refused to communicate with those who were called the orthodox (*i. e.*, those who held the true faith and acknowledged Meletius for their lawful bishop), because Meletius, although orthodox, had been elected by the Arians, and had in some things given way to them. Thus there were three bishops of Antioch at one time—Paulinus, the bishop of the original Catholics or Eustathians, a priest, afterwards consecrated by Luciferus; Meletius, the bishop of the orthodox, elected by the Arians, under the belief that he favoured their views; and Euzojus, whom the Arians had subsequently elected.

further from those who desired to return from Arianism, in order to union, than that, 1st, they should confess the faith of the council of Nicea; 2nd, they should anathematize the heresy of the Arians, and also that which teaches that the Holy Spirit is a mere creature, and not of the same substance with the Father and the Son. This was a necessary precaution to be taken against the new sect of the Macedonians; against whom it had already been decreed, by this same council, that it is necessary to believe that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance, and equally God with the Father and the Son; and that in the sacred Trinity, no one of the divine persons is either created, or inferior to other, or of later existence than another; lastly, they exhorted them to require that they should anathematize the impieties of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, Valentinus, Basilides, and the Manicheans, and that having so done, the Meletians ought to be received without suspicion, and that the followers of Paulinus should require nothing more. In this council a discussion was also raised upon the use of the term *ὁμοουσιος*, which subject at that time greatly agitated the whole Church; the Latins understanding by the term the actual "substance," were accordingly unwilling to allow more than *one* *ὁμοουσιος* in God, and accused those of Arianism who recognised three. The Greeks, on the contrary, using the word in the sense of "person," maintained that it was necessary to admit *three*, to avoid the error of Sabellianism. St Athanasius, therefore, in order to compose these differences, required from each party a definition of what they believed; and finding from their answers that they, in fact, held precisely the same doctrine, in nothing differing from the catholic faith, he permitted to each party the use of the term *ὁμοουσιος*, and bound them to receive the definitions of the Nicene council, without confusing themselves with new questions.¹ However, notwithstanding the pains and judicious conduct of Athanasius, the Church was, for a long time, sorely troubled about the use of this word. Another act of this council was a complete declaration of the doctrine of the Incarnation, in opposition to the heresy of Apollinarius, who already, not openly, but in secret, had begun to teach contrary to this truth. It was defined that Jesus Christ was born of Mary; that He was

¹ It rejected also the spurious additions of Sardica.

"very man" as to the flesh, and that He did not take to Himself a body only without a soul or mind.

The pains, however, which the council, and Athanasius in particular, had taken to procure peace to the Church of Antioch failed, owing to the intemperate behaviour of Luciferus, who, having first consecrated Paulinus, the chief of the Eustathians, withdrew, first from communion with Athanasius, and afterwards from that of the Church: whence arose the schism of the Luciferians, which lasted forty years.—*Cave's Apostolici*, p. 444. Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 97. 808.

ALEXANDRIA (363). Held in 363, consisting of all the bishops in Egypt, called together by St Athanasius, in order to fulfil the request of the emperor Jovian, that he would send him an exposition of the true faith. In the synodical answer, Athanasius exhorted the emperor to adhere to the declaration of faith settled at Nicea.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 823.

ALEXANDRIA (399). Held in the year 399. In this council the writings of Origen were condemned, as they had already been in the West. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who there presided, condemned also the four Great Brothers—Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Enthymus—so called from their great size, their crime consisting in sheltering the priest Isidorus from the fury of Theophilus. Many other councils were held this year in the East against the writings of Origen.—*See Jerusalem, Cyprus*. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1219.

ALEXANDRIA (430). Convoled by St Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, in the month of November, 430, to communicate a letter received by him from the Pope Celestine, and another, which the same pope had written to Nestorius.

The council determined that another letter should be written to Nestorius, warning him, both in the name of this council and of that of Rome, to renounce his errors and embrace the Catholic faith; and to signify to him, that, if he refused, they should no longer hold communion with him, or recognize him as bishop. This letter is divided into three parts: one containing an exposition of the faith, beginning with the Nicene creed; then follow the twelve celebrated anathemas of Cyril; and lastly, the announcement of the sentence passed against Nestorius by Celestine, in August, A.D. 430. *See Rome, 430*.

These anathemas referred to the twelve principal heads of the Nestorian heresy.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 395; *Conc. Eph. c. 26.*

ALNE (709). Held by Berthwald, archbishop of Canterbury, and Wilfrid of York, to inquire into the case of Egwin, who had been elevated to the see of Worcester, and subsequently deposed. He went to Rome, laid his case before Constantinus Syrus, the pope, and returned with letters in support of his claim. The land of Evesham, near Worcester, was granted to him by the king, and he was confirmed in his possession by the present council. He founded a monastery of Benedictine monks upon the spot, which was consecrated by Wilfrid in the following year.

ALTINO (802). [*Concilium Altinense*]. Held 802; where St Paulinus of Aquilea implored the help of Charlemagne against John, duke of Venice, who had thrown down from the top of a tower John, patriarch of Grado.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1187.

AMIDA, DIARBEEKIR, or KARA AMID (c. 1600) in Armenia. Catholicos of the Nestorians held a synod here, about 1600, where he renounced the errors of Nestorianism.

ANAZARBA (435). [*Concilium Anazarbicum*]. Held in 435. In this council many bishops, following the example of Theodoret, put themselves in communion with John of Antioch.

ANCYRA (314). [*Concilium Ancyranum*]. Held about Easter, 314. Eighteen bishops only were present, from Asia Minor, Cappadocia, Pontus, Armenia, Cilicia, and Syria, amongst whom were Vitalis of Antioch, who presided, Marcellus of Ancyra, well known in the history of St Athanasius, Lupus of Tarsus, Amphion of Epiphania, and Basilius of Amasia in Pontus, and St Leontius of Cesarea in Cappadocia.

Twenty-four canons were drawn up, chiefly relating to the case of those who had relapsed during the persecution of Maximinus.

1. Orders that priests who, after their fall, have sincerely repented, shall be permitted to retain their rank, but excluded from all exercise of their office.

2. Orders the same concerning deacons.

3. Orders that those who have been forcibly made to

sacrifice, shall be admitted to communion ; and that laymen should not, by such violence, be incapacitated from receiving holy orders.

6. Orders that those who have been induced to sacrifice by threats, &c., shall, upon repentance, be received as hearers from the time of holding this synod to the great day (Easter) : after this, as prostrators¹ for three years, and for two years more as communicants without offering. In case of sickness and danger, they might be received under limitation.

8. Orders that those who have sacrificed two or three times, even under violence, shall fulfil a penance of six years.

9. Enjoins a penance of ten years upon those who have led away their brethren.

10. Allows those persons who, at the time of their being made deacons, declared their intention to marry, to do so, and to remain in the ministry ; those who did not so declare their purpose, but were ordained professing continence, to be deposed if they afterwards marry.

12. Allows the ordination of those who sacrificed to idols before baptism.

13. Forbids the chorepiscopi to ordain priests or deacons without the permission of the bishop in writing.

14. Deprives those of the clergy who obstinately, through superstition, refuse to touch meat, and vegetables cooked with meat.

15. Enacts that Church property unlawfully sold by priests during a vacancy in the bishopric, shall be reclaimed.

16. Casts out, amongst the *Hyemantes*, those guilty of unnatural sins.

18. Excommunicates those who, having been appointed bishops, and refused by the persons in the parish to which they have been appointed, wish to invade other parishes.²

20. Enjoins seven years' penance for adultery.

¹ There were four grades of penitents, *flentes*, *audientes*, *prostrati* (or *substrati*), and *consistentes*. The first were, properly speaking, not in a state of penance at all, but only candidates for admission to the Church by penance. The second were allowed to listen to the Holy Scriptures and the sermon, but were compelled to withdraw from the congregation while prayer was offered. The third class, the prostrators, were allowed to remain in church upon their knees for certain prayers and the benediction ; while the consistentes were admitted to all the privileges of the Church, except the Holy Eucharist.

² The original meaning of this word is equivalent to that of the modern word "diocese."

24. Enjoins five years of penance to those who use sooth-saying, and follow the customs of the Gentiles.¹—Tom. i. Conc. pp. 1456, 1480.

ANCYRA (358). Held in 358, by certain semi-Arian bishops, headed by Basil of Ancyra, and George of Laodicea; twelve only signed, but more may have been present. They condemned the grosser blasphemies of the Arians. The pure Arians taught that the Son of God is but a mere creature, but the semi-Arians believed Him to be more than a created being, and even *like* to the Father, but not of the same substance with Him, nor equal to Him. The Eusebians favoured this latter notion, and at the same time condemned the notion of Eudoxius of Antioch, who held that the Son is "*unlike* in substance." It was to oppose this Eudoxian heresy that this council was chiefly called, and drew up a long exposition of the faith, which they presented to the bishops: in which they maintained that the Son is of *like* substance with the Father, and at first anathematized the term *consubstantial*, but afterwards withdrew the anathema. The semi-Arians sent a deputation to Constantius, and obtained the suppression of the second confession or formulary of Sirmium, made by the pure Arians in 357.—See Sirmium, 357. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 789. *Sozomen*, l. iv. c. 13. *Epiph. Hær.* lxxii.

ANGERS (453). [*Concilium Andegavense*]. Held in 453, in order to consecrate a bishop to the see of Angers; Leo, archbishop of Bourges, presided. The council, before separating, made twelve canons for the better maintenance of discipline. The first is to the effect, that since the emperor had granted to the bishops the power of trying civil causes, the clergy should, in every case of difference amongst themselves, apply to them instead of to the lay authorities; and that in case of dispute arising between any of the clergy and the laity, they should still require to be judged by their bishop; but if the other contending party would not agree to this, then they should first obtain permission of their diocesan to go before the secular judge. Further, the clergy were forbidden to occupy themselves with any secular business. Wandering monks were to be excommunicated. Assaults and mutilation were forbidden: showing what disorders were caused by the

¹ According to Baronius this canon is spurious. *Bar. A. D.* 314. No. 89.

incursions of the barbarians who then ravished Gaul. The fourth canon also deprives those of the clergy who would not abstain from intercourse with all "*strange*" women, *i.e.*, all who were not near relations.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1020.

ANGERS (1062). Held about the year 1062, against Berenger, archdeacon of Angers, born at Tours in the beginning of the eleventh century. Having studied in the school of St Martin, and subsequently at Chartres, under the famous Fulbert (afterwards bishop of Chartres), he was chosen to teach in the public school of St Martin at Tours; here it was that he first maintained that the body and blood of our Lord are not really present in the Eucharist, but only in a figure. He was condemned in twelve councils, among them Bordeaux, Brionne, Paris, Placenza, and two at Rome. He is said, also, to have maintained that the baptism of children is null and void, and that marriage is inexpedient, and promiscuous concubinage lawful.

ANGERS (1279). Held on the 22nd October 1279, by John de Monsoreau, archbishop of Tours. Five canons were made, one of which punished excommunicated clergy with the loss of the profits of their benefices as long as the period of excommunication lasted. This shows that the clergy themselves, by their own example, led the people to make light of the sentence of excommunication, and that it was no longer regarded as the extreme canonical punishment; also the second canon forbids the bishop's officials to require any fee for sealing letters of orders, under pain of suspension or excommunication.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1074.

ANGERS (1365). Held on the 12th of March 1365, by Simon Renoul, archbishop of Tours, and seven of his suffragans. Thirty-four articles were drawn up, the first of which relates to proceedings at law; other articles relate to the immunities of the Church, and a few tend directly to the correction of morals.—*Fleury*. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1939.

ANGERS (1448). A provincial council of Touraine was held at Angers in July 1448, by John, archbishop of Tours, with his suffragans. Seventeen regulations were made for the reformation of abuses. The third orders all priests to say the office for the dead, with three lessons at least, every day that was not an holy-day. The fourth forbids the giving the daily distribution to those of the clergy who were

not present at the holy office. The fifth forbids all talking in the choir.

The council orders, in canon seven, that the Word of God should be preached only in Churches and with becoming dignity; and forbids the preacher to make use of loud cries or extravagant gestures: it also forbids clandestine marriages, and the silly tumult and noise made in derision, when any are married a second or third time, commonly called "*charivari*."—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1352.

ANGERS (1583). Held in 1583, being a continuation of one held at Tours in the same year, which, on account of the plague, which had broken out in that city, was transferred to Angers. Several regulations were made: First, upon the subject of holy baptism, directions were given as to the choice of god-parents; it was also forbidden to re-baptize, even conditionally, in cases where that sacrament had been administered by heretics, provided the matter and form of words and intention had been preserved. Secondly, confirmation, the holy eucharist, the sacrifice of the mass, marriage, orders, the celebration of the festivals, and the worship of relics were treated of. Thirdly, the subjects of reform, ecclesiastical discipline, the duty of bishops, canons, curates, &c., were discussed; amongst other regulations, the monks were ordered to preserve the tonsure large and distinct, and to shave their beards. Fourthly, a rigid abstinence from meat every Wednesday and during all Advent was enjoined them. With respect to nuns, it was forbidden to appoint any one to be abbess or prioress under forty years of age, and eight of profession.

Matters concerning the burial of the dead, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, visitations, the preservation of ecclesiastical property, seminaries, schools, and universities, were also discussed in this council, and the regulations agreed upon were confirmed by a bull of Gregory XIII. of the same year, and published by order of the king, Henry III.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1001.

ANSE (990). [*Concilium Ansænum*.] Held in 990. Burchardus, archbishop of Lyons, Teubaldus, archbishop of Vienne, and nine bishops being present. Odilon, abbot of Clugny, with a large body of his monks, appeared before the council and solicited the confirmation of the privileges of the monastery, which was done, "sub anathematis

terribili vinculo." Certain canons were also enacted, some of which are lost, but nine remain.

1. Forbids any one but a priest to carry the Host to the sick.

3. Orders persons to attend at vigils and to stand with groans and sighs, without chattering and scurrility.

4. Forbids clerks to hunt, "abeo sciat, quem irridet, esse damnandum."

5. Orders priests to abstain from their wives; otherwise to desist from celebrating the holy mystery and to lose their benefices.

7. Forbids all work on the evening of the Sabbath after the hour of noon, and permits no buying and selling on Sundays.

8. Orders all lay persons to abstain from flesh on Wednesdays and to fast on Fridays, if they can do so, and give alms to the poor. Also, if they can do so, to hear mass on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays.

9. Contains a blessing and a curse upon those who break or respect the privileges granted to the monastery.—*Mart. Thes.*: Anec. tom. 4, col. 73.

ANSE (1025). Held in 1025, at Anse near Lyons. Gaustin de Maçon complained against Bouchard or Burchard, archbishop of Vienne, for having ordained certain monks of Clugny, although that monastery was in the diocese of Maçon. Odilon, the abbot, exhibited the pope's privilege, which exempted the monks of Clugny from the jurisdiction of their own bishop, and gave permission that they might be ordained by any bishop whom the abbot chose. However, the council having caused the canons to be read, which order that in every country all abbeys and monasteries shall be subject to their proper bishop, declared the privilege to be null and void, being plainly contrary to those canons.¹—*Fleury*. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 859.

ANSE (1100). Held in 1100. Five archbishops, of whom Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, was one, and nine bishops, were present. Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, demanded a subsidy to defray the expenses of a voyage which he was obliged to make to Jerusalem.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 726.

¹ C. ORLEANS, A.D. 511, Can. 19. C. EPAUNE, A.D. 517, Can. 19. ARLES, A.D. 554, Can. 2.

ANTIOCH (264 and 269). [*Concilium Antiochenum.*]
 Held in 264, against the errors of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, whose life was, in other respects, little suited to the sanctity of his office; his evil course of life caused him to lose sight of the truth. He taught, as Sabellius had done in 255, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were but One Person; that the Word and the Spirit were in the Father without a real and personal existence, and merely as reason is in man; so that, in fact, there was neither Father, Son, nor Holy Spirit, but simply One God. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that the Father produced the Word, but only in order that He might operate out of Himself; in which he differed from Sabellius. His error upon the subject of the Incarnation was equally fatal; he would not allow that the Son of God came down from heaven; he maintained that Jesus Christ was of the earth, a mere man, having, by nature, nothing above other men; he confessed that the Word, Wisdom, and Eternal Light were in Him, but only as dwelling in Him, not by a personal union.

Hence he recognised in Jesus Christ two *ὑποστάσεις*, two Persons, two Christs, and two Sons, one of whom was the Son of God by nature, and co-eternal with the Father, being no other, according to his showing, than the Father Himself; whilst the other, who was the Son of David and the Son of the Virgin Mary, was Christ only in an improper sense, having had no existence before His birth of the Virgin, and being called the Son of God only because He was the abode of the True Son. So that Jesus Christ was righteous, not because righteousness was an attribute essential to Him as God, but merely by the *practice* of virtue and righteousness; not by His *union*, but by His communication with the Divine Word.

In order to give the most complete check to so great an evil, the eastern bishops flocked to Antioch from all parts in great numbers, and amongst them were found some of great note, viz., Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia,¹ Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocesarea, Helenus of Tarsus in Cilicia, Hymenæus of Jerusalem, Theoctenus of Cesarea in Palestine, and Maximus of Bostra: there was also a large assemblage of priests and deacons. When

¹ He died at Tarsus, on his way to the second council upon the same subject, in 269.

they were assembled, a letter was read from Dionysius of Alexandria, who was too ill to be present, animating their zeal for the defence of the truth. What passed in this council is not exactly known; but it seems that two at least were held upon this subject, one in this year, 264, and a second in 269, which was continued in the year following. It is certain that Paul did every thing in his power to conceal the venom of his heresy, that the bishops declared the true faith with the utmost clearness, and earnestly besought Paul to renounce his heresy, and that he protested that he had never held the errors imputed to him. It would seem that it was in the first council, which assembled A.D. 264, that Firmilian condemned the errors of Paul, who then promised to recant. Subsequent events, however, showed that he had been merely deceiving the bishops, and accordingly the second council was called, where the prelates assembled to the number of seventy, according to St Athanasius, or eighty as St Hilary asserts. In this last synod Paul so craftily hid his real views that he would probably have again deceived the bishops but for the presence of Malchion, "an eloquent man, the head of the Greek School of dialectic at Antioch, who, for the exceeding purity of his faith, had been counted worthy of the Presbytery in the church there. He, pressing upon Paul his enquiry, was alone of all able to detect the crafty man."¹ Malchion for this eminent service, was allowed by the bishops to join his name to theirs. Then, after having used exhortations and entreaties with Paul, they clearly and unequivocally asserted the union of the Divine and human natures in the One Person of Jesus Christ, and the *Personal* distinction between the Father and the Son, in one and the same substance. Paul being thus convicted of all his errors, and especially of holding that Jesus Christ was merely man, was unanimously deposed and excommunicated, which judgment of the council was announced in a Synodical Epistle to Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria and to the whole Catholic Church, and was received and confirmed by all the bishops of the whole Church. Domnus was in the same council elected to succeed Paul on the throne of Antioch. *Euseb.* l. vii. c. 28. Tom. i. Conc. pp. 843 and 893. 901.

¹ *Euseb.* H.E. vii. 29, in Pusey's Councils, p. 93.

ANTIOCH (330). [*Pseudo council.*] Held in 330, by the Arians against Eustathius, the patriarch of Antioch, a strenuous defender of the Nicene faith; him Eusebius of Nicomedia and other Arians accused of Sabellianism and adultery, on which false charges he was unjustly condemned and deposed and banished into Illyricum. Soz. lib. 2. c. 19.

ANTIOCH (340). Held about the year 340; about ninety bishops were present. The Eusebians, hearing that St Athanasius had proceeded to Rome, became alarmed, fearing lest their falsehoods and artifices should be exposed by his presence. The fathers of the second council testify that St Firmilius had at that time come a *second* time to Antioch on this matter. He died on his way home. In order, therefore, to prevent, as far as lay in their power, what they dreaded, they, too, constituted themselves judges in their own cause, and held a council, in which they declared that any bishop, who, after having been deposed should take upon himself the exercise of his episcopal office, without the authority of a new council, should never be restored. Then they proceeded to set up at Alexandria a bishop of their own sect, Gregory of Cappadocia, an acknowledged Arian, whose intrusion was accompanied by every possible irregularity and violence, even so far as the employment of military force and heathenish cruelties.—*Tillemont*. Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 89. 558.

ANTIOCH (341). Held in 341, by the Eusebians, on the occasion of the dedication of the "Golden" Church at Antioch. The emperor Constantine commenced this work in a style of magnificence worthy of his piety, and Constantius had just completed it; and as Eusebius of Nicomedia lost no opportunity of advancing his schemes, he so managed matters, that under the pretext of dedicating the new church, he assembled a council, of which the real object was to condemn belief in the consubstantiality of the Son. Ninety-seven¹ bishops, of whom thirty-six or forty were acknowledged Arians, were present. They came chiefly from the following provinces: Syria, Phenicia, Palestine, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Isauria, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Thrace. The principal men

¹ Sozomen and St Hilary. Socrates and St Athanasius, "ninety." See Dr Pusey's Councils, p. 130, notes x and y.

amongst them were Eusebius, who had usurped the see of Constantinople, Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neronias, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Marsis of Macedonia, Acacius Cæsarea, Eudoxius, afterwards of Constantinople, George of Laodicea, and Theophronius of Tyana, in Cappadocia. Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, refused to attend, not forgetting how he had been, upon a former occasion (in the Synod of Tyre), surprised into subscribing to the condemnation of Athanasius. Placillus, patriarch of Antioch, presided.

No bishop from the west was present at the council, nor any one on the part of the pope. The Emperor Constantius, however, who saw only with the eyes of the Arians, attended in person. The sole object of the Eusebians was to crush Athanasius, and accordingly they brought forward again the accusations which had been urged against him in the council of Tyre, and had been repeatedly refuted. Moreover, they alleged against him, on the present occasion, certain murders which had been committed on his return to Alexandria, which they maintained had been resisted by the people to whom it was very displeasing. In the end he was condemned without a hearing; and Gregory, an Arian, was appointed to succeed him.¹

Three creeds were then drawn up. In the first they spoke with great reserve of the Son, making use neither of the terms "substance" nor "consubstantial." In the second² they said that He was immutably possessed of the divinity, or, as Socrates and St Hilary explain their meaning to be, that He was incapable of mutability or change; that He was

¹ According to Pagi, the proceedings against Athanasius were not taken in the council *in Encaniis*, properly so called, but subsequently, when the orthodox majority had departed, and the Eusebians, who purposely remained, had received news from Rome that their case against Athanasius was likely to be settled in his favour; they then, by confusing the fourth and twelfth canons just passed, concocted another, which condemned him. Thus this author seems to prove, that all the acts of the council, whilst the ninety-seven bishops were present, and during which time the three formularies and the twenty-five canons were drawn up, were regular and orthodox; but that the condemnation of Athanasius, and the publication of a fourth erroneous confession of faith, were authorized by a pseudo-council composed of the forty Arian bishops only.

² This is attributed by Sozomen to St Lucianus, priest of Antioch, but it is doubtful.

Begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Whole of Whole, &c. ; the *image* of the Father's Godhead, substance, power, and glory ; that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three in hypostasis, or subsistence, but one in consent, reducing the Unity to a mere unity of will. They seem, also, to have admitted in the Divine Persons a glory peculiar to each ; and whilst they denied the Son to be a mere creature, they added, as though He had been no more than this (just as they expressed themselves when speaking of His divinity), that He was the first-born of all creatures. (S. Hil. *de Synodis*, c. 29.)

The second formulary was styled the "Formulary of Antioch, or the Creed of the Dedication ;" and had been approved by the semi-Arians, at the council of Seleucia, in 359.

These canons were rejected by Pope Innocent I., as "composed by heretics," but received by the Council of Chalcedon (c. 4.) as "the righteous rules of the Fathers," and were placed on the codex of the Canons of the Universal Church. — This goes to prove Pagi's theory of the council ; the pope views it in respect to its latter end, the council to its orthodox character (*i.e.*, the majority) at its commencement. (See Schram. P., p. 129.)

The third formulary does not materially differ from the last ; it was drawn up by Theophronius, Bishop of Tyana.

In this council, moreover, various regulations were made ; and for many ages, twenty-five canons were attributed to it, which have come down to us. It is Tillemont's opinion that these twenty-five canons, which are excellent, and of great celebrity in the Church, may have been made at a more ancient council, held at Antioch under St Eustachius. However this may be, although absolutely rejected by Pope Innocentius and St Chrysostom, as having been the work of heretics, they were received without difficulty into the code of Church canons, which was confirmed in the Council of Chalcedon, although they are not styled canons of the Council of Antioch.

1. Excommunicates those of the laity who set aside the decree of Nicea concerning the festival of Easter ; deposes, and deprives, and declares to be aliens from the Church, any bishops, priests, or deacons guilty of so doing.

2. Orders that all those who come to church only to *hear*

the sacred Scriptures, and do not communicate in prayer, or who turn away from the holy Eucharist, shall be cast out of the Church. Forbids intercourse with the excommunicated.

3. Forbids priests and deacons to absent themselves from their churches.

4. Deprives of all hope of restoration a bishop deposed by the synod, or a priest or deacon by his own bishop who shall nevertheless dare to perform any part of divine service. (See C. ANTIOCH, 340.)

5. Enacts that if any presbyter or deacon, despising his own bishop, has separated himself from the Church, and collected a private congregation, and refused to attend and submit upon a first and second summons from his bishop, he shall be utterly deprived, without remedy. And that if he persists in troubling and disturbing the Church, he shall be corrected by the secular power.

6. Forbids a bishop to receive any one excommunicated by another bishop.

7. Strangers not to be received without letters of peace.

9. Orders all the bishops of a province to obey the metropolitan, and to give him precedence.

10. Permits the chorepiscopi to ordain readers, subdeacons, and exorcists; forbids them to dare to ordain either priests or deacons without the bishop.

11. No bishop or priest to go to the emperor without the consent, in writing, of the bishops of the province and the metropolitan, and without letters from them.

12. Deprives of all hope of restoration a deposed priest or deacon, who shall carry his complaint to the emperor instead of the synod of bishops.

13. Deposés a bishop who presumes to ordain in another province.

14. Orders that if the bishops in synod, when sitting in judgment upon the conduct of any bishop, cannot agree in their verdict, the metropolitan shall call in some from a neighbouring province.

15. No appeal to be allowed from the unanimous decision of the provincial synod.

16. A bishop not chosen in a perfect synod, *i.e.*, where the metropolitan is present, to be cast out, even though elected by all the people.

17. Excommunicates a bishop, who, after consecration, refuses to exercise his office.

19. Forbids to consecrate a bishop without a synod : the appointment to be made with the consent of, at least, the majority of the bishops of the province.

20. Two provincial synods to be held annually : one, three weeks after Easter, and the other on the ides of October. All who think themselves aggrieved may come for redress.

21. Forbids translations of bishops from one see to another.

22. Forbids bishops to interfere in the church of another bishop.

23. Forbids a bishop to appoint his own successor. Such appointments to be void.

24. Declares that Church property ought to be preserved with the utmost care, and administered by the bishop. Allows bishops to leave by will their own private property, but not that of the Church.

25. Gives the bishop power over the possessions of the Church ; permits him to partake of what he requires for his own necessary use, and for purposes of hospitality ; forbids him to pervert the Church revenue to his own family purposes.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 89. *Fleury*. (Hammond's *Canons of the Church*, p. 153.)

ANTIOCH (344 or 345). Held by the Arian bishops about 344, in which they drew up a long explication of their faith, inclining somewhat more to orthodoxy than its predecessors, but maintaining creation of the Son and His inferiority to the Father, commonly known as the "Macrostich" (*μακρόστιχος*), or large confession, containing, first, the formulary of Antioch, mentioned in the preceding council, to which they added a prolix explication of the principal articles, and opposed the heresies of Paul of Samosata, Photinus, Sabellius, and others. This formulary was sent by the hand of four bishops, to the western bishops, assembled at Milan. (*See C. MILAN*, 346. *Socr. Lib.* 2. c. 19. P. p. 132.)

ANTIOCH (360). Held in 360. A large synod, Meletius, bishop of Sebastia, was unanimously elected patriarch of Antioch, the Arian party flattering themselves that he would support their views ; but in the council, although violence was used to prevent him, he testified boldly before the emperor, in defence of the Catholic faith upon the subject of the nature of the Son. The Arians, enraged by his discourse, so prejudiced the mind of the emperor against

him, that in a council held in the following year, at which Constantius himself was present, he was accused of Sabellianism, and banished. The Arians, at the same time, published a new formulary of faith, in which they departed even further from the true faith, the word "like" was omitted, and it was declared the Son was in all things, Substance and Will, unlike the Father. (See SELEUCIA, 359.)—*Sozom.* iv. 28. *Theod.* ii. 31. *Tom.* ii. Conc. p. 96. 807.

ANTIOCH. Held by Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, and nine bishops, to absolve Aetius from his condemnation at Constantinople, 359. Eunomius, with four Arian bishops, who had been amongst those who refused to condemn him, then consecrated him bishop at Constantinople.

ANTIOCH (363). Held in 363, under Jovian. Acacius of Cæsarea and his party, seeing the good opinion which this prince had conceived of Meletius, entered upon a conference with him, which was the cause of this council. Twenty-seven bishops attended from different provinces; of these the principal were, Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, and Acacius of Cæsarea, Pelagius of Laodicea, Irenio of Gaza, Athanasius of Ancyra, &c. They unanimously agreed upon a letter to the emperor, in which they confessed the doctrine of consubstantiality, and agreed to the faith as settled at Nicea, inserting in the letter the Nicene creed, which they received as the exposition of the true faith; especially admitting the term "consubstantial"¹ as expressing that the Son is of the same substance with the Father.—*Tom.* ii. Conc. p. 825. *Socr.* l. iii. c. 25.

ANTIOCH (378). Held in the year 378, and every bishop subscribed it. The whole Eastern Church having held a council at Antioch, the letter of Pope Damasus, "to the catholic bishops throughout the East" (see Alexandria, 372), was read, and the bishops present [163 or 146] received the faith therein contained, and set their hands to the epistle as confirming it, amongst others, Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicea, Eulogius of Edessa, &c. This letter of the pope authoritatively set

¹ "Quandoquidem vocabulum *consubstantialis* quod quibusdam videtur parum recte in ea (the Nicene Creed) positum, est probe a Patribus commodaque interpretatione explanatum. Quæ quidem interpretatio ostendit Filium ex Patris substantia genitum Patri secundum substantiam similem."

forth the faith of the Catholic Church upon the subjects of the blessed Trinity, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and the errors of Apollinarius.—*Tillemont. Cave, Hist. Litt. t. i. p. 363.*

ANTIOCH (379). [*See* SCHRAM, i. 287.] In this council, moreover, a scheme was devised for putting an end to the long schism which had existed amongst the Catholics of Antioch who were divided into Eustathians and followers of Meletius. (*See* note, Council of ALEXANDRIA, 362.) It was agreed that Paulinus and Meletius should both admit that whichever of the two survived the other should be sole patriarch of Antioch, and the same thing was insisted upon, upon oath, from Flavianus and Theodorus, who were regarded as their most probable successors. Flavianus subsequently violated his promise.

ANTIOCH (391). Held about the year 391. Flavianus, the bishop, assisted by several priests and deacons, condemned and anathematized the errors of the Massalians, who regarded the sacraments as useless, and made Christian perfection to consist in prayer alone.

ANTIOCH (421). Held between 421 and 424, under Theodotus of Antioch, Praylius, the successor of John in the see of Jerusalem, being present. Heros and Lazarus again accused Pelagius of heresy, who had been acquitted in the council of Diospolis by the influence of John of Jerusalem; he was condemned, and letters to that effect were written to the pope. The acts and letters of the council have perished.—*Marii Mercatoris Opera, Studio Garnerii, Dissert. ii. de Synodis, &c., p. 207. Tillemont.*

ANTIOCH (431). Held in 445 or 444, in which Athanasius, bishop of Perrha, was suspended. Domnus the patriarch presided. The acts of this synod were read in the fourteenth action of Chalcedon.

ANTIOCH (433). Held in 433, by order of the Emperor Theodosius. In this council the heresy of Nestorius was condemned by John of Antioch, and this last named prelate was reconciled to St Cyril, as the emperor had commanded.—*Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1265.*

ANTIOCH (435). A general eastern council, held in the year 435. Three Synodal letters were written by this council, to the emperor, to Proclus, and to St Cyril, respectively. In the last, the memory of Theodorus of Mopsuestia (whom certain monks of Constantinople had required should be anathematized, and his writings condemned) was defended;

the bishops, speaking of his "Extracts," express themselves thus: "We allow that there are doubtful passages, which may be understood in a sense differing from that intended by the writer; but there are many abundantly clear. And as to those which appear obscure, we find similar passages in the ancient writers; so that if we condemn the former we also cast a reflection upon the latter. What endless confusion will it not lead us into, if we allow the opinions of the fathers who are dead to be combated! It is one thing not to approve entirely of some few of their opinions, and another to anathematize them; especially if the anathema be extended to themselves personally. . . . May not Theodore have been compelled to express himself thus, in order to contend effectually with the heresies which he, as the common defender of the East, opposed?"

In their letter to Proclus, the same bishops wrote: "It is not our office to judge those who have died in the faith; that belongs to God alone, who is the judge of the living and of the dead." St Cyril, however, made a reply to the council, in which he said, that he implored them not to attribute to the holy fathers, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, and others, the infamous opinions of such men as Diodorus and Theodorus, who openly impeached the glory of Jesus Christ, lest by so doing they should give occasion to scandal.—*Fleury, Col. Baluz., p. 943.*

APT (1365). Held in the choir of the Cathedral Church of Apt on the 14th of May 1365, there being present the Archbishops of Arles, Embrun, and Aix, Philip the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, John of Orange, John of Carpentras, George of Marseilles, John of Vaison, James of St Paul-Trois-Châteaux (*Tricastinensis*), Stephen of Venice, Laurentius of Nica, Raymond of Apt, and the Bishops of Toulon, Digne, Senez, Sisteron, and Riez, besides proctors of absent bishops, and chapters. Thirty canons were published.

1. Orders prayer to be made for the pope.
2. Grants indulgences of twenty days to those who kneel at the words, "*Qui propter nos homines,*" in the Creed, and the "*Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro,*" and to those saying or hearing the mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
7. Forbids clerks to have players or buffoons, or sporting dogs or hawks, lest they be led away by such amusements.

13. Forbids fairs and markets to be held on Sundays or festivals.

17. Against those of the religious orders who neglect their proper habit.—Mart., *Thes. Anec.*, p. 4. col. 881.

AQUILEIA (381). [*Concilium Aquileiense.*] Held in 381, under Valerian of Aquileia and St Ambrose of Milan. Palladius, Bishop of Illyria, and Secundianus, having been accused of Arianism, in order to justify themselves, demanded of the Emperor Gratian to be tried by a general council of the Eastern Church. Gratian acceded to this request, so far as to permit any bishop who might desire it to come to Aquileia, but without compelling any. Bishops from most of the provinces of Italy attended, and the bishops of Orange and Marseilles, acting as deputies for Gaul; two bishops, also, from Africa; and Annemius, the bishop of Sirmium, the capital of Illyria; in all, thirty-two bishops. But if this number was small, the eminent qualities of those who were present (viz., St Ambrose, St Valerian of Aquileia, Eusebius of Bologna, Justus of Lyons, &c.) compensated for the want of numbers. Palladius and Secundianus were the only Arian bishops present.

The bishops assembled on the 3rd September, when Palladius and Secundianus endeavoured in vain to prevent the question from being brought forward. The impiety of Palladius appearing clearly by his answers and his conduct, he was pronounced unworthy of the priestly office, and deposed from the episcopate, as was Secundianus. The decrees of the council were then transmitted to the Emperors Theodosius and Gratian, together with an entreaty that they would support them by their authority. The council further requested, that in order to remove the schism which had divided the Church of Antioch since the year 362, one party being formed under Meletius, supported by the whole Eastern Church, and another under Paulinus, who was favoured by the West, a council should be called at Alexandria, to be composed of all Catholic bishops, in order that it might be settled to whom communion should be granted and refused. This gave rise to the Council of Rome, in the year following, viz., in 382.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 978.

AQUILEIA (between 538 and 555). Held in the time of Pope Vigilius against those who maintained that He who was born of the Blessed Virgin was not God-Man, but

man only. It was decreed that the title of Θεοτοκος was rightly applied to the Virgin, for that her offspring was True God as well as true man.—*Gesta Epis. Leod. Mart. Vet. Scrip.*, tom. 4. col. 349.

AQUILEIA (558). In 558, according to the suggestion of Pagi, Paulinus of Aquileia held a synod in which the Council of Chalcedon was condemned. For this Pope Pelagius anathematized him, and hence arose the schism which for so long a time divided the churches of Rome and Aquileia. Paulinus fled to Grado, and assumed the title of patriarch. Some writers maintain that this council was held by Macedonius, the predecessor of Paulinus, in 553 or 554.—Ughel., *Ital. Sacr.*

AQUILEIA (791). Held in 791, by St Paulinus of Aquileia. Fourteen canons were published. 1. Against simony. 3. Against drunkenness. 4. Forbids to the clergy worldly pleasures, such as dancing, music, &c. 7. Forbids the suffragans of the diocese to condemn a priest without first consulting the Metropolitan of Aquileia. 10. Forbids parties separated on account of adultery to remarry. 13. Orders that the observation of Sunday should begin at vespers on Saturday.

AQUILEIA (1409). Held in 1409, near Udine, in the diocese of Aquileia, by Gregory XII., whilst endeavours were being made at Pisa to depose him. He held the first session on the 6th of June, but he put off the second until the 22nd, on account of the small number of bishops who attended. He here pronounced sentence against Pedro of Luna (Benedict XIII.) and Alexander V.; he declared them to be schismatical, and their elections null, void, and sacrilegious. And further, in the last session, on the 5th September, he agreed to resign the pontificate, if his two competitors would promise to resign their alleged claims to it also; however, he added a condition to this promise which seems to show that his real object was to hinder concord.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2012. (*See C. PISA.*)

AQUILEIA (1594). Held in 1594, under the patriarch Francis Barbaro. Sixteen canons of faith and discipline, formed upon those of Trent, were published.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1471.

ARCA (431). A council was held soon after the year 431 at Arca, a monastery in Persia, in which Dadjesus, the Chaldee

Catholic, who, by the wicked machinations of certain simoniacal bishops, had been deposed by King Beheramus and imprisoned, was restored.

ARENDA (1473). [*Concilium Arendense.*] Held in December 1473, at Arenda, in Spain, in order that some remedy might be applied to correct the ignorance and immorality of the clergy. Alphonso, Archbishop of Toledo, with his suffragans, made there twenty-nine rules of discipline, amongst which are the following: viz., that no one shall be admitted to holy orders who is not acquainted with Latin; that the clergy shall not wear mourning; that bishops shall not appear in public without the rochette; that they shall never wear any garment made of silk; that they shall cause the Holy Scriptures to be read at their table, &c. The other canons relate to such cases as fornication amongst the clergy, clandestine marriages, simony, shows and dramatic representations held in churches, sports forbidden to clerks, duels, rapes, &c. This is the same with the Council of Toledo of the same year.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1448.

ARIMINUM (359). [*Concilium Ariminense.*] Held in 359, by order of the Emperor Constantius, at Ariminum in Romania. All the bishops of the West were summoned, the emperor promising to supply them with the means of travelling and subsistence.¹ The whole number present was about four hundred, collected from Italy, Illyria, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain. Of this number eighty were Arians, headed by Ursacius and Valens. Neither Liberius of Rome, nor Vincentius of Capua were present.

The Catholic bishops, amongst whom was Restitutus of Carthage, wished, at the very outset, to anathematize the Arian and all other heresies, but this was opposed by Ursacius and Valens, who objected to the use of the word "consubstantial," maintaining that it was far better to use the expression "like to the Father in all things," than to employ new words, which only served to create divisions, and which, moreover, were not to be found in Scripture; and they then presented to the assembly a new formulary of faith, which they had privately drawn up. The orthodox bishops answered, that they had no need of any new for-

¹This offer was refused, amongst others, by the British bishops who were present, except three, who were too poor to maintain themselves.—*Cave. Collier, Eccl. Hist., Bk. i. Cent. 4. vol. i. p. 85* (Barham Edition.)

mulary—that they had met together there not to learn what they ought to believe, but to oppose those who set themselves against the truth, and who introduced novelties; that it was necessary to condemn the doctrine of Arius, and, without disguise, to receive that of Nicea. Then they declared the formulary of Valens and Ursacius to be utterly at variance with the true faith, and confirmed the acts of Nicea, asserting that nothing whatever should be added to them. *See Esp. Sacr., 12. p. 117.* It is there said that the Arians deluded the orthodox into agreeing with this expression, and that both parties boasted of the victory.

As Valens and his party refused to acquiesce in this decision, the council proceeded to declare them heretics, and excommunicated and deposed them. This decree was signed by three hundred and twenty bishops; and the doctrine of Arius, as well as that of Photinus and Sabellius, was anathematized.

Up to this point, therefore, that is, whilst the fathers of the council had liberty of action granted to them, the Catholic faith was triumphant in the Council of Ariminum.

But, after this decision, both parties made their representation of the matter to the emperor. The Catholics, by the ten deputies whom they sent, declared that they could decide upon no step better calculated to confirm the true faith than to keep close to the Creed of Nicea, which they highly eulogized, without adding to or taking from it. They then alluded to the opposition made by Valens and his party, and showed that they had been forced by their conduct to excommunicate them.

The Arians, on the other hand, by the deputies whom they sent to the emperor, prejudiced his mind against the Catholics; and showed him their formulary of faith, which the latter had rejected, but with which the emperor found no fault. Thus, when the Catholic deputies arrived at Constantinople, they were refused an audience, and were for a long time, upon one pretext or other, kept without any answer; the emperor delaying matters, with the hope that the bishops, wearied out, and separated from their churches, would at last yield to his wishes, and give up the terms “substance” and “consubstantial.”

Further, the Arians having compelled the ten deputies of

the council, in spite of themselves, to come to Nice in Thrace, and having intimidated them by threats, and worn them out by violence and ill-usage, obliged them at last to consent to abandon the two obnoxious expressions, and to receive a confession conformable to that drawn up at Sirmium two years before ; in fact, they obliged them to become parties to an act of union with the Arians, and to renounce all that had been done at Ariminum.

The emperor, in the meantime, sent orders to the prefect, Taurus, not to suffer the council to separate until this confession, which entirely suppressed the words *οὐσία* and *ὁμοούσιος*, had been subscribed by all the bishops. All of them, with the exception of twenty, gave way to the violence and ill-usage to which they were subjected, and signed this confession of faith, known as the formulary of Nice or Ariminum. In order to induce them the more readily to comply, the Arians endeavoured to persuade them that they could not, without wrong, reject a scheme of faith produced, as they falsely pretended, by the Oriental bishops ; and added, that if the formulary, in some parts, appeared not sufficiently clear to them, they were at liberty to make what additions they pleased. The Catholic bishops joyfully availed themselves of this seeming door of escape, and quickly drew up certain propositions containing a condemnation of Arius, and declaring the equality of the Son to the Father, and His existence from all eternity ; but when they were completed, Valens craftily persuaded them to add that the Son was not a creature like other creatures ; thus, in fact, inducing the simple bishops, who intended nothing less, to acknowledge Him to be but a creature. When this triumph over the truth was completed, a deputation, headed by Valens and Ursacius, was sent to Constantius ; and the formulary, thus shamefully signed, was circulated throughout the eastern part of the empire, with orders to exile all who should refuse to sign it : and in this way the signatures of a large number of bishops were obtained, some sooner, some later, either through fear, or ignorance, or bribery.

But although the number of signatures thus obtained was very great, it by no means appears that the majority of bishops in the Church signed it ; amongst those who made a noble stand in defence of the true faith, were Liberius of

Rome,¹ Vincentius of Capua, Gregory of Elvira, St Athanasius, St Hilary of Poitiers, and Luciferus of Cagliari. Most of those bishops, moreover, who had fallen into the snare laid for them by the Arians, quickly acknowledged their fault, when their eyes were opened. St Hilary says, that the acts of the Council of Ariminum were annulled throughout the world, and the Pope Liberius assured the whole East, that they who had been deceived or overcome at Ariminum, had since returned to the truth, and that they had anathematized the confession agreed to in that council, and had subscribed the Nicene Creed.—Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 791-801.

ARLES (314). [*Concilium Arelatense.*] A general council of the West, called by St Augustine, "a plenary council of the whole world," convened in 314, by the Emperor Constantine, upon the subject of the Donatists. The emperor, in order to get rid of the importunities of these schismatics, who were dissatisfied with the Council of Rome in the preceding year, granted them a fresh hearing, which gave rise to this council. The number of bishops present was very large, from Africa, Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and, above all, from the Gauls. Amongst the names subscribed we find those of the bishops of Arles (the Bishop of Arles presided; Pope Melchiades sent his legates, who were honoured with the second place), Lyons, Vienne, Marseilles, Autun, Aquileia, Rheims, Cologne, Rouen, and Bordeaux. Pope Sylvester sent two priests and two deacons, and three bishops and a deacon appeared from the British Church.²

It appears that the matter was examined with even greater care than at Rome in the preceding year; Cecilianus was acquitted, and his accusers condemned. It was also ruled by this council, in opposition to the general practice before this time in the African Church, that persons who have

¹ Liberius, who had been weak enough to yield an outward assent to the Arian doctrines for a time, had before this renounced his errors, and returned to the profession of the Catholic faith.

² These bishops were Eborius of York; Restitutus of London; Adelfius of *Colonia Londinensium*. Selden and Shelman believe this last see to be that of Camalodunum. Gale and Bingham regard it as a corruption of *Colonia Lindi* or *Lindinsi*, i. e., Lindsey, or the region of Lincoln. In the text copy of this council, first printed at Madrid, 1808, these bishops are thus given:—Ex Provincia Britanniae Eburius Ep.; Ex civitate Lugdunensium Restitutus Ep.; Ex curtate Clunia, Adelphus Ep.

received the form of baptism at the hand of heretics, ought not to be re-baptized, and that if it shall appear from their answer, that they have been baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, it shall be enough, that they be confirmed in order to receive the Holy Ghost.

Here were also composed the twenty-two celebrated canons of discipline, which bear the name of this council.

1. That Easter be celebrated on one day and at one time everywhere.

2. That everyone should remain where he was ordained.

3. That those who, in peace,¹ throw away their arms, be excommunicated.

4. That charioteers, while they continue their calling, be separated from communion.

5. That performers in the theatre, while they continue to act, be likewise separated.

6. That those who are converted in sickness receive imposition of hands.

7. Concerning the faithful, when they hold public offices in the State.

8. Concerning the baptism of those that are converted from heresy.

9. Orders that those who bear letters of confessors shall receive letters of communion instead of them.

10. Forbids one whose wife has been guilty of adultery to take another wife during her lifetime.

11. Orders young women who have married heathens to be excommunicated for a time.

12. Orders that those clergy who are guilty of usury be excommunicated.

13. Concerning those who are said to have delivered up the Holy Scriptures, the sacred vessels, or the names of the brethren.

14. Orders those who falsely accuse their brethren, to be excommunicated even to their death.

15. Forbids deacons to offer, as in many places had been allowed.

16. Orders that a man shall be received into communion again in the same place where he was excommunicated.

17. Forbids one bishop to trample upon another.

¹ Some read (and more probably) "in war," or "in battle."

18. Concerning the deacons of cities, repressing their presumption, and forbidding them to do anything without the knowledge of the presbyters.

19. Orders that a place for offering be afforded to bishops from other parts, who come to a city.

20. Forbids the ordination of any bishop except by seven other bishops; or, if this be impossible, by three at the very least.

21. Orders that presbyters or deacons who remove themselves to another place to which they were not ordained, be deposed.

22. Concerning apostates, who, in sickness, seek restoration to Church communion.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 1421.

ARLES (353). Held in 353, by Constantius, the emperor. This prince happening to be in Arles, lent himself to everything that the Eusebians suggested to him. Already they had invited the Pope Liberius to attend the council, who, however, sent Vincentius, the aged bishop of Capua, the pope's legate at Nicæa, and Marcellus, a Campanian bishop, to demand of Constantius, that the place of rendezvous should be Aquileia instead of Arles. Many other bishops also came to Arles to request the same thing; but reasonable as the request was, Constantius took offence at it. In the council the first thing which the Arians required was the condemnation of St Athanasius. As Vincentius, on his part, insisted that the true faith should be set forth and defended; but Valens and his accomplices persisted in requiring, that before anything else was done, the legates should renounce communion with Athanasius; which they, carried away by the example of others, and, it may be, induced by threats, did, promising no more to communicate with him. When, however, the council had gained this point, they refused to condemn Arius.

Photinus of Sirmium, Marcellus of Ancyra, and St Athanasius were condemned here.

The fall of Vincentius and the other legate overwhelmed the pope with grief; and Vincentius himself appears to have felt most deeply the sin he had committed, declaring that he desired nothing else than to die for the sake of Christ, whom he had thus calumniated, and the truth of whose Gospel he had violated: so he expresses himself in a letter which he wrote to Hosius, from which St Hilary

has preserved an extract. He returned to the orthodox faith, and by his after conduct effaced the disgrace which was attached to him on account of his fall. It ought, however, to be said, that the disgraceful cowardice of the orthodox at this council was not universal: Paulinus, Bishop of Treves, maintained the true faith with a constancy worthy of an apostolic man, and drew upon himself the punishment of exile, on account of the horror which he testified of the Arians, and of the determination which he showed not to participate in the oppression of an innocent man, by signing the calumnious accusation which they had drawn up against Athanasius. Constantius tried to wear out his patience by changing his place of exile, and by banishing him to places where the name of Christ was not worshipped, and which were infected with the heresy of Montanus and of Maximilian; he, however, continued firm to the day of his death.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 770.

ARLES (428 or 429). In the year 428 or 429, a numerous council of the French bishops was held either at Arles or Troyes, at which deputies from the English Church were present, seeking help against the heresy of Pelagius, which was spreading rapidly in that kingdom. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, were deputed by the council, with the pope's approbation, to proceed to England, in order that, "having confounded the heretics, they might lead back the Britons to the Catholic faith." Baronius gives 429 as the date of this council. For the reasons for preferring 428, and for assigning Arles for its place of meeting, see "Marii Mercatoris Opera, Studio J. Garnerii," Dissert. ii. p. 231.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1686.

ARLES (442). Held about the year 442. This seems to have been a council gathered from several ecclesiastical provinces, since it speaks of the obligation of the metropolitans to submit to its decrees, and gives to itself the title of *great* council. It was assembled by St Hilary, the bishop of Arles; during its sitting, fifty-six canons were drawn up, almost entirely compiled from those of the first council of Arles, in 314, those of Nicea, Orange, and Vaison. Amongst other regulations, it was forbidden to raise to the rank of sub-deacon, any one who had married a widow, agreeably to the decree of the Council of Valence in 374. According to Pagi, this council gave occasion of offence to

St Leo against St Hilary, who assumed to himself the right of assembling councils in Gaul.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1010.

ARLES (451). See GAUL.

ARLES (455). Held in 455, under Ravennius, Bishop of Arles, owing to a dispute between Faustus, abbot of the monastery of Lerins,¹ and Theodore, bishop of Frejus, concerning the jurisdiction of the latter over the monastery. Thirteen bishops were present; and it was determined that ordinations should be celebrated by the Bishop of Frejus alone, and that no clerk, not belonging to the monastery, should be received into communion or to minister without the bishop's licence. Theodore, on his part, leaving the care of the lay portion of the monastery in the hands of the abbot.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1023.

ARLES (475). Held about the year 475. The errors of Lucidus, a priest, having excited the zeal of Faustus, Bishop of Riez, he endeavoured in several conferences to bring him back to the true faith. From the letters of Faustus, we learn what were the errors of Lucidus, for all his exhortations having proved useless, he at last wrote to the latter a letter, containing six articles, which he desired him to anathematize: 1st, the errors of Pelagius, viz., that man is born without sin, that he is able to save himself by his own works, and to be delivered without the grace of God. 2ndly, That which teaches that he who falls after baptism *perishes in original sin*. 3rdly, That man is made subject to damnation by the foreknowledge of God. 4thly, That those who shall perish have no power to save themselves, including those who have been baptized, and the heathen who might have believed but would not. 5thly, That a "vessel of dishonour" cannot become a "vessel of honour." 6thly, That Jesus Christ did not die for all men, and does not will that all should be saved. This letter was signed by eleven other bishops, but the see of one only of them is known, viz., Patiens, Bishop of Lyons.² Whilst, therefore, Lucidus delayed making his recantation, this council was assembled at Arles, composed of thirty bishops.

¹ This celebrated monastery was situated on the small island of Lerins, near Marseilles, now called the Island of St Honarat. Faustus, when bishop of Riez, became known for his advocacy of semi-Pelagian doctrines. See the following Council.

² In the best MSS. there are no other signatures than that of Faustus.—Du Pin.

The ground for supposing that *Arles* was the place of assembly is this, that the name of Leontius, who was then bishop of that see, occurs first upon the list, and after his the names of Euphremius, Mamertius, Patiens, Eutropius, Faustus, Basil, &c. According to Faustus, they spoke strongly upon the subject of predestination, condemned the opinions which Lucidus had advanced upon the subject, and further insisted that he should himself condemn them. Lucidus obeyed, and addressed a letter to the bishops composing the council, in which he retracted his errors; which, however, are not identical with the propositions contained in the letter of Faustus.

Some imagine that Faustus himself drew up this recantation of Lucidus. Du Pin asserts that there are many things in it which savour strongly of Pelagianism. The condemnation of the errors of Lucidus, in this council, forms one of the proofs brought forward to show the existence of a sect of Predestinarians. The reader may see long dissertations upon the subject by Cardinal Norris, Pagi, and Alexander: the last shows that the errors of the Predestinarians were the same with those of which the priests of Marseilles accused St Augustine and his disciples. He allows, nevertheless, that the number of those comprising the sect of Predestinarians was very small, and proves such to have been the case, by the wording of this 25th canon of Orange: "Not only do we not believe that some men are predestinated by the Divine power to evil, but further, we, with the utmost detestation, anathematize those, if *there be any* (si qui sunt), who are willing to believe so grievous a thing." Upon which words, Alexander remarks, "The fathers used this form of speaking, 'si qui sunt,' because the followers and disciples of Lucidus were few and of no repute."

But to return to Faustus, he adds, after having related what passed in the council, that Leontius gave him a charge to collect together all that had been said upon the subject of Predestination, which he did, in two books upon Grace and Free-will, addressed to Leontius; but, according to Fleury, he erred in the opposite extreme, making too much of man's natural strength.

The learned Benedictine, Dom. Maur, in his list of certain and known councils, speaks in express terms con-

cerning those of Arles and Lyons ; that they are only known to us through the writings of Faustus of Riez,—writings, he adds, which savour strongly of semi-Pelagianism, and which, as such, were ranked amongst apocryphal books by the Council of Pope Gelasius, in 496.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1041.

ARLES (524). Held in 524, under Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles. Sixteen bishops were present, and four canons were drawn up relating to ordinations, one of which enacts that no man be made deacon under twenty-five years of age.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1622.

ARLES (554.) Held in 554, under Sapaudus, Archbishop of Arles. Here seven canons were drawn up, the second and fifth of which are to the effect that monasteries, whether for men or women, should be placed under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 779.

ARLES (813). Held in May 813. Convoled by order of Charlemagne, for the correction of abuses and the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline. The number of canons made was twenty-six. Amongst other things it was ruled, that bishops ought to be well-instructed in the Holy Scriptures and in the canons of the Church, and that their sole occupation should consist in preaching and instructing others. 2. That all shall pray for the king and his family. 15. Orders just weights and measures everywhere. 17. Enjoins that bishops shall visit their dioceses annually. 19. That parents should instruct their children, and god-parents those for whom they had answered at the font. The 21st orders, that with regard to burials in churches, the ancient canons shall be observed.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1231.

ARLES (1234). Held on the 8th July 1234, under John Baussan, Archbishop of Arles. Twenty-four canons were enacted, chiefly directed against the *Albigenses and Waldenses*, enforcing those of Lateran in 1215, and of Toulouse in 1229. Bishops are directed to preach the Catholic faith frequently, both themselves and by means of others. All confraternities are forbidden, except those which have the sanction of the bishop. Bishops are directed to apply themselves diligently to the correction of morals, especially amongst the clergy ; and for that purpose they are enjoined to have *spies* in every diocese. No one

was permitted to make a will save in the presence of the curate of his parish.

The reason given for this last injunction, which is very common in the acts of councils about this time, is, that persons who favoured the opinions of the heretics, might be thereby prevented from assisting them with legacies.—Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2339.

ARLES (1261). Held in 1261, or subsequently, by Florentine, Archbishop of Arles, with his suffragans, against the extravagances of the Joachimites,¹ who said that the Father had operated from the creation until the coming of Jesus Christ; that from that time to the year 1260, Jesus Christ had operated; and that from 1260 unto the end of the world, the Holy Spirit would operate. That under the operation of the Father, men lived after the flesh; under that of the Son, they lived partly after the flesh and partly after the Spirit; but that during the third period, they would live more entirely after the Spirit.

Seventeen canons were also drawn up, in the third of which it is enjoined that confirmation shall be administered and received *fasting*, except in the case of infants at the breast. This shows that the confirmation of little children was at this time still practised in the western Church.² The fifth canon orders, that in all parish churches belonging to the religious, curates taken from the community, or perpetual vicars, shall be appointed, with a suitable provision out of the proceeds of the benefice. And further, it forbids the regulars to receive the people to the holy office in the churches attached to their priories, &c., on Sundays or other holydays, or to preach during those hours in which mass was said in the parish church, in order that the laity might not be drawn away from the instruction of their own parochial minister. The seventh canon forbids the use of wooden candles painted to look like wax, in churches, processions, &c.—Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2359.

ARLES (1275). Held about the year 1275, by Bertrand

¹ So called from Joachim, Abbot of Flora in Calabria, who, although erroneous in his faith on the subject of the Blessed Trinity (*see* LATERAN, 1215), always submitted his judgment to that of the Church, and was pronounced to be venerable and orthodox by Pope Honorius in 1217 and 1221. His followers were probably more extravagant.

² The Council of Worcester, 1240 (can. 6), orders all children to receive confirmation within their first year. That of Exeter, 1287 (can. 3), within three years from their birth.

de St Martin, Archbishop of Arles. Twenty-two canons were drawn up, of which the first are lost.

7. Forbids to sell or pawn the chalices, books, and other ornaments of the Church, under pain of excommunication.

12 and 13. Of cases to be reserved to the bishop or pope.

14. Forbids all persons in holy orders to buy corn or wine for the purpose of selling it again.

16. Orders silver chalices in churches.—Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2369.

ARMAGH (1171). [*Concilium Armachianum.*] Held in 1171, ordered that all the English who had been kept in a state of slavery in Ireland, should be set free. The council acknowledged that the Irish were subject to the authority of England.

This appears to be the same with the Council of Waterford, A.D. 1158, in *Labbe*, Tom. x. Conc. p. 1183.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1452; *Wilkins*, Conc. vol. i. p. 471.

ARMENIA (1342). [*Concilium Armenorum.*] Leo, King of the Armenians, being oppressed by the Saracens, sent ambassadors to Pope Benedict XII., to implore assistance. The latter, however, replied that he need expect no help from the Roman See until the Armenian Church was purged from all its errors. Of these errors imputed to the Armenians he made a summary, and forwarded it in 1341 to Leo and the Armenian Catholic, or Patriarch, Mekquitar (or Consolator), bidding them convoke a general council of the whole Armenian Church and bring the matter before it for deliberation. Consequently, in the year 1342, the council met, the Catholic, six archbishops, fifteen diocesan bishops, four titular bishops (*Episcopi nullatenses*), four bishops of the court of the Catholic, ten abbots, and others being present.

When all were assembled, the Book containing the errors imputed to them, was read. It contained one hundred and sixteen Articles, to each of which the Synod drew up a reply, in which they evidence a plain desire to assimilate their doctrine as far as possible to that of Rome, but seemingly without complete success, for Martene, in his preface to the account of the Synod, says, “ Etsi purgare se Armeni tentaverunt, non omnino tamen apparet illorum fides in

omnibus illibata." It is impossible, in a work like the present, to do more than notice briefly the most important of these Articles and the replies of the Council.

Art. 1. That although many early teachers in the Armenian Church had held the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and the Son, the prelates and others of the Church of Armenia major had ceased to teach it, and in a Synod held some time previously, had condemned those teachers.

Answer. Denied, and it is urged in proof that they used annually at Pentecost a prayer manifestly containing the Latin doctrine of the Procession.

Art. 2. Amongst other things, that they condemned the Council of Chalcedon.

Answer. Some only of the Armenians had done so from an ungrounded belief that the Council of Chalcedon favoured the heresy of Nestorius.

Art. 3. That in the Synod of Manasgarde they had condemned the doctrine of one Person in two Natures defined at Chalcedon.

Answer. As above, also that two Synods were held at Sis, 1307, and Adana, 1316, in opposition to that of Manasgarde, in which the Catholic doctrine was received.

Art. 4. That they taught that Adam's descendants, up to the time of Christ's Passion, were all damned, not because of original sin (for that children had no taint of sin), but because of the *personal* sin of Adam; also that since Christ's death children are not born in a state of damnation.

Answer. Totally denied, and the doctrine of the Armenian Church shown to be that no one can enter into Life who is not cleansed from sin by the regeneration of Baptism.

Art. 7. That they taught that the souls of adults, after death, go to some place appointed by God (not Paradise), and there abide the day of judgment.

Answer. Totally denied, and proof given from their Offices that they believe that the souls of the just go into eternal life (*advitam eternam*), and behold the Everlasting Light.

Art. 17. That they denied a Purgatory and the efficacy of prayers for the dead.

Answer. This is denied, and extracts given from their Offices to show that they had always held this doctrine, though not by the name of Purgatory. They, however, hardly show that they held the present Roman doctrine in its full extent, and they add, themselves, that it was not till they came to the notice of the Roman Church, that they received the name of Purgatory, "verba purgatorii sicut præmemorata Ecclesia."

Art. 21 That they held a conversion of the human nature of Christ into the divine.

Answer. Denied.

Art. 27. That they taught that the Lord rose from the dead at the sixth hour on Saturday, according to a tradition of Gregory, one of their Catholics, and therefore kept their Easter on the Saturday.

Answer. Denied.

Art. 34. That they taught that they (the Armenians of Armenia major) are the Catholic and Apostolic Church, because they have the Catholic and hold the Apostolic faith.

Answer. That they had never heard of the Armenians claiming to be the Catholic Church, because they had the Catholic; that they hold themselves to be true and Apostolical because they held the true faith.

Art. 34—continued. That they denied the Greek Church to be Catholic and Apostolical because they mixed water with the wine. Asserted two natures in Christ, and kept the festival of the Nativity on the 25th of December. Also that they denied the Roman Church to be such for the same reasons, and because they had corrupted the Christian faith by receiving the decrees of Chalcedon.

Answer. States that the Greeks, after receiving from Rome the custom of mixing water with the wine and keeping Christmas on the 25th December instead of January 6th, which the Armenians did not, began to quarrel with them about it. Allows that some amongst the Armenians still differed with the Roman Church about the Synod of Chalcedon.

Art. 36. That they taught that the Catholic Church is with them only because they only have true baptism, the one Faith, and Holy Spirit, and the one Lord God, which others have not.

Answer. Grants that they have such high gifts, but denies that they teach as stated, and in proof states that they do not re-baptise those who come to them from other Churches.

Art. 37. That since the time of the Emperor Evaclius, there were three Catholics in Armenia, each one holding a different faith and different baptism, viz., some in water and some in wine.

Answer. Allows that the Archbishop of Archamard or Aghtamar had assumed the style of Catholic, and that there was a Catholic of Armenia Minor, but denies that they have or had different faiths or baptisms, and declares that the people of each diocese (answer to Art. 39) were in mutual Communion, except that the Catholic of Armenia having excommunicated the archbishop of Archamara and his suffragans, for his assumption of the title of Catholic, &c., they could not be admitted to communion.

Art. 40. That they taught that the bishops and priests of Armenia profit nothing towards the remission of sins, neither *principaliter*, nor *ministerialiter*. That God alone does so, wherefore they use the form, "Ego dimitto tibi peccata tua in terra et Deus dimittat tibi in cœlis."

Answer. Denies the charge, and states that after their recognition by the Roman Church they had adopted her form of absolution.

Art. 42. That they teach that the passion of God alone, without any other gift of God, even without that of grace, suffices for the remission of sins.

Answer. Denies this, and shows that they required penitence and all graces.

Art. 44. That they did not pray for the present but the future rest of the dead; and (2) that they Judaized in slaying a victim, having first put salt (blessed) into its mouth, at the door of the Church upon the death of any person.

Answer. Denies the first; admits the second as to the *fact*, but denies the motive, and states that the custom was built upon a tradition of St Gregory.

Arts. 66 and 67. Relate to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist and transubstantiation.

Answer. In their reply they endeavour to prove that they hold the doctrine of *transubstantiation* by an extract from the Canon of the Mass in use amongst them which

plainly only recognize the doctrine of the *Real Presence*, viz., "Spiritus Sanctum, per Quem panem benedictum Corpus veraciter efficiens Domini nostri et Salvatoris Jesu Christi." This indeed quite rebuts the objection of the Romans that they held the bread to be not the "*verum corpus Christi sed exemplar et similitudo Ejus*," but it says nothing to imply faith in transubstantiation.

Art. 71. That in the Synod of Manasgarde they had decreed that water should not be mixed with the wine.

Answer. That they did not receive the said council.¹

Art. 74. That the Church of Armenia Major did not admit of the use of the crucifix nor of images.

Answer. Admits that there had been some disputes amongst them on the subject of images, but states that they had never been *synodically* rejected [*a praelatis numquam sunt abjecta*]. Also that the cause of there being so few images in their churches arose from their fear of the persecution of the Saracens.

Art. 80. That (1) during Lent (which with them began on Quinquagesima) they celebrated Mass only on Saturdays and Sundays, and (2) the same in other weeks which they fasted, moreover (3) that they celebrated the Festivals which happened to fall during a fast week on the Saturday in that week (except 3).

Answer. Allows the first, except with respect to the palace of the king, where Mass was celebrated in the chapel every day in Lent. Declares (2) to be false, except as regarded the week before Septuagesima. Allows (3) that some Festivals, when they occurred towards the end of a fast week, were celebrated on the Saturday.

Art. 84. That they taught that the Catholic bishops and priests of Armenia had the same and equal power of binding and loosing as St Peter himself.

Answer. According to the Canon and Civil Law, the successor has the same authority as his predecessors: therefore the Pope has the authority of St Peter, and the Catholic, as the successor of St Thaddeus, has the same authority with St Thaddeus. In the Nicene Council, indeed, the Fathers gave sentence that the Roman Church is the head of all other Churches, and her head is the Pope. Therefore the Catholic and all other Patriarchs are under his power,

¹ See C. CONSTANTINOPLE 691, can. 32.

and less than him : truly our archbishops are less than the Catholic as to rank and not equal in the sense of the above Article, and no one amongst us is ignorant that the Catholic has greater power than the bishops and the bishops than the priests.¹

Nevertheless, if this seems to you to be unsuitable, we are ready to act as you direct us.

Art. 87. That they taught that up to the period of the Nicene Council the Pope had no greater power than the other Patriarchs, and that in that Synod it was ordered that the Roman Pontiff should have authority over the other Patriarchs, which authority they retained until the Synod of Chalcedon, when, owing to the definition of faith enacted, viz., that in Christ are two Natures and One Person, the Pope lost that power, and all those who consented to that definition also lost the power of binding and loosing, which henceforth remained in the Armenian Church alone.

Answer. If the Church of Rome, before the Council of Nicea, had greater authority than the other Patriarchs, we say nothing against it, but whatever the Sacred Council of Nicea determined, we hold : and the Roman Pontiff is greater in authority than the other Patriarchs, as we said in Answer to Art. 84.

Art. 89. That the king of Armenia minor elected their bishops and priests, and that for money—and that the persons he elected were afterwards sent to the Catholic and bishops for consecration or ordination.

Answer. Allows that the king had the election of bishops for reasons stated ; denies the general accusation of bribery, and that the election of priests belongs to him.

Art. 91. That they taught that the general power over the whole Church was not given to Peter or his successors by Christ, but by the Council of Nicea, which power the popes had afterwards lost.

Answer. That the Church of Rome is the head of all other Churches, and the pope more excellent than other Pontiffs, and that they (the Armenians) taught this not only because of the decision of Nicea, but because our Lord said to Peter, " Feed My sheep."

¹ *Quamvis secundum consuetudinem Ecclesiæ Armeniæ non astringimus auctoritate subditorum nostrorum populos, scilicet audire confessionem et absolvere large ab omnibus peccatis.*

Art. 92. That they had but three orders, viz., acolyths, deacons, and priests.

Answer. That they had acolyths (or ostiarii), sub-deacons, deacons, and priests,—a brief account of the form of ordination of each is also given.

Art. 93. That they allowed their deacons to marry virgins and nevertheless to continue in the exercise of their office, and even to be promoted to the priesthood.

Answer. That they allowed acolyths to be married before ordination, who might be promoted to the sub-deaconate and deaconate, but if the deacon married again, he could not be made priest.

Art. 94. That the Book of the Gospels was not put upon the head and shoulders of the bishop at consecration, nor was his head anointed according to the Roman form.

Answer. That the Gospel was so placed in Armenia Minor.

Art. 98. That they consecrated bishops in Armenia Minor, by placing upon their heads the arm and hand of St Gregory, and that they regarded no other as bishops who had not been so ordained.

Answer. Allows that they do so place the hand of St Gregory upon those who are ordained bishops, but denies that they refuse to regard others as bishops who have not been so ordained. States that they even regard the bishops made by the schismatical bishops of Alnana and Achtamar as true bishops, although they refused to communicate with them.

Arts. 102 and 103. That they allowed married persons who disliked each other to separate and marry others, and that often one man was allowed to have two wives living.

Answer. Denies that the latter was ever done lawfully, but admits that the former had been often the case, and still was done in Armenia Major.

Art. 110. That the following books of the Armenians contain many errors.—

- (1.) Tonapachaz : against the Roman and Greek festivals
- (2.) Anadoarmat, *i.e.*, *Radix fidei*.
- (.) Johannes Mandagonensis.
- (4.) Johannes Offinensis.
- (5.) Myastosuruy, *i.e.*, “ unius locutiones.”
- (6.) Michael Patriarchæ Antiocheni.
- (7.) Paulus Taronenski.

- (8.) Occenensis (or Octavensis).
 (9.) Mattheus.
 (10.) Canonum Apostolorum, in which all the errors of the Armenians are contained.
 (11.) Sergius.
 (12.) Marocha.
 (13.) Vanam ; an exposition of the Gospel of St John.
 (14.) Ignadius, of St Luke.
 (15.) Guanazan, *i.e.*, *liber virgarum*.
 (16.) Neginus Patarquin : an exposition of the Mass.
 (17.) Teytorgunt, *i.e.*, *liber epularum*.
 (18.) Aismavort, *i.e.*, martyrologium.
 And others.

Answer. That, of some of the above-mentioned books they knew nothing ; some which they did not in any manner receive, and some which, so far as they contained anything contrary to the truth and their union with the Church of Rome, they rejected.

Art. 105. That, in the time of Ethon, King of Armenia, a Synod was held to consider of a union with the Church of Rome, in which they held a disputation with the papal Legate, by which the king was persuaded of the errors of the Armenians, but that the masters and princes of the Armenians thought otherwise ; and a book was written by Varcham of Nigromonte, against the Roman Church, in which the pope was called a proud Pharaoh, drowned with his people in a sea of heresy, and it is stated that the Roman Church was deceived in many things, &c. : which book the Armenian bishops, priests, &c., venerate like the Apostolical Canons.

Answer. That the pope did send a Legate in the time of King Ethimy, who was honourably entertained by him and the Catholic Constantine. As to the book of Varcham, that it was universally reprobated by them, and burnt wherever it was found.

Art. 116. Accuses them of holding a fallen faith, and various other lies.

In answer, they give the creed which they held and had received from St Gregory, Illuminator, which we give at length.

“Credimus in unum deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Factorem cœli et terræ, visibilium et invisibilium, et unum Dominum J. C. Filium Dei unigenitum, a Deo Patre genitum, sciticet ex essentiâ Patris. Deum de Deo, lumen

de Lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, eundem ipsum de natura Patris, per quem omnia facta sunt in cœlo et in terra, visibilia et invisibilia, qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de cœlis, incarnatus est, humanatus est, natus est perfecte ex Maria Virgine per Spiritum Sanctum, per quem accepit corpus, animam, mentem et omnia quæ veraciter sunt in homine, indubitanter passus est, crucifixus est, sepultus est, tertiâ die resurrexit, ascendit in cœlum, sedet in dexteram Patris, venturus est eodem corpore et gloria Patris judicare vivos et mortuos, cujus regni non erit finis. Credimus et in Spiritum S. increatum et perfectum qui ex Patre Filioque emanat, qui cum Patre et Filio adoratur et glorificatur qui locutus est per prophetas in lege et in prophetis et in Evangelio. Qui descendit in Jordanem, prædicavit in Apostolis et habitavit in sanctis Credit in his sola universalis et Apostolica Ecclesia, in unum Baptisma pœnitentiæ in propitiationem et remissionem peccatorum, et in Resurrectionem mortuorum, in iudicium æternale animarum et corporum, in regnum cœlorum et in vitam æternam."

The above is a very imperfect analysis of the Articles and their answers. It is plain to see that the answers of the Synod to the charges brought against them were studiously framed to meet the wishes of the Roman Court, and considering their need of help from that quarter, it may be doubted whether they fully and freely express the sense of the Armenian Church at the period.—Martene, *Vet. Scrip. Coll.* Tom. 7, col. 310. Raynaldus, ad ann. : 1346, No. vi.

ARRAGON (1062). [*Concilium Arragonense.*] Held in 1062, when it was decided that the bishops of Arragon should be chosen from the monks of the monastery of St. Jago de Pegna.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1173.

ARRIS (1025). [*Concilium Attrebatense.*] Held in the year 1025, chiefly upon the subject of the holy sacraments, against certain heretics who had come from Italy, seventeen chapters were published. D. Achery, *Spicil.* t. I.

ATTIGNI-SUR-AISNE (765). [*Concilium Attiniacense.*] Held in the year 765, Chodegrand of Metz presided, assisted by twenty-seven bishops and seventeen abbots. All that remains to us of their acts is the promise, which they made amongst themselves, that when any one of them died, each of the rest should each cause the psalter to be chanted

a hundred times, and a hundred masses to be said by the priests, and should himself say thirty. Such promises are not unfrequent in the councils of this period.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1702.

ATTIGNI (822). Held in 822. In this council Louis le Débonnaire, by the advice of his bishops and lords, was reconciled to his three younger brothers, Hugues, Drogon, and Theodoric, upon whom he had forcibly imposed the tonsure. He made open confession of this act, and of his rigour towards his nephew, Bernard, King of Italy, and towards the abbot Adelhardus, and Wala his brother. He then performed penance openly, in imitation of the Emperor Theodosius. He at the same time evinced a desire to rectify the abuses which had been introduced through the neglect of the bishops and great lords. He also confirmed the rules for canons and monks, which had been made at Aix-la-Chapelle.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1529.

ATTIGNI (870). Held in May 870, thirty bishops attending from ten provinces. The king, Charles the Bald, was present; in it he brought to judgment his son Carloman. Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, accused of disobedience to the king, was compelled to promise fidelity to him, and also to Hincmar, his uncle, archbishop of Rheims; but he afterwards withdrew, and wrote to the pope, complaining of the conduct of the king and the archbishop, which was the cause of a quarrel between the pope and the king, the former taking part with Hincmar of Laon, who had all along supported the papal encroachments in opposition to his uncle.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 1537.

AUCH (1068). [*Concilium Aucense.*] A council of the province called by Hugo the White, legate. It was ordered that all the churches of Gascony should pay a quarter of a tithe to the cathedral. St Orens and a few others being exempted.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1195.

AUGSBURG (952). [*Concilium Augustanum.*] Held on the 7th August 952. Twenty-four bishops from Germany and Lombardy were present at it, amongst whom Uldaric, Bishop of Augsburg, was the most illustrious. They made eleven canons. It was forbidden to all the clergy, from the bishop to the sub-deacon, to marry, or to have women in their houses, or to keep dogs or birds for sporting, or to play at any game of chance. The sixth canon orders that

all monks shall submit to the bishop of the diocese, and receive his correction.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 635.

AUGSBURG (1548). Held on the 12th November 1548, by Cardinal Otho, bishop of Augsburg, at Dillenghen upon the Danube. Thirty-three regulations were drawn up relating to discipline and morality. Amongst other things it was ordered, that open sinners should be proceeded against canonically, and that those who were found incorrigible should be handed over to the grand vicar: that the deans of chapters should watch over the conduct of the canons, and be careful to punish those who were guilty of drunkenness, gaming, debauchery, fornication, &c.; that those who were possessed of many benefices should resign all but one within a year; that those of the monks who neglected their rule, and were guilty of drunkenness or immodest conduct, or who were suspected of heresy, should be corrected; that nuns and other female religious should not leave their monasteries, nor suffer any man to enter them, unless from some absolute necessity; that preachers should not advance anything untrue or doubtful; that they should accommodate their sermons to the capacity of their hearers; that they should avoid all obscure and perplexing subjects; that one uniform order should be observed in the administration of the sacraments, and no money be taken for the same, according to the apostolical traditions, the ancient canons, laws, and usages; that none but serious tunes should be played upon organs; that everything profane should be entirely done away with in all solemn processions.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 567.

AUGUSTINE'S OAK, ON THE SEVERN. Two Councils were held here in 601. See Collier, vol. i. p. 75. Churton, p. 42. Bramhall, i. p. 163.

AUTUN¹ (677). [*Concilium Augustodunense.*] Held in the year 677.² Six canons made in this council have come down to us, one of which orders that all priests and others of the clergy shall commit to memory the creed called the Creed of St Athanasius. This is supposed to be the first time that this creed was spoken of in France under the name of St Athanasius.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 535.

¹ According to Pagi this council was held in 663.

² Under St Leodegarius, Bishop of Autun. It was only a diocesan Synod.

AUTUN (1065). Held in the matter of Robert, Duke of Burgundy, whom Hugo, Abbot of Clugny, brought before the council, and induced to make satisfaction to Haganon, Bishop of Autun, and others, whom he had plundered and otherwise injured.—Richard., *Dict. Univ.*, vol. i. p. 464. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1183.

AUTUN (1077). Held by order of Pope Gregory VII. by his legate, Hugo, Bishop of Die, in 1077. Several French and Burgundian bishops and abbots attended. Manasses of Rheims, who, having been cited, refused to appear, was suspended from the exercise of his office, having been accused of simony, and of usurping that archbishopric. Certain other French bishops were brought to judgment at the same time.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 360.

AUTUN (1094). Held on the 16th October 1094, by Hugo, Archbishop of Lyons, and legate, assisted by thirty-two bishops and several abbots. They renewed the sentence of excommunication against the Emperor Henry and the anti-pope Guibert; also, they excommunicated for the first time Philip of France, for marrying Bertrade during the lifetime of his lawful wife; but Philip, by a deputation to the pope, averted the storm for awhile, and obtained a delay in the execution of the sentence until the feast of All-Saints, in the following year.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 499.

AUVERGNE (533). [*Concilium Arvernense.*] Held in 533, with the consent of King Theodebert; Honoratus of Bourges presiding. Sixteen canons were published.

3. Forbids to wrap the bodies of the dead in the consecrated cloths. "Ne pallis vel ministeriis divinis. . ."

6. Forbids marriage between Christians and Jews.

7. Forbids to place the coverlet (commonly known as the corporal; *Lat.* opertorium), used to be laid over the body of the Lord upon the corpse of a priest.

12. Of incestuous marriages.

15. Orders the country priests to celebrate the feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide with their bishops in the city.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1804.

AUXERRE (585). [*Concilium Autissiodorensis.*] Held about the year 585, under the Bishop Aunacairius, with seven abbots and thirty-four priests of his diocese. Forty-five canons were enacted, which, however, appear to have been made solely to enforce the execution of those of the Council of Mâçon in this year.

9. Forbids dances, singing of women, and feasting within churches.

10. Forbids two masses to be said at the same altar in one day.

12. Forbids to give the holy eucharist or the kiss to the dead.

13. Forbids the deacon to wear a pall or veil (*velum*) over his shoulders.

14. Forbids burials in the baptistery.

15. Forbids to bury one corpse upon another.

16. Forbids work on Sundays.

17. Forbids to receive the oblations of suicides.

18. Forbids to baptise any except at Easter, unless persons in danger of death, whom it styles *Grabatarii*.

17. Forbids priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, after having broken their fast, even to be present in church during mass.

26. Forbids a woman to receive the eucharist with her hand bare.

40. Forbids a priest to dance or sing at feasts.

42. Orders every woman who communicates to have her *Dominical*. This was a linen cloth, so called because being spread upon her hand; the body of the Lord was placed upon it, whereas the men received it on the bare hand.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 956.

AVIGNON (1060). [*Concilium Avenionense*.] Held in the year 1060, by the Cardinal Hugo, Abbot of Clugny, legate. Achardus, who had usurped the see of Arles, was deposed, and Gibelinus elected in his place.¹ Lantelme was also elected to the see of Embrun; Hugo to that of Grenoble; Desiderius to that of Cavaillon.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 390.

AVIGNON (1209). Held on the 6th of September 1209, by Hugo, Archbishop of Riez, composed of two legates, four archbishops, twenty bishops, and several abbots. Twenty-one canons were made. The first recommends to bishops to preach more frequently in their dioceses than they had lately done, and attributes the prevailing heresies and cor-

¹ Achardus or Aicardus, was deposed as an *intruder*, but his real fault seems to have been his taking part with the Emperor Henry against the court of Rome. He had been previously excommunicated.

ruption of morals to their neglect. The second relates to the extermination of heresies. The preface to the acts of this council states, that charity had become exceeding cold, that corruptions abounded on all sides to such a degree, that nearly all men were plunged into an abyss of vice and wickedness, and that the intention of the council was to remedy these evils and to renew the ancient laws.

In a council held the following year, or in this, as Mansi thinks, the inhabitants of Toulouse were excommunicated, because they had not driven out the Albigenses according to order. The Count of Toulouse also was excommunicated, although conditionally.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 41.

AVIGNON (1279). Held on the 27th of May 1279, by Pierre (or, according to some, Bernard) de Languissel, Archbishop of Arles. They drew up a decree containing fifteen articles, for the most part setting forth the usurpations and invasions of ecclesiastical property which were made, the violence committed upon the clergy, and the disregard of excommunications.

However, they provided no other means of opposing these evils than the passing fresh censures.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1050.

AVIGNON (1282). Held in 1282, by Bertrand Amauri, Archbishop of Arles, together with his suffragans. Of the canons published ten only are extant, which amongst other things enjoined the faithful to attend their own parish churches, which in many places were disregarded, and to go there, at least, on every Sunday and holy day.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1174.

AVIGNON (1326). Held on the 18th of June 1326. Three archbishops, eleven bishops, and the deputies of several others, who were absent, attended. They drew up fifty-nine articles, chiefly relating to the temporalities of the Church and its jurisdiction. They assume, generally, as an incontrovertible maxim, that the laity have no authority over persons or property ecclesiastical. Moreover, they complain bitterly of various abuses proceeding from the hatred which the laity bore towards the clergy; but it does not appear that they took any steps to lessen the grounds of this hatred, unless it were by an accumulation of censures and temporal penalties.

1. Orders that the Mass of the Blessed Virgin be celebrated once a week.

3. Grants an indulgence to those who pray to God for the pope.

4. Grants an indulgence of ten days to those who devoutly bow the head at the name of Jesus.

14. Orders the secular powers to forward a captured clerk to his own judge free of expense.

17, 18. Against administering poisonous drugs, and against the use of poisons or drugs to procure abortion.

19. Of proceedings against the exempt.¹

44. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, all abusive conversations in the houses of bishops, or in the presence of their officials.

46. Permits both archbishops and bishops travelling in dioceses not their own, to bless the people.

51. Relates to the condition in which benefices ought to be left by those who vacate them.—Tom. xi. Conc. pp. 1717 and 2476. *Fleury*.

AVIGNON (1337). Held on the 3rd of September 1337, by three archbishops and seventeen bishops. They published a decree containing sixty-nine articles, being chiefly a repetition of those drawn up in the preceding council. Amongst other things, it is enacted, that parishioners shall receive the eucharist at Easter only at the hands of their proper curate. By canon five, it is ordered, that incumbents and all persons in holy orders shall abstain from eating meat on Saturdays, in honour of the Virgin, that by so doing they may set a good example to the laity. This injunction to fast on Saturdays had been made three hundred years before, upon occasion of the "Treve de Dieu," but had not yet, it seems, been universally established; the other regulations of the council relate chiefly to the usurpations of Church property and acts of violence committed on the persons of the clergy.—*Gall. Christ.* Tom. i. p. 322. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1850.

AVIGNON (1457). Held on the 7th of September 1457, by the Cardinal Pierre de Foix, Archbishop of Arles, and legate, assisted by thirteen bishops. One purpose of

¹ The exempt were, 1, Churches responsible to the pope alone; 2, Churches (as Royal Chapels) subject to the supervision of the archbishop not to the bishop of the Diocese.

this council was to confirm the canon of Basle, relating to the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. It was forbidden (canon 9), under pain of excommunication, to preach anything contrary to this doctrine, or to dispute concerning it in public. All curates were enjoined to make known this decree, that no one might plead ignorance. The council, at the conclusion of this session, was, by common consent, prorogued to the second Sunday in Lent, and met again in fact March 23rd, 1458. In the two sessions twenty-eight canons were published.

13. Relates to the observance of Sundays and holy days; permits the bishops, in time of harvest and vintage, to remit the strictness of this observance, if necessary, Mass, however, being first completed.

15. Declares that infants are capable of receiving confirmation, the bishop's consent being first had.

20. "Also, since certain of the delegates of the Apostolic See often abuse their powers, we enact that the ordinaries, to whom, of right, recourse is to be had, shall provide for this." "*Ordinarii, ad quos de jure potest haberi recursus.*"—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1403. Martene, *Thes. Anec.*—Tom. iv. col. 379.

AVIGNON (1509). Held in October 1509, by Antonio Flores, Archbishop of Avignon, assisted by the proctors of his suffragans. Thirty-five canons were published. 20. Orders all curates to keep a register of the names of those who die in his parish.—Mart., *Thes. Anec.* Tom. 4. col. 385.

AVIGNON (1594). Held in 1594, Francis Marin, Archbishop of Avignon. Sixty-four canons were published, relating chiefly to the same subjects treated of in the synods held in various parts of France, &c., after the Council of Trent. 8. Provides for teaching the rudiments of the faith to adults as well as children. 9. Orders sermons on all Sundays, and every day in Lent and Advent. 11-21. Of the sacraments. 14. Orders that the baptismal water be renewed only on Holy Saturday and the eve of Whit-Sunday, unless need require; and that a silver vessel be used to pour it into the font. 25 and 26. Of relics and images. 28. Of behaviour in church. 44. Of Lent. 46. Of processions. 56. Of legacies, wills, &c. 57. Of medical men. 60. Against duelling. 62. Of Jews: orders them to keep in their houses on Easter-eve and Easter-day.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1434.

AVIGNON (1725). Summoned by Goutier, the archbishop, in conjunction with the bishops of Carpentras, Cavaillon, and Vaison, and a number of distinguished theologians. Fifty-one canons were drawn up relating to local ordinances.

AVRANCHES (1172). [*Concilium Avrincatense.*] Held on the 22nd of May 1172, the cardinal legates, Theodinus and Albert, presided. Henry the Second of England, having taken the oath which the pope's legates required of him, and annulled all the unlawful customs which had been established in his time, and done penance, was absolved from his participation in the assassination of Becket. Amongst other things, Henry engaged, 1st, not to withdraw from the obedience of the Pope Alexander III. or of his successors, so long as they continued to acknowledge him as Catholic king of England. 2ndly, That he would not hinder appeals to Rome. 3rdly, He promised, at the coming Christmas, to take the cross for three years, and in the year following to set out for Jerusalem; unless the pope should grant a dispensation, and unless he was obliged to go to Spain to oppose the Saracens.

This was rather an assembly than a council. The real council of Avranches, in this year, was not held until the 27th or 28th of September. The king then renewed his oath, adding to it some expressions of attachment and obedience to Alexander.

Twelve canons were then drawn up, enacting, amongst other matters, that it should not be lawful to appoint infants to benefices with cure of souls; that the incumbents of parishes, who could afford it, should be compelled to have an assisting priest; that it should not be lawful for a husband or wife to enter upon a monastic life whilst the other continued in the world. Abstinence and fasting during Advent were recommended to all who could bear it, and especially to the clergy.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1457

B.

BADAM (1014). See C. HABAM, A.D. 1014.

BAMBERG (1011). [*Concilium Bambergense.*] Held May 6, 1011, by the Emperor St Henry for the dedication of the Church of Saints Peter and George. Forty-six bishops

attended. Theodoric of Luxemburg was suspended from the exercise of his episcopal functions until he had cleared himself of the charge preferred against him, of having attained his see by unlawful means.—Tom. ix. Conc.

BARCELONA (599). [*Concilium Barcinonense.*] Held November 1, 599, in the church of the Holy Cross, at which twelve bishops of the province of Tarragona were present, Asiaticus of Tarragona presiding; they drew up four canons, of which the first two relate to the crime of simony; the third forbids the elevation of a lay person to a bishopric, the king's mandate notwithstanding; the fourth condemns the marriage of virgins consecrated to the service of God, and of penitents of either sex.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1605.

BARCELONA (1068). Held in 1068, by the legate, Cardinal Hugo the White. Raymond, Count of the principality, being well-inclined to do away with the use of the Gothic office within his dominions, according to the wish of Pope Alexander II. (being warmly urged to it by his wife, Adalmodis, a Frenchwoman), Hugo called together this council, at which all the bishops and abbots of the principality were present. They agreed unanimously to exchange the use of the Gothic office for the Roman; and further decreed that, in future, the clergy should live in perpetual continence, and that they should not be married, as had hitherto been permitted.—*Pagi.*

BARI (1097). [*Concilium Barensis.*] Held in October 1097, by Pope Urban II., at the head of one hundred and eighty-three bishops. Here, the question of the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches was discussed. Amongst other things, the Greeks, endeavouring to prove, from the Holy Scriptures, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, were answered by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who showed so clearly the truth of his procession from the Father and the Son, that the council pronounced anathema against all who should deny it; at his entreaty, moreover, the sentence of excommunication against William Rufus, his persecutor, was delayed.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 611.

BASLE (1431). [*Concilium Basiliense.*] Held in the year 1431. This council, convoked by Martin V. to assemble at Pavia, was transferred thence to Sienna, and afterwards from Sienna to Basle. Eugene IV., his successor, confirmed his injunction for the meeting of the council at Basle, and

also the privilege which had been conferred upon the Cardinal Julian¹ of presiding at it. The two principal objects of this council were the restoration of union between the Greek and Roman Churches, and the general reformation of the Church, both in its head and in its members, according to the plan suggested in the Council of Constance.

The council was opened on the 23rd of July.² The bishops who attended were divided into four classes: each class was composed of cardinals, archbishops, bishops, abbots, curates, and doctors, both secular and regular, as well in theology as in the canon law, taken indifferently from any nation or province; and in order that the numbers in each class might be kept the same, four persons were appointed, whose duty it was to distribute equally amongst them all new comers. Liberty was given to the classes to discuss the questions proposed to them, separately or together. They met in the chapter-house of the cathedral church, and there it was open to each member to say whatever he thought good upon the matter in debate, the conclusion arrived at being afterwards reported to the general council, which sat in the cathedral, and which passed the final judgment. As the Italian bishops were far more numerous than those from any other country, by a prudent regulation they were prevented from caballing together, and so hindering or retarding, by their numbers, that Church reform which was a chief object of the council. In the

First session, December 7, 1431, Cardinal Julian delivered an address, in which he exhorted those present to lead a pure and holy life, to have charity one towards another, and to labour together for the good of the Church. Then the decree of the Council of Constance, concerning the celebration of a general council after five and after seven years, was read, together with the bull of Martin V. convoking the council, in which he named Julian president, also the letter of Eugene IV. to the latter upon the subject; afterwards the six objects proposed in assembling the council were enumerated,—

¹ Bishop of Tusculum and Grossetum; Cardinal 1426, died 1445.

² The opening of the council was appointed for the 3rd of March, on which day only *one* person was present, viz., the Abbot of Veselai; even the president himself did not make his appearance. The abbot continued at Basle, and gradually a few prelates and others gathered together, and the council was opened, as stated, on the 23rd of July; but Cardinal Julian did not appear at Basle till September, and found there only three bishops and seven abbots.

1. The extirpation of heresy.
2. The reunion of all Christian persons with the Catholic Church.
3. To afford instruction in the true faith.
4. To appease the wars between Christian princes.
5. To reform the Church in its head and in its members.
6. To re-establish, as far as possible, the ancient discipline of the Church.

In this session the decrees of Constance against those who should trouble the council by secret intrigues or open violence, were renewed. Lastly, they made a decree to the effect that the holy Council of Basle was lawfully assembled, and that it was the duty of all prelates to attend it. In this session the notaries, promoters, and other officers of the council, were appointed.

In the interval between the first and second sessions, as it appeared that the pope was doing his utmost to dissolve the council, measures were taken to prevent him. The French bishops, in an assembly at Bourges, represented to Charles VII., that the council was lawfully convoked to Basle, and entreated him to prevail upon the pope to permit the council to proceed, and to allow the prelates of his kingdom to attend, which was done according to their request.

In the second session, held February 15 (14th—Martene), 1432, two decrees, made in the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance, were confirmed, and two new decrees enacted.

In the first it is declared, that the synod, being assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and representing the Church militant, derives its power directly from our Lord Jesus Christ, and that all persons, of whatever rank or dignity, not excepting the Roman pontiff himself, are bound to obey it¹ in all matters relating to the faith, the extirpation of schism, and the general reform of the Church, both in its chief and in its members.

In the second decree, the council declares that any

¹ "Primo declarat quod ipsa synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata generale concilium faciens et Ecclesiam Militantem representans, potestatem immediatè a Christo habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti schismatis et ad generalem reformationem Ecclesie Dei," &c.

person, of whatsoever rank or condition, not excepting the pope, who shall refuse to obey the laws and decrees of this or of any other general council, shall be put to penance and punished.

The occasion of this decree was the news that Pope Eugene had issued a decree for the dissolution of the council, upon the pretext that the union of the Greek and Latin Churches required that the council should be delayed. Upon this subject Cardinal Julian wrote two letters to Eugene, to induce him not to dissolve the council; in them he entirely refutes the pretence of the pope, that the council was not lawfully called; he shows him that no one could gainsay the authority of the Council of Basle, without at the same time impugning that of the Council of Constance, which no one questioned, for in that case the deposition of John the Twenty-third would be uncanonical; and consequently, all subsequent elections to the papal chair null and void, including, necessarily, his own. He further shows him, that he had no power to dissolve the council, it having been already determined in the Council of Constance that the pope is subject to the decrees of a general council in all matters relating to the faith, the extinction of schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members; that, in consequence, the council being superior to the pope in these three cases, Eugene must submit to the council in the same.

The council, seconding the views of Julian, gave a synodal answer to the pope's legates, in which they lay down the same principles, and support them by solid arguments, thus:—First, that no person can dispute the authority of the Church; or that all that she receives ought to be received by all the faithful; or that she alone enjoys the privilege of infallibility; therefore she alone can make laws binding universally upon all the faithful. Secondly, that œcumenical councils have an authority equal to that of the Church itself; because they, in fact, represent the Catholic Church, which derives its power directly from our Lord Jesus Christ, as is expressly declared by the Council of Constance; therefore œcumenical councils are infallible, since they are, in fact, the Church itself. Thirdly, that the pope, although the chief *minister* of the Church, is *not* above the whole *mystical body*, since the mystical body cannot err

in matters of faith, whilst experience shows that the pope, albeit the head of the body, can err. Moreover, the Church, the mystical body, has on several occasions deposed popes when convicted of error in faith; whilst, on the contrary, no pope has ever pretended to excommunicate or condemn the Church as a body. These arguments had little effect upon Eugene, who persisted in his wish to dissolve the council, which, on its part, made it a duty to oppose its authority to that of the pope.

Decrees were also published in the second session, forbidding to hinder in any way those coming to or present at the council; and forbidding those present to leave it without leave.

In the third session, April 29, 1432, it was enacted (amongst other things), that the council lawfully assembled, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and having all the authority of an œcumenical council, did warn, entreat, implore, and require the Pope Eugene to revoke, absolutely and entirely, the decree which he had executed for the dissolution of the said council; and to present himself at it within three months, his health permitting, or to send accredited persons who might act in his name. In case he should neglect to comply with this requisition, the council further declared, that they would proceed to take measures for the welfare of the Church according as the Holy Spirit should dictate to them.

In the fourth session, June 20, 1432, a safe conduct was granted to such Bohemians as should be sent to the council, the council guaranteeing the safety of as many under two hundred as chose to attend. A letter was also written to congratulate them upon the resolution they had formed in the city of *Ægra* to send deputies to the council, which gave reason to hope for a speedy reunion. As the Pope Eugene was then sick, the council made a decree to the effect, that, in the event of a vacancy in the holy see, the cardinals should not proceed to the election anywhere save in the council itself; and, further, that during the sitting of the council, the pope should not be permitted to advance any one to the rank of cardinal, the number of these being already a burden upon the Church; that should he do so, notwithstanding this decree, the election should be considered null and void. Also, that no person should be excused from

attending the council upon the plea of an oath or promise made to the pope, all such oaths and promises being declared to be not binding.

In the fifth session, August 9, 1432, three judges were appointed for the examination of questions relating to the faith, prior to the final judgment of the council, and three other bishops to take cognizance of all other matters brought before the council, not being matters of faith.

In the interval, between the fifth and sixth sessions, two congregations were held, in which audience was given to the four legates of the Pope Eugene—John, Archbishop of Tarentum; Andrew, Archbishop of Colosse (or Rhodes), Bertrand, Bishop of Maguelona, and Antonio de St Vitus. The Archbishop of Tarentum magnified the authority of the pope, pretending that he alone possessed the right to appoint the time, place, and celebrations of councils, and offering any place within the states of the Church that they might choose. The council, in reply, stated, that to wish to dissolve a council lawfully called, was, in fact, to desire to renew a schism in the Church; that those who acted so grieved the Holy Spirit, and drove Him from their heart, in breaking the only bond which can retain Him, viz., charity.

In the sixth session, September 6, 1432, as the pope had neither revoked the bull for the dissolution of the council, nor appeared in person nor by deputy, the promoters of the council required that he should be formally declared contumacious; after that the citation had been three times made at the door of the cathedral, but at the entreaty of the four legates this was deferred.

In the seventh session, November 6, 1432, the former decree of the council, made in the fourth session, concerning an election to the popedom in case of a vacancy, which enacted, that it should not be lawful for the cardinals to proceed to the election of a pope without the consent of the council, was renewed.

In the eighth session, December 18, 1432, it was agreed that the pope should be proceeded against canonically, in order to declare him contumacious, and to visit him with the canonical penalty; two months' delay, however, being granted him within which to revoke his bull for the dissolution, but if at the end of that period he should still remain contumacious, that he should be at once proceeded

against without further citation. A decree was made by which the council declared that since the holy Catholic Church is one (that being an article of faith), it is impossible that there can be, at *the same time*, more than *one* œcumenical council representing the holy Catholic Church ; and, accordingly, that whilst the council continued its sitting at Basle, it was impossible that another should assemble elsewhere ; that any such pretended council would be a schismatical assembly, and all persons present at it, *ipso facto*, excommunicated ; and, if incumbents, deprived of their benefices.

The deputies¹ being now arrived from the Bohemians, they presented to the council, on the 16th January 1433, four articles, by which they demanded,—First, the liberty to administer the holy Eucharist to all the faithful in both kinds. Secondly, that all mortal sin, and especially open sin, should be repressed, corrected, and punished, according to God's law, by those to whom it belonged to do so. Thirdly, that the Word of God should be preached faithfully and freely by the priests and by such deacons as were fit for it. Fourthly, that it should not be permitted to the clergy to possess authority in temporal matters.

In these four points, they declared, were comprised all in which they differed from their Catholic brethren ; and that if their wishes were so far acceded to, they were ready to return into union with the Church, and to obey their lawful superiors. These four articles having been examined in a congregation, it was decided to send deputies into Bohemia,² viz., Philibert, Bishop of Constance ; Peter of

¹ Rokyzana, Wenceslaus (or Nicholas—(*Martene*)) Uldaric, and Peter Payne, (Rayne—Cave) an Englishman, who each spoke at great length upon one article, and were answered by John de Ragusio, a Dominican ; Ægidius Carlerius, Dean of Cambray ; Henry Kalceisen, a Dominican ; and John de Polemar.

² Subsequently a Formulary of Concord was published upon the matter of the Bohemians, in which permission was given to the clergy in Bohemia and Moravia to administer the cup to those amongst the laity who desired it. . . . "Sacrum concilium sacerdotibus dictorum regni et marchionatus communicandi sub utraque specie populum, eas videlicet personas quæ in annis discretionis constitutæ reverenter et devote postulaverint, facultatem in Domino pro eorum utilitate et salute largietur ; hoc semper observato, quod sacerdotes sic communicantibus semper dicant quod ipsi debeant firmiter credere quod non sub specie panis Caro tantum, nec sub specie vini Sanguis tantum, sed sub qualibet specie est integer et totus Christus. . . ."

Augsburg; John de Polemar; Frederick Prasperger of Ratisbon; Ægidius Carlerius; Alexander Sparuc, an Englishman; &c., &c.

In the ninth session, January 22, 1433, the council, in order to testify their satisfaction at the conduct of the Emperor Sigismund, who, by his letters-patent, had declared to all his subjects that the holy council of Basle was under his protection, and that he would not permit its authority to be in any manner impugned, declared that whatever the pope might do against him should be considered null and void.

In a general congregation, held January 28, the legates proposed to the council twenty-eight articles containing the various false doctrines said to be held at the time in Bohemia. Amongst them were the following:—

1. That the substance of the bread and wine remained after consecration.

3. That Christ is not in the Sacrament by a real Corporeal Presence.

4. That water is not on any account to be mixed with the wine.

5. That the Sacraments of confirmation and extreme unction are useless.

6. That confession to the priest is unnecessary for a penitent.

10. That there is no purgatory after this life.

11. That prayer for the dead is vain.

12. That the saints are not to be prayed to, and that their suffrages cannot assist men.

13. That images and relics ought to be broken and burnt.

14. That the Church fasts and festivals are not to be observed.

17. That no one can be a civil magistrate or prelate whilst in mortal sin.

18. That the people may punish and depose their magistrates.

20. That all things happen by an absolute necessity.

23. That universities, studies, colleges, &c., are the introduction of the devil.

24. That no one need care for excommunication by a pope or bishop.

27. That the Holy Catholic Church is the whole body of the predestinated.

28. That ecclesiastical obedience is an unscriptural invention of the priests.

“The council also required the ambassadors of the Bohemians to reply to six queries, the last of which was, “Whether they held him to be a heretic whosoever should obstinately impugn these councils, viz., those of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, which the Universal Church holds in equal veneration with the four Gospels.”—*Mart. Vet. Scrip.*, 8 250.

In the tenth session, February 19, 1433, the promoters of the council required that Pope Eugene should be declared contumacious, on account of his obstinacy, in not revoking the bull for the dissolution of the council. Some time was consumed in deliberating upon this point; fresh endeavours were made to persuade Eugene to concede, and the emperor united his entreaties to those of Julian. Other princes, amongst whom was the King of France, gave public tokens of their resolution to protect the council.

In the eleventh session, April 27, 1433, it was resolved, that if the pope should neglect to convoke a council every ten years, according to the decree made in the thirty-ninth session of the Council of Constance, the right of calling the council should devolve upon the bishops, without any obligation to demand permission of the pope. It was also declared, that the absolute prohibition to prorogue a council signified in these words—“nullatenus prorogetur,” by the Council of Constance, was binding upon the pope, and that, consequently, a council once assembled could neither be prorogued, transferred, nor interrupted by the pope, unless two-thirds of the fathers composing it should consent.

Eugene, however, was now willing to send legates¹ to the council to preside at it in his name, but the council refused to admit them; because, as they stated, the pope had given to them such unlimited powers, that if they should think fit to object to any conclusion or enactment of the council, it would be thereby rendered null and void; whereas, the council maintained that not only the presidents but the pope himself was subject to the council. Besides, they main-

¹ Jordanus, Bishop of Sabin; Peter, Bishop of Albano; Cardinal Nicolas of St Cruz in Jerusalem, and Cardinal Angelotus, who were to preside with Cardinal Julian.

tained, the legates came rather to hold a new council than to confirm that which was actually sitting; since Eugene had refused to recognize it from the time of its assembling at Basle.

In the twelfth session, July 14, 1433, complaint was made of the bad faith of the pope, whose conduct tended to lower the authority of councils; by a decree, he was required to renounce within sixty days his design of transferring the council from Basle, upon pain of being pronounced contumacious. The election of prelates was declared to be free, as established by the holy apostles, and confirmed by the first council of Nicea; in consequence the pope was forbidden to reserve to himself the reversion to any ecclesiastical preferments beyond those which are contained in the rights of the Roman see, or which are situated in the lands dependent upon the Church of Rome; seeing that by reason of the vast increase of these reservations¹ every day the right of election was in a fair way of being in the end annihilated. The same decree enjoins those to whom the privilege of electing belongs to make choice of fit persons, viz., persons of mature age, of good report, and already in holy orders. It further forbids all simoniacal elections, pronounces them absolutely void, and deprives of the right of voting at any future election those who have been guilty of such practices. It, moreover, exhorts princes to abstain from all interference in elections, and to do nothing to bar their freedom.

The Pope Eugene, irritated by these proceedings on the part of the council, issued a bull, annulling all their decrees against himself, and especially the first of this session.²

¹ [Electiones expectandæ.] A "reservation," properly speaking, was a declaration by which the pope reserved to himself the right of presenting to such a cathedral, or to such a dignity or benefice, when it should fall vacant, with prohibition to the chapter to proceed to elect, and to the ordinary to consecrate. These reservations were accompanied by bad consequences; and it often happened that those to whom the promise of such reversions had been given, tired of waiting for the natural demise of the incumbents, found some means of putting an end to them. The Council of Lateran, in 1179, forbade generally this anticipation of vacancies. This prohibition was also inserted in the Pragmatic Sanction and in the Concordat.

² On the 14th of August a letter was read from James, King of Scotland, to a Scotch abbot (*abbati de Dourdrana*), in which he declared his

In the thirteenth session, September 11, 1433, the promoters of the council demanded that Eugene should be declared contumacious, the two months' grace granted to him having expired; however, at the solicitation of the Duke of Bavaria in the name of the emperor, the term was extended thirty days.

In the fourteenth session, November 6, 1433, the Emperor Sigismund was present in person: a new delay of three months was granted to the pope, on condition that he would within that time give in his adherence to the council, and revoke everything that he had done either for its dissolution or transfer, as well as against the decree of the twelfth session, and that by a distinct and unequivocal act, of which they drew up three forms for his use.

In the fifteenth session, November 25, 1433, the emperor was again present: various rules for the convocation of diocesan councils were drawn up; amongst others it was ruled that they should be assembled twice, or at the least once, in each year; that all present at them should be exhorted to lead a life suited to the holiness of their calling, to instruct the people on every Sunday and festival; to read the canons concerning the due administration of the sacraments, and to inform themselves concerning the lives and conduct of their clergy.

The Pope Eugene having, at the earnest solicitation of the emperor, promised to unite with the council, upon condition that they would revoke all their past acts against him, they were, on their part, anxious to make the most of his improved feeling towards them; accordingly, the ambassadors of the King of France and of the Duke of Burgundy, were sent to him to conclude the terms of accommodation which had been proposed. In the end, the pope chose four cardinals to preside with Julian at the council; he revoked all the bulls which he had issued for his dissolution, and published one according to the form sent him by the council. [Session xiv.] It was to the effect, that, although he had broken up the Council of Basle lawfully assembled, nevertheless, in order to appease the disorders which had arisen, he declared the council to have been

adherence to the council, and promised his aid and assistance, at the same time assuring them that his ambassadors would speedily arrive. The letter is dated Edinburgh, June 22, 1433.

lawfully continued from its commencement, and that it would be so to the end; that he approved of all that it had ordered and decided, and that he declared the bull for its dissolution, which he had issued, to be null and void; thus, as M. Bossuet observes, setting the council above himself, since, in obedience to his order, he revoked his own decree, made with all the authority of his see.

In the sixteenth session, February 5, 1434, the letters of Eugene approving of the council and revoking the dissolution which he had decreed, were read, the Emperor Sigismund being present. On the 24th of April, a congregation was held for the sake of incorporating the pope's legates with the council.

In the seventeenth session, April 26, 1434, the legates¹ were made to swear that they would labour faithfully to advance the honour of the council, and that they would observe all the decrees of the Council of Constance, especially those of the fourth and fifth sessions; it was further declared that they should not be permitted to preside, except upon the condition that they would admit their authority to be derived *solely* from the council, "without any co-active jurisdiction," and would bind themselves to give their conclusions in strict conformity with the decisions of the council; and a decree was made to the effect, that in case the legates should refuse to pronounce what had been agreed upon by the council,² the right of *making the declaration* should devolve upon the bishop who should sit next to them; for this reason that the laws passed in a general council derive their authority solely from the council itself, and that the right to preside and to pronounce the judgment of the council, which the legates of the pope asserted, is but honorary.

Alexander, in his eighth dissertation upon the Council of Basle, remarks, concerning this subject, that although the pope has greater authority than any one else in the council, presiding in person or by his legates, explaining its decrees, ordering their execution, &c., yet it by no means follows that the authority of an œcumenical council is so depend-

¹ Viz., John, Archbishop of Tarentum; Cardinals Nicolas and Julian; Peter, Bishop of Padua; and Louis, Abbot of St Justina at Padua.

² "Pronuntiare concilii sanctionem."

ent upon him, that he can at will change or annul its decrees; that his authority has no force without the concurrence of all the other members of the council, and that the binding authority of the resolutions made in council by no means arises from the authority of the Roman pontiff, but depends solely upon the unanimous consent of the fathers present, the pope himself included. This is allowed by the Pope St Leo in his letter to the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, as Cardinal Cuza remarks in his third book, *De Concord. Cath.* c. 5.

In the eighteenth session, June 27, 1434, the emperor was not present, having left Basle. The fourth and fifth canons of Constance were renewed. John, Patriarch of Antioch, laid a paper before the council, tending to establish the authority of œcumenical councils and their superiority over the popes.

Between the eighteenth and nineteenth sessions, *i.e.*, on the 30th July, a letter was received from John and Esaias, two Armenian bishops, concerning the union of the Churches of Rome and Armenia, which is given by Martene in his *Vet. Script. Coll.*, 8. 640.

In the nineteenth session, September 7, 1434, the Greek ambassadors, whom the Emperor John Paleologus had sent, were present.¹ Several matters in which they were concerned were discussed; various means were proposed to facilitate the holding a council of the two churches. It was determined to send legates to Constantinople, in order to induce the Greeks to agree to the city of Basle as the place of meeting, and to offer them money and four large ships to enable them to come there; and, moreover, two more armed ships for the defence of Constantinople against the Turks during the emperor's absence. Also, a decree was made in which all ordinaries were exhorted to send fit persons to preach the word of God amongst the Jews and infidels, and that for this purpose there should be appointed in all universities two professors of the Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, and Chaldee languages.

In the twentieth session, January 22, 1435, the subject under consideration was the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members. A decree was directed against

¹ These were Demetrius Palæologus, Isidorus (abbot of the monastery of St Demetrius), and Joannes Dissipatus.

the incontinence of the clergy, viz., against those who were living openly in a state of concubinage, to the effect that such, upon conviction, should lose the fruits of their benefices for three months; should they refuse to obey, they were to be declared incapable of holding any benefice in future; should they relapse after having been restored, and after having given tokens of amendment, they were to be declared incapable of holding any ecclesiastical dignity, without hope of the sentence being revoked. The second decree referred to the case of excommunicated persons, and declared that no one, whoever he might be, should be shunned as excommunicated, even in the administration of the sacraments, on account of any *general* sentence or censure, but only when the sentence was directed against him individually, pronounced by a competent judge, and specially notified to him.

In the twenty-first session, June 9, 1435, a decree was made against the annates or first-fruits, the origin of which dates no further back than the time of Clement V. The council declared that, as far as the court of Rome is concerned, in the confirmation of elections, in all grants, collations, and presentations made by the laity, in investitures to all cathedral churches, and other dignities and benefices, no sort of remuneration whatever should be made on account of bulls, seals, or common first-fruits, notwithstanding any custom or privilege to the contrary whatsoever. In a word, the council absolutely forbade the payment of first-fruits under pain of incurring the penalties of simony; and it added, further, this clause, that if (which God forbid!) the Roman pontiff, who ought to set an example to all others of obedience to the decrees of œcumenical councils, should offend the Church by doing anything contrary to this present ordinance, he should be brought before a general council.¹

The pope remonstrated with the council on this subject, and declared that he was willing to abolish the first-fruits, if the council would bind itself to provide for the necessities of the holy see. To this the Cardinal Julian answered, that in the primitive ages of the Church the popes abounded

¹ It may be remarked of this decree, that it was made at a time when the council was œcumenical, even according to the acknowledgment of those who were most opposed to it.

in works of charity without receiving any such revenue as the first-fruits ; that the council would provide for the wants of the holy see, if the pope, on his part, would observe the decrees of the council ; that the intention of the decree against first-fruits was simply to put an end to simony. The third decree related "*Pacificis possessoribus*," and enacts that those who have been in peaceable possession of a benefice for three years, having been inducted upon a lawful title, may not be disturbed in their possession. The fourth decree related to the celebration of divine service. It was ordered that service should be said at suitable and convenient hours ; that notice should be given beforehand by the tolling of a bell ; that the service should be chanted gravely and decorously, with proper pauses, &c. ; that all persons should stand during the Gloria Patri, and should bow at the sacred name of Jesus. Several other decrees upon the same subjects were made.

In the twenty-second session, October 15, 1435, a book written by a Roman monk¹ was condemned for containing certain propositions, which attributed to the human nature of our Lord what rightly belongs only to the Divine nature.

In the twenty-third session, March 25, 1436, several regulations were made relating to the election and the profession of faith of the sovereign pontiff. The council then, in order to put into execution the acts of the Council of Constance relating to the cardinals, proceeded to reduce their numbers to twenty-four ; it also regulated the manner of their election, in order to secure its freedom. It declared to be null and void all promises of reversions to ecclesiastical preferments, mandates and reservations of benefices, made by the popes for their own profit. All these decrees were made in proper canonical form, and declared in open council.

In the twenty-fourth session, April 14, 1436, the legates of the pope urged the council, on the part of Eugene, to make selection, as soon as it could be done, of some other place in which to assemble, promising on his part sixty thousand crowns to defray the expenses of the Emperor of the Greeks

¹ Augustine Favaroni, of the order of hermits of St Augustine, Bishop of Nazareth and Barletta, near Naples, who died about ten years afterwards. None of his writings appear to have been printed ; and some others of them were placed upon the *Index*.

and his suite, if they would make choice of a place which he could approve. They also complained bitterly of the decrees concerning elections and first-fruits. In answer to these complaints, it was stated that all had been done in order.

Between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions a congregation was held, at which as many as three hundred and fifty-seven prelates were present (as Panormitanus (Nicolo Tedeschi) declares in his history of the council), of whom many more than two-thirds signified their opinion that the council should continue at Basle, if such a course would be pleasing to the Greeks, but that if not, they should endeavour to make them consent to Avignon, or, as a last resource, have recourse to Savoy, which was one of the places which the Greeks themselves had named.¹ In consequence of this determination, the council sent two deputies to Pope Eugene to entreat him earnestly to concur with them in the great work they had at heart, viz., the reunion of the Greek and Roman Churches. The deputies, upon their arrival at Rome, besought the pope to go in person to the council.

The legates of the pope, on the other side, used all their endeavours to sow dissensions amongst the fathers of the council, and to induce the majority to demand that the council for considering the matter of a reunion should be holden at Florence, or at Modena, or at some other city in Italy in which the pope was all-powerful; they had, however, no success, for although they gained over a few, more than two-thirds of those assembled held to the original decree.

In the twenty-fifth session, May 7, 1437, a decree was drawn up enacting that the œcumenical² council, for con-

¹ The Greek legates do not appear to have been well pleased with any of these places, and accused the fathers of Basle of being careless about the convenience of the Oriental Prelates and consulting too much their own, expecting, as they did, the Eastern bishops to come many thousand miles, from Cairo and Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch, and from the most remote parts, even from Russia, whilst they themselves would scarcely move to meet them and to lessen their journey. Raynald, A. D. 1437. No. 4.

² During these discussions the Greek legates, being questioned as to what they understood by the words "concilium universale," answered, "Quod papa et patriarchæ sint in dicta synodo per se vel procuratores suos similiter, et alii prælati sint ibidem verè vel representativè."

sidering the matter of the reunion of the Greek and Roman Churches, should be held either at Basle or at Avignon; and that all ecclesiastics should pay a tenth of their revenue to defray the needful expenses attending the holding of the council. It is undoubtedly true, that Basle was too far distant from the Greeks; but the fathers of the council, who had little faith in the pope, feared lest Eugene, under pretence of transferring, should endeavour a second time to dissolve it, or at least remove it to some place in which all liberty of deliberation would be taken away from them; they offered to consent to the transfer of the council from Basle to Avignon, or to some city in Savoy, because in that case they would have had the protection of France, which was favourable to them, and close at hand. Such was the ground of all the disputes between the pope and the council.

In this session two opinions divided the members of the council; one party, and that by far the most numerous, was for holding the council at Avignon, the other for transferring it to Florence; and, although in a minority, they, in concert with the pope's legates, made a decree in the name of the council removing it to that city. Immediately Eugene confirmed this decree by a bull which transferred the council to Ferrara, and in order to prevent them from continuing to sit at Basle, he fitted out some galleys at Venice in opposition to those which the council were about to send in order to convey the Greeks. The Greek ambassadors embarking in these vessels, with three legates, whom the pope sent into the East, arrived at Constantinople before the deputies from the council; and in consequence, when the galleys of the council shortly after came, the Emperor of the Greeks refused to embark in them. The fathers at Basle, being informed of this conduct on the part of Eugene, resolved to oppose him with their whole power. The Cardinal Julian, however, withdrew from it in consequence of their refusal to follow his advice, which was to send legates to meet the Greeks who had arrived at Venice, and to endeavour to bring them to Basle.

In the twenty-sixth session, July 31, 1437, the council published a decree, in which, after enumerating all that they had done during six years for the reformation of the Church, and which Eugene had done all in his power to

thwart, they summoned him to appear before them, either in person or by deputy, within sixty days. Eugene, however, far from submitting to the will of the council, published a bull for its translation or dissolution, forbidding the enactment of any synodal act within that city under the heaviest penalties after the expiration of thirty days, which time was to be employed in treating with the Bohemian ambassadors who were present at the council. At the same time, he summoned a council to Ferrara, to which he invited the whole of Christendom: this convocation was ill received in France, and the king, Charles VII., forbade the French bishops to attend.

In the twenty-seventh session, September 26, 1437, the creation of two cardinals by the pope, without the consent of the council, was declared to be null and void.

In the twenty-eighth session, October 1, 1437, the sixty days given to the pope in which to appear before the council having expired without any one appearing in his behalf, he was declared contumacious, and it was resolved that he should be proceeded against.

In the twenty-ninth session, October 12, 1437, the bull of the pope for the transfer of the council to Ferrara was refuted by strong arguments. It was shown that the city of Avignon was convenient for the reception of the Greeks, being near the sea, and moreover had been agreed to already both by the Greeks and Eugene, who had himself approved of fitting out galleys at Avignon, which should wait for the Greeks there, but had, nevertheless, without consulting the council, sent other galleys to Constantinople to anticipate those of the council; that this division could only serve to scandalise the Greeks and to foment the schism.

It was after this session that the pope held his council at Ferrara: and that Cardinal Julian, according to some, left this council.

In the thirtieth session, December 23, 1437, a decree was made upon the subject of the communion in both kinds; it was declared that none of the faithful (not being priests) are bound by any Divine precept to receive the holy sacrament of the eucharist under both kinds; that it may not be doubted that Jesus Christ is entire under each kind, and that the custom of granting to the laity the communion in

one kind only is to be considered as a law, which no one may condemn or alter without the Church's sanction.

In the thirty-first session, January 24, 1438, two decrees were made, one enacting that all causes ecclesiastical should be terminated on the spot, and forbidding an appeal to the pope, to the exclusion of the ordinary. The second revokes all promises of reversions to ecclesiastical preferments, either already given, or which might be given in future, permitting the pope to appoint to one benefice in churches where there are ten prebends, and to two in churches having fifty: it also enacts that there shall be a theological professor in every cathedral church, who shall be a canon either B.D. or D.D., having studied for ten years in some privileged university; that in every cathedral or collegiate church the third part of the prebends shall be given to graduates, either doctors, or licentiates, or bachelors in some faculty; that the curates of walled towns must have proceeded to the degree of M.A. at least; and that the benefices of regulars shall be given to regulars.

Further, the council declared the Pope Eugene contumacious, suspended him from the exercise of all jurisdiction either temporal or spiritual, and pronounced all that he should do to be null and void.

At this time the Cardinal of Arles presided.¹

In the thirty-second session, March 29, 1438, the council denounced the assembly at Ferrara as schismatical and not worthy to be called a council. At the same time, they annulled all that had been done there, and excommunicated Eugene and all who attended it. They drew up eight articles against Eugene, which declare it to be a Catholic verity that a general council is superior to a pope, and that it cannot be transferred or dissolved but with its own consent.

In the thirty-third session, May 16, 1439, only about twenty bishops and abbots were present, a great number of prelates having by degrees withdrawn from the council; their places, however, were supplied by their deputies—archdeacons, priors, doctors, &c., to the number of four hundred.

¹ It is worthy of remark that this cardinal, who presided over the council after Cardinal Julian had withdrawn, and during the period when it is considered by the Ultramontanes as schismatical, was subsequently *canonized*.

They established by a decree, and as articles of faith, these three propositions: 1. That it is a Catholic verity that a general council has authority over the pope as well as all others. 2. That a general council, lawfully called, can neither be dissolved, nor transferred, nor prorogued by the pope's authority without the consent of the council itself. 3. That whosoever shall obstinately resist these verities is to be regarded as a heretic.

A general congregation was then held, in which they took measures for deposing the pope. In this year Panormitanus, the King of Sicily's theologian and the most noted canonist of his time, composed his treatise concerning the authority of the Council of Basle; in which he endeavours to show, 1st, that the council was truly an œcumenical council; 2ndly, that it possessed the power of citing Eugene, and of proceeding against him; 3rdly, that the council had done nothing against him but what was just. However, he showed himself afterwards to be not a little changeable in his opinions.

In the thirty-fourth session, June 25, 1439, thirty-nine prelates were present, and three hundred ecclesiastics of the second order. Eugene was cited a second time, and declared to be contumacious: then they pronounced sentence of deposition against him, making use of the strongest possible terms. France, England, and Germany disapproved of this sentence.

In the thirty-fifth session, July 2, 1439, it was debated whether they should proceed at once to the election of a new pope, and it was finally resolved that they should wait for two months.

In the thirty-sixth session, September 17, 1439, a decree was made, by which the opinion of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin was declared to be a pious opinion, agreeable to the worship of the Church, to the Catholic faith, and to right reason; and it was ordered that the festival of the Conception should be celebrated on the 8th of December. The fathers of the council then drew up an apology for their conduct, in answer to a decree which Eugene had directed against them.

In the thirty-seventh session, October 24, 1439, it was resolved that the election of the future pope should take place in the council, and not elsewhere; that it should be made

by the Cardinal of Arles and thirty-two prelates ; and that it should be no election if two-thirds of them did not agree.

In the thirty-eighth session, October 30, 1439, the officers of the conclave were appointed ; and on the fifth of November they elected Amedeus, Duke of Savoy, who was then in retirement in his solitude at Ripailles with his hermits.

In the thirty-ninth session, November 17, 1439, twenty-five deputies were sent to Amedeus to beg of him to consent to his election, which, with great unwillingness, he at last did, and took the name of Felix V. The council then ordered that he should be recognised as the pope by all the faithful.

In the fortieth session, February 26, 1440, the election of Amedeus was confirmed, and sentence of excommunication pronounced against all those who should refuse to recognise him.

In the forty-first session, July 23, 1440, the sentence of Eugene, declaring Felix and his party to be heretics, was condemned. On the day after this session Felix came in state to the council, and was there consecrated bishop by the Cardinal of Arles, and crowned pope with great solemnity. He gave his benediction to the people, and granted indulgences.

As Felix had no revenue wherewith to support his dignity, Eugene being in possession of the patrimony of St Peter, it was permitted him, by a decree of the forty-second session, held August 4, 1440, to exact, for the first five years of his pontificate, the fifth part of the revenue of all benefices, and during the five following the tenth part ; and the members of the council endeavoured all in their power to cause the secular princes to recognise him.

Alphonso, King of Arragon, the Queen of Hungary, and the Dukes of Bavaria and Austria, amongst the European princes, recognised Felix, as also did the universities of Germany, Paris, and Cracow ; but France, England, and Scotland, whilst they acknowledged the authority of the Council of Basle, continued to recognise Eugene as the lawful pope.

In the forty-third session, July 1, 1441, a decree was drawn up concerning the observance of the festival of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, July 2, but no mention

They established by a decree, and as articles of faith, these three propositions: 1. That it is a Catholic verity that a general council has authority over the pope as well as all others. 2. That a general council, lawfully called, can neither be dissolved, nor transferred, nor prorogued by the pope's authority without the consent of the council itself. 3. That whosoever shall obstinately resist these verities is to be regarded as a heretic.

A general congregation was then held, in which they took measures for deposing the pope. In this year Panormitanus, the King of Sicily's theologian and the most noted canonist of his time, composed his treatise concerning the authority of the Council of Basle; in which he endeavours to show, 1st, that the council was truly an œcumenical council; 2ndly, that it possessed the power of citing Eugene, and of proceeding against him; 3rdly, that the council had done nothing against him but what was just. However, he showed himself afterwards to be not a little changeable in his opinions.

In the thirty-fourth session, June 25, 1439, thirty-nine prelates were present, and three hundred ecclesiastics of the second order. Eugene was cited a second time, and declared to be contumacious: then they pronounced sentence of deposition against him, making use of the strongest possible terms. France, England, and Germany disapproved of this sentence.

In the thirty-fifth session, July 2, 1439, it was debated whether they should proceed at once to the election of a new pope, and it was finally resolved that they should wait for two months.

In the thirty-sixth session, September 17, 1439, a decree was made, by which the opinion of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin was declared to be a pious opinion, agreeable to the worship of the Church, to the Catholic faith, and to right reason; and it was ordered that the festival of the Conception should be celebrated on the 8th of December. The fathers of the council then drew up an apology for their conduct, in answer to a decree which Eugene had directed against them.

In the thirty-seventh session, October 24, 1439, it was resolved that the election of the future pope should take place in the council, and not elsewhere; that it should be made

He also, with the unanimous consent of the council, forbade investitures, and decreed that if any one should accept of a bishopric or abbey at the hand of any lay person, he should in no way be regarded as bishop, or abbot, and should be excluded from the communion of the Roman Church; and in like manner, any emperor, king, duke, prince, count, &c., so giving any preferment, should be excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 418.

BENEVENTO (1091). Held in 1091, under Urban II., in which many bishops and abbots are said to have been present, and the sentence of anathema against Guibert was renewed, and four canons drawn up, one of which forbids the election of any one to a bishopric who is not in holy orders.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 484.

BENINGDON (851). [*Concilium Benningdonense.*] Held in the year 851, by Ceolnath, Archbishop of Canterbury, by order of Bertulf, King of Mercia. The council was chiefly occupied in hearing and redressing the wrongs of the monks of Crowland in Lincolnshire.—Tom. Conc. viii.; Pettier, vol. i.

BERGHAMSTED¹ (896). [*Concilium Berghamstedense.*] Held in 896, by Wihtrud, King of Kent, who attended in person; there were also present, Brihtwald, "chief bishop of Britain," and Tobias of Rochester, together with some of every order in the Church, and many laymen. Twenty-eight laws, called the "Dooms of King Wihtrud," were published:

1. Declares the Church to be free from taxes.
2. Inflicts a fine of fifty shillings for a breach of the protection of the Church or king.
3. and the three following, relate to sins of uncleanness.
7. Suspends from his ministration a priest guilty of conniving at fornication, neglecting to baptize the infirm, or of being drunk.
10. Fines the master eighty shillings, who shall make his slave work after sunset on Sunday till sunset on Monday.²

¹ Probably Burstled or Bearsted, near Maidstone.—Johnson.

² By "Sunday evening" and "Monday evening" are meant here what we now call Saturday evening and Sunday evening; and this according to the scriptural account, "And the evening and the morning were the first day."

Canterbury, Tobias of Rochester, and several abbots, abbesses, and "wise men." The chief object of the council appears to have been to consult about the repairing of the churches in Kent, injured in the wars with the West Saxons.

King Wihtred then, with his own mouth, renewed and confirmed the liberties, and privileges, and possessions of the Church in his kingdom,¹ forbidding all future kings, and all aldermen and laymen, for ever, all dominion over the churches, and all things belonging to them. He further directed that, upon the death of any bishop, abbot, or abbess, the event should be immediately made known to the archbishop, and a worthy successor be chosen with his consent.—Johnson's *Ecc. Canons*. Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1356.

BECCANCELDO (796). Held about 796, by Athelard, Archbishop of Canterbury, in which the privileges granted to the churches by Wihtred and others were solemnly confirmed. This deed of confirmation is signed by the archbishop, twelve bishops, and twenty-three abbots.—Johnson's *Ecc. Canons*. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1148. Wilkin's *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 162.

BENEVENTO (1087). [*Concilium Beneventanum.*] Held in August 1087, by Victor III., in which the anti-pope Guibert was deposed and anathematized; also Hugo of Lyons, and Richard, Abbot of Marseilles, excommunicated, having refused to communicate with Victor. He thus expresses himself in the sentence: "We, therefore, with apostolical authority, command that you be careful to abstain from all communication whatever with them, since they, of their own act and deed, have deprived themselves of communion with the Church of Rome; for, as the blessed Ambrose writes, 'Whosoever shall separate himself from the Church of Rome is to be treated as a heretic.'"²

¹ "It would be well if all earthly rulers would ever bear in mind the words of this king of Kent: 'It is a horrible thing,' he said, 'for men to rob the living God, and to divide His raiment and portion among themselves;' and many strong denunciations are added against those of his successors who may neglect this truth."—Wilkin's *Concilia*, vol. i. p. 57.

² Ambrosii Opera Sermo i. Edit. of Erasmus, Paris, 1529. *Probably* the passage attributed to Maximus of Turin.

He also, with the unanimous consent of the council, forbade investitures, and decreed that if any one should accept of a bishopric or abbey at the hand of any lay person, he should in no way be regarded as bishop, or abbot, and should be excluded from the communion of the Roman Church; and in like manner, any emperor, king, duke, prince, count, &c., so giving any preferment, should be excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 418.

BENEVENTO (1091). Held in 1091, under Urban II., in which many bishops and abbots are said to have been present, and the sentence of anathema against Guibert was renewed, and four canons drawn up, one of which forbids the election of any one to a bishopric who is not in holy orders.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 484.

BENINGDON (851). [*Concilium Beningdonense.*] Held in the year 851, by Ceolnath, Archbishop of Canterbury, by order of Bertulf, King of Mercia. The council was chiefly occupied in hearing and redressing the wrongs of the monks of Crowland in Lincolnshire.—Tom. Conc. viii.; Pettier, vol. i.

BERGHAMSTED¹ (696). [*Concilium Berghamstedense.*] Held in 696, by Wihtred, King of Kent, who attended in person; there were also present, Brihtwald, "chief bishop of Britain," and Tobias of Rochester, together with some of every order in the Church, and many laymen. Twenty-eight laws, called the "Dooms of King Wihtred," were published:

1. Declares the Church to be free from taxes.
2. Inflicts a fine of fifty shillings for a breach of the protection of the Church or king.
- 3, and the three following, relate to sins of uncleanness.
7. Suspends from his ministration a priest guilty of coniving at fornication, neglecting to baptize the infirm, or of being drunk.
10. Fines the master eighty shillings, who shall make his slave work after sunset on Sunday till sunset on Monday.²

¹ Probably Burstled or Bearsted, near Maidstone.—Johnson.

² By "Sunday evening" and "Monday evening" are meant here what we now call Saturday evening and Sunday evening; and this according to the scriptural account, "And the evening and the morning were the first day."

Canterbury, Tobias of Rochester, and several abbots, abbesses, and "wise men." The chief object of the council appears to have been to consult about the repairing of the churches in Kent, injured in the wars with the West Saxons.

King Wihtred then, with his own mouth, renewed and confirmed the liberties, and privileges, and possession of the Church in his kingdom,¹ forbidding all future king and all aldermen and laymen, for ever, all dominion over the churches, and all things belonging to them. I further directed that, upon the death of any bishop, abbot or abess, the event should be immediately made known to the archbishop, and a worthy successor be chosen with his consent.—Johnson's *Ecc. Canons*. Tom. vi. Col. p. 1356.

BECCANCELD (796). Held about 796, by Athela Archbishop of Canterbury, in which the privileges granted to the churches by Wihtred and others were solemnly confirmed. This deed of confirmation is signed by the archbishop, twelve bishops, and twenty-three abbots. Johnson's *Ecc. Canons*. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1148. Wilkin's *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 162.

BENEVENTO (1087). [*Concilium Beneventanum*] Held in August 1087, by Victor III., in which the pope Guibert was deposed and anathematized; also Hugh of Lyons, and Richard, Abbot of Marseilles, excommunicated, having refused to communicate with Victor. He thus expresses himself in the sentence: "We, therefore, with apostolical authority, command that you be careful to abstain from all communication whatever with them, since they, of their own act and deed, have deprived themselves of communion with the Church of Rome; for, as the blessed Ambrose writes, 'Whosoever separates himself from the Church of Rome is to be treated as a heretic.'²"

¹ "It would be well if all earthly rulers would ever bear in the words of this king of Kent: 'It is a horrible thing,' he said, 'to rob the living God, and to divide His raiment and portion among themselves;' and many strong denunciations are added to those of his successors who may neglect this truth."—Wilkin's *Conc.* vol. i. p. 57.

² *Ambrosii Opera Sermo i.* Edit. of Erasmus, Paris, 1529. For the passage attributed to Maximus of Turin,

"majori excommunicatione," will not leave the church during the celebration of the Divine Office, he shall first be warned to do so by the celebrant; if he refuse to do so, the priest shall at once cease from his office, unless he has already begun the canon—in which case he shall continue till he has communicated, but all the congregation shall at once leave the church. In places where the church possesses temporal power, the offenders shall be compelled by force to leave the church.

20. Orders the priest not to treat any one as excommunicated merely *on report*, unless it be a notorious fact.—Mart., *Thes. Anec.*, tom. iv. col. 227.

BESIERS (1351). Held by Peter, Archbishop of Narbonne, with five bishops and the proctors of others who were unable to attend. Twelve canons were published.

1. Grants to the truly penitent who bow the head at the name of Jesus (and who have previously confessed) an indulgence of ten days.

3. Orders prayers for the pope, the king, the queen, and the prelates. Grants forty days' indulgence to those who do so.

7. That all in holy orders should abstain from meat on Saturdays. (*See C: AVIGNON, 1337.*)

8. Relates to the conduct of certain abandoned persons, who, pretending themselves to be priests and prelates, fulminated excommunications against those of the clergy who had excommunicated them for their sins.

9. Against those who offer violence to the bearers of letters on ecclesiastical matters.

11. That no canon or beneficed clerk shall dare to enter a Cathedral or Collegiate Church, during the Holy Office, without a fitting dress.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1918. Mart., *Thes. Anec.*, tom. iv. col. 327.

BETHLEHEM (1672). Held at Bethlehem in March 1672, but commonly named the Council of Jerusalem. Dionysius, Patriarch of Constantinople, at the suggestion of Dositheus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in January 1672, two months previous to the actual assembling of the council at Jassy, prepared an encyclical letter, which was sent round to the various prelates for the approval and signature of those who should be unable to attend the council. It asserts, in the first place, the seven sacraments,

BESIERS (1299). Held in 1299, by Ægidius, Archbishop of Narbonne, assisted by all his suffragans except those of Toulouse, Carcassona, and Uzez (*Uticensis*), who sent proctors. Eight canons were published.

1. Forbids clerks to follow unworthy trades, such as butcher, currier, cobbler, &c. (*See C. BOURGES, 1280.*)

2. Orders all suffragan bishops to cause search to be made for the aiders and abettors of heretics.

4. Forbids the assemblies of the Beguini, who met together at night and followed new ceremonies and rites differing from the common rites observed by the faithful.

6. Orders the due celebration of the Feast of St Louis on the day after that of St Bartholomew.—*Mart., Thes. Anec.*, t. 4. col. 225.

BESIERS (1310). Held in 1310, by the same archbishop and his suffragans. Twenty-one canons were made.

2. Orders that all persons promoted to the minor orders shall be able to read the Psalter and to sing the Antiphons and responses.

4. Orders that those to be made deacons, in addition to the acquirements necessary for the sub-diaconate, shall be able to read the Epistles, Homilies, and Gospels, intelligibly, and to construe them, "*et construere competenter.*"

5. Directs that those who are to be made priests shall be such as excel others in seriousness of life and knowledge of letters: and that they shall know, *at least*, the "*Liber Sacramentorum*," "*lectionarium*," "*antiphonarium*," "*baptismus*" [probably the ritual containing the order of Baptism, &c.], the penitential Psalms, &c.

9. Against false witnesses.

13. Forbids monks and priests to practise surgery without the special licence of the bishop.

15. Forbids any one to expose any goods (except eatables) for sale on Sundays and Festivals, which are named.

16. Contains a monitory letter to the Chaplain of Besiers and other chaplains, curates, &c., of the diocese, bidding them instruct their people to obey the injunction in canon

15.

19. Directs that if a man, publicly excommunicated,

"majori excommunicatione," will not leave the church during the celebration of the Divine Office, he shall first be warned to do so by the celebrant; if he refuse to do so, the priest shall at once cease from his office, unless he has already begun the canon—in which case he shall continue till he has communicated, but all the congregation shall at once leave the church. In places where the church possesses temporal power, the offenders shall be compelled by force to leave the church.

20. Orders the priest not to treat any one as excommunicated merely *on report*, unless it be a notorious fact.—Mart., *Thes. Anec.*, tom. iv. col. 227.

BESIERS (1351). Held by Peter, Archbishop of Narbonne, with five bishops and the proctors of others who were unable to attend. Twelve canons were published.

1. Grants to the truly penitent who bow the head at the name of Jesus (and who have previously confessed) an indulgence of ten days.

3. Orders prayers for the pope, the king, the queen, and the prelates. Grants forty days' indulgence to those who do so.

7. That all in holy orders should abstain from meat on Saturdays. (*See C: AVIGNON, 1337.*)

8. Relates to the conduct of certain abandoned persons, who, pretending themselves to be priests and prelates, fulminated excommunications against those of the clergy who had excommunicated them for their sins.

9. Against those who offer violence to the bearers of letters on ecclesiastical matters.

11. That no canon or beneficed clerk shall dare to enter a Cathedral or Collegiate Church, during the Holy Office, without a fitting dress.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1918. Mart., *Thes. Anec.*, tom. iv. col. 327.

BETHLEHEM (1672). Held at Bethlehem in March 1672, but commonly named the Council of Jerusalem. Dionysius, Patriarch of Constantinople, at the suggestion of Dositheus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in January 1672, two months previous to the actual assembling of the council at Jassy, prepared an encyclical letter, which was sent round to the various prelates for the approval and signature of those who should be unable to attend the council. It asserts, in the first place, the seven sacraments,

and declares an unequivocal belief that the living body of our Lord Jesus Christ is invisibly present with a real presence in the blessed Eucharist, and that the bread is really and truly and properly changed into the very body of our Saviour Christ, and that it, the holy Eucharist, is offered up as a sacrifice for all Christians, both quick and dead.

It then asserts the doctrine of baptism, and the necessity of infant baptism; denies the doctrine of final perseverance, maintains the necessity of episcopacy to a Church, the superiority of virginity to matrimony, the infallibility of the Catholic Church, the invocation of saints, the use of images, and the necessity of fasting. With regard to the Apocrypha, the letter uses much the same language with our own articles, and so far differs from the subsequent decision of the council, which adds it to the canon of Scripture.

This letter received the signatures of forty-six metropolitans and bishops, including that of Dionysius.

In March the council assembled at Bethlehem, Dositheus of Jerusalem presiding. The first act of the fathers was an ineffectual attempt to exculpate Cyril Lucar from the charge of Calvinism brought against him, and to deny the authenticity of the confession attributed to him. They then proceed to declare that the confession, whoever was its author, was never that of the Greek Church, and they repeat and authenticate the synods of Constantinople and Jassy, concluding with a confession of faith founded on that of Peter Mogilas, though in many respects differing from it.

Art. 1. On the Trinity and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone.

2. On the authority of the Church to interpret Holy Scriptures.

3. Against the doctrine of irrespective predestination.

4. Against those who call God the author of evil.

5. On the same; and on Divine Providence in turning evil into good.

6. On original sin.

7. On the incarnation and passion.

8. That there is but one Mediator, Jesus Christ, nevertheless, that the Church may and ought to have recourse to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and other saints.

9. That faith working by love, *i.e.*, by the fulfilment of the commandments, justifies.

10. That there is a visible Catholic Church; that episcopacy is essential to it, and that it is an order entirely distinct from the priesthood.

11. Of members of the Church living in sin.

12. Of the teaching of the Holy Ghost by the Fathers and by the œcumenical Church.

13. Of good works.

14. Of free will.

15. That there are seven sacraments.

16. Of the necessity of regeneration in baptism.

17. Of the Holy Eucharist; asserts the doctrine of transubstantiation, and condemns consubstantiation.

18. Clearly admits the Latin doctrine of purgatory.

Finally, the fathers proceeded to answer the four questions of Cyril: the first two in the negative; as to the third, relating to the canon of Scripture, they admit the title of the apocryphal books to be considered as canonical; and in their answer to the fourth, they assent to the doctrine of the second council of Nicea, with regard to images. They conclude by a defence of Monachism.

The acts are signed by Dositheus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, the Ex-Patriarch, seven other prelates, and the proxy of one absent, also by sixty-one other ecclesiastics; ten signed in Arabic, the rest in Greek; the date is March 20, 1672.—Neale's *History of the Oriental Church*.

The Acts of this Synod were given by Dom. Ant. M. Fouqueret at Paris, with a Latin version in 1678 under the title, *Synodus Hierosolymitana*.

BOLOGNA (1317). [*Concilium Bononiense*.] Held in 1317 by Raynaldus, Archbishop of Ravenna, and eight of his suffragans. Twenty-four articles were published. In them allusion is made to the licentious life of the clergy, which rendered them an object of contempt to the people, and gave them a handle for usurping the property and rights of the Church. In canon 4 it was forbidden to the clergy to carry arms, and to enter any place of bad fame; it also minutely described the fashion and quality of their dress. In canon 12 it was forbidden to say any other mass during mass at the high altar (*cum missa celebratur in nota*).—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1655.

BORDEAUX (385.) [*Concilium Burdegalense*.] Held in 385, by order of the Emperor Maximus, against the Pris-

cillianists. Instantius and Priscillianus were called upon for their defence. The former made out so bad a case for himself, that he was judged unworthy of the episcopate. Priscillianus, fearing the same treatment, ventured to appeal to the emperor from the council, which appeal the bishops weakly permitted, instead of proceeding at once to pass judgment upon him, as they ought to have done, or at least to have reserved the cause for the hearing of other bishops.

Priscillianus and the other accused parties were in consequence brought before the emperor at Treves, Idacius and Ithacius their accusers accompanying them. The zeal of these men, in endeavouring to bring the Priscillianists to judgment, would have been more commendable had it not urged them to carry matters to such an excess, that the *lives* of the accused parties were in the end forfeited: for the emperor, at the urgent request of Ithacius, and contrary to his promise made to St Martin, condemned Priscillianus and some of his followers to death. St Martin had before strongly urged Ithacius to desist from his violent accusations, and after this business refused to communicate with the Ithacians. Moreover, St Ambrose, the Pope Siricius, and the Council of Turin in 398, condemned the Ithacians, maintaining that it was far from the part of a bishop to be in any way instrumental in causing the *death* of heretics. St Ambrose in his writings also evinced his disgust at these cruelties, and the irregular condemnation of the Priscillianists.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1034. (*See C. SARAGOSSA.*)

BORDEAUX (1080). Held in 1080, in the month of October. Two legates, three archbishops, and several bishops were present. The notorious Berenger here, for the thirteenth and last time, gave account of his faith, either in confirmation of what he had declared at Rome in this same year, or to retract what he had just published in contradiction of that declaration. In the end he died in the communion of the Church, January 5, 1088, in his ninetieth year.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 381.

BORDEAUX (1255). Held on the 13th of April 1255. In it Gerard of Matemort, Archbishop of Bordeaux, published a constitution consisting of thirty articles. Amongst other things it is enacted, that all beneficed

clergy and others having the cure of souls, shall be constantly in residence; that those persons who remain in a state of excommunication for forty days shall pay nine livres, or some other suitable fine; it is absolutely forbidden (canon 11) to absolve any one under excommunication, even at the point of death, if he, or some one for him, hath not made satisfaction to the party interested, the priest so absolving him to be bound for him. To such an extent had the abuse of excommunications been carried in that age, that it was a common case to excommunicate in execution of a judgment, or on account of some money debt remaining unpaid. The 5th article enjoins that the consecrated host shall not be given to children who are brought to communion on Easter day, but only bread which has been blessed. This appears to have been a relic of the ancient custom of giving the Holy Eucharist to children from the period of their baptism, which is still preserved in the Greek Church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 738.

BORDEAUX (1583). Held in 1583, by Antoine, Archbishop of Bordeaux. Thirty-six regulations, relating to matters of faith, morals, and discipline, were drawn up, similar to those of the Council of Rheims in the same year. The last of these refers to the proper regulation of seminaries, and is divided into nine chapters, which enjoin, amongst other things, that they should be built in some open spot not far from the cathedral church; that mass and prayer should be said daily; that the members of the seminary should obey the superior and other officers; that they shall be modest in their behaviour, never eat out of the seminary, and never go out without leave; that all shall go to bed at nine, and rise at four in the morning, &c.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 944.

BORDEAUX (1624). Held in 1624, under Francis, Archbishop of Bordeaux, and cardinal. In this council twenty-two chapters, containing a large number of canons, were published, chiefly relating to discipline.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1632.

BOURGES (1031). [*Concilium Bituricense.*] Held in November 1031, under Aymo de Bourbon, Archbishop of Bourges. Twenty-five canons were published, the first of which orders the name of St Martial to be placed amongst

those of the apostles. The third forbids bishops or their secretaries to take any money on account of ordination. The seventh orders all ecclesiastics to observe the tonsure, and to be shaved. The twelfth forbids the exacting of any fee for baptism, penance, or burials, but permits the voluntary offerings of the faithful upon these occasions to be accepted.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 864.

BOURGES (1225). Held November 30th, 1225, by the legate, the Cardinal of St Angelo, assisted by about one hundred French bishops. Here Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and his opponent, Amauri de Montfort (who claimed to be Count of Toulouse by virtue of grants from Innocent III., and from the king, which he pretended had been made to his father and himself), pleaded their cause, Raymond on his part humbly praying for absolution and promising to bring all his lands into obedience to the Roman Church, without, however, any decision being arrived at. The pope's demand of two prebends in each abbey and cathedral church, and one prebend in every other conventual church throughout France, was rejected. When some few of the bishops appeared to be inclined to grant this, the deputies of the chapters boldly declared before the legate and all present, that the chapters which they represented would never, and under no circumstances, accede to the demand. After this the legate declared that the Pope had issued a commission for visiting all the abbeys of France and setting them in order, which greatly exasperated the bishops, who clearly saw that if such an act was permitted to pass unopposed their own lawful jurisdiction over the abbeys would be taken from them; they therefore unanimously declared that they would never, whilst they lived, consent to such an usurpation.—*Chron. Turonense. Mart., Vet. Scrip.*, tom. v. col. 1067.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 291.

BOURGES (1276). Held September 13th, 1276, by Simon de Brie, cardinal and legate. Sixteen articles were published, tending chiefly to the maintenance of the jurisdiction and immunities of the Church, and the freedom of elections. Amongst other things, the laity were forbidden to make use of violence or threats, in order to obtain the removal of censures. Secular judges were forbidden to constrain ecclesiastics to appear before them, &c. The

canons were sent by the cardinal to every one of the French bishops.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1017.

BOURGES (1280.) Held in April 1280. In this council it was ordered that the bishops or their officials should issue monitions, by name, to those clerks who exercised the following low trades, viz., those of blacksmith, cobbler, currier, and public-house keeper, also makers of weapons (*macellarii*) and those *vestes virgatas*¹ *continue publice portantes*. Mart., *Thes. Anec.*, tom iv. col 191.

BOURGES (1286.) Held on the 19th September 1286, by Simon de Beaulieu, Archbishop of Bourges, assisted by three of his suffragans. Here a constitution, consisting of thirty-five articles, was published, reiterating and enforcing those of the preceding councils. Amongst other things, it was ordered that the ecclesiastical judges should annul all unlawful marriages, and separate the parties, whoever they might be; that every beneficed person who should continue for one year under excommunication, should be deprived of his benefice; that curates should keep a list of all the excommunicated persons in their parishes, and publicly denounce them every Sunday and festival; that they should warn their people to confess at least once in every year; that bows and all kinds of arms should be removed from churches; that all Sundays and festivals be properly kept, &c. Other canons relate to the regulars.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1246. Mart., *Thes. Anec.* tom. iv. col. 199 and 203.

BOURGES (1432.) See Council of BASLE, page 58.

BOURGES (1438.) Held in 1438. Convoled by King Charles VII., who presided; five archbishops, twenty-five bishops, and a large number of princes, lords, and ecclesiastics, being present. Pope Eugene IV. and the fathers of the Council of Basle, sent legates. In this council the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction was drawn up. The French clergy had previously addressed memorials on the subject to the Council of Basle, and the council, in answer to these memorials, had forwarded to the King of France various decrees tending to re-establish the freedom of the Church in elections, at the same time begging him to cause them to be received in his kingdom. These decrees form the basis of the Pragmatic Sanction, which contains twenty-three

¹ Striped and gaudy dresses.

articles. This constitution, styled by some writers the rampart of the Gallican Church, takes from the popes very nearly the whole of the power which they possessed, of presenting to benefices, and of judging ecclesiastical causes within the kingdom.

The twenty-three articles of the Pragmatic Sanction were drawn up upon the decrees of the Council of Basle, hence the papal sanction of those decrees also approved twenty-one of those articles.

Art. 1. Relates to the authority of œcumenical councils.

2. Relates to the power and authority of the Council of Basle.

3. Relates to elections, and enjoins freedom of election, &c.

4. Abolishes all reservations of benefices, &c.

5. Relates to collations and benefices, and forbids expective graces, &c.

6. Relates to judgment and causes; orders that all causes [except the greater causes] which happen at places more than four days' journey from Rome, shall be decided on the spot.

7. Relates to frivolous appeals, and confirms the decree of the 20th September of Basle.

8. Confirms the decree of the 21st session of Basle, "de pacificis possessoribus."

9. Limits the number of cardinals (twenty-third decree of Basle).

10. Relates to the annates.

11. Contains regulations relating to divine service, and enjoins that the laudable customs of particular churches in France shall be observed.

12-19. Relate to the economy of cathedral Churches.

20. Relates to concubinary clerks.

21. Relates to excommunications.

22. Treats of interdicts.

23. Concerns the pope's bulls and letters.

These articles were confirmed by the French parliament, July 13th, 1439; and the law so enacted was called the Pragmatic Sanction, and was observed in France up to the period of the concordat, which suppressed the chief part of it. During this interval the popes made vigorous attacks upon the Pragmatic Sanction, which were as vigorously

resisted by the king, the parliament, and the bishops.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 1429.

BOURGES (1528.) Held by François de Tournon, Archbishop of Bourges, with his suffragans. Twenty-three decrees were made, of which the first five relate to the Lutherans, and the rest to matters of discipline. Curates are exhorted to instruct their parishioners, and in order to give more time for that purpose, they are directed to abridge the prayers made at sermon time. Provincial councils are directed to be held every three years, according to the decree of the Council of Constance. Bishops are ordered to visit their dioceses annually, in order that they may take due care of the sheep entrusted to them. The regulations of the Council of Constance and of the Pragmatic Sanction, concerning the residence of canons and other ministers, are confirmed; also that which directs that the psalms be chanted slowly, and with proper pauses. Curates are directed to explain to the people the commandments of God, the Gospel, and something out of the Epistle for the day. Pastors are enjoined to forbid penitents to reveal the nature of their penance, and themselves to observe secrecy, both as to what is revealed to them at confession, and also as to the penance they have imposed. No confraternity to be erected without the consent of the ordinary. It was further enacted that the bishops should have a discretionary power to retrench the number of festival days according as they should think best. That bishops should not grant letters dimissory, without having first examined the candidate for orders, and found him qualified; and then to those only who have a benefice or a patrimonial title. Further, that nuns shall not leave their monastery. Afterwards the council made various decrees concerning the jurisdiction and liberty of the clergy: the first is upon the subject of monitions; the second upon the residence of curates, that no dispensation for non-residence be granted without a full investigation of the reasons; the third respects cemeteries, which it orders to be kept enclosed and locked up.

After this, four-tenths for two years were voted to King Francis I., to make up the ransom of his two sons, then hostages at Madrid, to be levied on all the clergy, secular and regular.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 426.

BOURGES (1584.) Held in September 1584. Forty-

six chapters were published, each containing several canons (preceded by the confession of faith made by those present).

1. Relates to the worship and service of God; 2 and 3, of the faith and preaching; 4, of the abuse of Holy Scriptures, and orders that the Latin version of the Scriptures shall alone be used, and that bishops' secretaries shall keep a list of prohibited books, which shall be shown annually to publishers; 5, of avoiding heretics; 6, of invocation of saints and of festivals; 7, of pilgrimages; 10 and 11, of relics and images; 12, of the celebration of the holy office, &c.; 16, of cemeteries; 17, of tradition; 18-28, of the sacraments; 31, of excommunication; 34, of canons and chapters; 35, of parish rectors, orders them to reside, and to say mass themselves; orders bishops to divide parishes which become too populous; where there is no parsonage-house, it directs the bishop to take care to provide one at the expense of the parishioners; 36, of benefices; 40, of witchcraft and incantations; 41 and 42, of simony, concubinary priests, &c.; 43, of hospitals; 45, of the laity, forbids them to sit with the clerks at Church, bids them to abstain from dances, plays, &c., also from the use of frizzled hair; 46, of synods.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1067,

BRAGA (560).¹ Held about 560, by Lucretius, the metropolitan, assisted by seven other bishops, against the errors of the Priscillianists. They drew up twenty-two canons, mostly relating to ceremonies.

2. Forbids bishops in visitation to exact anything beyond the third of the revenue of each church for repairs, &c., except two crowns (*duos solidos*) *pro honore Cathedralæ*. [This is the first mention of the *Cathedraticum*.]

3. Forbids the bishop to use any other salutation to the people than that which rests upon apostolical tradition, viz., *Dominus vobiscum*, to which the people shall answer, *Et cum Spiritu tuo*. (Previously, according to Alcuinus, it had been the custom for bishops to use the form *Pax vobis*, the other salutation, *Dominus vobiscum*, being confined to the priests.)

¹ Florez seems to show (*España sag.* t. 15. p. 118) that this council was held in 561, and that St Martin of Dumio was present. The Rule of Faith against the Priscillianists drawn up in the Council of Toledo, 400, was alluded to in this Synod. Florez, 6, p. 122, § 191, &c., Council (at Braga probably) in Galicia in 447.

The seventh orders a tripartite division of the property of each Church; one for the bishop, another for the clergy, and the third for the repairs or lights of the Church, of which the archdeacon should give in an account to the bishop.

The ninth enjoins the deacons to wear the stole over the shoulder, and not to conceal it under the tunicle, in order to distinguish them from the sub-deacons.

The tenth directs that the sacred vessels be carried only by persons in holy orders.

The eleventh forbids the readers to chant in the Church in a secular dress, and to let their hair [or beard]¹ grow.

The twelfth forbids the singing of any hymns in Church, save the Psalms, and passages taken from the Old or New Testament.

The thirteenth forbids laymen to enter the *sacrarium*, or chancel, in order to communicate.

The fourteenth orders clerks who are unwilling to eat flesh, to avoid the suspicion of Priscillianism, to be compelled to eat at least herbs boiled with meat.²

The eighteenth forbids burials within the Church.

The twenty-first directs that the alms of the faithful shall be collected by a clerk, and distributed amongst the clergy once or twice a year.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 836.

BRAGA (572). Held in June 572, by St Martin, the Bishop, at the head of twelve bishops. In this council the four first œcumenical councils were acknowledged, but not the fifth, which was not yet recognised in Spain. Ten canons were drawn up.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 894.

BRAGA (675). Held probably in 675, in the time of King Wamba. Eight bishops were present, who drew up nine canons, in order to remedy certain abuses which had crept in.

The second forbids the offering of milk instead of wine, and also the dipping the bread in the wine at the Holy Eucharist.

The third forbids using the sacred vessels and ornaments of the Church for profane purposes.

¹ "Granos." Garsius and Binius suppose this to have been a part of the dress. St Isidore tells us that it refers to the hair.—See THOMPSON, tom. i. 722.

² See C. ANCYRA, canon 14.

The fourth forbids the priest to celebrate mass, or to receive the communion, without having the "orarium" or stole over both shoulders, and crossed upon his breast.

In some of these canons complaint is made of the conduct of the bishops, whom they accuse of augmenting their private estates at the expense of the Church.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 561.

BRAGA (1566). Held from September 8, 1566, to March 1567, by the Archbishop D. Bartholome de los Martires, who presided over the bishops of Coimbra, Viseo, Miranda, and Oporto. Regulations for the reformation of manners and the better order of divine service.—Florez, *Esp. Sagrada*, xxi. 189.

BRENTFORD (963). [*Concilium Brandanfordense.*] Held about the year 963, by King Edgar. Here the ordinances of King Edwin were annulled, and the property which he had usurped and plundered, restored to the Church and monasteries. Also St Dunstan was recalled from exile, and shortly afterwards preferred, successively, to the sees of Worcester and Canterbury.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 657. Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. i. p. 224.

BRESLAU (1268). [*Concilium Uratislaviense.*] Held in February 1268, by Guy, cardinal and legate, who there preached a crusade for the deliverance of the Holy Land; and succours were accordingly granted.—Conc. xi. Tom. 858.

BRESTIA. A Synod was held at *Brest Litofsky*, in Poland, in 1593 (others 1595), by command of Sigismund III., King of Poland, under Michael Ragosa, Metropolitan of Kieff, at which many of the Greek bishops of the province, to please the prince, declared for the supremacy of the pope, and signed a deed of union with the Roman Church.

Immediately afterwards an *orthodox* Synod was held here, at which Michael Ragosa was anathematised and deposed.

BRETAGNE (848). [*Concilium Britannicum.*] Held in 848, by order of the Duke of Bretagne,¹ to put a check upon the practice, of which the bishops were guilty, of taking money for ordinations. St Convoyon, the founder and first abbot of the abbey of Redon, accompanied two

¹ Nomenoy, who had declared himself King of Bretagne.

bishops, who were sent to Rome upon this business. (See C. of ROME, 848.)

BREVVY (519). Held in 513 or 519, at Brevy, now called *Llandewy-Brevy*, near Lampeter, in Cardiganshire, against the Pelagian heresy. St David attended, and at the close of the Synod, St Dubritius resigned his see to St David. The Synod allowed him to remove the see from Caerleon to Menevia. *Ang.-Sac.*, pt. 2. p. 638.

BRIONNE (1050). [*Concilium Briotnense.*] Held in 1050. This was rather a conference than a council; in it Beranger was silenced, and made to profess the Catholic faith.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1054.

BRISTOL (1216). [*Concilium Bristolense.*] Held under the pope's legate, on St Martin's day, in 1216, upon matters relating to discipline. Eleven bishops of England and Wales were present, with others of the inferior clergy, and of the nobility who continued faithful to Henry III. The barons who opposed that monarch were excommunicated.—Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol i. p. 546.

BRIXEN (1080) (in the Tyrol). [*Concilium Brixense.*] Held in 1080, by the Emperor, Henry IV. Cardinal Hugo the White, and thirty bishops were present. They maintained the rights of the emperor against Pope Gregory VII., who had excommunicated him; they proceeded so far as to depose Gregory, and to elect Guibert of Ravenna in his place, who took the name of Clement III.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 389.

BRUGES (1481). See **TOURNAY.**

BUDA (1279). [*Concilium Budense.*] Held on the 14th September 1279, by Philip, Bishop of Fermo, legate of the holy see. Sixty-nine canons were published, containing much the same regulations as others drawn up about that time, and showing that the Churches of Hungary and Poland were in great disorder. Eight of these canons relate to the dress and conduct of the clergy. The ninth forbids the clergy to sentence any one to corporal punishment, or to be present at the trial of capital causes. The thirteenth relates to the proper reverence to be observed during divine service; orders all clerks, whenever they pass the altar, the image of the Virgin, or the crucifix, and whenever they enter the choir for the holy office, to bow their heads; also forbids priests to sing the hours without their surplices.

The sixteenth orders that all beneficed clergymen, having the care of souls, shall reside and discharge their duties in person, and not by a curate. The nineteenth relates to the attendance of all persons who have been cited at synods, and the proper vestments of the prelates present there. The twenty-second declares that it is not to be suffered that any one should serve at the altar or read the epistle without a surplice and cassock. The twenty-eighth declares that those persons only are to be admitted to preach who have either the pope's or the bishop's licence. Also treats of questors. The fifty-eighth excommunicated those secular powers which forbade appeals to the holy see.

It is also ordered, canon 33, that all the faithful should hear divine service, and especially mass, every Sunday and holyday in their own parish, and should not wander to any other Church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1071.

BURGOS (1080). [*Concilium Burgense.*] Held in 1080 (according to others in 1076), by Cardinal Richard, legate. In this council the Roman office was substituted for the Gothic ritual, hitherto in use.

According to the Chronicle of Don Pelago (*Esp. Sag.*, xiv. 472), Adefonsus, sixth King of Leon, requested Pope Gregory VII. to impose the Roman Office for the Mass, "*Romanum Mysterium*," throughout *his kingdom*. The pope sent Cardinal Richardus, Abbot of Marseilles, who held this council in the 1123 era, *i.e.*, A.D. 1085.—Tom. x. Conc. 1815.

C.

CABERSUSSA (394). See CARTHAGE, 393.

CAIRO (or MISRA) (1086). Held in 1086. Certain bishops of Egypt having, by their conduct, given offence to many of the principal Christian inhabitants of Misra, the latter requested Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, to deprive them of his communion; and such was their importunity in this request, that they extorted from the patriarch a written promise of compliance. So far was he, however, from fulfilling this promise, that, with one exception, he retained about himself the very parties against whom exception had been taken. The other prelates, indignant at this conduct, presented a memorial to the *visier*, requesting him to

examine and pass sentence upon the conduct of their patriarch.

The synod, accordingly, assembled in a country-house belonging to the vizier, at Misra, near Cairo. The vizier opened it by an harangue, in which he severely rebuked the prelates for having neglected to pay that honour which, as he was informed, was due from them to their patriarch; it was impossible, he said, for him, unacquainted with their customs, and ignorant of their laws, to judge in the case before him; he therefore requested both the accusers and the accused to prepare from their canons and laws such a compendium as they thought most likely to enable him to pronounce a correct judgment. This was, accordingly, done by both parties, and at the end of three weeks (in the course of which he punished with death his head gardener for his contemptuous conduct towards the patriarch) the vizier summoned the bishops before him, and telling them that he had not read the collection of canons which they had put into his hands, and that he did not intend to read them; declared that he could do nothing else but exhort them to unity and peace, as worshippers of the same God, and as professors of the same religion; that he had already heard complaints of the love of money exhibited by some of those before him; that the proper use which a bishop should make of money, was not to pamper his appetite and to minister to his luxuries, but as Christ Himself has commanded, to give alms to the poor, &c. After much more excellent advice, he concluded by directing that each prelate should receive a written document assuring him of security and protection.

Cyril and his suffragans retired from his presence, rejoicing that so dangerous an appeal had had so happy an issue.—*Neale's Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church.*

CAIRO (1239). The peace of the Church being much disturbed by the complaints which were urged against Cyril, seventy-fifth patriarch of Alexandria, fourteen bishops met together in council at Misra, near Cairo, and held a conference with him, the end of which was their agreeing to return into concord with him, upon condition of his subscribing certain chapters containing the points necessary to be reformed in the Church. To this Cyril consented, and the chapters were drawn up accordingly. At the head of these chapters was placed the confession of faith according to the

decisions of the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, and Ephesus (which alone are recognised by the Jacobites). Then follows a profession concerning the observation of all things contained in Holy Scripture, the apostolical canons, and the decrees of those councils which the Jacobite Church receives, as well as of those customs which were in use in the Coptic Church.

Amongst the new decrees then made were the following:—That the patriarch should not excommunicate any one in the diocese of another bishop, except upon lawful and canonical grounds; and not even so, except the bishop, having been duly admonished to do this, should refuse, without assigning an adequate cause.

That (on the other hand) the patriarch should not *absolve* one excommunicated by his own bishop, unless it should appear that the excommunication was unjust, and the bishop himself, after two monitions, should refuse to do so.

That each bishop should have entire control over his own diocese; that nothing should be taken from it *territorially*; and that so in like manner each bishop should always confine himself to what had been the boundaries of his diocese on the day of his consecration. That the patriarch should not apply to his own use the offerings made in the churches on festival days, and at certain accustomed times, but that they should be at the disposal of the bishop of the diocese; except the patriarch should consent, at his consecration, to take such offerings in lieu of his usual pension.—*Le Quien*, Neale, vol. ii. p. 302.

CALNE (979). [*Concilium Calnense.*] Held in 979, in the fourth year of St Edward, king and martyr, in consequence of the dispute then rife between the monks and clergy, the former of whom were unduly favoured by Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the great prejudice of the latter.¹ Dunstan himself presided in this council, at the head of the chief nobility, the bishops, and other ecclesiastics. No decision was, however, arrived at, owing to a singular accident which broke up the council—the floor of the chamber in which they were assembled giving way, all were precipitated to the ground, except Dunstan,

¹ Beornelme, a Scotch bishop, was present here, invited by the secular clergy to defend their canon.

whose seat escaped.—*Baronius*, A.D. 977. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 724. *Wilkins' Conc.*, vol. i. p. 263.

CAMBRAI (1565). [*Concilium Cameracense.*] Held in August 1565, Maximilian, Archbishop and Duke of Cambrai, presiding, assisted by the Bishops of Arras, St Omer, and Namur. Twenty-two decrees were published, each of which contains several chapters.

The titles of the decrees are as follow :—

1. Of heretical books.
2. Of theological lectures in chapters and monasteries.
3. Of schools.
4. Of seminaries.
5. Of doctrine, and the preaching of the word of God.
6. Of ceremonies, and the holy offices.
7. Of the ministry.
8. Of the life and conversation of clerks.
9. Of the examination of bishops.
10. Of the examination of pastors.
11. Of the residence of bishops and curates.
12. Of the residence of pastors, and their duties.
13. Of visitation.
14. Of the ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction.
15. Of matrimony.
16. Of tithes, &c.
17. Of purgatory.
18. Of monasteries.
19. Of the saints.
20. Of images.
21. Of relics.
22. Of indulgences.

The third, relating to schools, contains six chapters; it orders that they be visited by the curate every month, and by the rural dean at least once in each year, in order that a report may be made to the bishop.

The twelfth enjoins the wearing of the surplice and stole by the priests, when they carry the holy sacrament to the sick, and also that a clerk carry a lighted taper and bell, that the people may be warned of its approach, and of their duty towards the holy sacrament and to the sick person.

Finally, the council confirmed the decrees of the Council of Trent.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 147.

CANTERBURY (603). [*Concilium Cantuariense.*] Held about 603, by St Augustine, in order to confirm the foundation of a monastery which he was about to build near Canterbury, to be dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul. The King Ethelbert and his Queen Bertha were present. Augustine did not live to finish this monastery and church; but the work was completed by Archbishop Laurence, who succeeded him.—Spelman, *Conc. Angl.*, cited by Wilkins, vol. i. p. 28.

CANTERBURY (969). Held in 969, by Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, Edgar, the king, being present, who, advocating the celibacy of the secular clergy, spoke with warmth of their present negligent and dissolute conduct. "How negligently," he said, "they conduct the services of the Church: they seem to come there rather for their own amusement than to sing the praises of the Almighty. I cannot refrain from speaking about a matter which is the cause of tears to all good people, and a subject of profane jesting to the wanton. The clergy give themselves up to the pleasures of the table, and to every shameful excess: they expend in gambling and debauchery those revenues which were left for the support and comfort of the poor." At the end of this celebrated speech of King Edgar, a plain hint is given of the violent measures then in contemplation by that monarch and the archbishop. "What wilt thou reply," said the prince, "to these complaints? I know, I know what thou wilt reply: when thou sawest a thief, thou didst not run with him, neither didst thou have thy portion with the adulterers. Thou hast convicted, thou hast besought, thou hast rebuked them. *Words have been despised; we must come to blows; and the royal authority shall not be wanting to thee.*"—Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 246.

CANTERBURY (991). Held in 991, in which those of the clergy of the cathedral who refused to become monks were turned out, and monks established in their places, to whom also great privileges and possessions were granted.—Spelman, *Conc. Angl.*

CANTERBURY (1439). Held November 1, 1439, by Henry Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury. A constitution was made for augmenting vicarages.

It declares that there were in the province of Canterbury

many vicarages belonging to rich churches, too poor to afford a livelihood to their vicars, who were unable to afford the necessary expense of prosecuting a suit before the ordinary for the augmentation of their portion. It then orders that proceedings in such cases shall thenceforth be summary, and conducted in a plain manner, and that ordinaries shall admit such vicars to prosecute such causes "*in formâ pauperum*," and shall take care to assign them such portions as shall be suitable to the revenues of their several churches. See for a history of the long struggle against the appropriation of the great tithes, which was maintained in England both by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, Bishop Kennet, *Case of Improvements*, sect. 18-24.—Johnson, *Ecc. Canons*, A.D. 1439. Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1282. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. iii. p. 535.

CANTERBURY (1554). Held in 1554, by Cardinal Pole, in which, for the sake of peace, the alienation of Church property, made in the preceding reigns, was sanctioned.—Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. iii. p. 101.

CAPPADOCIA (372). Held in 372, but it is uncertain at what place. In this synod the rights of the newly elected metropolitan see of Tyana were defined, both Basilus the Great, of Cesarea, and Anthimus, of Tyana, claiming metropolitanical jurisdiction over the sees of Cappadocia Secunda. The synod endeavoured to settle the dispute by erecting the new see of Sasima, which, however, Anthimus afterwards, by some means, got under his own jurisdiction.

CAPPADOCIA (376). Held in 376, in which the book of St Basil on the Holy Spirit was approved.

CAPUA (389). [*Concilium Capuanum*.] Held about the year 389,¹ for the purpose of putting an end to the schism which divided the Church at Antioch. The Emperor Theodosius granted it at the instant prayer of the Western Christians. The circumstances of the case were as follow:—After the death of Paulinus, Flavianus remained the sole bishop of Antioch, but Paulinus, before his death, had nominated Evagrius to succeed him, who was recognised by the party of Paulinus as bishop. None of the acts of the

¹ According to Ughellus in 392 (but wrongly?) 391. Newman's *Fleury*, index. See also Can. 38, CARTHAGE, 397, in the *Spanish Collec.*, col. 133.

council have come down to us ; but St Ambrose, who was present, speaks of it as having been numerously attended by bishops ; he also says that the absence of Flavianus was the reason why the affair could not be finally decided in this council. However, in order to preserve the peace of the Church, they granted communion to all the Eastern bishops who professed the Catholic faith, and entrusted to Theophilus of Alexandria and the other Egyptian bishops the decision of the differences between Flavianus and Evagrius, because they were biassed by no prejudices, and had not joined the communion of either party. See the Councils of Antioch, Constantinople, Alexandria (362), &c., on this subject.

Several regulations were also made, one of which, given in III. con., Carthage, forbids to re-baptise or re-ordain any person ; another forbids the translation of bishops.

Moreover, in the council, Bonosus, Bishop of Macedonium in Macedonia, was condemned, who said that the blessed Virgin ceased to be a Virgin after parturition, and also, Helvidius, the founder of the Antidico-marianites, who asserted that the Virgin had other children after the Lord's birth.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1039. *Ital. Sacr.*, vol. vi. p. 301. St Ambrose.

CARIA (368). Held in the end of 367 or early in 368, by the semi-Arians of Asia, of whom thirty-four were present, in which they refused to admit the word "Homo-ousion," and adhere to the creed of Antioch and Seleucia. In consequence of this council, that which was called to meet at Tarsus in the spring of 368 for the furtherance of orthodox faith in the East, was forbidden.

CARLISLE (1138). By the Legate Albericus, Bishop of Ostia. The king, David, held his court here, at the time ; nothing is known of what passed.—Skinner, 249.

CARPENTRAS (527). [*Concilium Carpentoractense.*] Held in 527. Cæsarius of Arles presiding at the head of sixteen bishops. They published but one canon, which forbids the bishop to take any thing from the parishes within his diocese, provided he has a sufficient revenue for his maintenance. In this council also, Agrecius, Bishop of Antibes, was suspended during a year for conferring orders contrary to the canons.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1663.

CARRION (1130). St Zoil de Carrion in Spain, where Cardinal Humbert presided, February 4, 1130, when the bishops of Oviedo, Leon, and Salamanca were deposed. See those bishops in *Esp. Sagrada*, t. 19, p. 307, t. 20, p. 497, t. 18, p. 122, and t. 16, p. 200.

CARTHAGE (or AFRICA) (253). [*Concilium Carthaginiense.*] Held by St Cyprian, at the head of sixty-six bishops, about 253 (?). Here a letter was read from Fidus, who informed them that another bishop named Therapis, had granted reconciliation to Victor, who had been ordained priest a long time before, without his having undergone a full and entire course of penance, and that, too, when the people had not required it, nor even known any thing about it; and there was no plea of necessity, such as illness, to constrain him. The council expressed great indignation at the act, and administered a strong rebuke to Therapis; nevertheless, they would not deprive of communion Victor, who had been admitted to it by his own bishop.

This same Fidus also started the opinion, that holy baptism should not be administered to infants until the eighth day, that being the divine law in regard to circumcision; but no bishop present supported him. On the contrary, they decided, unanimously, that God hath no respect either to persons or ages; that circumcision was but the figure of the mystery of Jesus Christ, and that no one may be shut out from the grace of God. St Cyprian, who wrote this decision to Fidus in his own name and in that of his colleagues, gives the reason for it in these words: "If the greatest sinners coming to the faith receive remission of sin and baptism, how much less can we reject a little infant just born into the world, free from actual sin, and only so far a sinner as being born of Adam after the flesh, and by its first birth having contracted the pollution of the former death; it ought to have so much the easier access to the remission of sins, inasmuch, as not its own sins, but those of others are remitted."

These words are quoted by St Jerome in his three dialogues against the Pelagians; and by St Augustine in his 294th sermon, in order to prove that belief in original sin has always been the faith of the Church.—Cyprian, *Epist.* 55. Tom. i. Conc. p. 741.

CARTHAGE (254). Held in 254, by St Cyprian, at

the head of thirty-six bishops. It was decided that Basilides, Bishop of Leon, and Martial, Bishop of Astorga, could not be any longer recognised as bishops, being both of them amongst the "Libellatici," and also guilty of various crimes.—*Fleury*. Tom. i. Conc. p. 746.

CARTHAGE (255). Held in 255. Eighteen bishops of Numidia having applied to St Cyprian for advice upon the subject of baptism, those who, having received the form out of the Church, were anxious to be received into her; he, with the assent of the council, replied that they ought, by all means, to follow the ancient practice, which was to baptise everyone received into the Church, who had previously been baptised only by heretics or schismatics.—*Cyp., Ep.*, 79. Tom i. Conc. p. 761.

CARTHAGE (255). About this time several councils were held at Carthage upon the same subject. In this council seventy-one bishops were present from the provinces of Africa and Numidia, St Cyprian presiding. They decided that there can be no valid baptism out of the Catholic Church, and addressed a synodical letter to Stephen upon the subject, informing him of their decision upon this and other matters. With regard to external baptism they speak thus:—"Eos qui sint foris extra ecclesiam tincti, et apud hæreticos et schismaticos profanæ aquæ labe maculati, quando ad nos atque ad ecclesiam, quæ una est, venerint, baptizari oportere; eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad accipiendum Spiritum S. nisi accipiant et ecclesiæ baptismum."—*St Cyp., Ep.*, 72.

Nothing is more clear than that the whole of Africa followed this custom from ancient times, as well as Cappadocia, Galatia, Cilicia, and several other Asiatic provinces.

This matter was the cause of a dispute between St Cyprian and Stephen of Rome; which last had no sooner received the synodical letter above-mentioned, than he refused to confirm the decision of the council, and instantly separated himself from the communion of Cyprian and the other bishops composing the council.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 763.

CARTHAGE (255). Another council was held in September in the same year, attended by eighty-seven bishops from the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania. The letter of Jubayen was read, who had

written to consult St Cyprian upon the subject of baptism, and likewise the answer of Cyprian. Also the letter of Cyprian and the former council to Stephen was read, and the answer of the latter. It does not appear that this answer, although accompanied by threats of excommunication, had the effect of shaking the opinion of St Cyprian.

After these papers had been read, St Cyprian delivered a discourse, in which forcibly, yet mildly, testifying his disapproval of the conduct of those who would, as it were, make themselves bishops over other bishops,¹ in wishing to compel them, by a tyrannical fear, to submit absolutely to their opinion; he again protested that he left to each full liberty in his faith as to the subject before them, without judging or desiring to separate them from communion with himself on that account. The other bishops present then delivered their opinion, afterwards St Cyprian himself declared his own, and all agreed unanimously.

Nevertheless, Pope Stephen, filled with anger, refused even to grant an audience to the deputies of the council, and St Cyprian wrote upon the subject to Firmilian, Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia. The latter in his answer declares twice, that in his opinion the pope had entirely broken peace with Africa; and that he did not fear to assert that Stephen, by the very act of separating all others from his communion, had, in fact, separated himself from all the other faithful, and therefore from the Communion of the Catholic Church; and, by so doing, had really become *himself* schismatical. This contest lasted until the pontificate of Sixtus, who succeeded Stephen, and it seems the bishops of Africa, little by little, yielded their opinion. St Jerome says, that many of the same bishops who had declared in council the invalidity of heretical baptism, afterwards concurred in a contrary decree.

As for St Cyprian himself, the Church of Rome has always expressed veneration for him, and has admitted his name into the sacred canon of the mass, and probably he died in communion with her; his martyrdom took place in

¹ "Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli, quid sentiamus, proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem si diversum senserit amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad observandi necessitatem collegas suos adigit."

258, under Valerian, and after the death of Stephen, which happened in 257.

"This holy bishop," writes St Augustine, "presiding though he did over so magnificent a church, and being himself so distinguished for understanding and eloquence, and for virtue, nevertheless, permitted others to combat his opinion without desiring to separate himself from their communion; and when we consider what multitudes would have followed him had he separated, we cannot but admire the spirit of real charity which distinguished him throughout this celebrated dispute."—Tom. i. Conc. p. 786. Pagi.

CARTHAGE (311). Held in 311, by seventy bishops of Numidia, under Secundus, Bishop of Tigisis, and primate of Africa, at the instigation of the notorious Donatus, Bishop of Casa Nigra, who, vexed at not having been called upon to consecrate Cecilianus, condemned him in his absence, for the offence of which he had himself been guilty (*see* C. CIRTA), and consecrated Majorinus in his place; many of the bishops present were also those which had been condemned at Cirta. They annulled the election of Cecilianus to the see of Carthage on the plea that Felix of Aphonga, who had consecrated him, was a *Traditor*,¹ and elected Majorinus in his stead. (*See* C. ROME, 313. C. CIRTA, 305.)

CARTHAGE (348). Held in 348 or 349, after a great number of the Donatists had united themselves to the Church, under Gratus, Bishop of Carthage. Bishops from all the provinces of Africa attended it, but neither their number nor the names of the greatest part of them are come down to us.

Gratus having returned thanks to Almighty God for the termination of the schism which had for so many years rent the African Church, they proceeded to publish fourteen canons. The first forbids to re-baptise those who have been baptised in the name of the Sacred Trinity; the second forbids to honour those as martyrs, who, by their indiscretion, have been instrumental in bringing about their own death, and treats generally of the honour due to the martyrs; the third and fourth forbid the clergy to dwell with women; it was also ruled, that three bishops are

¹ "*Traditores*," persons who, in the time of persecution, had delivered up the sacred books to the inquisitors.

necessary in order to judge a deacon, six for the trial of a priest, and twelve for that of a bishop.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 713.

CARTHAGE (390). Held in 390, by Genethlius, Bishop of Carthage. The number of the bishops present is unknown. They first drew up a profession of the Catholic faith, and then proceeded to publish thirteen canons.

The first enjoins belief in the Holy Trinity.

The second enjoins continence upon all the clergy

The third forbids the consecration of the chrism by priests, as also the consecration of virgins, and the reconciliation of penitents at public mass, by them.

The fourth allows a priest to re-admit to communion a penitent, being thereto authorised by his bishop.

The seventh orders, that those of the clergy receiving excommunicated persons shall be also excommunicated.

The twelfth forbids the consecration of a bishop without the consent of the metropolitan.

From the canons of this council it appears plainly, that the *bishop* was the *ordinary* minister in cases of penance, and the priest only in his absence, or in cases of necessity.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1158.

CARTHAGE (397). Held on August 28, 397, under Aurelius, the bishop, at the head of forty-four or forty-eight bishops, amongst whom was St Augustine. They published fifty canons. The first orders every bishop to ascertain from the primate, yearly, the day upon which the festival of Easter should be celebrated. The second enjoins that a council be held annually. The third directs that all the bishops and clergy shall acquire a knowledge of the canons of the Church before their consecration. The fourth forbids the ordination of deacons or the veiling of the consecrated virgins before their twenty-fifth year. The sixth forbids the administration of baptism or the eucharist to the dead. The twenty-first forbids any bishop to ordain the clergy of another diocese. The twenty-fourth forbids to offer anything at the altar but that which the Lord Himself commanded, *i.e.*, Bread and *wine mixed with water*. The twenty-ninth orders that mass be said fasting except on Holy Thursday. The thirty-fourth allows the baptism of sick persons unable to speak, if their desire of this be guaranteed by their friends. The thirty-ninth forbids the consecration of a

bishop by less than three bishops. The forty-sixth forbids the translation of bishops. The forty-seventh canon forbids the reading of any thing in the Church under the name of sacred Scripture, except the canonical writings, among which are included the apocryphal books of Tobit, Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, and the two books of Maccabees.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1165.

CARTHAGE (398). Held November 8th, 398, under Aurelius of Carthage, at the head of two hundred and fourteen or two hundred and fifteen bishops, including St Augustine. One hundred and four canons were published, chiefly relating to the life and conduct of the clergy.¹

1. Enjoins that no one be elevated to the episcopate without accurate inquiry first made as to his faith and moral character, in order to ascertain whether he hold the catholic faith, and have all the virtues necessary for the office; whether he be prudent, docile, moderate, chaste, sober, charitable, humble, well instructed in the word of God, &c.

The eight canons following are upon the ordination of bishops, priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, &c.

The 15th directs that bishops shall have nothing but what is plain and simple, either at table or in their furniture, and recommends that they should distinguish themselves only by the lustre of their faith and virtue.

The 16th prohibits bishops from reading the works of heathens, but allows those of heretics to be read in case of necessity.

¹Hardouin says of this Synod — *Silent de hoc concilio Ferrandus diaconus, Dionysius Exiguus, Codex Can. Eccl. Afric. omnesque Canonum collectores tum Græci tum Latini (Conc. ii. 975)*. The authenticity and genuineness of these canons are, however, maintained by Baronius and Tillemont. Schelstrate also sufficiently establishes their authority (*Eccles. Afric. Dissert.*, 3 Conc. viii. p. 210). They are given, together with the notes of Binius and others, by Labbe, ii. p. 1196, and Baluzi in his *Nov. Collect.*, col. 99, gives another canon, the 105th, which he found in an ancient MS. at Urgel, containing the acts of this Synod. Their authenticity is now generally acknowledged by Canonists.

It seems a mistake which some have fallen into to suppose that these canons were confirmed at Chalcedon. They, however, certainly were at the Council in Trullo.

The 22nd forbids that a bishop should ordain any one without the consent of his clergy, and the testimony of the laity.

The 24th orders that all persons leaving the church during the time of sermon be excommunicated.

The 34th forbids a bishop, whilst seated, to keep a priest standing.

The 36th speaks of priests as already fixed in parishes.

The 38th permits a deacon, in cases of great necessity, to administer the eucharist in the presence of a priest.

The 44th forbids clerks to let their hair grow long or to shave the beard.¹

The 51st and two following canons order the clergy to get their living by some honest trade.²

The 61st orders that a clergyman swearing by any creature be severely rebuked, and if he continues in fault he is to be excommunicated.

The 64th declares those persons not to be catholics who fast upon Sunday.

The 66th enjoins that the clergy who consider themselves harshly treated by their bishop, may appeal to a synod.

The 70th forbids all the clergy to keep company with heretics and schismatics.

The 83rd directs that greater respect be paid to old people, and to the poor, than to others.

The 84th allows every person whatever, whether heretic, Jew, or pagan, to remain in church until the mass of the catechumens.

The 85th excommunicates those who on the Festival Day of the Church absent the services and go to spectacles.

The 90th directs that the exorcists shall lay their hands on energumens³ daily.

The 92nd directs the exorcists to carry to the energumens, which sat in the church, their daily bread.

The 93rd and 94th order that the offerings of those who are at variance, or those who oppress the poor, be rejected.

¹ See BARCELONA, Conc. 540. § 3.

² These canons were directed against the Massaliani, who denied that it was lawful for the religious to labour for their bread. See Epiphanius, Hæres. 8vo.

³ *i.e.*, those possessed of the devil.

The 99th forbids a woman, however well instructed and holy, to presume to teach in an assembly of men.—
Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1196.

CARTHAGE (or AFRICA) (401). Held about the year 401, in June, by Aurelius, at the head of sixty-two bishops. It was agreed that deputies should be sent to Rome and to Milan, to submit for approval a scheme for putting into the order of clergy the children of Donatists who had been converted. The great scarcity of clergy in Africa arose chiefly from the oppression of the Donatists, and the extreme caution of the bishops in making choice of fit persons. Fifteen canons¹ were drawn up, one of which directs that the bishop shall live at his cathedral church. The decree concerning the continence of the clergy was confirmed.—
Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1241.

CARTHAGE (411). Held on the 1st of June 411, with a view of uniting the Donatists to the Church, and convincing them of the necessity of seeking for salvation in the Catholic Church.

These heretics appear to have increased to that degree in Africa, that they were in a fair way to overwhelm the catholics altogether, and from the time of their obtaining full liberty they were guilty of acts of violence equal to those of the greatest persecutors.

The catholic bishops having at last persuaded the Emperor Honorius to allow a public conference with the Donatists, Marcellinus was sent over to Africa by order of that prince, who appointed the first of June for the day of meeting. He also ordered that seven bishops only on each side should take part in the conference, to be chosen by the whole number, but that each party might have seven other bishops, with whom the disputants might take counsel, if they needed it; that no other bishop should be permitted to take part in the conference than the fourteen disputants; and lastly, that each party should bind itself to stand by the acts of those whom they had named to repre-

¹ It is doubtful whether these canons were published in this or in a preceding council held in the same year. C. AFRICA, A. D. 401. The note of Binius on this subject is as follows: "Triginta Duo canones de ecclesiasticâ disciplinâ, hoc aliisque præcedentibus conciliis Africanis constituti, in hac synodo confirmati, vel saltem iterum promulgati fuerint."—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1241, *note*.

sent them, and that notes of what passed should be taken by public notaries.

The Donatists, however, refused these terms, and desired that all their bishops should be present. The Catholics, on their part, wrote to Marcellinus, accepting his offers. In this letter they declare their object to be to show that the holy Church throughout all the world cannot perish, however great may be the sins of those who are members of it; and further they declare their willingness, if the Donatists can show that the Catholic Church is reduced to their communion, to submit themselves entirely to them, to vacate their sees and all their rights; but if the Catholics, on the other hand, can show that the only true Church is in their communion, and that the Donatists are in error, that they will, nevertheless, preserve to them the episcopal honour; that in cities where there are both a Catholic and a Donatist bishop, both shall sit alternately in the episcopal chair, and that when one of the two shall die, the survivor shall remain sole bishop.

Then they named, as their representative bishops in the conference, Aurelius of Carthage, Alipius of Tagaste, St Augustine, Vincentius of Capua, Fortunatus of Cirthea, Fortunatianus of Sicca, and Possidius of Calama. Seven others were also named for consultation, and four more as sureties that the result of the conference should be observed faithfully. The Donatists also (being compelled) named their representatives in the same order.

In the second sitting, after a long discussion, a delay was granted to the Donatists.

In the third sitting the Donatists did every thing in their power to prevent the question of the origin of the schism being inquired into; but Marcellinus caused the statement of Anulinus the Proconsul to be read, in which he set forth the complaints of the Donatists against Cecilianus. The Donatists, being thus hard pushed, presented a memorial, in which they endeavoured to show, from Holy Scripture, that bad pastors are spots and defilements in the Church, and that she cannot have amongst her children any that are openly wicked. After this document had been read, the Catholics answered it through St Augustine. He strongly established this verity, that the Church in this world must endure evil members, both open and concealed, and that

the good, although they are mingled with the evil, do not participate in their sin. From St Cyprian he showed that it was in the Church that the devil sowed the tares (which was contested by the Donatists), the object of the Catholics being to prove that neither the faults of Cecilianus nor of any one else could in any way affect their communion. Augustine then proceeded to say that Holy Scripture may not be so interpreted as to contradict itself, and that those passages which each party brought forward in support of their own views must in some way be reconciled. He showed that the Church is to be regarded in two lights, first, as she is, militant in this world, having within her both good and bad men; and secondly, as she will be, triumphant in Heaven, when all evil shall be purged out of her; he also explained how the faithful are bound in this life to separate from the evil, viz., by withdrawing from all participation in their evil deeds, not by separating from them outwardly.

When the Donatists found themselves too closely pressed by the reasoning of Augustine, they declared plainly that they did not conceive themselves to be permitted to join in any act of devotion with those who were not perfectly just, and true saints, for which reason they regarded the holy sacraments as utterly null and void, except they were administered by persons whom they conceived to be of irreproachable life, and for the same cause they insisted upon rebaptising Catholics. St Augustine, in reply, showed plainly that such a notion went at once to overthrow all external religion whatever, since difficulties without end must arise upon the question of the personal holiness of ministers.

They now proceeded to inquire into the original cause of the rupture between the Donatists and Catholics. The former maintained that they were justified in separating from Cecilianus, who had been consecrated by men who were themselves "*Traditores*."¹ However, the proofs which they alleged were without weight, and Augustine, in few words, again refuted their error, and further unravelled all their tricks and shifts. He bade them bear in mind, that Mensurius, the predecessor of Cecilianus, although charged with the same crime of having given up the sacred volumes,

¹ "*Traditores*." See note, page 120.

was yet never publicly condemned; that the Council of Carthage against Cecilianus condemned him in his absence, and that this was done by bishops who in the Council of Cirtha had been pardoned for the very same crime, in proof of which he caused the acts of the Council of Cirta, A.D. 305, to be read.

After various shifts on the part of the Donatists in the matter of this last-mentioned council, the acts of the Council of Rome, in 313, absolving Cecilianus, were read, and also the letter of Constantine to Eumalus, upon the subject of the contradictory judgment which that prince had given in the matter of Cecilianus. It seemed, indeed, as M. Tillemont observes, as if the Almighty constrained the Donatists to speak in spite of themselves, since the very document which they produced served only to bring out more clearly the innocence of Cecilianus, for, first, wishing to show that Constantine, after having absolved Cecilianus, had condemned him again by a later judgment, they were blind enough to produce a petition which they had formerly addressed to the prince, in which it appeared that he had himself condemned them, and maintained the innocence of Cecilianus; secondly, they produced a letter of Constantine, in which he acknowledges that the cause of Felix of Aptonga had not been examined and judged impartially, and in which he ordered that Inquitius should be sent to him, who allowed that he had told a lie, in order to bring about the condemnation of Felix.

Now, nothing could better serve the cause of the Catholics and more confound the Donatists, than to show that this very Felix was in truth *innocent* of the charge upon which he had been condemned; for properly speaking, their charge against Cecilianus was, that he had been consecrated by a man who had delivered up the Holy Scriptures. But to complete the proof of the innocence of Felix, the Catholics produced the statement of the proconsul Cælianus, who had acted as judge in the affair, and the very acts of the judgment, to none of which had the Donatists any thing to object; and finally, the Catholics having entirely established every thing that they had asserted, Marcellinus gave sentence, two hundred and eighty-one articles of which still remain to us; it was to the effect that the Donatists had been entirely refuted by the

Catholics; that Cecilianus had been justified, and that even had the crimes with which he had been accused been proved against him, it would in no way have affected the Catholic Church, and that, accordingly, those of the Donatists who should refuse to unite themselves to the Church, should be punished as the laws directed.

From this sentence the Donatists appealed to the Emperor, but in vain. Honorius confirmed the acts of the conference of Carthage by a law, bearing date the 30th of August 414.

This conference may be said to have given the death-blow to Donatism. From this time the sectarians came in crowds to unite themselves to the true Church, and the heresy declined.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1335.

CARTHAGE (416). Held in 416, against Pelagius and Celestius. It was composed of sixty-seven bishops, whose names are preserved; Aurelius of Carthage presiding. The letters of Heros and Lazarus were read, in which they accused Pelagius and Celestius of errors worthy to be visited with the censures of the Church. Then the acts of the council of 412, against Celestius, were read. It was finally resolved that both he and Pelagius should be anathematised, unless they would unequivocally abjure their wicked doctrine. A synodical letter was also addressed to Pope Innocent, to inform him of the affair, in order that he might add the weight of his authority to their decree. In this letter the principal errors of Pelagius are specified and refuted summarily from Holy Scripture; to it were added the letter of Heros and Lazarus, and the acts of the council of 412, in which Celestius was condemned.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1533.

CARTHAGE (417). Held about November 417, by Aurelius, at the head of two hundred and fourteen bishops. St Augustine, in several places, calls it a council of Africa. In it, certain decrees concerning the faith were made against the Pelagians, which were subsequently approved by the whole Church. Prosper has preserved one of these decrees, in which the fathers in council declare that the grace of God given to us through Jesus Christ, not only assists us to know what is right, but also to practice it in each particular action; so that without it we can neither have, nor think, nor say, nor do any thing which appertains to holiness and true piety.

At the head of these decrees, the two hundred and four-

teen bishops wrote to Zosimus, the pope, declaring that they were resolved that the sentence passed by his predecessor Innocent, against Pelagius and Celestius, should remain in force against them, until both of them should clearly recognise the necessity of divine grace, agreeably to the decrees of the council; and that so they need never hope to return into the bosom of the Church without abjuring their errors. They also reminded the pope of the mean opinion which Innocent had of the Council of Diospolis, and represented to him that he ought not to have given ear so readily to the representations of a heretic. Lastly, they laid before him all that had passed in Africa upon the subject. This letter was carried to Rome by Marcellinus, Subdeacon of Carthage.¹—*Bar.* 416. xxv. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1576.

CASHEL (1171). [*Concilium Cassiliense.*] Held in 1171, by Radulphus, Archdeacon of Llandaff, by order of Henry, King of England; Christian, Bishop of Lismore, presided. All the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of Ireland were present, who swore fidelity to Henry. Eight canons were published, intended to remedy the disorders which prevailed. By the first canon, we learn that polygamy was, at this time, common amongst the Irish, and it directs that no marriages shall be celebrated other than the law permits. The third orders the payment of the tithe of cattle, fruit, and all other produce, to the parish church; for many did not even know that it was due, and had never paid it. The seventh orders that the Irish Church shall thenceforth follow the customs of the Church of England.—*Wilkins' Conc.*, vol. i. p. 472.

CATALONIA (1246). [*Concilium Catalauniense.*] Held in May 1246, by the Archbishop of Tarragona, and six other bishops. Amongst other things, they ordered that Saracenic slaves, who demanded to be baptised, should remain some days with the rector of the parish, in order to give proof of their conversion.—*See TARRAGONA*, 1329, Can. 24, p. 20 at end.

CEALCHYTHE (785). [*Concilium Celchytum.*] Held

¹ Pagi proves that two councils were held in this year upon this subject. The first, which St Augustine calls an "African" council, was ended about the middle of February; the second was held in May. *See C. AFRICA*, A. D. 418.

in 785 or 787, by Gregory, Bishop of Ostia (the legate of Pope Adrian), who, in his letter to the pope, declares that Alfwald, the King, and Eanbald, the Archbishop of York, with all the bishops and abbots of the country were present, besides the senators, dukes, and people of the land. Twenty canons were published, which appear to have been previously drawn up by the legates and approved in council.

1. Insists upon the Nicene definition of faith being held by all clerks: orders the annual examination (in the faith) of all priests, by the bishops, in their synods; receives the first six œcumenical councils.

2. Orders the administration of holy baptism at the canonical times only, except in cases of necessity; and defines the duties of sponsors.¹

3. Orders that two councils be held annually; that every bishop visit his "parish" every year, orders them to preach to and confirm their flocks, and to separate incestuous; exhorts to the due fulfilment of all pastoral duties, and quotes Holy Scripture most appositely to that effect.

4. Directs bishops to take care that canons live canonically, and that monks and nuns behave themselves regularly, both as to diet and apparel, avoiding "the dyed colours of India and precious garments."

5. Relates to the election of abbots and abbesses.

6. Relates to the ordination of priests and deacons.

7. Directs that at all public churches the canonical hours be said with reverence.

8. Confirms ancient privileges conferred by the see of Rome on any churches; cancels all uncanonical privileges.

9. Forbids ecclesiastics to eat in private (unless on account of great infirmity²).

10. Forbids ministers to celebrate mass with naked legs; orders that a loaf be offered by the faithful, and not crumbs of bread only (*crustula*); forbids chalices made of horn; also forbids bishops to judge secular matters, quoting 2 Tim. ii. 4; and entreats that prayer be made assiduously for the Church.

¹ The Creed and the Lord's Prayer are, in this canon, mentioned as necessary to be known by all.

² This canon appears only to have been meant to prevent ecclesiastics from merely "appearing unto men to fast."

11. Relates to right government by kings ; orders princes to obey their bishops, because to them is committed the power of binding and loosing ; exhorts all persons to honour the Church.

12. Relates to the election of kings ; orders that it shall be made by the priests and elders of the people ; orders all men to honour the king, and directs that, if a bishop or priest shall conspire against him, he shall, like Judas, be thrust out from the apostolical degree.

13. Exhorts the great and rich to judge righteously, and without regard to persons or bribes.

14. Forbids to impose unjust tributes upon the Church ; exhorts to concord amongst all Christian people.

15. Forbids incestuous marriages.

16. Declares the sons of whores and nuns and those born in adultery, to be deprived of lawful inheritance ; declares a virgin devoted to God to be the spouse of Christ ; declares that the council presumes not to add to nor take from what has been prescribed in the canon, and in the Gospel, and in the decrees of the apostles, concerning lawful marriage and its use.

17. Declares that many refusing to pay tithe are often reduced themselves to a tenth, and orders the payment of tithe, and that men should live upon and give alms from the remaining nine parts ; also forbids usury and unjust weights and measures.

18. Exhorts to the faithful discharge of vows made in prosperity or adversity.

19. Forbids all Pagan rites, &c. ; forbids the wearing of Gentile garments, the maiming of horses, the use of sorcery, and the eating of horse-flesh, which last practice is mentioned as not uncommon.

20. Exhorts all to prepare for death, by confessing, receiving the holy eucharist, and repenting ; forbids prayer to be made for such as die without confession and repentance.

After the signatures appended to these canons, the legate proceeds, in his letter to the pope, to say, "When this was finished, and we had given our blessing, we departed, taking with us the legate of the king, and the archbishop, &c., who carried the decree with them to the Council of the Mercians, where the glorious king, Offa,

with the counsellors of the land, together with Janbyrht,¹ the Archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury, and the rest of the bishops of the country, were assembled." It then appears that the canons were again approved, and signed by Offa and his lords, by the archbishop and twelve bishops, and by four abbots, in this Mercian council.

There were two councils held in the same year, in which these canons, called "the canons of Cealchythe," were read and approved: the first in Northumberland, and the second in Mercia; in which of these two kingdoms the place called Cealchythe was situated is unknown. Bishop Gibson suggests that it was probably the same with Kelcheth, in Lancashire, on the borders of Cheshire. Litchfield was erected into an Archiepiscopal see at about this time.

The date of this council, according to Sir H. Spelman, is 797.—Johnson's *Ecc. Canon.* Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1861. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. ii. p. 145.

CEALCHYTHE (816). Held July 26, 816, Wulfred, Archbishop of Canterbury, presiding. Besides Kenulf, King of the Mercians, and his lords, there were present twelve bishops, amongst whom were those of Rochester, Selsea, Hereford, Lindisfarn, and London. Many abbots, priests, and deacons also attended. Eleven canons were published.

1. Relates to the faith and canonical precepts of the fathers.

2. Orders that churches newly built be consecrated by the bishop of the diocese, and that certain relics, or at least the eucharist, be there deposited; that it be written up to what saints the churches are dedicated.

3. Exhorts to unity, and mutual prayer one for another.

4. Gives to every bishop the power of electing the abbots and abbesses of his diocese, with the consent and advice of the family; orders due enquiry to be made respecting the fitness of those to be elected.

5. Forbids any one of Scottish extraction to usurp to himself the sacred ministry in any one's diocese, and to attend the priest when he celebrates mass.²

¹ Jambert, or Lambert, according to Wilkins.

² "Nullus permittatur de genere Scotorum in alicujus diocesi sacrum sibi ministerium usurpare, neque ei consentire liceat ex sacro ordine aliquod attingere, vel ab eis accipere in baptismo, aut in celebratione

6. Forbids the judgments of former bishops, confirmed by a synodical decree, to be infringed; directs that, in all cases, whatever has been corroborated with the sign of the cross shall remain in full force.

7. Forbids bishops, abbots, and abbesses to diminish the estates of their churches, or to grant away the inheritance of them for any longer time than for one man's life (and this with the consent of the fraternity); enumerates a few cases in which such alienation is allowable.

8. Directs that houses once erected into monasteries, with the advice of the bishop, shall remain so for ever; any priest, deacon, clerk, or nun offending against this canon to be deposed, anathematised, and excommunicated.

9. Relates to synodical judgments.

10. Orders that upon the death of a bishop, one-tenth of his substance be given, for his soul's sake, to the poor, that all his English slaves be set free, that at the sound of the bell throughout the parishes every congregation should meet in the basilicon, and there sing thirty Psalms together for the soul of the deceased, that afterwards, every prelate and abbot should sing six hundred Psalms, cause one hundred and twenty masses to be celebrated, and set free three slaves, giving them three shillings each; it further orders that for thirty days, when the canonical hours were finished, seven belts¹ of pater noster should be said for the departed soul, and that his obit be renewed on the thirtieth day.

11. Orders that bishops be content with their own dioceses, and abstain from interfering in those of others; charges all priests not to refuse baptism, directs them not to pour water on the child's head, but to immerse it in the font, and that thrice.—Johnson's *Ecc. Canon*. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1484. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 169.

CESAREA in PALESTINE (197). Held in 197. The causes which led to the assembling of this council were as follows. The Asiatic churches wished that Easter should be

missarum, vel etiam eucharistiam populo præbere, quia incertum est nobis, unde et an ab aliquo ordinentur. . . . respuendum est ab alienis nationibus sacra ministeria percipere, cum quibus nullus ordo metropolitanis, nec honor aliquis habeatur."

¹ "VII. *beltidum Pater noster.*" "This seems to imply that they had in this age belts with studs fastened on to them (like the beads now in use with Romanists), for the numbering of their prayers."—Johnson.

celebrated on the same day on which the Jews were directed to kill the Paschal Lamb, *i.e.*, on the fourteenth day of the moon, on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall, and in after times they who supported this opinion were called *quarto-decimani*. Other churches preserved the custom which they had received by apostolical tradition, of ending the fast and celebrating Easter on that day of the week on which our Lord rose. Theophilus, Bishop of Cesarea, and Narcissus of Jerusalem presided. Cassius of Tyre and Clarius of Ptolemais were present, with many other bishops. They decided that Easter-day should be celebrated on the Sunday, and wrote a synodal letter to that effect.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 596.

CESAREA (334). Pseudo-council.

CHALCEDON (451). [*Concilium Chalcedonense.*] The fourth œcumenical council was held at Chalcedon in 451, against the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies.

The heresy of Eutyches consisted in his acknowledging only one nature in our Lord Jesus Christ: he was a priest, and abbot of a monastery near Constantinople; and Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum,¹ having cited him to give an account of his faith before a council consisting of thirty-three bishops and twenty-three abbots, Eutyches there refused to retract, and was condemned, and separated from the communion of the faithful. He then took upon him to write to St Leo, the pope, imploring his protection, and sent to him a pretended profession of faith. Leo, deceived by these pretences, wrote to Flavianus of Constantinople, expressing his surprise at the sentence passed upon Eutyches. Flavianus, however, wrote back to him a true account of the matter, declaring that Eutyches maintained, that before His Incarnation our Blessed Lord had Two Natures, the Divine and Human, but that after His Incarnation He had but One; and he further entreated the pope to add his own testimony to the condemnation of Eutyches. By these statements Leo was convinced of the justice of the sentence, and, moreover, perceived the bad results which must follow from the patronage which the Emperor Theodosius extended to Eutyches, especially in convoking a council at Ephesus to reconsider the

¹ Or rather, Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople. See C. CONSTANTINOPLE, 448.

sentence of excommunication which had been passed upon him.

This pseudo-council assembled at Ephesus in 449, consisting of one hundred and thirty bishops, with Dioscorus of Alexandria, the great friend of Eutyches, as president; the censure before passed upon the latter was annulled, and Flavianus, who had condemned him, was with the utmost violence deposed. This pseudo-council, from the extreme irregularity and violence which accompanied all its acts, has been always known by the name of the "Latrocinium." Leo, distressed at these proceedings, wrote to the emperor a letter worthy of a Christian bishop, setting clearly before him what impious and sacrilegious acts had been done in that council, in open violation of the Catholic faith and of the canons of the Church; and he implored him in the name of all the churches of the West to convoke an œcumenical council in Italy. At the same time, he wrote to Pulcheria to entreat her to use all her influence to hinder this attack upon the Catholic faith from having more fatal results. He, lastly, addressed the clergy and people of Constantinople, and exhorted them to persevere in the true faith.

Dioscorus, irritated by the opposition which his designs met with, and especially by that of St Leo, separated himself from his communion, and by threats or otherwise, induced ten other bishops to concur in this schismatical act. This only caused Leo to redouble his efforts, and availing himself of the opportunity of a voyage which the emperor, Valentinian III., made to Rome at the time, he forcibly set before him the danger with which the true faith was threatened, and conjured him to induce Theodosius to repair by his authority the evil that had been committed at Ephesus, and to annul all that they had decreed there in an œcumenical assembly. But although Valentinian wrote upon the subject to Theodosius, he refused to permit the question to be re-agitated, and endeavoured to justify the act of the pseudo-council of Ephesus.

However, Theodosius dying in that very year in consequence of injuries received by a fall from his horse, Marcian, by his marriage with Pulcheria, became emperor, and all obstacles to the holding of the council were removed. His

chief desire was to see all his subjects united in one faith; and the empress herself wrote to St Leo, to assure him of her anxiety to see peace restored to the Church, and to banish all error and heresy, and for that end to cause the council to be assembled. An account of the events which occurred up to the time of the assembling of the Council of Chalcedon, will be found under the head of the Council of Constantinople, 448.

Marcian, at the petition of the bishops, consented to convoke an œcumenical council, as the only true remedy for the evils under which the Church laboured; and first he appointed Nicea as the place for holding it, by a letter addressed to Anatolus of Constantinople, and to all metropolitans, ordering them to attend there with the bishops of their respective provinces, and the most learned and talented of their clergy, declaring that all factions and cabal should be prevented, and that he would himself attend in person.

As custom and the state of things in the empire hindered St Leo from appearing at the council, he sent Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum (Marsala, in Sicily), and Bonifacius, to assist Lucentius and Basil (whom he had already sent into the East to investigate the case of the bishops who condemned Flavianus in the "Latrocinium"), as his legates; and these four, by the emperor's desire, were appointed to act as presidents in the approaching council.

Whilst the bishops were assembling at Nicea, certain troubles broke out in Illyria, which rendered it impossible for Marcian to absent himself so far from Constantinople; and he, accordingly, transferred the council to Chalcedon, which was separated from Constantinople by the Bosphorus only. Thither, then, the bishops came in vast multitudes towards the end of September; their number is reckoned at six hundred and thirty; all from the East, except the four legates of the pope. Three other distinguished bishops, however, were also present, viz., Maximus of Antioch, Eusebius of Dorylæum, and Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, the celebrated writer and historian of the Church, whom the emperor had recalled from exile.

The emperor sent as his representatives the chief officers of the empire: Anatolius, a nobleman, Palladius, Prefect of the Pretorium in the East; the Prefect of Constantinople,

Vincomulus; Sporacius, Captain of the Imperial Guard; various other persons of the highest dignity were also present. Moreover, Marcian, from the high idea which he had formed of St Leo, wishing him to have the chief authority in the council; Leo in his letter begged them to consider his legates as his representatives, and especially designated Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum, in Sicily, to act as president in his absence, rightly judging that there needed at the head of the council a man of firm mind, and one incapable of being turned aside from the right path.

It was arranged that the officers of the emperor should propose the questions for discussion, draw up the various motions, and pronounce the decision, after that the bishops had given their votes.

On the 8th of October 451, the council assembled in the Church of St Euphemia; in the centre sat the officers of the emperor, at their left, or on the epistle side, sat the Bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, Cesarea in Cappadocia, and of the other Eastern dioceses, and Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, together with the four legates; on the other side were Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius of Cesarea, and the other bishops of Egypt, Palestine, and Illyria, most of whom had been present in the pseudo-council of Ephesus. In the midst were the Holy Gospels, placed upon a raised seat. When they had taken their seats, the legates of the pope demanded that Dioscorus should withdraw from the assembly, accusing him of his scandalous conduct at Ephesus, and declaring that otherwise they would depart. Then the imperial officers ordered him to withdraw from the council, and to take his seat amongst the accused.

At the request of Eusebius of Dorylæum, the petition which he had presented to the emperor against Dioscorus was read. In this petition Eusebius demanded justice for the evils which Dioscorus had done to himself and Flavianus of Constantinople; he charged him with having favoured Eutyches in every thing; with having made use of notorious violence and the most unworthy means, in order to procure the absolution of Eutyches. He then required that the acts of the pseudo-council of Ephesus should be read, by which he hoped to show the injustice of Dioscorus in deposing Flavianus and himself. In the course of reading many passages occurred highly injurious to Theodoret, which

induced the emperor to order, by his officers, that he should enter, and take his place in the council, but the Egyptians, with great tumult, refused to allow this, saying that such an act would be to overthrow the faith, and that he must remain in the sole character of an accuser.

Many of the Oriental bishops also interrupted the reading of these acts with exclamations about the violence which they had suffered from Dioscorus, and when the latter pleaded in excuse that all that had passed at the council was with the consent of those present, the bishops exclaimed with vehemence against his assertion, declaring that they had been forced, and even beaten, and threatened with banishment, that soldiers had repulsed them when they desired to depart, and that they had, in short, been compelled to sign a blank paper.

After this, the acts of the Council of Constantinople were read, which were inserted in those of the pseudo-council of Ephesus. Amongst others they read the second letter of St Cyril to Nestorius, and that which he had written to the Eastern Church; these being ended, the bishops unanimously exclaimed that they contained their own belief and their own doctrine, and as Flavianus had approved these two letters in the Council of Constantinople, the legates, with Maximus of Antioch and Eustachius of Berythus, declared that in their opinion the faith of Flavianus was strictly in accordance with the true faith and the letter of Cyril. The Eastern bishops, also, with one voice, agreed that Flavianus had truly asserted the Catholic faith, and at the same time the bishops of Palestine passed over from the right hand to the side on the left of the imperial officer, to testify that they abandoned the Egyptian party, so that in the end Dioscorus was left with about twelve bishops.

Thus the innocence of Flavianus was established, and, at the same time, necessarily, the pseudo-council of Ephesus condemned; none of the bishops who had taken any share in the proceedings attempting to defend themselves. But although every one declared himself in favour of Flavianus, Dioscorus did not in the slightest degree abate his arrogance, declaring, that for his part he belonged to no party, and professed no faith but the Catholic and apostolic faith, neither did he regard men, but God alone.

After this, the opinion which Eustachius of Berythus had

delivered at the Council of Ephesus, came under consideration, maintaining that it is an error to believe in two natures in our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the right faith is, that there is in Him but one nature incarnate. This opinion was unanimously condemned. In the third place the confession of Eutyches, which had been approved by Dioscorus at the Council of Ephesus, was read in it: he declared his belief that in our Lord were two natures before His incarnation, and but *one* afterwards. This opinion was at once anathematised by the fathers in council, and when the sentence which Dioscorus had pronounced against Flavianus had been read, they proceeded to anathematise Dioscorus himself; and with one voice demanded that he, together with Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustachius of Berythus, and Basil of Seleucia, who had presided at the council, should be deposed from the episcopate.

On this day the acts of the first session only of the pseudo-council at Ephesus were read.

The second session begun on the 10th October. On this occasion Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, and Basil were absent. The bishops were now entreated on the part of the emperor to decide matters relating to the faith, in order to settle the minds of those who have been led astray; they replied that a new exposition of the faith was not needed, but that the fathers had left a sufficient exposition of the true faith, which they ought to follow, and that the letter of St Leo, which all the bishops in council had already subscribed, was a sufficient antidote to the heresy of Eutyches.

However, the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople were read, and also the letter of St Leo to Flavianus, in which the doctrine of the incarnation was admirably developed. The doctrine which is taught is as follows: "The divine nature and the human nature, each remaining perfect, have been united in one person, to the intent that the same Mediator might die, being yet immortal and impassible. . . . Neither nature is altered by the other; He who is truly God is also truly man. . . . The Word and the flesh preserve each its proper functions. Holy Scripture proves equally the verity of the two natures. He is *God*, since it is written, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the

Word *was* God.' He is also *man*, since it is written, 'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' As *man*, He was tempted by the devil; as God, He is ministered unto by angels. As *man*, He wept over the tomb of Lazarus; as God, He raised him from the dead. As *man*, He is nailed to the cross; as God, He makes all nature tremble at His death. It is by reason of the unity of person that we say that the Son of Man came down from Heaven, and that the Son of God was crucified and buried, although He was so only as to His human nature."

This exposition of the faith was approved by all the bishops, and anathema declared against all who should deny it.

After this, the Bishops of Illyria and Palestine earnestly demanded that pardon should be granted to the chiefs of the pseudo-council at Ephesus, specially naming Dioscorus. The Eastern bishops, however, without taking notice of the others, insisted upon the banishment of Dioscorus.

The third session was held on the 13th of October, at which the officers of the emperor were not present; probably, as Tillemont says, in order that it might not be said that the bishops were not permitted to pass a free judgment upon Dioscorus.

The petition of Eusebius was read, in which he demanded, that Dioscorus, having now been convicted of many crimes, the council should anathematise his impious dogmas; that it should punish him according to his deserts; that it should confirm the true faith, and annul all that had been done in the false Council of Ephesus; he also requested that Dioscorus should be cited before the council to answer him, and this was accordingly done; but Dioscorus, upon various pretexts, refused to appear. The petitions of the clergy and laity of Alexandria against Dioscorus were then read, in which they accused him of grievous crimes, stating that he had been guilty of homicide, had burnt and pulled down houses, had lived an infamous life, had bought up corn in order to enhance the price, and had connived at the residence of women of ill-fame in his diocese, and had even kept them in his own home. After this, Dioscorus was cited a third time to appear, but with as little success as before; and the deputies having made their report to the council, the legate, in a few words, enumerated the crimes of which

Dioscorus had been convicted, and declared him to be deprived by himself, as, acting for the pope, and by the council, of his episcopal office, and of all his ecclesiastical dignities. After this, they requested the council to make a decree conformable to the canons of the Church, and accordingly, each of the bishops present, with a loud voice, condemned Dioscorus, and the sentence being committed to writing, they all signed it; the whole number of signatures amounting to three hundred. They then drew up an act to signify to Dioscorus the judgment passed against him, and a letter to the emperor, informing him of the causes which compelled them to depose the former; lastly, his deposition was gravely pronounced irrevocable, and soon after he was banished to Gangra, in Paphlagonia, where, in the course of three years, he died.

At the fourth session, October 17, the emperor's officers were again present, and perceiving that the bishops were averse to drawing up any new definition of the faith, they contented themselves with demanding whether they received the letter of St Leo as agreeing with the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople. At the request of the bishop, Paschasinus declared it to be the faith of the council, and that they held to the definition of Nicea, and that of Constantinople, under Theodosius, as also to the exposition of St Cyril, and to the writings of St Leo against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches.

After this, the bishops, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basil, and Eustachius, having made open profession of the true faith, were absolved by the unanimous vote of the council, which considered that the deposition of Dioscorus ought to suffice, and that matters should not be pushed too far, for fear of originating a fresh schism.

Some other matters of minor importance were also transacted in this session.

Fifth session, October 22. Although the bishops had before expressed an unwillingness to draw up any new definition of the faith, they, upon further consideration, resolved to do so, endeavouring, however, to follow exactly all that had previously been decided by the fathers. They resolved that the definition of the faith as to the matter in question, should be examined into, and they appointed a committee of twenty-two, who assembled in the oratory of

St Euphemia. Having accordingly examined the existing definition of the faith, they proceeded to draw up a new form, in which, however, several bishops objected to the expression, that Jesus Christ was *of* two natures, and not *in* two natures, which, although, strictly speaking, *true*, yet was such a definition as the Eutychians could have received as well as the Catholics; after many difficulties and much discussion, they agreed to follow exactly the letter of St Leo, and the decree containing the definition was accordingly altered, and, in the end, accepted by the whole Church. This decree is not in the form of a creed, brief and abridged, but rather of a long discourse, in which both the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds are inserted; the two letters of St Cyril against Nestorius were added to it, and also that of St Leo to Flavianus against the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches; the council itself added a brief statement of the true faith, in respect to the incarnation, of which the following are the most important articles:—

“We confess and with one accord teach one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in the divinity, perfect in the humanity, truly God and truly Man, consisting of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father, according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us, according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, sin only excepted: who was begotten of the Father before all ages, according to the Godhead; and in the last days, the same was born, according to the Manhood, of Mary the Virgin, Mother of God, for us and for our salvation: who is to be acknowledged one and the same Christ, the Son, the Lord, the only begotten in two natures, without mixture, change, division, or separation; the difference of natures not being removed by their union, but rather the propriety of each nature being preserved and concurring in one person and in one *ὑπόστασις*, so that He is not divided or separated into *two persons*, but the only Son, God, the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, and one and the same person.”

When this decree was read, the bishops, with one voice, cried out that it contained the faith of the fathers, and it was unanimously received by them, to the number of three hundred and fifty-six. The council then forbade any one to hold or teach any other faith, upon pain, if a bishop

or clergyman, of being deposed, if a monk or layman, of being anathematised.

At the sixth session, October 25, the emperor was present in person, and delivered a speech in Latin, in which he unfolded what had been his intentions in convoking the council, and declared that his sole motive in attending it was to give his assistance in settling the true faith, and not at all to hinder the freedom of their deliberations. Then the above-mentioned decree was read, upon which the emperor asked if the council was agreed as to this confession, and the bishops, unanimously declaring that they were so, severally subscribed it.

This done, the emperor declared his will that the city of Chalcedon, in which the council had been held, should thenceforward enjoy the privileges of a metropolitan see; saving the dignity of the metropolitan of Nicomedia.

In the seventh session the arrangement which Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, had made upon certain disputes connected with their sees, were ratified.

In the eighth session Theodoret was re-established in his church, having pronounced anathema against Nestorius, and subscribed the letter of Leo.

In the ninth session the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, was considered, who complained of having been persecuted by Eutyches, and deposed in the pseudo-council of Ephesus in his absence.

These three sessions appear to have been held on the same day, viz., October 26.

In the tenth session, October 27, Ibas was pronounced to be orthodox, and his re-establishment in his see ordered.

In the eleventh session, October 29, Bassianus, Bishop of Ephesus, was declared to have intruded into that see, having obtained his chair by violence;¹ and Stephen, who also pretended to the same bishopric, was similarly condemned: it was, therefore, decreed, that it was necessary to proceed to a fresh election.

¹ The only real charge against him seems to have been that he was first Bishop of Evaza, but he was made so bitterly against his will, and out of malice, nay, as he says himself, after some hours' *hard whipping* at the Altar to compel him, so that the blood ran over the Altar itself. He was allowed to hold the see *for four years*, without a shadow of opposition, and was received to communion by all other Churches.

In the twelfth session, October 30, it was decreed, that although Stephen and Bassianus should be deprived of the see of Ephesus, the rank of bishop should not be taken from them, and that they should receive a maintenance out of the revenues of that Church.

In the thirteenth session, on the same day, it was decreed that the Bishop of Nicomedia should have the *authority* of metropolitan over the churches of Bithynia, and that the Bishop of Nicea should have metropolitan *honour* only, and submit to the see of Nicomedia.

In the fourteenth session, October 31, judgment was pronounced in the difference between Sabianus, Bishop of Perrha, in Syria, and Athanasius, who was also bishop of the same city, but who had been deposed, and afterwards replaced in the chair; it was ordered that Sabianus should fill the see, Anastasius having been justly deposed for his crimes.

In this session, October 31, twenty-eight canons were published.

1. Confirms all canons before made by the fathers in different councils; in other words, the code of the universal Church, containing one hundred and seventy canons, taken from the Councils of Nicea (20), Ancyra (25), Neo-Cesarea (14), Gangra (20), Antioch (25), Laodicea (59), and Constantinople (7)

2. Declares that if a bishop shall receive any money, &c., in consideration of conferring orders, both he himself and the person so ordained shall be deposed; and that any person acting in any way as the intermediate party on the occasion shall, if a clerk, be deposed; if a monk or layman, be anathematised.

3. Forbids any ecclesiastic or monk to undertake the management or stewardship of the property of others, or intrude himself into worldly ministrations. Amongst a few other exceptions, however, it is permitted to them to undertake the care of the property of orphans and widows, and other afflicted persons, with the bishop's consent.

4. Forbids the erection of any monastery or oratory without the permission of the bishop of the diocese. Orders all monks to submit to the bishop of the diocese, and not to meddle in any ecclesiastical or civil matters, out of their monastery, unless they be permitted to do so,

for some necessary purpose, by their bishop. Lastly, orders all bishops to keep watch over the conduct of the monks within their dioceses; offenders to be excommunicated.

5. Renews the prohibition made in a former council, forbidding the bishop or clergy of one church to quit their own church in order to go and serve in another.

6. Forbids a bishop to ordain a clerk unless he is, *bonâ fide*, intended to serve in some particular church, or chapel, or monastery, and declares all ordinations not made in accordance with this law to be null and void.

7. Forbids, under pain of anathema, those who have been ordained, or who have entered the monastic state to forsake their condition.

8. Enjoins the clergy attached to monasteries, chapels of martyrs, hospitals, &c., to submit to their bishops; offenders to be excommunicated.

9. Orders that all disputes between the clergy shall be settled before their bishop, and in no secular court, except by his permission. That if a dispute arise between a bishop and one of the clergy, it shall be judged in the provincial council. That all disputes between a bishop or clergyman and his metropolitan, shall be brought before the exarch of the diocese [*i.e.*, the patriarch] or the Bishop of Constantinople.

10. Absolutely forbids a clergyman to be on the list of the church of two cities at the same time, and orders that such as act thus, shall be restored to the church in which they were first ordained.

11.¹ Orders that letters of peace (or of communion) be given to poor persons going abroad, after examination; and that letters commendatory be given to those persons only who are of distinction.²

12. Forbids any bishop, under pain of deposition, to

¹ In the version of Dionysius Exiguus the canon is to this effect: "That letters of peace shall be given to poor persons going abroad, and not letters commendatory; because that letters commendatory are to be given only to more honourable persons."

² τοῖς οὐσις ἐν ὑπολήψει. Since this word ὑπολήψις signifies both *suspicion* and *honourable estimation*, this canon has been accordingly differently interpreted. I have given the version of Dionysius, which seems most probable. Balsanon, Lonaras, and other Greeks, as well as Huetus, interpret it to mean persons whose reputation had been unjustly suspected. See Cabass, *Not. Eccl.*, p. 24.

divide the province, by obtaining letters-patent from the emperor, erecting his bishopric into a metropolitan see.¹

13. Forbids that a foreign or unknown ecclesiastic be permitted to exercise any function in the church, except he bring letters commendatory from his bishop.

14. Forbids the lower order of ecclesiastics (readers, chanters, &c.), to whom it was permitted to marry, to marry Jewesses, or pagan, or heretical women, except they should promise to become Christians.

15. Forbids the ordination of a deaconess under forty years of age; if after ordination she shall marry, she shall be anathematised with her husband.

16. Orders that virgins marrying after having consecrated themselves to God, be separated from communion for as long a period as the bishop shall deem proper.

17. Makes over to the bishop for ever parishes in the country over which he has exercised jurisdiction for thirty years.

18. Deposés those of the clergy or monks, who form cabals against their bishop or any of their fellow clergy.

19. Renews the decree of the Council of Nicea, which directs that provincial councils be held twice in every year; and enjoins, that bishops who wilfully neglect to attend shall be reproved.

20. Directs that if any bishop shall receive a clergyman belonging to another bishop, both the bishop and the clergyman shall be separated from communion until the said clergyman shall return to his own bishop.

21. Forbids the receiving an accusation against a clergyman from any person without first inquiring into his character.

22. Forbids the clergy to take possession of the pro-

¹ The cause of this canon was this: Eustathius, Bishop of Berytus, had induced the Emperor Theodosius, Junior, to erect his see into a metropolis, taking for that purpose six sees from the province of Tyre, and submitting them to Berytus. This was allowed by the Acts of a Synod subsequently held by Anatolius at Constantinople, where Photius of Tyre was not present. He, however, brought his complaint before this council, which, in a congregation held before the fourth session, annulled all the Acts of that Synod, and confirmed the original rights of the Metropolitan of Tyre over the cities in question.—*See Oriens Christ.*, tom. ii. col. 815.

perty of their bishop after his decease,¹ under pain of losing their rank.

23. Directs that the defender of the Church of Constantinople shall drive out of the city all strange clergy or monks, coming there without letters from their bishop, and causing trouble and disturbance.

24. Orders that houses which have once been erected into monasteries, and consecrated, shall ever after be devoted to the same purpose.

25. Directs that the metropolitan shall consecrate to a vacant bishopric within three months after the death of the bishop.

26. Directs that in every diocese there shall be a steward (*œconomus*) chosen from amongst the clergy, who shall manage the property of the Church according to the bishop's directions.

27. Anathematizes those who have been guilty of rape or abduction, and all who have aided and abetted in those crimes, or who have consented to them; if any one of the clergy be amongst the guilty, he shall be deposed.

28. "We, following in all things the decisions of the holy fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the one hundred and fifty most religious bishops, which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy city of Constantinople, the new Rome. For the fathers properly gave the primacy to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the one hundred and fifty most religious bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome; judging, with reason, that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the elder royal Rome, should also be magnified, like her, in ecclesiastical matters, and be second after her. And (we decree) that the metropolitans only of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses, and, moreover, the bishops of the aforesaid dioceses who are amongst the barbarians, shall be ordained by the above-mentioned throne of the most holy Church of Constanti-

¹ It appears to have been not an uncommon practice at that time, not only for the clergy, but even for the laity, to seize upon the property of their bishop after his death.

nople ; each metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses ordaining the bishops of the provinces, as has been declared by the divine canons ; but the metropolitans themselves of the said dioceses shall, as has been said, be ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople, the proper elections being made according to custom, and reported to him."

It appears that the Roman legates had refused to be present when this last canon was carried ; however, immediately after, they called for an assembly of the council, and protested against it, alleging that it was contrary to the sixth canon of the Council of Nicea, which, as they asserted, commenced with these words, "The Roman see hath always had the primacy ;" this, however, was shown to be only an interpolation,¹ and after it had been proved that all things had been done rightly and canonically, the imperial judges delivered their opinion, which was to the effect, that granting to the bishop of ancient Rome, according to the canons, the primacy and prerogative of *honour*, the Bishop of Constantinople ought nevertheless to enjoy the same ecclesiastical *privileges* of honour, and that he should have the right of consecrating metropolitans in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. The bishops having then declared their entire concurrence in this opinion, and denied the assertion of the legates, viz., that they (the bishops) had been *compelled* to sign the twenty-eighth canon, the officers pronounced the decision, that the twenty-eighth canon must stand, declaring that the council had confirmed all that had been proposed. This was the last act of the Council of Chalcedon.²

Leo constantly opposed this twenty-eighth canon, upon the plea that it contradicted the sixth of Nicea, which assigned the second place in dignity to Alexandria ; however, in spite of his opposition and that of his successors, the canon remained and was executed.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1-1003.

¹ This reading appears only in one Latin version. All the Greek copies and all other versions unite in giving this canon as it is usually read, viz., "Let the ancient customs be maintained," &c.

² The Greek copies have two more canons :—

29. Declares it to be sacrilege to degrade a bishop to the rank of priest ; but if for any just cause he shall be deposed from the episcopal office, he must also be deposed from the priesthood.

30. Relates to the case of the Egyptian bishops who prayed for time before subscribing to the letter of St Leo.

CHALONS (603). [*Concilium Cabilonense.*] Held in 603, in which St Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne, was deposed and banished at the instigation of Brunichild and *Saint* (!) Aridius, by whose contrivance he was afterwards murdered. Domnolus was elected into the place of St Desiderius at this council.—*Fredegarii Chron.*, pp. 605-9.

CHALONS (649). [*Concilium Cabilonense.*] Held in 649, by order of Clovis II. ; present, thirty-nine bishops, the deputies of six who were absent, six abbots, and one archdeacon. Agapius and Bobonus, Bishops of Digne in Provence,¹ were here deposed from the episcopate for violation of the canons. The council also drew up twenty canons. The first orders that the true faith, as taught by the Council of Nicea and confirmed by that of Chalcedon, be observed. The fourth forbids the consecration of more than one bishop to the same Church at the same time. The fifth forbids the laity to meddle in the administration of churches and church property. The fourteenth directs that the clergy who serve chapels shall be subject to the bishop in all things. The sixteenth is directed against simony. The nineteenth inflicts penalties upon lascivious dancers, and women who sang immodest songs within the church enclosure, on saints' days and festivals of dedication.—*Tom. vi. Conc. p. 387.*

CHALONS (813). Held in 813, by order of Charlemagne, for the reformation of the Church and clergy. This council was assembled from all Gaul Lyonnaise (except the province of Tours, which met in a separate synod). Sixty-six canons were published.

The first eleven relate to bishops, and direct that they shall read the Holy Scriptures, the Councils, and the Pastoral of St Gregory ; that they shall preach to their people and edify them, establish schools, abstain from all shameful means of gain, &c., &c., &c. The twelfth forbids priests, deacons, or monks to become farmers. Fourteenth and fifteenth forbid ordinaries to put their clergy to any expense during their visitations. The twenty-seventh forbids the repetition of confirmation. The thirty-second declares that spiritual sins must be confessed, as well as bodily sins. Thirty-third declares that "some say confession is to be made to God alone, others that our sins must

¹ "Diniensis urbis episcopus."

be confessed to a priest." Commends *both* practices, and declares God to be the author of our salvation, who grants it sometimes in an invisible manner by His omnipotence, and sometimes by His physician (the priest). The thirty-fifth censures those who, when forbidden wine and meat, as a penance, make up for them by indulging in other delicacies and delicious drinks. Thirty-sixth declares that almsgiving avails only to release from venial sins, arising from frailty, and reproves those who go on in sin, thinking to escape punishment for their much almsgiving. Thirty-ninth orders prayers for the dead to be said at every mass, and declares it to be an ancient custom in the church to commend to the Lord the spirits of those asleep. Forty-third declares the ordination of certain priests and deacons conferred by certain Scotch persons calling themselves bishops to be null and void, being done without the consent of their diocesans, and with suspicion of simony. Forty-fifth condemns pilgrimages made in order to obtain remission of sins, which, on that pretext, the persons about to make the pilgrimage go on committing more freely; pilgrimages made from proper devotional motives are commended. Forty-seventh orders all Christians to receive the holy eucharist on Maunday Thursday.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1270.

CHALONS (1062). Held in 1062, by Peter d'Amien, cardinal and legate, at the head of thirteen bishops. The subject of the council was the confirmation of the privileges of the abbey of Clugny, which Drogon, Bishop of Maçon, had attacked. Peace was restored between him and the abbot.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1177.

CHALONS (1129). St Bernard was present. Henry of Blois, brother of Stephen, King of England, was deposed from the see of Verdun, on the ground of having forcibly seized it. He was afterwards Bishop of Winchester and created cardinal. He died 1164.

CHARROUX (989). [*Concilium Karrofense.*] Held about 989, by six bishops. Three canons were published. 1. Excommunicates those who break into churches, or carry away any thing out of them. 2. Excommunicates those who rob the poor. 3. Those who lay violent hands upon the clergy.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 733.

CHARROUX (1028). Held in 1028, against the

Manichæans, by William, Duke of Aquitaine.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 860.

CHARTRES (1146). Held on the third Sunday after Easter, 1146, at which all the French bishops were present, together with the king, Louis VII. The object was to arrange matters relating to the crusade, and to persuade St Bernard to accept the office of leader, which, however, he constantly refused. (See C. VEZELAI, 1146.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1102.

CHATEAUX GONTIER, in ANJOU (1231). [*Concilium apud Castrum Gontherii.*] Held in 1231, by the Archbishop of Tours and his suffragans, who published thirty-seven canons or regulations, of which the following are of most consequence. The first against clandestine marriages, ordering that those persons who have been so united be separated. 3. Exacts an oath from every clerk presented to a benefice, to the effect that he had neither directly nor indirectly given or promised any thing in return. 4. Orders the bishops to see that all beneficed clerks serve their own cures. 9. Forbids communicants to communicate with excommunicated persons. 10. Forbids the frequent use of general excommunication. 15. Deprives patrons who present unfit persons of their patronage. 16. Forbids to present to a living any one ignorant of the language of the place. 24, and some others relate to the conduct of monks. 30. Orders the sentence of excommunication against usurers to be read every Sunday. 33. Forbids to receive the testimony of Jews against Christians.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 438.

CHICHESTER (1157). [*Concilium Cicestreense.*] Held at Whitsuntide 1157, concerning the privileges of the Abbey "de Bello," *i.e.*, Battle Abbey, founded by William the Conqueror, who (it was alleged by the abbot, but disputed by the Bishop of Chichester) had founded it to be "free and at ease from all claim of servitude, and from all subjection, oppression, and domination of bishops, as is Christ Church, Canterbury."—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1176; Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 428.

CHICHESTER (1289). Held in 1289, under Gilbert, Bishop of Chichester. In this council forty-one canons were drawn up.

1 and 2. Recommend to all curates, prayer and reading,

humility, continence, and all the evangelical virtues, and forbids them to attend plays, tournaments, indecent shows, and taverns.

4. Sentences those curates who shall seduce their own parishioners to perpetual imprisonment in some monastery, after having first made a penitential pilgrimage during fifteen years.

8. Imposes a fine of sixty shillings, to be applied towards the fabric of the cathedral at Chichester, upon all those who appoint to the care of a parish priests who are notorious fornicators, or convicted or suspected of incontinence.

9. Relates to the priestly garments.

10. Orders that well-informed and pious men only be made curates.

15. Orders that the hours be said by the priests at the appointed times, and in such a manner as to minister to edification and true religion.

16. Directs that the priests shall visit the sick on every Sunday and festival, and administer the sacraments to them in their own houses at their own hour. It forbids also (what some had presumed to do) the sending of the eucharist to the rich by the hands of a deacon, while they are themselves indulging in drinking or other carnal pleasures.

19. Declares that neither the viaticum nor burial is to be refused on account of secret crimes.

20. Forbids every curate to receive confession or administer the communion to strange parishioners without the leave of their own curate, or of the pope.

21. Forbids all mention of *tithes*, or other temporal affairs, during the time of confession.

22. Orders that the communion be administered at Easter, and that no money be taken for so doing.

29. Orders that all churches be provided with suitable vessels, books, and ornaments; and that the *font* and the *chrism* be kept under lock and key.

33. Directs that the monks shall present to the bishop those monks whom they desire to appoint to parishes belonging to them.

37 and 38. Relate to marriages.

39. Condemns false preachers, who, without lawful

mission, preached and received confession for the sake of gain.

40 and 41. Excommunicate church plunderers, calumniators, &c., &c., &c.—Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. ii. p. 169; Tom. xi. *Conc.* p. 1346.

CHICHESTER (1292). Held in 1292, by the same prelate; here seven canons were published.

1. Forbids the permitting any animals, except tithe lambs, and those for fifteen days only, to feed in churchyards.

2. Forbids any restraint upon voluntary offerings made by the people to the Church.

3. Excommunicates, *ipso facto*, those who retain the tithe.

4. Orders silence and decent behaviour in church.

5. Forbids indiscriminate burial within the church; the lord of the manor, and the patron, with their wives, the rector, and the curate, are excepted.

6. Forbids the putting up an alms-box in the church without the bishop's permission.

7. Directs that these regulations shall be published four times in each year.—Tom. xi. *Conc.* p. 1361. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. ii. p. 183.

CILICIA (423). [*Concilium Ciliciense.*] Held in 423, against the Pelagian heresy. Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was considered as one of the heads of this heresy, himself pronounced anathema against Julian, who had before retired to him, in order to write his eight books against St Augustine, and whom the latter had crushed by his writings.—*Marius Mercator*, p. 219.

CIRTA (in NUMIDIA) (305). [*Concilium Cirtense.*] Held in 305, to fill up the vacant bishopric of Cirta. Secundus, the Primate of Numidia, presided, and drew from eleven or twelve of the bishops present, a confession that they had been guilty of betraying the sacred books during the persecution. The better to understand their crime, it must be borne in mind that, during the Diocletian persecution, an edict was promulgated, ordering the destruction of the churches,¹ and obliging the magistrates every where to take from the bishops and priests of the

¹ This very assembly was held in a private house, because the churches were not restored.

Church their copies of the Holy Scriptures. This edict was executed with the greatest rigour in Numidia; the magistrates themselves entered into the churches, and into the houses of the bishops and clergy, to search for the Scriptures, that they might burn them, threatening with the penalty of death all who refused to discover them. Many of the Christians were content to suffer any torment, and death itself, rather than betray them; but there were also many not merely among the lower orders of ecclesiastics, but also among the priests, and even bishops, who, through fear of death, were guilty of delivering up the sacred volumes: such were styled "*Traditores*." At Cirta there were many bishops and others of the clergy, who had committed this breach of trust, and were charged by Secundus with having done so; but eventually it appeared that he had himself been equally guilty, upon which there followed a mutual amnesty. After that the bishops had confessed their sin in the council, Secundus gave them absolution.—Fleury. E. H. (Newman's Trans.), A.D. 411, p. 191. Pusey, p. 96.

Silvanus, a subdeacon, who had also been a Traditor, was elected to the bishopric.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 936.

CIRTA (412). Held in 412, in the month of June, under Silvanus, Primate of Numidia, assisted by several bishops of the province and St Augustine, upon the subject of the Donatists, who, finding themselves entirely worsted in the conference of Carthage, spread abroad a report, to cover the shame of their defeat, that Mercellinus, the judge of the conference, had been bribed by the Catholics, and that the Donatists had not been permitted a fair hearing. The fathers wrote a letter, dictated by St Augustine, in which these calumnies are refuted.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1518.

CLARENDON (1164). [*Concilium Clarendonense*.] Held on the 25th of January 1164. This was not, strictly speaking, an ecclesiastical synod, since, besides the two archbishops and twelve bishops, there were present, the king and thirty-nine lay barons. Here the king laid before them certain laws, which he called the "*Customs of England*;" most of these customs (especially the twelfth) were, in fact, infringements upon the then existing rights and privileges of the Church; they were as follow:

1. All suits, whether between lay persons or clerks, or laymen and clerks, concerning advowsons and presentations, &c., to be prosecuted in the civil courts.

2. Churches which are fees of the crown, not to be granted in perpetuity without the king's consent.

3. Clergy accused of any crime to be prosecuted in the civil courts, and in case of conviction, to forfeit the immunity of their character, and be protected by the Church no longer.

4. No archbishops or bishops and others belonging to the kingdom to leave the country without the king's licence, and to give security that during their stay abroad they will solicit nothing to the prejudice of the king or kingdom. (*Nec perquirent malum regi, &c.*)

5. The laity not to be prosecuted in ecclesiastical courts, except there be legal and reputable witnesses to prove the charge.

6. Excommunicated persons not to be bound to give security for remaining in their present places of abode.

7. No chief tenant of the crown to be excommunicated without the king's consent.

8. All appeals in spiritual causes to be carried from the archdeacon to the bishop, thence to the archbishop; and from him in the last place to the king; in order that by his order the cause be finally tried in the archbishop's court; and no farther appeal be allowed without the king's leave.

9. In case of any dispute between a layman and clergyman, concerning a tenement which the latter declares to be holden by frank almoigne,¹ and the former to be a lay fee, if it be proven upon trial, before twelve reputable men, to be a lay fee, and not an ecclesiastical fee, the cause to be finally tried in a civil court.

10. If one residing on the demesne lands of the crown, or holding of the king, be cited by the archdeacon or bishop on account of any fault, they may put him under interdict, but they may not excommunicate him for non-appearance in the spiritual court, until the king's chief officer in the

¹ "*Frank almoigne*," i.e., a tenure by divine service.—Britton.—A tenure which exempted the clergy from every species of obligation except that of saying masses for the benefit of the grantor's family. Hallam, *M. Ages*. See Ducange, *Eleemosyna Libera*, Part ii. ch. 2.

place where he resides be summoned to compel him by civil authority to give satisfaction to the Church.

11. Archbishops, bishops, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, holding of the king in chief, to be regarded as barons of the realm, and bound to bear the burdens belonging to their rank, and to attend the king in council, &c.

12. The revenues of every archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, during a vacancy, to belong to the king; and the election to be made by such members of the chapter as he is pleased to summon for that purpose to court; the election to be made in the chapel royal, with the consent of the king, and by the advice of such persons of the government as he shall think fit to consult.

13. If any baron or tenant *in capite* should encroach upon the rights or property of any archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, the king to employ his authority in compelling him to make restitution and satisfaction; if, on the other hand, any of them should throw off their allegiance to the king, or encroach upon his lands, &c., the bishops to assist the king with spiritual censures.

14. No goods forfeited to the king to be detained in churches or churchyards, to secure them from seizure, &c.

15. The clergy not to attempt to enforce the payment of debts contracted on oath or promise; such cases to be determined by the civil courts.

16. Sons of copyholders not to be ordained without the consent of their lord.

Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the utmost of his power, resisted these encroachments; but the other bishops, being overawed by the presence and threats of the lay barons, yielded; and finally the archbishop signed the constitutions, and promised, "with good faith and without reserve to observe them." Immediately afterwards, when liberty of action was given to him, he revoked his assent, and appealed to the pope. The king, not daring openly to impeach him, accused him of not appearing in person to a summons served upon him, and sentenced him to confiscation of all his goods; after this, Becket retired into France, where he remained six years, during which time Henry enjoyed the revenues of the see of Canterbury, as well as the plunder of many of the archbishop's friends, whom he fined heavily for assisting him in his distress.—Tom. x.

Conc. p. 1425. See also Churton's *Early English Church*, chap. 18. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 435.

CLERMONT (535). [*Concilium Claromontanum* (or *Arvernense*).] Held on the 8th of November 535; Honoratus, Archbishop of Bourges, presiding over fourteen other bishops. Sixteen other canons were published.

The second deprives of communion those who endeavour to get themselves appointed to bishoprics by the influence of persons in high station, or by artifice or bribery; and declares that those persons shall be consecrated who have been duly elected by the clergy and people, with consent of the metropolitan. The eighth forbids to lend the ornaments of the church upon occasion of wedding festivities, and the like. Fifteenth directs that the priests who serve chapels in the country shall come together to celebrate the principal festivals with their bishop.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1803.

CLERMONT (1095). Held in November 1095, by Pope Urban II., at the head of thirteen archbishops, two hundred and five bishops and abbots. Here the crusade was determined upon. Philip I., King of France, who had deserted his lawful wife, and married Bertrade, was a second time excommunicated. The "Treve de Dieu" was confirmed, as was the primacy of Lyons: the Archbishop of Tours, also, in this council recovered his jurisdiction over Bretagne, and the Bishop of Dol, who had the title of archbishop, was compelled to submit to the Archbishop of Tours. Lastly, thirty-two canons were published.

1. Declares the days upon which the "Treve de Dieu" shall be kept, and orders that it shall be observed towards the clergy, monks, and women.

2. Declares that the pilgrimage to deliver Jerusalem, undertaken from motives of piety, supplies the place of every other penance.

5. Forbids to appoint laymen, and every one under the order of subdeacon, to bishoprics.

6. Forbids the purchase of a benefice of any kind by any person for himself or another; orders that benefices so purchased shall lapse to the bishop to dispose of.

8. Forbids the exaction of any fee for burials.

10. Forbids any woman, save those permitted by former canons, to dwell in the same house with a clergyman.

11. Forbids the ordination of illegitimates.
 12 and 14. Forbid pluralities.
 13. Every clerk to remain "semper" in the title to which he was ordained.
 15 and 16. Forbid the clergy to receive any ecclesiastical preferment at the hand of a layman, and kings, &c., to make any such investiture.
 18. Forbids the laity to have chaplains independent of the bishop.
 23. Forbids to eat flesh from Ash-Wednesday to Easter.
 24. Directs that holy orders shall be conferred only in the Ember seasons and on Quadragesima Sunday.
 28.¹ Directs that all who communicate shall receive the Body and Blood of Christ *under both kinds*, unless there be necessity to the contrary.
 29 and 30. Accord the same safety to those who, when pursued by their enemies, take refuge by a cross, as if in the church itself.
 32. Devotes to eternal infamy those who arrest or throw into prison a bishop.

However, of all the acts of this council the most celebrated is the publication of the crusade to recover the Holy Land. This project was conceived by Gregory VII.; and Urban, yielding to the earnest entreaties of Peter the hermit, put it into execution; declaring that all penitents who assumed the cross, should be henceforward absolved from all their sins, and freed from the duty of fasting, and every other penitential work, in consideration of the perils and fatigues they would have to encounter. Those who, having taken the cross failed to fulfil their vow, were excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 506.

CLOVES-HOO (OR CLIFF'S-HOE) (742). [*Concilium Clovehonense.*] Held in 742; Ethelbald,² King of the Mercians, and Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, presiding. Several bishops attended, and diligent inquiry was

¹ "Ne quis communicet de altari nisi Corpus separatim et Sanguinem similiter sumat, nisi per necessitatem et per cautelam." The necessity to the contrary, according to Martene, probably refers to the case of children or sick persons.

² "Ethelbald probably acted as a sort of chairman; but as the business was entirely ecclesiastical, the lead most likely was taken by Cuthbert, the archbishop."—Soames, *Hist. of Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 103, note.

made how matters relating to religion, and particularly to the creed, were ordered in the infancy of the Church of England, and in what esteem monasteries then were.

The ordinance of King Wihtred concerning the election and authority of the heads of monasteries, made in the Council of Becancelde, A.D. 692, was read, and renewed by Ethelbald in these words :

“I, Ethelbald, King of the Mercians, for the health of my soul and the stability of my kingdom, and out of reverence to the venerable Archbishop Cuthbert, confirm it by the subscription of my own munificent hand, that the liberty, honour, authority, and security of the Church of Christ be contradicted by no man ; but that she and all the lands belonging to her, be free from all secular services, except military expedition, and the building of a bridge or castle. And we charge that this be irrefragably and immutably observed by all, as the aforesaid King Wihtred ordained for him and his.”—Johnson’s *Ecc. Canon.* Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1532. Wilkins’ *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 86.

CLOVES-HOO (747). Held in the beginning of September 747, in the presence of Ethelbald, King of the Mercians, Cuthbert of Canterbury presiding ; eleven bishops and several priests attended. Two letters from Pope Zachary were read, after which thirty canons were drawn up.

1. Charges every bishop to be ready to defend his pastoral charge, and the canonical institutions of the Church of Christ with his utmost endeavours, and to be an example of good, not of worldliness, to his people, and to preach sound doctrine.

2. Exhorts bishops to unity and charity amongst themselves, so that, however far distant in sees, they may yet be joined together in mind by one spirit, serving God in faith, hope, and charity, and praying for each other.

3. Orders annual personal and thorough episcopal visitations of the whole diocese, and directs the bishop to call the people of every condition together to convenient places, and to plainly teach them, and forbid them all pagan and superstitious observances, &c.

4. Directs bishops to exhort all abbots and abbesses within their dioceses to exhibit a good example in their lives, and to rule well their houses.

5. Orders bishops to visit those monasteries which, owing to the corruption of the times, were governed by laymen.

6. Directs due inquiry to be made concerning the good life and sound faith of candidates for priest's orders.

7. Directs bishops, abbots, and abbesses to take care that their "families" do incessantly apply their minds to reading.

8. Exhorts priests to the right discharge of their duty; to desist from secular business; to serve at the altar with the utmost application; carefully to preserve the house of prayer and its furniture; to spend their time in reading, celebrating masses, and psalmody, &c.

9. Exhorts priests, in the places assigned to them by their bishops, to attend to the duties of the apostolical commission, in baptising, teaching, and visiting, and carefully to abstain from all wicked and ridiculous conversation.

10. Directs that priests should learn how to perform, according to the lawful rites, every office belonging to their order; that they shall also learn to construe and explain in their native tongue the Lord's Prayer and creed, and the sacred words used at mass and in holy baptism; that they shall understand the spiritual signification of the sacraments, &c.

11. Relates to the faith held by priests, orders that it shall be sound and sincere, and that their ministrations shall be uniform; that they shall teach all men that "without faith it is impossible to please God;" that they shall instil the creed into them, and propose it to infants and their sponsors.

12. Forbids priests "to prate in church," and "to dislocate or confound the composure and distinction of the sacred words" by theatrical pronunciation; directs them to follow the "plain song" according to the custom of the Church; or, if they cannot do that, simply to read the words. Also forbids priests to presume to interfere in episcopal functions.

13. Orders the due observation of the festivals of our Lord and Saviour, and of the nativity of the saints, according to the Roman martyrology.

14. Orders the due observation of the Lord's day.

15. Orders that the seven canonical hours of prayer be diligently observed.

16. Orders that the Litanies or rogations be kept by the clergy and people, with great reverence, on St Mark's day, and on the three days preceding Ascension Day.

17. Orders the observance of the "birth-days" of Pope Gregory, of St Augustine of Canterbury, who "first brought the knowledge of faith, the sacrament of baptism, and the notice of the heavenly country," to the English nation.

18 Orders the observance of the Ember fasts in the fourth, seventh, and tenth months,¹ according to the Roman ritual.

19. Relates to the behaviour and dress of monks and nuns.

20. Charges bishops to take care that monasteries, as their name imports, be honest retreats for the silent and quiet, not receptacles for versifiers, harpers, and buffoons; forbids too much familiarity with laymen, especially to nuns; bids the latter not spend their time in filthy talk, junketting, drunkenness, luxury, nor in making vestments of divers and vain-glorious colours, but rather in reading books and singing psalms.

21. Enjoins all monks and ecclesiastics to avoid the sin of drunkenness, and forbids them to help themselves to drink before three in the afternoon, except in cases of necessity.

22. Admonishes monks and ecclesiastics to keep themselves always prepared to receive the holy communion.

23. Encourages boys among the laity to receive frequently the communion, while they are not yet corrupted; also bachelors and married men who avoid sin, lest they grow weak for want of the salutary meat and drink.

24. Orders that laymen be well tried before they be admitted into the ecclesiastical state or into monasteries.

26. Relates to almsgiving.

27. Relates to psalmody, as used for the cure of the soul, and as a satisfaction for sin.

28. Forbids to receive greater numbers into monasteries than can be maintained; relates to the dress of monks and nuns.

29. Forbids clerks, monks, and nuns, to dwell with lay persons.

¹ The *Lenten* Ember fast seems to be here omitted, as forming part of the great Lent fast.

30. Enjoins, amongst other things, that prayer be made by all monks and ecclesiastics for kings and dukes, and for the safety of all Christian people.—Johnson, *Ecc. Canons*. Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1565. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 94. Godwin, *De Prat. Angl.*, p. 44. (Ed. Richardson.)

CLOVES-HOO (800). Held in 800, by Athelhard, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence of Kenulf, King of the Mercians. Laws were made for the preservation of Church property, and the faith of the Church declared to be substantially the same as that delivered by St Augustine. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1153. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 162.

CLOVES-HOO. (803). Held October 12, 803, by Athelhard of Canterbury, with twelve bishops of his province, and four priest abbots. The object of this council was to settle the primacy finally at Canterbury, and to restore the dioceses which had been taken from that province by King Offa and Pope Adrian, viz., Lichfield, Worcester, Leicester, Sidnacheater,¹ Hereford, Helman,² and Thetford. All these sees had been united to make a province for the Archbishop of Lichfield, who at this time was Adulf. Leo III., upon his attaining the popedom, favoured the request of King Kenulf and Athelhard, that the dismembered dioceses should be restored to the archbishopric of Canterbury, which was finally done in this council, which Adulf himself attended. It was decreed, "that the see archiepiscopal, from this time forward, should never be in the monastery of Lichfield, nor in any other place but the city of Canterbury, where Christ's Church is, and where the Catholic faith first shone forth in this island." The deed is signed by Athelhard and twelve bishops, each making beside his signature the sign of the cross.—Johnson, *Ecclesiastical Canon* Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1189. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 166.

CLOVES-HOO (822). Held in 822. Cænwulf, King of Mercia, having forcibly seized several of the Church lands in Kent, threatening the Archbishop Wulfred with banishment in case of resistance, gave them to his daughter Wendritha, Abbess of Whinchcombe in Gloucestershire. After the death of Cænwulf, Wulfred was enabled to obtain redress, and in this council the property of the Church was restored.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1527. Wilkins' *Conc.*, vol. i. p. 172.

¹ Probably Hatfield, in Lincolnshire.

² Probably Elmham, in Norfolk.

CLOVES-HOO (824). Held in 824. In this council the difference which had existed between Herbert of Worcester and the monks of Berkley, concerning the monastery of Westbury, was settled; the monastery being surrendered to the bishop. The decree, dated October 30, was signed by the king, twelve bishops, four abbots, the pope's deputy, and several lords.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1555. *Wikins' Conc.*, vol. i. p. 175.

COBLENTZ (922). [*Concilium Confluentinum.*] Held in 922, by order of the two kings, Charles the Simple, of France, and Henry of Germany. Eight bishops were present, Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, presiding, who drew up eight canons, of which no more than five have come down to us. The sixth directs that monks shall submit in all things to the jurisdiction and control of the bishop of the diocese; also marriages between relations, as far as the sixth degree, are forbidden.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 579.

COGNAC (1238). [*Concilium Coprinianense.*] Held on the Monday after the octave of Easter, 1238, by Gerard de Malemort, Archbishop of Bordeaux, together with his suffragans. Thirty-eight canons, or articles of regulation, were published, amongst which we find some which show what great abuses had then crept into the monastic system.

9. Orders that each bishop shall take care that sentences of excommunication pronounced by a brother bishop be enforced within his own diocese.

12 and 13. Forbid priests and monks to act as advocates in any cause, save that of their own churches or of the poor.

18. Fines those who continue forty days in a state of excommunication.

19. Directs that not only those persons who maltreat a clergyman shall be excluded from holding any ecclesiastical office or preferment, but their descendants also to the third generation.

20. Forbids abbots to give money to their monks in lieu of board, lodging, and clothing; also to take any entrance fee from new comers. Orders that, if the revenues of the house are too small for the maintenance of a large number of monks, the number shall be reduced.

22. Forbids monks to leave their walls without leave, and to eat abroad.

25. Orders that if either monk or canon shall be found to possess any property, he shall be deprived of church burial.

29. Forbids them to eat their meals with lay persons.

30. Forbids their living alone in priories, &c.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 556.

COGNAC (1255). Held in 1255, by the same archbishop, in which thirty-nine canons were published. The first seventeen are but a repetition of those of the Council of Cognac, 1238.

19. Relates to fasting and abstinence.

20. Prohibits, under pain of excommunication, to eat flesh in Lent, especially on the first Sunday.

21. Contains a list of festivals to be observed throughout the year.

22. Declares that there are but ten prefaces.

23. Forbids the laity to enter the choir during service.

24. Directs that women about the time of their confinement shall confess and communicate.

26. Excommunicates those who attend fairs and markets on Sundays or festival days.

38. Forbids the married clergy to exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

39. Forbids to bury any corpse within the church, except that of the founder, the patron, or the chaplain.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 746.

COGNAC (1260). Held in 1260, by Pierre de Roncevaux, Archbishop of Bordeaux. Nineteen statutes were made.

1. Forbids night-service or vigils either in the church or churchyard, on account of the disorders committed by the people who attended.

2. Forbids an ancient custom of dancing within the church on the day of the festival of the Holy Innocents, and choosing a mock bishop.

5. Forbids a priest to marry parties belonging to another parish without the licence of the chaplain or prior belonging to that parish.

7. Forbids, under anathema, cock-fighting, then much practised in schools.

15 and 16. Forbid extra-parochial burial without the

curate's permission. One object of this canon was to prevent the ecclesiastical burial of excommunicated persons—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 799.

COGNAC (1262). Held in 1262, by the same Archbishop of Bordeaux. Seven statutes were published.

1. Lays under an interdict those places in which ecclesiastical persons or property were forcibly detained.

5. Enjoins the clergy to say the office within churches with closed doors in places under interdict, and forbids any of the parishioners attending.

Another council was held by the same archbishop in the following year; the place is uncertain. Seven articles were agreed upon, of which the second declares that a person under sentence of excommunication for twelve months shall be looked upon as a heretic.—Tom. xi. p. 820-822.

COLOGNE (346). [*Coloniense.*] A council of fourteen bishops was held here (according to Sirmondus in 345) when Euphratas, the Bishop of Cologne, was deposed as a follower of Photinus, denying the divinity of Christ. As Euphratas, Bishop of Cologne, was present at Sardica in the year following, Pagi infers that his successor bore the same name; Sirmondus, that he had recanted and been restored to his see. Schram. i. 207.

COLOGNE (887). Held on the 1st of April 887. In it the ancient canons were confirmed, and censures pronounced against those who pillaged the property of the Church, oppressed the poor, and married within the forbidden limits.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 396.

COLOGNE (1260). Held on the 12th of March 1260, by Conrad, Archbishop of Cologne. In it were drawn up fourteen canons of discipline for the clergy, and eighteen for monks. Amongst the former:

1. Is directed against those of the clergy who kept mistresses: forbids them to be present at the marriage of their children, and to leave them any thing by will.

3. Declares that all clergy should know how to read, and to chaunt the praises of God; and orders such as cannot do so to provide a deputy.

7. Orders that in churches belonging to canons, if there be no dormitory,¹ one shall be forthwith built, and that

¹ "*Dormitorium*," a gallery divided into several little cells, in which the monks live and sleep.

the said canons shall occupy it, that they may be always ready to assist at matins; also forbids them to eat or sleep out of the confines of their church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 784.

COLOGNE (1266). Held in 1266, by Engilbert, Archbishop of Cologne. Fifty-four canons were drawn up, which are chiefly against the plunderers of the Church, and those who killed, injured, and defrauded ecclesiastics. The last orders that the name of sacrilegious persons shall be kept in a book, and constantly read out.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 835.

COLOGNE (1280). Held in 1280, by Sifridus, Archbishop of Cologne; eighteen canons were drawn up.

1. Relates to the life and conversation of the clergy, and forbids them to play at games of chance; directs them to say daily the office of the Blessed Virgin.

3. Relates to the state, &c., of the religious, and forbids monks or nuns to have any sort of property.

7. Treats at length of the sacrament of the altar, and directs that before celebrating the communion, the priests shall have said matins and prime, and have confessed, if they have the opportunity.

8. Treats of the sacrament of penance, and forbids priests to say, *themselves*, the masses which they impose by way of penance.

9. Of orders.

10. Of matrimony.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1107.

COLOGNE (1300). Held about the year 1300, by Wichbold, Archbishop of Cologne; twenty-two canons were published. The second orders deans to deliver in writing a list of all non-resident incumbents in their deaneries. 15. Orders all priests in the diocese to excite their parishioners to contribute towards the fabric of the cathedral of Cologne. 17. Orders that the clerks appointed to ring the bells shall not be illiterate persons, who, if occasion require, may be able to assist the priest at the altar. (*See next council.*)—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1439.

COLOGNE (1310). Held on the 9th of March 1310, by Henry, Archbishop of Cologne, and three bishops. Twenty-nine canons were published.

11. Directs that the epistles and gospels shall be read only by persons in holy orders.

16. Directs that those persons, whose office it is to ring the

church bells, shall know how to read, in order that they may be able to make the responses; and also that they shall wear the alb during divine service.¹

17. Directs that the rural deans shall provide that all their churches be furnished with proper ornaments.

21. Forbids to pronounce a curse against any person in the church, and to sing the "*Media Vita*" against any one, without the bishop's leave.

23. Directs that in future the year shall commence at the festival of Christmas, according to the use of the Roman Church.

Others forbid parishioners to receive the holy communion, at Easter, at the hands of any but their own curates; order nuns to keep close to their cloisters, and monks to observe strictly the rule of poverty.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1517.

COLOGNE (1423). Held in 1423, by Theoderic, Archbishop of Cologne. Eleven canons were made. Amongst other things, it was decreed, that clergymen convicted of incontinence should be deposed, if, after due warning, they did not amend their scandalous life; that priests alone should be named to preach indulgences and to collect alms; that canons and other clerks refrain from talking during divine service, under penalty of losing the allowance.

The ninth canon is directed against the doctrines of Wickliff and John Huss.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 360.

COLOGNE (1452). Held in 1452, by Cardinal Nicolas de Cusa, legate *à latere* for Germany. Here it was decreed that a provincial council should be held at Cologne every three years, so that a synod should be held every year in one of the three dioceses; that all Jews, of both sexes, should have their dress marked with a circle, in order to distinguish them; that the clergy should keep their hair cut short; also, that processions with the holy sacrament should not be permitted to take place too frequently, and then that all should be done with extreme reverence.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1378.

¹ Bede, who lived in the early part of the eighth century, seems to be the first author who speaks of bells (*campanæ*). Probably they were first introduced in churches in the seventh century. Originally it was the priest's duty to sound the bells. Charlemagne, in his *Capitulars*, l. vi. c. 168, directs that the priests alone shall ring the bells for the canonical hours; and at least as late as the last century, it was the custom at *Nôtre Dame*, in Paris, for the bells to be rung by clergymen in surplices.

COLOGNE (1536). Held in 1536, by Hermann Weiden, Archbishop of Cologne, assisted by his suffragans, and several others. This prince-prelate afterwards forsook the doctrines of the Church for those of Luther and the reformers of Germany. He established Bucer at Bonn in 1542, and invited Melancthon, Pistorius, and others. His clergy opposed him, and appealed to Rome, where he was cited to appear. In his absence he was excommunicated, April 16, 1546, and all his subjects released from their oath of allegiance. The clergy were ready to act upon this, but the nobles, whom the mild and virtuous life of the prelate had attached to him, refused to do so. Eventually, for the sake of peace, Weiden resigned, January 25, 1547, and died 1552. His successor, Prince Adolphus of Schawenburg, re-established the Catholic faith. The acts of this council are divided into fourteen articles, each article containing several decrees relating to the discipline of the Church.

Art. 1. Consists of thirty-six canons, and treats of the duties of bishops, especially in ordaining and visiting. Amongst other things:—4. Buying and selling of benefices, and worldly motives in giving them, are denounced as detestable; also, 32. Pluralities are condemned, and those who have the pope's licence for a plurality of benefices are bidden to inquire of their consciences whether they have God's licence also.

Art. 2. Relates to the offices of the Church, &c., and contains thirty-two canons. Bishops are exhorted to reform their Breviaries where they are defective, and to purge out all false or doubtful legends, which have been inserted, "*nescimus qua incuria*," instead of passages from Holy Scripture; directions are given that the Breviary be recited with reverence and attention, and that the mass be celebrated with proper devotion. Canon 15. Defines the proper use of organs, which, it states, are intended to excite devotion, and not profane emotions of joy. With regard to the morals and conduct of the clergy, it states (canon 22), that pride, luxury, and avarice are the principal causes of their evil reputation; and (in canons 23, 24, 25,) that they ought to abstain from great feasts and good living, and from drunkenness and other like vices.

Arts. 3, 4, and 5, relate to cathedral and other churches,

and those who serve them, to the mendicant friars, &c., and contain in all fifty-seven canons. Canons are ordered to live canonically, as their name imports, to remember the original intention of their institution, which was, that they should dwell together, &c. ; if they fail on any occasion to be present at mass after the epistle, or at the hours after the first Psalm, they shall be deprived of their allowance. Non-residence is forbidden. Persons having cure of souls are exhorted to be careful to exhibit a pattern to their flocks.

Art. 6. Relates to the preaching of the word of God, and contains twenty-seven canons; states that the preacher ought constantly to read in and meditate upon the Holy Scriptures; to accommodate his discourse to the understanding of his hearers; to avoid profane eloquence and worldly declamation, and everything tending to the ridiculous; shows how the clergy are to instruct the people upon controverted subjects, and to repress vice. Canon 26 directs that the decalogue and creed shall be plainly recited immediately after the sermon.

Art. 7. Relates to the sacraments of the Church, and contains fifty-two canons. It reckons seven sacraments; directs that the clergy should instruct the people that the visible part of a sacrament is but the sensible sign of the effect produced upon the soul; it treats of each of the seven sacraments in detail. Amongst other things, it declares, that, in order to be admitted to the communion, it is necessary to have a pure conscience, a heart truly penitent, and a lively faith, to realise the truth of Christ's body, offered and his blood poured forth in that sacrament. With regard to the communion in both kinds, canon 15 directs the priest to teach those of his parishioners who are hurt at the denial of the cup, that the layman who receives the bread only, receives as fully and completely both the body and the blood of our Lord, as the priest does who receives in both kinds; that the Church, out of reverence to the sacrament, and for the salvation of the faithful, hath thought proper so to order it, and that, consequently, the laity, being assured that they do receive both the body and the blood of Christ, should submit to its judgment.

Art. 8. Containing seven canons, is upon the subject of the maintenance of the clergy; it forbids any fee for the administration of the sacraments or for burials; it also

enjoins the restoration of tithes by those laymen who had usurped them.

Art. 9. Containing twenty-one canons, speaks of the usages and customs of the Church; directs that fasting, being an ordinance of the Church, may not be neglected, and declares that to eat delicious first-meals on days appointed to be observed with fasting, is not to obey the spirit of the Church's injunction; it also explains the appointment of Rogation days, and declares that Sunday is to be observed and kept holy; that on that day it is the duty of the faithful to hear mass and the sermon, and to sing psalms and hymns; forbids fairs to be held on that day, and the frequenting of taverns.

Art. 10. Contains nineteen canons, and relates to monastic discipline.

Art. 11. Contains eight canons, relating to almshouses, hospitals, and similar establishments; states that it is the bishop's duty to look after the repair of those which have fallen into decay, and to provide for the spiritual care of those persons who dwell in them.

Art. 12. Contains nine canons, relating to schools, libraries, &c.

Art. 13. Relates to contests about ecclesiastical jurisdiction, &c., and contains four canons.

Art. 14. Relates to episcopal and other visitations, and contains twenty-four canons.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 484.

COLOGNE (1549). Held in 1549, by prince Adolphus de Schawenburg, archbishop. Several statutes were made for the reformation of the Church; the six principal methods recommended are the following.

1. The restoration of learning.
2. The examination of candidates for holy orders.
3. Care and diligence on the part of the clergy in the performance of their sacred function.
4. Episcopal and archidiaconal visitations.
5. The frequent convocation of synods.
6. The removal of the principal abuses.

1. As to the first, it was ordered that the education of the young should be confided only to persons of known purity of faith and life, and who had undergone an examination by the ordinary, or by persons approved by him. That no suspected nor contagious works should be allowed in colleges or universities.

2. It is declared that the examination of candidates for orders, and of persons to be instituted to benefices, belongs to the bishop alone, or to persons authorised by him; and that those who desire to be ordained shall give public notice of the same.

3. The clergy are ordered to inflict the penalty enjoined by the canons upon those whose sins have deserved it, and not to remit it for money. Pluralities are forbidden.

4. The end of episcopal visitations is declared to be the correction of vice, and the restoration of purity of life and discipline. Bishops are exhorted to take but few followers with them in their visitations, to avoid burdening their clergy.

5. The necessity of holding ecclesiastical synods is shown, in order to preserve the faith and discipline of the Church in their integrity, and to maintain purity of morals, to ensure the reformation of abuses.

6. Treats of the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline.

The statutes were approved by the emperor's letters patent.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 627.

COMPIEGNE (756). [*Concilium Compendiense.*] Held in 756. At this council, Pepin, King of France, several bishops and lords, together with the legates of Pope Stephen, were present. An organ sent by the Eastern emperor to Pepin was received. Eighteen canons were published, chiefly relating to questions about marriages.

1. Orders the separation of parties marrying within the fourth degree.

3. Declares that a wife taking the veil without her husband's consent, must be given up to him, if he requires it.

5. Allows a free man who marries a slave under the idea that she was free, to put her away and to marry again; also allows the same to a free woman.

9. Declares baptism administered by an unbaptised priest, in the name of the Blessed Trinity, valid.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1694.

COMPIEGNE (1235). Held on the 5th August 1235, concerning certain articles which, according to the Archbishop of Rheims, violated the liberties of the Church. The archbishop and six of his suffragans proceeded to St

Denys, in order to make a second monition to the king, which step induced the lords to prefer a complaint by letter to the pope against the bishops and clergy; this letter is dated September, 1235. The king (St Louis), by an ordinance, declared that his own vassals and those of the lords, were not bound, in civil matters, to answer any charge in the ecclesiastical courts; and that if the ecclesiastical judge should proceed to excommunicate any one in such a case, he should be compelled to remove the excommunication by the seizure of his temporalities. The pope exhorted St Louis to revoke this ordinance, declaring, amongst other things, that God had confided to the pope both the temporal and spiritual government of the world. However, the letter seems to have had little effect upon St Louis, who refused to revoke the edict.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 503.

COMPIEGNE (1277). Held in 1277, by Peter Barbet, Archbishop of Rheims, with eight of his suffragans. They made a decree relating to the insubordinate conduct of the chapters of the cathedral churches of the province, who pretended, amongst other things, to a right to put a stop to divine service, and to lay the city under an interdict, for the sake of protecting their own immunities.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1031.

COMPIEGNE (1304). Held on the 4th January 1304, by Robert de Courtenay, Archbishop of Rheims, assisted by eight bishops, and the deputies of three absent. They made five decrees.

2. Forbids the levying imposts upon the clergy under false pretences.

5. Restricts the dinner of the clergy of the province to two dishes, over and above the pottage or soup, except they have any great person at the table.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1402.

COMPOSTELLA (899). Held on Sunday, May 6th, 899, upon occasion of the dedication of the church to the Saviour and St James. In this synod Oviedo was raised to a metropolitan see.—*Esp. Sagr.* Tom. xix. p. 944. Seventeen bishops were present, together with King Alfonso, his family, and many others.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 482.

COMPOSTELLA (1061). Held in 1061, by Cresconius, Bishop of Compostella. Amongst other things, it was de-

creed that all bishops and priests should say mass daily, and that the clergy should wear hair shirts on days of fasting and penitence.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1087. Aguirre tom. iii. p. 322, and Hardouin.

CONSTANCE (1414 to 1418). [*Concilium Constantiense.*] This council was assembled by Pope John XXIII., in accordance with the writ of the Emperor Sigismund. One of its chief objects was to put an end to the schism which had afflicted the Church for thirty years, and which was caused by the several claimants of the papacy. At this time, besides John (Balthasar Cossa), two others claimed the title of pope, viz., Pedro of Luna, a native of Catalonia, who styled himself Benedict XIII., and Angelo Corrario, a Venetian, who assumed the name of Gregory XII.

Another object of the council was to take cognisance of the heresies of Huss and Wickliff. The council was convoked to meet at Constance on the festival of All Saints, A.D. 1414, and so great was the influx of persons, that it was reckoned that not less than thirty thousand horses were brought to Constance,¹ which may give us some idea of the enormous concourse of people.

The council was opened on the 5th, with solemn prayer, and the first session held on the 16th November, in which John the pope presided, and delivered an address, in which he exhorted all present to give themselves entirely to the business of the council. After which the bull of convocation was read, and the officers of the council were appointed, viz.,

Ten notaries.

One guardian of the council.

Four *Scrutators*, viz., one auditor of the camera, one auditor of the Rota,² one "Scriptor apostolicus" and one canon of Rome.

¹ One archbishop alone brought with him six hundred horses. It was therefore no wonder that provender for cattle became extremely scarce; indeed, a regulation was subsequently made, restricting John himself to twenty horses; the cardinals, to ten each; the bishops, to five; and abbots, to four.

² "*Rota*," one of the chief tribunals of Rome, composed of twelve prelates called "auditors of the rota," eight of whom are Italians, two Spaniards, one French, and one German, the senior acting as president. The sovereigns of their respective nations nominate the last four. They take cognisance of all appeals relating to ecclesiastical suits, and to matters relating to benefices, &c. From them an appeal lies to the pope in persons. The origin of the name seems not to be very clear. Their judgments are called "decisions."

Denys, in order to make a second monition to the king, which step induced the lords to prefer a complaint by letter to the pope against the bishops and clergy; this letter is dated September, 1235. The king (St Louis), by an ordinance, declared that his own vassals and those of the lords, were not bound, in civil matters, to answer any charge in the ecclesiastical courts; and that if the ecclesiastical judge should proceed to excommunicate any one in such a case, he should be compelled to remove the excommunication by the seizure of his temporalities. The pope exhorted St Louis to revoke this ordinance, declaring, amongst other things, that God had confided to the pope both the temporal and spiritual government of the world. However, the letter seems to have had little effect upon St Louis, who refused to revoke the edict.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 503.

COMPIEGNE (1277). Held in 1277, by Peter Barbet, Archbishop of Rheims, with eight of his suffragans. They made a decree relating to the insubordinate conduct of the chapters of the cathedral churches of the province, who pretended, amongst other things, to a right to put a stop to divine service, and to lay the city under an interdict, for the sake of protecting their own immunities.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1031.

COMPIEGNE (1304). Held on the 4th January 1304, by Robert de Courtenay, Archbishop of Rheims, assisted by eight bishops, and the deputies of three absent. They made five decrees.

2. Forbids the levying imposts upon the clergy under false pretences.

5. Restricts the dinner of the clergy of the province to two dishes, over and above the pottage or soup, except they have any great person at the table.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1402.

COMPOSTELLA (899). Held on Sunday, May 6th, 899, upon occasion of the dedication of the church to the Saviour and St James. In this synod Oviedo was raised to a metropolitan see.—*Esp. Sagr.* Tom. xix. p. 944. Seventeen bishops were present, together with King Alfonso, his family, and many others.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 482.

COMPOSTELLA (1061). Held in 1061, by Cresconius, Bishop of Compostella. Amongst other things, it was de-

Council of Rome against the writings of Wickliff was confirmed.¹

The emperor was present in the sixth session, April 16, in which Pope John XXIII. was summoned to present himself at the council, or to issue a bull, declaring that he had vacated the pontificate. It is, however, easy to see by his answer to the deputies, that his design was only to amuse the council, and thenceforward the fathers resolved to proceed against him as against a notorious heretic and schismatic. A citation was also issued against Jerome of Prague.

In the seventh session, May 2, John was cited to appear in person with his adherents within nine days, in order to justify himself with respect to the charges of heresy, schism, simony, and various other enormous crimes brought against him; in case of refusal, they declared that they would proceed against him. It may be observed that John, after many removals, had at this time settled at Brisac.

In this session the affair of Jerome of Prague was again discussed.

In the eighth session, May 4, the condemnation of Wickliff's errors was proceeded with. The errors imputed to him were contained in forty-five articles or propositions. He is said in the first three to deny the doctrine of transubstantiation and a real corporal presence. In 4, to assert that a bishop or priest, in mortal sin, cannot perform the proper functions of his office. In 6, that God is obliged to obey the devil. 8, That a bad pope has no power over the Church. In 13, that they who hinder preaching will be held excommunicated by Christ in the last day. 16, That the temporal powers may, at will, take away the property of the Church. 18, That tithes are merely charitable offerings, which may be denied to the bad ministers. 27, That all things happen by an absolute necessity. 28, That confirmation, ordination, and consecration of places have been reserved to the pope and to bishops solely for the sake of gain. 29, That universities, schools, &c., are mere vanities, which help the devil as much as they do the Church. 34, That all of the order of mendicants are heretics. 35, That no one entering into any order of religion can keep the Divine precept, and therefore cannot attain to the kingdom

¹ The decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions were entirely approved and received by the clergy of France, in an assembly held in 1682.

tion requiring the opinion of the Church, refuse to convoke a council for the purpose.

2. When important matters concerning the government of the Church are in agitation, requiring to be set at rest by an œcumenical council, which, nevertheless, the pope refuses to convoke.

In the third session, March 25, the Cardinal of Florence¹ read a declaration made in the name of the council, by which it is declared, first, that the council is lawfully assembled; secondly, that the flight of the pope cannot dissolve it, and that it shall not separate, nor be transferred to another place, until the union of the Church shall have been effected, and the Church reformed as to faith and morals; thirdly, that John XXIII. shall not withdraw his officers from Constance without the approval and consent of the council, nor shall the prelates leave the council without just cause.

The Emperor Sigismund was himself present in the fourth session, March 30, in which the Cardinal of Florence read the five articles upon which the fathers of the council had agreed. The most worthy of note is the decree, which declares that the aforesaid Council of Constance having been lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and forming an œcumenical council of the whole Church militant, hath received its authority immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ; a power which every person whatsoever, of whatever state or dignity he may be, even the pope himself, must obey in all matters relating to the faith, the extirpation of schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members. It was also decreed that the pope should not transfer the council to any other place, and declared null and void all processes and censures directed by the pope against those attending the council.

In the fifth session, April 6, the articles which had been read in the last, were a second time read, and unanimously approved. The departure of John was declared to be unlawful, and that he would justly subject himself to corporal punishment and imprisonment should he refuse to return. The emperor was charged to arrest all persons endeavouring to quit Constance in disguise. Also the decree of the

¹ Cardinal Francesco Zabarella, Archbishop of Florence, commonly called the Cardinal of Florence.

Council of Rome against the writings of Wickliff was confirmed.¹

The emperor was present in the sixth session, April 16, in which Pope John XXIII. was summoned to present himself at the council, or to issue a bull, declaring that he had vacated the pontificate. It is, however, easy to see by his answer to the deputies, that his design was only to amuse the council, and thenceforward the fathers resolved to proceed against him as against a notorious heretic and schismatic. A citation was also issued against Jerome of Prague.

In the seventh session, May 2, John was cited to appear in person with his adherents within nine days, in order to justify himself with respect to the charges of heresy, schism, simony, and various other enormous crimes brought against him; in case of refusal, they declared that they would proceed against him. It may be observed that John, after many removals, had at this time settled at Brisac.

In this session the affair of Jerome of Prague was again discussed.

In the eighth session, May 4, the condemnation of Wickliff's errors was proceeded with. The errors imputed to him were contained in forty-five articles or propositions. He is said in the first three to deny the doctrine of transubstantiation and a real corporal presence. In 4, to assert that a bishop or priest, in mortal sin, cannot perform the proper functions of his office. In 6, that God is obliged to obey the devil. 8, That a bad pope has no power over the Church. In 13, that they who hinder preaching will be held excommunicated by Christ in the last day. 16, That the temporal powers may, at will, take away the property of the Church. 18, That tithes are merely charitable offerings, which may be denied to the bad ministers. 27, That all things happen by an absolute necessity. 28, That confirmation, ordination, and consecration of places have been reserved to the pope and to bishops solely for the sake of gain. 29, That universities, schools, &c., are mere vanities, which help the devil as much as they do the Church. 34, That all of the order of mendicants are heretics. 35, That no one entering into any order of religion can keep the Divine precept, and therefore cannot attain to the kingdom

¹ The decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions were entirely approved and received by the clergy of France, in an assembly held in 1682.

of heaven. 37, That the Church of Rome is the synagogue of Satan. 38, That the decretals are apocryphal, and the clergy who study them fools. 39, That the emperor and secular princes who endowed the Church were seduced by the devil. 41, That it is not necessary to salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme amongst all other churches. 42, That it is folly to put faith in the indulgences of popes and bishops. 44, That Augustine, Benedict, and Bernard are damned, unless they repented of having had property, and of having entered the religious state. 45, That all religions indifferently have been introduced by the devil. All of these forty-five articles, together with all the books written by him, were condemned, and his bones ordered to be dug up, and cast out of consecrated ground.

In the interval between sessions eight and nine, John XXIII. was arrested at Fribourg.

In this session, May 13, a proposition was received from the pope, offering to send three cardinals to the council to answer the charges brought against him; but the council rejected the offer. Two cardinals and five prelates were nominated to summon the pope thrice at the door of the church, and as he did not appear, an act declaring this citation was drawn up.

After this session the depositions of witnesses against John were taken; amongst the ten who came forward were bishops, abbots, and doctors.

On the following day, in the tenth session, May 14, the commissioners made their report of the depositions against the pope. After which, having been again cited thrice without appearing, the council proceeded to declare John XXIII. convicted of the charges brought against him; viz., of having brought scandal upon the Church by his corrupt life, and of having publicly been guilty of simony, and as such, suspended from the exercise of any of the functions of the papal office and from every administration temporal or spiritual, with a prohibition, at the same time, to every Christian, of whatever rank or condition, to obey him thenceforth directly or indirectly, under penalty of being punished as an abettor of schism. The accusations were contained under seventy heads, all well proved; but fifty only were read in the council (in the following session), relating chiefly to his simony, his worldly life, his vexatious conduct, his false oaths,

&c. ; other things which decency required to be passed over in silence, were suppressed. Sentence of suspension having been thus pronounced, messengers were sent to him to notify what the council had decreed. He did not deny the justice of his sentence, recognised the council as holy and infallible, and delivered up the seal, ring, and book of supplications, which they demanded of him, begging the council to take measures for his subsistence and honour.

In the eleventh session, May 25, the various heads of the accusation against John XXIII. were read. Jerome of Prague, who had endeavoured to escape, was arrested, and thrown into prison.

In the following session, May 29, the sentence of deposition against John XXIII. having been read, and unanimously approved, was definitively passed; at the same time, all the three competitors for the papacy were declared incapable of being elected again.

In the thirteenth session, June 15, a decree was made, in reply to a petition presented by the Hussites, upon the subject of the communion in both kinds, to this effect, that although Jesus Christ instituted the holy sacrament of the Eucharist after supper, under the two kinds of bread and wine, nevertheless, the use sanctioned by the Church is not to celebrate that sacrament after supper, nor even to permit the faithful to receive it otherwise than fasting, except in cases of sickness or other necessity; and that, secondly, although in the primitive Church this sacrament was received by the faithful in both kinds, yet, in after-ages, the laity had been permitted to receive in one kind only, viz., the bread, and for this reason, because it ought to be most surely believed that the whole body and the whole blood of Jesus Christ is truly contained under the species of bread; that, therefore, the custom introduced by the Church must be regarded as a law, which may not be rejected or altered at the will of individuals, without the sanction of the Church; and that to maintain that this custom is sacrilegious or unlawful is an error, such that the obstinate perseverance in it deserves to be punished as heresy, and even with the secular arm, if necessary.

In this session, July 4,¹ several decrees were read: the

¹ [In the preceding *Baronius*.] Also the three rival popes were by name excluded from the possibility of being again elected.

first of which forbid to proceed to the election of a new pope, without the consent of the council ; also the abdication of Gregory XII. was received, being made in his name by Charles de Malatesta and Cardinal Dominic. Pedro of Luna was called upon to do the same ; but he steadily refused to the day of his death, which happened in 1424.

In the fifteenth session, July 6, the trial of Huss, who was brought before the council, was terminated.

The promoters of the council demanded that the articles preached and taught by John Huss, in Bohemia and elsewhere, being heretical, seditious, deceitful, and offensive to pious ears, should be condemned by the council, and that the books from which they were extracted should be burned. Huss not being willing to retract, was condemned to be degraded and given over to the secular arm, and in the end was cruelly burned alive, on the 6th of July 1415. In the same session, the opinion of John Petit, a D.D. of Paris, was condemned as heretical, scandalous, and seditious ; he maintained that any individual had a right to take away the life of a tyrant, and that the deed was even meritorious ; no sentence, however, was passed upon the author of this opinion, who was protected by the Duke of Burgundy and other powerful friends.

In the two following sessions, July 11 and 15, preparations were made for the departure of King Sigismund, who proposed to go in person to the King of Arragon, to induce him to renounce the cause of Pedro of Luna.

In the eighteenth session, August 17, various decrees were made, one declaring the same credit and obedience to be due towards the bulls of the council, as to those of the holy see.

In the next session, September 23, Jerome of Prague, terrified by the horrible end of Huss, was induced to make a recantation of the errors imputed to him. A declaration was also made, in which it was stated that, notwithstanding the safe conduct of kings, inquisition might always be made into the conduct of heretics.

In the twentieth session, November 21, at which Andrew, titular Archbishop of Rhodes, was present, the differences between the Bishop of Trent and Duke Frederick of Austria were discussed. The twelve Chapters of Narbonne

agreed upon between King Sigismund, and the deputies of the council, and the deputies of Benedict, were approved.

After the session, an assembly was held to consider concerning the reformation of the Church, and the repression of simony.

Also, in the interval between the twentieth and twenty-first sessions, several congregations were held; in one, the affair of John Petit was further discussed; in another, held April 27, 1416, Jerome of Prague, whose retractation was suspected, was brought forward.

In the next session, May 30, 1416, Jerome was again brought before the council, and revoking his forced retractation, spoke boldly in favour of his original opinions; sentence was then passed upon him, he was declared to be a relapsed heretic, was excommunicated and anathematised, and lastly, was handed over to the secular arm, and burned.

Measures were taken in this session, October 15, to unite the Arragonese to the council, they having hitherto acknowledged Benedict XIII.

In the twenty-third session, November 5, 1416, the proceedings against Benedict XIII. (Pedro of Luna) commenced, and he was definitively condemned in the thirty-seventh, July 26, 1417, when he was deposed, and declared to be a perjurer, and to have brought scandal upon the whole Church, &c.; and, as such, the council degraded and deposed him, deprived him of all his dignities and offices, forbidding him thenceforward to consider himself as pope, and all Christian people who obey him, under pain of being dealt with as abettors of schism and heresy.

To the thirty-fifth session, the countries acknowledging Benedict sent deputies.

In the thirty-eighth session, July 28, the decree of the council, annulling all sentences and censures uttered by Benedict XIII. against the ambassadors or allies of the King of Castile, was read. It forbade the pope for the future to take the first-fruits of vacant benefices, which it declared to belong to those to whom ancient use gave them.

In the thirty-ninth session, October 9, the question of Church reform was entered upon, and several decrees made, one of which declares the necessity of frequently holding councils, in order to check the progress of heresy and schism, and directs that another œcumenical council shall

be held five years after the dissolution of the present; a third, seven years after the second; and, after that, one every ten years, in a place appointed by the pope at the close of each council, with the approbation and consent of the council; in case of war or pestilence, the pope, with the concurrence of the cardinals, to have power to appoint any other place, and to hasten, but not to retard, the time for assembling. Another decree provides for cases of schism, and orders that, when there shall be two claimants of the papal chair, a council shall be held in the very next year, and that both claimants shall suspend every administration until the council shall have commenced its sittings. The third decree relates to the profession of faith, which the newly elected pope was to make in the presence of his electors; in it eight œcumenical councils are recognised,¹ besides the general councils of Lateran, Lyons, and Vienne. A fourth decree is directed against the translation of bishops.

In the fortieth session, October 30, a decree, containing eighteen well-matured articles of reformation, was proposed. It was there provided that the new pope, whom they were about speedily to elect, should labour to reform the Church, in its head and in its members, as well as the court of Rome, in concert with the council, or the national deputies. Its principal articles relate to the annates, the reserves of the apostolic see, the collations to benefices, and the expectatives; what causes may or may not be carried to Rome; in what cases it is lawful to depose a pope, and how it can be done; to the extirpation of simony; to dispensations; to indulgences, and to tithes.

The article upon the annates or first-fruits was very warmly discussed by the cardinals and national deputies, but the latter finally declared that it was necessary to suppress them altogether, and chiefly for this reason, that whereas they had been originally but a voluntary offering to the Roman see, they had subsequently been made, under pretext of custom, an obligatory payment. In fact, we find no mention of annates before the time of Clement V., who for three years imposed them upon England, but was opposed by the parliament. Boniface IX. was the first who pretended to claim

¹ Namely, two of Nicea, four of Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon.

them as a right attached to the dignity of sovereign pontiff. Moreover, the taxing of benefices was pronounced a simoniacal exaction.

In the forty-first session, November 8, it was decreed, that for this time alone, six prelates of different nations should be chosen within the space of ten days, in order to proceed to the election of the pope with the college of cardinals. Accordingly the electors held a conclave, and on the 11th of November after, Cardinal Colonna was elected pope, and took the style of Martin V. After his coronation, the national deputies having required of him that he would labour to effect a reformation of the Church, he renewed his promise to do so.

In the forty-second session, December 28, the new pope presided, and the emperor was present. A bull was read, releasing the emperor from the custody of Balthasar, and ordering him to be delivered over to the pope. The national deputies presented a memorial on the subject of reform to the pope. Martin, troubled by their importunity, gave in a scheme of reformation, based upon the eighteen articles proposed in session forty.

Between this and the forty-third session the pope issued a bull confirming the acts, &c., of the Council of Constance. In the edition of Hagenau, A.D. 1500, this bull is regarded as the act of the council itself, whereas in other editions it appears to be the pope who approves and confirms the council. However this may be, the first article of this bull is worthy of remark, for in it Martin desires that any one suspected in the faith shall swear that he receives all the œcumenical councils, and especially that of Constance, which proves that the pope considered this council lawful and œcumenical, and as he desired that all the acts of this council should be received by all persons, he thereby approves that passed in the fifth session, which declares the superiority of the council to the pope.

In the forty-third session, March 21, 1418, decrees were published restraining the abuse of exemptions and dispensations, and condemning simony. The canons relating to modesty of dress in ecclesiastics were renewed, but no other objects of reform were proposed besides those contained in the decree of the fortieth session, and of them six only were drawn up in this forty-third session. The

reformation of the college of cardinals and of the court of Rome, which had been decreed by the council, was passed over without notice.

The pope, in order to satisfy the decree made in the thirty-ninth session, April 19, appointed Pavia for the meeting of the next council.

On the 22nd of April 1418, the last session was held. After the celebration of high mass, the pope read a discourse to the council, which being ended, one of the cardinals, by order of the pope and council, dismissed the assembly with the words, "Go in peace." This council lasted three years and a half.¹—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 1-294. Herman Vander Hart, *Acta Concil. Const.* 6 vols. in fol. 1698. *Bourgeois de Chastenot, Hist. du Conc. du Constance.* Paris, 1718.

CONSTANTINOPLE (359). [*Concilium Constantinopolitanum.*] Ten bishops from the Arian, and ten from the semi-Arian factions at Seleucia, attended at the opening of this council, which Acacius of Cesarea persuaded the emperor to call together. Ursacius and Valens and other Arians afterwards appeared from Ariminum, pretending to represent that council. On their arrival they communicated with the Acacian legates from Seleucia. The emperor strenuously endeavoured to compel all to subscribe the creed of Ariminum, with the Acacian alterations, and even threats and violence were employed, so that eventually Constantius' will prevailed, and most of the semi-Arian legates from Seleucia agreed; the exception was Basil of Ancyra. Eleusius of Cyzicus, Eustachius of Sebastia, and some others were deposed and excommunicated. Also Aelius, accused of many crimes, was deposed from the priesthood, and St Cyril of Jerusalem, reinstated in his see at the Council of Seleucia, was here again deposed, also St Hilary of Poitiers, who was present, was, by the emperor's orders, sent back to his see, and Basil was banished to Illyria. According to some these events took place in two councils held nearly concurrently.

CONSTANTINOPLE (360). Held by Acacius of Cesarea, in which sixty-two bishops, mostly Anomæans, excommunicated and deposed Macedonius, the Arian

¹ In this council it is said that H. de Abendon, Warden of Merton, advocated the claim of the University of Oxford to take precedence of that of Salamanca, which was allowed.

bishop of Constantinople; Basil, Bishop of Ancyra; Eleusius of Cyzicus, and others. Basil was banished to Illyria.—Socrates, Lib. 2. cap. 42.

CONSTANTINOPLE (381). The second œcumenical council was held at Constantinople, A.D. 381, probably before Easter, convoked by order of the Emperor Theodosius.

The principal objects for which this council was convoked were the following :

To confirm the faith as delivered at Nicea.

To appoint a bishop to the church of Constantinople.

To take measures for the union of the Church.

To make regulations for the good of the Church.

Bishops attended from all parts of the East, except (in the early part of the council) Egypt. The number of those present, as commonly received, was one hundred and fifty, but the signatures amount to one hundred and forty-two only. Amongst the more celebrated of the bishops were St Gregory of Nazianzum, Isidorus of Tyre, Gelasius of Cesarea, St Meletius of Antioch, St Gregory of Nyssa, St Peter of Sebaste, St Amphilochius of Iconium, St Pelagius of Laodicea, St Eulogius of Edessa, St Cyril of Jerusalem, Helladius of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Acacius of Berea. "Never were there," says Tillemont, "in any council of the Church, so large a number of saints and confessors." It does not appear that any letter or deputies were sent on the part of Damasus, the pope, or of any other bishop in the West. Theodosius assembled this council from the Eastern Church only. St Meletius at first presided, although his ill health obliged him frequently to absent himself.

The first question considered was that relating to the Church of Constantinople, and it was declared that Maximus,¹ called the Cynic, had not been lawfully made

¹ This Maximus pretending singular holiness, had deluded St Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, and prejudiced him against St Gregory (of Nazianzum) then acting as bishop of the few Catholics at Constantinople. So completely was Peter deceived that he went the extreme length of sending bishops, who secretly, by night, consecrated Maximus to the see, administered by Gregory. Maximus was expelled from Constantinople, as well as from the presence of Theodosius, to whom he betook himself, and could find no other supporter than Pope Damasus, who was prejudiced against St Gregory.

bishop ; that his ordination, and all that he had since done in his pretended character of bishop, was null and void, and that in fine he was a usurper of the see of Constantinople. Then they proceeded to elect to the see St Gregory of Nazianzum, and eventually, notwithstanding his entreaties and tears, obliged him to accept the office. During these proceedings, St Meletius, whose health had been rapidly failing, passed away, and St Gregory of Nazianzum succeeded him as president of the council. He endeavoured with all his powers that Paulinus should be left in the see of Antioch, with the view of appeasing the divisions of that Church ; but his efforts were ineffectual. The council refused to confirm Paulinus in the see, and recommended St Flavianus, the choice of the people of Antioch, who subsequently was elected, and the schism continued for seventeen years longer, Evagrius having been set up to fill the place of Paulinus, by his followers, and even uncanonically consecrated by Paulinus himself. Flavianus was put out of the communion of the whole West and of Egypt. The Macedonian bishops and those of Egypt (who had now arrived) vehemently opposed him, objecting to his election upon the ground that, being already bishop of another see (which he strictly was not), he ought not to have been translated to that of Constantinople. In consequence of this, St Gregory entreated the fathers to permit him to resign the see of Constantinople, which he, in the end, did, and Nectarius, a senator of Tarsus, was elected in his room. During this interval, Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria, presided over the council ; but Nectarius, immediately after his election, took that office upon himself. Now Nectarius, so far from having passed through the inferior degrees, as the canons direct, had not been even baptised.

The exact time at which the following acts were passed in the council is unknown. After labouring in vain to unite the Macedonians to the Church, by proposing to them to receive the faith as settled at Nicea, and which they had previously accepted, they were pronounced to be heretics. The council published in all seven canons.

1. Confirms the faith of the Council of Nicea, and anathematises ("extrema execratione ac detestatione") all who deny it, especially the Arians, Eunomians, Eudoxians, Sabellians, Apollinarians, and others.

2. Forbids bishops to go beyond their borders, and to trouble other dioceses. Orders that the Bishop of Alexandria shall have the sole administration of Egypt, and that the privileges given to the Church of Antioch by the Nicene canons shall be preserved. Orders that the affairs of the Asian, Pontic, and Thracian dioceses shall be severally administered by their respective bishops, and that the synod of each province shall administer the affairs of the province, according to the canon of Nicea.

3. By this canon the primacy of honour is given to the Bishop of Constantinople after the Bishop of Rome, on account, as it states, of its being "the new Rome."¹

4. Declares the nullity of the consecration and of the episcopal acts of Maximus.

5.² As regards the Book of the Western Church, we have also received those in Antioch, who confess one and the same Divinity in the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity.

6. Lays down a rule for ecclesiastical judgments, and permits all persons whatever to bring an accusation against a bishop or any other ecclesiastic on account of any private injury or wrong said to have been received; but in Church

¹ ". . . Constantinopolitanus tamen Episcopus obtineto præcipuum honorem et dignitatem secundum Episcopum Romanorum, ideo quod Constantinopolis Nova Roma est." According to Dupin, the popes rejected the canons of this council on account of the foregoing passage. Yet see the Lateran council, A.D. 1215, chap. v.

² Great doubt exists whether this and the two following canons were made in this council; they are omitted in two of the versions. It is also extremely doubtful what is meant by the "Book of the Western Church." According to Beveridge this book was the letter of the western bishops inviting the Orientals to the Council of Rome, in 382, to which an answer was returned in the following Council of Constantinople. But it is more probable that the epistle of Pope Damasus, circulated throughout the East, and received by the Council of Antioch in 380, is intended. (See C. ANTIOCH, A.D. 380.) Some suppose it to mean the Nicene definition of faith, as confirmed at Sardica.—Hammond's *Canons of the Church*.

The Book mentioned is probably the Confession of Faith transmitted from the West through St Athanasius and St Basil, and by him sent on to St Meletius, and there signed by him and the bishops in communion with him.—Dr Pusey.

matters it directs that no accusation shall be received coming from heretics or schismatics, or from persons excommunicated or deposed, or accused of any crime, before they shall have justified themselves.

7. Gives direction as to the manner in which heretics ought to be received into the Church; Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, Quartodecimani,¹ and Apollinarians, were simply to be required to renounce their errors in writing, to anathematise all heresies, and to be anointed with the holy chrism on the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Others, such as the Eunomians (who baptised with one immersion), Montanists, Sabellians, &c., were to be received as heathens, *i.e.*, to be catechised, exorcised, and baptised.

As to the faith, the council (in canon 1) condemned the Arians, semi-Arians, and Eunomians, who denied the proper Divinity of the Word; the Macedonians, who refused to recognise that of the Holy Spirit; and the Apollinarians, who denied the truth of the Incarnation.

The consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, was set forth, the acts of the Council of Nicea were confirmed, and all the recent heresies anathematized; further, the creed of the Church, as laid down at Nicea, was extended to meet the heresies of the Apollinarians and Macedonians. Thus for the words, "He was incarnate," as contained in the Nicene creed, were substituted "He was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." The original creed of Nicea said simply, "He suffered and the third day He rose again, ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead."

The Constantinopolitan creed says, "He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered, and was buried; and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end."

¹ In the original Greek, *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτιται*, *i.e.*, those who kept the festival of Easter on the 14th day of the Pascal moon, and not on the Lord's day.

The Nicene creed also makes mention only of the Holy Spirit, omitting the Church. The creed, as settled at Constantinople, is exactly the same with that which is said at this day at communion in all Catholic churches, with the exception of the words, "and the Son," in the article concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit; the council said only that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, the words, "and the Son" (filioque), were subsequently added by the Western Church, first in Spain in 589. See C. TOLEDO, A.D. 589, and Hammond's *Canons of the Church*, Const. 381.

The acts of this council remaining to us are the creed, the seven canons, and the letter addressed to the Emperor Theodosius, requesting him to confirm the acts of the council—"We, therefore, entreat your clemency . . . as by your letter convoking the council, you have honoured the Church, so now you would, by your sentence and seal, confirm the summary of its acts, and the conclusion arrived at"—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 911.

CONSTANTINOPLE (394). Held on the 29th September 394, on occasion of the dedication of the church of the apostles, Peter and Paul, built by Ruffinus, Prefect of the Pretorium. The dispute concerning the bishopric of Bostra was brought before this council.¹ Nectarius of Constantinople presided, in the presence of Theophilus of Alexandria, and Flavianus of Antioch, Gregory of Nyssa, Palladius of Cesarea in Cappadocia, and many other bishops of note. It was determined, that although three bishops are sufficient to consecrate, a larger number is required in order to depose.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1151.

CONSTANTINOPLE (403). Held in 403, by forty or sixty bishops, in support of St Chrysostom, unjustly deposed by the pseudo-council, "ad Quercum," because of his non-appearance there. Although Arcadius had weakly confirmed this deposition, and banished him into Bithynia, his exile lasted but for *one day*, for the Empress Eudoxia, frightened by a terrible earthquake, which happened at the time, sent after him to recall him, and he re-entered Constantinople in triumph.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1331. D.

¹ Agapius and Bagadius (or Gebadius) both claimed to be lawful bishops of this see, *Or. Christ.*, vol. ii. p. 355.

CONSTANTINOPLE (403). Held in the same year. After the restoration of St Chrysostom to his bishopric, he ordered those priests and bishops who, upon his condemnation, had intruded into the sees and benefices of his followers, to be deposed, and the rightful pastors to be restored; he then demanded of the emperor that his own cause should be considered in a lawful synod. Upon which sixty bishops assembled, who came to the same conclusion with the last council, viz., that St Chrysostom had been unlawfully deposed in the council, "ad Quercum," and that he should retain the bishopric.—*Soz.* l. 8, c. 19.

CONSTANTINOPLE (427). Held in 427, under the Patriarch Sisinnius. The acts of the Council of Sida, against the Messalians were read and confirmed.—Pagi, in Baron. A.D. 427., No. viii.

CONSTANTINOPLE (448). Held on the 8th day of November 448, by Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, for the condemnation of Eutyches. The following is a slight sketch of the man and of his errors:—

Eutyches was abbot of a large monastery near Constantinople; he was already advanced in life when he began to publish his heresies. St Leo speaks of him as an old man, equally imprudent and ignorant; in fact, he had neither learning nor talent, but a great deal of pride, and choosing rather to follow his own private judgment, than the teaching of the Church, with regard to the mystery of the Incarnation, he fell away. Wishing to refute the heresy of Nestorius, who maintained that the Son of the Virgin was man only, and not God, he went so far as to declare that He was not truly man, and that He had but the *appearance*, and not the reality of a human body.

According to Nestorius, the Word of God was not *made man*, in uniting the human to His Divine nature; according to Eutyches, He was made man in such a way, that the Divine and human nature being united in Him, formed but one substance and one nature. This was the distinctive point in his heresy, and all the offsets from it, that there is in our Lord only *one nature*.

In order in some degree to qualify this notion, he declared that our Lord "had two natures before the union, but that after the union of the two natures they formed but one;"

an error from which the most fatal consequences necessarily flow ; for in taking from our Lord the reality of His human nature, he took from Him His character of Mediator, and, at the same time, destroyed the reality of His sufferings, death, and resurrection.

Eutyches seems to have been drawn into this error by degrees, and at last he spread his doctrine, not by his writings, but by means of the discourses which he delivered before the monks over whom he presided, and others. When his heresy was beginning to work its way amongst the people, Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum, zealously set himself to oppose it, and may justly be considered as the main cause of the first condemnation of Eutyches. After having in vain tried to convince the latter of his error, Eusebius warned Flavianus of what was going on, and seized the opportunity afforded by the assembling of a council, to settle certain differences between the metropolitan of Lydia, and two of his suffragans, to present a petition, in which he accused Eutyches of heresy, and earnestly prayed that they would take the case into consideration, and cite Eutyches to appear before them, which was accordingly done.

In the second session, held November 15th, there were present eighteen bishops ; and at the request of Eusebius, the letter of St Cyril to Nestorius, confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, and another by the same, were read. This done, Eusebius maintained that these letters contained the true faith, and that from them he would refute those who attacked the faith of the Church.

Flavianus declared his adherence to the doctrine contained in these letters, and further explained the faith with respect to the mystery of the incarnation : he said that our Lord is perfect God and perfect man, consubstantial with the Father as to His Godhead, and consubstantial with His mother as to His manhood ; that the two natures are united in one *ὑπόστασις* and one person, so that after the incarnation there resulted one Jesus Christ.

All the bishops agreed to this definition of the faith, which was subsequently more authoritatively confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon ; Flavianus then went on to say, " If any one maintains a contrary faith, we separate

him from the ministry of the altar and from the body of the Church," which sentence was unanimously approved.

In the meantime, Eutyches, who had been cited to appear, excused himself to the deputies by saying that, on retiring from the world, he had made the resolution never to leave his monastery, and that, besides, Eusebius was his personal enemy; that as to his faith, he was ready to agree to the exposition of faith made in the holy Councils of Nicea and Ephesus, and to subscribe to their interpretations; at the same time, if the fathers in those councils had been deceived, or had erred in some few of their expressions, he declared that he neither would condemn nor follow them, but that he would follow the Holy Scriptures alone, as a more sure guide than the expositions of the fathers.

The deputies having reported this answer of Eutyches, in the third session, the council judged it right to cite him a second time; and in the interval, it was proved that he was endeavouring to form a party amongst the monks of his own and other monasteries. When the deputies of the council, who were sent to cite him the second time, had arrived, he persisted in saying that he could not violate the resolution which he had made. This answer being also reported to the council, it was resolved to cite him for the third and last time, but still he refused to appear; nevertheless, he sent to the council the archimandrite Abraham, to plead his cause; he was, however, refused a hearing, upon the ground that it was the duty of Eutyches to appear in person. Subsequently, he promised to attend on the 22nd of November, and the fathers, at the instigation of Flavianus, granted him this delay. Eutyches, however, availed himself of it only to have recourse to the eunuch Chrysapius,¹ a chief officer of the emperor; and upon the plea that his life would be in danger if he were to present himself at the council, he obtained a large escort of soldiers to accompany him there.

In the sixth session, of the 22nd November, thirty bishops

¹ This man was the kinsman of Eutyches and had taken deep offence at the refusal of Flavianus to make him the accustomed *present* upon his elevation to the patriarchate. To him may, in a great measure, be attributed all the evils which followed.

being present, they demanded whether Eutyches was in attendance, and presently he arrived in great state, surrounded by a large body of monks and soldiers; an officer then presented a letter from the Emperor Theodosius, to the effect that he had chosen the patrician Florentius to assist in the deliberations of the council. This appointment Flavianus had opposed to the best of his power, but in vain. The letter having been read, cheers were given for the emperor, and shortly after Florentius arrived. The acts of the preceding sessions were then read, and Eutyches was questioned as to whether he believed in a union of the two natures. In his answer he declared it to be his opinion that there were two distinct natures before the incarnation. Eusebius then inquired of him whether he confessed two natures in our Lord *after* the incarnation, and that He was of the same substance with mankind as to the flesh? Feeling himself in a strait, and hard pressed, he declared that he had not come there to dispute, but to give an account of his faith, and at the same time presented a paper, which he said contained the substance of his belief. Being told to read it to the council, he refused, and Flavianus then decided that it could not be received; upon which Eutyches said that he confessed that Jesus Christ incarnate was born of the blessed Virgin, and was made perfect man for our salvation.

Flavianus, however, wishing for a more precise declaration, demanded of him whether he believed our Lord to be consubstantial with His mother and with us, as to the flesh, and to be of two natures; the first point he confessed; as to the second, in answer to a question put to him by Florentius, he said that our Lord had been of two natures *before* the union, but that after the union he recognised one nature only. Basil of Seleucia then said, "If you do not admit two natures after the union, you admit a mixture and confusion of natures." Eutyches was then told that he must anathematise every thing contrary to the doctrine which had just been read from St Cyril's writings; this, however, he absolutely refused, saying that if he were wretched enough to do so, he should be anathematising the fathers, upon which all the bishops in council rose up, crying out that Eutyches himself was anathema. The sentence of the council was, that he should be deposed;

but before pronouncing judgment, fresh entreaties were made to him to induce him to recognise in the Lord Jesus Christ two natures after the incarnation. Even Florentius exhorted him to confess the two natures. Eutyches, however, only replied to those entreaties by bidding them read certain writings, as he said, of St Athanasius,—probably some spurious work attributed to him, and perhaps written by Apollinaris. Since he would yield nothing, it was unanimously agreed that it was in vain to make any further attempts to persuade him, and his sentence was accordingly read by the priest Asterius.

The sentence was to the effect that Eutyches, having been fully convicted of following the errors of Valentinus and Apollinaris, was thenceforth entirely deprived of all ecclesiastical dignity, excluded from the communion of the Church, and deprived of his monastery; and that whoever would not withdraw from intercourse with him should be excommunicated. This sentence was signed by thirty or thirty-two bishops, and by twenty-three abbots. It is said that Eutyches, in a low voice, declared to Florentinus that he appealed to an œcumenical council, and that he gave to him, after the council was over, a petition to that effect. The condemnation of Eutyches was signed by the abbots of Constantinople, and by the eastern bishops; but the Egyptian monks rejected it. In the end, Eutyches prevailed upon the emperor to summon a council at Ephesus to try his case. [Latrocinium Ephesinum, 449.]

On the 9th of April, in the following year, the act of condemnation against Eutyches was confirmed in another council, consisting of thirty bishops.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1466 and 1470.

CONSTANTINOPLE (450). Held in 450, under Anatolius, the successor of Flavianus in the see of Constantinople, who had died of the injuries he received in the Latrocinium, or pseudo-council of Ephesus. All the bishops, abbots, priests, and deacons at the time in Constantinople were present. The letter of St Leo to Flavianus was read, together with the passages from the holy fathers which he adduced in support of his doctrine. Nestorius and Eutyches, together with their dogmas, were anathematised. The pope's legates returned thanks to God that all the Church

was thus unanimous in the true faith. Several of the bishops who had yielded to the violence of Dioscorus in the Latrocinium, were present in this assembly, and having testified their sorrow for what they had done, desired to condemn the act with its authors, in order to be received back into the communion of the Church; they were subsequently received into communion,¹ and restored to the government of their respective churches.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1475.

CONSTANTINOPLE (459). Held in 459, under the Patriarch Gennadius, seventy-three bishops attending. One canon, against simony, and the synodical letter, without date, remains. The Eutychian heresy, there is good reason to believe, was also again condemned, and the church of the *Anastasis* or Resurrection, built by Marcian, the *Æconomus*, upon the site of that in which St Gregory Nazianzen delivered his celebrated orations, was consecrated.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1025.

CONSTANTINOPLE (478). Held in 478; in which Peter the Fuller,² John of Apamæa, and Paul of Ephesus, were condemned.

CONSTANTINOPLE (518). Held on the 20th July, 518, under the Emperor Justin. The Patriarch John II. brought together in this council forty bishops of the neighbourhood. The abbots of the city, to the number of fifty-four, accompanied by a large concourse of the people, presented a petition, requesting that the names of Euphemius and Macedonius, and that of Pope Leo, should be inserted in the diptychs or sacred registers.³ All those persons who had been banished on account of these two

¹ They were not admitted to communion with the universal Church, but were ordered to confine themselves to the communion of their own churches respectively.

² Peter Fullo, so called from his original trade, which he exercised in his monastic state. He usurped the see of Antioch. He was attached to the Eutychian heresy. His followers were called Theopaschites, from an error attributed to him by his adversaries, that all the three persons in the blessed Trinity were crucified.

³ "*Diptycha*," from two Greek words, meaning a thing folded in two, because the sacred diptych amongst Christians, was a catalogue thus folded. On one side were written the names of the living, on the other those of the saints who were dead. The persons whose names were thus registered were those of bishops who had well governed their churches, of emperors and others who had done well to the Church, or were distinguished for their virtues. The names of those who were

patriarchs were recalled and re-established. The names of the fathers present in the first and œcumenical councils were also inserted in the diptychs. Severus of Antioch, and some others, were anathematised.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1586.

CONSTANTINOPLE (533). A conference was held in 533 between the Catholics and followers of Severus; the latter were silenced, and many of them returned into the Church.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1763.

CONSTANTINOPLE (536). Held in 536, by Pope Agapetus in person. Anthymus was there deposed, who, although bishop of another see, had been raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople, contrary to the canons, by the influence of the Empress Theodora. He had refused to make an open profession of the Catholic faith, being opposed to the Council of Chalcedon. Mennas, Abbot of the monastery of St Sampson in Constantinople, was consecrated in his stead by the pope.¹—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1.

CONSTANTINOPLE (536). Held in the same year by Mennas, by order of the Emperor Justinian,² and attended by sixty bishops, and fifty-four abbots of monasteries in Constantinople.

In the first session, Anthymus was cited to appear within registered on the diptych were read secretly at mass by the deacon, whose office it was; and the time when this was done was called the time of the diptych, and was just after the oblation had been made. After the secret recitation of the names, a prayer was offered for the persons, which was called "collectio post nomina."

Euphemius and Macedonius were Catholic patriarchs of Constantinople, ejected by the heretical Emperor Anastasius. It seems that their names had been erased at the instigation of Pope Hormisdas, because it appeared that they had permitted the name of Acacius to be recited with the others at the altar.

This council seems to have been held to restore union between the Churches of Constantinople and Rome, broken by the obstinacy of the former in retaining the name of Acacius on the diptychs. In this Synod his name was erased, and union restored. It appears that Hormisdas (who had made this condition a *sine qua non*) subsequently carried his requirements farther, and insisted on the names of Euphemius and Macedonius being erased, which was done. There seems to be some confusion of two councils here.

¹ He died at Constantinople in this year, and was magnificently buried.

² It was rather the same council with the last, for, Pope Agapetus dying, Mennas assumed the presidency of the assembly.

three days, and in the fifth, not having appeared, sentence of deposition was passed upon him. At the same council Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamæa, and other Acephalists, were anathematised and banished by the emperor.—Tom. v. Conc. at the beginning.

CONSTANTINOPLE (538). Held about the year 538, according to Baronius, under Mennas. The edict of Justinian, anathematising Origen and the errors attributed to him, was approved. This condemnation of Origen gave occasion to Theodorus of Cesarea in Cappadocia, a follower of Origen, and secretly an Acephalist, to demand the condemnation of the three well-known chapters, containing, 1. The writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia; 2. The books which Theodoret of Cyrus wrote against the twelve anathemas of St Cyril; and 3. The letter of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to one Maris, a Persian, concerning the Council of Ephesus, and the condemnation of Nestorius. Theodorus had flattered the Emperor Justinian, that if these three chapters were condemned, the sect of the Acephalists would rejoin the Church and acknowledge the Council of Chalcedon.

CONSTANTINOPLE (547). Held in 547; Pope Vigilius, who had been sent to Constantinople by Justinian, presided, at the head of seventy bishops. Facundus, Bishop of Hermium, in Africa, strongly defended the three chapters in this assembly. This council came to no decision, owing to the fearful divisions and disputes then raging, Justinian having just condemned the three chapters. So great was the scandal produced by this act, that Theodorus of Cesarea confessed that both Pelagius, the legate who had caused the condemnation of Origen, and himself, who had caused that of the three chapters, deserved to be burned alive for originating it. Subsequently, in 548, Vigilius gave his "judicatum," by which he condemned three chapters, without prejudice to the Council of Chalcedon. This step, however, satisfied neither the friends nor the enemies of the three chapters, and the bishops of Africa and Illyricum refused to communicate with him until he had retracted his "judicatum."—Tom. v. Conc. p. 390.

CONSTANTINOPLE (553). The fifth œcumenical council was held on the 4th of May 553, at Constantinople, summoned by the Emperor Justinian. The causes which led to the assembling of this council were principally these:—

I. The troubles excited by many of the monks with reference to the errors attributed to Origen.

II. The three chapters, and the edict of the emperor against them, drawn up by Theodorus of Cesarea ; which the emperor required every bishop to subscribe under pain of banishment, but which many refused to sign, from an ill-founded fear that by so doing they should impugn the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. To add to the troubles originating from this question, the pope had condemned these chapters in his "judicatum," and for so doing had been excommunicated by some of the African bishops, the most celebrated of whom was Facundus, who composed a treatise in defence of the three chapters.

The council was opened on the 4th of May 553, in the cathedral. In the first and second sessions, which were styled conferences, Eutychius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who presided, Apollinaris of Alexandria, and Domnus of Antioch, were present, together with three bishops, deputies of Eustachius, the Patriarch of Jerusalem ; there were in all one hundred and sixty-five bishops, amongst whom were five Africans, the only bishops who attended from the West.

The emperor's edict upon the subject of the three chapters was read, May 4, in which the reasons for convoking the council were stated. In it he represents, that the four preceding œcumenical councils had been convoked by his predecessors ; that the Nestorians, no longer daring to speak of Nestorius, had put forward :—1. Theodorus of Mopsuestia, his master, who had advanced blasphemies even worse than those of Nestorius ; 2. The impious writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against St Cyril ; and 3. The detestable letter of Ibas of Edessa, which two latter writings they pretended had been sanctioned by the Council of Chalcedon. In conclusion, he says, "As there are still many persons who persist in adhering to these three impious chapters, we have called you together to this city, and exhort you to declare your opinion upon the subject."

Besides this, the confession of faith given by Eutychius to Vigilius was read, together with the answer of the pope, and other letters, and means were proposed for inducing the latter, who was in Constantinople at the time, to come to the council.

In the second conference, May 8, the acts of the foregoing conference were read. The deputies sent to Pope Vigilius made their report of his answer, which was to the effect that being sick he could not attend the council, but that he would, after a time, send his written opinion of the three chapters to the emperor.

In the third, May 9, the bishops declared that they received the doctrine of the first four œcumenical councils, and that they adhered to that of the fathers; viz., of St Athanasius, St Hilary, St Basil, St Gregory Nazianzen, St Gregory of Nyssa, St Ambrose, St Augustine, St Theophilus, St John Chrysostom, St Cyril, St Leo.

In the fourth conference, May 12, the question of the three chapters was entered upon, the first enquiry was made into the doctrine of Theodorus of Mopsuestia. Amongst other errors, he maintained that Jesus Christ is the image of God, that He is to be honoured as one would honour the image of an earthly prince; that He is but an adopted Son, like other men, &c., &c., &c. The fathers of the council, after hearing these repeated errors read, cried, "Anathema to Theodorus of Mopsuestia! Anathema to his writings! This creed was composed by Satan!"

After this fourth conference, Pope Vigilius gave his decree or *Constitutum*, addressed to the emperor, in which, first, he rejected the errors attributed to Theodorus; secondly, he undertook the defence of Theodoret of Cyrus, upon the ground that the fathers at Chalcedon had required nothing further from him than that he should anathematise Nestorius and his doctrine, which he had done; and thirdly, with respect to the letter of Ibas, he said that this bishop had been declared innocent and orthodox in that same council, although the fathers had not approved of such parts of his letter as were injurious to St Cyril. This *constitutum* was signed by sixteen bishops, but it had no effect, and was not read in the council.¹

In the next conference, May 13, certain extracts were first read from the books of St Cyril, directed against Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and other papers which the same

¹ The *Constitutum* concludes with a declaration, that it was thenceforth unlawful for anyone to decree anything concerning the three chapters contrary to what Vigilius had laid down, or even to discuss the question any further.

Cyril had written in answer to what had been urged in his defence; then the question was agitated whether or not it was lawful to condemn those who were dead, and two passages (from St Cyril and St Augustine) were cited to prove that it was lawful. The example of Origen was alleged, who had been condemned by Theophilus at Alexandria. The second of the three chapters then came under discussion, and extracts were read from the works of Theodoret of Cyrus, proving that he had defended Nestorius and opposed St Cyril; at the same time it was remarked that Theodoret had anathematised Nestorius and his impious doctrine at Chalcedon.

In the sixth conference, May 19, were read the letter of Ibas, the acts of the Council of Ephesus approving the letters of St Cyril, and those of the Council of Chalcedon approving the letters of St Leo. Afterwards it was discussed whether the last-mentioned council had really approved of the letter of Ibas; the letter was compared with the creeds of the Church, and, amongst other things, this proposition, viz., "Those who maintain that the Word was incarnate, and made man, are heretics and Apollinarians." The fathers declared that this was entirely contrary to the definition of the Council of Chalcedon, and unanimously condemned it as heretical, but spared the memory of its writer.

In the following conference, May 26, the declarations which the Pope Vigilius had made to the emperor, anathematising the three chapters, were read, as well as the oath which he had taken to concur with all his power in the condemnation of those writings, and his letters to Valentinian and Aurelian, Bishop of Arles, to the same effect.

In the eighth and last conference, June 10, the sentence of the council condemning the three chapters was read; it is drawn up in these terms:

"We receive the four holy councils, of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; we teach according to their definition of the faith. We condemn Theodorus of Mopsuestia and his writings, together with the impieties written by Theodoret against the true faith, the twelve anathemas of St Cyril, and the Council of Ephesus, and also those which he wrote in favour of Nestorius and Theodorus. We anathematise the impious letter said to have been written by Ibas of Edessa to Maris the Persian, which

denies that the Word was incarnate of the holy Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, which accuses St Cyril of being an heretic and an Apollinarian, and which blames the Council of Ephesus for having deposed Nestorius without examination, and defends Theodorus and Theodoret. We, therefore, anathematise the three chapters, together with their defenders, who pretend to support them by the authority of the fathers and of the Council of Chalcedon." Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, about 380, was also condemned as a heretic.

The bishops, to the number of one hundred and sixty-five, subscribed this sentence.

To this sentence the fathers added fourteen anathemas, which contain in an abridged and theological form the doctrine of the Incarnation, as opposed to the errors which they had just condemned. Lastly, the authority of the Council of Chalcedon was solemnly confirmed, while the heresy of Eutyches and the doctrine of a confusion of natures in our Lord, were unequivocally condemned. The condemnation of Origen does not appear amongst the acts of this council which remain to us; it is, however, generally believed that his doctrines were condemned here, and the fifteen canons still extant, condemning the chief of his errors, and entitled "the canons of the one hundred and sixty fathers assembled in council at Constantinople," are assigned to this synod.—See Le Quien, tom. iii. col. 210.

The acts of this council were approved by Pope Vigilius in the same year, as appears from his letter to the Patriarch Eutychius.

For a long time it was not received by the Churches of Africa, Spain, and France, from a false idea that its acts were repugnant to those of the Council of Chalcedon; and Pope Gregory the Great appears to have had no great veneration for this council for the same reason. In after years, when the truth of the question became more generally known, all Churches, both in the West and in the East, received this Council as œcumenical.—Tom. v. Conc. p.

411.

CONSTANTINOPLE (588). Held by the Patriarch John IV., surnamed *Jejunator*, who, in the letters of convocation addressed to the bishops of the whole East, styled himself *œcumenical patriarch*, a title which gave great offence to