

Guettee's Papacy Schismatic Teaching - 1867

Article I

Orestes Augustus Brownson (1873), a noted Catholic convert challenged a contemporary of his in the 19th century, René-Francois Guettée, a "renowned" French historian and Roman Catholic priest who became convinced that the Eastern Orthodox Church was the true Church. In the 1860s, he converted to Orthodoxy and took the name "Fr" Vladimir Guettée.

Brownson's brief herein exposes the fallacies of Guettee's propositions. Guettee is wrong!

Among other propositions, Guettee submitted to the Eastern Orthodox premise;
"Peter was nothing more than "primus inter pares"; i.e., first among equals, without jurisdiction or absolute authority in the church."

Guettee studied the position he adopted from an Anglicanism perspective and never believed in the primacy of Rome to begin with, though he "was" a Roman Catholic priest; which was not uncommon post-Protestant Reformation that many Catholic priests never really did adopt the Roman Catholic view since centuries before the 16th century back to the 8th century.

Guettee endeavored to prove his newly adopted position saying that the Roman theologians or even Eastern theologians do not mean what we say, or that what they wrote may be understood in a different sense. He concedes in some sense the primacy of Peter, and that the bishop of Rome is the first bishop of the church, that by ecclesiastical right he has the primacy of jurisdiction, though not universal jurisdiction; but denies that the Roman pontiff has the sovereignty of the universal church by divine right. Guettee further says his study of the subject has brought him to these conclusions: "1. The bishop of Rome did not for eight centuries possess the authority of divine right that he has since sought to exercise; 2. The pretension of the bishop of Rome to the sovereignty of divine right over the whole church was the real cause of the division," or schism between the East and the West. (p. 31.)

Guettee's two propositions undertakes to prove, by asserting that the proofs which theologians allege from the Holy Scriptures, the fathers, and the councils, do not prove the primacy claimed by the bishop of Rome.

The Pope is, and long has been, in possession by the acknowledgment of both East and West, and is up to Guettee to prove otherwise, not the other way around. The Pope is not obliged to show his titles. That the pope is in possession of all he claims is evident not only from the fact that he has from the earliest times exercised the primacy of jurisdiction claimed for him, but from the Council of Florence held in 1439. "We define," say the fathers of the council, "that the holy apostolic see and ***the Roman pontiff hold the primacy in all the world***, and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles and true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole church, the father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him is given in blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ, full power to feed, direct, and govern the

universal church; et ipsi B. Petro pasoeni, regeivli, et gubernandi plertampolestatem traditam.”

This definition was made by the “universal” church, for it was subscribed by the bishops of *both the East and the West*, and among the bishops of the East that accepted it were the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, and the metropolitans of Russia, with those of Nicaea, Trebizond, Lacedaemon, and Mitylenae. We know very well that the non-united Greeks reject this council, although the Eastern Church was more fully represented in it than the Western Church was in that at Nicaea, the first of Constantinople, Ephesus, or Chalcedon; but it is for the non-united Greeks to prove that, in rejecting it and refusing obedience to its decrees, they are not schismatic. At any rate, the council is sufficient to prove that the Pope is in possession by the judgment of both East and West, and to throw the burden of proof on those who deny the papal authority and assert that the papacy is schismatic.

The real question for Guettee isn’t whether the primacy of the Roman pontiff has its ground in the written word, but whether anything in the written word denies or contradicts it. Again, it’s up to the one who refutes the position against the Pope’s primacy, not the other way around.

The fact is, ipso facto, *the constitution of the church is older than scripture*. It was not necessary for the Church to account for its constitution on the written word. The church holds the written word, but does not hold from it or under it, but from the direct and immediate appointment of Jesus Christ himself, and is inconceivable without her constitution.

Roman theologians assert the primacy, but not, in the ecclesiastical order, the sovereignty of the Roman pontiff; the Pope. Sovereignty is a political, not an ecclesiastical term; it is, moreover, exclusive, and it is not supported that the authority in the church by divine right but that of the Roman pontiff nor that bishops are simply his vicars or deputies. In feudal times there may have been writers who regarded him as being in control, but none that held the Roman Pontiff to be *sovereign*. By some writers, chiefly French, called him *sovereign pontiff*, but only in the sense of supreme pontiff, pontifex maximus, or summvsponlifex, to indicate that he is the highest but not the exclusive authority in the church. The Council of Florence, defines him to be primate, not sovereign, and ascribes to him plenary (absolute) *authority* to feed, direct, and govern *the whole church*, but does not exclude other and subordinate pontiffs, who, though they receive their sees from him, yet within them govern by a divine right no less immediate than his. **The real and only sovereign of the church**, in the proper sense of the term, **is Jesus Christ himself**. *The Pope is his vicar*, and as such is bound by his law as the humblest Christian. He is not above the law, nor is he its source, but its *chief minister and supreme judge*, and his legislative power is restricted to such rescripts, edicts, or canons as he judges necessary to its proper *administration*. The sovereign (Jesus) makes the law, and Christ’s vicar, the Pope administers the law and teachings of Christ.

Catholic theologians say the Church is founded on Peter, Matt. 16:18, "I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The [rock on which the Church is built is Jesus Christ](#): I Cor. 3:11.

That Jesus Christ is the rock, sovereign and sole foundation of the Church in the primary and absolute sense, nobody denies or questions this; but this does not exclude Peter from being

its foundation in a secondary sense; Ephesians 2:20, "You are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being himself the chief corner-stone." The principal, primary, absolute foundation is Christ, but the prophets and apostles are also the foundation of the Church. The faithful are raised on these foundations, and form the edifice itself; finally, Jesus Christ is the principal stone, the cornerstone, which gives solidity to the monument. There is "no other foundation" in the primary sense, "no other principal cornerstone than Jesus Christ;" but he himself asserts, as does St. Paul, other "foundation" in a secondary sense. So, though our Lord is the principal or first foundation in the sense in which God is the first cause of all creatures and their acts, yet nothing hinders Peter from being a secondary foundation.

But in this secondary sense, "all the apostles are the foundation, and the Church is no more founded on Peter than on the rest of the apostles," not founded on Peter to the exclusion of the other apostles certainly, but not founded on Peter as the prince of the apostles, or chief of the apostolic college, does not appear, and never does Peter exclude the other apostles.

Our Lord gave, indeed, to Peter alone the keys of the kingdom of heaven, thereby constituting him his steward or the [chief of his household](#); but he gave to all authority to teach all nations all things whatsoever he had commanded them, the same power of binding and loosing that he had given to Peter, and promised to be with them as well as with him all days to the consummation of the world. There is in this nothing that excludes or denies the primacy claimed for Peter, or that implies that our Lord, as the author says, merely "gave to Peter an important ministry in his church."

The Lord gave Peter the command, "feed his sheep", John 21:17, Peter's chief commission.

Matthew 23:8-10, "But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your master; and all you are brethren. [9] And call none your father upon earth; for one is your father, who is in heaven. [10] Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, Christ."

[9] "Call none your father upon earth": Neither be ye called masters. The meaning is that our Father in heaven is incomparably more to be regarded, than any father upon earth: and no master to be followed, who would lead us away from Christ. But this does not hinder but that we are by the law of God to have a due respect both for our parents and spiritual fathers, (1 Cor. 4. 15) and for our masters and teachers.

The meaning of Jesus's words isn't difficult to understand. He commands his disciples not to call any one master, teacher, or father, that is, not to recognize as binding on them any authority that does not come from God, and to remember that they are all brethren, and must obey God rather than men. God alone is sovereign, and we are bound to obey him, and no one else; for, in obeying our prelates whom the Holy Ghost has set over us, it is He and He only whom we obey. He commands his disciples to suffer no man to call them masters; for their authority to teach or govern comes not from them, but from their Master who is in heaven, and therefore they are not to lord it over their brethren, but to govern only so as to serve them. "Let him that is greatest among you be your servant." Matt. 23:11.

Power is not for him who governs, but for them who are governed, and he is greatest who best serves his brethren. *The Pope*, in reference to the admonition of our Lord, and from the humility with which all power given to men should be held and exercised, calls himself

"servant of servants." The words so understood—and they may be so understood—convey no prohibition of the authority claimed for the Roman pontiff as the vicar of Christ, and father and teacher of all Christians, by divine authority, *not by his own personal right*.

Again, **the Eastern Orthodox proports that Peter is nothing more than "primus inter pares"; first among equals**, but without jurisdiction; that no father of the church has seen in the primacy of Peter any title to jurisdiction or absolute authority in the church."

Guettee claims that St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage in the 3rd century supports his position. Guettee claims that Cyprian denies that Peter had any authority not shared equally by the other apostles; or that the bishop of Rome had or has by divine right any pre-eminence above any other bishop; or that the Church of Rome has any authority not possessed equally by the other churches that had apostles for their founders. He concedes that Peter and Paul founded the Church of Rome but denies that Peter was ever its bishop. Yet history tells us that both St Cyprian and St. Ignatius says, of the Church of Rome, as holding pre-eminence over all other churches, with whose bishop it was necessary that all others should agree or be in communion. Guettee asserts that what the fathers "meant" was "the faith of Peter," "the chair of Peter meant the entire episcopate," which was one and held by all the bishops in solido, and the pre-eminence ascribed to the church of Rome was in consequence of her exterior importance as the see of the capital of the empire. This is the author's theory, and he submits that he finds it in the Treatise on the Unity of the Church, by St. Cyprian.

Guettee claims that "he (St. Cyprian) positively denies the primacy of St. Peter himself; he makes the apostle merely the type of unity which resided in the apostolic college as a whole, and by succession in the whole episcopal body, which he calls the See of Peter." "After mentioning the powers promised to St. Peter, St. Cyprian remarks that Jesus Christ promised them to him alone, though they were given to all. 'In order to show forth unity,' he says, 'the Lord has wished that unity might draw its origin from one only.' 'The other apostles certainly were just what Peter was, having the same honor and power as he. 'All are shepherds, and the flock nourished by all the apostles together is one, in order that the church of Christ may appear in its unity.'" Pg 79.

St. Cyprian actually says, our Lord (ut unitatem manifestai'et, unam catharam consbituit, vnitatis ejusdem originem db uno incijzientem sua auctoriate disposuit); established by His authority **one chair**, made the origin of **unity began from one**, that the **unity of the body** might be manifested or shown forth. St. Cyprian evidently teaches that the unity of the church derives, as the author holds, from the unity of the episcopate, and the unity of the episcopate from the unity of the apostolic college; but that the unity of the apostolic college or apostolate may be manifested, and hence the unity of the church be shown forth, or rendered visible, **our Lord made its origin begin from one, that is, Peter**. All the apostles, indeed, had what Peter had, that is, the apostolate, partook of the same gift, honor, and power; but the beginning proceeded from unity, and the primacy was given to Peter, that the church of Christ and the chair, the apostolate, by succession the episcopal body, if you will, may be shown to be one. All are pastors, and the flock, which is fed by all the apostles in unanimity, is shown to be one, that the unity of the church of Christ may be demonstrated. Also, St. Cyprian says, (Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio pcediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium db unitate proficisciUtr; et primatus Petro datur,ut una Christiecclesia

et cathedra una monstretur. Etpastores sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur, ut ecclesia Christi, una monstretur*)

St. Cyprian says the our Lord has so arranged it that the unity of each may be made to appear be seen to be ONE. The unity of the apostles, of the pastors, or of the church, regarded as a collective body, is invisible. How, then, if it does not arise from one, or if it has no visible center and beginning in the visible order, is it to be made to appear? St. Cyprian evidently holds that the unity of the apostolic body establishes the unity of the episcopal body, since he holds the bishops to be the successors of the apostles; and the unity of the episcopal body establishes the unity of the flock, which in union with the body each pastor feeds, and therefore the unity of the entire (*Opp. Cypriani, Migne's Edition. De Unitate Ecclcaise, pp. 498-500.)

The words "primatus Petro datur", are rejected by Baluze, French Jesuit scholar and historian, 1718, and some others as an interpolation, and Archbishop Kenrick does not cite them in his Primacy, when they would have been much to his purpose. They express what is obviously the sense of St. Cyprian and seem to support his argument.

As we understand St. Cyprian, whose treatise on the Unity of the Church is, perhaps, the profoundest and most philosophical ever written on that subject, the church is an organism with Jesus Christ himself for its invisible and ultimate center and source of life. But as the church is to deal with the world and operate in time and space, it must be visible as well as invisible. Then the invisible must be visibly expressed or represented. But this cannot be done unless there is a visible expression or representation in the exterior organic body of this interior and invisible center and source of unity, life, and authority, which our Lord himself is. To establish this exterior or visible representation, our Lord institutes the apostolic college, and through that the episcopal body, through whom the whole flock becomes in union with their pastors, who are, in union with the apostles, one organic body; but only on condition of the unity of the apostolic college, which unity must start from one, from a visible center and source of unity. Hence, our Lord chose Peter as the central point of union for the apostolic college, and Peter's chair, the cathedra una, as the visible center of union for the episcopal body, and through them of the whole church, so that the whole church in the apostolate, in the episcopate, and in the flock, is shown to be one, represented with the unity and authority it has in Jesus Christ.

Guettee recognizes no visible apostolic or episcopal unity, since Eastern Orthodoxy recognizes no visible center or source from which it originates; and hence neither the apostolate nor the episcopate, save as Jesus Christ, is a unity, but an aggregation, as we have said, a collection, or at least, a sort of round table of conciliar prelates. By denying the primacy or center and beginning of unity to Peter and Peter's chair individually, it denies what St. Cyprian maintains was instituted to manifest or show forth unity. It denies both the manifestation of unity and external unity itself, both of which are strenuously insisted on by St. Cyprian, who, indeed, says expressly in his letter to St. Cornelius, **the Roman pontiff that "the Church of Rome," that is, "the chair of Peter," is the center whence sacerdotal unity arose.**

Guettee further says, in his book, p. 67, that "St. Cyprian was right in calling the Church of Rome the chair of Peter, the principal church, whence sacerdotal unity emanated. He submits that the bishop enjoyed authority by divine right. He understands by the chair of Peter the entire episcopate, regards St. Peter as the equal of the other apostles, denies his primacy, and

makes him the simple type of the unity of the apostolic college." The Church of Rome "was the source of sacerdotal unity in this sense, that Peter was the sign and type of the unity of the apostolic college." St. Cyprian makes St. Peter, p. 79, "merely the type of the unity that resided in the apostolic college as a whole, and, by succession, in the episcopal body, which he calls 'The See of Peter.'" "The See of Peter, in St. Cyprian's idea, is the authority of the apostolic body, and, by succession, of the episcopal body. All the bishops had the same honor and the same authority in all that relates to their order, as all the apostles had the same honor and authority as Peter." (pp. 79, 80.) – Guettee.

Peter, then, is the sign and type of apostolic and episcopal unity, and "the chair of Peter," or "the see of Peter," is the sign and type of apostolic authority. But supposing this to be so, and Peter to have been in no respect distinguished from the other apostles, or to have held no peculiar position in the apostolic body, how came he to be regarded as the sign and type of apostolic unity, and his chair as the sign and type of apostolic authority? There is a logic in language as well as in the human mind of which it is the expression, and there is a reason for every symbolical phrase that gains currency. If the fathers and the church had not held Peter to be the prince of the apostles and his see the center and source of apostolic authority, would they or could they have made his see or chair the symbol of apostolic authority, or Peter himself the symbol, "the sign and type," of apostolic unity? Why the see of Peter rather than that of Andrew, James, or John? or Peter rather than any other apostle? The fact, then, that St. Peter and his see or chair were taken as symbolic, the sign and type, the one of apostolic unity, and the other of apostolic authority, is a very conclusive proof that the primacy was given to him and his see by our Lord, and by succession to the holy apostolic see and the Roman pontiff, as the fathers of Florence define and Roman theologians hold.

Again, how could Peter be a sign and type of apostolic unity or his see the sign and type of apostolic authority, if he, Peter, had no relation, and his see none, to that authority not held equally by all the apostles and their sees? In the church of God there are and can be no shams, no make believes, no false signs or types, no unrealities, no calling things which are not as if they were. Signs which signify nothing are not signs, and types which represent nothing are simply no types at all. The real apostolic unity and authority are internal, invisible in Jesus Christ himself, who, in the primary and absolute sense, as we have seen, is the rock on which the church is founded, the sole basis of its solidity and permanence, the sole ground of its existence and fountain of its life, unity, and authority. Peter and Peter's see, if the sign and type of this invisible unity must represent it or show it forth in the visible order. I know not how can Peter represent that unity, unless he is in the visible order its real center and source, in which it begins and from which it emanates? Or how can the see or chair of Peter be the sign and type of the invisible apostolic authority, unless it really be its source and center in the visible order? The external can represent the internal, the visible the invisible, only in so far as it copies or imitates it. In calling Peter the sign and type of apostolic unity, Guettee then concedes that Peter represents our Lord, and that he is, as the Council of Florence defines, "the true vicar of Christ;" and in making Peter's see the sign and type of apostolic authority, he makes it the real center in the visible order of that authority, and consequently concedes the very points which he rejects, and undertakes to prove from St. Cyprian are only the unfounded pretensions of the bishop of Rome.

Sovereignty is not claimed. The pope is not the sovereign, but the vicar or chief minister of the sovereign. He governs the Church in apostolic unity, not as isolated from the episcopal body, but as its real head or supreme chief. His authority is said to be (*loquens ex cathedra*), speaking from the seat of apostolic and episcopal unity and authority. He is the chief or supreme pastor, not the only pastor, nor pastor at all regarded as separate from the Church. He is the visible head of the Church united by a living union with the body; for it is as necessary to the head to be in living union with the body, as it is to the body to be in living union with the head. Neither can live and perform its functions without the other; but the directing, controlling, or governing power is in the head. St. Ambrose says, "Where Peter is, there is the church;" but he does not say Peter is the Church, nor does the Pope say, "L'Eglise, c'est moi," I am the Church. Succeeding to Peter as chief of the apostolic college, he is the chief or head of the Church.

Guettee's theory makes the Church in the visible order as a whole, acephalous, headless, and therefore brainless. He bases his assertion that St. Cyprian denies the primacy of Peter on the fact that he says, "All the other apostles had what he had, the same honor and the same power." He claims that The church has no visible chief; that all the apostles had equal honor and authority; that all bishops as successors of the apostles are equal; that one bishop has by divine right no pre-eminence above another; and that, if one is more influential than another, he owes it to his personal character or to the external importance of his See. And this he contends is the doctrine of St. Cyprian. But, if he had understood St. Cyprian's argument, he would have never done that great saint such flagrant injustice. St. Cyprian's argument is, as is evident from the passage we have cited at length, that, although all the apostles received the same gift, the same honor, and the same power, yet, for the sake of manifesting unity, our Lord constituted one chair from which unity should begin, and gave the primacy to Peter, that the unity of the apostolic or episcopal body and of the whole church of Christ might be shown. The author himself contends that the apostolate, and by succession the episcopate, is one and indivisible, and held by the apostles or bishops. Then, if all the other apostles had the apostolate, they must have had precisely what Peter had, and if the other bishops have the episcopate at all, they must have precisely what the Roman pontiff has, yet without having another apostolate or another episcopate than that which they all equally receive and hold in its invisible unity, or anything in addition thereto. He may, nevertheless, be the head or chief of the episcopal body and the center in which episcopal unity and authority in the visible order originate, and from which they radiate through the body, and from the bishops to their respective flocks, and bind them and the whole church together in one, which, as we understand it, is the precise doctrine of St. Cyprian, and certainly is the doctrine of the Roman and Catholic Church.

There are depths in St. Cyprian's philosophy and theology which Guettee is unable to comprehend and is unaware of the real constitution of the Church, the profound significance of the Gospel, the vast reach of the Christian system, its relation to the universal system of creation, or the reasons in the very nature of things there are for its existence, and for the existence and constitution of the Church. All the works of the Creator are strictly logical, and together form but one dialectic whole, are but the expression of one divine thought.

Guettee cites the controversy on the baptism of heretics, in proof that St. Cyprian denied the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, or his authority to govern as supreme pontiff the whole church, but unsuccessfully. St. Cyprian found the custom established in Carthage, as it was also in certain churches in Asia, to rebaptize persons who had been baptized by heretics, and he insisted on observing the custom. He complained, therefore, of St. Stephen, the Roman pontiff, who wrote to him to conform to the ancient and general custom of the church. Whether he conformed or not is uncertain, but there is no evidence that he denied the authority of the Roman pontiff, and he certainly did not break communion with him, though he may have regarded his exercise of his authority in that particular case as oppressive and tyrannical. It would seem from the letter of St. Firmilianus to St. Cyprian, if genuine, of which there is some doubt, as there is of several letters ascribed to St. Cyprian, and from the address of St. Cyprian to the last council he held on the subject, which M. Guettee cites at some length, that the question was regarded as one of discipline, or as coming within the category of those matters on which diversity of usage in different churches and countries is allowable or can be tolerated, and on which uniformity has never been exacted. He insisted not that the entire world should conform to the custom he observed, but defended, as our bishops would to-day, what he believed to be the customary rights of his church or province. The universal church has sustained the Roman pontiff.

Guettee is unable to deny the preponderating influence of the Roman pontiff and his See in the government of the Church, and the importance everywhere attached to being in communion with the bishop of Rome, seeks to evade the force of the fact by attributing it not to the belief in the primacy of the Church of Rome, but to the superior importance of the city of Rome as the capital of the empire, as if the Catholic Church were merely a Roman church, and not founded for the whole world. We indeed hear something of this when Constantinople, the New Rome, became the rival of Old Rome, and its bishop, on account of the civil and political importance of the city, set up to be ecumenical bishop, and claimed the first place after the bishop of Rome; but we hear nothing of it during the first three centuries, and the author adduces nothing to justify his assumption. All the fathers, alike in the East and the West, attribute the primacy held by the Church of Rome not to the importance of the city of Rome in the empire, but to the fact that she is "the Church that presides," is the principal" or "governing Church," is "the See of Peter, holds the chair of Peter, prince of the apostles," is "the root and matrix of the Catholic Church," and that Peter "lives" and "speaks" in its bishops.

Guettee say, "We See," p. 48, "that as early as the third century the bishops of Rome, because St. Peter had been one of the founders of that See, claimed to exercise a certain authority over the rest of the church, giving themselves sometimes the title of '*bishop of bishops*'; but we also see that the whole Church protested against these ambitious pretensions, and held them of no account." That the bishop of Rome was accused by those whom the exercise of his authority offended of assuming the title of bishop of bishops, by way of a sneer, may be very true, but that he ever gave himself that title, there is, so far as we are aware, no trustworthy evidence.

"The church protested against these ambitious pretensions." Where is that protest recorded? That bishops were then as now jealous of their real or supposed rights, and ever well-disposed

to resist any encroachment upon them, is by no means improbable; and this, if the bishops generally held that the Roman pontiff had no more authority by divine right over the Church than any other bishop, must have made it exceedingly difficult for him to grasp the primacy of jurisdiction over them. Their power to resist, in case they believed they could resist with a good conscience, must have been, being, as they were in the fourth century, eighteen hundred to one, somewhat greater than his to encroach. That the bishops or simple priests whom the Roman pontiff admonished or censured protested sometimes, not against his authority, but against what they regarded as its unjust, arbitrary, or tyrannical exercise, is no doubt true, and the same thing happens still, even with those who have no doubt of the papal authority; but that the whole Church protested is not proven; and in all the instances in which protests were offered on the part of individual bishops that came before an ecclesiastical council, the universal Church uniformly sustained the Roman pontiff. When St. Victor excommunicated the Quartodecimans, some bishops remonstrated with him as being too severe, and others opposed his act, but the council of Nicaea sustained it. Even before that council, the author of the *Philosophumena*, whose work must have been composed in the early part of the third century, treats the Quartodecimans as heretics, although, except as to the time of keeping Easter, their faith was irreproachable. So, on the question of the baptism of heretics, the whole Church, instead of protesting against the decision of St. Stephen, approved it, and follows it to this day. It will not do to say the whole Church treated the acts of these popes "as of no account."

The writers of the letters attributed to Sts. Cyprian and Firmilianus are good evidence that the Popes claimed and exercised jurisdiction over the whole Church in the controversy on the baptism of heretics, and Tertullian affords no mean proof of the same fact at a yet earlier date. In a work written after he had fallen into some of the heresies of the Montanists, he writes, as cited by our author, p. 78, "I learn that a new edict has been given, a peremptory edict. The sovereign pontiff, that is, the bishop of bishops, has said: 'I remit the sins of impurity and fornication.' O edict! not less can be done than to ticket it—GOOD WORK! But where shall such an edict be posted? Surely, I think, upon the doors of the houses of prostitution." This passage undoubtedly proves that Tertullian himself, fallen into heresy, did not relish the papal decision that condemned him, and perhaps that he was disposed to deny the authority of the Roman pontiff; but if it had been generally held that the Roman pontiff was no more in the Church than any other bishop, and therefore that his decision could have no authority out of his diocese or province, would his decision have so deeply moved him, and called forth such an outburst of wrath? If the claim to the primacy of authority in the whole Church, and therefore to jurisdiction over all bishops, was not generally recognized and held, what occasion was there for so much indignation? What point would there have been in the sneer, or force in the irony, of calling him the sovereign pontiff, or the bishop of bishops? Tertullian's language, which was evidently intended to exaggerate the authority claimed by the Roman pontiff, plainly enough implies that he was generally held to have authority to make decisions in doctrine and discipline for the whole Church, and that a censure from him was something of far more importance than that from any other bishop or patriarch.

Guettee cites to the same effect as Tertullian the work published at Paris a few years ago under the name of Origen, entitled *Philosophumena*, "justly attributed," he says, "to St. Hyppolytus, Bishop of Ostia, or to the learned priest Caius." The authorship of the work is unknown, and no documents have yet been discovered that enable the learned to determine with any degree

of certainty by whom it was or could have been written. The work, however, bears internal evidence of having been written by someone belonging to the East, and who lived during the pontificates of St. Victor, St. Zephyrinus, St. Callistus, St. Urban, and perhaps St. Pontian, bishops of Rome, that is to say, from 180 to 235, certainly not later. The work, when published by M. Miller at Paris, in 1851, attracted the attention of English and German Protestants by its gross charges against the two venerated Roman pontiffs and martyrs, St. Zephyrinus and St. Callistus—charges which for the most part refute themselves. But though Protestants have not been able to make much of it against the papacy, Catholics have found in it new and unexpected proofs of the authority extending over the Church in all parts of the world, exercised by the popes of that early period. "In his invectives," says the Abbé Cruice, "the adversary of Callistus acknowledges his great power, and furnishes new and unexpected proofs of the supremacy of the holy see." The Abbe Cruice, who, we think, we have heard recently died Bishop of Marseilles, published at Paris, in 1851, an interesting History of the Church of Rome under the pontificates of St. Victor, St. Zephyrinus, and St. Callistus, in which he has incorporated these proofs with great judgment and effect. As we are not now considering the affirmative proofs of the primacy of the Holy See, but the arguments intended to prove the papacy schismatic, we can only refer the reader to this learned work and to the *Philosophumena* itself. We will only remark that the unknown author is far more bitter against the popes than his contemporary Tertullian and leaves more unequivocal evidence to the extent of the papal power. No one can read the *Philosophumena* without perceiving in the complaints and incidental remarks of the author that the hierarchy at the end of the second century was as regularly organized as now, and precisely in the same manner, with the Roman pontiff at its summit.

Guettee, p. 82, says Tertullian, who in several passages refers to the Church of Rome as a witness to the apostolic tradition, "does not esteem her witness testimony superior to that of others." Perhaps so, for in the cases referred to Tertullian had no occasion to discriminate between one apostolic Church and another. He is using against heretics the argument from prescription. Their doctrines are averse to the apostolic tradition, and therefore false. If anyone would know what is the apostolic tradition, he may learn it from any of the churches founded by apostles "where their sees still remain, where their epistles are still read, where their voice still resounds, and their face, as it were, is still seen. Is it Achaia that is near thee? thou hast Corinth; if thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast the Philippians; if thou canst go to Asia, thou hast Ephesus; if thou dwells near Italy, thou hast Rome, whose authority is near us," that is, near us in Africa. It is true Tertullian pronounces a eulogium [on the Church of Rome that he does not on the others, but no great stress need not be laid on that. Any one of the apostolic churches was sufficient for determining the apostolic tradition, and there was no reason why he should mention the primacy of the See of Peter if he held it, and it would have weakened his argument if he had appealed to that primacy, doubtless then as now rejected by heretics.

All the churches founded by the apostles endured the first three centuries preserving apostolic doctrine or tradition (without the written sacred scriptures in hand) and these traditions were available in Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Ephesus and to the recurring to the supreme authority of Rome; successors of Peter. This is all omitted from Guettee's quotes along with several of the fathers (Popes) who call the See of Antioch, Peter's See. Had Guettee done so, he might have gone further and shown that each of the four great patriarchal Sees, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were so-called, and because they were held to have been

founded by Peter. This is the reason why they received the dignity and authority of all the Eastern Churches. Peter was held to be the authority in each one of them, but more especially in Rome, where he gave his life for his faith, and where his tomb stands. It is Peter who governs indivisible in them all, and consequently, to get Peter's authority, it was not necessary to apply to his successor in the See of Rome. It is this fact, misapprehended by Guettee that the See of Peter, or the chair of Peter, means the universal episcopate which all the bishops, as St. Cyprian says, hold. Every bishop **in communion with Peter's see**, no doubt, was regarded as solidarity with the whole episcopal and apostolic body, as already explained ; but we have not found the "See of Peter," or "chair of Peter" applied to any particular churches, except those tradition asserted were founded by Peter, and only those Sees had originally patriarchal jurisdiction, and this fact is, in itself, no slight proof that the primacy was held to be vested in Peter as we have already explained from St. Cyprian.

This fact that Peter was held to govern in the four great patriarchal Sees, though supremely only in the Church of Rome, explains why it is that in the early ages we find not more frequent instances of the exercise of jurisdiction beyond his own patriarchate of the West by the Roman pontiff. The bishops of these Petrine churches were not originally called patriarchs, but they exercised the patriarchal power long before receiving the name, and probably from times immediately succeeding the apostles. **So long as these patriarchs remained in communion with the bishop of Rome, their head and chief, most of the questions of discipline, and many of those of faith, could be, and were, settled by the patriarch, or local authority, without resort to the Roman pontiff. But when these Sees fell off from unity into heresy or schism, Peter remained only in the Roman See, and all causes that had previously been disposed of by the patriarchs of the East had to be carried at once to Rome, before the supreme court.**

Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were the three chief cities of the empire, and the capitals, the first of the empire itself, and the others of its two largest and most important prefectures. This fact may seem to favor Guettee's theory, that the ecclesiastical superiority is derived from the civil superiority; but had this been so, Jerusalem would hardly have been selected as the seat of the third patriarchate of the East. The geographical position and civil and political importance of these cities may have influenced the apostle in selecting them to be the chief seats of the ecclesiastical government he under Christ was founding, but could not have been the ground of their superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction, because **the Church was not organized as a national religion**, or with a view to the Roman Empire alone, and the apostles themselves carried the gospel beyond the furthest limits of that empire, into regions never penetrated by the Roman eagles. The Church was catholic and was to subsist in all ages and teach all nations, as well as all truth. Our Lord said, "My kingdom is not of this world; it does not hold from the kingdoms of this world, and is independent of them, both in its constitution and in its powers. These remain always and everywhere the same, whatever the revolutions or the rise and fall of states and empires. The authority of the Church is immediately from God; her grandeur and glory are spiritual and not derived from the greatness, grandeur, wealth, or power of earthly cities. St. Augustine makes the city of Rome the type of the city of the world, which he contrasts with the Church or city of God. The idea that the rank or the authority of the bishop derived from the civil rank and importance of the city in which he held his see was a Constantinopolitan idea not heard of till the fifth century, and, as we shall see in its place, one of the chief causes of the schism between the East and the West.

Guettee denies that St. Peter was ever, in the proper sense of the word, bishop of Rome, or of any particular See. If he is right, how could the unity of the Church have a visible starting-point or center? Or how could it be said to begin from Peter or the chair of Peter, as his own witness, St. Cyprian, asserts? If Peter had no particular See, established his See, or set up his chair, his cathedra, nowhere in particular, the whole argument of St. Cyprian as to the origin and manifestation of unity is baseless, and goes for nothing. Besides, it is contradicted by universal tradition. The testimony that Peter had his chair at Rome is ample, and leaves nothing to be desired. But this is not the point. It is for Guettee to prove that he was not bishop of Rome; for he has undertaken to prove the papacy is schismatic, and at every step he takes, **the burden of proof is on him**. Where are his proofs?

Guettee says St. Linus was the bishop of Rome when Peter first arrived in that city. A Church which has a bishop is already a church founded and constituted. Yet the author allows and cites authorities that prove that Peter was the founder, or at least one of the founders, of the Roman Church! That St. Linus was the first bishop of Rome after St. Peter there is no doubt; that St. Linus was the first bishop, or bishop of Rome, **before the arrival of St. Peter in the city, there is no evidence**. The lists given by the fathers sometimes enumerate him as first and sometimes as second, as they do or do not include the apostle; but **all make Linus the successor of St. Peter**. The fathers, in giving the lists of other apostolic sees, are not uniform, and sometimes they include and sometimes they exclude the apostle and reckon only from his death. Eusebius says, as cited by the author, p. 144, "After the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first that received the episcopate at Rome." Tertullian, as also cited by the author, p. 145, says that "Peter sat on the chair of Rome;" but Guettee submits that Tertullian "does not mean that he was bishop, but that he taught there," that is, St. Peter was a professor of theology at Rome! In ecclesiastical language, chair, cathedra, means simply the seat of the bishop, and figuratively the episcopal authority. To say Peter sat in the chair, or cathedra of Rome is saying simply he was bishop of Rome. The presumption is, that Tertullian meant what he said, understood according to the usages of the language he used. Besides, if chair may sometimes be used figuratively for teaching, it is Guettee's business to prove that it must mean so in this particular case. This he cannot do.

Guettee pretends that the tradition which makes Peter seven years bishop of Antioch and twenty-five years bishop of Rome is obviously false; for any one can see by counting that there was not time enough for it between the day of Pentecost and the martyrdom of Peter. The day of Pentecost, according to the usual reckoning, was in A. D. 33, and St. Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome under Nero, A. n. 66, or at the earliest 65. But even an error in the chronology would not prove that Peter was not bishop of Rome.

The pretense that it was incompatible with the dignity of an apostle to be the bishop of a particular See has nothing to sustain it. It is not necessary to suppose Peter, by establishing his See at Rome, was obliged to confine his whole attention and labor to only the Church in Rome. Indeed, it is very possible, and thought by many to be very probable, that he committed the care of that Church during his absences to St. Linus as his vicar, and there are several authorities to that effect. Some of them join Pope St. Anacletus, also known as Cletus, was the third Bishop of Rome and St. Clement, successively bishops of Rome, with St. Linus in the government of the Roman Church under Peter during his lifetime; but, however this may have been, tradition is constant that St. Linus was the immediate successor of Peter, which at least

implies that Peter was regarded as having held the See as well as having assisted in founding it; for otherwise St. Linus could not have been regarded as his successor, and no reason could be assigned why he was called the successor of Peter, rather than of Paul, who also assisted in founding it, and is honored even today by the Roman Church as one of its founders.

Guettee's theory point by point, the authorities he cites do not support him, as with St. Cyprian, speak point blank against him. Guettee may have demolished **the man of straw** which he himself had set up, but he leaves standing the papacy as held by the Catholic Church and defined by the Council of Florence. He has asserted in very strong terms the ignorance, the chicanery, the sophistry, and the dishonesty of the Roman theologians "he" cites, and leaves no doubt in the minds of intelligent readers that he greatly excels them in the qualities and practices he ascribes to them; but he adduces nothing beyond his own assertions and misrepresentations. From first to last Guettee proves that he lacks the modesty and reserve of true learning and science, and that he is moved not by love of truth, but hatred and revenge.

It would be simple to close here but we must not forget, Guettee's work has been translated and published here under Protestant auspices, set up as an important work against the papal authority and the Church of Rome, "the root and matrix of the Catholic Church," as St. Cyprian said, and, were it left unnoticed, many people might take it to be what Guettee represented to be, and conclude that we cannot answer it because we have not done it.

Besides, the controversy between large classes of Protestants and Catholics is narrowed down to two questions, **the honor we render to Mary the mother of God**, and **the authority we attribute to the Holy See and the Roman pontiff**.

Guettee, having been reared as a Catholic and separated from Catholicism because he was not truly Catholic in the first place, and doing his best to prove the "papacy schismatic", and that its assertion has been the cause of the schism between the East and the West, it affords to discuss the latter question, and to consider the arguments, facts, and authorities alleged in their defense by those who refuse their obedience to St. Peter in his successor. The work he presents contains in some form all that schismatic allege first and last against her.

Article II

Guettee published a second part of his thesis but based on the first article and its lack of weight and convincing arguments, we refrain from even citing the second article wherein he tries to lean on even less authoritative theologians and misquotes many other church fathers.